National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form

This form is used for documenting property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* (formerly 16B). Complete each item by entering the requested information.

___X___ New Submission ________ Amended Submission

DRAFT

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

Chicano Moratorium in Los Angeles County

B. Associated Historic Contexts

(Name each associated historic context, identifying theme, geographical area, and chronological period for each.)

Making a Democracy: Latino Struggles for Inclusion

C. Form Prepared by:

Teresa Grimes and Becky Nicolaides
GPA Consulting
617 S. Olive Street, Suite 910
Los Angeles, CA 90014
teresa@gpaconsulting-us.com
310-792-2690
May 2017, Revised November 2017

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation.

____________________	State Historic Preservation Officer	________________
Julianne Polanco	Title	Date

California State Office of Historic Preservation
State or Federal Agency or Tribal government

I hereby certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

____________________	____________________
Signature of the Keeper	Date of Action

Contents

Section E. Statement of Historic Contexts 3
Section F. Associated Property Types 16
Section G. Geographical Data 20
Section H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods 21
Section I. Major Bibliographic References 22

Section E. Statement of Historic Contexts

This Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF) builds upon the contexts developed for the *Latinos in Twentieth Century California* Multiple Property Submission (MPS) as well as the *American Latinos and the Making of the United States: A Theme Study*. While the properties nominated under this MPDF may also be eligible for listing under the *Latinos in Twentieth Century California* Multiple Property Submission, it was concluded that the history and significance of the Chicano Moratorium warranted a more thorough discussion provided by an independent MPS.

Introduction

The Chicano Moratorium was a movement of Chicano and other Latino anti-Vietnam war activists who converged in Los Angeles, where their efforts shaped both the antiwar and Chicano movements nationally. By challenging the Mexican American tradition of military service, which had long served as a basis for civil rights claims, the Chicano Moratorium sought to redirect Mexican American energies toward fighting for social justice at home and in turn redefined the nature of Mexican American patriotism. While the Chicano Moratorium was technically short-lived—its main organization, the Chicano Moratorium Committee, existed from late 1969 to early 1971—its significance was far reaching. Moratorium activists assumed a key leadership role in the Southern California antiwar movement. Their ideology helped push the Latino civil rights movement toward cultural nationalism. Their protest actions were groundbreaking, culminating in the march and rally of August 29, 1970, the largest mass protest of Mexican Americans in history to that date. While that dramatic rally began in exuberance and hope, it ended in violence and tragedy, vividly illustrating the problem of police brutality, which Chicano activists had been vigorously critiquing. The Moratorium Committee disintegrated shortly thereafter, leaving an important legacy in the realms of Latino political activism and thought.

Latino Military Service and Civil Rights Activism

For generations, Mexican American identity and claims of first-class citizenship were tied closely to military service. Mexican Americans had a long history of military service in America, beginning with the American Revolution and continuing with every military conflict since. For many Latinos, this service was a badge of honor and proof of their patriotic allegiance to America. These sentiments intensified during World War II, when between 250,000 and 500,000 Latinos served in the war, a number of them honored for their valor on the battlefield.[1]

This service, in fact, became closely tied to the ideology of Mexican Americanism, which began taking shape in the 1930s. This ideology emphasized acceptance, equal rights, and full integration into American society. This ideology was greatly influenced by Franklin Delano Roosevelt's Good Neighbor

[1] The estimate varies widely because military service records for World War II are incomplete. It has not been possible for historians to document precisely the number of Latinos who served. There were approximately 500,000 persons with Spanish surnames in the armed forces. This does not account for Latinos without Spanish surnames. The number of Puerto Ricans who served has been documented at 53,000, and is more precise because they were not classified as whites, as were Mexican Americans.

policy, which sought to redefine the way Americans perceived Latin Americans. The policy helped to improve relations with Mexicans abroad, but also within the U.S. The World War II experience was pivotal in galvanizing these ideas. It juxtaposed unparalleled Latino wartime military service against virulent racism at home, exemplified vividly by two Los Angeles events – the Sleepy Lagoon trial and the Zoot Suit riots. As symbols of racial repression, these incidents intensified Mexican American expectations and demands for civil rights.[2] A new generation of leaders guided these efforts, including returning veterans and college graduates on the G.I. Bill. Veterans especially bristled at the specter of racial discrimination in the wake of their military service. As veteran Raul Morín put it, "How could we have played such a prominent role as Americans over there and now have to go back living as outsiders again? ... Here now as veterans who had risked their lives for the U.S. was the opportunity to do something about it."[3]

Moreover, for Mexican Americans – as for other minority groups – military service had long been a way to prove one's Americanness, embodied in the idea of "warrior patriotism." With few other avenues for upward mobility open to them, Mexican Americans had come to rely on military service to show they deserved equal treatment. Some Latino civil rights organizations emphasized this connection, such as the assimilation-oriented G.I. Forum and the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), both of which emphasized patriotism and, in turn, their worthiness as an ethnic group.[4]

The interlinking of military service with the civil rights goal of full inclusion defined the approach of the postwar generation of Mexican American leaders.[5] As it would for many segments of American society, the Vietnam War shattered this earnest consensus. It led many to question American foreign policy, its military agenda, and the country's very value system. For Mexican Americans especially, given their history, it took a "powerful combination of events to propel them" to oppose the war.[6]

The Chicano Moratorium

The Chicano Moratorium was significant for its immediate efforts to end the Vietnam War, and also for reshaping critical strands of Mexican American political thought and identity. By striking at the heart of

[2] George Sanchez, *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900-1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993) 253-269; Louis DeSipio, "Demanding Equal Political Voice… and Accepting Nothing Less: The Quest for Latino Political Inclusion"; *American Latinos and the Making of the United States: A Theme Study* (Washington DC: National Park Service, 2013), 277; Albert Camarillo, *Chicanos in California: A History of Mexican American in California* (San Francisco: Boyd & Fraser, 1984), 65-68.
[3] Camarillo, *Chicanos in California*, 79; Matt Garcia, *A World of Its Own: Race, Labor, and Citrus in the Making of Greater Los Angeles, 1900-1970* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 227; also see "Latinos in the Military" context in *Latinos in Twentieth Century California* MPS, 2015.
[4] Lorena Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No! Chicano Protest and Patriotism During the Viet Nam War Era* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), chap. 1 and *passim*; Laura Pulido, *Black, Brown, Yellow & Left: Radical Activism in Los Angeles* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 74; Ron Vera, "Observations on the Chicano Relationship to Military Service in Los Angeles County," *Aztlán* 1, 2 (October 1970), 33-34.
[5] Historian Lorena Oropeza refines this even further, claiming that this earlier generation's ideal of citizenship rested on the tripod of whiteness, masculinity, and military service. Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 6-8, 194-195. The postwar generation pursued an integrationist agenda, and by the 1950s had won significant victories in dismantling *de jure* segregation in housing, education, jury selection, and public facilities.
[6] Pulido, *Black, Brown, Yellow & Left,* 74.

