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“…man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not experimental science in search of law but an interpretative one in search of meaning.”

—C. Geertz

“Historically, ethnography has been an important medium for Chicano expression.”

—Angie Chabram

“In the contemporary period, we have come to realize that there is no fixed Chicano discourse but rather a field of Chicano discourses.”

—Richard Chabrán

“I chose this case from bioethnographic view point in order to ‘reconstruct a literate’ text. if not a literary text, while admitting that my view of experience is not only colored, but that I participated in its creation, as did all my colleagues and friends.”

—Carlos Vélez-Ibáñez
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Abstract

In the course of this presentation I will talk about my family’s work in the area of Chicano Studies, notably that of my brother, Richard, and my sister, Angie. In no way should any of this be taken as any kind of an exemplar — that is not what this is about. It is, however, about us (Latinos) studying ourselves as academics and what Angie, has called “the need for Chicano scholars to engage in oppositional ethnography.”
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Introduction

As the French Romanian sociologist of Literature, Lucian Goldmann used to say, “The problem of history is the history of a problem.” I am a member of a Chicano-riqueño family of “teacher-scholars” educated in Berkeley in the 60’s and 70’s. My search for place and space has lead me on an interdisciplinary journey where I have had to draw from different discourses. I am not a social scientist, but for the past 12 years I have worked closely with a sociologist — Professor Les Howard in a paired course at Whittier College. This paired course, made up of two discreet classes — my Southern California Chicano/a Literature and Cultural Production and Les Howard’s Introduction to Sociology class, are part of Whittier College’s innovative interdisciplinary liberal education program. Students in this pair must take both classes in the same semester and the instructors sit in on each others’ classes. The syllabi for both classes are developed together with many points of interconnection. This pair is called “Perspective on the San Gabriel Valley,” a geographical area near Los Angeles and the Whittier College campus. In the past 12 years, I have had an opportunity to compliment my early readings in sociology which I began as an undergraduate at University of California, Berkeley in the late 60’s.

My training, like that of my sister, was conditioned by the socio-historical approaches to Chicano, Spanish, and Latin American literature that we learned during our graduate work in the Department of Literature at UC, San Diego. While trained in literature, I must say that I have never been interested in traditional forms of literary criticism. Instead, I work out of what Kuhn calls an “interdisciplinary matrix.”

I work in four areas of substantive research; (1) The Reception of positivism and Darwinism; (2) The connections between Science and Literature; (3) The meeting of Medical Traditions in 16th Century Spain and New Spain; and (4) Chicano Studies. As I said, my first area of substantive research has focused on the reception of positivism and Darwinism in Spain. My first published article dealt with a family of progressive Andalusian intellectuals — the family of Antonio Machado and their work in the reception of positivism and Darwinism in Spain (Chabrán 1984). One of the members of this family, Antonio Machado Alvarez, was one of Spain’s first anthropologists and an early student of Spanish folklore. Since the time of my doctoral dissertation on the development of positivism and Darwinism in Spain, I have been interested in the interconnections between science
and literature. Just as those who teach in the pairs in Whittier College’s Liberal Education, I, too, truly believe in the interconnections of all knowledge. I have also been very interested in working toward the connections between the science and the humanities in both my teaching and research.

Science and Literature

In 1987, I attended the first meeting of the Society for Literature and Science and I have participated and been a member of that professional organization since that time. At that first meeting, I organized a section on the connections between Sciences and Literature in Spain and Latin America. As far as I know this was the first meeting of this kind. This session was of great personal importance to me because of the fact that I presented a paper on two Latin American writers whose work was relatively new to me, the Central American priest poet Ernesto Cardenal and the Cuban American poet Rafael Catalá. Before this point I had only worked with Spanish (Peninsular) writers and only with prose (novel and essay). This new area of research brought me into contact with Modern Latin American poetry and its connections with the ideas of Modern Physics, especially particle physics and cosmology.¹

The Francisco Hernández Project: Medical Natural History and Ethnography

For the past six years I have worked on the life and works of Francisco Hernández and what I have called the “Meeting of Medical Traditions in New Spain” — here I mean the meeting of Spanish and Nahuatl medical styles. In this area, I am interested in studying and translating the medico-botanical and ethnographic writing which Hernández first carried out in Mexico in the 16th Century (Chabrán 1996; Varey and Chabrán 1995; Varey and Chabrán 1994; Chabrán and Varey 1992).*¹

