

“America’s Scapegoats”

Ideas of Fascism in the Construction of the US
Latina/o/x Left, 1973–83

Michael Staudenmaier

In 1980, speaking to the United Nations Special Committee on Decolonization, the Chicago-based Puerto Rican independence activist José E. López railed against the specter of fascism in the United States. He argued strenuously that the Caribbean commonwealth of his birth—formally known as a “Freely Associated State” and in legal terms an unincorporated territory of the United States—was in fact a colony, and thus should fall under the purview of the UN Committee. López drew on the exemplary case of Nazi Germany to connect the problem of colonialism on a global stage with the threat of fascism: “One has only to look at Hitler addressing one million applauding German workers to understand that his ability to do this was at the expense of millions of lives of Jews, Poles, and other Slavs, whom he sacrificed as scapegoats. One does not have to be a wise man to decipher who are to be America’s scapegoats. They most certainly will be found,” he concluded, “in this country’s internal colonies—the Blacks, the Chicano-Mexicanos, the Puerto Ricans and the Native Americans.”¹

By 1980, López was an experienced community organizer and a leading member of a small US-based revolutionary group named the Movimiento de Liberación Nacional (National Liberation Movement, or MLN). The MLN was one tiny part of a wave of radicalism to emerge in the United States in the aftermath of the upheaval of the late 1960s. While the decade of the 1960s has remained fixed in

Radical History Review

Issue 138 (October 2020) DOI 10.1215/01636545-8359247

© 2020 by MARHO: The Radical Historians’ Organization, Inc.

popular memory for its radicalism, the 1970s featured its own dizzying array of community organizing projects, cultural centers, study groups, and self-declared revolutionary parties, most of which were motivated by various combinations of Marxism, nationalism, feminism, and other ideological frameworks.² What made the MLN unique in this broad milieu was its binational character as a group that brought together two specific sets of revolutionaries under one organizational umbrella: its members included both Puerto Rican nationalists and Chicana/o/x militants, who routinely labeled themselves “Mexicanos” because they rejected the post-1848 border separating the United States from Mexico.³ Its activism principally focused on resisting its own repression by the federal government, and López perhaps predictably held that the danger of fascism, whether in the United States or elsewhere in the Americas, was directly linked to the power of the state to stifle dissent in racially charged ways.

López’s UN speech, and indeed the overall body of work of the MLN, exemplified one crucial vector of a broader trend among radicals of color in the 1970s and 1980s that linked state repression, colonialism, and fascism, frequently with unexpected repercussions for broader issues of race and ethnicity. In this particular case, a relative handful of committed militants helped develop and promote a notion of US Latina/o/x panethnicity. They did so because they believed this was a necessary precondition for, among other tasks, defeating the threat fascism presented to Puerto Ricans, Chicana/o/xs, and other distinct national groupings. While the 1970s are frequently identified as a pivotal decade for the construction, whether from above or below, of what today is sometimes referred to as “Latinidad” (a common, if complicated, identity based on shared experiences among US residents of Latin American birth or heritage), the role of political radicals in this development has largely been ignored.⁴ Nonetheless, for organized Left forces in diverse Latina/o/x communities during the post-1960s era, fascism provided a coherent frame for understanding a common threat. It also offered a clear impetus to collective action, which in turn further advanced the development of panethnic connections within and beyond radical sectors. In the event, Chicana/o/x and Puerto Rican revolutionaries built deliberate political alliances with each other as a way to respond both to rising attacks on their communities and to the defeats suffered by inspirational Left forces abroad.

The idea of fascism helped Puerto Rican and Chicana/o/x radicals theorize not only their own oppression as internally colonized peoples in continental North America but also their relationships with a rapidly transforming Latin America. During the decade after the US-sponsored right-wing coup in Chile removed Salvador Allende from power in 1973, the MLN and other participants in the US Latina/o/x Left denounced as fascist Latin American leaders as disparate as Chilean dictator Augusto Pinochet, Mexican president Luis Echeverría, and Puerto Rican

governor Carlos Romero Barceló. While the precise utility of the term *fascism* as a descriptor for these figures and others was (and remains) subject to challenge, the rise of the New Right and ultraconservative forces certainly represents a major theme in the transnational political historiography of the Western Hemisphere in the 1970s and 1980s, from Pinochet and Ronald Reagan to Central American death squads and a resurgent Ku Klux Klan.⁵ Dealing with issues ranging from police brutality to border enforcement, US Latina/o/x activists found themselves and their allies repeatedly on the defensive and, in response, they accelerated the process of developing a shared identity through common struggles on both a regional and transnational scale. It is clear—and on some level deeply ironic—that the rise of ultraconservative and/or fascist tendencies in the United States and on the hemispheric stage helped lay the groundwork for contemporary ideas of Latina/o/x identity, against which so much twenty-first-century white nationalism in the United States has in turn been deployed.

This article situates the MLN as a case study of this two-part process, both reactive and proactive. Responding to intense state repression, the MLN developed a theory of fascism that, despite analytical limits, helped mobilize a broader radical response to the threat of right-wing governments both in the United States and across Latin America. This defensive maneuver contributed directly to an ambitious and forward-looking attempt to organize Latina/o/xs across lines of national identity. The MLN's binational life span was brief; by 1983 the group split amicably into two separate organizations, one Puerto Rican and the other Mexicana/o/x.⁶ Nonetheless, this tiny grouping, in its relatively short window of organizational unity, had an outsized impact on the construction of Latinidad, helping set in motion the emergence of US Latina/o/x identity as it exists in the twenty-first century.

The Emergence of the MLN: State Repression and Pan-Latina/o/x Radicalism

The logic of scapegoating that López described in 1980 was built on an analysis of decades of direct government attacks on Puerto Rican radicals, both in Puerto Rico and stateside. Many facets of the infamous COINTELPRO program—in which the FBI attempted to surveil and disrupt potentially “subversive” political activity that in theory should have been constitutionally protected under the First Amendment—were pioneered in Puerto Rico before being implemented in the United States proper, with independence activists being the primary targets.⁷ By the mid-1970s, repression against the Puerto Rican independence movement had reached new heights. The emergence of a highly visible armed clandestine wing of the movement, most prominently in the form of the Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional (Armed Forces of National Liberation, or FALN) active after 1974 in New York, Chicago, and other diasporic centers, generated a polarizing debate about revolutionary strategy among both Puerto Rican and Chicana/o/x radicals, but it also

precipitated a predictably aggressive response from the federal government. The FBI actively investigated anyone with even a tangential connection to the diasporic independence movement, and by 1976 multiple federal grand juries had begun targeting both Puerto Rican and Chicana/o/x activists. Those called as witnesses had little choice beyond either testifying against comrades or accepting jail time as a punishment for the refusal to do so.⁸

