

**Methods in Movement:
Coalitional Consciousness in UC San Diego Social Justice Communities**

Eliseo Rivas
2014 June 15
Ethnic Studies Honors Thesis
Advisor: Daphne Taylor-García

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

Literature Review: Theorizing Coalition

Methodology: Coalitional Consciousness

Setting the Stage for Coalitions

How Activists Organized Coalitionally

Ideological and Material Tensions

Acknowledgments

This writing belongs first and foremost to the activists on whose shoulders I stand on. These are the people who are building another university every single day: the love from the Campus Community Center's staff, the principles of the Student Affirmative Action Committee, and the ever supportive professors of UC San Diego. Without their contributions, this thesis would not exist. Additionally, I would like to thank the Ethnic Studies cohort for the 2013-2014 year. Their support, input, and laughter has helped mature this project. Finally, a thank you to my advisor Daphne for allowing me to struggle and grow with my project. Thank you.

For You:

This project is for the people wishing to organize conscious of the past and critical of the present at UC San Diego. To those that have intense love for their communities and frustration with UCSD. For some, this is just the beginning to an awakening that will last a lifetime. To others, it may be another institution that pleads for immediate revolution. I hope that by speaking across contexts and conversations, politics and peoples, that new methods for consciousness are built.

Introduction

Student organizing that responded to the racist incidents in Winter of 2010 illustrate the power of organizing in coalitions. This propelled many other organizations and collectives to work coalitionally and support student demands for initiatives that would improve campus climate for students of color. Through demands and negotiations, these students were able to secure some of their demands from UC San Diego: namely the Black Resource Center, the Raza Resource Centro, and the Inter-Tribal Resource Center. However, this process of working coalitionally is ridden with tensions between activists, especially after emergency organizing subsided. These tensions are important to examine so that they can let future activists know potential fault lines in organizing that might also result in tensions amongst each other.

I take the beginning of this project, from the prologue of two other Ethnic Studies Honors projects. In both Mar Velez's thesis, "Our Student Movement: Understanding and Deconstructing Student Activism at UC San Diego" and Mabel Tsang's "Symptoms of Organizing in the University: Costly Disciplining and the Potentiality of the Illegible", they both express a profound sense of pain from organizing and hope from what has yet to happen. The cost of their and many other's organizing efforts lead to a moments of deep frustration and heavy conflict within the very community that organized together during Winter of 2010. While orthodox scholarly material would dismiss this as just another facet of organizing or interpersonal conflict inherent to working within communities, examining this moment opens opportunities to consider frictions in organizing to develop a consciousness in the cycles of organizing. One that specifically addresses material and ideological tensions that arise during organizing efforts.

Coalitional organizing against the sequence of racist events in Winter of 2010 demanded the need for long over due change in campus climate. Ties between activists and organizations where collaborative and coalitional even before the racist events. However, organizers' coalitional consciousness shifted from one that one that was mobilized against racist events and engaged with each other, to one where people began to fight within community. As a result, activists became more vitriolic and reclusive to work with one another. This shift in the kind of organizing activists were willing to partake in illustrates the cycling of coalitional consciousness. In these sections, I will establish: 1) the basis of how activists were coalitional since the beginning, 2) then discuss why and how activists organized coalitionally, and finally, 3) uncover what were some of the ideological and material tensions between organizers. Dividing this section of the study into these 3 components allows us to examine how organizers arrived at the concept of coalition, the ensuing shifts with people's engagement in coalitions, and their consciousness about organizing coalitionally.

Within this section, I will provide a text analysis across conversations between 4 undergraduate Ethnic Studies theses on the Compton Cookout student organizing. I will compare and contrast these projects with each other alongside conversations represented *Another University is Possible*, the "Do UC Us?" Report, and the amended demands by the Black Student Union (BSU) to the administration. Examining the gaps and contentions between these various texts allows for a broader understanding of the logics of coalition within circuits of resistance. Ultimately this is to give material examples to the conceptual idea of coalitional consciousness.

Throughout this project I will use the term coalition instead of community to describe

how people organized together. I think that coalition provides a greater basis to examine politics instead of sole feelings within communities. Coalition allows for heterogeneity while community masks it. Coalitions are neither continuous, nor harmonious. It is this kind of fleeting continuity that helps me describe how various people came together, how they separated, and how this process recycled. Other scholars may use community to describe the collective biography of people I am analyzing because they were a group of people that were organizing together. Yet, I am pulled to use coalition because it provides the basis to describe greater nuances in politics, desires, and contentions.

These very contentions are a radical place to situate a coalitional consciousness because it grapples with student organizing from a self-represented coalitional manner. Students who organized knew of interconnected and intersecting struggles. They knew of the importance to work together in coalitions. As time persisted, relations between activists splintered. The turmoil from the subsequent racial events and tensions from the outcome of the demands resulted in crumbled relationships between activists. Therefore, it is with the deepest of reverence for the labor, pain, and organizing of activists before me that I venture forward in this research study.

At no point is my aim to establish a “right” way to organize, name the most “critical” of activist’s action, or point to the ways that organizing should and could have been different. For now, instead of focussing on a sole prescription for organizing, I hope to understand what happened to situate coalitional consciousness. The frame of thought in coalitional consciousness serves to understand the shifts in activists relations with one another. Hopefully, this section can serve organizers who wish to organize coalitionally and examine the ever shifting mobility of coalitions.

To situate myself within the context of this research, I was a first year when coalitional organizing against the racist events took place. Although I did not formally organize alongside the central students, I attended most, if not all, rallies, demonstrations, and teach-outs. As someone from the outside, I saw the beauty of people coming together to organize. Tears were shed not only for the racist acts, but also from the administration’s reservation, if not outright denial, to accept our communities pain and demands for action. I hope that my contribution to activists before and after me have this study as a resource around the idea of coalitional consciousness; so that they can meditate with coalitional struggles, fully aware of all its dimensions in organizing and consciousness.

Literature Review: Coalitional Theorizing

The primary texts that guide this study are based in Women of Color Feminism and Queer of Color Critique because the focus on knowledge between forgotten peoples. Ethnic Studies as a scholarship emerged as resistance to the continued exclusion of the experiences and knowledge by people of color. Knowledge that exalted itself as universal was thus critiqued and contextualized within the of color experience to produce relevant material for people of color. Although critique is important, I want to reframe these conversations between universal white scholarship and the peoples that contest it. I want to reframe these conversations to examine how communities of color relate, struggle, and negotiate with each other in coalitions. Coalition is a space that provides the largest opportunity for these reframed encounters because it is a vexed heterogenous-identity based space, with complex people organizing with and getting to know each other.

Even though the subjects of analysis are communities of color, I do not want to reduce

the complexity of these conversations to simply race. Rather, I hope to map the myriad of political projects, that include race, within coalitions and how the concept of coalitions have been engaged with and theorized. This mapping process looks for convergences and trends within coalitions, and divergences, or how each theorization and organizing is differentiated.

