



University of Texas at El Paso

From the SelectedWorks of Stacey K. Sowards

January 2010

Rhetorical agency as haciendo caras and differential consciousness through lens of gender, race, ethnicity, and class: An examination of Dolores Huerta's rhetoric

Contact
Author

Start Your Own
SelectedWorks

Notify Me
of New Work



Available at: http://works.bepress.com/stacey_sowards/11

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Rhetorical Agency as *Haciendo Caras* and Differential Consciousness Through Lens of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class: An Examination of Dolores Huerta's Rhetoric

Stacey Sowards

Department of Communication and Sam Donaldson Center for Communication, University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX 79968, USA

*This study explores the rhetoric of Dolores Huerta, cofounder of the United Farm Workers of America, and expands theoretical understandings of rhetorical agency as a negotiation of the intersectional aspects of gender, ethnicity, race, and class. Huerta's rhetoric illustrates how rhetorical agency can function through what Gloria Anzaldúa calls *haciendo caras* [making face, making soul] and what Chela Sandoval calls differential consciousness. Using these rhetorical *caras*, Huerta embodies collaborative agency through rhetorical styles of emotionality, *familia* [family], egalitarianism, and optimism, using factors from social and material dispositions relating to ethnicity, gender, and class, that both enable and constrain her sense of rhetorical agency. Ultimately, Huerta's *caras* and negotiation of *habitus* shape rhetorical agency through optimism, resistance, and transformation.*

doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2010.01361.x

Born in 1930 in Dawson, New Mexico, Dolores Huerta has spent much of her life fighting for the rights of farm workers throughout the United States and constructing a persona as an outspoken, confrontational, and assertive union leader (García, 2008). In 1955, she founded the Community Service Organization's (CSO) branch in Stockton, California, where she met César Chávez (United Farm Workers, n.d.). Chávez and Huerta decided that farm workers needed the right to unionize and greater protection than what the CSO could offer for them (Ferriss & Sandoval, 1997; United Farm Workers, n.d.; Shaw, 2008). In 1962, Dolores Huerta and César Chávez cofounded the National Farm Workers Association (NFWA), the organization that eventually became the United Farm Workers (UFW). The NFWA and the UFW activities started with membership drives in 1962 and the boycott beginning in 1965, and strikes that followed in subsequent years. In short, the UFW was able to obtain collective bargaining between farm workers and growers; establish union contracts

Corresponding author: Stacey Sowards; e-mail: ssowards@utep.edu

that provided breaks, toilets, drinking water, certain protections against pesticide exposure, farm worker seniority, and job security; and develop programs for a farm worker health plan, pension plan, and credit union (United Farm Workers, n.d.). As the UFW became the strongest and best known advocate for farm workers' rights, these accomplishments ensured greater protections for farm workers in the United States.

As the president of the NFWA, César Chávez was the primary spokesperson for the organization, but Huerta's commitment and assertiveness drew attention to her vice-presidential role in the organization as well. Huerta was well known for her stamina, often working 18-hour days, earning between \$5 and \$35 a week, and living on donated food, clothing, and shelter (Felner, 1998; Rose, 2004). She also had 11 children to support, and because she was twice divorced, many of her children lived with union families or the Chávez family while she traveled throughout California and the East Coast to support boycotts, membership drives, and lobbying efforts (Frank, 1987). Huerta was a charismatic leader of the UFW, as evidenced by numerous reports of her speaking style (Baer, 1975; "A Life-Time Commitment," 1979; Speer, 1977). She was called Adelita ("the symbolic *soldadera* [female soldier] of the Mexican Revolution") (Ruiz, 1998, p. 134), "La Pasionaria (the passionate one)" (García, 2008, p. xv), General Patton, and the Grand Lady of Steel (Dolores Huerta, n.d.; Miller, 1996; Ross, n.d.). She also was frequently described as a powerful, dynamic, and eloquent speaker (Melendez, 1971; Speer, 1977).

Several communication scholars have studied the Chicana/o and farm workers movements of the 1960s and 1970s (Delgado, 1995; Hammerback & Jensen, 1980, 1994, 1998; Hammerback, Jensen, & Gutiérrez, 1985; Jensen, Burkholder, & Hammerback, 2003; Jensen & Hammerback, 1980, 1982, 2002; Yinger, 1975; Zompetti, 2002), yet these studies focus on male leadership in both movements and overlook women's roles in these movements, erasing women like Dolores Huerta in Chicano movement history. For example, John Hammerback and Richard Jensen have written extensively about the rhetorical legacy of César Chávez, yet their work only gives passing reference to Dolores Huerta. In their 1985 book (written with José Angel Gutiérrez), *A War of Words: Chicano Protest in the 1960s and 1970s*, Huerta is mentioned once. In their 1998 book, *The Rhetorical Career of César Chávez*, Huerta is mentioned six times, cited for her comments about Chávez's leadership style. None of these references elaborates on Huerta's contributions or her leadership within the UFW.

Not only has Huerta been overlooked in rhetorical scholarship, but César Chávez has received credit for ideas that Huerta claims were hers. For instance, Hammerback and Jensen discuss how Chávez converted the name of a neighborhood he had lived in, "*Sal Si Puedes* (get out if you can)," to "*Sí, se puede* (Yes, we can),"¹ which has long been used as a rallying cry for the UFW (Jensen & Hammerback, 2002, p. xix). Yet, Huerta has said that she was the person who initiated "*sí, se puede*" as a rallying cry (Huerta, 2003). Many of her contributions and successes may have been attributed to Chávez, without recognizing her role in those union activities. As Margaret Rose

observes: “Such male-centered interpretations have distorted the history of the UFW and the role of women in its development” (Rose, 1990a, p. 26).

In addition to being underrepresented in rhetorical scholarship, Dolores Huerta’s rhetorical styles are especially useful exemplars of how women from places of marginality negotiate rhetorical agency through intersectional identities of gender, race, ethnicity, and class. Several scholars have argued that women, especially historically, often employ different rhetorical styles, such as “feminine” styles that include such practices as relying on personal experiences and tone, structuring arguments inductively, inviting audience participation, addressing the audience as peers, basing authority on experience, creating identification with audience, and focusing holistically on relationships (Blankenship & Robson, 1995; Campbell, 1989; Dow & Tonn, 1993; Hayden, 1999). Michael Calvin McGee (1980) discusses the notion of “feminization” of power, which focuses on leadership styles that emphasize gentleness, caring for others, and good will of the people. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell (1986, 1989, 1995) also has observed that some women enact diverse rhetorical styles. For example, Mari Boor Tonn (1996) examines what she calls “militant motherhood” in the rhetoric of Mother Jones, who used both feminine (mothering) and masculine (militant) rhetorical styles (see also Hayden, 2003; Japp, 1985). However, Raka Shome (1996) problematizes “the generalized notion of a ‘woman’s/feminist rhetorical or communicative perspective’ that often gets articulated by feminists in the discipline” (p. 53). She argues that nonwhite women may negotiate rhetorical situations very differently because of their diverse cultural backgrounds. Similarly, other Latina communication studies scholars interrogate assumptions of women’s similarities and public/private spheres in the choice of texts for study (Flores, 1996; Holling, 2000; Palczewski, 1996). For these reasons, Dolores Huerta’s rhetoric provides a compelling example of how marginalized women might negotiate rhetorical agency in different ways, as I will demonstrate in this analysis of a wide range of primary texts that were obtained through archival research, including public statements, speeches, congressional testimonies, UFW organizational documents, and private letters.

In what follows, I discuss how rhetorical agency serves as a theoretical framework for understanding Huerta’s work. I then explain how Dolores Huerta negotiates rhetorical agency by accounting for social and collective forces that shape agential rhetorical space through three different, but interconnected concepts: Pierre Bourdieu’s *habitus*, Gloria Anzaldúa’s *haciendo caras* [making faces/soul], and Chela Sandoval’s differential consciousness. Ultimately, I argue that Huerta’s rhetoric adds to theoretical understandings of agency through Huerta’s use of *haciendo caras* and differential consciousness, expanding the meaning of agency as it relates to intersectional identities of gender, race, and class. I use four examples of *caras* that include emotionality, *familia*, collaborative egalitarianism, and courageous optimism. Each of these *caras* creates a framework for expanding our understanding of rhetorical agency as collaborations and *haciendo caras* through negotiations of social structures and race, ethnicity, gender, and class.

Rhetorical agency: *Habitus*, *Haciendo Caras*, and differential consciousness

The idea of rhetorical agency, despite recent efforts to theorize and define this term, remains ambiguous and unpredictable, although I will argue that *habitus*, *haciendo caras*, and differential consciousness, shaped through social and collective spaces, offer an expanded understanding of rhetorical agency through examining intersectional aspects of gender, race, ethnicity, class, and national origin status. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell suggests that the very nature of rhetorical agency is “promiscuous and protean” because it “can refer to invention, strategies, authorship, institutional power, identity, subjectivity, practices, and subject positions, among others” (Campbell, 2005, p. 1). Indeed, Huerta’s rhetoric illustrates the promiscuous and protean nature of agency through her negotiations of social, political, economic, and cultural forces.