deeply entrenched traditions and values among Mexican Americans, the Moratorium Committee helped push the Chicano movement toward cultural nationalism in ways that challenged the earlier approaches of civil rights activists. As a highly controversial conflict, the Vietnam War accelerated a critical view of the U.S. among Chicanos, and magnified rifts within the Mexican American community. The Chicano Moratorium ultimately challenged "what had become a narrow, unproductive civil rights strategy" of the previous generation, and embrace an agenda of cultural nationalism, pride, and self-determination.[7] In this way, for many Mexican Americans antiwar activism "catalyzed a larger political awakening."[8] These ideas evolved in tandem with the Chicano antiwar movement itself. While the scope of the movement was nationwide, much of the organizing occurred in the Boyle Heights neighborhood of the City of Los Angeles and the East Los Angeles (East LA) neighborhood, an unincorporated area of the County. These two communities are situated next to each other and the boundary is indistinguishable to the residents. By 1930, East LA was home to the largest single concentration of Mexican Americans in the Los Angeles area—90,000 out of the total county population of one million.[9] Boyle Heights was still a multiethnic community through World War II, and by the 1960s it had become a predominately Mexican American neighborhood.

Early Organizing

Two Chicano groups initiated the formation of the Chicano Moratorium: student activists from the University of California-Los Angeles (UCLA) and the Brown Berets from East Los Angeles (East LA). Rosalío Muñoz and Ramsés Noriega, fellow Chicano activists from UCLA, played pivotal roles. Muñoz was the first Chicano student body president of UCLA, the son of well-educated parents. Admittedly a latecomer to both Chicano and antiwar activism, Muñoz became the public face of the Chicano Moratorium. As he approached graduation in spring 1969—and the subsequent loss of his student deferment from the draft—Muñoz envisioned his role as "a Chicano version of [Muhammad] Ali," someone who would confront the draft issue from a Chicano perspective. He developed many of the ideas that defined the movement.[10] Ramsés Noriega, a good friend and fellow activist from UCLA, had worked alongside Muñoz on several issues at UCLA and on Muñoz's campaign for student body president. Born and raised in Mexico until the age of twelve, Noriega lived in a Coachella Valley farmworker community as a teenager and later became active in the farmworkers' union. He recalled being deeply moved hearing César Chávez in 1966, impressed by "his spirit... of confrontation." Noriega worked behind the scenes as lead organizer and strategist for the Chicano Moratorium, effectively drawing upon his contacts in the labor movement.[11]

The two friends joined forces in September 1969 to stage a public protest against the draft, marking what some scholars consider the first public action of what became the Chicano Moratorium. Nearly 100 protestors, mostly college students, picketed in front of the Army induction center in downtown Los Angeles, on September 16, 1969, the day Muñoz was scheduled to be inducted that coincided

[7] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 8, 192.
[8] Pulido, *Black, Brown, Yellow & Left*, 73.
[9] L.H. Gann and Peter J. Duignan, *The Hispanics in the U.S.* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1986), 40.
[10] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 120.
[11] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 118-122, quote at 122; Jaime Pelayo, "The Chicano Movement and the Vietnam War" (unpublished senior thesis, Yale University, 1997), 12-13, located at Gloria Arellanes Papers, California State University, Los Angeles.

fortuitously with Mexican Independence Day. The goal of this protest was "mobilization," as both later explained, to inspire large numbers of Mexican Americans to stand up against the war and for the Chicano movement.[12]

In a speech to the crowd, 23-year-old Rosalío Muñoz began articulating ideas that would drive the Moratorium movement. "I accuse the government of the United States of America of genocide against the Mexican people," he said. "Specifically, I accuse the draft, the entire social, political, and economic system... of creating a funnel which shoots Mexican youth into Vietnam to be killed and to kill innocent men, women, and children."[13] At this event, the protestors articulated three critical themes of the Chicano Moratorium. First, they made a tight link between the Vietnam War and unjust conditions at home. Pervasive discrimination disadvantaged Mexican Americans through inferior schooling, leading to low college attendance, poor jobs, and police abuse. These conditions in turn made them vulnerable to the draft and ultimately higher casualty rates in Vietnam. They could not benefit from student deferments, which helped many white college students avoid the draft. Some Latinos joined the Armed Forces because they had so few other options, living in impoverished communities plagued by police brutality and dim job prospects. This context of discrimination, they argued, made opposition to the war a distinctly Chicano issue, as they were disproportionately hurt by the war.[14] This argument mirrored similar ones made by African American civil rights leaders, and led some Chicano protestors to express an affinity with the Vietnamese who they saw as fellow colonized people.[15]

Second, antiwar activists emphasized Chicano cultural nationalism. Muñoz proposed that young Latinos should get draft deferments to serve their own barrio communities, and this should represent a new, redefined Chicano patriotism, challenging the long-entrenched military service tradition. As Muñoz told a reporter in August 1970, "Chicanos came back from World War II [and] they put on their uniforms and medals and they'd say, 'We served; you can't call me a wetback, you can't tell me where to go'.... We developed this cultural and psychological thing. You prove yourself ... by going through the service." The Moratorium's "first priority was educating the community" to reconsider this interlinking of military service and civil rights.[16] Protestors hoped that antiwar activism would ultimately lead to Chicano community empowerment, to a redirection of Chicano energy to uplift their own community rather than shed blood for an unnecessary war to prove their patriotism. In this way, antiwar activists helped shift the Latino civil rights movement toward Chicano nationalist ends.

Third, the antiwar protestors welcomed people with diverse political outlooks. The Chicano Moratorium came to reflect this inclusive vision, with people spanning the gamut from mainstream Democratic politicians to leftist Chicano Trotskyites.[17] The distinctly Chicano perspective of these themes arose

---

[12] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 117-118.
[13] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 113; Ernesto Chávez, "*¡Mi Raza Primero!" (My People First!): Nationalism, Identity, and Insurgency in the Chicano Movement in Los Angeles, 1966-1978* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 62.
[14] An early report by Ralph Guzman indicated, in turn, that Latino death rates were disproportionately high in Vietnam, suggesting pro-white biases among draft boards. See Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 67-68; Vera, "The Chicano Relationship," 29-34.
[15] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 114, 131, 191-200; Chávez, "*¡Mi Raza Primero!"* 62-64; Pelayo, "The Chicano Movement," 13. See Oropeza, chapter 3, on the Chicano affinity with the colonized Vietnamese.
[16] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 149; Vera, "Observations on the Chicano Relationship," 34-35.
[17] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 9, 114-115, 121, 149-151, 194-95.

partly from the disillusion of Muñoz and others with the Anglo antiwar movement, which seemed to ignore how the war was unfairly disadvantaging people of color and was marginalizing their role in the mainstream antiwar movement.[18]