Mapping Coalitions from contemporary Queer of Color Critique and Women of Color Feminism, to Decolonial and Anti-Capitalist Struggles

One of the first convergences that help frame coalitions is the concept that coalitions are a contested space that view the margins to inform future political organization. Women of Color Feminism emerged from the misrecognition of women of color within white feminist movements and male centered racial justice movements. Similarly, Queer of Color Critique emerged from queer theories' insufficiency to consider the queer of color experience. These are political projects that make space for the continually excluded. Assessing the latter body of literature, these political projects converge to view the margins as an arena for continued theoretical and conceptual contestation. As organizers continue to struggle with each other and find new ways of relating, decolonial and anti-capitalist struggles serve as the next grounds to continue building coalitions in order to make sense of interconnected struggle. The link between mapping both together in contemporary struggles is colonialism.

Initiated by Moraga, highlighted by Crenshaw, and cemented by Hong & Ferguson, women of color feminism and queer of color critique became political projects to contest exclusionary identity politics to make space for the marginal. These authors converge to make sense of how complex seemingly single issue organizing are and make room for coalition as a territory to relate and negotiate. While Moraga incorporates the body and experience into this theoretical parameters, Crenshaw and Hong illustrate the conceptual complexity of coalition.

The writings of Cherrie Moraga wholeheartedly understand the importance of making sense of movement and contestation between racial, gendered, and sexualized lines. In the inaugural book *This Bridge Called my Back*, Moraga writes how “the deepest political tragedy [she] has experienced is how with such grace, such blind faith, this commitment to women in the feminist movement grew to be exclusive and reactionary” (Moraga xiv). Exclusionary or racism within the feminist movement, and reactionary to not ponder how the exclusion functioned or was manipulated. Moreover and more importantly, she establishes a blueprint for future coalitional organizing with the complex claim that inherent to meeting someone else. She wants to “repeat over and over and over again, the pain and shock of difference, the joy of commonness, the exhilaration of meeting through incredible odds against it” (Moraga xiv). These two last mentioned quotes capture the essence of the critique by Women of Color Feminism because they illustrate the common theme of the insufficiency of exclusionary movements, but also the corporal complexity of meeting another, who is alike. This is a meeting despite the odds where coalition can become a place of otherwise, with shock, joy, and exhilaration to meet a different similar. This directly connects to Hong and Ferguson because they continue this encounter to establish a scaffolding for organizing.

Moraga's theorization of coalition through meeting another connects to Hong and Ferguson because of the connection and similarity in difference. The main argument by Hong and Ferguson is that they center women of color feminism and queer of color critique “as a blueprint for coalition around contemporary issues” (Hong and Ferguson 3). This comparative analysis allows for a critique of how human life is devalued through racialized, gendered, and sexualized processes. These modes of comparison are deeply rooted in and around difference to

“attempt to do the vexed work of forging a coalitional politics through these politics of difference” (Hong and Ferguson 9). The encounter that Moraga speaks of connects to the “forging” of coalition because neither are assumed to inherently exist. The shock and joy in forging coalitions is finding the similarity of difference. Along the same lines as Moraga, and Hong and Ferguson, Crenshaw examines how dynamic power is according to location at the intersection in order to name difference, but also understand movements coalitionally.

What is unique about Crenshaw in her political move to name intersectionality as an analytics, in comparison to Moraga and Hong and Ferguson, is that she can articulate location, or rather intersection, as to how power is dynamic. This is a development off of what Moraga articulates because while Moraga gives body to the idea, Crenshaw extrapolates her encounter to make sense of identity-based locations at the where violences exist. Crenshaw’s formulations simultaneously compliment Hong and Ferguson because they consider intersectionality in a zone of coalition where new modes of relating can be organized. It is these multi-varied locations that give importance to marginalized epistemologies put forth by Women of Color Feminism and Queer of Color Critique within the contested space of coalitions. Each of these three projects still converge to make space for the excluded.

To specify the generative work Crenshaw does, is that she challenges how “intergroup differences” within identity groups are flattened to be one identity (Crenshaw 279). Intersectionality disrupts this by challenging us to think of the multiplicities of the intersections for one person to make sense of invisibilized violences. It is the silence and exclusion of difference that continuously marginalizes people within communities of color and women groups (Crenshaw 279). Thus, intersectionality provides a way to reconceptualize “coalition between men and women of color” by offering intersectionality as a method to distinguish difference (Crenshaw 300). As a result of this formulation, “critical resistance strategy for disempowered groups is to occupy and defend a politics of social location rather than to vacate or destroy it” (Crenshaw 298). Crenshaw’s work does not diverge from what Moraga and Hong and Ferguson do because they each make space to think of coalition as a vexed space of relating. Crenshaw converges at coalition to make space to think through location at various marginalized identities at the intersection. An important divergence between how coalitions are formed within Crenshaw’s work and Jasbir Puar’s work is the concept of encounter.

While Crenshaw’s work takes on identity and the intersections of identity, Puar’s work seemingly diverges from ready made categories of identity in order to contest how identities are made at an encounter. What is interesting about this work is not simply Puar critique’s of Crenshaw’s usage of intersectionality, but rather, how important spatial context is to relating amongst identities. Crenshaw is thinking through the margins and contestation for women of color within the U.S national context. To contrast, Puar’s work stems from the transnational context of how sexuality is deployed for imperial usage in order to inform their theorization of assemblage. Both examine how dynamic power can function, but Puar pays particular attention to the instability of identity because of how identity is simultaneously created at the encounter. In regards to a theoretical framework of coalition, both provide an analytics to conceptualize the self in coalitions. While Crenshaw allows for one to name the particularities of their struggle through the framework of intersectionality, Puar allows for a continual active identity that changes according to encounter and environment. Both are useful because they allow for unique modes of analysis to examine power.

A gap between the work of Crenshaw and that of Puar is attention to the margins and

politics of exclusion. Crenshaw is thinking through social justice movements that examine where movements are faulty to offer a reconfigured notion of coalition. Puar does this work within US policies of inclusion to question how sexuality is deployed. Crenshaw is not thinking so much about inclusion, but rather recognition of how a movement already exists as a coalitional space because of the particularities of so many identities. This is much different from Puar because they examine how the tactic inclusion and acceptance of sexuality are imperial strategies to continue to occupy. Although there is tension between how inclusion and margin are conceptualized, this a generative site of analysis for coalition theorizing in social justice movements; it questions to what end is an identity being included, how has something been placed at the margins, and what are the dynamics in being critically inclusive without an add-and-stir method into a coalition? Examples to think through this are Cathy Cohen's work on marginal identities, and Linda Smith's work on indigenous scholarship that can simultaneously exist with other political movements.

Cohen's and Smith's work function with the framework of coalition theorizing to examine the margin and be cognizant of how to be inclusive without an add-and-stir method. While Cohen is focussed on centering the margin as the compass for future construction of coalitions, Smith suggests for Ethnic Studies scholarship to seriously consider decolonization by taking into account the indigenous condition. Both of their arguments do not ask that they be added into movements. Rather, they ask that for fundamentally restructuring conceptions of coalition to continuously question and reposition itself to how it is mutually constructed at encounters of subjugation. This is a gap from what Hong and Ferguson propose because the politics of difference they center are ones that are gendered, raced, and sexualized. By prioritizing gendered, raced, and sexualised units of analysis, it might prove harder to think through indigeneity and marginality that are not encompassed in these units. But it is precisely because of this gap that Women of Color Feminism and Queer of Color Critique can continue to evolve. The latter have the blueprints to think through marginalized identities, and the scaffolding that results from these can structure to make sense of marginality and indigeneity. Thus, I return to Cohen's reformulated queer politics to make sense of marginality.

