# Gender, Labor History, and Chicano/a Ethnic Identity

Sarah Deutsch

*Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 2. (1994), pp. 1-22.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0160-9009%281994%2914%3A2%3C1%3AGLHACE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-4

*Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* is currently published by University of Nebraska Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/journals/unp.html.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

http://www.jstor.org
Sat Jul 21 05:08:31 2007

Sarah Deutsch

# Gender, Labor History, and Chicano / a Ethnic Identity

It is commonplace now, if not universal, to recognize that gender issues are inseparable from those of culture, class, and race.[1] That recognition has both arisen from and influenced works on Chicano history as it has other fields. Recently, Douglas Monroy and Ramón Gutiérrez, in their elegant prizewinning books on colonial California and New Mexico respectively, made gender and the political economy of sex central to their arguments about imperialism, conquest, race, and ethnicity.[2] In addition, a flurry of publications that focus more specifically on Chicanas has altered our picture of ethnicity, race, and class in the American West.[3]

Yet this common recognition still leaves some gaps in the literature, alongside some resisters. This article originated in an attempt to convince that remnant, not a uniformly sympathetic audience, of the importance of gender analysis even where it seems most unlikely.[4] I chose as examples what seemed at the time to be unrelated arenas and methodologies: the social history of Chicano labor and a literary analysis of ethnic identity as expressed in selected second-generation Chicano autobiographies. Indeed, few if any works have managed to encompass both these sites of analysis, even in their more general sense. Works on shifting definitions of race or ethnicity for Chicanos have assumed that no difference existed in men's and women's experience.[5] Works on labor mobilization and strikes, even in works about women or works that note differences between men and women, have tended to have little room for an analysis of the formation of ethnic identity as it varied on gender lines.[6] These gaps resulted in part from differences in focus, from lack of sources, and also from the state of the field at the time.[7]

Copyright © 1994 by Frontiers Editorial Collective.

This article marks a provisional and tentative attempt to explore how these two seemingly unrelated paths — the first path being labor history, and the second the construction and reconstruction of identity among non-working-class Chicanos and Chicanas — might converge. The locations of struggle differ in the two sets of literature, the actors differ in their social locations, and the texts those actors produce differ. Yet both Chicano labor history and autobiographies are concerned with issues of identity and consciousness. They both make clear that identity and consciousness are constructed and emerge through contest and struggle. The different facets of identity central to each literature illuminate each other. Chicano labor historians' focus on the construction of "a" class identity and mobilization has made it difficult to understand the differences in behavior of men and women on the same site. On the other hand, the autobiographies often center exactly on articulating the gender differences in the meaning of being Chicano / a. While their middle-class insights cannot be directly transferred to Chicano and Chicana workers, they can warn us against taking ethnic identity as a given and redirect us to those working-class movements and texts for clues as to the ways in which the construction of a gendered ethnicity might help explain variations in labor strategies. In other words, what the two literatures together clarify is that the identity being constructed through struggle on any given site involved gender as well as class and ethnicity, and that struggles occurred within as well as between groups.

## Labor History

It is essential to begin this exploration by examining the way in which labor history has treated men and women workers. When I was at the Lowell Conference on industrial history a few years ago, I was struck by the differences in the treatment of women's and men's labor history. The theme of the conference that year was immigration, ethnicity, and the Industrial Revolution. In the morning, at the session on immigrant workers, two men told stories of men and unions. The male workers they described seemed to exist entirely outside of families or, at least, without women — a situation not impossible, but unlikely. Because there was little sense of a family economy or sexual division of labor, there was little explanation of how these men could afford to leave their jobs or strike, or even of why their language and organizing styles took the particular gendered forms they did.

In the afternoon session on women, work, and ethnicity, three women described the complex interrelationships of work and family for women workers of various ethnic groups in various industries. As had the men in the morning, they discussed the formative influences of ethnic background on the workers' behavior. But there was no "story" here, no chronological narrative; there were "uprisings," but there was no movement history of growing or developing consciousness or change over time.

This sense of the different social locations of men and women in relation to work, due to ideologies of family and gender, had led to an exaggerated split in the labor histories of men and women, the development of different methodologies and languages — institutional vs. family history — different ways of understanding labor history and class consciousness, as gender specific. But the differences in consciousness, in identity, between women and men workers is not so neat and clean.[8] After all, men exist in families, too. Margaret Rose's study of the United Farm Workers (UFW) makes clear the centrality of family structure and dynamics in determining the shape and strategies of the UFW. The innovation of sending whole families east, instead of just young men, to publicize the boycott, for example, arose from the realities of lonely male organizers who kept abandoning their posts to return to their families.[9] Similarly, even migrant men remote from home, as was clear with the Chicano miners I studied in northern Colorado in the 1920s, made organizing and investment decisions within a network of kinship relations, as, indeed, they had often been sent forth from the family to do. Insurance records of the Rocky Mountain Fuel Company showed these miners sending wages to parents and wives in Mexico, New Mexico, and southern Colorado.[10] In short, men's and not just women's labor organizations grew out of a particular framework of a family economy and a sexual division of labor.

On the other hand, women's consciousness and forms of protest, as Vicki Ruiz's study of cannery workers demonstrates, also have a historical dynamic; they are influenced by past as well as present events. Her cannery workers learned from the series of protests they launched in the 1930s, and that politicizing lesson affected their demands and organizing skills. The knowledge thus gained allowed them to take advantage of the labor shortage in World War II to achieve unprecedented benefits in the way of childcare, for example.[11]

Beyond the simple corrective of recognizing that men have families and that women have histories, however, still lies the question of the ways in which men's and women's separate consciousnesses did derive from differences in their work situations and influenced each

other. Differences in time, space, and industry all affected the consciousness of women and men, sometimes in the same family. In this context, I cannot help wondering, for example, what David Montejano's powerful argument in *Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas* would have looked like had he included women and gender as a category of analysis.[12] Montejano uses a modes-of-production analysis to argue that race and ethnic relations took their shape from shifting economic relations of production — from a move from pastoral to agricultural to industrial. The inclusion of women, who were often engaged in a different mode of production from the men with whom they lived, might have had a profound impact on his argument.