Other recent discussions, such as the 2003 Alliance of Rhetoric Studies Conference on the Status and Future of Rhetorical Societies and a 2004 special issue of *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, have broadened our understanding of rhetorical agency, suggesting that it might be understood as enactment (Brouwer, 2003; Campbell, 1988; Lucaites, 2003), performance (Fishman, 2003), articulation (Biesecker, 2003), personal will (Condit, 2003), resistance (Dube, 2003), invention (Benacka, 2003; Zaeske, 2003), “ability to make decisions” on one’s own (Holling, 2000, p. 145), and creativity (McNay, 1999). For example, Susan Zaeske (2003) observes that agency might be viewed as agentic or subversive invention, in which resistance requires creativity. Cheryl Geisler (2004) clarifies some of these position papers from the Alliance of Rhetorical Studies conference by noting that the “common understanding of rhetorical agency at the ARS was the capacity of the rhetor to act” (2004, p. 12). Emirbayer and Mische further explain that agency is a multifaceted concept that includes:

a temporally embedded process of social engagement, informed by the past (in its “iterational” or habitual aspect) but also oriented toward the future (as a “projective” capacity to imagine alternative possibilities) and toward the present (as a “practical-evaluative” capacity to contextualize past habits and future projects within the contingencies of the moment). (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998, p. 962)

To begin to understand agency requires an examination of how rhetors or groups of rhetors reach a moment in which they desire or are invited to speak. Several scholars contend that agency is relational and an ongoing negotiation with oneself, interactions, and power structures within social and material constraints (Bourdieu, 1990, 1991; Campbell, 2005; Enck-Wanzer, 2006; Greene, 2004; Herndl, 2003; Holling, 2000; Lundberg & Gunn, 2004). While this article focuses on a single individual, I contend that Huerta’s rhetorical successes are more than just her own creativities and abilities. She is a product of many social forces, related to family, education, religion, social movements of the 1960s and 1970s, particularly the

Chicano/a movement, the farm worker movement, the women's rights movement, and collaborative relationships with specific people and organizations.

Specifically, Pierre Bourdieu's work on *habitus* illustrates how agency is influenced by the past, or what Emirbayer and Mische call the habitual element of agency. Bourdieu contends that habitus relates to the dispositions that originate in childhood, as individuals are socialized by parents, family members, educational systems, and others who teach them the unspoken and unwritten rules of appropriateness and inappropriateness:

The habitus is a set of *dispositions* which incline agents to act and react in certain ways. The dispositions generate practices, perceptions, and attitudes which are "regular" without being consciously co-ordinated or governed by any "rule". The dispositions which constitute the habitus are inculcated, structured, durable, generative and transposable. (Thompson, 1991, p. 12)

Bourdieu suggests that agency emerges from these dispositions in the act of balancing opposing forces, such as "possibilities and impossibilities, freedoms and necessities, opportunities and prohibitions" (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 54). Individuals base their expectations on "the accessible and inaccessible, of what is and is not 'for us,' a division as fundamental and as fundamentally recognized as that between the sacred and the profane" (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 64). Habitus, and these opposing forces, influence our abilities to speak, invent, perform, act, and resist in ways that may not be consciously recognized.

As Michelle Holling (2000) explains, agency exists in relationship to other subjects, so that for Chicanas, socialization (e.g., related to family), social contracts of marriage (e.g., related to Catholicism), and sexuality can limit rhetorical options, voice, and construction of one's own identity. To negotiate these social and material constraints, Lisa Flores argues that Chicana feminists create a rhetoric of difference through their writing that includes rejecting mainstream rhetoric and shaping their own constitutive rhetoric. This rhetoric of difference allows for the "creation of discursive space [that] means that the margins are transformed into the center of a new society, and the disempowered find power" (Flores, 1996, p. 152). One way such transformation occurs is through collective agency that functions to foster and constitute identity (Enck-Wanzer, 2006). That is, collective agency shapes how the "subject" responds to the possibilities of individual and group identities that allow such rhetors to negotiate rhetorical constraints. Rhetorical agency is not just the process of negotiating one's individual and social habitus but, rather, the agent embraces enabling mechanisms, such as collective and collaborative efforts for social organizing and elements that facilitate the constitution of identity, from past and present dispositions, while resisting rhetorically constructed social conventions that limit or foreclose rhetorical options.

Based on these theoretical explications of agency, I propose, using Dolores Huerta as an exemplar, that rhetorical agency is a function of individual dispositions, social contexts, and a rhetor's ability to respond to those situations as they change over time

and negotiate social standings related to gender, race, ethnicity, class, and national origin status. Gloria Anzaldúa (1990) employs the idea of *haciendo caras* [making face, making soul] to demonstrate rhetorical limitations and enabling mechanisms, even while recognizing that *haciendo caras* is fostered through collaborative relationships and the tacit approval of such *caras*. First, she explains: “‘Face’ is the surface of the body that is the most noticeably inscribed by social structures, marked with instructions on how to be *mujer*, *macho*, working class, Chicana” (1990, p. xv). She further suggests that *haciendo caras* is a way to manage, negotiate, subvert, and confront dominant structures and ideologies, using “gestos subversivos, political subversive gestures, the piercing look that questions or challenges” (1990, p. xv). The idea of *haciendo caras* is also a strategic *movida* [move] in which a rhetor may address internal insecurities or lack of confidence, the kinds of masks, “*las máscaras*, we are compelled to wear, [that] drive a wedge between our intersubjective personhood and the *persona* we present to the world” (p. xv). As Mitsuye Yamada writes: “My mask is control/concealment/endurance/my mask is escape/from my/self” (p. 114). These masks are also *más/caras*, or a type of “super face,” that require extra work to maintain. Finally, *haciendo caras* is also the ability to transform through the ability to “‘change’ faces . . . like a chameleon” (Anzaldúa, 1990, p. xv). For Anzaldúa (1987), the mestiza consciousness allows the transformation of one’s own inner and outer *caras* and *más/caras* in the construction of persona and identity.

In order to employ these *caras*, Chela Sandoval explains that a differential consciousness is required:

enough strength to confidently commit to a well-defined structure of identity for one hour, day, week, month, year; enough flexibility to self-consciously transform that identity according to the requisites of another oppositional ideological tactic if readings of power’s formation require it; enough grace to recognize alliance with others committed to egalitarian social relations and race, gender, sex, class, and social justice. (Sandoval, 2000, p. 60)

Rhetorical tools such as strength, flexibility, and grace establish grounds for the rhetor to employ *caras*. In essence, *haciendo caras*, infused with an understanding of differential consciousness, function as rhetorical styles (or practices) related to language and delivery choices and as rhetorical strategies, or conscious efforts to command audiences.

In the rest of this article, I explore habitus in relationship to Huerta’s rhetoric to understand how she negotiated social and material constraints relating to gender, ethnicity, race, and class through collaborations and relationships with others. I then examine how Dolores Huerta’s rhetoric as *haciendo caras* functions as a major role in facilitating other aspects of rhetorical agency, such as negotiations, experimentations, and collaborations. Ultimately, I conclude that *haciendo caras* functions through differential consciousness and rhetorical styles relating to flexibility, optimism, resistance, and transformation.

Negotiating social constraints: Rhetorical agency through habitus

In the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, Mexican and Mexican-American women faced significant rhetorical constraints related to the intersectional aspects of gendered, classed, and ethnic status in both Mexican and Mexican-American culture as well as within the dominant hierarchical structures (García, 2008). Such social constraints that these women faced relate to Mexican and Mexican-American traditions that called for women's subservience and obedience to men within the family structure, the Catholic church, the institution of marriage, labor markets, educational systems, legislative and legal systems, and heterosexual relationships (Saldívar-Hull, 2000, citing Sonia López; see also Holling, 2000, 2006; Williams, 1990; Zavella, 1987 for discussions on *familia* [family]). Many Mexican farm workers were traditionalists and Catholic, expecting Mexican women to be reserved and to care primarily for family (Alarcón, 1989; Hurtado, 1998; Rose, 1990b). Studies of the Chicano and the UFW movement in the 1960s and 1970s also have reported that leadership roles were effectively limited for women (Blackwell, 2003; del Castillo, 1980; Rose, 2004). Highlighting the social expectations for and stereotypes of Mexican-American women, one grower's representative noted that Dolores Huerta was "a violent woman, where women, especially Mexican women, are usually peaceful and pleasant" (quoted in Baer, 1975, p. 40). In short, Mexican-American women were socially prohibited or discouraged from challenging men's authority, participating in leadership roles, pursuing higher education, and acting or speaking outside of the home.

However, Huerta's habitus, shaped by her early family life and her relationship with Chávez, is in part what enabled Huerta to become the outspoken and powerful leader of the UFW. Huerta's mother, her family, and César Chávez were instrumental in shaping who she became and why she became involved in social justice causes (Griswold del Castillo & Garcia, 1995; "A Life of Sacrifice," 1990; Rose, 2004). According to Huerta, her childhood, relationship with her mother, and the educational opportunities she was afforded as a child and a young adult were in part what enabled and motivated her to become a powerful spokesperson for the UFW and leader on other issues relating to civil rights. Bourdieu explains that "[e]arly experiences have particular weight because the *habitus* tends to ensure its own constancy and its defence against change through the selection it makes within new information by rejecting information capable of calling into question its accumulated information, if exposed to it accidentally or by force, and especially by avoiding exposure to such information" (Bourdieu, 1990, pp. 60–61). That is, as we become older, we may become more resistant to new ideas; what we are exposed to in our early experiences can have a profound influence in how we interact with the world.