Cohen's work highlights the contradiction between identity and position. Identity as units that Crenshaw and, Hong and Ferguson utilize, and position as one's relation to power. It might appear to be the same as Crenshaw because Crenshaw discusses position, but position in relation to the intersection of women of color identities. Cohen contrasts this with her thinking of politics where she "envision[s] a politics where one's relation to power, and not some homogenized identity, is privileged in determining one's political comrades. I'm talking about a politics where the nonnormative and marginal position... is the basis for progressive transformative coalition work" (Cohen 438). Thus, Cohen attempts to fill the gap between identity and position, registering position before identity. This compliments Puar's discussion on encounters because it demonstrates how even before identities are made, they are mutually constructed by position. In the same way that Puar destabilizes position ready-made identities, Cohen adds to this logic of identities to state how these "identities and communities...must be complicated and destabilized through a recognition of the multiple social positions and relations to dominant power found within any one category or identity" (Cohen 459). What both Cohen and Puar cement are how multiple "social positions and relations" destabilize identity. This is not to say that coalitions are always unstable, or should never be grounded in one contestation, but rather, to show the complexity within coalitions and coalitional organizing. Alongside the work of Cohen is Linda

Smith's work on indigeneity and Chandra Mohanty's work on third world feminisms.

The link between Smith's and Mohanty's work is that they seriously consider decolonization within the contexts of the first and third world. The links between decolonization and Women of Color Feminism and Queer of Color Critique are that they are linked by histories of colonization in a modern capitalist system that produced contemporary categories like race, gender, and sexuality. While Smith outlines the Indigenous People's Project, Mohanty establishes ways to think through solidarity with third world women (Smith 121, Mohanty 7). Smith's project adds to how coalition is conceptualized because it begs the question of the colonial condition indigenous people face alongside how other people of color or subjugate alongside them. This is newly formulated encounter fills the gaps built by not registering colonial violence and the connection between various peoples. Just as striking, Mohanty's work on anti-sexism and anti-racism is informed by the position of third world women and the capitalist system. Both of these analyses converge within the space of coalition to consider how indigenous and third world peoples are subjugated.

The link in subjugation Mohanty and Smith provide give context to colonialism and capitalism, both of which return to Women of Color Feminism and Queer of Color Critique because all these categories are implicated within raced, gendered, and sexualized encounters. Links between the latter categories of analysis are made possible by continually posing the marginal identity as the basis for transformative coalitional work.

Coalition Theorizing from Consciousness

Much of the theoretical terrain I covered discusses at large concepts and developments of these concepts. However, much of the work done in coalitions is done on the ground, by people resisting because they have no other choice. They are the "theory in the flesh" that inform everything this project is about. Therefore, to give importance to the self implicated in this process of theoretically understanding coalition, I want to examine how people think through resistance, consciousness, and contradictions inherent to much of this work on coalition.

Firstly, is Chela Sandoval's work on coalitional consciousness. Within much of her theorizing, she notes 5 modes of consciousness inherent to resistance strategies within complex coalitions. This is important to a coalitional framework because it works with how people actually engage with coalitions. It is helpful because coalitions are not just units of analysis, but resistance tactics people use to survive. One useful understanding of consciousness that she utilizes is her concept of differential consciousness where this "functions like the clutch of an automobile... that permits the driver to select, engage, and disengage gears in a system for the transmission of power" (Sandoval 58). This give people the opportunity to alter resistance according to how power alters itself. The non static nature of this is reminiscent of how Hong and Ferguson understand the non-static nature of identities in movement.

Coalitional consciousness shifts the politics of liberation from one based on opposition to one based on affinity that constructs communities unseen. As Sandoval states, "the differential occurs when the affinities inside of difference attract, combine, and relate new constituencies into coalitions of resistance. The possibilities of this coalitional consciousness were once bypassed when they were perceived as already staked and claimed by differing race, gender, sex, class or cultural subgroups" (Sandoval 64). As Sandoval states, coalitional consciousness is achieved through the differential where instead of focusing on the differing axes of identities, affinities inside of these differences can form new entities. Coalitional consciousness is thus a refocus on the creation of new entities that struggle together towards liberation. This connects to,

Jacqueline Martinez on Phenomenology and Maria Lugones work on journeys in coalition.

What is useful by both Martinez and Lugones is that they incorporate the self in knowing and journeying coalitionally. Martinez work on Phenomenology centers itself around engaging in “communication phenomenologically as a reflection on and interrogation of...those who struggle successful against” oppression” (Martinez 6). How in communication, we can create points of “consciousness” and the “possibility of self-consciousness” about one’s social position and identities (Martinez 7). Lugones takes a similar route by marking pilgrimages as pivotal for earning and working through coalitions. Ultimately, what both of these works do is that they understand the on the ground, with fellow people, the aspect of knowing and engaging with resistance. Theorizing at the complexities has already been thought of by Nadine Naber.

Very explicitly, she states how the experience of:

“coalition building is a power-laden process where [identities] are constantly transformed and reproduced. Requiring an understanding of historical commonalities and differences, coalition building also necessitates consistency in the willingness to forge political unity with a variety of struggles ..., despite differences in the benefits or repercussions of supporting one struggle as opposed to another” (Naber 219).

What Naber beautifully captures that other theoretical works have difficulty saying is the complexity in negotiating inherent to organizing. She states how identities are not stable, that there are multiple histories and powers at play. But ultimately, that forging political unity is necessary and difficult.

Methodology: Coalitional Consciousness

For the methodology, I will do a comparative methodology analysis between two books about a consciousness of the oppressed. By comparing Chela Sandoval’s *Methodology of the Oppressed* to Jacqueline M. Martinez’s *Phenomenology of Chicana Experience and Identity: Communication and Transformation in Praxis* I hope to meld these texts in order to develop a more comprehensive understanding of consciousness within coalitions. The shared concern of both texts is that they center consciousness in relation to one’s oppressed position. Additionally, each authors presents disparate theories, methodologies, and methods to arrive at their constructed, descriptive consciousness. Ultimately, I argue that rather than complementing one another, these two books complete each other because of their contrasting methodological approaches that examine collective and individual consciousness. By comparing and contrasting each methodology, I hope to better arrive at a coalesced “coalitional consciousness” that bridges both books for a more comprehensive consciousness of the oppressed. This derived methodology of coalitional consciousness thus presents one way to simultaneously examine unique oppressed positions and differences inherent to coalitions. My hopes are that this results in new ways to examine movement building and liberation.

The imperative to a methodology of coalitional consciousness is that it combines analyses that examine broad movements while simultaneously rooting itself in lived experiences. The broad movement as the purpose for a coalition, and lived experiences as rooting oneself within a coalition. Rather than designing a potentially colonizing prescriptive analysis, I think a descriptive methodology would be more useful outside the confines of this project. Useful because it oscillates between: various perspectives of one’s oppressed position, individual and collective consciousness, and social justice movements. Sandoval and Martinez’s respective conceptions of consciousness cohesively combine to allow for this kind of descriptive methodology. Aside from their central thesis of consciousness, another difference that helps

complete coalitional consciousness lies in their respective approaches in using method.

