

TOWARDS A CRITICAL MASS: DOCUMENTING THE STATE OF CHICANO ART

Tere Romo

Chicano Studies Research Center (UCLA), Los Angeles



Fig. 1. Cover, *Metamorfosis: The Journal of Northwest Art and Culture*, vol. 3, no. 1 (1980).

In 1980, *Metamorfosis: Northwest Chicano Magazine of Literature and Culture*, a journal published by the Centro de Estudios Chicanos at the University of Washington in Seattle, published an essay by Chicano artist and activist Malaquias Montoya and his wife, Lezlie Salkowitz-Montoya (fig. 1). Titled “A Critical Perspective on the State of Chicano Art,” it was a scathing indictment of artists who, according to the Montoyas, had abandoned the core values of the Chicano Movement and had been co-opted by the mainstream art world. Instead of serving the Movement by representing pictorially the struggle for societal equality, these artists were creating personal imagery for the sole purpose of entering the art market. The Montoyas believed that the economic situation that gave birth to the Movement had not changed, thus Chicano artists needed to remain committed as activists. The subsequent double issue of *Metamorfosis*, which appeared in 1981, included two

responses. Pedro Rodriguez, a professor of Chicano studies at Washington State University, revalidated the Montoyas’ stance on the importance of producing art grounded in the sociopolitical tenets of the Chicano Movement in “Arte Como Expresión del Pueblo.” In “Response: Another Opinion on the State of Chicano Art,” Los Angeles-based art historian Shifra Goldman countered that artistic and cultural resistance could remain effective—even within the dominant culture—if it maintained its ideology. The Montoyas’ essay also prompted letters to the journal, including one from a member of the group Mujeres Muralistas, San Francisco painter and muralist Graciela Carrillo.

A point central to the understanding of these documents and the resulting debate is the role of the Seattle-based *Metamorfosis* in the exchange of ideas prompted by the Montoyas’ essay. *Metamorfosis*, which was launched on May 13, 1977, was an essential cultural contributor to the Chicano Movement in the state of Washington and beyond until 1984. It provided a forum for academic papers and artistic writing on Chicano/Latino arts and culture in the Northwest during a period when the Chicano Movement at the national level had begun to dissipate. The journal’s influence is especially impressive when one takes into account the relative isolation of Seattle from other Chicano cultural centers such as San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Antonio, and Denver.¹ The fact that *Metamorfosis* used off-campus, community-based entities for design and printing (for example, the issue with the Montoyas’ essay was produced in the San Francisco Bay Area) points to a strong network of Latino artists, which made it possible for this small and very specialized publication to be produced and widely distributed. As a result of this symbiotic relationship, the debate on Chicano art spread beyond academic centers and was fueled by the participation of independent scholars and community artists.

The journal published the Montoya essay to “encourage dialogue on the state and function of Chicano art” thus inviting artists and critics to “respond to the position represented here in the form of letters, reviews or articles.”² These sources—the Montoyas’ essay, the two published responses, and Carrillo’s personal letter—along with an understanding of *Metamorfosis*’s role as a forum for academics and artists, not



Fig. 2. “El Plan Espiritual de Aztlan,” adopted in 1969 at the First National Chicano Liberation Youth Conference in Denver, Colorado.

War protests, and university youth leadership demands. According to scholar and cultural critic Tomás Ybarra-Frausto, because it was “anguished by the lack of social mobility, frustrated by insensitive institutions which fostered discrimination and racism, and exploited in economic terms, the Chicano community engaged in a total evaluation of its relationship to the dominant society.”³