Montejano may have assumed, as scholars traditionally have, that women derived their class status and consciousness vicariously, from men. But increasingly historians recognize, first, that when women were working for wages, whether in the home or outside of it, that work brought relations of production to bear directly on their notions of themselves and their place in the world. And second, they recognize that even for women not engaged in wage work, class has a different meaning when experienced differently. When Texas Chicanas were domestic servants, for example, they derived a sense of their identity as workers from a hierarchical, personalist relationship with Anglo women, certainly a different sense of "worker" and a different set of race relations than a male industrial worker experienced; similarly, if men were farm laborers and women were pecan shellers, they, too, were in different modes of production.[13] If men and women lived together, these distinct consciousnesses would affect each other in ways obscured or denied if women's experience is ignored.[14]

On the other hand, even when women were not engaged in wage labor, their activities affected men's strategies and consciousness. In southern Colorado and northern New Mexico, for example, only Spanish Mexican village women's maintenance of food production made possible migrant men's ability to slip in and out of wage labor.[15] Only their maintenance of the relations and material production that sustained the village made it possible for the men to continue to conceive of themselves as villagers, and not simply as wage workers.

The varying sexual division of labor within families at different sites, due, in part, to the nature of local industries, may, in fact, have contributed to site-specific senses of identity as Chicanos, Chicanas, and workers. These identities, in turn, may help to explain the different labor strategies and demands generated on different sites. In the coal-mining camps of southern Colorado in the early years of this century, Chicano miners joined other miners of different ethnic backgrounds in

a major strike. The new sense of identity emerging in the mines, symbolized by this new cross-ethnic alliance as well as by splits among local Hispanics, owed itself in part to the local ethnic and sexual structure of labor. In the coal-mining camps, the women depended totally on their husband's or son's wage. They had no produce gardens as they had back home, and their very residences were occupied at the company's will.[16]

Women's consciousness, like men's, emerged in a particular context, a particular set of economic and social relations that varied by industry as well as region and era. In the coal fields, women had supported the strike and the men's demands. In agriculture in the 1930s, when beet workers struck in northern Colorado, women supported this strike, also. But this time their relation to the strike differed. In the beet fields women worked alongside the men. But men received the wages for the women's labor. Beet labor demands could have included a demand for an individual instead of a family wage; they did not. Unlike the coal miners' demands, however, they did include a demand for garden lots with adequate water. In conjunction with other demands, these gardens would have recreated a village structure of symbiotic male and female labor and a separate, autonomous productive base for women without denying the centrality of the family to all areas of their life.[17] Examining the sexual division of labor and its impact on consciousness, even when women seem most invisible and distanced from the workplace, illuminates workplace as well as homeplace strategies for men and women and for the group as a whole.

Not only do the material circumstances of each sex help govern the choices and identity of the other, but the meaning with which work experience is endowed depends, to some extent, on the individual players involved and their responses. Patricia Zavella and Emma Perez have both documented a range of Chicano attitudes toward Chicana wage, work even within the same industry and era, from those men who would not permit their wives to work outside the home, to those who expected them to help support the family in that way.[18] The women themselves displayed similar conflicts.

This is not to deny that larger forces had a powerful effect on family strategies and women's sense of identity as women and as workers. It is merely to recognize that that effect is complex and varied. The assumption that wage work brings autonomy, for example, and a shift in consciousness from identity by family role to identity by workplace role, has long come under fire.[19] In her study of Chicana cannery workers in the 1930s, Ruiz found that waged work did seem to increase the women's weight in consumer decision-making at home and helped

women develop peer networks alongside kinship ones. Moreover, as the two cases of coal and beet work indicate, it may have increased their voice in mixed-sex labor organizations. Yet the low wages also came permeated with domination by bosses, often but not always male. An individual wage, in this context, would not have resolved Chicana beet workers' dilemma. Increased autonomy in the form of an independent income could accompany, rather than oppose, subordination and dependence. Patricia Zavella found that Chicana cannery workers more recently, despite their individual wages, identified themselves by their family roles rather than their work roles. They felt ambivalent about what work meant to their identity when it did not pay enough to make them independent of their family, had they desired such independence, and when it did not free them from discrimination, long hours, sexual harassment, and dangerous conditions at work.[20]

In short, the relation of experience to consciousness, of behavior, to ideology remains harder to grasp than that. Whether women were visible at the work site or not, the sexual division of labor had an impact on the strategies of both sexes and the way in which they experienced class. How, for example, do we understand what it means about Chicanas' consciousness when Chicanas were more militant, judged by strike action, in 1930s San Antonio, than were Chicanos?[21] And how do we make sense of the fact that in 1910, Anglo and Spanish Mexican male census takers in northern New Mexico found only ten women with occupations for every one hundred men, while a local Spanish Mexican woman found seventy-nine women with occupations for every one hundred men? What are the implications for the group's ethnic and labor consciousness of the fact that she recognized women's productive labors in home fields and gardens and the men and Anglo women did not?[22]

Devra Weber's recent article in *Oral History Review* on striking California Chicana farm workers of the 1930s reveals not only that women were militantly conscious of their position as workers, but that their definition of "worker" was gendered, as was their experience of the strike. According to Weber, men and women had different memories of key demands and leaders as well as of their own roles. To the women, the central issue was food and the provision of it to their community, and the central striking group was women in concert. To the men, the central issue was wages, and they did not recall the female bar owner who played a central role in the strike stories of the women. The strike's meaning changed according to the sex of the striker.[23] That

meaning was bound up with their different identities as workers, providers, and community builders.

Traveling still deeper into the Chicano working-class consciousness, Margaret Rose's study of women in the United Farm Workers reveals significant differences not just between women and men but among women as to the meaning of work and activism and as to aspirations and self-definition. Helen Chávez and Dolores Huerta pose quite different models for the younger women of the movement as well as for Anglo consumers of boycott literature.[24] According to Rose, Dolores Huerta, with her unconventional life, her numerous scattered children, and her activism, is a model that young women organizers seek to emulate only as part of a life-stage. When they look to lifelong models, they prefer Chávez, the behind-the-scenes reluctant player, solidly married to a strong male figure.

