



Intimate Activism

The Struggle for Sexual Rights in Postrevolutionary Nicaragua

CYMENE HOWE

Intimate Activism

Intimate Activism



*The Struggle for Sexual Rights
in Postrevolutionary Nicaragua*

CYMENE HOWE

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
DURHAM AND LONDON 2013

© 2013 Duke University Press

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ©

Typeset in Whitman by Tseng Information Systems, Inc.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Howe, Cymene.

Intimate activism : the struggle for sexual rights in
postrevolutionary Nicaragua / Cymene Howe.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8223-5437-6 (cloth : alk. paper)

ISBN 978-0-8223-5450-5 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Gay liberation movement—Nicaragua. 2. Sexual rights—
Nicaragua. 3. Lesbian activists—Nicaragua. 4. Nicaragua—
Politics and government—1990– I. Title.

HQ76.8.N5H69 2013

306.76'6097285—dc23

2013011688

THIS BOOK IS DEDICATED
TO MY GRANDMOTHER MARIE LOUISE KOONCE
AND HER FEMALE PARTNER OF MORE THAN
SIXTY YEARS, ORA LEE CRAIG.



Although you never called yourselves lesbians, your relationship was a model to me, unique in its duration, commitment, and mutual respect. You defined family as “a group of people who care about one another”; it continues to be one of the best descriptions of family that I have ever heard. I hope that now, as you, grandma, are almost one hundred years old, you will continue to remember all of the good times.

CONTENTS



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ix

INTRODUCTION

The Struggle 1

1. A History of Sexuality 23
2. Intimate Pedagogies 61
3. Pride and Prejudice 92
4. Mediating Sexual Subjectivities 128

CONCLUSION

Getting the Word Out 160

NOTES 173

REFERENCES 197

INDEX 221

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS



Sitting down to write these acknowledgments is an exercise in nostalgic reckoning, through many years, places, experiences, and relationships. While this book is now complete, it is hard to know precisely where it began. I am sure it had something to do with growing up with “two grandmas” on my mom’s side of the family and never really thinking there was anything out of the ordinary about that. I am sure that my first trip to Nicaragua as a punky backpacker was influential, too. I was impressed with how loquacious and proud Nicaraguans were, especially when they were reflecting on their revolutionary experiences—and rightly so. I am sure that this book had some start in the fact that I was exposed to feminist teachers from high school on and that I was able to read Judith Butler’s *Gender Trouble*, when it first came out, at Berkeley as an undergraduate. This is all to say that it may be impossible to know where a project like this one, which spans so much of my life in so many dimensions, began. It has involved a lot of sweat and a lot of screen time. And in the end—and this is a truism, to be sure—I could not have done it without you all.

In the town of San Marcos, in Nicaragua’s western highlands, I spent many days and nights talking with Chefo, who shared his experiences, both good and bad, as a *cochón* (“fag”). Chefo made sexuality and gender constructions far more real, and far more complex, than they ever were in the pages of academic life or in my experiences in the United States. I thank him. The stories he told me in the early 1990s were foundational to the work I have done in Nicaragua over the years. I am glad that he and I got to share a bottle of Flor de Caña and dance together again, just a few years ago. San Marcos was a

wonderful place for me, and the generosity of Alba Luz, Carolina, Inti, and Maria Berta made it so.

In Managua, I had the honor of being able to work with many committed advocates for sexual and gender rights. They generously gave me their time, explaining the intricacies and intimacies of life in Nicaragua and the life of the *lucha* as well. Without their dedication and without their investment in our conversations, this research and this text surely never would have come into being. While I will maintain the confidentiality that we agreed to at the time these conversations took place, I suspect that all of you will know who you are, even if only by your given names. For all of the information, and all of the good times, I thank Ada Luz, Agner, Amy, Evelyn, Ana C., Ana P., Ana Q., Bismark, Brigitte, Carolina, Christian, Clara, Elena, Elieth, Erick, Fernando, Geraldine, Hazel, Helen D., Helena R., Ileana, Isabel, Julia, Kefrén, Maira, Maria Lidia, Marlene, Mary, Mavila, Mikel, Patricia, Rita, Roger, Rosario, Rubén, Sheyla, and Victoria. I extend my very deep appreciation to Martita, whose presence throughout my fieldwork, and beyond, has been inspiring. While conducting my research over the course of three years, I lived with two different families who, again, were kind and patient and, luckily for me, wonderful people to talk to and hang out with. So I thank Norma and Noreli, and I thank Doña Xilo and the whole family.