The activism of these students coincided with the "increasingly antiwar agenda" of the Brown Berets, who played an equally significant role in the formation of the Chicano Moratorium.[19] The Brown Berets were a militant community group committed to Chicano nationalism and resistance to white oppression. Donning "military style" uniforms, members demonstrated against police brutality and harassment, helped organize the East LA student walkouts,[20] and protested against the war. Their aggressive posture attracted the attention of law enforcement officials, who deemed them a dangerous threat and "involved in the violent disruption of the establishment," in the words of one Los Angeles police sergeant testifying before the U.S. Congress. Under the leadership of David Sánchez, the Brown Berets brought a distinct presence to the antiwar movement, marked by a confrontational, aggressive approach that characterized their language more than their physical actions.[21]

<u>The Chicano Moratorium Committee Forms</u>

Both the Chicano students and Brown Berets participated in antiwar demonstrations through the fall 1969, including a pivotal rally in San Francisco organized by New Mobe, a national antiwar group. When New Mobe organizers balked at fully including Chicano speakers at the November rally, this pushed the Chicano activists to break away and form their own organization. The Chicano students and Brown Berets united to form the Chicano Moratorium Committee in December 1969, with David Sánchez and Rosalío Muñoz serving as co-chairs.[22] This union benefitted both sides. The Brown Berets helped bring in members, attracting younger "grass roots kids in the Brown Berets," as Muñoz saw it. The students, in turn, brought in more moderate Mexican American individuals and organizations that might otherwise have been put off by the Brown Berets' militancy.[23]

The Chicano Moratorium quickly attracted a diverse array of participants, from Chicana community activists to labor unions, former gang members, and middle-class Mexican American families. They also attracted support from mainstream Latino politicians and political organizations, including Ed Roybal who was serving in the U.S. Congress, the Mexican American Political Association (MAPA), the Congress of Mexican American Unity (CMAU), a coalition of 300 ethnic advocacy groups), and quite

---

[18] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 120; Vera, "Observations on the Chicano Relationship," 34-35. If the white antiwar movement framed draft resistance as an individual moral decision, Muñoz "saw the draft as a broad injustice that affected the entire Mexican American community." (Oropeza, 120). On how the white antiwar movement was marginalizing Chicano activists, see Oropeza, 126-130.
[19] George Mariscal, *Aztlán and Vietnam: Chicano and Chicana Experiences of the War* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 197.
[20] The walkouts are also referred to as blowouts on the blowout.
[21] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 137. Also see David Sánchez, *Expedition through Aztlán* (La Puente: Perspectiva Publications, 1978). Sánchez emphasized the defensive, nonviolent approach of the Brown Berets, in David Sánchez Oral History Interview, UCLA Oral History Collection, accessed July 20, 2015, http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/viewItem.do?ark=21198/zz002hkcv5&title=%20Sanchez,%20David
[22] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 126-138; Chávez, "*¡Mi Raza Primero!"* 55; Pelayo, "The Chicano Movement," 24-28. In contrast to the account described and cited here, David Sánchez claimed he founded the Chicano Moratorium Committee, with Rosalío Muñoz joining in January 1970 as co-chair. (Sanchez, *Expedition through Aztlán,* 4).
[23] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 126-139, quote at 138.

significantly the G.I. Forum, which symbolized the older political orientation. Their most critical practical support came from Chicano groups such as the Brown Berets and Movimiento Estudiantil Chicanx de Aztlán (MEChA), the Chicano student group founded in 1969 in Santa Barbara. The Episcopal Church of the Epiphany in Lincoln Heights, with its social justice mission, also backed the Moratorium. The support of Esteban Torres, a labor leader and president of the CMAU, gave the Moratorium "enormous credibility in the public eye."[24] This broad-ranging support reflected the growing opposition to the war among Mexican Americans by this point.[25]

Chicano-run newspapers and magazines played a critical role in spreading the message of the Chicano Moratorium. The late 1960s witnessed the rise of grassroots publications that covered the Mexican American community, and advocated on its behalf. One of the earliest such newspapers was *La Raza*, founded in 1967 by Eliezer Risco. *La Raza* was originally published out of the basement of the Church of the Epiphany. Father John Luce, the church's pastor, was a supporter of Chicano issues and allowed the church to be used for a variety of organizing activities. Another community newspaper was the *Inside Eastside*, founded by students from California State University at Los Angeles. Raul Ruiz, one of the founders explained the organizational structure of the newspaper. "With no experience, a few of us organized ourselves into an editorial group. Each member was assigned a beat or a particular section of East LA and was responsible for covering the high school in that area."[26] Ruiz eventually left the *Inside Eastside* to form the *Chicano Student Movement* and later transformed *La Raza* into a magazine.

Two key figures of the Moratorium Committee were Roberto Elias and Gilberto Cano. Elias grew up in South Central Los Angeles and joined with Muñoz after the September 16 event, working on planning, networking, and recruitment. Cano, who grew up in East LA, dropped out of high school and joined the military at age 17, returning to East LA with "a very conservative" mind set. After working for a War on Poverty program, he became a full-time Moratorium worker. Both men became key speakers and organizers for the Moratorium.[27]

Women also played a crucial role in the Chicano Moratorium, sometimes challenging their marginalization as they were routinely relegated to staff support positions. Hilda Reyes, a member of the Brown Berets, had a personal history of activism for Chicano causes. When she suggested the Moratorium solicit donations from East LA merchants, she was put in charge of fundraising. Another Brown Beret, Gloria Arellanes, was an early supporter of the antiwar movement. She grew up in El Monte, attended East Los Angeles Community College, then worked for a neighborhood anti-poverty program. Arellanes was named director of the El Barrio Free Clinic, founded by the Brown Berets in summer 1969. Her commitment to public health and healing drew her to the antiwar movement, where she took a pacifist approach.[28] Other notable Moratorium activists were Katarina Davis del Valle, a Los

---

[24] Pelayo, "The Chicano Movement," 41.
[25] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 151-160; Pelayo, "The Chicano Movement," 29, 40-41. One survey in Santa Barbara found that Mexicans Americans were more opposed to the war than the general public, and that a majority would discourage their sons from serving in the Army. Charles Ornelas and Michael Gonzalez, "The Chicano and the War: An Opinion Survey in Santa Barbara," *Aztlán* 2, 1 (October 1971), 23-35; Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 152.
[26] Mario T. García, *The Chicano Generation: Testimonios of the Movement* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015), 35.
[27] Pelayo, "The Chicano Movement," 21, 28-30, 40; Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 157-158.
[28] Arellanes obtained the permit for the December 1969 march of the Chicano Moratorium. Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 140.