In June 1977, Puerto Ricans based in New York and Chicago, as well as Chicana/o/xs active in Chicago, Colorado, New Mexico, and elsewhere, founded the *Movimiento de Liberación Nacional*. The MLN conceived of itself as a vehicle for “the strategic unity of Chicanos-Mexicanos and Puerto Ricans within the framework of one organization.”⁹ Much of the impetus to create the MLN’s innovative panethnic organization was reactive, since in some ways the central common experience of Chicana/o/x and Puerto Rican militants in the 1970s was repression and attacks by the US government. Almost every member of the founding leadership of the organization had already been subpoenaed to one or more of the grand juries. As José López recalled decades later, Puerto Rican and Mexicana/o/x radicals had by 1977 reached the point where “we understood that we could no longer do this work as separate entities. We needed a unified world view for the people facing grand jury repression. Mexican people were going to prison and at that time we saw the importance of unifying what few resources we had as Puerto Ricans and Mexicans.”¹⁰ The binational structure of the MLN was highly unorthodox, but the notion of multiethnic alliances, especially those connecting black organizers with either Puerto Rican or Chicana/o/x activists, had been popularized over the previous decade by efforts like Martin Luther King Jr.’s Poor People’s Campaign and the original Rainbow Coalition in Chicago, led by the local chapter of the Black Panther Party for Self Defense.¹¹ While acknowledging the need for all colonized racial groups to collaborate in an anti-imperialist framework, the MLN’s very existence suggested that the links connecting its two constituent nationalities were stronger than those that tied them to black and indigenous allies, or to radicals in the nominally sovereign nations of Latin America itself, from Mexico to Chile.

The militants who founded the MLN had come of age in the midst of the initial high period of the Chicana/o/x and Puerto Rican movements of the late 1960s and early 1970s, and many had experience in older organizations like the Young Lords and Puerto Rican Socialist Party in Chicago and New York City, and the Crusade for Justice in Denver. While profoundly nationalist in their outlook, they increasingly came to see their own experiences of oppression and resistance as intimately linked to those of others, living inside the borders of the United States, who shared Latin American heritage. Like prior generations, their Marxist commitment to internationalism led them to advocate a transnational approach to revolutionary politics that attempted to link struggles in Chile and Mexico (among other Latin American countries) with US urban centers and rural regions containing large Spanish-speaking populations.¹²

The Chilean case proved particularly influential on the MLN's founders. The 1973 coup and its aftermath had coincided with their own political coming-of-age, and it presented a case study in the twin dangers of state repression and fascism. The example resonated even more intensely once several leading members of the newly established MLN found themselves sitting in federal prison, held in contempt of court for refusal to testify in front of the grand juries. In September 1977, just three months after the founding of the MLN and on the fourth anniversary of Pinochet's coup, they issued a communiqué from jail that highlighted the transnational impact of the Chilean tragedy while signaling the comparable dangers throughout the Southern Cone and as far north as the Caribbean and the United States. The communiqué argued, in part, that "the fall of the Salvador Allende government in Chile, as well as the emergence of fascism in Uruguay, Bolivia, and Argentina, have had a profound impact on the Puerto Rican people and its independence movement."¹³ Framed as an open letter to the Chilean revolutionary group *Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria* (Revolutionary Left Movement, or MIR), the document built an analogy from the Chilean experience to the situation of the US Latina/o/x populations, with the dangers of a totalitarian state as the unifying thread.

The need for a theory of fascism formed the core lesson the MLN prisoners took from the Chilean experience. And the importance of Chile to the state of hemispheric politics in the 1970s highlighted the shared Latin American cultural heritage that brought Puerto Rican and Chicana/o/x radicals together in and around the MLN. But conditions were not the same in every locale, and the imperatives of internationalist anti-fascism looked different inside the imperial stronghold of the United States. Here, the particular contours of internal colonialism brought together Puerto Ricans and Mexicans specifically and prompted them to collective action. For many early members and supporters of the MLN, FBI counterintelligence efforts and the use of federal grand juries as a political weapon appeared to be first steps toward a fascist turn inside the United States that had already proven horrifically disastrous in Chile. This analysis proved wrong in the event, but for the Puerto Rican and Chicana/o/x radicals who participated in or supported the MLN during the 1970s and 1980s, it did much to promote an embryonic sense of panethnicity, and even more to sensitize them to the threat of fascism, however that fraught term was defined.

Defining Fascism: Mexico and Puerto Rico

Pinochet's brutality, as well as the lasting influence of the Black Panther Party (in particular, their high-profile 1969 conference promoting a "United Front Against Fascism"), led many radicals to utilize *fascist* as a broadly applicable and frequently deployed epithet.¹⁴ But the term did not go untheorized in Puerto Rican and Chicana/o/x movement circles. For the MLN and many other US Latina/o/x radicals of the late 1970s, fascism was first and foremost an extreme variant of state repression under capitalism. Much of the US Leninist Left during this period, regardless of

national origin, drew on the classic phrasing that originated in theses approved by the Thirteenth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Soviet-led Communist International (the so-called Third International or Comintern) in 1933: “Fascism is the open terroristic dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital.”¹⁵ The context for this declaration, which has largely been associated with Giorgi Dimitrov, a Bulgarian Communist who popularized the formulation as head of the Comintern beginning in 1934, was the sharp rightward turn in Europe in the context of the Great Depression, and especially Adolf Hitler’s rise to power in Germany months before the Thirteenth Plenum. The logic and usefulness of Dimitrov’s definition has been skillfully and appropriately challenged in various ways by generations of anti-fascist activists and scholars, who have instead highlighted the autonomous and insurgent character of fascism as a social movement frequently subject to forms of state repression that mirror those applied to Left insurgencies.¹⁶

Whatever the flaws in such an understanding, the MLN put significant effort into applying it to then-contemporary conditions in the United States and across the Western Hemisphere. It saw echoes of the Depression in the global economic downturn of the 1970s, and of Nazi Germany in the government attacks political radicals were facing during the second half of the 1970s. This latter category included not only the grand juries in the United States and the generalized repression in Chile, but also military and police violence in Mexico, Puerto Rico, and elsewhere. In a historical and theoretical analysis of new trends in international capitalism, published in 1979, the MLN maintained that “the choice of fascism was thus a new political option open to capitalism for internal dominance. Fascism is an intensely ideological form of capitalist thought, tending to the mobilization of an entire society for the implementation of imperialist policies.”¹⁷ The link to López’s speech to the UN the next year was clear: fascism, whether in Depression-era Europe or the stagflation-plagued 1970s, built collective unity in a crisis-ridden society by targeting—“scapegoating”—marginalized peoples.