Huerta has also reported that her mother played an influential role in how and why she became a strong and outspoken woman: "We were close—like sisters. She was a very gentle woman . . . She was absolutely influential in my life. She was very strong and she called the shots" ("A Life of Sacrifice," 1990, p. 257). Her mother divorced her father when she was 5 years old and raised Dolores and her siblings while working at a

cannery, and then later, running her own businesses including a hotel, a grocery store, and a restaurant, where her mother often provided rooms and/or food for farm workers. Huerta grew up surrounded by working-class Mexicans and Mexican Americans, and her mother's sense of social justice became infused in Huerta's life (Rose, 2004). Because Huerta's mother worked so much, her children were often left in the care of relatives, especially Huerta's grandfather (Rose, 1988, 2004). According to Huerta, this reversal of traditional gendered caretaker roles in Huerta's family allowed her to see that independent and assertive women could succeed in U.S.-American society, describing her mother as a "Mexican-American Horatio Alger type" (Huerta, quoted in Coburn, 1976, p. 12). Huerta's grandfather called her Seven Tongues, because she talked so much and with great ease (Rose, 2004), foreshadowing her assertive persona as an adult. These early experiences, combined with Huerta's family's sense of social justice, contributed significantly to Huerta's later roles in civil rights activism.

In many ways, Chávez was also instrumental in enabling and motivating Huerta's negotiation of rhetorical agency because he constantly encouraged Huerta to become an effective leader. Because Chávez was very supportive of Huerta's leadership role within the UFW, he established a set of dispositions or habitus within the UFW in which most organizers came to respect Huerta. In this case, Huerta's voice was authorized, in part, because of Chávez's leadership in the UFW. In essence, Chávez encouraged her to be a leader within the UFW. As Huerta herself reports, "I told Cesar one time, 'Seems like the workers know more about organizing than I do.' But Cesar said, 'Dolores, if they didn't need you, they would have organized themselves long ago'" ("Martin Luther King Farm Workers Fund," 1976, p. 12). Chávez, who had great respect for Huerta's leadership abilities, observed, "No march is too long, no task too hard for Dolores Huerta if it means taking a step forward for the rights of farmworkers" ("A Life of Sacrifice," 1990, p. 266) and "Dolores is absolutely fearless, physically and emotionally" (Coburn, 1976, pp. 12–13). As Griswold del Castillo and Garcia (1995) observe, Huerta and Chávez engaged in coleadership of the UFW. Huerta looked to Chávez to confirm her ideas, actions, and self, which, in turn, may have fostered her sense of agency and motivation to continue her work with the UFW. Huerta's relationships with her mother, family, Chávez, and others created a framework for collaborative and collective agency. Huerta's relationships with her family and Chávez helped to authorize and create her own rhetorical space. In effect, these collaborative relationships produce their own authority, instilled through the confidence and motivation that is inspired by these relationships.

***Haciendo Caras* and differential consciousness: Construction of public persona and identity**

Huerta used a range of rhetorical styles or *caras* that are not easily classified as feminine or masculine, despite efforts in the communication discipline to label such practices as feminine/masculine. These styles are illustrated in her public persona, what some have called the Dragon Lady (Huerta, 2003; Miller, 1996), although this

term is problematic as both a gendered and racialized assessment of her rhetoric. Understanding Huerta as the Dragon Lady implies that she was extremely aggressive, combative, and uncompromising, styles that violated expectations of marginality related to race, gender, and class. These labels of her rhetorical style were negatively connoted by her detractors, primarily because she was a Mexican-American woman, expected to be reserved and apolitical. In what follows, I propose a different rendering of Huerta's public persona, as Huerta adopts *caras* of social justice, optimism, and courage, in addition to *caras* of *familia* and emotionality.

As Anzaldúa explains, *caras* of resistance mean “to put on a face, express feelings by distorting the face—frowning grimacing, looking sad, glum, or disapproving . . . *haciendo caras* has the added connotation of *gestos subversivos*, political subversive gestures, the piercing look that questions or challenges, the look that says ‘Don’t walk all over me,’ the one that says, ‘Get out of my face’” (Anzaldúa, 1990, p. xv). Conversely, these *caras* might also function as masks that may obscure one's true feelings, insecurities, or lack of confidence. As Margaret Montoya explains: “For stigmatized groups, such as persons of color, the poor, women, gays and lesbians, assuming a mask is comparable to being ‘on stage.’ Being ‘on stage’ is frequently experienced as being acutely aware of one's words, affect, tone of voice, movements, and gestures because they seem out of sync with what one is feeling and thinking” (Montoya, 1994/1995, pp. 531–532). These faces and masks that Huerta used include a range of rhetorical styles, demonstrated through four examples, manifested through both physical and verbal expressions: *caras* of emotionality, *familia*, collaborative egalitarianism, and courageous optimism.

Caras of emotionality

Huerta both consciously and unconsciously employed emotion in her public presentations and negotiations with growers, often relying on appeals of passion or tears. In these *caras*, Huerta literally distorted her face to reflect the powerful emotions she felt about farm worker, Chicana/o, and women's rights. These *caras* rhetorically functioned in three ways. First, they functioned to demonstrate her passion and lifetime commitment to justice, especially for those in marginal positions. For example, a description of Huerta's negotiating style demonstrates how she employed these faces of emotion:

In the hundreds of negotiating sessions she led between 1966 and 1971, Huerta's emotional involvement was her strength and her weakness. She shouted and cried easily. She fought with insults, tears, and individuals' testimony, believing so strongly in winning everything the workers told her they needed she would not compromise . . . She encouraged spontaneous political demonstrations during negotiations as the grievances were shouted out. (Baer, 1975, p. 39)

Rhetorical studies rarely mention the use of this kind of emotionality or passion that was seemingly so effective for Dolores Huerta. These faces of emotion were effective

for audiences who could see Huerta's passion and commitment for her causes literally inscribed on her face, an embodied form of resistance.

Yet, there is also rhetorical risk in showing this kind of emotion in public because the use of emotion or tears is not an avowed rhetorical style and, when used, becomes unruly and unexpected. A second rhetorical function of this style, then, is that Huerta disrupts traditional rhetorical styles through her faces of *gestos subversivos* [subversive gestures]. Huerta used these faces of emotionality (both consciously and unconsciously), which often left her audiences (especially growers and politicians) without response. As one observer noted: "It is widely known that the growers do not like to face Huerta over a bargaining table. During the 1970s, they labeled her as 'crazy' and walked out on her. They say she is 'unprofessional'—because she shouts at them and cries easily and condemns them for decades of repression" ("A Life-Time Commitment," 1979, p. 6). Huerta explained why she believed this strategy worked for her: "It's hard for them—the growers—to negotiate with a woman . . . I think it throws them. A woman can be much more tenacious than a man. Women are not as ego-involved as men are" (quoted in Sims, 1974, p. 3-B). In one speech, she also noted that it was tenacity that created an effective bargaining persona: "They [the growers] didn't like that. They didn't. I really stuck to my guns. I was really tenacious. I never swore at them or yelled at them, that's why they called me that. They couldn't swear at me because it wasn't a man that was doing it" (Huerta, 2003).

Another way in which these *caras* of emotionality function rhetorically relates to the use of emotional excess, or melodrama. Huerta herself observed that, "as a woman I can cry in negotiations and they can't you know. I can just do ALL kinds of things . . . I can get really melodramatic and talk about the poor farm workers and their families and all that and get reeeeeeally mushy about it and fellas have more problems doing that" (quoted in Sims, 1974, p. 3-B). Huerta's conscious rhetorical use of what Nájera-Ramírez (2003) calls emotional excess connected with audiences in her passion and disavowal of rhetorical styles that rely solely on reason. As Valenzuela Arce explains, melodrama may be especially suited for addressing and expressing issues related to social justice, especially for *campesinos'* concerns:

Melodrama in Mexico is constructed in the interstices of urbanized rurality and its recreation in mass communication, especially cinema and later television.

The *campesino* masses expelled from the countryside with the Revolution at the beginning of the twentieth century, and the subsequent exoduses associated with misery and dispossession, formed important cultural adaptations, reterritorializations, and recreations of expressive forms and of *campesino* ways of life in new urban contexts no less plagued by abuses and injustices.

(Valenzuela Arce, 2003, p. 222)

Although Valenzuela Arce (2003) and Nájera-Ramírez (2003) discuss melodrama in mediated form in Mexico, there are parallels of Chicana emotional performance in Huerta's rhetoric, especially in her emphases on justice, reformulating expression, and conscious choice to use emotionality. Perhaps illustrating the blurred boundaries of

the physical and metaphorical U.S.–Mexico border, Huerta uses emotional excess as a way to connect with farm workers who were predominantly Mexican and Mexican American and to challenge the boundaries of acceptable behavior for Latina women. Steven Schwarze further explains that melodrama in U.S.-American social movements relies on constituting social and political conflict, polarizing conflict, framing issues as moralistic, and creating monopathy, or a “unitary emotional identification” (Schwarze, 2006, p. 244). Huerta’s rhetorical *cara* of emotionality embodies each of these elements through her passionate beliefs in justice for farm workers.

Huerta inverted seemingly powerless rhetorical options, such as tears and emotional appeals, into effective rhetorical practices that may have invoked emotional reactions for her audiences, such as guilt, anger, sentimentality, and/or passion. In essence, Huerta’s use of *caras* of emotionality functioned as a kind of differential consciousness, as a “*tactical subjectivity* with the capacity to de- and recenter” dominant rhetorical styles (Sandoval, 2000, p. 59). As Anzaldúa (1990) explains: “Our strength lies in shifting perspectives, in our capacity to shift, in our ‘seeing through’ the membrane of the past superimposed on the present” (p. xxvii) to become a chameleon. Her sometimes conscious and deliberate choice to use these faces represents Huerta’s ability to read audiences, to understand social contexts, and to use unexpected measures in order to craft a space for rhetorical agency. Her use of these *caras* expands the use of emotion beyond the individual private sphere into the collective public sphere because her audiences, whether growers, politicians, or farm workers, react to and engage with her use of emotion.