Angeles native, and Irene Tovar who was born in Boyle Heights and grew up in Pacoima. Tovar coordinated antiwar protests in the San Fernando Valley.[29]

The group's diversity at times fostered tension, as members differed on approaches, strategies, and roles. There was some disagreement over whether the group should take a nonviolent or confrontational approach.[30] Other disputes erupted between men and women, the latter routinely consigned to secondary positions. As Gilbert Cano put it, "The men did all the talking and the women did all the work."[31] A rift between Gloria Arellanes and the Brown Berets illustrated this chasm. When the Berets chastised her as a "women libber" and proponent of nonviolence, she left that group, along with several other women, and formed a new East LA women's group called Las Adelitas. They came to work exclusively for the Chicano Moratorium, which continued to include many Brown Berets as members. Other accounts reported power struggles between David Sánchez and Rosalío Muñoz over control of the group.[32]

Protests and Actions

By late 1969 and into 1970, the Chicano Moratorium stepped up efforts, spreading its antiwar message in newspapers, speeches, and especially marches. Their efforts unfolded against a backdrop of heightened racial tension in East LA. In early 1970 there were several cases of extreme police brutality, high school student walkouts that were met with harsh police tactics, and grassroots protests over police brutality. A U.S. Commission on Civil Rights report issued in March 1970 effectively confirmed this pattern, when it reported widespread police abuse against Mexican Americans in the Southwest.[33] Race relations were deteriorating as the Vietnam War was escalating due to the suppression of social activism.

Against this backdrop, the Chicano Moratorium began staging mass protests. On December 20, 1969, about 70 Brown Berets led a march down Michigan Avenue, marking the first large-scale Chicano protest against the Vietnam War in Los Angeles. Their route paid tribute to Mexican American military service, starting at a World War II memorial and ending at Eugene A. Obregon Park, named for a Mexican American Marine killed in Korea. Advertised as a "March Against Death," it was staged as a mock funeral for the war dead, complete with pallbearers carrying a coffin that symbolized the Mexican Americans who died in Vietnam. About 1,000 young people followed, chanting anti-war slogans like, "¡Raza si! ¡Guerra no!" At a rally in the park after the march, several speakers emphasized the link between the Vietnam War and "oppression at home," including Rosalío Muñoz and Manuel Gómez, a poet and Bay Area draft resister. Alicia Escalante, the mother of two Brown Berets and head of a local welfare rights group, Chicana Welfare Rights Organization, spoke about poverty in the area and

---

[29] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 137-140, 155-157.
[30] David Sánchez apparently disavowed violence, hoping to avoid more trouble from the police. See Pelayo, "The Chicano Movement," 48.
[31] Pelayo, "The Chicano Movement," 31.
[32] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 159-160; Pelayo, "The Chicano Movement," 31-33, 47-49. Also see Gloria Arellanes Oral History Interview, UCLA Oral History Collection, accessed July 17, 2015, http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/viewItem.do?ark=21198/zz002cftg9&title=%20Arellanes,%20Gloria.
[33] Rodolfo Acuña, *A Community Under Siege: A Chronicle of Chicanos East of the Los Angeles River, 1945-1975* (Los Angeles: UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center Publications, 1984), 197-203; Edward J. Escobar, "The Los Angeles Police Department and the Chicano Movement, 1968-1971," *Journal of American History* 99 (1993), 1495-1500; Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 144, 163, 164-167; Pelayo, "The Chicano Movement," 42-45.

declared, "I'd rather have my sons die for La Raza and La Causa than in Vietnam."[34] Two days before the march, the Moratorium Committee had released a statement against the draft that highlighted the vulnerability of Mexican American youth. The statement condemned both the Nixon administration and the white peace movement for the disproportionate number of Mexican Americans being drafted.[35]

Two months later, they staged another antiwar march. On February 28, 1970, several thousand protestors from California and throughout the Southwest marched in the rain in East Los Angeles.[36] Led by the Brown Berets, the marchers began at Atlantic Park at noon, travelled south on Atlantic Avenue, then west onto Whittier Boulevard, concluding at Laguna Park. It drew an African American contingent from the Che Lumamba branch of the Communist Party, members of Las Adelitas, a member of the Puerto Rican Young Lords group, and white members of the Peace Action Council. The East LA community cheered on the marchers, offering umbrellas and some merchants closing shop in "honor of the war dead." Rosalío Muñoz, Roberto Elías, David Sánchez, Oscar Zeta Acosta,[37] Alicia Escalante, and others spoke at the rally that followed.[38] The March in the Rain, as it became known, demonstrated the ability of Chicanas/os to mobilize at the national level as well as to build a multi-ethnic coalition.

The March in the Rain was also documented in a 30-minute black and white film, *Chicano Moratorium*, directed by Victor Millan and produced for the Ahora public affairs program on the local PBS station. According to Jesus Trevino in his memoir *EYEWITNESS*, this film was a part of a developing relationship between Chicano filmmakers and activists and public television, which became one of the few avenues, other than the work of Ruben Salazar, through which the Mexican American community could present their culture and concerns through the English-language television broadcast medium.

Throughout the spring and summer of 1970, the Chicano Moratorium continued to mobilize support for their cause. They distributed thousands of antiwar flyers, spoke at community gatherings, showed a film about the February protest, and staged rallies at local parks. They launched efforts to sponsor moratoriums in other cities throughout the Southwest, partly to build support for a national rally in August. Moratorium demonstrations spread to other regions and states, including Texas, Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, New York, and throughout California. They emphasized the message that the most important battle for Mexican Americans was at home and not in Vietnam.[39] By this point, the Chicano Moratorium was a key leader in the Southern California antiwar movement.[40]

[34] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 135-136, 140-142, quote at 142.
[35] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 142; Chávez, "*¡Mi Raza Primero!*" 65.
[36] The numbers vary in different sources: Oropeza claimed it was "some 2,000" (Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 148); David Sánchez claimed 5,000 (Sánchez, *Expedition through Aztlán,* 4); the *Belvedere Citizen* claimed it was 2,500 (Acuña, *A Community Under Siege,* 199).
[37] Known as "The Brown Buffalo," author and attorney Acosta represented many activists in the Chicano movement. A good friend of the writer Hunter S. Thompson, Acosta shared his narrative of events, which became the basis for Thompson's *Strange Rumblings in Aztlan* and their shared experience was later memorialized in *Fear and Loathing in Las Vegas.*
[38] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 148-149; Chávez, "*¡Mi Raza Primero!*" 65; Pelayo, "The Chicano Movement," 35-36; Sanchez, *Expedition through Aztlán,* 4; Acuña, *A Community Under Siege,* 199. The *Los Angeles Times* did not cover this event.
[39] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 158-159; Pelayo, "The Chicano Movement," 38. Moratorium leaders claimed that 20 demonstrations took place across the nation around this time. See Pelayo, 39.
[40] Pulido, *Black, Brown, Yellow & Left*, 73.