This analysis clearly echoed the classic 1950 essay “Discourse on Colonialism” by the Martinican writer Aimé Césaire. For Césaire, fascism was the imposition at home of the horrors of imperialism that were previously restricted to the colonies themselves. In his construction, first world liberals—embodied in “the very distinguished, very humanistic, very Christian bourgeois of the twentieth century”—fundamentally misunderstand the nature of fascist criminality: “At bottom, what he cannot forgive Hitler for is not *the crime* itself, *the crime against man*, it is not *the humiliation of man as such*, it is the crime against the white man, and the fact that he applied to Europe colonialist procedures which until then had been reserved exclusively for the Arabs of Algeria, the ‘coolies’ of India, and the ‘niggers’ of Africa.”¹⁸ In 1966, Césaire’s treatise was translated into Spanish and published in Cuba; it took until 1972 for it to be translated into English.¹⁹ Like the various theories of internal

colonialism developed in the United States in the late 1960s, Césaire served as a lodestone for both the MLN and other Spanish-speaking radicals across the hemisphere.²⁰

Nor were the imprisoned MLN members the first to describe the various South American military dictatorships as fascist. When the US-backed military coup overthrew Allende in 1973 and installed General Augusto Pinochet as dictator, many in the Latin American Left were quick to label the outcome. Within weeks, Cuban leader Fidel Castro denounced Pinochet as the head of a "fascist coup" and boldly claimed that "the Chilean people will fight fascism."²¹ Student protesters in Mexico City the following June carried signs reading "Muera el fascismo Chileno y sus bufones" (Death to Chilean fascism and its clowns).²² Seeing fascism as a top-down, right-wing modality of capitalism, rather than an insurgent threat from the far right that challenged capitalist hegemony, it became easier to categorize a wide variety of ruling elites across the globe as fascist.

This theory of fascism also generated specific strategic imperatives. As the state itself became for the MLN and other Latina/o/x radicals the essential element of fascism, it also came to be seen as an illegitimate strategic orientation for anti-fascists. That is to say, the MLN strongly opposed using appeals to government authorities—whether in Puerto Rico or stateside—as a mechanism in the fight against fascism. The MLN's approach deliberately echoed an older formulation, *retramiento* (literally, "withdrawal"), associated with the mid-century Puerto Rican nationalist leader Pedro Albizu Campos, who argued for total noncollaboration with the colonial regime. More recent notions of "no platform"—the use of direct action rather than appeals to police in order to prevent fascist and far-right activists from appearing in public—have in some ways carried forward the tradition of distancing anti-fascist organizing from the state. As Mark Bray notes regarding twenty-first-century struggles against fascism, "militant anti-fascists oppose harnessing state power to suppress fascism because of their anti-state politics and their belief that any such measures would more often be turned against the left."²³ While the MLN was not anti-statist per se, the latter concern regarding state repression was integral to its own existence, not merely hypothetical.

For the MLN, *retramiento* served as a guiding principle in defining the limits and possibilities of the battle against fascism and the state. Speaking at an anti-fascist conference in San Francisco in 1981, Steven Guerra, a Chicano-Mexicano member of the MLN from Chicago, challenged the use of state repression against the Klan: "We must recognize that the state is our prime enemy, and no compromise with it is possible. And for this reason, we must never collaborate with the state in any endeavor. To call for grand jury investigations of the Klan or police killings, is to ask for a cancer to cure itself."²⁴ The alternative, for Guerra and the rest of the MLN, was to build panethnic unity, both among self-identified leftists and within broader, transnational communities. For the binational MLN, this strategic

principle extended well beyond the United States. In fact, the sovereign and non-sovereign homelands of the MLN's two component national groups, Mexico and Puerto Rico, became crucial proving grounds for their theory of fascism and their strategy for fighting it.

In the late 1960s and into the 1970s, as Alan Eladio Gómez has detailed, the Chicana/o/x movement in the United States was deeply divided over the question of how to understand the political character of Mexico itself. For the cultural nationalists who made up the largest tendency within the movement, Mexico was, first and foremost, the once and future national homeland and was thus to be praised by contrast with the imperialist United States. Luis Echeverría, president of Mexico from 1970 to 1976, staked out a populist politics that appealed to widespread pride in Mexican identity within and beyond the republic. He also readily granted asylum to political refugees from Chile and other Latin American countries under right-wing military dictatorships, most prominently Allende's widow, Hortensia Bussi. Such actions were lauded by many Chicana/o/x nationalists in the United States, even though, as Fernando Herrera Calderón and Adela Cedillo note, "welcoming political exiles reveal[ed] a number of contradictions within Mexico's foreign and domestic policies. By providing asylum, the PRI [Partido Revolucionario Institucional, or Institutional Revolutionary Party] supported, for 'humanitarian' reasons, guerillas abroad while persecuting in the name of patriotism, anyone who questioned its revolutionary nationalism at home."²⁵ Indeed, a core of Chicana/o/x leftists of the era denounced Echeverría for his role in the 1968 Tlatelolco Massacre of student militants in Mexico City, for his record of imprisoning leftists, and for collaborating with the Nixon administration to spy on radicals on both sides of the Rio Grande.

Thus, when Echeverría visited San Antonio, Texas, in 1976, leftist Chicana/o/x protesters, led by Mario Cantú, demonstrated against his arrival. In the absence of significant police protection, Cantú was able to confront Echeverría in person, holding a sign that read (in Spanish) "Free Political Prisoners." In Gómez's telling,

As they came face to face, Echeverría took Cantú's sign, tore it in half, and called him a "pequeño joven fascista" (little fascist). Returning the "fascist" insult, Cantú then held an impromptu press conference to announce he was cancelling the protest for the rest of the week in light of the violence. "[Echeverría] demonstrated to the world that he is a fascist," Cantú said. "He should be responsive. He has the attitude of a dictator, like in Chile."²⁶

This vignette connects several of threads in the tapestry of the MLN and Latina/o/x radical analysis of fascism in the 1970s. Cantú himself had never been directly connected with the MLN, but he been radicalized as a Chicana/o/x nationalist while in prison in the United States. Among those who helped inspire his politicization were several Puerto Rican nationalist prisoners, including Rafael Cancél Miranda, who

also had a direct influence on the MLN's political development. Further, Cantú's comparison of Mexico to Chile, as previously noted, was particularly potent in the period after the 1973 coup, when part of Echeverría's credibility came from his willingness to grant asylum to Bussi, the widow of Allende. And, finally, Cantú's quick turnabout of Echeverría's insult reflected the delicate balance between "fascist" as a catchall insult and fascism as a constituent element of the conjuncture against which any revolutionary US Latina/o/x politics must position itself.

Under the regime of Echeverría's successor as president of Mexico, José López Portillo, the MLN, and other Chicana/o/x radicals began to use fascism as a lens to understand the continuous one-party rule of the PRI in Mexico since the 1920s. In 1982, the MLN and other groups organized a protest at the Mexican consulate in Denver, Colorado. Amid a laundry list of demands, protesters aimed "to expose the fascist nature of the repressive PRI government, which is nothing more than a built-in dictatorship, in control for over 60 years."²⁷ That same year, white radicals in the Prairie Fire Organizing Committee, which publicly declared that it took leadership on US Latina/o/x issues from the MLN, argued that "behind the PRI's carefully constructed 'progressive' mask is the face of fascism," and, commenting specifically on the Central American civil wars that were then heating up, maintained that "when revolution is on its doorstep, threatening the stability of Mexico itself, the façade of internationalism can't be maintained and fascist repression is the response."²⁸ While this analysis of PRI fascism never gained a wide foothold within the US Latina/o/x Left, it did at least superficially resonate with increasingly common criticisms of Mexico's authoritarian system of one-party rule.