In 1577, Dr. Francisco Hernández, recently turned 62 years old, sailed back to Spain after a grueling, 7-year research expedition in Mexico. Already distinguished in Spanish medical and scientific circles for his translation of and commentary on Pliny’s Natural History, Hernández had risen in the 1560’s to the position of royal surgeon after prestigious appointments at hospitals in Guadalupe and Toledo. King Philip II had selected Hernández to lead the expedition to the Americas and appointed him “Protomédico general de todas las Indias, islas y tierra firme del Mar Océano,” an impressive title that implied a great deal more than what it meant in reality. The idea of the expedition was that Hernández should travel first to New Spain to gather information from medical men about “herbs, trees, and medicinal plants,” with the purpose of learning uses, doses, and conditions for cultivation (so that medicinally useful plants could, if possible, be grown in Spain).

Chicana/o-Latina/o Studies

My third area of substantial research, involves my work in Chicano Latino studies. I am of Puerto Rican and Mexican background and was born in California. I have been teaching Ethnic Studies and Chicano-Latino Studies, especially literature, since 1972, when I first began teaching. Teaching this material and doing research in this area is intimately related to who I am and what I do. My research in Chicano-Latino studies began in the 1980’s in Spain when I came into contact with a large body of Spanish-Language Press published in the U.S. while I was researching Spencer and Darwin in the Spanish Press. My chief interest in this area involves the study of the history and evolution of the Spanish-Language Press of the U.S. (Mexican-American, Spanish Cuban, and Puerto Rican). I am most interested in Radical (Anarchist, Labor, and Socialist) press published from 1880-1930. I have lectured and published chapters in books on this topic in the U.S. and in Germany (University of Bremen). Along with my brother, I am considered an expert in this area of my study. This research has lead to two important publications which I would like to underscore. The first is a chapter called “The Spanish- Language and Latino Press of the United States: Newspapers and Periodicals” co-authored with Richard Chabrán (UCLA) and which has appeared in Vol. 1 in The Handbook of Hispanic Culture of the United States: Literature and Art (1993). Most recently, my brother and I have co-edited the publication of the sixth volume of the Latino Encyclopedia (New York: Marshall Cavendish, 1996).
**Interdisciplinary Perspectives**

These areas of research are interrelated and interconnected to who I am as a teacher-scholar, and a person. They are interconnected because I truly believe in the *interconnectedness* of knowledge, and because I see my teaching as being connected to my research. As I have said, I work out of an “interdisciplinary matrix.” My paradigm includes several models, patterns or research programs for the questioning of texts. The French critic, R. Barthes, helps me to explain what I understand by interdisciplinary approaches when he writes:

“*Interdisciplinary work... is not about confronting disciplines. To do something interdisciplinary it’s not enough to choose a ‘subject’ (a theme) and gather around it two or three sciences. Interdisciplinary consists in creating a new object that belongs to no one* (Barthes 1986).

Since the 60’s, in France, a new subject or scholarly approach has come into being. This area or discipline has been called the “human sciences.” The French have described this area or approach as a scrambling together of formerly well separated disciplines (history, philosophy, science, and the arts).

My ideas of the interdisciplinary matrix from which I work is also informed by the ideas of what has been called, “The New French History” (Nouvelle Histoire), especially the ideas of Braudel and the “Annals” paradigm (Carrard 1992). In my studies on the intellectual development of Unamuno, I have used the “History of mentalities” approach which the New French historians have taken from the Annals School. Another concept which I have taken from these historians is the idea of “Total History,” which López Piñero has used in approaching the work of Francisco Hernández. According to López Piñero:

*La introducción en Europa, a partir del siglo XVI, de las medicinas, drogas y alimentos vegetales del Nuevo Mundo es un proceso de extraordinario relieve, no solamente para la evolución de la medicina, la farmacia y la ciencia, sino también para la historia económica, social y cultural. Constituye un ejemplo paradigmático de la necesidad de uti -

(In order to study the introduction of medicines, drugs and plants from the New World into Europe after the 16th Century, one does not only need to study the history of medicine, pharmacy and science but also Economic, Social, and Cultural history. This constitutes an exemplar of the need to use a multidisciplinary approach based on the underpinnings of “Total History.”)