The August 29, 1970 March and Rally

For months, the Chicano Moratorium planned for its largest rally to be held on August 29 in East Los Angeles. They spread the word at antiwar gatherings across Los Angeles and several states, like the Chicano Youth Liberation conference held in Denver in April 1970. "We're out recruiting people to take part in the march," Rosalío Muñoz told the *Los Angeles Times*. "We're teaching them that our front line is here—*not* in Vietnam. This is where our battle for cultural survival is taking place."[41] He noted that organizers from as far away as Washington and Texas had visited the committee's headquarters to be briefed on the march. Ed Roybal also voiced his support for the impending march in the *Los Angeles Times*, praising the Moratorium's "constructive and nonviolent approach to halting" the war.[42]

The Moratorium Committee also took preemptive steps to ensure a peaceful protest. Wary of the violence at recent demonstrations at Kent State University and of tense relations in their own community, the Moratorium Committee met with law enforcement officials to plan the march. They also appointed over 200 peace-keeping monitors to ensure an orderly protest. Gilberto Cano coordinated the monitors, who included members of MEChA, clergymen, unionists, medics, and a group of lawyers and law students who would give legal advice if conflicts arose. They also distributed flyers urging marchers to take steps to avoid "a police attack." Several individuals, including Ruben Salazar and Bert Corona, expressed apprehension before the march about the ability of law enforcement to refrain from violence, fearing that police informants would provoke a conflict one way or another.[43] There was some tension between the Brown Berets and Moratorium Committee members just before the march. Some Brown Beret members felt slighted and overshadowed, and threatened to withdraw altogether. They ultimately stayed, recognizing the importance of the event.[44]

At 10 a.m. on August 29, 1970, people began gathering at Belvedere Park, marking the start to what would be the largest protest march in Mexican American history to that date. As more and more people arrived, they began marching on Whittier Boulevard along a three-mile route ending in Laguna Park. About 20,000 to 30,000 protestors walked the route.[45] Los Angeles County Sheriff's deputies described the mood as "cheerful" and "boisterous," while participants called it "intense, energetic, festive," "defiant," and "a very beautiful community experience." Others described strong feelings of unity and pride, and in the words of Irene Tovar, "a spirit, alive and dynamic."[46] The marchers included Brown Berets, Mexican American veterans, teenagers and their parents, radicals, liberals, families, children, and grandparents. They were joined by Native Americans, Puerto Ricans from New York, and whites and blacks from Los Angeles. This broad cross-section showed just how far the Chicano Moratorium had come.[47] During the march itself, the Chicana/o monitors quelled a handful of disturbances, working

[41] Richard Vasquez, "Thousands Expected in Latin War Protest," *Los Angeles Times*, August 11, 1970.
[42] "Roybal Backs Chicano Viet Moratorium," *Los Angeles Times*, August 25, 1970. One account states that at this point, Muñoz and Elias were co-chairs of the Moratorium committee. See Pelayo, "The Chicano Movement," 38.
[43] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 168; Chávez, "*¡Mi Raza Primero!*" 68; Pelayo, "The Chicano Movement," 46-51.
[44] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 159-160; Chávez, "*¡Mi Raza Primero!*" 66.
[45] The *Los Angeles Times* reported 15,000 to 20,000 in attendance; Charles T. Powers and Jeff Perlman, "One Dead, 40 Hurt in East L.A. Riot," *Los Angeles Times*, August 30, 1970. However, Chicano movement publications reported higher attendance, including *Regeneración*, Vol. 1, No. 6, 1970. Thus, scholars and mainstream newspapers in retrospect provide a broad range of 20,000 to 30,000.
[46] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 145.
[47] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 148.

to keep the peace.[48]

After walking three miles in the hot sun, the protestors arrived in Laguna Park and many "fell wearily—and gratefully—to the ground."[49] Rosalío Muñoz began the post-march rally with a speech praising the movement's progress from a small group to "a powerful force for change." He called for an end to police brutality. Within minutes, the rally turned violent as Sheriff's deputies advanced on the demonstrators. At this point, different sources offer contrasting interpretations of what transpired. Historian Lorena Oropeza, who drew on Chicano media reports, leftist newspapers, oral histories, and to a lesser extent the *Los Angeles Times*, described events from the perspective of the protestors. She claims a line of deputies at the edge of the park began pushing forward and "bore down" on the protestors, shooting tear gas and reacting to some resistance from demonstrators, some who threw rocks, and one who fired at and barely missed a deputy, using the deputy's gun. As more of the young protestors resisted the police advance—armed with "picket signs, magazines, flyers, purses, bottles, feet and fists"—the police responded with greater force, wielding batons and tear gas. Many of the protestors considered the police onslaught unprovoked, inciting some to forcefully resist. Riots ensued, as angry youth shattered windows and looted stores along Whittier Boulevard in reaction to being forced out of the park.[50] *La Raza*, the Chicano Moratorium magazine, called the violence "the police riot," noting that Sheriff's deputies and LAPD officers arrived at the park wearing full riot gear.[51]

Immediate coverage by the *Los Angeles Times* emphasized the Sheriff's Department perspective. It claimed a disturbance at a nearby liquor store triggered the police response. About 300 marchers had descended on the Green Mill Liquor Store, and "began looting the shelves."[52] When the owner tried to close the door, he was "threatened with clubs and knives." The deputies responded, pursuing the looters who were making their way to the park. When deputies tried to make arrests at the edge of the park, some of the protestors responded by lobbing bottles. The Sheriff's Department responded with more force, and the conflict spun out of control.[53]

After the rally in the park, Ruben Salazar, a columnist for the *Los Angeles Times* and the news director at television station KMEX, had stopped at the Silver Dollar Café for a beer, along with a colleague and his two friends. While Salazar sat at the bar, he was struck in the head by a tear gas canister, which killed him instantly. Sheriff Deputy Thomas Wilson claimed he fired the canister in response to reports of a person with a gun inside. However, eyewitnesses claimed the only persons with guns were the Sheriff's deputies, who were forcing people into the bar at gunpoint. A photograph in *La Raza*, reprinted

---

[48] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 168. Also see the film *Requiem 29* (Los Angeles: National Latino Communications Center Educational Media, 1971).
[49] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 160.
[50] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 169-171. Similar account are in Chávez, "*¡Mi Raza Primero!"* 68-70 and Escobar, "The LAPD and the Chicano Movement," 1483-1485. David Sanchez claimed he was personally "laying low" during the rally, hoping to avoid an anticipated confrontation with police. He claims the Brown Berets "got the word that the gangs were coming down to fight. I heard a couple people from out of town were coming down to fight. I knew there was going to be trouble." See David Sánchez Oral History Interview, session #4, UCLA Oral History Collection, accessed July 20, 2015, http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/viewItem.do?ark=21198/zz002hkcv5&title=%20Sanchez,%20David.
[51] Elvia Rodriguez, "Covering the Chicano Movement" (Ph.D. dissertation, UC Riverside, 2013), 97.
[52] This report is implausible given the fact that the store is approximately 1,500 square feet.
[53] Charles T. Powers and Jeff Perlman, "One Dead, 40 Hurt in East L.A. Riot," *Los Angeles Times*, August 30, 1970.

in the *New York Times*, seemed to confirm that account. Many people were horrified and outraged by Salazar's death. Several scholars have noted that Salazar was preparing to report on police brutality in the Latino community, which had drawn the ire of police officials.[54] After the release of the Salazar files in 2000, the *Los Angeles Times* published a series of articles that confirmed the Sheriff's Department animosity towards Salazar, including an incident when Salazar and his cameraman were directly confronted and nearly physically assaulted by a Sheriff's deputy.