Each of their projects contribute to better understanding of the position and process of the oppressed. On one hand, Sandoval discusses the consciousness of ideologies, and shifting tactics as they relate to power. On the other hand, Martinez is much more attentive to critical individual consciousness in their process of learning, growing, and becoming critical. Sandoval broadly describes the tactics and strategies of the oppressed while Martinez more narrowly describes the process to come to know about primary categories of oppression. Especially so in necessary ways that complete each other under the framework of coalitional consciousness; Necessary in the sense that both projects are a part of a coalitional consciousness that can take into account both the purpose and direction of a coalition, but also individual positions within a coalition that are constantly shifting.

One bridge between both authors is that they use consciousness to describe a unique knowing of the oppressed. While Sandoval broadly discusses “differential oppositional consciousness” at a collective level, Martinez focuses on “spiraling consciousness” at the individual level. These texts complete each other because they are attentive to both the collective and the individual. Bridging these methodological approaches acknowledges the forces of a larger collective, but does not forget the individuals that comprise the collective. In terms of collectivity, Sandoval’s “differential oppositional consciousness” describes third world women and their ability in “choosing and adopting the ideological stand best suited to push against [powers’] configurations” as a tactic against oppression (Sandoval 60). This contrasts 4 other forms of oppositional consciousness that are rigid in their ideological standing. The differential allows for “weaving” through the 4 rigid, strategy ideologies, and transforms static “ideology-praxis... into tactical weaponry for intervening in shifting currents of power” (Sandoval 58). For Martinez, “spiraling consciousness” is based on how in communication, we can create points of “consciousness” and the “possibility of self-consciousness” (Martinez 7). The circular path of spiraling consciousness is based on continual 3 phase process of critically learning about one’s position in society. The book details the process from not knowing, to questioning, to knowing, and spiraling back to not knowing as part of a continual process struggling against oppression. Another way that these books help bridge for a coalitional consciousness is based on how each consciousness engages with position and process.

Sandoval’s method is text analysis of a selective history of feminist consciousness while Martinez’s method is her first hand experience alongside other Chicana Lesbian’s experiences. These two methods complete each other in a coalitional consciousness because they bridge past social movements, to the present experiences of oneself. Both methods are important because they offer both material opportunities of knowing for the oppressed: one in history, and the other in self. These methods make it important to know history, and know self, in order to critically engage with the oppressive conditions of the present. These complete each other in coalitional consciousness because one has to be attentive to present conceptions of oppression, but also the history that underlies the present. To better understand this, I’ll go more in depth as to how and why the authors use certain methods.

Sandoval’s method is text analysis of the prominent writings of feminisms within the 20th century. She pays special attention to writings and strategies of resistance by these feminists, and how their exclusionary, rigid logic made it difficult to cross-collaborate (Sandoval 47). Text analysis of previous oppositional consciousness is what allows Sandoval to put forward differential consciousness. This contrasts Martinez’s methods, which is predominantly rooted in

phenomenology and expresses itself as an examination of a self-reflexive family archive. This method is also about communicating her personal experiences with other Chicana Lesbian's knowledge.

These methods complete each other in the knowing by the oppressed because these approaches do not assume that the consciousness of the present is isolated and spontaneous, but rather, carries deeper roots from feminist consciousness histories. Additionally, it does not assume that by knowing the past we can fully know the present. In fact, the transformations of oppression mean that those who experience them can best tactically respond to them through method of self-reflexivity. These dual components complete each other in coalitional consciousness because they are attentive to the historic consciousness, but also the transfiguration of present consciousness in one's life. Another difference in methodology is the theoretical approaches by each respective author. An examination of theories in methodology offers an opportunity to examine the root of an idea, as opposed to the physical practice of a method.

Both approaches converge at consciousness, but with different theoretical starting points. Sandoval relies on a "U.S third world feminist theory" while Martinez relies on Chicana Lesbian phenomenology. Under coalitional consciousness, these two approaches complete because they are attentive to the broad histories of resistance, and also the individual experience of knowing. They combine concrete acts, movements, and histories of third world women alongside theory in the flesh presently done by women of color. Both are crucial consciousness to have as one theorizes about one's position in the world and connection to others for liberation.

Sandoval's theory of U.S third world feminists is based off of contesting hegemonic feminisms. This is to develop a "theory of ideology that considers...more effective, persistent, and self-conscious oppositional manifestations" (Sandoval 43). She builds this theory to contrast philosopher Louis Althusser's theory, which states that resistance to dominant power may actually sustain and reinforce it from his 1970s chapter "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Towards Investigation)". As a result of Sandoval's theorization of U.S. third world feminists, she can describe the differential consciousness that U.S. third world feminists manifest. Ultimately, this is to arrive at a "theory and method of consciousness-in-opposition that can gather up the modes of ideology-praxis represented within previous liberation movements" into a differential paradigm (Sandoval 55). This broad theorization is different from the theoretical approach Martinez utilizes.

Firstly, Martinez describes the theory of phenomenology as an attempt to articulate "the essential existential structures of what is present in the immediate lived experience of the person" (Martinez x). The purpose of this is to engage in "communication phenomenologically as a reflection on and interrogation of...those who struggle successfully against" oppression (Martinez 6). This means relying on a Chicana Lesbian feminist theorizations from the body as resistance. Therefore, by comparing these two approaches, we can more clearly see the convergences and divergences in approach to consciousness.

Even though Sandoval and Martinez theoretically seemingly diverge from their starting point, they converge at giving importance of women of color within the consciousness of the oppressed. Sandoval bases her starting point as a contestation, particularly how resistances is conceptualized at large with Louis Althusser's theory. This basis then works to arrive at theorizing resistance through the lived experiences of women of color and the subsequent theorization of differential consciousness. Sandoval work does not so much begin from

contestation, but rather affirmation of her experiences understand consciousness of the oppressed. In sum, Sandoval launches her work from contestation in text analysis of resistance, while Martinez starts from her experience and the implications of her process of consciousness. Ultimately, this is to arrive at a bridge coalitional consciousness.

These two approaches complete each other to form a bridge of coalitional consciousness because this means being dually aware of dynamics of contestation and affirmation. Contestation to dominant understandings of resistance, but also affirmation of one's experience and forms of knowing. To critically engage in coalitions, consciousness has to be acutely aware of both. Contestation provides the basis for the oppressed to be united, despite the varied relationships and differences between the oppressed. Contestation is vigilant of oppressive dynamics that carry the weight of systems of power. Indeed, the very fabric of a coalition is based on its heterogeneous composition. Contestation offers an opportunity to agree and coalesce. Affirmation completes contestation because the focus of affirmation is to not mean simply always say no to oppression and uniting, but saying yes to livelihood and uniting. Affirmation within coalitional consciousness is the point of agreeance that does not center the historic oppressor or sedimented relations of power, but rather the self and one's experiences.