At issue here is not simply their identity as workers or as women, but their identity as Chicanas as apart from Chicanos and as apart from Anglo women. These women constructed a distinctly female ethnic identity. That construction interpenetrated their interpretation of themselves as women workers. At the same time, the racial and ethnic dynamics that helped determine their opportunities as Chicana workers also contributed to their construction of their identity. Moreover, as Margaret Rose's work implies, their definitions of what it was to be a Chicana varied among themselves.[25]

### Ethnic Identity

It is here that a closer examination of the impact of gender on the construction of ethnic identity might prove helpful. Susan Glenn has convincingly argued in *Daughters of the Shtetl* that one generation of Jewish immigrant women's sense of themselves as Jewish women in a modernizing world explains why their patterns of labor activism differed from those of male and other female workers in the early twentieth century. Vicki Ruiz has shown that Chicana workers, too, felt the allure of modernity in the form of popular culture, and that it altered their sense of what it meant to be Chicana.[26] Working-class texts tend to be silent on explicit, articulated definitions of a particularly Chicana ethnic identity. Working-class Chicanas have had few opportunities to create literary vehicles of self-expression. Scholars have approached these issues for working-class Chicanas indirectly, through an examination of behavior and language—when they moved out of the home, wore makeup, or had different memories of strikes. The middle-class

authors who do produce autobiographical examinations of ethnic identity, on the other hand, rarely focus on workplace struggles and identity. The different social locations of these classes are crucial to the nature of the texts they produce. Nonetheless, as self-conscious reconstructions of self for a public audience, the autobiographies may provide the best entry point for examining the ways in which ethnic consciousness grows differently from the lived experience and social locations of men and women.

It also grows from differences among women. In the past two years or so, a spate of articles by prominent feminist scholars has addressed the salience of differences among women in the creation of women's identities, the importance of recognizing that ethnic differences, definitions, and identities arise in part from relations of power among women as well as between men and women. Norma Alarcón has argued, in regard to "the psychic and material violence that gives shape to" one's understanding of one's own position, that "not all of this violence comes from men."[27]

Beyond calling for the removal of what I would call Monolithic Woman, the portrayal of women as though they all shared the same experiences and oppressions, most of these writers point away from a focus on a single ethnic group or sex as a narrative strategy. Gerda Lerner has urged us to write history focused on the interweaving of sex, race, class, and cultural systems as they mutually reinforced each other.[28] Elizabeth Fox-Genovese similarly, though for different reasons, has warned about the dangers and pitfalls encountered on the way to making the marginal central by focusing solely on one group's construction of its identity. Too often an analysis of the construction of ethnic identity loses sight of larger relations of power. Citing works that depicted such a thoroughly successful slave community that the realities of dominance and oppression receded into the deep background, Fox-Genovese reasserts the shaping impact of the dominant group's power over social relations and also over notions of identity.[29]

Yet by treating the dominant group's actions, whether of women or men or both, as generating responses by all others, such a narrative reinforces the dominance of the one group and distorts the history of those other groups. It allows the dominant group to set the agenda and write the text for all groups. Textual analysis of autobiographies and oral testimony allows us to escape some of the dangers of a narrative built around the dynamics of domination.

Autobiographical texts by people outside the dominant group recenter the narrative without losing sight of relations of power. Such relations are inescapable, for example, in Richard Rodriguez's *Hunger*

*of Memory,* where he argues that it was the realities of cultural power in the United States that led him to choose assimilation to fulfill first the expectations of his upwardly mobile first-generation family and then his own. Despite their different conclusions, the work of Cherríe Moraga, Gloria Anzaldúa, and Olivia Castellano also consciously presents their social location between classes and ethnic groups. Castellano recently described the rage that motivates her: "When nothing on either side of the two cultures, Mexican or Anglo-American, affirms your existence, that is how rage is shaped."[30] Her sense of herself as a Chicana was intimately bound to the negative messages of the two cultures that dominated her and could not be understood without examining both.

Moreover, however hard-pressed they may have been, Chicanas and other groups were driven also by their own needs, desires, and heritage. Alma Garcia has argued that Chicana feminism, for example, emerged from dynamics within the Chicano movement rather than from contagion by a largely Anglo, middle-class women's movement. And Deena Gonzáles has shown how Spanish-Mexican women of New Mexico managed to use a court system in which they had no direct representation for their own ends.[31] Anglo males, and occasionally Anglo females, and sometimes even Chicanos, hardly unified, may have called the tune, but those who danced had usually learned their steps from someone else.[32]

In short, both external and internal forces combined to shape Chicano and Chicana experiences of class, gender, and ethnicity, and individuals experienced their class, gender, and ethnicity not as autonomous categories but as entangled and interdependent. That interdependence ensured that, while gender was not the only significant factor in the shaping of individual experience and ethnic identity, it was a crucial one. In this essay, for this difficult topic, my hope is to be suggestive rather than definitive, to lay out one possible approach among many, and to make clear by that path what the issue might have to offer in a fuller examination of more or different texts using this or another focus. Here I examine the construction of ethnic identity through symbolic reconstructions of history in autobiographical writings of second-generation Chicanas and Chicanos.

The reconstruction of the past, in particular, a story of origins, is often a strategy for creating a unified, distinct group identity or even nationalism in the present. In the years immediately following the American Revolution, for example, the United States sought to distance itself from England by leaping across time and laying claim to both the wilderness and classical Rome as its immediate forebears.

England, in this account, contributed little to the new republic. Similarly, one hundred years later, Japan, seeking to distance itself from the West and legitimize its ascendancy in the East, rewrote Chinese history into a narrative that would logically culminate in Japan rather than in a Far East dominated by China.[33] In the same vein, John Chávez explored, without gender analysis, Chicano uses of "Aztlán" in *The Lost Land*.[34]

The autobiographies of both Chicanos and Chicanas — specifically those of Cherríe Moraga, Gloria Anzaldúa, Richard Rodriguez, and Oscar Zeta Acosta — reconstruct the Mexican and Chicano past to aid in the creation of their own identities. It is this self-conscious restructuring of the past that makes these autobiographies particularly useful vehicles for examining the ways in which ethnic identity is constructed, just as national myths illuminate notions of national identity among their promulgators.