The specifics in Puerto Rico were rather different, but a comparable analysis identified the threat of fascism in power during the same era. Puerto Rico's nominal status as "self-governing" was (and remains) largely based on its free and open elections structured around a political party system that partially resembled that in the United States itself. Of the main political parties, the New Progressive Party (PNP), which advocated for Puerto Rico's admission as the fifty-first state, was widely understood as the archipelago's most conservative political tendency. In 1980, the MLN applied the group's theory of fascism to the situation on the island by targeting the PNP, or at least sections of it, in a discussion paper: "In 1976, an ideologized fascist clique at the head of the PNP, came to power in colonial elections. . . . The colonial fascist[s] under the leadership of [Governor] Carlos Romero Barceló set about the transformation of the balance of forces in our homeland, and the mobilization of the masses of Puerto Ricans to support statehood."²⁹ Here again, for the MLN and other pro-independence groups, the link between fascism, colonialism, and government repression was clear: becoming a state would permanently cement the colonial subjugation of the Puerto Rican nation by the United States, and the MLN argued that the PNP's "fascist clique" was actively utilizing the power of the (colonial) state to promote statehood and to crack down harshly on dissent from

the Left. This was a problematic interpretation, to say the least. The notion that pro-statehood control of the Puerto Rican government amounted to fascism implied a fundamental contradiction within the MLN's overall theoretical frame: if Puerto Rico was indeed a colony controlled by the United States, then self-rule was a myth, in which case the PNP did not actually hold the sort of state power that the MLN and others believed was central to their definition of fascism. Nor would statehood itself produce fascism, since the constraints of the constitutional system necessarily made states subordinate to the federal government.

Nonetheless, whether accurately described as fascist or not, the government of Puerto Rico during the 1970s was undeniably brutal. It was, as the MLN noted, deeply engaged in a wide variety of counterinsurgency measures. Describing a later period of PNP control in the 1990s, Marisol LeBrón has used the term *punitive governance* to describe "the ideological work undertaken by the state to promote an understanding that punishment, justice, and safety are intrinsically linked."³⁰ The similarities between LeBrón's formulation and José López's notion of "scapegoating" are made clear in any assessment of the PNP's regime in the later 1970s. Romero Barceló's government inherited and actively utilized a long-standing counterintelligence apparatus that kept files on thousands of dissidents in a system of *carpetas* (folders) that resembled and was frequently coordinated with the FBI's COINTELPRO efforts.³¹ Dozens of radical activists were targeted for more proactive forms of harassment, including arrests, grand juries, and police violence.

In the most notorious case, undercover police lured two young pro-independence militants to a remote mountaintop and murdered them after they had surrendered without resistance. The incident, universally known by its location, Cerro Maravilla, scandalized Puerto Ricans on all sides of the status question, in part because the entrapment was so egregious and in part because the extrajudicial killings were so brutal.³² It also led directly to the disclosure of the long-hidden *carpetas*. If "America's scapegoats" were marginalized racial groups, the PNP targeted both marginalized populations and fringe political organizations, including the most radical sectors of the independence movement. Surveillance, investigations, and targeted violence against pro-independence revolutionaries served a double purpose: to discredit or even to dismember the militant Left, and to convince a majority of Puerto Ricans that backing statehood was the only solution to so-called terrorist subversion.

Like Echeverría, Romero Barceló attempted to fuse political repression with populist rhetoric, which was more than enough for the MLN and other radical US Latina/o/x militants to label him a fascist. For the membership and leadership of the MLN, based neither in Mexico nor in Puerto Rico, the very breadth of the fascist danger, stretching from the Southern Cone to Mesoamerica to the Caribbean, served as an object lesson in the necessity of panethnic identity and binational organization. Inside the continental United States, the stakes were, if anything, even higher.

Surviving Reagan's America(s)

If fascist threats in Latin America presented a cause for concern within the MLN and among other US Latina/o/x militants, not even high-profile acts of state terror at Cerro Maravilla and Tlatelolco could match the urgent challenge of responding to fascism within the United States. For the MLN, fascism in the United States was a double danger, as both governmental and vigilante groups targeted marginalized racial groups for attacks. Under this theory, Puerto Ricans were the primary targets of state attacks, via the grand juries and police harassment, while Chicana/o/xs were the core targets of violence perpetrated by the extragovernmental far right. Thus, while the two communities faced different immediate threats, the MLN interpreted them as two aspects of a singular reality: Latina/o/x people, regardless of national or ethnic distinctions, had become "America's scapegoats"; to fight back successfully, they would need to work together.

For Chicana/o/xs in particular, this marked a dramatic shift that required some rethinking of the theory of fascism that the MLN had developed with reference to Latin America. While right-wing paramilitary groups were endemic to the region as a whole during this period, the strength of the repressive state actually made them atypically scarce in the three places to which Puerto Rican and Chicana/o/x radicals of the era paid the most attention: Chile, Mexico, and Puerto Rico. In the United States, by contrast, the 1970s featured a resurgent Ku Klux Klan and a small but vibrant neo-Nazi movement, both of which began to target Mexican and Mexican-descended people for violence and intimidation.

Two distinct transformations in extragovernmental right-wing domestic politics during the late 1970s ensured that fascist activity specifically targeted Chicana/o/x residents of the southwestern United States, alongside Mexican immigrants to that region. First, as Raquel Minian has demonstrated, the militarization of the US-Mexico border, beginning under Richard Nixon and continuing through the following decades, created an opening for white nationalists of the post-Civil Rights era to reframe their racist sentiments in the more acceptable rhetoric of opposition to immigration, while carefully pretending to do so without explicit reference to race or ethnicity.³³ Second, by the end of the decade, old-line Ku Klux Klan forces had begun a realignment that anti-fascist activist Michael Novick has described as "the Nazification of the KKK."³⁴ Kathleen Belew suggests that the core principle uniting these previously antagonistic strands of white power was a shared desire "for a war against communists, blacks, and other enemies."³⁵ US Latina/o/x radicals found themselves a direct target of this evolving new phase of fascist organizing.

One early venue in which these new trends began to emerge was the anti-immigrant "Border Watch," sometimes known as "Klan Border Watch," established by white nationalists in the US Southwest in the mid-1970s. Led in southern California by Tom Metzger and a handful of other KKK organizers, this effort aimed to demonize Mexican immigrants as "illegal alien mixed-bloods" and promoted

paramilitary violence against them as a way to establish the white racial purity of the southwestern United States.³⁶ Metzger, a rising Klan organizer in Southern California and future founder of the White Aryan Resistance (WAR), typified the convergence of neo-Nazi and old-line Klan tendencies, as well as the willingness of far-right activists to advocate for, and secure for themselves if necessary, the militarization of the border.

