that political parties are not unitary rational actors but, instead, a negotiated order where meanings are challenged. I agree. But wherever struggles over meaning occur, strong emotion usually is involved. And when the discussion revolves around sexual minorities (or other "others"), we are in the realm of stigma and prejudice and thus in the realm not simply of strategy and ideology but of viscerality as well. The emergence into the public sphere of any marginalized group raises standard political questions about rights and equality, but it also tends to stir up feelings, in this case, I would imagine, potentially unsettling feelings about bodies, gender transgression, and non-normative desires and pleasures. An exploration of the affective dimensions of the partisan Left's initial hostility and eventual opening toward LGBT activists would complement de la Dehesa's already compelling institutional and cultural analysis.

The other questions I have also concern the felt dimension of politics. Throughout the book, de la Dehesa pays careful attention to the ways that activists navigate the transnational field with its norms of behavior for those states that wish to be considered modern. He notes that just as "a transnational construction of women as rights-bearing political subjects . . . has increasingly come to define what so-called modern nation-states just do" (p. 3), an evolving construction of sexual rights similarly establishes transnational norms for the treatment of sexual others. De la Dehesa acknowledges the power of this transnational project of liberal modernity while instructively showing us how local actors adapt transnational norms to local conditions. Again, Mexican activists, for example, have deployed a sexual diversity frame, rather than the identitarian one that dominates transnationally.

My questions arise with regard to a conundrum faced by activists in the "periphery" as they navigate the transnational and national fields in which they are embedded. On the one hand, in the transnational field sexual rights are increasingly associated with modernity and civilization and homophobia is linked to backwardness and barbarism; on the other hand, in the national field homophobia is sometimes defended as a manifestation of nationalism and tradition against the foreignness and neocolonial domination that homosexuality ostensibly signals. What a loaded and complex discursive context that activists must navigate! To argue for sexual rights is to risk being cast as a foreigner aligned with oppressive neocolonial powers. What does it feel like to be accused of being a traitor to your nation? Or to engage in a struggle that risks the "first" world's condemnation of your country as backward and barbaric? The intensity of having to straddle contradictory worlds and worldviews makes me wonder whether feelings of (un)belonging, outsiderhood, and ambivalence about self and society shaped these activists' engagements. How might national and activist emotion cultures, or better, emotional habitus, have shaped their navigations of complex transnational and national fields? De la Dehesa shows how activists deployed transnational norms in hybridized forms that responded to local imperatives and constraints. My guess is that the complex feelings entailed in being embedded in two sometimes contradictory fields shaped activists' navigations as well.

My main point, then, really is a surmising that more attention to the felt dimensions of politics would strengthen de la Dehesa's analysis. But even as I make that suggestion, I wish to conclude by emphasizing that his account already provides a tremendously nuanced and rich history showing how Brazilian and Mexican LGBT activists navigated transnational and national fields and took advantage of institutional and cultural shifts to make political demands of the state. Drawing from a colossal amount of empirical material—including more than 260 interviews and exhaustive primary research in organizational archives—de la Dehesa makes a substantial contribution to our knowledge of LGBT movements and of Brazilian and Mexican politics. Equally important, his comparative analysis deepens our understanding of how globalization, in particular the transnational project of liberal modernity, powerfully affects local activism, but in contingent and nonhomogenizing ways.

Response to Deborah Gould's Review of *Queering the Public Sphere in Mexico and Brazil: Sexual Rights Movements in Emerging Democracies*

doi:10.1017/S1537592711000533

— Rafael de la Dehesa

As I wrote in my review, Deborah Gould offers us a valuable conceptual tool kit in *Moving Politics* with which to explore the role of affect and emotion in social movements. In her review of my book, she invites me to address these dimensions in my own account of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender (LGBT) activism in Brazil and Mexico.

Affect and emotion can undoubtedly play a determinative role in the course of social movements. As Gould suggests, early debates about alliances with leftist parties, for instance, were bitterly divisive within LGBT movements in both Brazil and Mexico, in the former case ultimately dividing the first and most important gay and lesbian group in the country, Somos/São Paulo, and in the latter, leading to the organization of competing LGBT pride marches on more than one occasion. Underlying these divisions were constellations of feelings that included a hope for social and political acceptance, strongly felt commitments to particular visions of social change, dynamics of shaming and mutual recrimination, and intense disappointment and anger at the homophobia rampant within the Left. Constructions of the national and the foreign also played into these dynamics. These were evident not only in leftist militants' common dismissals of activists' concerns as irrelevant to national priorities but also—in Brazil in particular, where an American activist living in

the country played a central role in pushing for alliances with the Left—among activists who rejected such a strategy as an importation from abroad.

Indeed, so much of activism involves affective and emotional labor, whether it be in fostering intensities of feeling about particular issues or (more recently) in NGOs' efforts to transform people's relationship to sexuality and risk, that this dimension of mobilization can easily be taken for granted. At several points in my book, I consider moments of conflict and tension among activists, although Gould is correct in noting that I do not address affect and emotion as such in my analysis. This speaks primarily to the broader theoretical concerns that informed my work. When I wrote the book, most of existing literature on LGBT activism in these countries focused on dynamics, particularly conflicts, internal to movements themselves. One of my central concerns was thus to recast this relatively narrow focus by situating the story of activism within broader histories of changing institutional, political, and cultural terrains unfolding nationally and transnationally. In doing so, I may well have underplayed the affective dimension of these social changes.

That said, my work does share with Gould's an underlying concern with challenging narrow rationalist approaches in the social sciences. Thus, without denying the importance of strategic calculation for both activists and party militants at various points in the analysis, as Gould notes in her review, I also sought to trouble such approaches both by historicizing rationalities that are often taken as a given and by underscoring that rational calculation is always imbricated with a much messier story of desire, as actors coalesce around particular goals.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592711000533 Published online by Cambridge University Press