After five hours of unrest, which involved fewer than 400 people according to police, the final toll was three dead, 31 civilians and 43 police officers and Sheriff's deputies injured, and 152 persons arrested. Property damage from fires and looting topped $1 million. Besides Salazar, the other fatalities were Lyn Ward, a 15-year-old member of the Brown Berets, who died from an explosion set off by "unknown persons" according to police, and 30-year old Jose Angel Díaz, who was shot in the head by a Sheriff's deputy after he drove through two barricades.[55]

The tragic ending to the march marked a fateful climax for the Chicano Moratorium. As Oropeza writes, "A day of unparalleled unity and tragedy, the National Chicano Moratorium March of August 29, 1970, marked both the pinnacle of organizational achievement for Chicano movement activists and their most serious setback."[56] In the immediate aftermath of the march, the Moratorium Committee focused on releasing all persons arrested and demanding an investigation of Salazar's death. The group experienced an initial spike of support. Irene Tovar, who helped form the Chicano Defense Fund to raise bail money, recalled large turnouts and numerous donations to the cause. The Moratorium, meanwhile, led a broad range of individuals and groups calling for the U.S. Justice Department to investigate Salazar's death. The official response was strong and negative. The City of Los Angeles held an inquest into the events of August 29 to determine why the riot occurred and why Salazar was killed. A hearing was open to the public and broadcast on television. Footage from the hearing was included in the film *Requiem 29*.

The general criticism of the inquest is that the designated hearing officer, Norman Pittluck, was particularly biased against the perspective and concerns of the Chicano activists and focused on validating the perspective of law enforcement and exonerating the Sheriff's Department. Meanwhile, the Sheriff's Department worked to discredit the Moratorium Committee. Federal officials seemed more interested in investigating Chicano protestors than the police, while local officials blamed "a small group of hard-core subversives," in the words of LAPD Chief Edward Davis, for infiltrating the group and provoking violence.[57] Siding with the Moratorium and mourning the loss of one of its own, the *Los Angeles Times* ran a series of articles about Salazar's death. The official coroner's inquest yielded a split

---

[54] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 172; Steven Roberts, "Mexican American Hostility Deepens in Tense East Los Angeles," *New York Times*, September 4, 1970; Escobar, "The LAPD and the Chicano Movement," 1501; Pelayo, "The Chicano Movement," 44-45. On Chicano reaction, also see Vicki Ruiz, *From Out of the Shadows* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 115.
[55] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 171-172. In another account, Lyn Ward was killed by an exploding tear gas canister that blew him through a plate glass window.
[56] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 148.
[57] Federal officials themselves had actually infiltrated the Chicano Moratorium, the most notorious figure being Eustacio "Frank" Martinez, an LAPD and ATF informant who joined the Moratorium in October 1970. He fomented dissention within the group, and staged incidents to provoke police attacks. These actions contributed to the group's demise. See Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 181; Ian F. Haney Lopez, *Racism on Trial: The Chicano Fight for Justice* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2003), 149-150; Escobar, "The LAPD and the Chicano Movement," 1500-1506.

verdict, prompting Los Angeles D.A. Evelle Younger to drop the case against Deputy Wilson and federal officials to back off from further investigation.

In late 1970, David Sánchez and Rosalío Muñoz made a plea for unity, facing intensifying pressure from the police, officials, and, increasingly, conservative voices in the Mexican American community. The focus of the Moratorium Committee shifted from protesting the Vietnam War to calling attention to police abuse. The group began to organize another large demonstration on January 31. Separate marches that began days beforehand in Pomona, Venice, Long Beach, La Puente, Boyle Heights, Lincoln Heights, San Fernando/Pacoima, and Wilmington/San Pedro converged on Belvedere Park.[58] The size of the crowd ranged from 7,000 to 15,000 people.[59] At the end of the rally, Muñoz explicitly warned the crowd to disperse peacefully out of respect for those who had traveled so far.[60] Unfortunately, a group of protestors decided to march to the Sheriff's substation nearby and began to throw rocks. The deputies responded with full force: more than 40 persons were arrested, 25 persons were seriously injured, and one young man, Gustav Montag, died. Afterward, the Moratorium Committee decided to rethink their tactics in the face of police violence against demonstrators. By the middle of 1971, the group had largely disbanded.

---

[58] Frank Del Olmo, "Chicanos Start March to Join Rally in East L.A." *Los Angeles Times*, January 29, 1970, A1.
[59] Mario T. García, *The Chicano Generation, Testimonios of the Movement* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015), 291.
[60] Mario T. García, 292.

Section F. Associated Property Types

Properties directly associated with the Chicano Moratorium are significant at the local level of significance under Criterion A in the areas of Ethnic Heritage: Hispanic, Politics/Government, and Social History. The Chicano Moratorium left an important legacy on multiple fronts. As a leading force in the Southern California antiwar movement, it hastened the end of the Vietnam War. It also shifted the ideological terrain of Mexican American identity, pushing it toward a fuller embrace of cultural nationalism and challenging "a long-standing tripod of citizenship that had rested upon whiteness, masculinity, and military service."[61] With this redefined sense of patriotism, the Moratorium inspired many Latinos to recognize injustice and work toward positive change. It galvanized more Mexican Americans to join the Chicano movement, many spurred by the violent police response, which ultimately worked to "politicize and empower the Mexican-American community."

As historian Edward Escobar writes, "These new attitudes led Chicanos to act with more determination and self-consciousness in voting, in litigating, and in developing new institutions that ultimately curtailed the power of the police to suppress legitimate protest."[62] The Moratorium also helped create a more mature Chicano leadership, and spurred activism in many quarters. Some Moratorium members transitioned into other areas of engagement, such as union organizing, public health, and welfare rights, while others went into politics or academia. Others continued antiwar work and activism to improve conditions for Latinos. The Moratorium, ultimately, left a legacy that transcended Los Angeles. As one activist noted in 2012, the legacy of the Chicano Moratorium belongs "to all Chicanos and Latinos who embrace its proud symbolism and lessons of struggle that further the demand and quest for social justice."[63]

The properties identified as eligible include:

- Brown Beret Headquarters, 2639-41 East Fourth Street, City of Los Angeles
- Church of the Epiphany, 2808 Altura Street, City of Los Angeles
- El Barrio Free Clinic, 5014-18 East Whittier Boulevard, unincorporated Los Angeles County
- Chicano Moratorium March, December 20, 1969, Five Points Memorial in the City of Los Angeles to Obregon Park in unincorporated Los Angeles County
- Chicano Moratorium March, February 28, 1970, Atlantic Park to Laguna Park (Salazar Park), in unincorporated Los Angeles County
- National Chicano Moratorium March, August 29, 1970, Belvedere Park to Laguna Park (renamed Salazar Park).
    - Including as a district contributor, Silver Dollar Café, 4941-51 East Whittier Boulevard, unincorporated Los Angeles County

---

[61] Oropeza, *¡Raza Si! ¡Guerra No!* 194.
[62] Escobar, "The LAPD and the Chicano Movement," 1486, 1488.
[63] Jimmy Franco, Sr., "The Significance of the Chicano Moratorium," *La Prensa San Diego*, August 31, 2012. Franco is the moderator of the blog site, http://www.latinopov.com/blog/?author=1.