Few would claim that any of the four authors — two lesbian feminists, one conservative gay male, and one counterculture hero — is typical of Chicanos, but their typicality is not at issue here. It may well have been, in part, the contested nature of their sexual politics and identity that drove them to print or helped provide them, and not other Chicano authors, with a market, for there are few other second-generation autobiographies of the era available, and none that focus so clearly on the construction of identity. These would certainly be fragile pillars for an argument about the nature of ethnic identity for all Chicanos and Chicanas. I am using these autobiographies rather to support an argument that ethnic identity is gendered and resists totalizing tendencies. And I am posing one possible method for analyzing the gendered nature of ethnic identity in particular cases by focusing on the selves these authors constructed and articulated in these texts rather than outside them. In a sense, these autobiographies are manifestos of ethnic identity specific to place, generation, class, and sexuality. My focus, however, is far more limited. Reading four autobiographies of a single generation, with similarities in context and experience, allows a comparison of the ways they reconstruct the past. All these authors wrote after the Chicano movement had begun, though they had widely different relations to that movement, and all use some aspects of that movement ideology (including the choice of symbols) in their writings. All are educated and middle-class in distinction to their own parents and in ways that stem directly from their status as second-generation.[35]

All four of these authors represent themselves as multiply identified and torn between their Anglo and Chicano heritage, their middle-

class opportunities and attributes, and their identity with a working-class past. Indeed, as distinct from the workers discussed in the first part of this essay, it is in part their class position itself that seems to make their ethnic identity problematic. Their ethnic identity and consciousness become bound up with social mobility between races and between classes in a land where to be middle-class assumes some identification with a dominant cultural and not just an economic group.

The authors call on the same set of symbols — Malinche, Aztlán, and the Virgin of Guadalupe — to resolve these tensions, but the men and women do so differently.[36] Symbols are always created by someone for some purpose. There was never a time when these symbols were not appropriated, and they have no meaning apart from their use. Malinche, or Malintzin, was the native Mexican woman sold to Cortez who became his consort. Aztlán is the territory claimed by the Chicano movement as their ancient southwestern homeland straddling the current international border between Mexico and the United States. The Virgin of Guadalupe is the version of Mary who appeared miraculously, with a Mexican face, to an Indian, Juan Diego, in 1531.[37] Each of the authors is selective in the symbols used, and appropriates the symbols for his or her own end.

Moraga and Anzaldúa call on both Malinche and Aztlán to construct a Chicana identity. Part of the feminist Chicana agenda, in which they participate, has been to appropriate and redefine Malinche or Malintzin.[38] While they describe Malintzin in vivid, concrete terms, Aztlán, to these two authors, is instead often a shadowy, imprecise place, a falsely romanticized past.[39] The two symbols are linked. Cherríe Moraga describes Aztlán in its usual ideal terms, but then turns the table and calls it a dream: "*Pero, es un sueno*. This safety / of the desert. / My country was not like that. / Neither was yours. / We have always bled / with our veins / and legs / open / to forces / beyond our control."[40] For Chicana feminists, Aztlán was the place where Malintzin was always already betrayed, rather than simply betrayer. Caught between two patriarchal cultures, sold by her mother that her mother might curry favor with her brother, Malintzin, also called La Vendida, was the sell-out who had already been sold, been alienated.[41] Similarly, Anzaldúa claims, "Not me sold out my people but they me. *Malinali Tenepas*, or Malintzin, has become known as *la Chingada* — the fucked one.... Not me sold out my people but they me." To see Malintzin as the betrayer, in this view, is to ignore the power relations within and not just between cultures. Anzaldúa demands "an accounting with all three cultures — white, Mexican, Indian." To be female, to be Chicana, in this view, is to be multiply-identified.

Knowing that redefining these symbols has placed her outside of the Chicano movement's definition of ethnicity, Anzaldúa proclaims, "And if going home is denied me then I will have to stand and claim my space, making a new culture — *una cultural mestiza* — with my own lumber, my own bricks and mortar and my own feminist architecture."[42] Anzaldúa and Moraga have rejected Aztlán as defined by the male-dominated Chicano movement, or as they have constructed that definition. Their own lived experience and their interpretation of that experience differ from the men's; they are not the displaced rulers, and Malinche serves as a symbol of that difference and the power relations bound up in it. Instead of using Aztlán, as the land stolen from men by their own women and the men of another culture, Moraga and Anzaldúa construct their own ethnic origins in the woman Malintzin, the site of cultural contest and mixing. In her, they create their own "homeland," their own female ethnic identity.

Moreover, having constructed Malinche as on the border between cultures, for Anzaldúa and Moraga, lesbianism becomes an extension of their Chicana identity, another borderland, another betrayal of Chicano men, of their own. In describing the fear she inspires in her mother, Moraga explains,

> The line of reasoning goes:
>
> Malinche sold out her indio people by acting as courtesan and translator for Cortez, whose offspring symbolically represent the birth of the bastardized mestizo-Mexicano people. My mother then is the modern-day Chicana, Malinche marrying a white man, my father, to produce the bastards my sister, my brother, and I are. Finally, I -- a half-breed Chicana -- further betray my race by choosing my sexuality which excludes all men, and therefore most dangerously, Chicano men.
>
> *I come from a long line of Vendidas.*
>
> I am a Chicana lesbian. My own particular relationship to being a sexual person; and a radical stand in direct contradiction to, and in violation of, the women [*sic*] I was raised to be.[43]

By refusing to be "the women [she] was raised to be," Moraga has rejected the prescribed roles she sees available for her in Chicano culture. She is betraying not her ethnicity, but that particular construction of Chicano culture, and substituting for it a Chicana culture, a culture redefined to include her. She is not simply a lesbian, but "a Chicana lesbian." "Chicana" here means Malintzin, the borderlands within, not

Aztlán, the mythically pure, monocultural territory. Like Malinche's, their sexuality is a betrayal that does not gain them the dominant culture's acceptance or place them within the dominant culture. Instead, it is another enactment of dual marginalization.

Oscar Zeta Acosta's use of the same symbols stems more directly from the Chicano movement. In *The Revolt of the Cockroach People*, he uses the semi-autobiographical novel's centerpiece trial to give the jury a Chicano history lesson. Aztlán is more concrete here, "the northern deserts, the land we now call the Southwest. It is the ancient land of Aztlán, the original home of the *aztecas*."[44] While also fighting for freedom and autonomy, Acosta's battle differs from Anzaldúa's and Moraga's. "What the hell are we fighting for?" His main character rages during a dispute with fellow activists. "For land and to live just like we want."[45] Anzaldúa and Moraga fight in the borderlands, not over the borderlands; Acosta's character fights for reconquest.