Huerta’s rhetoric relies on gender essentialist interpretations of emotion as a gendered tactic. She also employed new and reinvented practices to challenge those social norms and strategies that are enacted through structures of power. Her use of emotion allowed the growers and lobbyists to walk out of meetings and negotiations because they did not see her as rational or reasonable. Perhaps, then, her *caras* or tactics of emotion both resisted social expectations, but also inscribed normative expectations of how women might speak and behave in political realms. Her reliance on gender essentialism of emotion is both a production of power and a reproduction of gendered and racialized social expectations. Yet as Valdivia observes, for Latina/os to be able to participate in social movements, academic discussions, or other kinds of discourses, “bringing [the] chair to the table is not done without stress, challenge, and/or resistance. . . . while theories of social change may be palatable, the methods and struggles that these might entail are not” (Valdivia, 2008, p. 5). Valdivia suggests that approaches used in resisting dominant ideologies can be disavowed, without recognizing the difficulties in choosing strategies or *caras* of resistance.

Caras of Familia

Another *cara* that Huerta used was *familia* [family], which rhetorically functioned to simultaneously disrupt traditional beliefs about and embrace values of the Mexican and Mexican-American familia. According to Flores and Holling (1999), “the concept of *la familia* [the family] among Mexican Americans serves as a means through which

cultural values, attitudes, and assumptions are taught” (1999, p. 340). They contend that Mexican-American values of “harmony/silence; rationality/emotionalism; the concept of personhood; respect for hierarchy, age, and gender; and solidarity and a sense of community” contribute to understanding the nature of familia (p. 340, citing Gangotena, 1994; see also Holling, 2006). Huerta both embraced and resisted these values in the construction of her consanguineous familia (her children) and her union familia in several ways. Huerta’s *cara* of familia was literally embodied in her persona through her pregnancies, nursing and raising her 11 children, involving her children in UFW activities, and talking about her status as mother in interviews, speeches, and letters. The UFW’s rhetorical construction of the union as familia also allowed her to participate fully in union activities (Rose, 1990b; Zavella, 1987). In essence, her face of familia disrupted traditional rhetorical styles and facilitated the UFW’s construction of familia as a broader concept beyond the nuclear family.

However, Huerta was committed to the idea of consanguineous familia, as she explained, “in our culture, raising kids is the most important thing you can do” and “[w]omen are getting afraid to have kids. I still believe you are supposed to conceive children” (Huerta, quoted in Coburn, 1976, pp. 13–14). Although she was extremely occupied with union activities throughout the childhoods of all of her children, she was also devoted to their welfare. When she began lobbying in Sacramento, for instance, she reported that “I had to do it [the lobbying], but at the same time I was too distracted to work. My husband was trying to take the kids away from me in court. I couldn’t lose my children, but I couldn’t quit working for people who counted on me” (Baer, 1975, p. 39). Huerta was (and is) also immensely proud of her children, as illustrated in her frequent references to their successes in articles, speeches, and conversations. She often mentioned their accomplishments, noting that her children have pursued careers in teaching, law, medicine, filmmaking, and the UFW (Huerta, 2002, 2003).

Huerta’s belief in having children did not prevent her from also challenging traditional values of the Mexican-American familia. For example, because she was twice divorced, and never married her current partner, Richard Chávez, as she rejected the social norms of the nuclear family and Catholic tradition that discouraged divorce. According to Huerta, several years passed before she was able to reconcile her identity in relationship to familial expectations in order to organize for farm workers’ causes: “I knew I wasn’t comfortable in a wife’s role, . . . but I wasn’t clearly facing the issue. I hedged, I made excuses, I didn’t come out and tell my husband that I cared more about helping other people than cleaning our house and doing my hair” (Baer, 1975, p. 39). After Huerta divorced, she often struggled to provide for her children, evidenced in her letters to Chávez, in which she asked for financial support for baby sitters, food, clothing, gasoline, and other living expenses (Huerta, n.d., “Just a few short lines,” 1962). Fregoso explains that “Chicana/o family ideology also draws from Anglo-American norms around heterosexuality and consanguinity, especially in its assumptions about very particular roles for women as wives, mothers, economic dependents, nurturers, and cultural transmitters” (Fregoso, 2003, p. 77; for further

discussion, see also Holling, 2006; Williams, 1990; Zavella, 1987). Huerta rejected the wife role and economic dependence within the nuclear family, yet she used the union (and Chávez) as a support mechanism, accepting the union as her familia.

Instead of allowing her struggles in raising her children to impede her leadership role in the UFW, she sometimes used this status as an enabling mechanism, as Huerta noted:

When I had my younger children and I was still negotiating, I would take nursing breaks. So I would take my baby into the negotiations and then I would take a nursing break, and everybody would have to wait while the baby ate. Then I would come back to the table and start negotiating again . . . I think it made employers sensitive to the fact that when we're talking about benefits and the terms of a contract, we're talking about families and we're talking about children. (quoted in Covey, 1994, p. 47)

Vicky Ruiz explains: "A tough, savvy negotiator, Huerta skillfully manipulated her positionality as a mother at the bargaining table" (Ruiz, 1998, p. 134). Huerta may have used her family's status as a way to control the bargaining process by forcing a break in negotiations on her own terms. Rather than allow the physical aspects of motherhood, such as breastfeeding, to constrain her ability to speak and participate in the UFW and bargaining processes, Huerta embodied resistance to dominant social expectations.

In addition to nursing some of her children during breaks of meetings and negotiations, Huerta also involved her children in other union activities. When possible, she encouraged them to participate in marches and protests, and all of them were raised within the union family structure, sometimes staying with the Chávez family, or other union families. Felner explains: "Rather than choosing to be with her children and going to work, she brought her children to work (and, as they became adults, put them to work)" (Felner, 1998, p. 2). Her children became a part of her rhetorical *cara* of familia because her audiences saw her as part of a familia that melded her family life with her union life. In fact, some of her children were arrested and sent to jail for their participation in strikes, including one of her children who was 3 months old at the time (Cárdenas, 1977). The rhetorical presence of Huerta's children at union activities allowed audiences to see her as a family-oriented person and to remind nonfarm-worker audiences that children and families would be affected by policies, decisions, and contracts. This approach was also a UFW rhetorical strategy because the boycotts, pickets, and protests often involved entire families (Rose, 1990b). The familial bond thus expanded to include a much larger union family, in which people worked together to support each other and their causes.

Anzaldúa (1987, 1990) argues *la mestiza* must constantly look for different faces, moves, and ways of thinking to subvert dominant structures, to access places of rhetorical space and agency. Using differential consciousness, Huerta used familia as a way to "read the current situation of power and self-consciously choosing and adopting the ideological stand best suited to push against its configurations"

(Sandoval, 2000, p. 60), that is, as a way to interrupt dominant ways of thinking, as illustrated through her practices of breast feeding during meeting and negotiation breaks. In another way, Huerta's 11 children were often visible or referenced within the union and various articles that have been written about Huerta, demonstrating her values of familia and culture, while also resisting traditional familia structure. Rather, Huerta embodies a *cara* of familia that emphasized both her independence and her children's independence and values of social justice and her total life commitment to the union. In essence, Huerta used familia within the union to construct her own way of being and her own identity. As with her use of emotion, she invoked gender (and racialized/ethnic) essentialism in resistive ways through her emphasis on the consanguineous family and role of woman as mother.

***Caras* of collaborative egalitarianism**

Huerta's rhetoric of social justice, as evidenced by her and her family's lifelong activities in the UFW and several other causes, was both collaborative and egalitarian in nature. Like the collaborative relationship Huerta had with Chávez, Huerta also worked to establish a collaborative egalitarianism with her audiences, especially those comprised of farm workers. Huerta embodied and enacted this rhetoric through her emphasis on her own life of sacrifice for the cause, such as accepting a very low salary to work for the UFW and practicing a form of citizenship based on sacrifice. Her mixed use of Spanish and English, audience involvement, and repetitions of resistance and optimism through *gritos* [shouts, rallying cries] at the end of her speeches also functioned to equalize speaker–audience roles through collaborative egalitarianism.

In addition to enacting a lifestyle that reflected the living conditions many farm workers faced, Huerta also used language that rhetorically functioned to establish a *cara* of egalitarianism. For example, in a presentation at the Campesino Centers Conference, Huerta spoke about paternalistic approaches to helping farm workers:

Part of the “agency mentality” is paternalism. Get rid of it! You need to sort out your feelings. Watch out for feeling superior to “those illiterate farm workers” or for ***** [illegible] in reverse, feeling sorry for the “the poor, little [*sic*] farm workers.” I know what I'm talking about. I used to be a schoolteacher and had to sort through my own feelings. Feeling superior or feeling sorry for the farm workers are both wrong attitudes. We have to establish equality—service for service. We're neither more nor less than farm workers, we are equal. (“Martin Luther King Farm Workers Fund,” 1976, p. 6)

Huerta's approach demonstrates her commitment to egalitarianism, a view that she fostered within the farm worker movement. She believed that farm workers had the ability to help themselves, and demanded great sacrifice from the farm workers, who had to pay dues to the union, participate in boycotts and pickets, and give their time to work for the union, all while working to support their families on very little income. The demand for justice and farm workers' rights was not a call for charity,

but rather for egalitarianism and collaboration, to find ways in which farm workers could help themselves.