But what does all of this have to do with Chicano Studies? Put in another way, why is a Chicoano-Riqueño who is interested in a 16th Century Spanish converso physician like Francisco Hernández also interested in teaching Chicano Literature in the San Gabriel Valley? There are two answers: the easy answer and the difficult answer. The easy answer is that Latinos are still using the plants first described by Hernández and they/we are still buying them in Botanicas on Whittier Boulevard. The more difficult one is found in the autobiographical family journey which I am sharing with you.

I have found myself, as my brother Richard has said, “establishing a new dialogue with various theoretical positions.” This requires what Fregoso and my sister have called “the predicament of double positioning.” Here, I am referring to “the mode in which the Chicano movement has positioned us as intellectu/als, as cultural practitioners, and as community subjects.” Secondly, we are addressing the way in which mainstream critical theory has positioned us within cultural discourse (Fregoso and Chabram, 1990, 209). I find myself working in strange spaces, such as when in 1990 I was affiliated with The Center for Chicano Studies and The Center of Medieval and Renaissance Studies at UCLA. As my brother, Richard has written, this double and sometimes multiple positioning has led many of us to consider what Lata Mani describes as the politics of simultaneously negotiating not [only] multiple [at times] disparate… audiences...” (Mani 1989: p. 6).

During the height of the Chicano Movement, Chicanos in colleges and universities frequently observed that we needed our own theories and methods in approaching that corpus which we refer to as Chicano Studies.
In the “Introduction” to *Becoming Mexican American* (1993), George S. Sánchez has described the evolution of Chicano History from its early focus on cultural nationalism to its attention on cultural resistance and the ways in which Chicano historians focused their work on developing the approaches of internal colonialism, the process of barrioization or dual labor theory (Sánchez, 1993: 5-7). He also outlines what he calls “new perspectives” from Chicano Scholars working in the field of Cultural Studies. As he says “Across a variety of disciplines, the very language used to describe the particularistic experiences of individuals—culture, ethnicity, identity, gender, and race—has been challenged” (Sánchez: 1993, 8). He then goes on to describe the ways in which scholars have questioned the term “culture” on terms of the “changing language” of anthropology.

Anthropology, Ethnography, and Ethnobiography

In an 1990 essay, later revised in 1992, my brother Richard Chabrán outlined what he called a “possible genealogy of interpretive anthropology” (Chabrán 1990; 1992). In this paper, he traces the history of interpretive anthropology and its subsequent shift of emphasis of analysis from system to interpretation. In this school of thought Greetz’s metaphor of “culture as text” gives way to Metaphor as dialogue. This research has been further developed by Marcus and Fischer who have noted that interpretive anthropology continues to shift “the emphasis from behavior and social structure toward the study of symbols, meanings, and mentality” (1986, 33). Preceded by the work of Edward Said (1979), this group of interpretive anthropologists (Fischer, Clifford, Marcus, Tedlock, Tyler, and Rosaldo) have contributed to a critique of the classical writers of ethnography. Literary scholars have also influenced anthropologists in using the methods of hermeneutics and deconstruction in their critiques of classical ethnography. These approaches seek to demonstrate how anthropology’s claim to scientific truth is masked by its rhetorical strategies, strategies which can be uncovered by deconstruction ethnography in much the same way a literary critic deconstructs a literary text. One of the best examples of the ways in which literary scholars have engaged in the critique of ethnography is found in the work of Mary Louise Pratt and her study of travel writings and European expansion (1992).

Cultural Studies, Ethnography, and Chicano Studies

Cultural studies is one of the latest intellectual currents to hit the halls of academe. As Richard indicates, until recently, this field has been most closely associated with the work of Raymond Williams, Stuart Hall, and the Centre for the Study of Contemporary Culture at Birmingham, England (Williams, 1989, Hall 1980). We have witnessed how cultural studies has now crossed the Atlantic and is being transformed and incorporated into a variety of existing paradigms. Within Chicano studies, the impact of a particular vein of cultural studies is represented by Michael J. Fischer’s “Ethnicity and the Post-Modern Arts of Memory,” which, according to Richard, “subsumes Chicano into a post modern framework.” While critical of this essay José David Saldívar, a member of another family and Chicano Scholar, marks it as the beginning of Chicano Cultural Studies (Saldívar, 1990, 251). As my brother has pointed out, the problem of such an assertion is that it fails to recognize that several Chicana/os were conducting work in cultural studies avant la lettre — before it became officially recognized. There are several Chicano critics, including Saldívar himself, who could be regarded as writing within the area of cultural studies long before Fischer’s article. Many of the literature students who worked under the direction of Rosaura Sánchez at UC, San Diego, like my sister, most certainly fit within the general frameworks of “cultural studies.” I would be remiss if I did not cite explicitly the work of my sister in this area of research.