The greater definition of place in Acosta's book is reinforced by his use of the land for recuperation. He presents a primal connection to the land, a sexual connection. Out in the California desert, he recalls, "I kiss the dirt. I eat the sand. I roll over so that I am flat on my ass, stretched out with my palms to the skies. . . . I am at peace. Content with my commitment to the earth."[46] Like a warrior battling over territory, after the above-mentioned court case, Acosta declares, "Now is the time to forget those days and nights of fighting with the pigs. And now is the time of women."[47] Sex, like the land, becomes restorative, a necessary breather for an embattled activist lawyer.[48] Women become part of the scenery.

In light of his own characterization of Malinche as the one who "to her everlasting disgrace, provides him [Cortez] with her brown body and her strange words," Acosta's depiction of his main character's sexuality is significant.[49] Aggressive heterosexuality and reconquest are linked. Those Chicanos who do not join Acosta in his battle are given derogatory labels, as was one judge, "a short faggoty Mexican."[50] Anzaldúa and Moraga identify with Malintzin and internalize the borderlands, viewing themselves, like Malintzin, as caught between and being the site where diverse strands cross. Acosta does not internalize the borderland; he has sex with it. He poses his relation to the lost land as reconquest through sex with all contemporary Malinches. Not Cortez this time but Acosta will have Malinche.[51]

Acosta, too, struggles with his ethnic identity. Indeed, early in the book, Acosta's hero confesses that he has avoided Mexican women: "I haven't thought of myself as a member of a group since I was with the Baptists in 1956. A dozen years have come and gone. . . . All through

schools, jobs and bumming, I haven't even held the hand of a Mexican woman, excepting whores who are all the same anyhow." "Am I ashamed," he asks himself, "of my race?"[52] In the context of his prior rejection of Chicanas as lovers, his turning to Chicanas as sexual partners represents his return to Chicano ethnicity. Not simply his sexual prowess, but his sexual partners help define the meaning of Chicano — women are the site of his struggle; his struggle is externalized.

Moraga explains this difference in ethnic identity and the dilemma for Chicano men by their validation and privilege in their Chicano homes and their potential privilege in the Anglo world. "The pull to identify with the oppressor was never as great in me," she writes, "as it was in my brother. For unlike him, I could never *become* the white man, only the white man's *woman*" (*sic* underline).[53] It is not simply deep sexism that separates Acosta from Anzaldúa and Moraga. As a male struggling between patriarchal societies, Acosta cannot be Malintzin; Anzaldúa and Moraga, similarly, cannot usurp Cortez's role.

In both Acosta's and Rodriguez's work, the temptation to identify with the oppressor can be overwhelming, particularly for that segment of the second generation whose parents had achieved a precarious perch in the middle class. Both depict main characters experiencing success in the Anglo world. For Acosta, the temptation is heterosexualized, personified in a variety of sexual partners. In Rodriguez's *Hunger of Memory,* however, Malinche does not appear. Instead Rodriguez provides her opposite: the asexual Virgin of Guadalupe. This asexual figure Rodriguez can outgrow.

Rodriguez claims that the Anglo Catholic church "excited more sexual wonderment than it repressed."[54] The Mexican religion of his home was, in contrast, feminized, soothing, full of fairy tales. When he remembered his family's religion, he heard "the whispering voices of women." "Whereas at school the primary mediator was Christ," he recalls, "at home that role was assumed by the Mexican Virgin," and "the superstitious Catholicism of home provided a kind of proletarian fairy-tale world." On the other hand, "The *gringo* church, a block from our house, was a very different place. In the *gringo* church Mary's statue was relegated to a side altar, imaged there as a serene white lady who matter-of-factly squashed the Genesis serpent with her bare feet." Jesus, not Mary, reigned supreme, and even Mary was fearless, bold, and white.

Since Rodriguez's agenda is assimilation to Anglo culture, neither a search for Aztlán nor a rehabilitation or even repudiation of Malintzin would serve his purpose. Instead he poses the Mexican

church as childlike and the Anglo one as adult and manly. As a child, he identifies with the "shy Mexican Mary" who "appeared, I could see from her picture, as a young Indian maiden — dark just like me." It is the Anglo church and the Anglo world, however, that Rodriguez chooses as an adult, claiming that in the realities of the distribution of power in the United States, that choice is synonymous with "coming of age" and "becoming a public man."[55] Choosing the Virgin of Guadalupe, identifying with the Chicano culture as he defines it, would lock him forever in a marginal, privatized, childlike, and domestic realm.

Anzaldúa also calls on the Virgin of Guadalupe. Unlike Rodriguez, however, Anzaldúa uses the Virgin not as a symbol of childlike faith, but as "a synthesis of the old world and the new, of the religion and culture of the two races in our psyche, the conqueror and the conquered. . . . the symbol of our rebellion against the rich, upper and middleclass [*sic*]; against their subjugation of the poor and the *indio*."[56] The difference in usage demonstrates the malleability of symbols and of definitions of Chicano culture. At the same time, even with this definition of the Virgin as rebel, not submissively shy, it still fits with Rodriguez's agenda of assimilation and participation in the dominant power structure to reject her.

These four autobiographies point to a stark contrast between Chicana and Chicano definitions of ethnicity. With a recuperated Malinche rather than Aztlán as the archetypal Chicana image, the Chicana encompasses opposites, racial mixing, ambivalence, power, and powerlessness. Anzaldúa goes back still further, before Cortez, to find an Aztec goddess, Coatlihue, to provide an "Indian women's history of resistance" and to affirm just where the betrayal surrounding Malintzin lies: "The worst kind of betrayal lies in making us believe that the Indian woman in us is the betrayer."[57] Anzaldúa argues for a Chicana identity that recognizes a plural personality, "tolerance for ambiguity," and synthesis. Rodriguez and Acosta, on the other hand, seem to demand choice.[58]

## Implications

The point of this skimming analysis of four autobiographical writings is not to provide a definitive statement on the difference between Aztlán and Malinche as gendered usable pasts, but to draw attention to the way in which the construction of ethnic identity is gendered, in this case differing by the substantial distance between Acosta's reconquest and Anzaldúa's and Moraga's incorporation. In discussions

about the growth of ethnic consciousness, such gender distinctions must be attended to, and their meaning for the group as a whole sought. The fundamental differences in social location within their own group and between groups of women and men critically affected their definition of their interests, their strategies, and their agendas. They stood, as male and female, symbolically as Malinche and her brother, in different relation to the distribution of power both in their own society and in relation to the dominant society. Their position in relations between the groups inevitably, therefore, also differed. This social and cultural location intimately affected their sense of their own and the group's best interests and their interpretation of the actions resulting from contact between the groups as well as their interpretation of the meaning of their ethnic identity.