Affirmation and contestations are not mutually exclusive. Nor are they diametrically opposed. Taking from the theories of consciousness and resistance used by Sandoval and Martinez, they are succinct starting points to further elaborate consciousness of the oppressed. By highlighting the theories that backdrop their thesis, I think it becomes easier to see how their individual importance, but also crucial comparison. Each approach offers a different perspective into consciousness and this difference is what is important to settled coalitional consciousness. In the same way that examining their diverging approaches, I think its also important to note how they converge. Sandoval and Martinez converge at giving importance to women of color. A mutual basis for both projects is centering the contributions women of color. Specifically, how the work the theorizing of women of color alters commonly held understandings of activism and consciousness.

At the core of their work, Sandoval and Martinez focus on the contributions of women of color. The theories and acts of women of color is what allows Sandoval to develop differential consciousness. This is also what allows Martinez to develop her spiraling consciousness. The spiraling consciousness as not one event, but as a process of continued learning through her women, Latina, and lesbian identities. One aspect that I don't want to discount is that they actually think about the term women of color differently. For Sandoval, this means examining the *where* to women of color activism is located in relation to other peoples' strategies against oppression. It is from this question that Sandoval develops differential consciousness. Again, this is grasping the contributions of women of color from broad movements. Centering U.S. third world feminism makes it possible to align "U.S. movements for social justice not only with each other, but with global movements toward decolonization" (Sandoval 42). Sandoval does give importance to women of color, but then also moves towards an international solidarity framework by citing third world women more than women of color. This is to contrast Martinez, who examines the contributions of women of color, specifically Chicana Lesbians.

Taking from Anzaldúa, Martinez maintains a commitment to engage "the complexity [of] struggle at the lived level of the body" through "*la conciencia de la mestiza* (Martinez 83, 84). First is to "take inventory" and examine the inheritance left from her ancestors (Martinez 86). This is to make meaning out of the "uncharted space[s]" and create "possible meaningfulness"

(Martinez 86). Although Martinez is connected to third world feminism, she locates the activism of women of color feminism as central to the U.S. Her focus of women of color feminism is gravitates more towards what is U.S. focussed through the inheritance of ancestors from elsewhere. Contrasting these two approaches to women of color activism, I think it becomes easier to ask: if resistance dynamics are U.S. focussed or internationally focussed?; From where do they inherit their consciousness?; and What is the potential for coalition in each of these rootings?

To work towards a coalitional methodology, I think all three of these are important to answer because they engage consciousness of the oppressed according to connection of other movements, but also the inheritance of the coalition.

Setting the Stage for Coalitions at UC San Diego:

The forward to *Another University is Possible* names organizing during Black Winter as something “powerfully *new*” because of the “interlocking dynamics” between the Black Student Union (BSU), the Movimiento Estudiantil Chicana/o de Aztlán (MEChA), and incorporation of different campus groups “hopes and rage” (Alvarez et al. xi). However, examining the university as a stage that structures present coalitions shifts the conversation to register coalitional organizing rather than pure multiethnic organizing from specific organizations. In this section I argue that UCSD activists have historically worked together in coalitions against the toxic white supremacist campus. Since UCSD’s inception, it set the stage for organizers to work together rather than work separately.

The foundation of the Elite University is premised on an area exclusive to white citizens, that serves the military-industrial complex for an exclusive faculty. Additionally, the struggle for non-science majors and libraries since the schools beginning illustrates the kind of resistance to non-science, humanities, and ethnic studies disciplines. This set the stage for an avid demand for an education that represents students of color. In this section I preface the longstanding connection’s UCSD has with the military to discuss who and why it is white supremacist. Then I delve into organizing for Lumumba-Zapata College and a few of the complications in organizing coalitionally.

UCSD’s long history of working with the military-industrial complex highlights the universities priorities and their conflict of interest with students, specifically students of color. This kind of political atmosphere provides the context for white supremacy at UCSD by prioritizing relations with the military rather than the diverse community of San Diego. With priorities on military funding, consideration for historically underrepresented students was all but absent. In 1957, the universities Academic Senate “implied that the planned institute [would] primarily serve the military-industrial complex”, where investigation focussed on the “longe-range merits” (Anderson 46). Therefore, the foundation of UCSD was premised on its ultimate contributions the military, not simply a space for innocent inquiry. This is also evident in Robert Gordon Sproul’s press release to militarize the university through its research. Gordon is described as “emblematic of the university’s land-grant success” and the “university’s greatest president” during his service from 1958-1967 (Anderson 7, 9). His conviction to establish and expand the new university was to carry “out its responsibilities to the State and the Nation”, in response to newly made Sputnik by Russia (Anderson 48). Ultimately, these kinds of explicit ties to the military conflicted student and tenure interest.

In the late 1960s, student demonstrations and Academic Senate's ban of on campus classified research illustrate a degree of resistance to the military-industrial complex. What this shows is student resistance to conduct normal to the university. Student's held demonstrations against the Institute for Defense Analysis in April of 1968 and again in April of 1969 against "war-related research" (Anderson 116, 124). Ultimately, William McGill, the chancellor during these demonstrations, agreed that "It is a simple fact" that every nuclear weapon was manufactured through the University of California (Anderson 125). In 1971, the Academic Senate passed a resolution to oppose "classified research" on campus, in part because it would not serve tenure or promotion routes for its faculty (Anderson 128.) What is important about this section is that UCSD has a conflicted history with the military. At odds with research conducted is the ability for professors to actualize a tenureship.

This kind of reading of the university illustrates the priorities of the university, shifting dynamics with the university and military-industrial complex, and student conflict with the administration. A contemporary example of conflict of interest with the university that highlights these tensions is in Ricardo Dominguez's art installation about drones and their normalization in daily life. Dominguez's art called the attention of Huffington post and media response by UCSD spokespersons.¹ This kind of art work calls attention to drones' production on UC campuses and raises questions about contemporary ties between the military and UCSD. Ultimately, the military-industrial components of UCSD structures activists to work in coalitions because the universities focus was on military relations, not ones for the students. Another example that illustrates UCSD's white supremacy through the military-industrial complex is the physical location of the university.

Choosing UCSD's campus in La Jolla is also emblematic of its white supremacy and military ties. This can best be illustrated with the actual location of La Jolla. Roger Revelle, one of the founders of the university, resisted to having the campus in downtown San Diego in Balboa Park, or central San Diego by Lake Murray. Ultimately, Revelle's push for the campus in La Jolla was designed to combine the Scripps Institute for Oceanography and General Atomic, a leading company in high-technology military systems (Anderson 55). Moreover, Anderson notes that the "La Jolla Real Estate Brokers Association (REBA) enforced restrictions in property deeds that denied residency in the village to all but white Christians" whose policies reflected that of adjacent grants stating that "No 'part of said tract shall, at any time, be lived upon by any person whose blood is not entirely that of the Caucasian race'" (Anderson 53). This dually illustrates the priority given to the "Caucasian Race" and the exclusion of anyone not deemed pure enough to live in La Jolla. Resistance to the campus by the La Jolla community was based on the idea that the anticipated campus would "considerably change the character of the town", as one La Jollan comments (Anderson 55). Revelle's fervent push to have the campus on La Jolla ultimately succeeded. Mariscal notes that by not having the campus in downtown, it effectively lost potential college accessibility for working class peoples (Mariscal 217). In addition to Mariscal's perspective, making the future campus in La Jolla essentially wed the military-industrial complex to subtle white supremacy for the rising university. Desiring to bridge the existing Scripps institute to General Atomics through a campus meant having to build a campus on an area that exclusive to Caucasians.