Some US-based radicals first seriously took note of the surging domestic danger of fascism when it was highlighted with violent severity near the end of 1979 in Greensboro, North Carolina. Over the course of that year, Klan and neo-Nazi forces in the Carolinas had worked diligently to develop a working alliance called the United Racist Front.³⁷ On November 3, the Front attacked a “Death to the Klan” rally in a public housing project, killing five members of a small Maoist organization, the Communist Workers Party (CWP), in what subsequently became known as the Greensboro massacre. It was not lost on the US Latina/o/x Left, in particular, that one of the five dead was César Vicente Cauce, a twenty-five-year-old Cuban immigrant and CWP organizer. Cauce, who had been radicalized as a student, did not fit the typical profile of the MLN or other wings of the Puerto Rican and Chicana/o/x Left: his father had been a cabinet secretary under Cuban dictator Fulgencio Batista, and his parents had fled to the United States with other wealthy elites after the 1959 revolution that brought Fidel Castro to power.³⁸ These particulars didn’t impress white power militants, who later falsely claimed that Cauce had arrived in the United States as part of the Mariel boatlift, which in fact didn’t begin until five months after the massacre in Greensboro. For far-right anti-immigration ideologues, Mariel represented the Caribbean equivalent of Mexicans crossing the southwestern land border. In 1983, one fascist publication posthumously connected Cauce to the “thousands of undesirables” Castro had supposedly sent as an advance guard “for his planned communist overthrow of the U.S. government,” rearticulating the anti-immigrant and anti-Latina/o/x racism of Metzger’s Klan Border Watch within the now-unified Klan and neo-Nazi nexus.³⁹

In the aftermath of the Greensboro massacre, leftists of various stripes began to assess the threat of Klan and fascist violence in a new light. It had suddenly become harder to deny the risks run by the organized Left, as well as the danger to working-class and frequently immigrant-heavy communities of color. Radicals of color sat at the intersection of these two lines of attack. Having been subject to targeted far-right violence for more than a generation, they brought particular historical and theoretical insights to these conversations. In November 1981, commemorating the second anniversary of Greensboro, a national anti-Klan conference was held in San Francisco. Guillermo Suarez, a Chicano-Mexicano from Los Angeles, spoke on behalf of the MLN, highlighting the special threat fascism presented to colonized people living in the United States during the Reagan era.

Speaking to a largely white audience of anti-Klan activists, Suarez offered an extended history lesson in which the annexation of northern Mexico by the United States via the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was the crucial pivot point. In this context, Suarez argued, "the Klan today represents but a continuation of that mentality . . . of white supremacy."⁴⁰ But while the line was straight, it wasn't necessarily continuous. Although a small number of local Klan factions in the Southwest expressed hostility to Mexican migrant laborers prior to 1924, historian Thomas Pegram notes that "Ku Kluxers in other centers of Mexican American settlement, however, remained silent."⁴¹ Indeed, Suarez next turned to the Johnson-Reed Immigration Act of 1924, which created the United States Border Patrol. He argued that the second-era KKK's endorsement of the patrol marked "the first time that the Klan makes its appearance with respect to Mexicano people."⁴² By the 1970s, Metzger's Border Watch efforts had yet again made the Klan a top-tier concern for Chicana/o/x radicals, and Suarez detailed extensive organizing done by the Brown Berets and other militant groups to prevent Metzger from completing a Klan-sponsored car caravan from San Diego to Brownsville, Texas, designed to intimidate immigrants.

Drawing on the MLN's critique of state power, Suarez maintained that "ultimately the question of the Klan must be tied to the question of the state, and without a clear understanding of the state and its repressive role, and without a clear understanding of the strategy to defeat it, we will not be able to eliminate the Klan."⁴³ Since the MLN demanded the socialist reunification of Mexico on the basis of the pre-1848 border, "the struggle against the Klan has to be tied to the struggle [for] the destruction of the United States, as we currently know it"; alternatively phrased, "the only way they [the KKK] will be defeated is through the destruction of US imperialism."⁴⁴ Indeed, this broader project of revolutionary anti-imperialism represented the indispensable strategic core of the MLN's politics, to which Suarez hoped to recruit a broader audience of anti-Klan militants.

Nonetheless, the threat of fascism was not limited to the intersection between the state's repressive apparatus and the self-avowed white power movement. Ronald Reagan's ability to unify a broad swath of right-wing tendencies was particularly notable for its mobilization of conservative Christians. In 1983, the MLN published an essay written by Oscar López Rivera, a political prisoner and José López's older brother. In it, López Rivera examined the rising power of right-wing evangelicals in both the United States and Latin America. "Every Latin American and progressive North American," he argued, "must be conscious of these fundamentalist sects because they are the stronghold of imperialism and the ideological bastion of fascism."⁴⁵ He further suggested that they "intend to break the cultural wall and establish the base for fascist ideology in the U.S."⁴⁶ Where his brother had focused on identifying "America's scapegoats," López Rivera was more concerned

with determining who was planning to do the scapegoating and how. Writing well before the full extent of the Guatemalan genocide of the 1980s was clear, López Rivera maintained that US-based evangelicals helped bring the born-again General Efraín Ríos Montt to power in Guatemala, and suggested they would next turn their attentions toward their own country.⁴⁷ A decade after the Chilean coup, the connection between Latin American fascism and US fascism remained clear, at least in the depictions offered by the MLN.

Conclusion

The MLN's unique experiment in cross-national organization ended in 1983 with a declaration that "our organization has reached a level of political growth and maturity, that in actual fact, does not permit us to continue with the same organizational structure that has characterized it since its beginning."⁴⁸ To some extent, this reflected the continuing problem of government repression: according to the communiqué, "in the past two years, over fifty members and sympathizers have been arrested or detained by US authorities on unsubstantiated charges," including "four members of our national leadership [who] are presently facing a three year sentence for criminal contempt."⁴⁹ One of these was Steven Guerra, who ended up serving slightly less than two years in federal prison due to his refusal to cooperate with yet another federal grand jury investigating the Puerto Rican independence movement. At the height of the Reagan revolution, the MLN thus devolved into two distinct groups, the MLN-PR and the MLN-M, which remained friendly but pursued their respective projects of national liberation independently.

Despite this breakup, the overall project of *Latinidad* as a panethnic identity in the United States was actually far stronger by the mid-1980s than it had been a dozen or even a half dozen years before. Grassroots activists had successfully forced the United States Census Bureau to add a question to the 1980 census regarding "Hispanic" identity, with the eventual result that, as Cristina Mora puts it, the bureau's "reports and charts insinuated that Hispanics constituted a distinct group that was commensurate with whites and blacks."⁵⁰ Of course, this process was a double-edged sword: on the one hand, it generated economies of scale for the US Latina/o/x population in terms of both electioneering and the distribution of governmental resources, resulting in a rapid increase in Puerto Rican and Chicana/o/x officeholders as well as greater visibility for the communities' political demands. But it did little to benefit the organized Latina/o/x Left, of which the MLN was a small but significant part. Further, it legitimated long-standing far-right fears of the racial degeneration of the United States, even as it gave cover to racist attacks on Latina/o/x people as the source of the impurity.