Oppositional Ethnography and Chicano Studies

My sister is Associate Professor in the Chicana/Chicano Studies Program at the University of California, Davis. She has published essays on Chicano/a literary criticism, feminism, ethnography, and theory and Chicano culture. With Rosa Linda Fregoso, she co-edited a volume of *Cultural Studies* entitled “Chicana/a Cultural Representation: Reframing Alternative Cultural Discourses” in October, 1990. From 1989 until present, Angie has written and published several important articles and chapters in books on the emergence of Chicano/a Critical discourse as a cultural practice. I will mention a few studies: “I Throw Punches for my Race, but, I don’t want to be a Man: Writing Us Chicanos (Girls Us)/
Chicanas into the Movement Script” (1992), “And, yes the earth did part… On the Splitting of Chicano/o Subjectivity” (1993), an essay which examines the ideological formations that led to splitting of Chicano/o subjectivity, focusing primarily on cultural production of the 1970’s and in which Chicanas consciously dis-associated themselves from male hegemonic constrictions of group identity and her (1994) “Chicana? Rican!, No, Chicana-Riqueña: Refashioning the Transnational Connection,” as well as her most recent 1996, “The Spanish Colón-alista Narrative” and the essay on oppositional ethnography, which I will discuss in a moment, are part of an important, forthcoming primary work to be called “Conversations with Chicano Critics: Portrait of a Counter Discourse.”

In 1990, Angie published the article, “Chicana/o Studies as Oppositional Ethnography” in the journal Cultural Studies. She introduces her article with excerpts or examples of ethnographic statements from Chicana/o academics, as well as from her own life history. From the outset, she warns us — if we are thinking of her as a literary scholar — entering into a “discussion of the merits of ethnographic methods for Chicano metacritical representation” (230) but rather, to:

...consider exploring the benefits of constructing our own revised oppositional ethnographies, not only to study Chicano communities outside, but to study them — “within the academy” [her Italics] (Chabram, 1990: 230).

She states that she is deeply concerned about the fragmentary and over-specialized character of contemporary Chicano Studies (230). In brief, the essay is a call for “institutional ethnography” within the area of Chicano studies and a re-examination in which the writing of cultures through oral history can attain that goal. In a self-examination of her own intellectual formation as a literary critic she concludes the following:

...I realized that, to a certain degree; I had been complicit within a mainstream hegemonic discourse that doesn’t pose certain questions pertaining to the topic [that she was interested in]. Topics that aren’t traditionally valued as academic material (Chabram 1990: 235).

She further realized that in her attempt to map the history of Chicano literary criticism, the form of her approach had to certain extent, (cover) determined her content (235). According to her, what is needed are forms of participatory approaches to Chicano research. Here she links these types of approaches with Tedlock’s work on the so-called “analogical tradition” in anthropology (Tedlock 1983: 34).

However, she is quick to underscore the fact that in participating in the co-discursive mode of ethnography, Chicanos and Chicanas must also engage in what she calls “a deconstruction project (an attack on anthropology)” that she sees as being central to the practice of Chicano ethnographic discourse. As we know, the critique of classical ethnography has been central to the work of Clifford (1983), Rosaldo (1984, 1985), and others, as we will see.

In the conclusion of her essay, Angie states that scholars in Chicano studies should not view conceptual paradigms from non-Chicano cultural contexts as being models of colonial imposition. Instead, she argues for the inclusion of critical and theoretical perspectives based on the writings of such cultural critics as Stuart Hall, Paul Willis (1980), Edward Said (1982), and others (242).

**Rosaldo’s Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis**

In the same year, Richard Chabrán took up Angie’s challenge at doing a “deconstruction project on anthropology” in an analysis of Rosaldo’s work, *Culture and Truth* (1989). Richard, currently holds two positions. He is the Director of the Chicano Studies Library at the Chicano Studies Research Center at UCLA and he is also the Director of the new Center for Virtual Research at UC, Riverside. In what follows I have attempted a brief outline of Richard’s work.