¹ http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/12/07/drone-crash-uc-san-diego_n_2258323.html

Emphasis on the military, and consequently the sciences, makes future pushes for non-sciences more understandable. In order to combat a campus solely focussed on the sciences, Chancellor Galbraith helped push for a humanities, social sciences, and a library that was up to par with other developed UC campuses.

It is with the recruitment of humanities minded professors that UCSD began to have traction for student movements and mobility. Since Revelle's goal was to attain solely accredited scientists, it was Galbraith's endeavor to struggle for humanities development. Chancellor Galbraith's struggle to enhance the humanities was made primarily by "science superstars" who created "a court of academic 'dukes and earls'" with "more emphasis on ego satisfaction" (Anderson 93). Galbraith's was able to appoint non-science professors and a library by 1965 (Anderson 94-95). It was also in 1965 when philosophy professor Herbert Marcuse joined UCSD faculty. As a dedicated Marxist scholar, Marcuse is also accredited with nurturing graduate student Angela Davis (Anderson 118). The support of both Maracuse and Davis helped organize for the racial justice begins to take shape in the late 1960s at UCSD.

Critique of the rising "New Left" during the late 1960s represents resistance to minority communities, and underrepresented student's resoluteness to create a university in their image. Although Anderson would describe the "New Left", as "fragmented ideologically", she fails to take into account how this early period of critical consciousness offers itself as moment of incubation for future radical coalitions at UCSD (Anderson 114). Dismissal towards this kind of thinking in the rising left is represented McGill's response to Eldridge Cleaver visit to UCSD in 1968. Eldridge Cleaver was the presidential candidate for the Peace and Freedom Party and head of the Black Panther Party. McGill's critique of his visit and speech focusses on his vernacular and style, stating "Why should the vernacular of the ghetto intrude the elevated discourse of the University?" (Anderson 117). Clearly, the university conceives its elite foundations as no place for racial unrest or "ghetto" knowledge.

The ensuing tensions between Affirmative Action measures for diverse faculty and UCSD faculty anxieties about lowering the research expectations also represent a growing divide in the role for faculty members at UCSD. In 1969, McGill instituted some Affirmative Action measurements to increase faculty of color, but not without resistance. To challenge UCSD's status as a "bastion of status quo privilege" administration altered faculty tenure requirements from research and publication to also include teaching and public service (Anderson 122). The fear to this is that it would weaken academic standards. Regardless of the Academic Senate's acceptance to recruit faculty of color, faculty members expressed that it would lower the standards for the university (Anderson 197).

The Academic Senate's approval for the plan was contingent upon acknowledging how the then Master Plant of UCSD had "not [provided] sufficiently for the education of minority students" (Anderson 194). McGill considered the Academic Senate's approval to these coalitions plan as "cav[ing] to irresponsible student demands" and further deepening the "ideological chasm between the administration, the faculty, and the students" (Anderson 195). Another conservative faculty member from the Committee to Save the University states that the Academic Senate approved these requests because they were intimidated by the presence and humorless stares of the present Black Panthers and Brown Berets (Anderson 197). The plan and development of the college demonstrates how not only where the present faculty afraid that it

would lower academic standards, but that these students were seen as intimidating.

Student and faculty organizing for Third College between 1969-1972 is an example coalitions coming together to fight for an education that represents them. It also represents the anxieties by present faculty to change the educational system to meet those needs. Presently knowing as Thurgood Marshall College, and then as Third College, I will refer to this college as Lumumba-Zapata College to honor the work by students and faculty to create a college that represents them. It is at this point that Third World organizing by students for Lumumba-Zapata College battles with UCSD's elite interest and white supremacy. As Mariscal notes, organizing for this college was "exceptional", partly because this occurred during the earliest moments of the Chicana/o movement, and also because "they struggled to maintain a multiethnic coalition" during negotiations between a diverging nationalist and internationalist activist agendas (Mariscal 212). Tensions between activists in negotiating Lumumba-Zapata College plans serves as reference point to think through tensions between activists after the Compton Cookout, which I will discuss during the contemporary examples between activists.

The plan for Lumumba-Zapata College was a forceful effort to develop a college within UCSD that represents and targetedly educates underrepresented ethnic minorities. As Davis interprets it, the Lumumba-Zapata College was created to provide Brown and Black students with "the knowledge and skills we needed in order to more effectively wage our liberation struggles" (Mariscal 221-2). Coupled with an education that takes into account students of color liberation, it was also about dismantling racism. Therefore, the pursuit of a multiethnic coalition was of the utmost importance because it meant to represent the interests of students of color, not just one ethnic minority. Originally drafted by Jamaican and Black individuals, the plan for Lumumba-Zapata College later underwent several collective revisions between Black Student Caucus (BSC), and the Mexican American Youth Association (MAYA) organizers in early of 1969 (Mariscal 221-2). During these collaborative processes, organizers faced ideological tensions about to work or not work with each other.

Ideological tensions between organizers were based on advancing individual ethnic agendas or working together for the Third College. Essentially, the tension surfaced between individual Black and Chicana/o nationalist agendas and their internationalist counterparts, whom argued for joint collaboration using Third World frameworks (Mariscal 223). Within Mariscal's analysis, activists with nationalist agendas advocated for ethnic-centric focus, or, sole emphasis on Chicana/o or Black identities. Activists with an internationalist agenda advocated for a focus on the Third World and for organizers to work together. Whereas people from an internationalist perspective advocated for collaboration and unity, nationalist agendas focussed on their own community. Mariscal makes it a point to state that Chicana/os who practiced an internationalist perspective and worked with black comrades were "considered *mayateros* [nigger lovers]" according to an interview with Vince C. Baca (Mariscal 223). This illustrates anti-blackness present in Chicana/o communities within the confines of Chicana/os language. Therefore, even in organizing together, logics of particularized racism could still be mobilized to disassemble collective efforts. However, this is not also without tensions within nationalist agendas.

Another tension noted by Mariscal was the difference between "revolutionary and sectarian nationalisms" (Mariscal 224). Revolutionary nationalists seek to question the owners of wealth while also considering their connections to Third World peoples. Sectarian nationalists seek in middle-class security and see college as a tool for this advancement. Mariscal notes how

Carlos Blanco Aguinaga, a Marxist literary professor, helped mentor and unite Chicana/os during the tensions within the Chicana/o community. Aguinaga acted as an intellectual mentor to many and bridged the disjuncture between these two competing nationalisms. Divisions between Chicana/os of this period illustrate ideological tensions in keeping the Lumumba-Zapata moment alive. However, regardless of the struggle to maintain unity, outside conservative forces would slight activist measures with the appointment of the new provost.

The Fall Out

The fall of the Lumumba-Zapata movement was marked by the appointment of Joseph W. Watson as provost for Third College because it caused mutual distrust between organizers. Subsequently, tensions between Black and other students of color rose over the leadership and direction of the college with Watson in power. Coalitional politics that gave rise to the Lumumba-Zapata College faced stern tensions stemming from the dispute of Watson's appointment. These tensions help elucidate fault lines in multiethnic coalitional organizing because they reveal the logics that were mobilized against one another.