Future scholarship and surveys may reveal additional significant properties or alter what is known about the referenced properties.

The properties associated with the Chicano Moratorium meet Criteria Consideration G: Properties That Have Achieved Significance Within the Past Fifty Years. Events surrounding the Chicano Moratorium have been sufficiently studied by scholars to determine their exceptional importance. The Chicano Moratorium March on August 29, 1970 was the largest demonstration during the Chicano movement and the most significant civil rights and community empowerment movement by Mexican Americans in the country to that time. The Moratorium was an important component of the student protest movement against the Vietnam War as well as the Chicano movement for civil rights. The Moratorium showed the courage and commitment of young Chicanos to take on the system and to demand that a "war of choice" be ended, a war that was particularly injurious to Chicanos and other minorities. In so doing, the Moratorium laid the foundation for subsequent Latino political power.

Property Types Associated with Making a Democracy: Latino Struggles for Inclusion

Headquarters and Offices of Prominent Organizations

Registration Requirements—To be eligible under Criterion A, buildings must be strongly associated with a prominent organization that played an important role in the Chicano Moratorium. It is not necessary for the organization to have constructed the building, which does not appear to have been the case with any of the organizations in Los Angeles. It is only necessary for the organization to have occupied the building during the period in which it gained significance. Buildings should retain sufficient integrity to convey their overall character from the period of significance including height, massing, and roof form. The historic location, setting, feeling, and association must be strongly present in the evaluation of integrity. Buildings may be modest in their workmanship and materials due to the limited financial resources of most organizations, especially given the youth of the members. Most of the buildings were designed for commercial or mixed-uses, and the organizations adapted them for their purposes. Limited materials replacement or alteration may have occurred, as the buildings continue to be adapted by new owners and tenants. Integrity of design is not an essential aspect of integrity. The buildings in the working class neighborhoods in which these organizations operated were typically not designed in a particular style. They tended to meet the functional requirements of the use they served and were lacking in embellishments for purely aesthetic purposes.

The prominent organizations directly associated with the Chicano Moratorium in Los Angeles include the Chicano Moratorium Committee, the Brown Berets, and the El Barrio Free Clinic. The offices of the Chicano Moratorium Committee were located at 4629 Brooklyn Avenue in the City of Los Angeles. Brooklyn Avenue was renamed Cesar Chavez Avenue in 1994. The building at 4629 East Cesar Chavez Avenue in unincorporated East Los Angeles was constructed in 2010. Therefore, the building in which the Chicano Moratorium Committee had offices is presumed to be demolished. There is now a parking lot where this building once stood.

The Brown Berets, an influential group of social activists and leading advocates of the Chicano

movement in East Los Angeles during the 1960s and 1970s, met in several locations. They were forced to move frequently as their financial resources were limited and their activities were monitored by the police. Their location during the Chicano Moratorium was 2639-41 East Fourth Street in the Boyle Heights neighborhood of the City of Los Angeles. The mixed-use building in which they rented space was large enough for the members to practice marches. Directly across the street from Theodore Roosevelt High School, it was also conveniently located for student members.

El Barrio Free Clinic was located at 5014-18 East Whittier Boulevard in unincorporated East Los Angeles. The first meetings of the Moratorium Committee took place here, and the Brown Berets began using one of the rooms in the clinic as a temporary headquarters in 1969. The clinic was the most important legacy of the Brown Berets and demonstrates the important role of women in the Berets. Female members included Gloria Arellanes, Lorraine Escalante, Arlene Sánchez, Elena and Yolanda Solís, and Hilda and Grace Reyes. Despite its short existence, it helped many people in East LA and became a model for other free clinics.

Resources Associated with Historic Events

Registration Requirements—To be eligible under Criterion A, buildings or sites must be demonstrably important with a historic event or series of events that played an important role in the Chicano Moratorium. These will likely be pivotal or singular events that changed the course of the Latino civil rights, antiwar, and Chicano movements in California. These events must have occurred prior to 1971. In some cases, the events associated with the Chicano Moratorium occurred within buildings and in other cases they occurred in public spaces. To be eligible, the building or site must retain integrity of location, setting, feeling, and association from the period in which the event occurred. Unlike architecturally significant properties, culturally significant properties like those associated with the Chicano Moratorium were not photo-documented. The few photographs that exist are more often of the people involved with the historic event as opposed to the place in which the event occurred. Thus, testimony from people involved with the historic event may be required to establish the integrity of feeling and association.

The Silver Dollar Café is a prime example of a property associated with a singular historic event that came to symbolize the struggle for Latino civil rights that occurred during the Chicano Moratorium. The Café is located at 4941-51 East Whittier Boulevard in unincorporated East Los Angeles along the route of the National Chicano Moratorium March of August 29, 1970. The Silver Dollar Café is the site where the revered journalist Rueben Salazar was killed. Salazar became a martyr for Latinos, although some criticized his reporting during his lifetime. His death drew attention to the tensions between law enforcement officials and Chicano activists and motivated many to join the Chicano civil rights movement. As there are no other properties associated with this pivotal event in Latino history, and the building retains its overall character from the period of significance including height, massing, and roof form, the building retains sufficient integrity as a district contributor for eligibility under Criterion B

The Church of the Epiphany is located at 2808 Altura Street in the Lincoln Heights neighborhood of the City of Los Angeles. During the 1960s, it became an important center of the Chicano civil rights

movement. Union organizer Cesar Chavez gave talks at the church. Community organizers held meetings here to plan the 1968 high school student walkouts and 1970 Chicano Moratorium protests. The pastor of the church, Father Luce was instrumental in mentoring, organizing, and helping to secure financial assistance for the Young Citizens for Community Action, which eventually became the Brown Berets. The basement of the church housed the printing presses for *La Raza*, a local newspaper that would evolve into a magazine that helped shape a Chicano identity. Thus, the Church of the Epiphany is a prime example of a property associated with a series of events that played an important role in the Latino civil rights movement as well as the Chicano Moratorium.

The first Chicano Moratorium march occurred on December 20, 1969. It began at the Five Points Memorial in the City of Los Angeles and ended at Obregon Park in unincorporated East Los Angeles. The march was a significant event, drawing attention to the historic contributions of the Latino community to the United States military in past wars and on the ongoing, disproportionate sacrifices of the community in the Vietnam War. The success of this march garnered public support and attention for the Chicano movement and the Chicano Moratorium.