The MLN, never a large or well-known organization, strenuously rejected any and all appeals to the US government as reformist and characteristic of a colonial mentality. Nonetheless, it contributed in an outsized fashion to the slow

emergence of US Latina/o/x identity during and after this period. The group combined three elements into a potent mixture: a hemispheric political analysis of allies and enemies; a shared culture of resistance against internal colonialism; and an understanding of a common enemy in the fascist potentials of state power. In doing so, the MLN helped ensure that grassroots activists of widely divergent politics and various ethnonational backgrounds struggled together to defend their communities against the attacks of an emboldened far right. Many of the local organizers who embraced this panethnic logic—educators, public health workers, and others doing the quotidian work the Black Panthers had labeled “survival pending revolution”—did not identify as nationalists, which allowed them to embrace panethnicity all the more thoroughly.⁵¹

In this context, it is unsurprising that the MLN itself could not survive the transformations of the 1980s. As Mora notes, the success of *Latinidad* depended precisely on the failure of its advocates to define the limits of membership: “Ambiguity was important because it allowed the stakeholders to bend the definition of Hispanic panethnicity and use the notion instrumentally—as a means to an end.”⁵² While the MLN certainly mobilized its binational identity in an instrumental fashion, it hesitated to accept the implications of this strategy for the constituent national communities it hoped to organize. Instead, the group held tightly to its precisely detailed definitions of national identity and to the fundamental and presumably unambiguous distinction between Puerto Ricans and Chicana/o/xs. In the end, then, the MLN could not accommodate the lack of clarity on which the overall project of developing US Latina/o/x identity depended. As other, less ideologically rigid groupings increasingly embraced *Latinidad* as an organizing principle, the MLN devolved into parallel, nationally bounded organizations. By the turn of the millennium, the Puerto Rican MLN had ceased to exist, while the Mexicana/o/x MLN had faded to a shadow of its former self. Still, in retrospect, the group represented a set of possibilities, even if these were never actually realized in the moment.

In the twenty-first century, many of the same dynamics that drove the transformations of the 1970s and 1980s have resurfaced with a vengeance. Latina/o/x people in the United States remain, in López’s prescient words, “America’s scapegoats.” Immigration is perhaps the hot-button political issue of the current moment, and Donald Trump has successfully weaponized the false equation between immigrants and Latina/o/x people that Metzger and others had developed in the 1970s. The direct inheritors of the Klan and neo-Nazi fusion that Metzger helped pioneer have gained greater strength than at any time since the 1980s, surging to prominence before and after the deadly “Unite the Right” rally in Charlottesville, Virginia, in August 2017.⁵³ Meanwhile, Democratic Party candidates for elective office frequently scramble to appeal to an undifferentiated Latina/o/x constituency and sometimes seem incredulous at Republican successes in targeting specific subsets of voters. Recent judicial skirmishes over the 2020 US census, regarding the possibility of

asking respondents whether or not they are US citizens, are widely understood to be a proxy battle over the suppression (or not) of US Latina/o/x participation in the political process itself.⁵⁴

In terms of more explicitly left forces, the MLN is long gone, but the radical student group MEChA, one of the few still remaining from the peak period of revolutionary nationalism in the 1970s, initiated a process in 2019 to drop the specifically Mexican-centered words *Chicanx* and *Aztlán* from its name in order to connect with a broader US Latina/o/x constituency and to better acknowledge Afro-descended and indigenous identities under the larger umbrella.⁵⁵ In this context, the little-known history of how Puerto Rican and Chicana/o/x radicals developed a shared (if flawed) understanding of the threat of fascism, in the United States and beyond, can help shape future struggles on behalf of all those threatened by contemporary manifestations of fascism.

Michael Staudenmaier (mjstaudenmaier@manchester.edu) is assistant professor of history at Manchester University in North Manchester, Indiana. He teaches and writes about Chicago's Puerto Rican community, Latina/o/x social movements in the second half of the twentieth century, and the role of race, racism, and antiracism in United States history.

Notes

1. López, "Statement," 14.
2. The literature on the 1970s Left is now quite extensive. See, among others, Berger, *Hidden 1970s*; Elbaum, *Revolution in the Air*; Pulido, *Black, Brown, Yellow, and Left*; and Blackwell, *¡Chicana Power!*
3. I use the suffix *a/o/x* to refer to people of Latin American birth or ancestry living in the United States ("Latina/o/x"), including specifically people of Mexican ("Chicana/o/x" or "Mexicana/o/x") birth or ancestry. The rise of gender-inclusive terminology—including *a/o* to note both feminine and masculine genders in Spanish, as well as the use of *x* as a marker of gender nonbinary identity—is an important, ongoing, and contested development in Latina/o/x studies. See Trujillo-Pagán, "Crossed Out by LatinX," and Vidal-Ortiz and Martínez, "Latinx Thoughts" for especially thoughtful reflections on the terminological and political questions raised by "the *x*."
4. The focus on the 1970s can be seen in Padilla, *Latino Ethnic Consciousness*, and Mora, *Making Hispanics*. While both sources address the role of grassroots activists, self-described radicals are largely absent.
5. On the rightward turn in the United States, see McGirr, *Suburban Warriors*; Self, *All in the Family*; and Belew, *Bring the War Home*. On comparable processes in Latin America, with a stronger emphasis on state power, see Finchelstein, *Ideological Origins*; Power, *Right-Wing Women*; and Lindo-Fuentes and Ching, *Modernizing Minds*.
6. Movimiento de Liberación Nacional, "On the Separation within the M.L.N."
7. Churchill and Vander Wall, *COINTELPRO Papers*, 63–90. On COINTELPRO more broadly, see Cunningham, *There's Something Happening Here*.
8. For more on the grand jury resistance efforts surrounding the FALN investigations, see Deutsch, "Improper Use of the Federal Grand Jury."