Firstly, tensions between activists are something not isolated within themselves, but symptoms of larger structures that seek to neutralize revolutionary efforts. Chancellor McGill effectively co-opted student efforts by appointing Watson because McGill felt this would "take Third College away from the militants", as stated by McGill to UC President Charles Hitch (Mariscal 234). The original plan for the college was joint representation of Black and Chicana/o, and equal power between student voice and administrative say. However, Watson was seen by Chicana/os to only advance Black interest and consider student voice as merely advisory. This instigated Chicana/o's suspicion of Watson under the belief that Watson was retracting recruitment activities of non-black minority students and Chicana/o faculty members (Mariscal 236-7). Considering McGill's conservative agenda and Watson's leadership, tensions between activists over Watson's appointment are rooted in conservative forces bent on snubbing revolutionary progress. Although the fault line lies in white supremacist academy, this manifested itself in relationships between activists.

Chicana/o and other students of color retaliated Watson's appointment because they felt their needs were being slighted. Chicana/o activists called for Watson's resignation because of his failure to create programs for and admit more Chicana/o students. The "Chicano position" by Latina/o faculty members called for his removal because Watson's position would inherently "benefit any group or groups to the detriment of others" because of Watson's absolute authority and lack of joint representation of other minority groups in decision making processes (Mariscal 237). Thereafter, a sector of Third College joined to help remove Watson, such as the Asian American Student Alliance, United Native Americans, the White Caucus, and a few Black students. Essentially, progressive faculty and students advocating for the original Lumumba-Zapata College wanted to revive the demands that gave breath to their initial efforts. However, this was not without backlash by Black Nationalists who countered critiques of Watson by criticizing other students of color.

Black nationalists who were in support of Watson therein critiqued other faculty for their charges against Watson and students of color for working alongside white students. Their primary critique is that other faculty "do not care about minority education" and only want to use

Third College as a “soapbox” for people to to “rhetorize [sic] and learn nothing that benefits the communities from which we come” (Mariscal 237). Intrinsic to Black nationalists defense of Watson is the threat that faculty members would use Third College as a platform for their careers without helping marginalized communities because they seek to primarily to “rhetorize” and not act to benefit “the communities”. Working with “whites” was interpreted by this faction of Black Nationalists as “asking the white man’s approval” according to James A. Trotter of the *Black Voices* (Mariscal 237). In other words, working with white students at all was considered by Black Nationalists as antithetical to revolutionary efforts by solely black and brown students.

Conclusion

There is two striking moments within the Lumumba-Zapata episode that illustrate a coalition’s rise and fall. The coalitions rise began with the push to work together to accomplish Third World goals of liberation for students of color. This was accomplished by pushing through nationalist and sectarian tendencies that would otherwise immobilize coalitional student movements. The coalition's fall began with Watson’s appointment as Third College provost. Following Watson’s appointment, activists fought over conservative tendencies of the new administration, negligence of other communities of color by a Black provost, definitions of revolution, and allegiances with white students.

Pressures by conservative politicians, faculty, and students will always be present, but what stands as unique useful during the fall of the coalition is the logic utilized by students of color against one another. During the fall of the coalition, Chicana/o students and faculty resisted the conservative tendencies that focussed on the Black community. As a consequence, recruitment, involvement, and participation of other individuals. Backlash from the black community was based on a critique of faculty that wished to use Third College as a "soapbox". Here, what is at odds becomes what is of black interest that is being prioritized by Watson, and the interests and representation of other minority groups within Third College.

Exclusion of Frameworks:

Unraveling the stories of resistance within UCSD are framed from a Black and Chicana/o perspective. What awaits to be told is the stories and politics of Asian and Asian Pacific Islander (API) Students and Native American students. Ignoring students with these identities perpetuates the erasure of API students and assumes that racial struggles are only for people who are Black and Brown. The extent to which Anderson discusses “Asian” during the history of Third World College is the changing constituents of the student body, many of whom “were interested in medicine and science, not in revolution” (Anderson 199). The extent to which Mariscal notes Asian American presence is their request to remove Watson from his provost position, alongside the Chicana/o position (Mariscal 237).

How Activists Organized Coalitionally:

An overlooked aspect of organizing in *Another University is Possible* is the focus on organizing based in Student Affirmative Action Committee (SAAC) as opposed to the the relationship between BSU and MEChA. In fact, instead of solely using an analysis between MEChA and BSU for movement building, undergraduate Ethnic Studies theses discuss how movement building was collaborative since the inception. Castellon notes that SAAC was founded in 1975 and houses 8 different organizations that are historically underrepresented,

underserved, and student run. They have a lasting presence on the Camps Climate Council and use undergraduate voice to speak to the needs of community to keep the university accountable to its modes of exclusion of undergraduates.

SAAC consists of progressive organizations that either founded the space, or were included in. The organizations it presently houses are: the Asian Pacific-Islander Student Alliance (APSA), the Black Student Union (BSU), Kaibigang Pilipino (KP), Movimiento Estudiantil China@ de Aztlan (MEChA), the Muslim Student Association (MSA), the Native American Student Alliance (NASA), Queer People of Color (QPOC), and Students with Disabilities Coalition (SDC).

SAAC was the organizing platform for the student organized events like the press-conference and the “Teach-Out!”. The press-conference served as a point for SAAC to stand united, supporting Black students and students of color (Velez 26). The “Teach-Out!” was a student organized retort to UC San Diego administration’s attempt to create a “Teach-in” and was created “for the people” (Velez 26). Originally, the teach-in was created by the administration as a space to discuss the racial tensions on campus. However, the limited physical capacity of Ballroom West, in which the teach-in was housed, and the administrative power for the university to do more caused activists to teach their own protest. Noted by Castellon and Velez, the teach out began with Fnann Keflezigui and Jasmine Marie Phillips taking the stage during the teach out to be lead by Chicana Feminists Crystal Alvarez and Jenny Romero (Velez 26, Castellon 18).

Tensions in Coalitions: ideological and material tensions

Two primary tensions that lead to the collapse of the Winter 2010 Coalition were based on material and ideological tensions. Material tensions were based on negotiating with the university and the burnout state of activists from so much painstaking organizing. Ideological tensions were based on: clashes between identity politics of being black vs. coalition politics of organizing; and “standard” social justice politics. For this portion, I examine 4 theses on post organizing alongside an interview conducted with Edwina Welch, the director of the Cross-Cultural Center. Ultimately, competing ideas of the direction of the whole coalition ended with the coalition’s cycling from an engaged and mobile state, to a withdrawn state of frustration and healing. This shift illustrates coalitional consciousness because it demonstrates how people shift in their engagement with coalitions. This shift was largely seen as the activist community breaking down, but I believe it was shifting because the coalition did not function the same during negotiations as opposed when it was used during extreme organizing. The coalition stopped working the same way in order to address the trauma from the incident and the conflict between activists.