The second Chicano Moratorium march was held on February 28, 1970, and is commonly referred to as the March in the Rain. It began at Atlantic Park and ended in Laguna Park (renamed Salazar Park), both in unincorporated East Los Angeles. The March in the Rain was filmed by Chicano documentarians. When the film was shown to 2,000 Chicano youth leaders at the Second Chicano Liberation Conference on March 28, 1970, at the Crusade for Justice in Denver, they overwhelmingly voted to support a National Chicano Moratorium march on August 29, 1970.

The National Chicano Moratorium march occurred on August 29, 1970. It began at Belvedere Park and ended at Laguna Park (renamed Salazar Park). The march was the largest demonstration of Mexican Americans in history; about 20,000 to 30,000 protestors walked the route. The march and rally at Laguna Park became one of the pivotal moments in the Chicano movement when activists within the community became polarized between those focused on conflict with law enforcement and those focused on correcting broader social inequalities affecting Chicano people.

Section G. Geographical Data

Los Angeles County, California

Section H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

This MPDF for the Chicano Moratorium in Los Angeles County was sponsored by the Los Angeles Conservancy. The foundational documents included the *American Latinos and the Making of the United States: A Theme Study* (2013) and the *Latinos in Twentieth Century California* MPDF (2015). Placing the Chicano Moratorium firmly within the context of the Latinos civil rights movement as well as the context of the anti-Vietnam War movement was the purpose of this independent MPDF. The geographic area covers the County of Los Angeles, and the majority of the organizations and events related to the Chicano Moratorium occurred in the Boyle Heights neighborhood of the City of Los Angeles and the East Los Angeles neighborhood, an unincorporated area of the County.

The Los Angeles Conservancy formed an advisory group to guide the project. The group included Gloria Arellanes, Dr. Richard E. Espinoza, Belinda Faustinos, Rosalío Muñoz, Raul Ruiz, David Sánchez, and Sal Valdez. Notably, several members of the group played key roles in the Chicano Moratorium. The group met on April 24, 2015 to exchange information and to discuss potential associated properties. Staff members from the Los Angeles Conservancy involved with the project included Adrian Scott Fine, Manuel A. Huerta, and Laura Dominguez. GPA Consulting was hired to prepare the document, as they were also responsible for the preparation of the *Latinos in Twentieth Century California* Multiple Property Submission. The GPA project team included Teresa Grimes, Allison Lyons, and Becky Nicolaides.

Following the advisory group meeting, the project team conducted archival and field research about the Chicano Moratorium in Los Angeles. The Chicano Moratorium elicited strong, sometimes conflicting opinions by participants, observers, and historians. This MPDF attempts to be transparent about these differences where possible, especially on the more controversial aspects of this history.

This MPDF relies heavily upon the monograph by Lorena Oropeza,*¡Raza Si!¡Guerra No! Chicano Protest and Patriotism During the Viet Nam War Era* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), the most complete, authoritative source on the Chicano Moratorium. It is a deeply researched, fairly well-balanced accounting of Chicano antiwar activism that attempts to place this activism in larger historical context. As a peer-reviewed book published by a reputable academic press, this book is a reliable source. While Oropeza's book was a major source for this report, it should be noted that several key themes in her book were articulated by Jaime Pelayo, "The Chicano Movement and the Vietnam War" (unpublished senior thesis, Yale University, 1997). Pelayo's thesis is also used in this MPDF. Other prime sources included the oral histories of David Sánchez, Gloria Arellanes, and Esteban Torres in the UCLA Oral History Collection as well as Mario García, *The Chicano Generation: Testimonios of the Movement* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015), based on interviews with Raul Ruiz, Gloria Arellanes, and Rosalío Muñoz.

The Los Angeles Conservancy received funding for the project from former Los Angeles County Supervisor Gloria Molina. The funding supported the preparation of the MPDF and National Register nominations for some, but not all of the properties identified as eligible.

Section I. Major Bibliographic References

Acuña, Rodolfo. *A Community Under Siege: A Chronicle of Chicanos East of the Los Angeles River, 1945-1975.* Los Angeles: UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center Publications, 1984.

Camarillo, Albert. *Chicanos in California: A History of Mexican American in California*. San Francisco: Boyd & Fraser, 1984.

Chávez, Ernesto. "*¡Mi Raza Primero!" (My People First!): Nationalism, Identity, and Insurgency in the Chicano Movement in Los Angeles, 1966-1978.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

DeSipio, Louis. "Demanding Equal Political Voice… and Accepting Nothing less: The Quest for Latino Political Inclusion," *American Latinos and the Making of the United States: A Theme Study*. Washington DC: National Park Service, 2013.

Escobar, Edward J. "The Los Angeles Police Department and the Chicano Movement, 1968-1971," *Journal of American History* 99 (1993), 1495-1500.

Gann, L.H. and Peter J. Duignan. *The Hispanics in the United States*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1986.

García, Mario. *The Chicano Generation: Testimonios of the Movement*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015.

Garcia, Matt. *A World of Its Own: Race, Labor, and Citrus in the Making of Greater Los Angeles, 1900-1970.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

GPA Consulting, National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form, *Latinos in Twentieth Century California,* 2015.

Lopez, Ian F. Haney, *Racism on Trial: The Chicano Fight for Justice*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2003.

Oropeza, Lorena. *¡Raza Si, Guerra No!: Chicano Protest and Patriotism during the Viet Nam War Era*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Ornelas, Charles and Michael Gonzalez. "The Chicano and the War: An Opinion Survey in Santa Barbara," *Aztlán* 2, 1 (October 1971), 23-35.

Pelayo, Jaime. "The Chicano Movement and the Vietnam War" (unpublished senior thesis, Yale University, 1997), Located in: Folder 2, Series V, Box 3, Gloria Arellanes Papers 1967-1979. Special Collections and Archives, John F. Kennedy Memorial Library, California State University, Los Angeles.

Pulido, Laura. *Black, Brown, Yellow & Left: Radical Activism in Los Angeles*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Mariscal, George. *Aztlán and Viet Nam: Chicano and Chicana Experiences of the War*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Rodriguez, Elvia. “Covering the Chicano Movement,” Ph.D. dissertation, UC Riverside, 2013.

Ruiz, Vicki L. *From Out of the Shadows: Mexican Women in Twentieth-Century America.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Sánchez, David. *Expedition through Aztlán*. La Puente: Perspectiva Publications, 1978.

Sánchez, George. *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture, and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900-1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

UCLA Oral History Collection, Oral History Interviews with David Sánchez, Gloria Arellanes, and Esteban Torres.

Vera, Ron. “Observations on the Chicano Relationship to Military Service in Los Angeles County,” *Aztlán* 1, 2 (October 1970), 33-34.

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C.460 et seq.).
Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 250 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, PO Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Project (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.