Key to understanding the community’s reevaluation was the bicultural condition of Chicanos: a people with a historical connection to Mexico who exist within a (North) American geopolitical reality. The proximity of the United States to Mexico allowed for a constant infusion of social “nutrients” via new immigrants, cultural objects, and family visits.⁴ At the same time, there were many Mexican American families whose presence in the United States extended back for generations and who no longer spoke Spanish. The imperative of uniting a heterogeneous community became an important challenge to the Chicano sociopolitical agenda. A major step was taken with the adoption of “El Plan Espiritual de Aztlan” at the First National Chicano Liberation Youth Conference held in Denver, Colorado, in 1969 (fig. 2). This seminal document and the conference’s rhetoric generated language—that is, content and media—for art-making in the service of cultural identity and political unity. El Plan declared, “We must ensure that our writers, poets, musicians, and artists produce literature and art that is appealing to our people and relates to our revolutionary culture.”⁵ Thus, a cultural production of art that supported the Movement’s goals of political resistance and cultural affirmation was emphasized.

The Chicano Movement’s integration of politics and art had a profound impact on Mexican American artists by essentially mandating that they become community activists. Initially, Chicano artists incorporated all art media that affirmed and celebrated a Mexican cultural identity, utilizing both political and artistic tactics to reach the overall goal of resisting American oppression. As historian Juan Gomez-Quiñones notes, “Against domination various kinds of resistance take place... Political dissent, class conflict and cultural resistance reinforce each other. Culture must be joined to politics of liberation for it to be an act of resistance.”⁶ To that end, many artists turned to familiar public art forms: the mural and poster.

Malaquias Montoya, who became one of the foremost proponents of these art forms, was recognized for his dedication to creating art based on what I term “the aesthetics of the message,” the capacity to assign equal attention to visual form without sacrificing the political content. Montoya arrived at University of

California, Berkeley, in 1968, at the height of the campus strikes led by the Third World Liberation Front (TWLF). Along with the TWLF strike at San Francisco State College, the strikes at Berkeley were among the longest, most costly, and most militant student strikes in California history.⁷ Montoya, who had done commercial silk-screening while a student in San José, California, quickly became involved in producing posters for the strike. During this time, Montoya also met and joined three other Chicano artists—Manuel Hernandez, Esteban Villa, and Rene Yañez—to form the Mexican American Liberation Art Front (known as MALA-F, or *Mala-efe*), a collective based in Oakland.

MALA-F was the first of its kind and the important precursor to other California collectives, including the Galeria de la Raza in San Francisco and the Rebel Chicano Art Front (RCAF) in Sacramento. Formed “for the purpose of organizing Chicano artists who are interested in integrating art into the Chicano social revolution sweeping the country,” the collective offered Chicano artists the opportunity to critique each other’s work, discuss important social issues, such as the Chicano civil rights movement and the United Farm Workers struggle for unionization, and strategize their role as artist-activists.⁸ MALA-F developed a manifesto of cultural nationalism that compared the Chicano Movement of the 1960s with the Mexican Revolution of 1910, which also sought to reject western European-influenced art in favor of a more indigenous Mexican expression.⁹ The group lasted for only a year, but it held many meetings in which discussion and debate focused on the philosophy and definition of Chicano art.¹⁰ According to MALA-F member Esteban Villa, “Discussions were heated, especially the polemics on the form and content of revolutionary art and the relevance of murals and graphic art.”¹¹

Because of his experiences at UC Berkeley and his participation in MALA-F discussions, Montoya understood that art could have no other role than that of social change. In fact, he believed that “the struggle of all people cannot be merely intellectually accepted. It must become part of our very being as artists.”¹² As a result, after graduating from UC Berkeley and becoming an instructor at the California College of Arts and Crafts (CCAC) in Oakland, Montoya’s strong commitment to community art-making led him to establish the Taller [“workshop”] de Artes Graficas with fellow MALA-F artist Manuel Hernandez. The concept of the Taller placed a high importance on teaching art in the community. For Montoya and Hernandez, it was not enough to make art *for* the community; art had to exist *within* the community through ongoing art classes, poster workshops, and exhibitions. Montoya continued his commitment to teaching in the community and creating an “art of protest” after the

Taller closed in 1980 and even after he left the CCAC and became a professor at the University of California, Davis, in 1989.

Malaquias and his wife Lezlie wrote their essay in 1980, just as the Chicano Movement was changing and giving way to the forces of multiculturalism in the United States.¹³ Beginning in the mid-1970s, cultural organizations, educational institutions, and government agencies that funded the arts embarked on efforts to diversify programming and class offerings. Even now, more than two decades later, it is difficult to assess the success of these efforts, but one concrete outcome was the increase in cultural activities sponsored by government and mainstream institutions that sought to “reflect” or “celebrate” ethnic diversity. From about 1980 through the late 1990s, many major museums and commercial galleries participated in these efforts. A majority of the museums were spurred by the increased number of grant opportunities and by pressure from public funders. It was this major shift—the increase in funding to artists of color, either through grants to ethnic arts organizations or to individuals for major traveling exhibitions and public art commissions—that the Montoyas found troubling. For them, the expanded opportunities afforded to Chicano artists to exhibit and sell their work as a result of multiculturalism only served to co-opt and to divert them from the true work of the Chicano artist. It was this threat of co-optation that they addressed in their *Metamorfosis* article.

“A Critical Perspective on the State of Chicano Art” (fig. 3) begins with a detailed outline of a trend that had become apparent in the late 1970s: Chicano artists were moving away from a community focus to individual artistic pursuits. According to the Montoyas, the United States’ capitalistic system of oppression demanded that Chicano artists produce an art of protest. They cautioned against the temptation to exhibit and sell art within a mainstream art market which was part of a political and economic system that exploited Chicanos and the members of immigrant communities in the United States. The essay historicizes Chicano art by outlining its origins and development not only within Chicano/Mexican American art history but also as part of larger international, sociopolitical artists’ movements. It contains a detailed description of two approaches that artists had developed over the preceding fifteen years: the “participatory approach,” which was deemed unrealistic because it meant “giving up some of the wealth in order to establish a reasonable balance,” an “interchange” that could not be considered even by “the liberal sector”; and the “intermediary approach,” by which artists who understood the system minimized their participation in it.¹⁴ It is the latter that the Montoyas supported, since it allowed the ideals of the Chicano Movement to reach a



Fig. 3. Malaquias Montoya and Leslie Salkowitz-Montoya's "A Critical Perspective on the State of Chicano Art," published in *Metamorfosis* (1980).

can take place and make possible a re-dedication to the original commitment and to working together."¹⁶ Consequently, Chicano art became predicated on aspiring to the goals of transforming each individual and, thereby, generating social change within the community and ultimately across the nation.

Second, yet equally important, even though the Montoya essay can be seen as another example of the "artist as critic" perspective, it was unique in its unilateral definition of Chicano art as inherently and exclusively oppositional. The essay also took the additional step of publicly assailing the artists that abandoned this stance for material gain or artistic fame, something no Chicano artist had done before. By publicizing their beliefs in *Metamorfosis*, the Montoyas prompted a response from other artists, curators, and scholars. Even if they did not write a letter in agreement or disagreement, the essay made readers think about the need to define Chicano art and to place it within the context of a Chicano art history that described its origins, development, and future direction.

While we may never know how many letters were received, we can evaluate the two responses that appeared in the next issue. Pedro Rodriguez's "Arte Como Expresión del Pueblo" (fig. 4) echoed the tone and sentiment of the Montoyas' essay. Now a visual artist living in Texas, in 1980 Rodriguez was teaching at Washington State University. His essay posited the uniqueness of Chicano art as stemming from its "radical" origins. Rodriguez made the case that before the Chicano Movement, Mexican American artists had created mainstream art, which he characterized as not reflecting "our identity, our culture, or our racial, economic and political conditions."¹⁷ In addition, the establishment's refusal to accept Chicano art alienated Chicano artists and the community they represented and served to make the art more radical and artists justifiably more defiant. Yet, Rodriguez acknowledged that in the late 1970s, as artists began to meet and form collectives and to create their own art galleries and cultural centers, the government took notice and funds became available through such entities as the National Endowment for the Arts. "The term 'Chicano' became an acceptable term," Rodriguez observed. "The *Movimiento* became an avenue for success for a few individuals, while the masses of people remained in essentially the same powerless position, or worse."¹⁸ The essay also refuted the accusation that Chicano artists sacrifice aesthetics in deference to the sociopolitical message. Instead, Rodriguez argued, this accusation only obscured the fact that it was the mainstream art world that used this excuse not to accept the many Chicanos who continued to produce political works. In conclusion, Rodriguez asked an essential question: "Why should *artistas*