Moreover, it is unlikely that the effects of the different meanings of ethnic identity were limited to private constructions of the self. Rather, they bring us back to public outcomes, such as the labor and community actions addressed earlier. For these varying interpretations would intimately affect strategies of resistance and of assertion chosen by women and men. Strikes and other workplace contests, which combine resistance and assertion, would have been crucibles for the articulation of that interpretation of identity and its transformation, as the interpretation would be contested by employers, co-ethnics, and other strikers from different groups. The different memories of Devra Weber's informants, the different interpretations of census takers, and the different levels of activism in depression Texas all bespeak differences between the self-definition of Chicanas and the definitions others bestowed on them. Gendered definitions of ethnicity must be examined, not assumed away by labor historians, just as social location must not be elided by cultural historians.[59]

The two models I have provided here use two quite different methodologies: a standard social historical analysis and a cultural analysis borrowing from new cultural criticism. Both recognize the multiplicity of ethnic identity; both look at men and women in relation to each other and to other "others." Joan Scott has urged social historians alienated by the textuality and the language of new literary theory not totally to reject it.[60] Instead, we can use it to listen to old sources in new ways, to find new entry points to the lived experience of those about whom we write, to look at the relation between language and behavior, expression and identity, and to look at the multiple ways in which power is expressed, exercised, and diffused. Surely it is, after all, in part through language that groups create and recreate each other, themselves, and their past.

## Notes

1. See, for example, Gerda Lerner, "Reconceptualizing Differences Among Women," *Journal of Women's History* (Winter 1990): 106-122; Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, "Between Individualism and Fragmentation: American Culture and the New Literary Studies of Race and Gender," *American Quarterly* 42 (March 1990): 7–34; and Nancy A. Hewitt, "Beyond the Search for Sisterhood: American Women's History in the 1980s," in Ellen Carol DuBois and Vicki L. Ruiz, eds., *Unequal Sisters: A Multi-Cultural Reader in U.S. Women's History* (New York: Routledge, Chapman & Hall, Inc., 1990), 1-14.

2. Douglas Monroy, *Thrown Among Strangers: The Making of Mexican Culture in Frontier California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990); Ramón A. Gutiérrez, *When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away: Marriage, Sexuality, and Power in New Mexico, 1500–1846* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991).

3. Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands / La Frontera: The New Mestiza* (San Francisco: Spinsters / Aunt Lute Book Company, 1987), 2, 77, 194–195. See also Alarcón, "The Theoretical Subject(s), of *This Bridge Called My Back* and Anglo-American Feminism," in Gloria Anzaldúa, ed., *Making Face, Making Soul: Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Women of Color* (San Fransisco: Aunt Lute Foundation, 1990), 359: "this exploration [of common differences] appears impossible without a reconfiguration of the subject of feminist theory, and her relational position to a multiplicity of others, not just white men"; and Tey Diana Rebolledo, "The Politics of Poetics: Or What Am I, a Critic, Doing in This Text Anyhow?" in Anzaldúa, ed., *Making Face,* 352: "we have grown up and survived along the edges, along the borders of so many languages, worlds, cultures and social systems that we constantly fix and focus on the spaces in between. . . . Categories that try to define and limit this incredibly complex process at once become diminished for their inability to capture and contain." See also Adelaida R. Del Castillo, ed., *Between Borders: Essays on Mexicana / Chicana History* (Encino, CA: Floricanto Press, 1990); this volume is an excellent collection of essays, many originally given at a 1983 conference, including material on Mexicanas in Mexico and in the United States and essays by Gutiérrez, Monroy, Ruiz, Weber (essay cited below), Perez, Antonia Castañeda, Louise Ano Nuevo Kerr, and many others.

4. At a panel on Chicano history at the OAH in 1991 where, though Vicki Ruiz was the chair, I was the only female presenter, and the only Anglo member of the panel.

5. See, for example, Mario T. García, "Mexican Americans and the Politics of Citizenship: The Case of El Paso, 1936," *New Mexico Historical Review* 59 (April 1984): 187–204, and *Mexican Americans: Leadership, Ideology, & Identity, 1930–1960* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989); and David Montejano, *Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1836–1936* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987).

6. See, for example, Vicki L. Ruiz, *Cannery Women / Cannery Lives: Mexican Women, Unionization, and the California Food Processing Industry, 1930–1950* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1987); Devra Anne Weber, "Raiz Fuerto: Oral History and Mexicana Farm Workers," *Oral History Review*: 17/2 (Fall 1989): 47–62, and "Mexican Women on Strike: Memory, History and Oral Narratives," in Castillo, ed., *Between Borders*: 175–200, which is particularly rich in its implications for this topic; and Sarah Deutsch, *No Separate Refuge: Culture, Class, and Gender on an*

*Anglo-Hispanic Frontier in the American Southwest, 1880–1940* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).

7. Some new studies illuminate precisely these congruences, for example, Deena J. González, *Resisting Colonization: The Spanish-Mexican Women of Santa Fe, 1820–1880* (forthcoming), and Irene Ledesma's work toward her dissertation.

8. A few recent studies have attempted to bridge this gap, some of them in progress on Chicano history, for example, Margaret Eleanor Rose, "Women in the United Farm Workers: A Study of Chicana and Mexicana Participation in a Labor Union, 1950–1980" (Ph.D. dissertation, UCLA, 1988); see also the work in progress of Devra Weber and Irene Ledesma; Susan A. Glenn, *Daughters of the Shtetl: Life and Labor in the Immigrant Generation* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990); Mary H. Blewett, *Men, Women, and Work: Class, Gender, and Protest in the New England Shoe Industry, 1780–1910* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988); and Eileen Boris and Cynthia R. Daniels, eds., *Homework: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Paid Labor at Home* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1989), also Ava Baron, ed., *Work Engendered: Toward a New History of American Labor* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991).

9. Rose, "Women in the United Farm Workers."

10. Deutsch, *No Separate Refuge.*

11. Ruiz, *Cannery Women / Cannery Lives,* for example, 82.

12. Montejano, *Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1836–1986.*

13. See Vicki Ruiz, "By the Day or the Week: Mexicana Domestic Workers in El Paso," in Vicki L. Ruiz and Susan Tiano, eds., *Women on the U.S. / Mexico Border: Responses to Change* (Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1987), 61–76; and Evelyn Nakano Glenn, "The Dialectics of Wage Work: Japanese-American Women and Domestic Service, 1905–1940," *Feminist Studies* 6:3 (Fall 1980), 466–460, and Julia Kirk Blackwelder, *Women of the Depression: Caste and Culture in San Antonio, 1929–1939* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 1984) on pecan shellers.

