Preface

One of the most persistent social narratives in our society is the notion of machismo, with its inherent sexism, as a defining feature of all Latino cultures. According to this master narrative (Stewart and Romero 1999) machismo continues to exist in Latino communities in the United States, which are generally perceived as homogeneous in nature, with little internal diversity regardless of differing geographical location, national origin, or educational levels. Many times Latino cultural practices are used as the measure of the liberal sexual and gender attitudes of other nation-states, including the United States. This perception of the Latino population is a powerful representation, not only in the US media but in academic writing as well.

This book challenges the prevailing notions of Latino machismo, sexism, and homogeneity by presenting the narratives of young, educated Latinos living in the United States and by demonstrating how a combination of education, life experiences, and exposure to feminist ideas has contributed to changes in norms, values, and perceptions, not only for our respondents but for their communities as well. The young, educated Latino men presented in this book have grown up in a world in which feminism is a viable framework for understanding culture and gender relations that affords them the opportunity to reconfigure what it means to be a man. The respondents in our study spoke eloquently about the privileges they had as men, as well as their vulnerabilities as they contended with issues of race, ethnicity, sexuality, and class. The respondents also represent the next generation of Latino leaders as all of them at the time of the interviews were attending or had attended institutions of higher education. This book, therefore, sets forth the possibility of feminist mascu-

linities emerging in this generation of Latinos.[1] Furthermore, the analyses presented here, including the writings of Chicana feminists, document the effects feminist movements have had on changing gender norms and privileges that may potentially lead to a men's movement that critically examines and redefines masculinities.

The second contribution of the book is the application of a Chicana feminist Intersectional Theory to the study of Latino masculinities. This approach allows for the simultaneous examination of the advantages Latino men have because of the privileges accorded to masculinities *and* the disadvantages they are subject to because of derogated categories such as class, sexuality, ethnicity, and race. Chicana feminist writings elucidate the process our respondents have undergone that has resulted in a deeper understanding of feminist issues.

A third contribution of this book is a focus on successful, educated Latinos instead of the more frequently examined focus on young Latinos who have not succeeded in the educational system. This emphasis on success rather than failure allows the reader to go beyond the usual narratives describing Latino men as well as other men of Color. Therefore, the lens shifts from Latinos as a social problem to Latinos as contributors to US society.

Another intention of the book is to highlight the nature of cultural change achieved through education. Our respondents eloquently recounted how their perceptions, ideas, and values were transformed through education. But education alone does not explain their transformation on feminist issues; they also attributed these changes to witnessing the hardships experienced by the women in their lives (especially their mothers) and to the Chicana feminist frameworks they were exposed to in their journey through higher education.

Traditionally, scholarly feminist analyses have focused primarily on white men's gender consciousness. Absent are studies that examine Latino men's views on feminisms. This book's theoretical framework facilitates the integration of three areas of research: the interdisciplinary study of masculinities, including the extensive literature using the concept of machismo as an organizing concept; the theoretical and empirical work on Intersectionality as embodied in Social Identities and extended through Anzaldúa's Borderlands Theory; and the writings of Chicana feminists, specifically, the theoretical writings on mestiza consciousness and the writings on the process of conocimiento for personal and political transformations. Together these research areas provide the evidence and direction for identifying new Latino masculinities.

Overview

Chicana feminisms are characterized by "finding absences and exclusions and arguing from that standpoint" (Hurtado 1998b, 135).[2] Arredondo et al. (2003, 2) claim that "Chicana feminist writings move discourse beyond binaries and toward intersectionality and hybridity." Their work is "grounded in our understanding of power as relational" and "working toward an explanatory matrix that confronts the shifting boundaries of discourse and captures ties to lived experiences" (2). The Chicana feminist project aligns itself with Anzaldúa's notion of "Chicanas' bodies as bocacalles. Literally, bocacalle translates as an intersection where two streets cross one another" (Arredondo et al. 2003, 2). Because Chicana feminists speak and live in complex social realities that are constantly crossing borders—physical and metaphorical—they situate their writing in multiple constituencies. Working within this standpoint can be arduous, entailing consideration of multiple debates and critiques. Chicanas strategically engage and move fluidly among different social formations, always risking the consequences of not aligning themselves absolutely with any of them (Arredondo et al. 2003).