Fig. 4. Pedro Rodríguez offers a response to the Montoyas in "Arte Como Expresión del Pueblo," *Metamorfosis* (1980–81).

not make explicit their political ideology?"¹⁹ Here he cited as examples and models the murals and writings of the great Mexican muralists, the writings of Moholy-Nagy, and the rhetoric of the Cuban Revolution. In fact, the essay ends with a long quote from Fidel Castro.

Rodriguez agreed to a significant degree with the ideology expressed in the Montoyas' essay. Along with connecting the definition of Chicano art to its origins as an art with a political message and sociocultural purpose, Rodriguez also supported the international aspects of Chicano art as expressed by the Montoyas. For them, Chicano art was not a nationalistic art that served only the Mexican American community from which it sprang; it was also part of a larger effort to reach across continents to join with other artist-activists striving to produce an "art of struggle" that exposed and fought oppression. The title of Rodriguez's response, which translates as an "Art As an Expression of the People," expressed his support for the Montoyas' arguments, and his essay issued a similar challenge to Chicano artists.

The title of Shifra Goldman's essay—"Response: Another Opinion



Fig. 5. Shifra Goldman's "Response: Another Opinion on the State of Chicano Art," *Metamorfosis* (1980–81).

on the State of Chicano Art" (fig. 5)—registered her disagreement with the Montoyas. Her response opened with a different quote from Castro: "The enemy is not abstract art but imperialism." Goldman first responded to the Montoya's description of "co-optation" by discussing the need to consider its complexity. She stated her appreciation for the Montoyas' essay and acceptance of many of their premises, but she also declared her intent to expose contradictions and to clarify, and in some instances refute, certain definitions and assumptions.

She then presented her response in three sections: Is Separatism Possible or Desirable?, Characteristics of Art Production, and Artistic Survival and Art Consumption.²⁰ In the first section Goldman examined the Montoyas' proposal that Chicano artists separate themselves from the dominant culture. She called this "an illusion" and defined Chicano art as a combination of technology, formal expression, and ideology, and discussed the relationship of each element to Chicano art practices. Goldman proposed that separatism, not resistance, constituted a more realistic position. In fact, Goldman writes, the Chicano "vanguard—political militants, artists, intellectuals, and self-educated workers, students—now have the twin obligation of dissemi-

nating and testing constantly evolving new ideas within the U.S. Mexican community, and among potential allies outside that community.²¹ Next Goldman defended the ability of Chicano artists to retain an oppositional perspective while experimenting with a range of styles and techniques, including those associated with mainstream art movements. Using the example of the Cuban poster makers, Goldman reminded readers that “the Cubans freely appropriated the most contemporary artistic modes of the capitalist world and placed them at the service of revolutionary content.”²²

In the last section, Goldman addressed the Montoyas’ concern with the overall co-optation of Chicano art. She challenged their notion that such work be exhibited only in alternative spaces, pointing out that artists, out of economic necessity, have always sustained varying levels of engagement with the art market and major institutions. Furthermore, she argued that Chicano artists should use the establishment—including its museums, galleries, and educational institutions—to promote their sociopolitical and cultural agenda: “It is not technology, style, or even the art structure that is at fault ... but the philosophies and practices that inform them. They must be adapted to the needs of the people.”²³

The most significant aspect of Goldman’s response was her conclusion that for Chicano artists to remain outside of the American art world as proposed by the Montoyas was unrealistic and impractical and represented a reductive characterization of Chicano art and culture. She argued that the complexity of practical concerns—something as simple as access to art supplies—denied the possibility of pure separatism. Instead, Goldman insisted that Chicano artists could retain critical, culturally specific practices by avoiding the production of art for art’s sake and by rejecting superficial novelty. She proposed that Chicano art was more accurately described in terms of ideological heterogeneity and complexity, with a historical tendency toward reformist politics and cultural nationalism.