Renato Rosaldo’s work *Culture and Truth* (1989) represents the first book length contribution by a Chicano in the area of what has been called the shifting definition of social analysis and ethnography. In this work he argues that, “cultural studies has eroded the once-dominant conceptions of truth and objectivity” (1989, 21). While Rosaldo never defines cultural studies, he does, however observe that “such terms as objectivity, mentality, and impartiality refer to sub-
ject position once endowed with great institutional authority (1989, 21). According to Rosaldo, “social analysis must now grapple with the realization that its objects of analysis are also analyzing subjects who critically interrogate ethnographers” (1989, 21). The tables have been turned.

I agree with my brother’s view that it is a mistake to view Rosaldo’s discourse as primarily “Chicano.” Rather, it seems to us, that this book is grounded in an anthropological discourse which privileges the interpretation of texts and rhetorical strategies. Rosaldo is not trying to develop a Chicano anthropology (he has never asserted these claims) although his anthropological approach includes Chicano subjects. After a discussion of culture as improvisation, Rosaldo dedicates the final section of his work to narratives, principally Chicano narratives. In this final section, Rosaldo positions himself outside of the text. He is no longer the ethnographic collections data and reporting, but rather as an analyst of the “literacy” narrative text. Related to the issue of narrative is the current interest in the so-called “life history” method. It has become so popular, in part, because it focuses on issues of representation and foregrounds agency and voice as people “tell” their lives. Yet this method seems to be ahistorical. While Rosaldo evokes notions of class, race, and gender within the ethnographic texts, one can be left with the question of whether narrative can also describe the large context in which the narrative takes place. Contrast this approach with that of George Sánchez in Becoming Mexican Americans (1993) or Carlos Vélez-Ibañez’s use of ethnography or ethnobiography in his most recent Border Visions (1997).

Carlos Vélez-Ibañez, Border Visions, and Ethnobiography

Vélez’s recent work deals with the themes of continued emergence and subordination of Mexican population in the Southwest of the United States. It chronicles the narrative struggles of Mexicanos for space and place. He approaches his subject by using ethnography or mini-ethnobiographies. He begins to tell his story, of the “cultural bumping process” through the mini-narratives of a family, the history of the Vélez family.

In his study of emergent and residual cultural practices, Vélez makes use of the rich concept of “Funds of Knowledge.” “Funds of Knowledge” is a concept which Vélez developed and which Luis Moll has found to have important implications for pedagogy as well as social analysis. “Funds of Knowledge” refers to information which includes a great array of family, household, and neighborhood knowledge. It allows us to uncover and celebrate many of our cultural practices. As Luis Moll has indicated, it is what teachers need to know in order to teach Latinos. Moll and his team of researchers have carried out extensive work doing this kind of anthropological work and studied how it can be used in teaching Latino children.

Vélez uses a highly sophisticated mix of qualitative and quantitative methodology in his narrative of Mexican-American’s search for place and space. He provides us with a rich historical synthesis of anthropology, archeology, border land studies, and Chicano historiography. Unlike the work of Rosaldo, Vélez’s work is grounded in the historical. I cite the example of the study of trade routes and the historical connections between the Northwest of Mexico, Mexico, and the Southwest of the U.S.

As Vélez observes, in a most moving fashion, the search of place and space can also be and has also been destructive. In the section of Border Visions, which Vélez deals with what he calls “Distribution of Sadness” he narrates Chicanos over-representation in low educational attainment, involvement with drugs, gangs, crimes, and most touching, at least for me, with war.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have attempted a review of the work of my sister and brother and ways in which it fits into recent scholarship on the importance of ethnography and the critique of classical ethnography as well as remarks on the highly suggestive work of Carlos Vélez. But I cannot end without stressing the importance of pedagogy. I come from an institution that values the importance of teaching and innovative approaches to pedagogy. So I leave you with what I view as a critical question in the attempt to assess the most recent and important contributions of the social science to Chicana/o Studies. The question is: How do we teach their interesting materials? And how do we
relate them to the connections between critical thinking and the writing process? Lastly, how do we use these critical approaches in connecting Chicana/a History, Life Histories, “Herstories,” and the Chicana/o texts which we are studying?
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