One of the first material questions was negotiating with the UC San Diego administration to address students’ demands. Tensions between activists was instigated by the administration because of the administration’s selection of who got to be at the table negotiating. Castellon, for example, cites how “this outside force- the university- began to create/select leaders for the movement, excluding bodies in the process” during private negotiations with university officials, which caused divisions between organizers (Castellon 17, 21). Castellon cites this problem of exclusion to address how activists were made invisible. Therein, within the coalition, there was differential value placed on activists among themselves according to who was represented or

visible, and therefore remembered or important. This self-implicated value system of representation developed divisions between organizers. However, in an interview with Edwina Welch, she focuses on the rhetoric of inclusion between organizers during negotiations. Specifically, how questions like “why am I not in those rooms” negotiating with others or feeling left out of the conversations did not to change dynamics, but rather, further developed tensions (Interview with Edwina Welch, San Diego, CA May 30, 2014). Between organizers, there became a lack of trust and claiming others to be power tripping. Ultimately, Welch describes how black students at the negotiating table were “being pinned from both ends” from a university that only responded to numbers and activists that mistrusted those at the table (Interview with Edwina Welch, San Diego, CA May 30, 2014). Questions of inclusion and representation caused more in fighting than it did mend them. This conversation was mediated by the university and served as a basis to fragment coalitions.

Another material tension was the state of people’s mind and body after the organized rallies and teach-out. The original urgency that called for students to organize took a deep impact on the mind and body of many activists. Zullo describes this in his reflection about post organizing and the state of community. Zullo was a staple leader for the the Art Collective, an organization in which many students of color used to express their identities and perform for rallies, protests, and teach outs. The following quarter, and even year, Zullo notes how this collective was dimming. He states that the Art Collective,

“(and this goes for the general environment of the community)[,] the physical and psychological effects of the tireless organizing and the processing of the racial escapades had taken a toll on us[...]. Perhaps the sparkle of our progress had been so bright during those times that the present revealed more worn-down bodies and psyches than in-the-moment creative luster” (Zullo 56).

Zullo reflects on how student’s had receded from activism. How the state of the group of people who organized had organized too intensely. This shifting in engagement with coalitions connects to how the pain and effort that went into organizing eroded people and now needed rest. How part of the effects of organizing for community is also laden with wearing down. A coalition with that level of engagement was cycling out of the emotional intensity that generated the actions to respond to the racist incidents.

A final material question between activists is the representation chosen by media and administration that highlights certain individuals and not others. I argue that activists have little say in UC San Diego institutional memory of the reality people experienced or the idealized symbol certain activists became. Castellon cites the erasure of work essential to the movement and the glorification of individuals during this moment (Castellon 29).

One of the ideological tensions between activists was based on “standard” social justice politics and theory from Ethnic Studies courses, which developed more rifts between activists than they did mend. By “standard” social justice politics, I mean strict adherence to what progressive campus activists call “community guidelines”. These guidelines work to make activist spaces more inclusive and cognizant of different identities, abilities, and social dynamics. This community guidelines exist so that others can feel safe, interact, and learn from each other. The pedagogy of social justices goes that these standards are assumed to be understood by the whole community. Some of these are: check your privilege (Castellon 14). However,

communities within these coalitions weaponized social justice rhetoric and Ethnic Studies theory to attack each other. In a speech by Professor Wayne Yang, he notes how activists are using these rhetorics against each other, or “weaponizing” knowledge to theorize how others are wrong or doing social justice wrong.

Post-Coalition Politics

Another ideological tension was the relationship between the identity politics of being black vs. the coalitional politics based in SAAC. I argue that the rhetoric of connected and fluid struggle was strategically useful to bring together peoples for organizing in coalitions, but as coalitions shifted, this utility could not withstand the need for differentiated struggles. This illustrates coalitional consciousness because it marks the shift in people coming together with a coalesced consciousness of unified acts, to one where people demand for different ends. Castellon, Velez, and Tsang each touch on the subject of working together in coalitions versus a black positionality. Central to all three theses is negotiating blackness: Castellon argues for connected struggle from a third world perspective during activist conflict for the joint MEChA/BSU Resource Center; Velez argues for a critical coalition politics that does not separate according to blackness; and Tsang argues against a legible activist subjectivity that is read solely through blackness by the university. Ideological tensions stemming from these politics resulted in a coalition that retreated from engagement with each other.

Ideological tensions between coalition politics and identity politics revealed themselves during the episode of negotiating through the joint MEChA/BSU Resource Center. Tension between individuals here is based between the perspective of third world students versus being black in a university and the conflict that ensued as a result of this debate. Castellon interviews an anonymous individual on this politics of coalition between communities. I quote the following interview at length because it is indicative of the primary tension between BSU and MEChA during planning of the joint resource center from a Chican@ perspective:

“The most painful and violent part was when we came together to discuss the joint Resource Center. To hear from a BSU member that MEChA doesn’t know how it’s like to be a black body on this campus was not only sickening but also heartbreaking. Although I may not understand or experience the struggle our black brothers and sisters are experiencing, our struggle as Chican@s is fluid amongst the Black struggle.”
(Castellon 23-4)

Thereafter, Castellon describes how the dynamic of separating struggles creates a sense of “oppression Olympics” between activists where Black struggle is more important than any other (Castellon 24). From a Black perspective that speaks against this, Castellon quotes a BSU member saying:

“no one can know what it’s like to be Black on this campus. You don’t struggle like I do so you can’t know” (Castellon 27-8).

The counter to this statement is a sense of shock and hurt by another activist because they felt themselves to be third world person in a first world space. The shock and hurt was based on seeing the coalition from a third world body perspective that did not want to divide or separate peoples.

These interviews highlight the lack of agreement amongst communities between: efforts

to see struggles as intersecting and interconnecting, and seeing the social positioning of being black. To see struggles as “fluid” and to speak from a third world perspective is to speak from a coalitional politic that sees struggles as intimately woven together. These kinds of frameworks allow for heterogenous peoples to come together and find affinity and commonality. However, in contrast to this connected struggle framework is the distinct position of being black. It argues against conflation into third world peoples’ rhetoric. During this episode, Edwina discusses how both MEChA and BSU wanted fundamentally different outcomes from the center. While MEChA wanted a blended communal space for everyone, BSU wanted professional development and retention of black students (Interview with Edwina Welch, San Diego, CA May 30, 2014). This clash of outcomes illustrates a tension in coalitions, because sometimes, the varying constituents of coalitions come together for different ends. Similar to the tension Castellon’s describes with interconnected struggle thesis is Velez analysis on a critical coalition politics.

Velez’s concept of a “critical identity politics” and “self-critical coalition” is useful for the cycling together of coalitions, but does not allow for autonomy during tensions within coalitions. This autonomy is related to communities, specifically black peoples, own authority to think about their community and leave the coalition. Velez’s section “Remembering the Goal: (Through) Oppositional Consciousness” seeks to “critique the separatist politics that were happening in community” where the focus was on the intersections of struggles in the community as a whole (Velez 32). Here, critical identity politics recognize identity and connected struggle in order to create a to coalition for the benefit of all (Velez 32-3). Velez’s second interview with a Chicana feminist reveals how the Compton Cookout is seen as a black issue, but that it can and should be expanded for coalition purposes of strategic alliance (Velez 34). Thus, a self-critical coalition is one that continues to expand the conversation on identity, to fight oppression for all because all oppressions are interconnected.