Graciela Carrillo’s unpublished letter to *Metamorfosis* (fig. 6) offers further insight into artists’ reactions to the Montoyas’ essay. Carrillo challenged the authors not only on their choice of a “college professor” rhetorical style, which made the essay hard for her to read, but also on their ideological stance, which did not represent her views as a Chicana artist. She outlined her views in six bulleted points. In the first two and the last points, Carrillo addressed what she perceived to be the male and Marxist perspectives of the Montoya essay, noting that MALA-F did not have female members: “Women can also contribute to the society *not only* as mothers and wives, but as

co-workers and *maybe* that should be the issue to discuss that is more real than ‘A Critical Perspective on the State of Chicano Art.’”²⁴ In her third point, Carrillo questioned the reality of adhering to a political belief at the expense of basic survival: “If we follow the route of a Marxist-dreamworld [sic] in a capitalist society, depending on only our communities for financial support and not going outside them, *we’d starve*.”²⁵ Ironically, in her fourth point Carrillo echoed one of the beliefs expressed by the Montoyas: using art to educate, to provide role models, and to offer opportunities for what Carrillo described as “working together for a better existence on this world.” Carrillo urged the Montoyas to take a more “positive/optimistic point of view” in her fifth point. She ended with a question, which was more of a plea: “What happened to the word *carnalismo*?”—a term used in the Movement to denote brotherhood or sisterhood. She was clearly frustrated by the Montoyas’ idealistic call for artistic integrity and political purity in the face of the daily economic challenges experienced. Carrillo’s letter also serves as a powerful reminder of the very real gender issues confronted (even still) by Chicana artists and the balancing act required of those who, like her, functioned daily as “painter, muralist, mother, worker.”²⁶

Upon its publication in 1980, the Montoya essay incited a furious and long-lasting debate on the definition of Chicano art. Today, it attests to the myriad definitions already in circulation by that year. Individually, the three essays published in *Metamorfosis* and the Carrillo letter elucidate diverse personal and aesthetic perspectives on issues related to the role of Chicano art and artists during the waning of the Chicano Movement. Taken together, they provide an important window on the development of Chicano art and criticism in a transitional period. The slow separation of Chicano art from its initial dependence on posters and murals and its corresponding role as the voice and/or tool of the Movement, and its shift back to expressing the artist’s vision, gave rise to tensions, especially the pull between individual expression and the collective agenda. For artists such as the Montoyas, a true Chicano art could only be achieved by realizing “the political significance of Chicano Art and its unifying power.”²⁷

By using language drawn from the Chicano Movement, the Montoyas established a historical framework for the discourse on a nascent Chicano art. By situating artistic practice within the Chicano Movement’s foundational sociopolitical ideology, the Montoyas elevated this discourse to incorporate the elements of collective goals, agenda re-evaluation, and artistic intent. As a result, their essay and the debate which included many Chicano artists, activists and curators created a “critical

Metamorfosis
In answer to "A Critical Perspective on the State of Chicano Art", M. Montoya and L. Salkowitz

Dear Malaquias: fellow artist:

After the second attempt to read your article, all I can say is that if you were trying to communicate to the people in the community, why do you write in such a language that only a college professor could understand! We in the barrio are simple people, speak so everyone can understand not only a few people or an elite group.