This articulation of Chicana feminists' standpoints aptly captures the structure and content of *Beyond Machismo*. The lack of scholarly attention to the complexity of Latino men's experiences qualifies as an "exclusion" to be addressed. Furthermore, in her groundbreaking anthology *Making Face, Making Soul/Haciendo Caras* (1990, xvii–xviii), Gloria Anzaldúa organizes writings by women of Color that reflect what she calls "our fragmented and interrupted dialogue which is said to be discontinued and incomplete discourse" and asks readers to participate "in the making of meaning . . . to connect the dots, the fragments." The analyses in this book are based on three original studies, which we use to follow Anzaldúa's articulation of the purpose of the Chicana feminist project to "connect the dots" and create a "dialogue" that is either "discontinued" or "incomplete" among Latinos, Latinas, and white men. The respondents in all three studies help us understand their experiences at the intersections of their various Social Identities and illuminate (by connecting the dots between their Intersectional Identities and the usefulness of a Chicana feminist intersectional framework) the potential emergence of new Latino masculinities.

The three studies are described in detail in Chapter 1 and were conducted by the authors: the Latino Masculinities Study (LMS), the Chicana Feminisms Study (CFS), and the Brown and White Masculinities

Study (BWMS). Although we use all three studies in this book, the core arguments come from the Latino Masculinities Study. This study was conducted among Latino men and was designed to mirror the Chicana Feminisms Study (presented in *Voicing Chicana Feminisms: Young Women Speak Out on Sexuality and Identity* [Hurtado 2003b]), which was conducted among Latinas of Mexican descent. Both of these studies are based on in-depth qualitative interviews with over 100 respondents of Latino ancestry between the ages of twenty and thirty who had education beyond high school and who hailed from different locations across the United States. In the LMS, the respondents were considered Latino if they had at least one parent of Latin American ancestry. In the CFS, only respondents who had at least one parent of Mexican ancestry were interviewed.

The similarities in research design between the LMS and the CFS allow for important theoretical and empirical comparisons. Although our primary focus is on young Latinos, we take advantage of the research design and the comparability of the data from the two studies. The structure of this book and of *Voicing Chicana Feminisms* permits scholars and educators to use both books in tandem, as two sides of one coin. What do young Latinos and Chicanas think about their lives in the context of their communities, gender socialization, views on feminism, and commitment to social change? How do these young people's intersectional positionings as embodied in their Social Identities of race, class, ethnicity, sexuality, and gender influence their views and behaviors? The reading of *Beyond Machismo* and *Voicing Chicana Feminisms* (Hurtado 2003b) is designed to communicate, dialogue, and theorize about and, ultimately, to bridge the experiences of Latinos and Chicanas through the lens of their multiple and, many times, stigmatized Social Identities.

The third source of data is the Brown and White Masculinities Study, a comparison questionnaire study of Latino and white college-educated men and their views on feminisms. In this questionnaire study we examined men's attitudes toward feminism and political commitments to gender equality quantitatively. Following Arredondo et al. (2003), we consider the three studies (LMS, CFS, BWMS) used in this book as our core empirical glorieta (roundabout) to open up avenidas (avenues) in each chapter to explore different aspects of Latinos' masculinities.

In *Beyond Machismo* we combine methodologies, data sources, and findings from multidisciplinary writings to gain a better understanding of a long-overlooked segment of the Latino male population and to broaden the readers' perspective of Latino men's views on gender relations. We see education and other processes as potential means of fostering a commit-

ment to gender equality and new definitions of Latino masculinities. By documenting these changes, we hope that Latinos will be viewed as complex human beings and that the general perception of them inside and outside the academy will move beyond machismo.

A Word about Our Dedication

We begin this book with a dedication to Daniel Márquez, Isaac Torres, José G. Hurtado, and Don Luis Leal.[3] Don Luis was an internationally recognized scholar who made his last academic home at the University of California, Santa Barbara, in the Department of Chicana and Chicano Studies. Don Luis, as everyone affectionately referred to him, lived a long, healthy, productive, intellectually engaged life and passed away in 2010 at the age of 101. He was also known for his kindness, sense of humor, and mentoring of young men. He represented a masculinity that we are very much in need of, and this book honors that history on which we should build.