14. See, for example, Joan Scott's article on French garment workers in Joan Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988). Tamara Hareven is one of the few scholars to recognize women's productive labor at the same time that she recognizes the importance of male family relations to male workplace strategies, but her analysis is hindered by her refusal to recognize the distinct interests of men and women in the families and the conflict that often resulted. These ideas are worked out more fully in S. Deutsch, "Confronting Capitalism: Comparative Perspectives on Capitalism and Gender in Modern America, 1870–1940," (unpublished paper at the Conference on Rural Women and the Transition to Capitalism, Northern Illinois University, March 1989).

15. Deutsch, *No Separate Refuge.*

16. Deutsch, *No Separate Refuge.*

17. Deutsch, *No Separate Refuge.*

18. Patricia Zavella, *Women's Work and Chicano Families: Cannery Workers of the Santa Clara Valley* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987); Emma Perez, at 8th Berkshire Conference on the History of Women.

19. Capitalism, according to many historians and social scientists, liberated women from dependence on the family. Through individualized earning or a cash market for women's production, it bestowed a measure of autonomy. Deutsch, *No Separate Refuge*; MariJo Wagner, "'Helping Papa and Mamma Sing the People's Songs': Children of the Populist Party," in Wava G. Haney and Jane B. Knowles, eds., *Women and Farming: Changing Roles, Changing Structures* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1988), 319–338; Laura F. Klein, "Contending with Colonization: Tlingit Men and Women in Change," in Mona Etienne and Elanor Leacock, eds., *Women and Colonization* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1980), 88–108; Kathy Peiss, *Cheap Amusements: Working Women and Leisure in Turn-of-the-Century New York* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986); and Joan Jensen, *Loosening the Bonds: Mid-Atlantic Farm Women, 1750–1850* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), can all be taken as supporting this viewpoint to a limited extent. In reaction to this theory — as pertaining more to middle-class than to working-class women — and in response to an older vision of urban capitalism wreaking its disintegrating havoc on working-class and immigrant families fresh from the countryside, generating a quivering pathological mass of impoverished city-dwellers, historians and social scientists retorted that capitalism instead had reinforced the family's bonds. These scholars argued that when confronted with the strategies of resourceful new recruits, wage work and market activity still occurred in the framework of and for the support of a family. See, for example, Virginia Yans McLaughlin, *Family and Community: Italian Immigrants in Buffalo, 1880–1930* (1971, reprint, ed., Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977); Judith E. Smith, "Our Own Kind: Family and Community Networks in Providence," in Nancy F. Cott and Elizabeth H. Pleck, eds., *A Heritage of Her Own: Toward a New Social History of American Women* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1979), 396–407; Tamara Hareven, "Family Time and Industrial Time: Family Work in a Planned Corporation Town, 1900–1924,"*Journal of Urban History* 1:3 (May 1975), 366–384; among others. Certainly in the beet fields of northern Colorado, the wage rates were so low that the pooled labor of the entire family barely provided enough wages for the individuals to survive. Most women's wages were far too low for independent living. I suppose one could call that cementing the family bond, but the concept clearly bears further examination. Deutsch, *No Separate Refuge*.

20. Ruiz, *Cannery Women / Cannery Lives*; Zavella, *Women's Work and Chicano Families*; Deutsch, *No Separate Refuge*.

21. Ruiz, *Cannery Women*; Blackwelder, *Women of the Depression* (both pecan shellers and garment workers). Rosaura Sánchez, "The History of Chicanas: A Proposal for a Materialist Perspective," in *Between Borders*, 1–29, examines (on p. 19) Ruiz's attempt to reconcile traditionally defined Mexican family roles with Mexican women's labor activism. Sánchez adds, "The question here would be whether it is in fact family roles that lead to labor activism or whether it is a particular type of production which leads both to particular family roles and to a particular type of exploitation which calls for resistance." Though they both mention the strains on the family that women's activism produced, neither Ruiz nor Sánchez examines the way in which what these women mean by "Chicana," the attributes that word encompasses, may differ from the men's definition and may change in the course of their labor experience.

22. Deutsch, *No Separate Refuge*, 54. It was not simply an issue of whether or not the women were paid for their labor, as many of the men listed with occupations also were not paid. The norm would be not listing the women, as happened with Anglo

farm women; what was significant was that the Spanish Mexican woman did list them.

23. Weber, "Raiz Fuerto." The same could be said of Barbara Kingsolver's *Holding the Line* and the film *Salt of the Earth.*

24. Rose, "Women in the United Farm Workers."

25. Rose, *ibid.*; see also, for variations in women's definitions of their ethnicity, Sylvia Junko Yanagisako, *Transforming the Past: Tradition and Kinship Among Japanese Americans* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985), and Micaela di Leonardo, *Varieties of Ethnic Experience: Kinship, Class, and Gender Among California Italian-Americans* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984).

26. Glenn, *Daughters of the Shtetl;* Vicki L. Ruiz, "Star Struck: Acculturation, Adolescence and Mexican American Women," in Adela de la Torre and Beatriz Pasquera, eds., *Building with Our Hands: New Directions in Chicana Scholarship* (Berkeley: University of California Press, forthcoming), and also in Elliott West and Paula Petrik, eds., *Small Worlds: Childhood and Adolescence in American History* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, forthcoming).

27. Norma Alarcón calls for "a reconfiguration of the subject of feminist theory, and her relational position to a multiplicity of others, not just white men." Norma Alarcón, "The Theoretical Subject(s)," 359.

28. Lerner, "Reconceptualizing Differences Among Women."

29. Fox-Genovese, "Between Individualism and Fragmentation." See also Maria C. Lugones and Elizabeth V. Spelman, "Have We Got a Theory for You! Feminist Theory, Cultural Imperialism and the Demand for 'the Woman's Voice,'" *Women's Studies International Forum* 6 (1983): 573–581; Hewitt, "Beyond the Search for Sisterhood."

30. Richard Rodriguez, *Hunger of Memory: The Education of Richard Rodriguez: An Autobiography* (Boston: David R. Godine, 1982); Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands / La Frontera: The New Mestiza* (San Francisco: Spinsters / Aunt Lute, 1987); Cherríe Moraga, *Loving in the War Years: lo que nunca paso por sus labios* (Boston: South End Press, 1983); Olivia Castellano, "Canto, locura y poesia," *The Women's Review of Books* 7:5 (February 1990), 18–20.

31. Alma Garcia, "The Development of Chicana Feminist Discourse, 1970–1980," in Ruiz and DuBois, eds., *Unequal Sisters*, 418–431; González, *Resisting Colonization.*

32. For the best bibliography of this literature, see Ruiz and DuBois, eds., *Unequal Sisters.* In addition, see Asian Women United of California, *Making Waves: An Anthology of Writings By and About Asian American Women* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989); Gloria Anzaldúa, ed., *Making Face, Making Soul / Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Women of Color* (San Francisco: Aunt Lute Foundation, 1990). See also, Linda Gordon, "On 'Difference,'" *Genders* 10 (Spring 1991): 91–111 for a critique at concentrating on cultural aspects of differences among women to the exclusion of recognizing similarities in women's experiences relative to structures of power.

33. See Stefan Tanaka, *Japan's Orient: Rendering Pasts into History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, forthcoming, 1993).

34. See John R. Chávez, *The Lost Land: The Chicano Image of the Southwest* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984), on the uses of Aztlán. There is no gender analysis in the book.

35. I am grateful to one of *Frontiers'* anonymous readers (number 6) for pointing out the similarities and the need to explain these similarities to the reader. I also find it significant that these are four of the five second-generation autobiographies available. It seems to me that it makes a statement about the market, about what images of Chicanos the book-buying and book-publishing market is willing to buy. We have, on the one hand, the macho, Chicano, wild animal (Acosta), and the darling of the right, a conservative, "tamed"?, "Hispanic" (Rodriguez). On the other hand, the alternative feminist press has provided a market for the most "different," and so we have two Chicana lesbian feminists to "represent" Chicanas to us. Oral history collections are far more wide-ranging in their representation of Chicanos than autobiographies are. On Rodriguez's sexuality, which is not explicitly defined in *Hunger of Memory,* in distinction to the other books, see, for example, Richard Rodriguez, "Late Victorians: San Francisco, Aids, and the Homosexual Stereotype," *Harper's Magazine* (October 1990): 57–66. Here, again, Rodriguez does not explicitly identify himself as gay, but is ironically admonished by his dying friend as "the only one spared" AIDS because "'You are too circumspect'" (65).

36. José Limón, in a valuable and fascinating essay on another symbol, La Llorona, has analyzed why so many of these symbols are female and the very different significance of the symbols in terms of their counter-hegemonic potential. His gender analysis is centered on the symbol, rather than the purveyors of the symbol. José E. Limón, "La Llorona, The Third Legend of Greater Mexico: Cultural Symbols, Women, and the Political Unconscious," in del Castillo, ed., *Between Borders,* 399–432.

37. José Limón claims that her importance as a symbol of and for national Mexico grew mainly in the Seventeenth century. Limón, "La Llorona," 399–403.

38. Norma Alarcón, "Chicana's Feminist Literature: A Re-vision through Malintzin / or Malintzin: Putting Flesh Back on the Object" in Cherríe Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds., *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color* (New York: Kitchen Table / Women of Color Press, 1981): 182–190.

39. See John R. Chávez, *The Lost Land: The Chicano Image of the Southwest* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984), on the uses of Aztlán. There is no gender analysis in the book.

40. Cherríe Moraga, *Loving in the War Years: lo que nunca paso por sus labios* (Boston: South End Press, 1983), 45. See also Tey Diana Rebolledo, 353.

41. Moraga, *Loving,* 98–99.

42. Anzaldúa, *Borderlands / La Frontera,* 21–22.

43. Moraga, *Loving,* 117. And see Anzaldúa, *Borderlands,* 18–20.

44. Oscar Zeta Acosta, *The Revolt of the Cockroach People* (New York: Vintage Books, 1989; original ed. 1973), 160.

45. Acosta, 207.

46. Acosta, 70–71.

47. Acosta, 164.

48. Acosta, 191–194. And, for example, after his return from Mexico, during which absence an activist has been killed, he defensively declares to his peers, "Just because I go around and screw who I want to, you think I'm not in this fight whole hog?" Acosta, 207.
49. Acosta, 160.
50. Acosta, 49.
51. The book's sex scenes and objectifications of women are too numerous to delineate here, but for some examples, see pp. 62, 130, 164, 221. It is not clear whether "gringas" also count as Malinches here. While Acosta reclaims Chicanas, he does not abandon Anglo women.
52. Acosta, 29–31.
53. Moraga, *Loving*, 92.
54. Rodriguez, 84–86, 87.
55. Rodriguez, 7.
56. Anzaldúa, *Borderlands*, 30–31.
57. Anzaldúa, *Borderlands*, 22, 41–51.
58. This dichotomy shows up in daily practice. At a Latino Studies Conference at Oberlin in the Spring of 1990, the scholars held a discussion on the topic, "What is a Latino?" They soon found themselves discussing terminology. Some of the men present argued for the term Latino to encompass Cubans, Chicanos, and Puertoriqueños. Some of the women, who came from Colorado and New Mexico, pointed out that the choice of such a term as a monolith would alienate many people who self-identified as Spanish-American or Mexican. They argued for a more inclusive strategy and a tolerance for diverse labeling. The men argued that such a strategy would weaken the Latino cause, and they reconstructed the debate to label the women's strategy as a feminist strategy and their own as a Latino strategy.
59. Gordon, "On 'Difference,'" on the tendency of those scholars focusing on cultural differences to ignore power relations.
60. Joan Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History.* At the same time, such methods must not simply be an excuse to look once again at the dominant group, whether men or Anglos. They must not solely study other groups through representations of gender or of Chicanos instead of privileging the experience and self-representations of Chicanos and Chicanas themselves. The theories brought to bear must not emerge simply as bonding exercises among Anglo theorists, male or female, as both María Lugones and Barbara Christian have labeled them, but must have roots in the lived experience, the social location of Chicanas and Chicanos. Lugones and Spelman, "Have We Got a Theory for You," 573–581; Barbara Christian, "The Race for Theory" in *Making Face*, 335–345.