You do not speak to me:

1. Because you are coming from a male, Chicano, marxist perspective: I am a female/woman Chicana, survivor person.
2. No where in your article does it or will it discuss the issue of the male, Chicano artist-attitude experience in relationship to the Chicana artist: too explosive! To elaborate did MALAF have a Chicana artist in the group; I don't mean cooks, wives or lovers, or doormats. When did you place yourself and the others as the gods for the Chicano Art Movement? When I receive respect, recognition, credit, support and honest friendship from the Chicano Artists per say then I will listen to what you have to say.
3. We do not live in a vacuum: there is rent to pay, PGE, families to feed; the realities that we have to live with day to day. If we follow the route of a marxist-dreamworld in a capitalist society, depending on only our communities for financial support and not going outside them, we'd starve.

That's the plain truth and I like life and what I'm doing too much to die just yet.

4. A protest is doing something, not just one narrowminded idea; freedom of expression in what one paints to educate; different role models to emulate; cultural identity; social, people working together for a better existence on this world.
5. Instead of criticizing, degrading, or tearing down the Chicana/Chicano Art Movement within our communities why can't you take a more positive/optimistic point of view; what happened to the word carnalismo?
6. Everyday I face life with three strikes against me: a woman, a Chicana, and an artist. Women can also contribute to the society not only as mothers and wives, but as co-workers and maybe that should be the issue to discuss that is more real than "A Critical perspective on the State of Chicano Art".

Graciela Carrillo
Painter, muralist, mother, worker
December 18, 1980
La Misión, San Francisco, California

Fig. 6. Graciela Carrillo, unpublished letter to *Metamorfosis* and Malaquias Montoya, December 18, 1980.

mass” for the development of Chicano art criticism. The perspectives reflected in these documents underscore the reality that Chicano art was never a monolith. Equally important, the documents are testaments to the ability of Chicano art to evolve and remain relevant.

NOTES

- 1 In addition to Ricardo Aguilar, the first editorial board of *Metamorfosis* was composed of scholars Yvonne Yarbro-Bejarano, Mercedes Fernandez, Genaro Padilla, and Luis Torres, and poet, Raul Salinas.
- 2 Malaquias Montoya and Lezlie Salkowitz-Montoya, “A Critical Perspective on the State of Chicano Art,” *Metamorphosis* (Seattle), vol. 3, no. 1 (1980), 3.
- 3 Tomás Ybarra-Frausto, “The Chicano Movement and the Emergence of a Poetic Consciousness,” *New Scholar*, no. 6 (1977), 82.
- 4 Amalia Mesa-Bains, “The Sensibility of Chicana Rasquache,” *Aztlan*, vol. 24, no. 2 (Fall 1999), 159.
- 5 The conference was sponsored by Corky Gonzalez’s *La Crusada Para Justicia* (Crusade for Justice), which was a community service center in Denver. Many historians credit this conference and the resultant document, “El Plan Espiritual de Aztlan,” as the formalization of “Chicano” as the new name for the movement activists and “Aztlan,” with its direct links to Mexico’s glorious indigenous past, as the Chicano homeland.
- 6 Juan Gomez-Quiñones, “On Culture,” *Revista Chicano-Riqueña*, vol. 5, no. 2 (1977), 29.
- 7 “The Third World Liberation Strike circa 1969,” *Third World Forum*, vol. 24,

no. (February, 2003), 3.

Ed.Note: The French student uprisings of May 1968 spurred militancy across universities the world over, including the events in California, which, in turn, reverberated across American campuses. Established in January 1969, Berkeley’s TWLF was born from the coalescence of three minority student fronts that called a strike on January 22, 1969, requesting: the establishment of a Third World College with four departments; the appointment of minorities to administrative, faculty, and staff positions at all levels in all campus units; greater admission, financial aid, and academic assistance for minority students; minority control of all minority-related programs; and, finally, amnesty for all student strikers. Among other things, their efforts succeeded in establishing the Department of Ethnic Studies during the fall of 1969. See: Ling-chi Wang, *Newsletter of the Department of Ethnic Studies at U.C. Berkeley*, vol. 2; no. 2 (Spring 1997). For a Latin American perspective on the same turbulent time, see Cristina Rossi’s essay on Julio Le Parc’s connections to the French student uprisings of May 1968 Parisian unrest (“Julio Le Parc y el lugar de la Resistencia,” published in this same volume).