Furthermore, Huerta's rhetorical style of audience involvement at the end of her speeches also fostered this sense of egalitarianism because it functioned collaboratively. Almost all of Huerta's speeches end with audience participation through gritos:

All together, huh. I'll say Viva La Causa and everybody yells Viva, really loud, okay? Viva La Causa! Viva! Ugh, that was very weak. This is very important. This is like kind of praying together in unison you know, so it's really important. Let's try it again. Viva La Causa! Viva! Viva La Justicia! Viva! Now so Cesar can hear us in the hospital—where he's at the growers can hear us where they're at. Viva Chavez! Viva! Okay, now we'll try Abajo. Down with Fear! Abajo! Down with Lettuce and grapes! Abajo! Down with Gallo! Abajo! You know, this really works . . . Can we live in a world of brotherhood and peace without disease and fear and oppression? Si Se Puede, right? Okay, let's do it together. Si Se Puede. Clapping. Si Se Puede, Si Se Puede. (Huerta, 1974)

Such audience involvement functioned to develop an egalitarian relationship with the audience by strengthening audience commitment to the cause through their participation and use of language such as "*sí, se puede*" and "*viva justicia*." The mixed use of Spanish and English, which was quite common at the conclusion of her speeches, also functioned to galvanize audiences, in that both Spanish- and non-Spanish-speaking audience members could participate. Jensen and Hammerback (2002) explain how César Chávez was able to interchange Spanish and English in such a way that the audience accepted the usage of both languages. By introducing a term or phrase (in either language, depending on the audience's language preferences, but usually in Spanish), and then translating, audiences felt comfortable in their repetitions because Huerta (and Chávez) established grounds for acceptance of this mixed use of Spanish and English.

Huerta also recognized the rhetorical power in the repetition of *sí, se puede* [yes, we can/it can be done] and *¡viva!* [long live]. Huerta's rhetoric created space for the voice of farm workers and others who were able to participate through audience involvement and repetition of empowering gritos, such as *¡Viva!* [Long live], *¡Abajo!* [Down with], *¡Sí, se puede!* (Huerta, 1974). Huerta's audience involvement guides the audience toward a politicized consciousness of social justice issues that influence the everyday lives of farm workers as well as those involved in other social causes. The farm workers and other supporters became a part of social resistance, part of a larger social movement for farm workers' rights through these repetitions and reformulations of empowering language. Huerta both consciously and unconsciously reconfigured and rearticulated the rhetorical context to create resistance on her own terms rather than adapting to normative requirements.

In particular, the chanting of *sí, se puede* enabled Huerta to construct a *cara* oriented toward collaborative egalitarianism. Her rhetorical use of this face fosters a

sense of rhetorical agency for herself and others in the sense that repetitions of *sí, se puede* allows the audience to speak, and to speak about what each person can do. *Sí, se puede* is often translated as “yes, we can” but it can also be translated as “yes, one can” or “yes, it can be done.” The first translation fosters the collaborative element of agency in that the group, “we,” will work together to achieve social justice, while the second translation emphasizes the individual’s sense of ability in that anyone can achieve social justice, and the third translation suggests a collective movement for change. In addition, when a speaker involves the audience in such a way, it may function to further enhance that speaker’s sense of affirmation. That is, Huerta can hear that the audience believes what she says, so that the act of persuasion is completed and confirmed by the audience’s involvement.

***Caras* of courageous optimism**

The final example of *haciendo caras* is Huerta’s *cara* of courage and optimism, perhaps used to inspire both herself and her audiences (consciously and unconsciously). At times, Huerta reports that she often lacked confidence and self-esteem, constantly worrying about her effectiveness and self-image. For example, in an interview, she observed “I know I have a terrible temper. It might be that I’m still suffering from guilt about my divorce, and from the feeling that I shouldn’t be the leader people see in me . . . I guess I just haven’t forgiven myself the divorce, and if you haven’t forgiven yourself something, how can you forgive others?” (quoted in Baer, 1975, p. 40). In a letter to Chávez, Huerta requests a visit to the farm workers she has been working with, recognizing what she saw as her limitations: “You know they are quite used to me in Stockton, so I am not anything special to them. I keep telling them I’m here, that they don’t need to talk to you, but somehow, they are not convinced” (Huerta, n.d. “Received”).

To overcome these feelings of insecurity and doubt, Huerta adopted *más/caras* (a kind of “super” face) of courageous optimism. This *cara* rhetorically functioned to enable Huerta to speak out, emphasize immediate action, and develop optimism for future change, shaped through the encouragement of and authorization by others, a collaborative effect of agency. Acquisition of voice and the ability to speak out originated from years of working as an organizer with the Community Service Organization and later with the United Farm Workers. In Huerta’s own account, she reports:

One of the greatest things I have learned in the movement is courage. We really don’t have courage when we have to make tough decisions . . . When Cesar asked me to work for the United Farmworkers Union, I was divorced, had seven children, and had been a school teacher . . . The decision took a lot of sweat. I learned to have courage . . . Working for a cause is the baptism of fire. Being involved is good, because then you lose all types of fear. Then what really happens in [*sic*] you become strong. (quoted in Cárdenas, 1977)

Throughout Huerta's rhetoric, this *cara* of courage and optimism is prevalent, enabling her to overcome fear, insecurity, and lack of confidence. Huerta also recognized the risks associated with her confrontational, courageous rhetorical style: "Internally, you know something has to be done, and you do it. You have to make decisions, and it's sometimes difficult, but you do it anyway. You have to know in advance that you will make mistakes and not be afraid" ("A Life of Sacrifice," 1990, p. 261).

Huerta also was fearless with Chávez in their interpersonal communication, even though they both respected each other for their own strengths and contributions to the UFW movement. This ability to be confrontational or expressive came from an open discursive and collaborative space, in which Huerta felt confident and comfortable in expressing her opinions and ideas. In one letter, she wrote to Chávez:

To further finish up with my peeves, since I am not the quiet long suffering type, I also resent it when you are not honest with me . . . I do not mind playing the part of the heavy if If [*sic*] I know why and when I am supposed to take this role—please remember this for any future conspiracies. This is what I mean by your "honesty" of sin cerity [*sic*] if it sounds nicer thatway [*sic*]. (Huerta, 1964)

In another memo to Chávez, she wrote: "For the 10 Billionoth [*sic*] time, I have not given any orders to anyone outside of my Department. It is important as a sign of courtesy to check with me before you make false accusations" (Huerta, 1970).

Having the confidence to take immediate action was also part of Huerta's fearlessness that fostered her public persona. Huerta directed others to be more assertive and active in whatever cause they might support, a principle in which she strongly believed. During marches or protests, she would shout "Don't be a marshmallow!" (quoted in Baer, 1975, p. 38) to potential supporters to galvanize them to join in the protests, picket lines, and strikes. In one speech she emphasized immediate action rather than waiting for others to make decisions:

We'can't [*sic*] really wait for legislation. You know there's a lot of things that we can do right away. I think that the one thing that we've learned in our union is that you don't wait. You just get out and you starting doing things. And you do things in such a way that you really help people to lay the foundations that you need. (Huerta, 1974)

Her emphasis on the need for action demonstrated her confidence in the UFW. According to Huerta, action at all levels, ranging from the individual to the entire structure of government and society, was useful.

Finally, Huerta's rhetoric of courageousness fostered a sense of optimism, best illustrated in *sí, se puede*, as a rallying cry and challenge to action. Faith was another aspect of this optimistic persona, as Huerta noted: "We can make the changes as long as we have faith in ourselves" (Huerta, 2006). Faith, confidence, and optimism function rhetorically to inspire audiences (and rhetors) that change can and will occur. This commitment to differentialism and optimism reflects the future orientation of rhetorical agency, to imagine new possibilities and alternatives (Emirbayer & Mische,

1998) in collaborative and collective ways, rather than allowing normative thinking to function as rhetorical constraints.

¡Sí, se puede!: *Haciendo Caras* and rhetorical agency

In this article, I have suggested that Dolores Huerta's rhetoric, through *haciendo caras*, differential consciousness, and negotiation of gendered, racial, and classed constraints, illustrates a reframing and expanded understanding of rhetorical agency. Through the works of Bourdieu, Anzaldúa, and Sandoval, and illustrated through Huerta's rhetoric, rhetorical agency can be understood as a process in which an agent negotiates past and present individual and societal dispositions (*habitus*) that constrain, limit, or facilitate one's ability to create rhetorical space. While I have focused on some of Huerta's individual rhetorical practices, her relationships with family, Chávez, and others, religion and spirituality (García, 2008), social movements, and other contextual facets also illustrate how agency functions beyond the individual agent. Some rhetorical scholars have suggested that rhetorical agency includes creative, inventive, collaborative, and resistive elements (Benacka, 2003; Campbell, 2005; Enck-Wanzer, 2006; Holling, 2000; Zaeske, 2003); *haciendo caras* and differential consciousness in Dolores Huerta's rhetoric more fully explicates and expands these ideas through Huerta's emphasis on flexibility, hope and optimism, resistance, transformation of self and others, and how she uses these tactics to negotiate intersectional identities related to gender, race, ethnicity, class, and national origin through language choices.

First, rhetorical agency, in Huerta's rhetoric, is marked by flexibility (Sandoval, 2000), or as Bernadette Calafell explains, "the power of the shapeshifter and the power of Chicanas as translators. I guess we all get used to wearing different masks at different times" (Calafell, 2007, p. 57, citing Sarah Amira de la Garza). Although rhetorical scholars have argued that creativity, invention, craft, and form are facets of rhetorical agency, Huerta's rhetoric illustrates to a fuller extent as to why flexibility and adaptability enable a rhetor to experiment, adapt, and resist dominant and normative rhetorical structures, especially for Chicanas and Latinas. That is, creativity in invention, style, and form is expanded through the rhetor's ability to maintain flexibility while speaking or in the process of invention. Huerta's use of multiple rhetorical *caras* illustrates her rhetorical flexibility and *movidas* that enabled her success as a rhetor. It is the constant rhetorical adaptations in *haciendo caras*, of using available means to negotiate rhetorical barriers related to race, ethnicity, gender, class, and religion, that fostered her sense of rhetorical agency, the ability to read audiences and create a response. Huerta had to adapt through a "process of taking and using whatever is necessary and available in order to negotiate, confront, or speak to power—and then moving on to new forms, expressions, and ethos when necessary—[as] a method for survival" (Sandoval, 2000, p. 28). She used rhetorical *caras* to adapt to in-group and out-group audiences, negotiating dominant ideologies, power, and material conditions as it suited her needs and contexts.