9. Movimiento de Liberación Nacional, *Struggle of Vieques*, 2. For more on the origin and ideology of the MLN and the context of the stateside Puerto Rican Left of the 1970s in which it emerged, see Torres, "Introduction," 5–15, and Starr, "'Hit Them Harder.'"
10. López, "Making the Impossible Happen," 12.
11. On the multiracial character of the Poor People's Campaign both before and after King's assassination, see Mantler, *Power to the Poor*. On the original Rainbow Coalition, see Williams, *From the Bullet to the Ballot*. Other black-brown alliances are described in Araiza, *To March for Others*, and Lee, *Building a Latino Civil Rights Movement*.
12. On stateside Puerto Rican internationalism before the 1970s, see Sánchez-Korrol, *From Colonia to Community*, and Thomas, *Puerto Rican Citizen*. On pre-1970s internationalism among Mexican Americans, see Flores, *Mexican Revolution in Chicago*, and Akers Chacón, *Radicals in the Barrio*.
13. Movimiento de Liberación Nacional, *The Time Is Now*, 48.
14. On the high-profile if idiosyncratic use of the term *fascism* by the Black Panther Party, see Bloom and Martin, *Black against Empire*, 299–302.
15. *Communist International*, 3:293.
16. For a brief recent academic gloss on this criticism, see Griffin, *Fascism*, 15–17.
17. Political Studies Commission, *Trilateral Commission*, 23. There is a long history of both left- and right-wing criticism of the Trilateral Commission, including some fascist conspiracy theories. On the Left, see Sklar, *Trilateralism*. For a brief summary of right-wing criticisms, see Gill, *American Hegemony*, 167–69.
18. Césaire, *Discourse on Colonialism*, 36.
19. Oliva, "La figura de Aimé Césaire," 15n5.
20. For more on theories of internal colonialism, see Gutiérrez, "Internal Colonialism."
21. Castro, "On the Coup in Chile," 76, 78.
22. Martínez, "Transnational Connections," 159.
23. Bray, *Antifa*, 151. Thank you to an anonymous reader of an early draft of this manuscript for highlighting the connection here to contemporary ideas.
24. Guerra, "Speech to the Statewide Anti-Klan Conference," 3.
25. Herrera Calderón and Cedillo, "Introduction," 5.
26. Gómez, *Revolutionary Imaginations*, 164.
27. *Conciencia Mexicana*, "16 de Septiembre in Denver," 5.
28. *Breakthrough*, "Mexico and Revolution," 28.
29. Movimiento de Liberación Nacional, *Struggle of Vieques*, 15.
30. LeBrón, *Policing Life and Death*, 3.
31. Blanco-Rivera, "Forbidden Files."
32. Suarez, *Two Lynchings on Cerro Maravilla*.
33. Minian, *Undocumented Lives*.
34. Novick, *White Lies, White Power*, 51.
35. Belew, *Bring the War Home*, 60.
36. Langer, *Hundred Little Hitlers*, 129. The quote is from a leaflet distributed on December 8, 1974, at the San Ysidro–Tijuana border crossing by Metzger and others.
37. Belew, *Bring the War Home*, 60–63.
38. Bermanzohn, *Through Survivors' Eyes*, 161.
39. Quoted in Belew, *Bring the War Home*, 68.
40. Suarez, "Speech to the Statewide Anti-Klan Conference," 3.
41. Pegram, *One Hundred Percent American*, 58.

42. Suarez, "Speech to the Statewide Anti-Klan Conference," 4.
43. Suarez, "Speech to the Statewide Anti-Klan Conference," 1.
44. Suarez, "Speech to the Statewide Anti-Klan Conference," 8.
45. López-Rivera, "Phenomenon of the 'Moral Majority,'" 6.
46. López-Rivera, "Phenomenon of the 'Moral Majority,'" 6.
47. For historical context on Ríos Montt's regime, see Garrard-Burnett, *Terror in the Land of the Holy Spirit*.
48. Movimiento de Liberación Nacional, "On the Separation within the M.L.N.," 12.
49. Movimiento de Liberación Nacional, "On the Separation within the M.L.N.," 11.
50. Mora, *Making Hispanics*, 115.
51. Bloom and Martin, *Black against Empire*, 474n4. While the phrase is often attributed to Huey Newton, its first use in print came in an article by Gwen V. Hodges.
52. Mora, *Making Hispanics*, 5.
53. Lyons, *Insurgent Supremacists*.
54. For a brief summation of the census issue as it stood in late June 2019, see Williams, "What You Need to Know."
55. On the MEChA name change, see *Remezcla*, "Message."

References

- Akers Chacón, Justin. *Radicals in the Barrio: Magonistas, Socialists, Wobblies, and Communists in the Mexican American Working Class*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Press, 2018.
- Araiza, Lauren. *To March for Others: The Black Freedom Struggle and the United Farm Workers*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.
- Belew, Kathleen. *Bring the War Home: The White Power Movement and Paramilitary America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018.
- Berger, Dan, ed. *The Hidden 1970s: Histories of Radicalism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010.
- Bermanzohn, Sally Avery. *Through Survivors' Eyes: From the Sixties to the Greensboro Massacre*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2003.
- Blackwell, Maylei. *¡Chicana Power! Contested Histories of Feminism in the Chicano Movement*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011.
- Blanco-Rivera, Joel A. "The Forbidden Files: Creation and Use of Surveillance Files against the Independence Movement in Puerto Rico." *American Archivist* 68 (2005): 297–311.
- Bloom, Joshua, and Waldo E. Martin Jr. *Black against Empire: The History and Politics of the Black Panther Party*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2016.
- Bray, Mark. *Antifa: The Anti-fascist Handbook*. Brooklyn, NY: Melville House, 2017.
- Breakthrough*. "Mexico and Revolution in the Americas." Spring 1982, 26–30. Breakthrough Collection, Freedom Archives, San Francisco, CA.
- Castro, Fidel. "On the Coup in Chile." In *Chile: The Other September 11: An Anthology of Reflections on the 1973 Coup*, edited by Pilar Aguilera and Ricardo Fredes, 68–85. New York: Ocean Press, 2006.
- Césaire, Aimé. *Discourse on Colonialism*, translated by Joan Pinkham. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2000.
- Churchill, Ward, and Jim Vander Wall. *The COINTELPRO Papers: Documents from the FBI's Secret Wars against Dissent in the United States*. Boston, MA: South End Press, 1990.
- The Communist International, 1919–1943: Documents*. Selected and edited by Jane DeGras. 3 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.