⁸ Eva Cockcroft and Holly Barnet-Sanchez, eds., *Signs from the Heart: California Chicano Murals* (Venice, CA: Social and Public Art Resource Center, 1990), 27.

⁹ **Ed.Note:** The group’s interest in the philosophical tenets of the Mexican Revolution reflects a pervasive strategy among Chicano artists and activists of linking their own struggles with antecedents from Mexico. Another example of this is how, inspired by José Vasconcelos’ *La raza cósmica* (1922), Latino artists and activists from the Midwestern United States adopted the Spanish term for race, *raza*—which in certain uses can also imply the overarching concept of caste, purity—to designate pan-Latino cultural identities and the related term, *Raza art*, for the resulting art. See: Olga Herrera, “Raza Art & Media Collective: A Latino Art Group in the Midwestern United States,”

- Documents Project Working Papers* (ICAA, MFAH), vol. 1 (September, 2007), 31–37, 33.
- ¹⁰ “Mexican American Liberation Art,” *Bronce*, vol. 1, no. 1 (1969), 7.
- ¹¹ Ybarra-Frausto, “The Chicano Movement/The Movement of Chicano Art,” in *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, ed. Ivan Karp and Steven D. Levine, (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991), 130.
- ¹² Lincoln Cushing, “One Struggle, Two Communities: Late 20th Century Political Posters of Havana, Cuba and the San Francisco Bay Area,” interview with Rupert Garcia, September 19, 2003, <http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/~lcushing/BACshow.html>, accessed September 2, 2007.
- ¹³ In order to understand multiculturalism, it has to be seen both historically and conceptually. Although the term came from the educational community, which was grappling with the need to increase diversity within student bodies and curricula, the effects of multiculturalism spilled over into other sectors of U.S. society, including the arts.
- ¹⁴ Montoya and Salkowitz-Montoya, “Critical Perspective,” 5.
- ¹⁵ See: Mildred Monteverde, “Contemporary Chicano Art,” *Aztlan* vol. 2, no. 2 (1971), 51–61.
- ¹⁶ Montoya and Salkowitz-Montoya, “Critical Perspective,” 7.
- ¹⁷ Pedro Rodríguez, “Arte Como Expresión del Pueblo,” *Metamorfosis*, vol. 3, no.2 (1980)/vol. 4, no. 1 (1981), 59.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 61.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*
- ²⁰ Shifra Goldman, “Response: Another Opinion on the State of Chicano Art,” *Metamorfosis*, vol. 3, no.2 (1980)/vol. 4, no. 1 (1981), 3.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*
- ²² *Ibid.*, 5. **Ed.Note:** Goldman probably recalled the activities of the leftist quarterly *Tricontinental*, published in Cuba by OSPAAL, Organización de Solidaridad con los Pueblos de Asia, África y América Latina (Organization of Solidarity with the People of Asia, Africa and Latin America), which not only served as a hotbed of revolutionary ideology but also as a means of distributing the posters that provided the Revolution’s graphic identity. In its heyday, the journal published such influential texts as Ernesto Che Guevara’s “Mensaje a los pueblos del mundo a través de la Tricontinental” (known in English simply as the “Message to the Tricontinental”) in which he called for the end of capitalism and its last straw, imperialism. See: *Tricontinental*, special supplement, (April 16, 1967); later published in: Ernesto Che Guevara, *Escritos y discursos*, vol. 9, (Havana: Editorial de Ciencias Sociales, 1977).
- ²³ Goldman, “Response,” 7.
- ²⁴ All italics in these quotes substitute underlined text from original typewritten letter. Graciela Carrillo, unpublished letter to *Metamorfosis* and Malaquias Montoya, December 18, 1980, 2. Collection of Malaquias Montoya.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, 1.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, 4.