Huerta's *caras* of optimism and hope are also overarching currents within her rhetoric, an element of rhetorical agency little recognized by rhetorical scholars. Each of her *caras*—emotionality and passion, familia, collaborative egalitarianism, and courageous optimism—employ optimistic and futuristic orientations. Emirbayer and Mische, and others, have discussed the importance of the past, present, and future in the study of agency. However, a future orientation does not always suggest social change or optimism (e.g., complacent or apocalyptic rhetoric). Huerta's rhetoric illustrates the specific examples and rhetorical successes in her orientation toward the future. One might have the right material and social conditions to create discursive space, but without a hopeful and optimistic vision for the future, that person may not seize available opportunities or attempt to negotiate rhetorical situations. Huerta and the UFW's *¡Sí, se puede!* is the best example of their hopeful optimism, even though there are many other examples. "Yes, we/one can" or "it can be done" imbues a powerful sense of agency with future orientation, one that is optimistic and hopeful for changing social conditions.

Furthermore, Huerta's rhetoric illustrates the importance of the resistive nature of agency. Several rhetorical scholars have argued that agency can function resistively or subversively (Holling, 2000; Zaeske, 2003), yet more concrete examples are needed to illustrate the resistive element that Latinas employ to navigate gender, race, and class constraints. In essence, Huerta used *caras* through fearless, public, and embodied resistance, utilizing simultaneously expected and unexpected rhetorical styles such as motherhood and emotionality. That is, traditional and gendered audience assumptions might expect women to be both motherly and emotional, yet Huerta used motherhood and emotion in unexpected ways to disrupt dominant ways of thinking. As Chela Sandoval explains, "the citizen-subject can learn to identify, develop, and control the means of ideology, that is, marshal the knowledge necessary to 'break with ideology' while at the same time *also* speaking in, and from within, ideology" (Sandoval, 2000, p. 43). Huerta resisted dominant rhetorical styles, but also used such strategies when useful.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, rhetorical agency in Huerta's case embodies transformation for both self and other. Holling (2000) and Enck-Wanzer (2006) illustrate how agency functions constitutively in Chicana feminism and the Young Lords' social movement, respectively. Holling (2000) and Flores (1996) examine identity construction in Chicana feminist rhetoric, specifically in the process of self-naming and self-labeling, while Enck-Wanzer's work explores the consciousness-raising aspects of the Young Lords Organization's 1969 garbage offensive. Huerta's rhetoric illustrates two important additional functions. First, Huerta used the masking function of *haciendo caras* to enact courage through *más/caras*, that is, a face of confidence that had the effect of diminishing her self-doubt and constituted a rhetorical attitude of empowerment. Second, Huerta was able to transform beyond herself through the repetition of key phrases that are simultaneously hopeful, optimistic, and resistive that helped the audience to constitute their own sense of transformation and

empowerment. In the process of speaking out, Huerta also created space for audience transformations through rhetorical collaborations, courage, and egalitarianism. Ultimately, rhetorical agency, through *haciendo caras* and differential consciousness, is transformative for both Huerta and her audiences.

Notes

- 1 Spanish grammar conventions require an accent on *sí* when translated to mean *yes* (*si* means *if*). Because many writers in the United States did not have access to typewriters or computer programs that allowed the insertion of accents, often accents were/are not included for Spanish language words. In cases where authors did not include accents, I have not included them either, when quoting their materials. Here, Jensen and Hammerback (2002) do not include the accent on *sí*, nor do they note that *sí*, *se puede* can be translated as “yes, we can,” “yes, one can,” or “it can be done.” *Se puede* in Spanish is generally used to reflect the absence of an actor or the passive voice; in this case it can be translated in several different ways. The ambiguity of these translations is meaningful in the context of discussing rhetorical agency, which I discuss later in this article.

Acknowledgments

I would like to extend my gratitude to the numerous people who have read this article and offered invaluable comments, especially Richard Pineda, Michelle Holling, Sonja Foss, William Waters, Darrel Enck-Wanzer, and Catherine Palczewski, as well as anonymous reviewers and Angharad Valdivia.

References

- Alarcón, N. (1989). Traductora, traidora: A paradigmatic figure of Chicana feminism. *Cultural Critique*, *13*, 57–87.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/La frontera: The new Mestiza*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1990). Haciendo caras, una entrada: An introduction. In G. Anzaldúa (Ed.), *Making face, making soul: Haciendo caras: Creative and critical perspectives by feminists of color* (pp. xv–xxviii). San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.
- Baer, B. (1975, September). Stopping traffic: One woman’s cause. *Progressive*, pp. 38–40.
- Benacka, E. (2003, September). No title. Paper for the Alliance of Rhetoric Societies Conference on the Status and Future of Rhetorical Societies, Evanston, IL. Retrieved from <http://www.comm.umn.edu/ARS/Agency/Benacka,%20agency.htm>
- Biesecker, B. (2003, September). *How ought we to understand the concept of rhetorical agency?* Paper for the Alliance of Rhetoric Societies Conference on the Status and Future of Rhetorical Societies, Evanston, IL. Retrieved October 15, 2003, from <http://www.comm.umn.edu/ARS/Agency/Biesecker,%20agency.htm>
- Blackwell, M. (2003). Contested histories: *Las Hijas de Cuauhtémoc*, Chicana feminisms, and print culture in the Chicano movement, 1968–1973. In G. F. Arredondo, A. Hurtado, N. Klahn, O. Nájera-Ramírez, & P. Zavella (Eds.), *Chicana feminisms: A critical reader* (pp. 59–89). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Blankenship, J., & Robson, D. C. (1995). A “feminine style” in women’s political discourse: An exploratory essay. *Communication Quarterly*, *43*, 353–366.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brouwer, D. (2003, September). *Position statement*. Paper for the Alliance of Rhetoric Societies Conference on the Status and Future of Rhetorical Societies, Evanston, IL. Retrieved October 15, 2003, from <http://www.comm.umn.edu/ARS/Agency/Brouwer,%20agency.htm>
- Calafell, B. M. (2007). *Latina/o communication studies: Theorizing performance*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.
- Campbell, K. K. (1986). Style and content in the rhetoric of early Afro-American feminists. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *72*, 436–441.
- Campbell, K. K. (1988). Enactment as a rhetorical strategy in *The Year of Living Dangerously*. *Central States Speech Journal*, *39*, 258–268.
- Campbell, K. K. (1989). *Man cannot speak for her: A critical study of early feminist rhetoric*, Vol. 1. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Campbell, K. K. (1995). Gender and genre: Loci of invention and contradiction on the earliest speeches by U.S. women. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *81*, 479–495.
- Campbell, K. K. (2005). Agency: Promiscuous and protean. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, *2*, 1–19.
- Cárdenas, J. (1977, December). Chicanas need “Courage and Commitment.” *El Popo*.
- Coburn, J. (1976). Dolores Huerta: La pasionaria of the farmworkers. *Ms.*, 1976, 11–16.
- Condit, C. M. (2003, September). *Why rhetorical training can expand agency*. Paper for the Alliance of Rhetoric Societies Conference on the Status and Future of Rhetorical Societies, Evanston, IL. Retrieved October 15, 2003, from <http://www.comm.umn.edu/ARS/Agency/Condit,%20agency.htm>
- Covey, A. (1994). *A century of women*. Atlanta, GA: TBS Books.
- del Castillo, A. R. (1980). Mexican women in organization. In M. Mora & A. R. del Castillo (Eds.), *Mexican women in the United States: Struggles past and present* (pp. 7–16). Los Angeles, CA: Chicano Studies Research Center Publications, University of California.
- Delgado, F. P. (1995). Chicano movement rhetoric: An ideographic interpretation. *Communication Quarterly*, *43*, 446–455.
- Dow, B. J., & Tonn, M. B. (1993). “Feminine style” and political judgment in the rhetoric of Ann Richards. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *79*, 286–302.
- Dube, R. (2003, September). *Rhetorical agency beyond modernity/postmodernity: Aristotelian praxis as the return of the repressed in the era of globalism*. Paper for the Alliance of Rhetoric Societies Conference on the Status and Future of Rhetorical Societies, Evanston, IL. Retrieved October 15, 2003, from <http://www.comm.umn.edu/ARS/Agency/Dube,%20agency.htm>
- Emirbayer, M., & Mische, A. (1998). What is agency? *American Journal of Sociology*, *103*(4), 962–1023.
- Enck-Wanzer, D. (2006). Trashing the system: Social movement, intersectional rhetoric, and collective agency in the Young Lords Organization’s garbage offensive. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *92*(2), 174–201.
- Felner, J. (1998). For a lifetime of labor championing the rights of farmworkers. *Ms.* Retrieved April 5, 2000, from <http://www.ufw.org/ms.htm>

- Ferriss, S., & Sandoval, R. (1997). *The fight in the fields: Cesar Chavez and the farmworkers movement*. Orlando, FL: Paradigm Publications, Inc.
- Fishman, J. (2003, September). *Rhetorical and performative agency*. Paper for the Alliance of Rhetoric Societies Conference on the Status and Future of Rhetorical Societies, Evanston, IL. Retrieved October 15, 2003, from <http://www.comm.umn.edu/ARS/Agency/Fishman,%20agency.htm>
- Flores, L. (1996). Creating discursive space through a rhetoric of difference: Chicana feminists craft a homeland. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, **82**, 142–156.
- Flores, L. A., & Holling, M. A. (1999). Las familias y las Latinas: Mediated representations of gender roles. In M. Meyers (Ed.), *Mediated women: Representations in popular culture* (pp. 339–354). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.
- Frank, M. (1987). Dolores Huerta: “Sí, se puede—We can do it.” File: Dolores Huerta. Available: Archives of Labor and Urban Affairs, Ruether Library, College of Urban, Labor, and Metropolitan Affairs, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI.
- Fregoso, R. L. (2003). *meXicana encounters: The making of social identities on the Borderlands*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gangotena, M. (1994). The rhetoric of la familia among Mexican Americans. In A. González, M. Houston, & V. Chen (Eds.), *Our voices: Essays in culture, ethnicity, and communication* (pp. 69–80). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Press.
- García, M. T. (2008). *A Dolores Huerta reader*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Geisler, C. (2004). How ought we to understand the concept of rhetorical agency?: Report from the ARS. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, **34**(1): 9–16.
- Greene, R. W. (2004). Rhetoric and capitalism: Rhetorical agency as communicative labor. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, **37**, 188–206.
- Griswold del Castillo, R., & Garcia, R. A. (1995) *César Chávez: A triumph of spirit*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Hammerback, J. C., & Jensen, R. J. (1980). The rhetorical worlds of César Chávez and Reies Tijerina. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, **44**, 166–176.
- Hammerback, J. C., & Jensen, R. J. (1994). Ethnic heritage as rhetorical legacy: The plan of Delano. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, **80**, 53–70.
- Hammerback, J. C., & Jensen, R. J. (1998). *The rhetorical career of César Chávez*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.
- Hammerback, J. C., Jensen, R. J., & Gutiérrez, J. A. (1985). *A war of words: Chicano protest in the 1960s and 1970s*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Hayden, S. (1999). Negotiating femininity and power in the early twentieth century West: Domestic ideology and feminine style in Jeannette Rankin’s suffrage rhetoric. *Communication Studies*, **50**, 83–102.
- Hayden, S. (2003). Family metaphors and the nation: Promoting politics of care through the Million Mom March. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, **89**, 196–215.
- Herndl, C. G. (2003, September). *Shifting agency: Agency, kairos, and the possibilities of social action*. Paper for the Alliance of Rhetoric Societies Conference on the Status and Future of Rhetorical Societies, Evanston, IL. Retrieved October 15, 2003, from <http://www.comm.umn.edu/ARS/Agency/Herndl,%20agency.htm>
- Holling, M. (2000). *Extending critical rhetoric and feminist theory: Rhetorical constructions of Chicana subjectivity, identity, and agency*. Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University.

- Holling, M. A. (2006). *El simpático* boxer: Underpinning Chicano masculinity with a rhetoric of *familia* in *Resurrection Blvd.* *Western Journal of Communication*, **70**(2), 91–114.
- Huerta, D. (n.d.). Retrieved April 5, 2000, from <http://wupa.wustl.edu/asmbly/bio/Huerta>
- Huerta, D. The UFW's Grand Lady of Steel. (n.d.). Retrieved April 5, 2000, from <http://www.inconnect.com/%7Ervazquez/huerta.html>
- Huerta, D. (n.d.). Just a few short lines. Collection: United Farm Workers, Box 2, Folder 13. Available: Archives of Labor and Urban Affairs, Reuther Library, College of Urban, Labor, and Metropolitan Affairs, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI.
- Huerta, D. (n.d.). Received your concise communication . . . Collection: United Farm Workers, Box 2, Folder 14, Archives of Labor and Urban Affairs, Reuther Library, College of Urban, Labor, and Metropolitan Affairs, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI.
- Huerta, D. (1962). You have probably thought that the FWA . . . Collection: United Farm Workers, Box 2, Folder 14. Available: Archives of Labor and Urban Affairs, Reuther Library, College of Urban, Labor, and Metropolitan Affairs, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI.
- Huerta, D. (1964). Since I had not heard from you . . . Collection: United Farm Workers, Box 2, Folder 13, Archives of Labor and Urban Affairs, Reuther Library, College of Urban, Labor, and Metropolitan Affairs, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI.
- Huerta, D. (1970, July 11). Handwritten note responding to memo from Chávez. Collection: UFW Office of the President, Series III Correspondence, Box 36, Folder 11, Archives of Labor and Urban Affairs, Reuther Library, College of Urban, Labor, and Metropolitan Affairs, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI.
- Huerta, D. (1974, October 21). Keynote address before the Annual Convention of the American Public Health Association, New Orleans, LA. Collection: UFW Office of the President: César Chávez collection, Part 2, Box 46, Folder 11, Archives of Labor and Urban Affairs, Reuther Library, College of Urban, Labor, and Metropolitan Affairs, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI.
- Huerta, D. (2002, March 9). Speech, for Mexican American Political Association, Rialto Chapter. Rialto, CA.
- Huerta, D. (2003, April 24). *A Life's Work in the Building of Community*. Speech at the 16th Annual Tomás Rivera Conference, Zacatecas Restaurant, Riverside, CA.
- Huerta, D. (2006, April 25). Speech, for Chamizal National Memorial Guest Lecture Series, El Paso, TX.
- Hurtado, A. (1998). Sitios y lenguas: Chicanas theorize feminisms. *Hypatia*, **13**, 134–161.
- Japp, P. M. (1985). Esther or Isaiah?: The abolitionist-feminist rhetoric of Angelina Grimké. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, **71**, 335–348.
- Jensen, R. J., Burkholder, T. R., & Hammerback, J. C. (2003). Martyrs for a just cause: The eulogies of Cesar Chavez. *Western Journal of Communication*, **67**(4), 335–356.
- Jensen, R. J., & Hammerback, J. C. (1980). Radical nationalism among Chicanos: The rhetoric of José Angel Gutiérrez. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, **44**, 191–202.
- Jensen, R. J., & Hammerback, J. C. (1982). "No revolutions without poets:" The rhetoric of Rodolfo "Corky" Gonzáles. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, **46**, 72–91.
- Jensen, R. J., & Hammerback, J. C. (Eds.). (2002). *The words of César Chávez*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.
- A life of sacrifice for farm workers (1990, July). Collection: Dolores Huerta, Main Biographical Folder, Archives of Labor and Urban Affairs, Reuther Library, College of Urban, Labor, and Metropolitan Affairs, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, 257.