José, Aída's only brother, served five years in prison for possessing and selling drugs. After his release, he came to live with Aída and her family and received a bachelor's degree as a reentry student in community studies at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Two years later, he received his master's degree in social work from San Jose State University.

Unlike Don Luis and José, Daniel and Isaac died young and were unable to fulfill their gifts. Daniel died in a drive-by shooting on August 22, 2005. He was twenty-seven years old and the brother of a respondent in *Voicing Chicana Feminisms*. He was killed less than four miles from the University of California, Santa Cruz campus, the university from which his sister graduated with a bachelor's degree in psychology, where Aída Hurtado built her academic career in psychology, and where Mrinal Sinha completed his doctoral degree in psychology.

Isaac grew up in Newark, New Jersey. He too was connected to the academy. His sister Mellie Torres writes eloquently about the relationship she had with her brother and his tragic death (Torres 2009). Aída Hurtado advised Mellie Torres on her dissertation, and Mellie assisted her on a book covering the topic of Latino men and boys (Noguera, Hurtado, and Fergus 2012). Mellie Torres's dissertation also focuses on young Latinos and their educational vulnerabilities. She received her doctoral degree in education in 2012 from New York University.

Daniel and Isaac had several Intersectional Identities in common with

José: Latino, working class, men, and heterosexual. They also had sisters who considered themselves feminists and were educationally successful: Aída Hurtado and Mellie Torres are professors, and Sandra Marquez is a social worker. The same family and environment that created the educationally successful women also created the circumstances that led to Daniel's and Isaac's deaths and José's incarceration. We propose that Intersectionality connected to Social Identity Theory (SIT) as developed by Chicana feminists and other feminists of Color, facilitates an understanding of José's successful reintegration into and contributions to society. We also trust that Intersectionality Theory will facilitate an understanding of how the systems delineated as successful in José's reintegration failed to help Daniel and Isaac. In fact, Daniel was killed in the same community that saved José from reincarceration.

It is obvious that the presence of a feminist community, supportive familial relationships, and a commitment to feminism are important elements but not sufficient for the successful engagement of young Latinos. Also needed are individuals involved in the day-to-day application of this framework to the intricate dance of survival—the application of mestiza consciousness, the process of conocimiento, the network of caring, the importance of feminist nonprofits in alliance with men's organizations, the inclusion of women in the process of redefining masculinities, the reconstitution of culture and language as a healing practice, and the recentering of treatment for addiction on indigenous practice rather than on Western medical modes of recovery. All have to be coordinated and balanced to produce a successful outcome similar to José's.

Why should we commit such tremendous resources to save one life? Shouldn't individuals be responsible for their own recovery? Shouldn't they pull themselves up by their own proverbial bootstraps? Why should feminists be responsible, again, for the recovery and healing of men—even if those men are family members? Isn't the cost to women high and at the expense of their own development? These questions generate much debate and have no clear-cut answers. We offer one answer, which is in line with a Chicana feminist consciousness: by saving one life we break the cycle of violence, despair, and loss. Another answer lies in Chicana feminist writings, as noted by Jennifer Browdy de Hernández, who wrote the following in a blog post:

> I would say that spiritual activism is any form of engagement with the world undertaken out of love, compassion and the desire to collaborate with others in a common project of highlighting the interconnection of

all beings on our planet, and perhaps in our universe as well. "Love thy neighbor as thyself" and other conventional formulations along these lines contain the essential kernel of spiritual insight, which is that we are all sparks of a divine flame and the positive forces in our world pull us toward unity and harmony and the apprehension of our interbeing.

What makes Gloria Anzaldúa such a wonderful model for spiritual activism and the process of conocimiento (coming to awareness, and then taking action on that new awareness) is that she somehow manages to balance the spiritual and the material, the intellectual and the emotional, the theoretical and the pragmatic. These are the strands she is weaving together so brilliantly in her texts and in her lifework, and we women of the world must take note, and gird ourselves to continue her important project in her absence. (http://womenscrossroads.blogspot.com/2006/01/gloria-anzaldua-personal-is-political.html)

We believe that Chicana feminisms' answer to the question, "Why care?" is that by saving the Josés of the world, we ultimately save ourselves and those we love.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK