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Men’s perspectives on nonviolence is a relatively rare topic of feminist research. This article examines Latinos’ pathways to a commitment to nonviolent masculinities within intimate relationships. Examining literature on nonviolence and drawing on interviews with six Latinos the article uses a feminist ecological approach to identify and examine contributing factors to “emergent masculinities” characterized by a commitment to nonviolence in intimate relationships. It examines experiences of marginalization, exposure to domestic violence, and the influence of a close woman mentor as factors that contribute to a commitment to nonviolence. It also critiques the common equation of the absence of physical violence with nonviolence as it examines how even among self-identified nonviolent men it is possible to identify some forms of violence against intimate partners.
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It is of great importance, both theoretically and practically, that there are many nonviolent men in the world. (Connell, 2000, p. 22)

Given its severity, it is not surprising that much attention has been and should continue to be given to examining men’s violence against women. Country studies from around the world indicate that between 10 and 50 percent of women are abused by an intimate partner and that the perpetrators are almost exclusively men (WHO, 2001). Men also suffer as the most common targets of other men’s violence, but women are at significantly higher risk of being sexually assaulted by men and of violent victimization in intimate relationships (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000; Truman & Rand, 2010). However, violence against women is only one of many resources available to men in the construction of masculinity (Messerschmidt, 1993). Most men are not violent towards their intimate partners (Katz, 1995), and societies in which domestic violence is absent or very low have been documented (Counts, Brown & Campbell, 1999; Fry, 1998; Levinson, 1989).
Men’s perspectives on nonviolence and engagement as anti-violence allies is still a relatively rare topic of feminist research across disciplines (Casey & Smith, 2010; Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach, & Stark, 2003; Funk, 2008; Katz, 1995; Sinha & Hurtado, 2008; White, 2001). More specifically, there is a dearth of literature on the experiences of masculinity and anti-violence engagement among non-White men (Hurtado & Sinha, 2008; Lemons, 1998; White, 2001), and few studies have employed intersectional approaches to examine the topic (Hurtado & Sinha, 2008). We know, however, that the intersecting race, gender, and class identities of non-White men problematize generalizations about male privilege, since minority men are typically more vulnerable to oppression, exploitation, and discrimination than White, middle-class men (Burkner, 2012; Chavez, 2008; Gutmann, 1996; Levy, 2007; Mastro & Behm-Morawitz, 2005; Mirande, Pitones, & Diaz, 2011; Ramirez, 2011; J.M. Rodriguez, 2003; Wendt, 2007). Hurtado and Sinha (2008) found that feminist-identified Latinos “were aware of their subordinate status in society based on their racial categorization, and viewed this as influencing their experience of being men” (p. 343). Men referred to themselves as “Latino men” rather than simply as “men” to emphasize how their multiple social identities intersected in everyday life. Following Hurtado and Sinha (2008), I propose that in anti-violence research it is similarly important to consider if and how racialization influences men’s experiences of violence and anti-violence engagement.

This article contributes to existing literature by proposing that we examine anti-violence engagement as a complex process in which violence may continue to be present, and that we examine this process through an intersectional lens. I suggest that Galtung’s (1985) concepts of negative and positive peace are particularly useful in examining anti-violence engagement as a process. Seen as a process, it is possible to move away from violence/nonviolence binaries and critically analyze the forms of violence that men may continue to be subjected to and engage in during times of relative peace within the contemporary U.S. Employing an intersectional approach, we can examine not only men’s gendered identities but also, in cases that will be discussed, men’s perceived or real status as racialized immigrants. I underscore men’s self-reflections on their experiences of discrimination due to their racialization as Latinos and their (real or assumed) immigrant status as factors associated with Latinos’ anti-violence engagement.

The first part of the article begins by introducing the theoretical frameworks of intersectionality, structural violence, and negative and positive peace that underpin my analysis, and it also presents the methodology for this study. I then provide a brief overview of the two bodies of literature to which this research most clearly contributes and brings together: Latino masculinities in the U.S. and men’s anti-violence engagement. In the second part of the article I draw on a small group of interviews to examine four themes in Latino anti-violence engagement: exposure to domestic violence during childhood, an invitation to participate in anti-violence work by a respected peer, self-reflection on their intersectional identities, and self-reflection on anti-violence engagement as a process characterized by negative peace. The findings discussed here are not representative of patterns of anti-violence engagement among all men, or all Latinos, yet they point to possible configurations and contribute to a richer, more nuanced understanding of Latinos’ engagement with anti-violence initiatives, a largely under-researched area that holds significant promise for more inclusive agendas to end violence against women.
Intersectional approaches were developed largely as a reaction to and critique of White feminist analyses that privileged gender as the main lens through which to view oppression. Crenshaw (1994) coined the term “intersectionality” to refer to the ways in which women’s identities and experiences of oppression are founded on multiple intersecting markers of difference, such as gender, race, class, and sexuality. Collins (1998), hooks (1989), and Hurtado (1997) similarly conceptualize interlocking systems of domination whose effects can be felt both at the community and individual level. An intersectional analytical lens helps us to consider the configurations of structural and individual factors that result in experiences of stigmatization or exclusion in the lives of individual Latinos, and, in the case of immigrants, it helps us see how immigrant status may intersect with other social identities to contribute to those experiences of exclusion (Burkner, 2012).

Understood as indirect violence embedded in unjust societal structures that are hegemonic and taken for granted by those in power, Galtung’s (1969) conceptualization of structural violence is a lens through which to approach how the intersecting influences of gender, migration, race, class, and sexuality contribute to the lived experience of marginalization and exclusion of specific groups and individuals. For example, as a structure of domination racism is experienced as a pervasive form of violence in everyday life for many Latinos in the U.S. South, despite individual class background, gender identity, or immigration status (Chavez, 2008; Southern Poverty Law Center, 2009; Winders, 2007). Moments of discrimination based on perceived racialized immigrant status contribute to Latinos’ experiences of exclusion.

The forms of exclusion and discrimination Latinos may experience underscore the prevalence of structural violence during times of relative peace (i.e., no war), that peace is not the same as the absence of all forms of violence, and the usefulness of Galtung’s notions of positive and negative peace. Positive peace implies social justice in the shape of egalitarian relations and the absence not only of violence but also of factors that contribute to violence (Galtung, 1969, 1985). Negative peace, which is more common, signifies the end of war but may still include structural violence and more direct violence, such as violence in intimate relationships. Against this background, anti-violence engagement is not the same as nonviolence. Men’s anti-violence engagement aims to achieve positive peace but the everyday realities of men’s experiences and engagement are better understood as examples of negative peace. Similarly to geographers’ view of peace as a process in which different forms of violence may continue to take place long after peace has been proclaimed (Loyd, 2012; Pankhurst, 2003), understanding men’s anti-violence engagement as a process cautions us against assuming that anti-violence engagement signifies the absence of violence in men’s lives.

**Methodology**

To my knowledge, there have been no other studies specifically on Latino anti-violence engagement in the U.S. This article draws on existing literature on Latino masculinities, literature on men’s anti-violence engagement, and interviews with six Latinos who are members of or are interested in joining a community organization of Latino men against violence. In her work on African-American feminist
men, White (2001) notes that identifying participants was difficult because self-identified African-American feminist men do not typically belong to a formal organization specifically for them. Similarly, identifying Latino men engaged in anti-violence practices was challenging because of difficulties in locating organizations for self-identified Latinos against violence. My previous research on the intersections of Latino masculinity and violence against women had been facilitated in part by the existence of a court-mandated batterer treatment program specifically for Latinos (Alcalde, 2011). For interviews for this part of the project on Latino masculinities and anti-violence engagement, there was no similar program or organization to which to turn. Fortunately, a Latino anti-violence community group in a nearby community was forming just as I was beginning my research and I was invited to join the group as an ally and interested researcher. The community group was concerned primarily with outreach to the local Latino community about gender equality, health issues, and immigration. Made up of a small group of committed men and women allies, the group consisted primarily of middle-class, professional men and women when I conducted interviews during the group’s first year.

The community group provided men with a safe space in which to discuss and analyze their and other men’s experiences of violence, the structures and beliefs that sustain violent masculinities, and men’s own feelings of vulnerability. The monthly lunchtime meetings required that men sometimes re-arrange their work schedules to attend but in return provided them with time to socialize and discuss the group’s plans with a supportive group of men as well as women allies supporting their efforts.

In addition to participant observation during monthly group meetings, I conducted interviews with group members and other men referred to me by group members. Among interviewees, four of the men were participants in the anti-violence Latino community group and two were interested in joining but had not yet joined at the time of the interview. Four of the men identified as heterosexual and two identified as gay. All six men were in long-term intimate relationships. Among the six men, educational background ranged from high school to graduation from college and professional graduate school. The age range was from 26 to 70 (other ages included 27, 41, 45, and 67). Four of the men were from Mexico, one from Chile, and one from the U.S. side of the Mexico-U.S. border. All four men identified as Latino, grew up in Spanish-speaking homes, were fluent in English, and, for those born outside the U.S., had lived in the U.S. for at least ten years.

Interviews addressed a range of topics, from childhood experiences to intimate relationships as adults to discrimination in their host communities. Interviews were semi-structured and open-ended and lasted between forty minutes and two and a half hours. I interviewed each man one time, usually in Spanish but in a few cases in a combination of Spanish and English (Spanglish) to reflect individual preferences, and I transcribed the interviews verbatim. Transcripts were analyzed using a grounded theory approach, employing open coding to identify themes and axial coding to understand the range of themes (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

**Latino Masculinities**

Latino men have historically been represented as hot-tempered, violent, and lacking intelligence (Mastro & Behm-Morawitz, 2005). On television, “Latino characters
are more likely than characters of other ethnic groups to be cast as having low-status occupations … [and] are more often represented in stories related to crime and participate in a disproportionate amount of conversations about crime and violence” (Rivadeneyra, Ward, & Gordon, 2007, p. 263). In the U.S., this popular culture stereotype of Latino men as criminal and treacherous dates back to silent movies that commonly depicted Latinos as ruthless banditos out to kill White men and rape or kill White women (Bender, 2003, p. 12). The reality is much more complex.

At 16% of the national population, Latinos are the largest and fastest-growing minority group in the U.S. (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). In the U.S. South, where this study took place, there is widespread evidence that low-income Latinos “are encountering widespread hostility, discrimination and exploitation” (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2009, p. 4). Because there is now a long history of popularly viewing Latinos as exploitable, low-wage workers who take away U.S. jobs from citizens and drain public services such as health care and public education, both undocumented and “legal” Latino immigrants are vulnerable to these forms of discrimination (Ransford, Carrillo, & Rivera, 2010; Winders, 2007). More generally, in the U.S., “half of second-generation Latin youths and up to two-thirds of Mexican Americans report having suffered discrimination” (Portes, 2009, p. 18).

Much recent scholarship underscores the complexity and changing forms of masculine identities in Latin America and among Latinos in the U.S. In Mexico City, Gutmann (1996) documents the experiences of men who enjoy holding and playing with their children, are responsible, and view fatherhood as one of their most important commitments. González-López (2005) introduced the concept of “regional patriarchies” to refer to the regional variation in masculinities in Mexico and among Mexican men in the United States, particularly in connection to men’s understanding and control of women’s sexuality. When Mirandé (1997) asked Latino men in the United States to describe what it means to be “macho,” responses ranged from negative characteristics such as violence, irresponsibility, disrespectfulness, and selfishness to positive characteristics such as courage, responsibility, nurturance, and respect. Mirandé, Pitones, and Diaz (2011) found that sexist, machista beliefs are class-based, noting that lower status men in their sample exhibited more machista attitudes than higher status men. Also challenging common views of Latinos as machista and underscoring diversity, Torres, Solberg, and Carlstrom (2002) point out that only a minority of Latino men fit the stereotypical model of the authoritarian, exist, promiscuous, and violent macho.

Smith (2006) points to changing forms of masculinity facilitated by the experience of migration, and Ramirez (2011) similarly discusses the importance of changing geographic, economic and sociocultural contexts in examining how “masculinity unfolds against a backdrop of racialized nativism and citizenship hierarchy in the United States” (p. 111) for a group of Latino gardeners. Noting the importance of place and context and that many jobs—including that of gardener—have become largely relegated to Mexican immigrant men, Ramirez (2011) examines men’s workplaces as important sites for the construction and enactment of masculinities.

In the realm of sexuality the journal Culture, Health, and Sexuality published a special issue on Latin American men’s alternative sexual cultures in 1999, documenting and analyzing gay communities and homosexual behaviors among men in Brazil, Mexico, and Peru as well as in the U.S. Many more studies of Latino gay
communities, queer Latino studies, and connections among sexuality and migration have expanded the study of diverse Latino sexualities since then (see Cantú, 2009; Hames-Garcia & Martínez, 2011; J.M. Rodriguez, 2003; R.T. Rodriguez, 2009). These studies, however, do not explicitly engage with Latino anti-violent masculinities.

In Peru, Ramos (2006) challenges the view of violence as central to masculinity and points to men’s varied perspectives on violence as a characteristic of masculinity. In a more recent study, working-class Latino men in the U.S. discussed how their feminist and class consciousness influenced their definitions of manhood and rejection of aspects of hegemonic masculinity (Hurtado & Sinha, 2008). In Lucinda Broadbent’s documentary Macho (2000), an activist in the men’s anti-violence movement in war-torn Nicaragua speaks about his decision to redefine masculinity by rejecting his own (past) use of violence against those closest to him and speaking out to stop violence against women.

MEN’S ANTI-VIOLENCE ENGAGEMENT

In the U.S., as in many other places, “violence has long been understood as the best way to ensure that others publicly recognize one’s manhood” (Kimmel, 2000, p. 253 cited in Wendt, 2007, p. 544). Feminist studies of men’s violence against women emphasize gender inequality as central to men’s use of violence, underscoring that men employ violence to maintain, gain, or attempt to gain power and control over individual women and to more broadly maintain and reinforce male privilege and domination (Dobash & Dobash, 1998; Kaufman, 2000; Yllo, 1993). Physical, psychological, sexual, and, to a lesser extent, economic violence against an intimate partner are widely recognized in the literature on men’s violence against women (Coker, Smith, McKeown, & King, 2000; Fawole, 2008; Heise, 1998; Thompson et al., 2006).

In contrast to our understanding of men’s violence against women, of which there is an increasingly robust interdisciplinary literature, there has been little theorization and analysis of men’s anti-violence practices and activism. Emerging research on men’s perspectives on their violence and nonviolence tends to focus on White, middle-class men, and a significant amount on college-age and college-educated men in the U.S. (Broido, 2000; Brown & Messman-Moore, 2010; Carlson, 2008; Carmody, 2006; Casey & Smith, 2010; Casey & Ohler, 2012; DeKeseredy, Schwartz, & Albi, 2000; Fabiano et al., 2003; Katz, 1995; Kimmel, 2008; Marchese, 2008). We know from available literature that men involved in anti-violence efforts are commonly met with suspicion and homophobia by other men, and express feeling isolated in their communities as a result of their anti-violence work (Crooks, Goodall, Hughes, Jaffe, & Baker, 2007; Funk, 2008).

Perhaps the best known example of men’s anti-violence work is the White Ribbon Campaign, which began in 1991 on the second anniversary of one man’s massacre of fourteen women engineering students in Montreal, Canada. The White Ribbon Campaign became the first, and is now the largest, protest by men against violence against women, and it has expanded to various regions of the globe (Kaufman, 2001). Other groups, campaigns, and movements include Coaching Boys into Men (CBIM), Mentors in Violence Prevention (MVP) focusing on college athletes (Katz, 1995), Men Against Sexual Assault and Rape (MASAR), Men Against Sexual Violence (MASV), Men Can Stop Rape (MCSR), Men Stopping Violence, various cam-
paigns within the National Latino Alliance for the Elimination of Domestic Violence (Alianza), and Real Men (Katz, 2006). Typically, the main focus in these groups is men’s anti-violence advocacy and violence prevention strategies (Marchese, 2008; Umberson, Anderson, Williams, & Chen, 2003). Writing on his experience in a men’s anti-violence group in Nicaragua, Ruben identifies himself as “a man against violence” and explains that “with this I mean that I belong to a group of men who have committed themselves to not practice violence in their everyday relationships, especially in our relationships with women” (Reyes Jiron, 2002, p. 104, my translation).

Recent work on men’s engagement with anti-violence efforts suggests possible factors associated with men’s anti-violence engagement. One factor associated with men’s involvement in anti-violence work is “exposure to or personal experiences with issues of sexual or domestic violence” (Casey & Smith, 2010, p. 959). On the one hand, common risk factors for being abusive in an intimate relationship and developing attitudes that condone the use of violence include having experienced or witnessed violence as a child, particularly as a boy (Dutton, 1995; Heise, 1998; Pease & Flood, 2009; Ramos, 2006; Thompson et al., 2006). On the other hand, as my interviews and other literature on men’s anti-violence organizing and attitudes about violence against women underscore, the path from violence in childhood to using violence as an adult is only one of many (Pease & Flood, 2009).

A second factor associated with anti-violence engagement is being invited to become involved in social justice work by respected peers or mentors (Casey & Smith, 2010). In a recent U.S. study, “one in five men (21%) reported that they did not actively support community efforts to stop violence against women because no one had asked them to get involved” (Crooks et al., 2007, p. 219). Other studies have similarly found that men involved in anti-violence efforts refer to specific invitations they received to become involved (Barker, 1998; Broido, 2000).

Casey and Smith (2010) found that a “intrapersonal factors (such as the ability to critically self-reflect)” are also associated with men’s involvement in and identification with anti-violence work (p. 955). In the present article, I connect men’s self-reflection as a factor associated with anti-violence engagement to their experiences of discrimination due to their racialization as Latinos and their (real or purported) immigrant status. It is through reflection on these experiences of vulnerability and discrimination that men empathize with women victimized by men’s violence and find anti-violence engagement both appealing and necessary.

Writing on her research with African-American feminist men, White (2001) explains that men “use their blended personal experiences of oppression as a reference point in order to understand the oppression of women” (p. 15). However, the experience of racism is not sufficient to explain men’s identification as feminist. As White emphasizes, “what distinguishes profeminist men from other men who also experience various forms of powerlessness and oppression, but do not develop profeminist outlooks, is their progressive interpretation of their experiences and their ability to see how various forms of oppression interact and reinforce each other” (p. 16) through the process of self-reflection. Similarly, Hurtado and Sinha examine how Latino men who engage in anti-sexist work critically reflect on how their particular vulnerabilities result from the intersection of their class and ethnic identities.
FINDINGS

Exposure to Domestic Violence

Oppression through violence was not particularly new to the men I interviewed. Of the six men, four came from abusive homes in which they were victimized or had witnessed their father or stepfather regularly abuse their mother. As 41-year-old Pedro, an active member of the men’s community group described, as a child he witnessed his father use “threats, lots of verbal [threats]. Many were denigrating, and always, that she [mother] was never good enough, never good enough for him. And physical [violence] also.” Rather than follow his father’s example, Pedro rejected violence precisely because he had seen how those closest to him—in this case, his mother—suffered from it.

Another man in the men’s community group also described his involvement in the group in connection to the violence in his childhood. Alberto described how as a father of two young children one day when his children were being particularly rowdy he took his belt off to discipline them, as his father had done with him. It was at that moment that he stopped himself before using the belt because “that was the moment that I said, ‘I don’t want to be the same as my father.’” Both Pedro and Alberto rejected violence precisely because—rather than in spite of—they had either witnessed the suffering it caused the women closest to them or had been abused as children by men in their family. Witnessing or experiencing violence became a sensitizing experience that, combined with other sensitizing experiences as immigrant men, contributed to the rejection of broader forms of oppression and activism.

José also grew up in an abusive home. Growing up in Mexico, he described how as a child he “felt safer on the streets than at home” because both parents abused him. He would ask himself, “why did I get this family?” and wonder what it would be like to have a different family. José left home at a young age to live on the streets because of the violence at home. And, although he encountered violence and drugs living on the streets, he also discovered “angels,” persons who took him under their wing and protected him. As an adult, instead of asking himself why he got stuck with the family he did, he tells himself “it’s part of life” and adds that “a lot of good things have also happened to me in my life.” In discussing his commitment to living without violence, he sums up his feelings by stating that “I am grateful to life for having showed me the bad side of life because now I know and appreciate what it means to be loved and to live without violence.” For Pedro and Alberto, the realization that violence against women was not limited to “bad men” and first-hand knowledge of the harmful effects of men’s violence on the well-being of women and families directly contributed to the desire to raise awareness about men’s violence against women.

Samuel did not grow up in an abusive home, but he was keenly aware of its existence in other families in his community and society. He regularly witnessed “fights between friends, fights between couples, between couples that were not part of my family” in his community. More broadly, newspapers he read routinely covered multiple forms of violence in ways he considered to be graphic and sensationalist. As a child, seeing pictures of mutilated corpses and bloodied people

---

1 In this and all other cases, pseudonyms are used to protect participants’ identities.
“affected me a lot for weeks at a time…. I felt fear, a sense of disgust internally because of what happened to those people and later I would constantly think about it.”

Invitation to Participate by a Respected Woman Peer

Among the men I interviewed, men who participated in the anti-violence community group in Kentucky during its first months received a special invitation to do so from Camila, a respected woman leader they each personally knew within the Latino community. An immigrant from Latin America herself, Camila had been active as an advocate in violence prevention efforts within the Latino community both locally and nationally for over a decade by the time the men’s group began. Well-liked, outgoing, and involved in various anti-violence projects, she had received both local and national awards for her advocacy.

When I asked Miguel why he joined the group, he immediately replied it was “because of my great friendship with Camila.” Similarly, when I asked Alberto why he joined the group, smiling, he answered, “Because of Camila. Because she asked me to and you never say no to her.”

He then added that he had also joined because “I also saw other friends of mine [participating], and I said to myself, ‘Well, I have to help, I have to do what I can.’” Other men echoed Alberto’s answer: they had been invited to participate to create the group by a woman they respected and they felt the need to do something about a problem they personally recognized as significant. Joining the group allowed them to work directly with other men who had similar attitudes about violence against women as well as women allies.

Self-Reflections on Intersectional Identities

During interviews, men engaged in anti-violence work reflected on the ways in which their intersecting identities as men, immigrants, and Latinos made them feel particularly vulnerable to structural forms of violence. As a direct result of migration to the U.S., men believed their gendered experiences could not be fully understood without also examining their intersecting experiences as immigrants.

Alberto, a 67-year-old business leader in the Latino community and a member of the Latino men’s community group stated that “the doors do not open for the person of color like us, even if we were Chinese, African, it’s the same thing. The gringo here doesn’t help us, first he helps the other gringo … and that’s discrimination.” Similarly, twenty-six-year-old Manuel explained that, as a construction worker, “there have been times when they send us to work and the home owners sometimes want a White person working for them and they talk to my boss. There have been times when they’ve turned us away, I mean, when we couldn’t work.” Miguel similarly noted the effects of racism on everyday life, explaining that “some police officers are like that, somewhat racists one could say. Because you are Latino they stop you, and they arrest you because of any little thing.” The pervasiveness of racism aimed at him and other Latinos makes him acutely aware that “I am no longer in my country,” regardless of how long he lived in the U.S.

For 45-year-old Samuel, marginalization as a result of discrimination based on his perceived outsider status and Latino identity began early in his schooling. Sitting in his office, where he works as an administrator, he explained that “one of the
things that bothers me is the idea that because you are Latino you are a foreigner. When does a foreigner go from being a foreigner to being a native?” Growing up on the U.S. side of the U.S.-Mexico border, where his family had been for generations, as a child Samuel regularly accompanied and worked alongside his family as a migrant farm worker in various U.S. states. Because of the seasonal work, he sometimes missed school. In spite of missing school to work, he did well in school and was particularly good in mathematics. His eighth grade teacher recommended that he be placed in the highest math class. Nonetheless, the counselor refused to place him in the advanced class because Samuel missed the beginning of school due to work responsibilities in another state. Worse yet, the counselor assumed that because he came from a migrant farm worker family “I would not go to college” and therefore did not need the advanced classes. Instead, the counselor placed Samuel in a low-level basic math class again with other Latinos and suggested he then enroll in a practical trade such as car mechanics. In spite of the continuous discrimination he faced throughout school, Samuel succeeded in his studies and later earned a master’s degree. Reflecting on his experiences of discrimination, he explains that he is now involved in several social justice community organizations because “we have to do something. We can’t leave the situation as it is.”

For the two men who identified as gay, marginalization based on their sexual orientation had been a factor from very early in their lives. Both in their countries of origin as children and in the U.S. as immigrants, peer pressure to conform to dominant, heterosexual forms of masculinity and fear of losing their jobs cautioned them against disclosing their sexual orientation to acquaintances and co-workers. As Kimmel (2000) has emphasized and these and other men know, homophobia is a key component of hegemonic masculinity. José, for example, had to decide how to respond each time someone asked him about his wife when they saw a ring on his “wedding ring” finger. In his case, he and his partner (whom I did not interview) wore what he described as engagement rings yet co-workers and strangers regularly asked him about his wife because of the assumptions they made about him based on the ring. If he responded that he was not married and added that he was gay and had a partner, he became vulnerable to homophobic remarks. If he simply smiled or said nothing, he “let people think I’m heterosexual” to avoid possible problematic reactions from others. Being the target of homophobic remarks and behaviors may be associated with a critical understanding of hegemonic masculinity as oppressive.

Self-Reflections on Anti-Violence Engagement as a Process

In discussing their intimate relationships, men engaged in anti-violence work were particularly reflective regarding their commitment, and the obstacles they faced, to live free of violence. They acknowledged that in spite of their belief that violence was detrimental to men and women, at times the threat of violence and insistence on dominance was not far from the surface in their intimate relationships. They thus examined their commitment to avoid violence as a process that was far from complete and which required continuous self-reflection.

Speaking about his views on intimate relationships and women, Pedro defined himself as feminist and discussed how he believes that “women are the owners of their own bodies…. I believe in the right of women to be able to act on and be part of their own lives intellectually and with whatever they do with their bodies.” In
his same-sex intimate relationship, Pedro similarly believes that each of them should have a right to control his own life. Yet as he described his relationship with his partner, it became clear that the egalitarianism and anti-violence commitment that guided his relationship did not always coincide with the behaviors he engaged in. Pedro explained that he and his partner never fought physically, but that they did fight verbally occasionally. He then added that it was actually he who attacked his partner verbally “about once a week.” While he avoided physical violence, he admitted and reflected on how it pained him that avoiding verbal violence proved more difficult for him in his relationship. He recognized that his behaviors did not always reflect his ideals and that he needed to continue to work to avoid verbal violence.

José also described his relationship with his partner as “egalitarian at home” and “very close.” And, during our two-hour interview José similarly reflected on how he continuously struggles to maintain egalitarianism and nonviolence in his relationship. Discussing the difficulty of keeping violence out of his relationship, José tells me that he and his partner “would both like to have children” yet he is afraid to because of how he behaves towards their pets. He and his partner have two dogs they love and spoil. In a self-critical tone, José tells me that “sometimes I hit the dogs with a shoe” when he becomes angry with them. Because of his violence, the dogs are sometimes scared of him. Reflecting on what he admits is undesirable behavior, he tells me that after hitting them with a shoe “I ask myself, ‘Why do I do that?’” and that the more he thinks about it, the more he fears that he would also behave violently towards any children they had. José feels committed to living without violence in his home yet he continues to rely on violence at times. He also considers his occasional sexual rejection of his partner “a type of violence” and wants to also cease engaging in that behavior. José’s occasional use of violence in his relationship troubles him and complicates his otherwise nonviolent, egalitarian relationship. He hopes to rely less on these forms of violence the more involved in anti-violence work he becomes.

Samuel insisted that constant self-reflection is essential to remain committed to social justice and anti-violence work. He, noted, however, that “our economic system, as we try to better our economic situation, we don’t give ourselves time. It forces many men to not have time to reflect.” In his own life, he discussed how “even after getting married, my mother tells me that I must behave well towards my wife, and she continuously asks me about her and about how I’m behaving.”

Seventy-year-old Miguel similarly describes his empathy towards women and commitment to not use violence against women in his family as a process that required significant self-reflection. In his case, growing up in a home in which his father practiced a dominant and sometimes violent masculinity and his mother and grandmother upheld this sort of masculinity resulted in what he critically understood to be the oppression of his older sister. Miguel counted his older sister as one of the earliest and most important influences on his views about women and violence. He told me that “my older sister, she was very feminist, and she would talk with me directly about the fact that women should have the same work opportunities as men; and that was before, maybe before 1950.” Seeing how his sister, who had a significant influence on his life, was denied opportunities he was given as a child and in school, Miguel witnessed the consequences of unequal gender relations and their negative effects on his sister very early on in his life. It was these early influences that inspired him to continue to think about women’s oppression,
and what he could do about it. Miguel does not believe he would respect women the way he does or be as committed to preventing violence against women had it not been for his sister’s influence.

DISCUSSION

Childhood exposure to domestic violence, invitations to participate in anti-violence work by a trusted and respected peer, and self-reflection both on how their experiences of oppression are informed by their intersectional identities and on anti-violence engagement as a process that defies violence/nonviolence dualisms and requires continuous evaluation of one’s actions, all inform and fuel men’s anti-violence engagement. Employing an intersectional approach allows us to better understand Latinos’ anti-violence engagement by making visible the vulnerabilities men experience that result from the intersection of their class and ethnic identities, their immigrant status, and for some, their sexual orientation, and how men may reflect on these intersecting identities. Samuel’s comment that “because you are Latino you are a foreigner” regardless of your immigrant status was echoed by Latinos in the present and other studies (Hurtado & Sinha, 2008) and underscores the feelings of marginalization that inform what it means to be Latino in the U.S. Far from being secondary to men’s identity and experiences, men spoke of their experiences of or perceptions as immigrants as central to their lives.

In joining a Latino anti-violence group, for example, men accepted an invitation from a Latina immigrant, Camila, who appealed both to men’s identities as Latinos and to their identities as immigrants vulnerable to and aware of multiple forms of structural violence in their lives and in their communities. The group was thus a safe space in which “to engage them at the level of their lived experience, which may include feeling powerless” (Crooks et al., 2007, p. 220) precisely because of men’s own feelings of vulnerability as Latino immigrants or perceived immigrants. Men felt grateful to have been invited to join the group in part because the reflection process within the group helped men make sense of violence earlier in their lives and provided an outlet for their commitment to anti-violence engagement. For example, in discussing the violence he witnessed as a child in his home, Pedro explained that “being in this group has helped me to analyze it a little already because I still haven’t been able to internalize it and find a way to process it.”

Pease’s call to “ask whether male anti-violence allies are being sufficiently critically reflective of their own complicity in the culture that perpetuates men’s violence” (2011, p. 179) invites us to more carefully examine men’s anti-violence engagement. In the cases discussed here, we see that anti-violence engagement is informed and fueled by continuous self-reflection that allows men to identify areas that they believe require more attention in their efforts to live free of violence. For the men in this study, witnessing or experiencing violence as children became a sensitizing experience that, combined with other sensitizing experiences as Latino immigrant men, contributed to the process of rejecting broader forms of oppression. Thus, rather than follow the more common—and commonly written about—path of witnessing violence as children and exercising violence as adults, the men in this study critically thought about their childhood experiences and drew on these as the foundation for their rejection of the use of violence against a loved one.

In approaching anti-violence engagement as a process, men’s experiences caution us against assuming that the ideological rejection of violence is easily or
quickly translatable to nonviolent practices. The everyday realities of men’s experiences and use of violence are better understood as reflective of negative peace: war is absent yet unequal structures that contribute to violence, through racist and sexist practices, for example, persist. In men’s lives, men’s anti-violence engagement moves them closer to nonviolence, but it should not be understood simplistically as the equivalent of nonviolence. Pedro and José are committed to anti-violence work and to having egalitarian relationships that facilitate nonviolence; yet as they reflect on their everyday practices, they point out that they sometimes continue to rely on unequal structures within intimate relationships to exert power over others, and engage in behaviors that contribute to violence. More broadly, as Latinos and immigrants, they also continue to be vulnerable to structural violence in the form of racism and other discriminatory practices.

CONCLUSIONS

To commemorate the 2011 International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women, then U.N. Women Executive Director Michelle Bachelet proposed a sixteen-step policy agenda to end violence (Bachelet, 2011). Recognizing that men play a key role not only in promoting but also in ending violence against women, Bachelet’s agenda included mobilizing men and boys to help end violence against women and girls. This article embraces the goals of this sort of inclusive agenda and underscores the importance of examining diverse anti-violence masculinities to contribute to ending violence. More specifically, this article suggests that an intersectional lens allows us to include gender while also paying close attention to other social identities, such as immigrant status and race, that inform men’s experiences of violence and anti-violence engagement. Complementing interviews with existing literature on men’s anti-violence engagement, this study underscores childhood exposure of domestic violence, invitations to participate in anti-violence work by a respected peer, and critical self-reflections on intersecting identities and anti-violence engagement as a process as significant factors in Latino anti-violence engagement.

Men were keenly aware of the stigma attached to their identities as Latinos in the U.S. The sorts of exclusion and oppression they experienced as Latinos and immigrants informed their commitment to social justice issues, including embracing and advocating for nonviolent behaviors within intimate relationships. Through their own experiences of structural violence, and self-reflective analyses of these experiences, men developed empathy for women’s vulnerability in the context of multiple identities and roles in their lives in the U.S. Yet even as men drew on their own experiences and reflected on how their identities accentuated their vulnerability, they also reflected on how anti-violence engagement is not the same as the experience of nonviolence.

As we examine anti-violence engagement as a process, we can see that men live negative peace through their own experiences of continued discrimination as Latinos and immigrants and by exerting power over those close to them in ways that facilitate or directly draw on violence. Interviews with men suggest that commitment to ending violence may not always result in nonviolent behaviors within intimate relationships. Positive peace occurs when the conditions to prevent all forms of violence are met so that repression is absent both at structural and personal levels. Latino anti-violence engagement moves men closer to nonviolence and positive
peace, yet it does not erase the forms of structural violence or the complex processes that may continue to include other forms of inequality and oppression within intimate relationships. Future research should continue to employ an intersectional approach and include non-White samples to more thoroughly examine contributing factors and obstacles to diverse men’s anti-violence engagement.
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