- A Life-Time Commitment. (1979, June 29–July 5). *Pacific Sun*, p. 6.
- Lucaites, J. L. (2003, September). *Understanding “rhetorical agency.”* Paper for the Alliance of Rhetoric Societies Conference on the Status and Future of Rhetorical Societies, Evanston, IL. Retrieved October 15, 2003, from [http://www.comm.umn.edu/ARS/Agency/Lucaites\[1\].Agency.htm](http://www.comm.umn.edu/ARS/Agency/Lucaites[1].Agency.htm)
- Lundberg, C., & Gunn, J. (2005). “Ouija board, are there any communications?” Agency, ontotheology, and the death of the humanist subject, or, continuing the ARS conversation. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, *35*, 83–105.
- Martin Luther King Farm Workers Fund, Campesino Centers Conference Minutes. (1976, July 9–14). Collection: Dolores Huerta unprocessed materials, Box 7/25, Archives of Labor and Urban Affairs, Reuther Library, College of Urban, Labor, and Metropolitan Affairs, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI.
- McGee, M. C. (1980). The origins of “liberty”: A feminization of power. *Communication Monographs*, *47*, 23–45.
- McNay, L. (1999). Subject, psyche, and agency: The work of Judith Butler. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *16*, 175–193.
- Melendez, L. (1971, February 8). Minutes from Schenley Ranch Committee meeting. Collection: UFW Office of the President, Box 36, Folder 12, Archives of Labor and Urban Affairs, Reuther Library, College of Urban, Labor, and Metropolitan Affairs, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI.
- Miller, R. (1996, October 15). Union leader: Root out racism; Farm workers harvest hope as union rebounds. *Salt Lake Tribune*, p. A1.
- Montoya, M. E. (1994/1995). *Máscaras, trenzas, y greñas: Un/masking the self while Un/braiding Latina stories and legal discourse.* In Richard Delgado (Ed.), *Critical race theory: The cutting edge* (pp. 529–539). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Nájera-Ramírez, O. (2003). Unruly passions: Poetics, performance, and gender in the ranchera song. In G. F. Arredondo, A. Hurtado, N. Klahn, O. Nájera-Ramírez, & P. Zavella (Eds.), *Chicana feminisms: A critical reader* (pp. 184–210). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Palczewski, C. (1996). Bodies, borders, and letters: Gloria Anzaldúa’s “Speaking in tongues: A letter to 3rd world women writers.” *Southern Communication Journal*, *62*(1), 1–16.
- Rose, M. E. (1988). *Women in the United Farm Workers: A study of Chicana and Mexicana participation in the labor union, 1950 to 1980.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1988.
- Rose, M. (1990a). Traditional and nontraditional patterns of female activism in the United Farm Workers of America, 1962 to 1980. *Frontiers*, *XI*(1), 26–32.
- Rose, M. (1990b). “From the fields to the picket line: Huelga women and the boycott,” 1965–1975. *Labor History*, *31*(3), 271–293.
- Rose, M. (2004). Dolores Huerta: The United Farm Workers Union. In E. Arnesen (Ed.), *The human tradition in American labor history* (pp. 211–229). Wilmington, DE: SR Books.
- Ross, B. (n.d.). Stockton activist honored for struggle against injustice. *Lodi News-Sentinel*. Retrieved April 5, 2000, from <http://www.lodinews.com>
- Ruiz, V. L. (1998). *From out of the shadows: Mexican women in twentieth-century America.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Saldívar-Hull, S. (2000). *Feminism on the border: Chicana gender politics and literature.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Sandoval, C. (2000). *Methodology of the oppressed*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Schwarze, S. (2006). Environmental melodrama. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *92*(3), 239–261.
- Shaw, R. (2008). *Beyond the fields: Cesar Chavez, the UFW, and the struggle for justice in the 21st Century*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Shome, R. (1996). Postcolonial interventions in the rhetorical canon: An “other” view. *Communication Theory*, *6*, 40–59.
- Sims, P. (1974, January 30). Growers cower when Dolores sits at bargaining table. *Philadelphia Inquirer*, p. 3-B.
- Speer, R. (1977, April 26). Dolores Huerta on “people’s movement”. *Wildcat News & Review*, pp. 1, 4.
- Thompson, J. B. (1991). Editor’s introduction. In P. Bourdieu, *Language and symbolic power* (pp. 1–31). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tonn, M. B. (1996). Militant motherhood: Labor’s Mary Harris “Mother” Jones. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *82*, 1–21.
- United Farm Workers. (n.d.). Dolores Huerta biography. Retrieved April 5, 2000, from <http://www.ufw.org/dh.htm>
- United Farm Workers. (n.d.). UFW History. Retrieved April 5, 2000, from <http://www.ufw.org/ufw.htm>
- Valdivia, A. (2008). Is my butt your island? The myths of discovery and contemporary Latina/o communication studies. In A. Valdivia (Ed.), *Latina/o communication studies today* (pp. 3–26). New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.
- Valenzuela Arce, J. M. (2003). . . . *And to suffer again: New approaches to melodrama*. In G. F. Arredondo, A. Hurtado, N. Klahn, O. Nájera-Ramírez, & P. Zavella (Eds.), R. M. Gámez (Trans.), *Chicana feminisms: A critical reader* (pp. 220–227). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Williams, N. (1990). *The Mexican American family: Tradition and change*. Dix Hills, NY: General Hall, Inc.
- Yamada, M. (1990). Masks of woman. In G. Anzaldúa (Ed.), *Making face, making soul: Haciendo caras: Creative and critical perspectives by feminists of color* (pp. 114–116). San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.
- Yinger, W. (1975). *Cesar Chavez: The rhetoric of nonviolence*. Hicksville, NY: Exposition Press.
- Zaeske, S. (2003, September). *Position paper on agency*. Paper for the Alliance of Rhetoric Societies Conference on the Status and Future of Rhetorical Societies, Evanston, IL. Retrieved October 15, 2003, from <http://www.comm.umn.edu/ARS/Agency/Zaeske,%20agency.htm>
- Zavella, P. (1987). *Women’s work and Chicano families: Cannery workers of the Santa Clara Valley*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Zompetti, J. P. (2002, May 24). *Applying a Gramscian critical rhetoric: Exploring Cesar Chavez’s rhetoric of resistance*. Paper presented at the Annual Rhetoric of Society of America Conference, Las Vegas, NV.

从性别、种族、民族和阶层角度谈修辞手段在Haciendo Caras
的作用和不同意识：对Dolores Huerta修辞学的研究

Stacey Sowards
美国德克萨斯大学传播系

【摘要】

本研究探讨了美国合众国副主席Dolores Huerta的修辞，并大了修辞手段作性、民族、族和各方面商的理解。Huerta的修辞了修辞手段如何通Gloria Anzaldúa所言的haciendo caras [外表与心灵]以及Chela Sandoval所言的有不同意而起作用。通使用些修辞caras (手法)，Huerta囊括了多修辞格手段来体现情、家庭、平等主和，并使用来自社会和生活中的族、性和的因素来促和限制她的修辞手段的感知。最，Huerta的caras(手法)和商性通、反抗和而成就她的修辞手法。

La capacité d'agir rhétorique en tant que *haciendo caras* et conscience différentielle, selon le genre, la race, l'ethnicité et la classe sociale : une étude de la rhétorique de Dolores Huerta
Stacey Sowards

Cette étude explore la rhétorique de Dolores Huerta, vice-présidente du syndicat United Farm Workers of America. Elle développe la compréhension théorique de la capacité d'agir (*agency*) rhétorique comme étant une négociation entre des aspects intersectionnels de genre, d'ethnicité, de race et de classe sociale. La rhétorique de Huerta illustre les manières par lesquelles la capacité d'agir peut fonctionner à travers ce que Gloria Anzaldúa appelle *haciendo caras* (*making face, making soul*) et ce que Chela Sandoval nomme la conscience différentielle (*differential consciousness*). Utilisant ces *caras* rhétoriques, Huerta incarne la capacité d'agir collaborative par le biais de styles rhétoriques d'émotion, de *familia* (famille), d'égalitarisme et d'optimisme, usant de facteurs provenant de dispositions sociales et matérielles liées à l'ethnicité, au genre et à la classe sociale, qui tout à la fois permettent et restreignent son sentiment de capacité d'agir rhétorique. Finalement, les *caras* de Huerta et sa négociation de l'habitus donnent forme à sa capacité d'agir par l'optimisme, la résistance et la transformation.

Rhetorische Agentschaft als *Haciendo Caras* und differentielles Bewusstsein aus dem Blickwinkel von Geschlecht, Rasse, Ethnie und Klasse: Eine Untersuchung der Rhetorik von Dolores Huera

Stacey Sowards

Die Studie untersucht die Rhetorik von Dolores Huerta, Vizepräsidentin der Vereinigung der Farmarbeiter in Amerika, und erweitert das theoretische Verständnis von rhetorischer Agentschaft als die Vermittlung der intersektionalen Aspekte von Geschlecht, Ethnie, Rasse und Klasse. Huertas Rhetorik zeigt, wie rhetorische Agentschaft durch das, was Gloria Anzaldúa *hacienda caras* (einen Gesichtsausdruck machen, Seele machen) nennt und was Chela Sandoval *differentielles Bewusstsein* bezeichnet, funktionieren kann. Unter Verwendung dieser rhetorischen *caras* verkörpert Huerta die kollaborative Agentschaft durch eine rhetorische Art von Emotionalität, *Familia* (Familie), Egalitarismus und Optimismus und benutzt Faktoren der sozialen und materiellen Art, die sich auf Ethnie, Geschlecht und Klasse beziehen und ihrem Verständnis von rhetorischer Agentschaft sowohl zuträglich sind als es auch beschränken. Letztendlich formen Huertas *caras* und die Vermittlung von Habitus die rhetorische Agentschaft durch Optimismus, Widerstand und Transformation.

젠더, 종족, 민족, 그리고 계급의 렌즈를 통하여 Haciendo Caras와 차별적 인식으로서

수사학적인 수단: Dolores Huerta의 수사연구

Stacey Sowards

본 연구는 미국 농부 협회 부회장인 Dolores Huerta의 수사에 대한 연구이며, 젠더, 인종, 민족, 그리고 계급 상호교차적인 측면의 협상으로서 수사학적 수단의 이론적 이해를 확대한 것이다. Huerta의 수사는 어떻게 수사적인 수단이 Gloria Anzaldúa가 주장한 *haciendo caras*를 통하여, 그리고 Chela Sandoval가 주장한 차별적 인식을 통하여 기능할 수 있가를 보여주고 있다. 이러한 수사학적인 이론을 이용, Huerta는 감성, 가족, 복음주의, 그리고 긍정주의의 수사학적인 형태를 통하여 집합적인 수단을 구현하였으며, 종족, 젠더, 그리고 계급과 관련된 사회적 그리고 물질적 성향으로부터의 요소들을 이용하여 그녀의 수사학적 감각을 가능하게 하고 제한하였다. 궁극적으로 Huerta의 *caras*와 체형의 협상은 긍정주의, 거부, 그리고 변환을 통하여 수사학적 수단을 형성하였다.

La Agencia Retórica en *Haciendo Caras*
y la Consciencia Diferencial a través de las Lentes del Género, la Raza, la Etnicidad, y la Clase:
Una Revisión de la Retórica de Dolores Huerta

Stacey Sowards

Department of Communication, University of Texas-El Paso, El Paso, TX 79968, USA

Resumen

Este estudio explora la retórica de Dolores Huerta, vice-presidenta de los Trabajadores de Granja Unidos de América, y expande los entendimientos teóricos de la agencia retórica como una negociación de los aspectos de intersección del género, de la etnicidad, la raza y la clase. La retórica de Huerta ilustra cómo la agencia retórica puede funcionar a través de lo que Gloria Anzaldúa llama *haciendo caras* [*haciendo el alma*] y que Chela Sandoval llama la consciencia diferencial. Usando estas caras retóricas, Huerta representa la agencia colaborativa a través los estilos retóricos de la emocionalidad, la familia, la igualdad, y el optimismo, usando factores de las disposiciones sociales y materiales relacionadas con la etnicidad, el género, y la clase, que a la vez permite y constriñe su sentido de la agencia retórica. En última instancia, las caras de Huerta y la negociación del cuerpo dan forma a la agencia retórica a través del optimismo, la resistencia, y la transformación.