- Conciencia Mexicana*. "16 de Septiembre en Denver." December 1982, p. 5. Movimiento de Liberación Nacional (MLN) Collection, Freedom Archives, San Francisco, CA.
- Cunningham, David. *There's Something Happening Here: The New Left, the Klan, and FBI Counterintelligence*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Deutsch, Michael E. "The Improper Use of the Federal Grand Jury: An Instrument for the Internment of Political Activists." *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 74, no. 4 (1984): 1159–96.
- Elbaum, Max. *Revolution in the Air: Sixties Radicals Turn to Lenin, Mao, and Che*. New York: Verso, 2002.
- Finkelstein, Federico. *The Ideological Origins of the Dirty War: Fascism, Populism, and Dictatorship in Twentieth Century Argentina*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Flores, John H. *The Mexican Revolution in Chicago: Immigration Politics from the Early Twentieth Century to the Cold War*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2018.
- Garrard-Burnett, Virginia. *Terror in the Land of the Holy Spirit: Guatemala under General Efraín Ríos Montt, 1982–1983*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Gill, Stephen. *American Hegemony and the Trilateral Commission*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Gómez, Alan Eladio. *The Revolutionary Imaginations of Greater Mexico: Chicano/a Radicalism, Solidarity Politics, and Latin American Social Movements*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2016.
- Griffin, Roger. *Fascism*. Medford, MA: Polity, 2018.
- Guerra, Steven. "Speech to the Statewide Anti-Klan Conference, San Francisco, CA." November 14, 1981. MLN Collection, Freedom Archives, San Francisco, CA.
- Gutiérrez, Ramón A. "Internal Colonialism: An American Theory of Race." *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 1, no. 2 (2004): 281–95.
- Herrera Calderón, Fernando, and Adela Cedillo. "Introduction: The Unknown Mexican Dirty War." In *Challenging Authoritarianism in Mexico: Revolutionary Struggles and the Dirty War, 1964–1982*, edited by Fernando Herrera Calderón and Adela Cedillo, 1–18. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Langer, Elinor. *A Hundred Little Hitlers: The Death of a Black Man, the Trial of a White Racist, and the Rise of the Neo-Nazi Movement in America*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2003.
- LeBrón, Marisol. *Policing Life and Death: Race, Violence, and Resistance in Puerto Rico*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2019.
- Lee, Sonia Song-ha. *Building a Latino Civil Rights Movement: Puerto Ricans, African Americans, and the Pursuit of Racial Justice in New York City*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014.
- Lindo-Fuentes, Héctor, and Erik Ching. *Modernizing Minds in El Salvador: Education Reform and the Cold War, 1960–1980*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2012.
- López, José. "Making the Impossible Happen: An Introduction to the Life of José López in His Own Words." In *Tribute to José López*, October 31, 1999, Chicago, IL. Free Puerto Rican POWs and Political Prisoners Collection, Freedom Archives, San Francisco, CA.
- López, José. "Statement before the Committee on Decolonization of the United Nations on the Colonial Case of Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans in the United States on Behalf of the Movimiento de Liberación Nacional." *De pie y en lucha*, Fall 1980, 12–15, 19. In the author's possession.
- López-Rivera, Oscar. "The Phenomenon of the 'Moral Majority' and the Development of Fascism in the U.S." *De pie y en lucha*, Summer/Fall, 1983, 3–6. MLN Collection, Freedom Archives, San Francisco, CA.

- Lyons, Matthew N. *Insurgent Supremacists: The US Far Right's Challenge to State and Empire*. Montreal: Kersplebedeb, 2018.
- Mantler, Gordon K. *Power to the Poor: Black-Brown Coalition and the Fight for Economic Justice, 1960–1974*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013.
- Martínez, Nydia A. “Transnational Connections of the Mexican Left with the Chicano Movement, 1960s–1970s.” PhD diss., University of New Mexico, 2015.
- McGirr, Lisa. *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Minian, Ana Raquel. *Undocumented Lives: The Untold Story of Mexican Migration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018.
- Mora, G. Cristina. *Making Hispanics: How Activists, Bureaucrats, and Media Constructed a New American*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014.
- Movimiento de Liberación Nacional. *The MLN and the Struggle of Vieques: Discussion Document No. 7*. Chicago: Rebeldia Publications, 1980. MLN Collection, Freedom Archives, San Francisco, CA.
- Movimiento de Liberación Nacional. “On the Separation within the M.L.N.” *De pie y en lucha* Summer/Fall, 1983, 10–12. MLN Collection, Freedom Archives, San Francisco, CA.
- Movimiento de Liberación Nacional. *The Time Is Now: A Discussion Paper*. Chicago, n.d. MLN Collection, Freedom Archives, San Francisco, CA.
- Novick, Michael. *White Lies, White Power: The Fight against White Supremacy and Reactionary Violence*. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press, 1995.
- Oliva, Elena. “La figura de Aimé Césaire: Trayectoria y pensamiento anticolonial en el poeta de la negritud.” In *Aimé Césaire desde América Latina: Diálogos con el poeta de la negritud*, edited by Elena Oliva, Lucía Stecher, and Claudia Zapata, 10–20. Santiago de Chile: Facultad de Filosofía y Humanidades, Universidad de Chile, 2011.
- Padilla, Felix. *Latino Ethnic Consciousness*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1985.
- Pegram, Thomas R. *One Hundred Percent American: The Rebirth and Decline of the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s*. Chicago, IL: Ivan R. Dee, 2011.
- Political Studies Commission of the Movimiento de Liberación Nacional. *Trilateral Commission: The New US Imperialist World Strategy*. Chicago: Rebeldia, 1979. MLN Collection, Freedom Archives, San Francisco, CA.
- Power, Margaret. *Right-Wing Women in Chile: Feminine Power and the Struggle against Allende, 1964–1973*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.
- Pulido, Laura. *Black, Brown, Yellow, and Left: Radical Activism in Los Angeles*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.
- Remezcla*. “A Message from ME(ChA)’s National Board: Why We Decided to Change the Name of our Movimiento.” April 5, 2019. remezcla.com/features/culture/mecha-national-board-statement-on-name-change.
- Sánchez-Korrol, Virginia. *From Colonia to Community: The History of Puerto Ricans in New York City, 1917–1948*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Self, Robert O. *All in the Family: The Realignment of American Democracy since the 1960s*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2013.
- Sklar, Holly, ed. *Trilateralism: The Trilateral Commission and Elite Planning for World Management*. Boston, MA: South End Press, 1980.
- Starr, Meg. “‘Hit Them Harder’: Leadership, Solidarity, and the Puerto Rican Independence Movement.” In *The Hidden 1970s: Histories of Radicalism*, edited by Dan Berger, 135–54. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010.

- Suarez, Guillermo. "Speech to the Statewide Anti-Klan Conference, San Francisco, CA." November 15, 1981. MLN Collection, Freedom Archives, San Francisco, CA.
- Suarez, Manuel. *Two Lynchings on Cerro Maravilla: The Police Murders in Puerto Rico and the Federal Government Cover Up*. San Juan, PR: Editorial del Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña, 2003.
- Thomas, Lorrin. *Puerto Rican Citizen: History and Political Identity in Twentieth-Century New York City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- Torres, Andrés. "Introduction: Political Radicalism in the Diaspora—the Puerto Rican Experience." In *The Puerto Rican Movement: Voices from the Diaspora*, edited by Andrés Torres and José E. Velázquez, 1–22. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998.
- Trujillo-Pagán, Nicole. "Crossed Out by LatinX: Gender Neutrality and Genderblind Sexism." *Latino Studies* 16, no. 3 (2018): 396–406.
- Vidal-Ortiz, Salvador, and Juliana Martínez. "Latinx Thoughts: Latinidad with an X." *Latino Studies* 16, no. 3 (2018): 384–95.
- Williams, Jakobi. *From the Bullet to the Ballot: The Illinois Chapter of the Black Panther Party and Racial Coalition Politics in Chicago*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013.
- Williams, Timothy. "What You Need to Know about the Census Citizenship Question." *New York Times*, June 27, 2019. www.nytimes.com/2019/06/27/us/citizenship-question-census.html.