A considerable amount of appreciation goes to my friends and mentors at the University of New Mexico, who spent countless hours with me, in and out of class, helping me to think through this project. Without the intellectual generosity and supportive friendship of Les Field in particular, I certainly would not have become the anthropologist I am today; I hope I have even a fraction of the commitment and compassion that he does. Elizabeth Hutchison, Louise Lamphere, Roger Lancaster, Carole Nagengast, Sylvia Rodriguez, and Marta Weigel were also caring and productively critical companions and guides in my graduate school sojourn. Someone once told me that choosing one's dissertation committee is like getting to select your academic parents; if in some karmic way that is in fact true, then I am most pleased with my choice of kin. In addition to being inspirational sexuality scholars, Martin Manalansan and Ellen Lewin have been truly phenomenal with their feedback and, not incidentally, encouragement on this project. At various junctures along the way, all of the following friends and colleagues have given me valuable responses to this work, as well as intellectual support and com-

panionship. I thank them all: Florence Babb, Jodi Barnes, Andrew Bickford, Evelyn Blackwood, Katherine Bliss, Yarimar Bonilla, Dominic Boyer, Hector Carrillo, Jane Fajans, James Faubion, Melissa Fisher, Katherine Frank, William French, Nia Georges, Victoria González-Rivera, Rosemary Hennessey, Gilbert Herdt, Nell Haynes, Sarah Horton, William Leap, Paul Liffman, Lois Lorentzen, Jeffrey Mantz, Michelle Marzullo, Linda Mayo, Lavinia Nicolae, Ratheesh Radhikrishna, Margaret Randall, Brian Riedel, Susan Terrio, Niels Teunis, Deborah Tolman, Terry Turner, Jennifer Tyburczy, Marike van Gijssel, David Vine, and Thomas Walker. The participants in the Mellon Faculty Seminar at Cornell University (2005–2006, 2006–2007), as well as all of the participants in the Sexuality Studies Working Group at Rice University, have my appreciation for their commentaries and enthusiasm. The many students with whom I have had the pleasure of working over the past few years also deserve accolades for the ways in which they have shaped this book through their excellent questions and clarifications. They have pushed me to create a lucid text out of what is, for me, an immensely compelling story that my Nicaraguan interlocutors have lived.

Financial support, as we all know, is absolutely crucial to fieldwork and to our ability to carry out research and write. I am grateful to the Fulbright Foundation, the National Women's Studies Association, and the Mellon Foundation for their remunerative support of this project. The institutions at which I have worked over the past handful of years also have contributed to field excursions and supported my ability to develop this project and the book itself; thanks are due to American University, Cornell University, Rice University, San Francisco State University, and the University of New Mexico. This manuscript has seen a lot of locales, and I believe little epistemic bits of Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Ithaca, Albuquerque, and Houston, and of course Managua, are woven into the text itself.

Anonymous reviewers at *Cultural Anthropology*, *City and Society*, *GLQ*, the *Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology*, and Duke University Press have provided productive and engaged comments on this text as it has developed and matured. I appreciate their time, intelligence, and close readings of the manuscript in various stages. Sue Deeks provided excellent, detailed copyediting on the manuscript, and Liz Smith, Sara Leone, Naomi Linzer and Amy Buchanan also have my deepest appreciation for the work they have done bringing this book to press. Ken

Wissoker definitely deserves recognition and then some for guiding this project to completion. His support and cheerful e-mails have meant a lot.

My utmost thanks go to my mom and dad for their overall support of me as a fledgling being and of course their willingness to hear yet one more report about Nicaraguan sexual rights activists. Barbara and John Boyer have also been an important source of support and encouragement to me; it is good to have writers in the family, if only to know that there is always a sympathetic wordsmith nearby. Melissa Abrams, Brenda Maiale, and Rocky Patten should also count themselves among the most appreciated friends, correspondents, and people mentioned here.

Finally, I reserve one last thank you—one that is not really captured by the concept of an “acknowledgment.” And that is for the love of my life. You know who you are.

INTRODUCTION



The Struggle

Nicaragua is a place where people like to talk, even about things one is not really supposed to talk about. Because the subject of homosexuality has been not only taboo but illegal to “promote” or “propagandize” for most of the past two decades, Nicaraguans have needed more than a little courage to speak about sexuality, rights, and social change. Marta, who has spent long years in the struggle for sexual rights, was my closest friend in Nicaragua. We often shared our opinions about the differences between lesbian and gay rights movements in Nicaragua and el Norte (the United States). But our conversations were also peppered with more quotidian topics: Marta’s concerns about her mother’s health, stories about former girlfriends, or speculations about the plot twists in Nicaragua’s first social-justice soap opera. Marta and I spent many hours at Galería Praxis, an art gallery and café in the middle of Managua. Galería Praxis was a place that evoked many of the significant political trajectories that have affected Nicaragua over the past three decades. The café has hosted celebrations for Orgullo Lésbico-Gay (Lesbian and Gay Pride),

and its moniker, “Praxis,” conjures Marx’s humanist call to combine theory with practice, a reminder of Nicaragua’s Sandinista Revolution and the politics of liberation that have been fundamental to contemporary sexual rights activism. But Marta and I also liked Praxis simply because it served excellent *tostones* (fried plantains), just salty enough to make us really appreciate our cold orange Fantas. Sheltered from the late afternoon sun by the broad leaves of banana trees, Marta explained to me one day that she believed that Nicaraguans were changing the way they thought about homosexuality:

They’re beginning to understand same-sex sexuality in different terms. . . . The people are becoming more educated. It used to be, even just a couple of years ago, that you would see in the newspapers some report that “this and that *fulano* [what’s-his-name], a *cochón* [fag], robbed someone . . . or some *cochona* [dyke] got drunk and beat up her woman.” But this is changing, and you don’t see the news reports using those old-fashioned and negative terms. Now the reporters don’t put that kind of thing in there, the sexuality of the person. This has been changing little by little because of the campaign for Sexuality Free from Prejudice and maybe, in some smaller ways, because of the lessons and conversations we have been having in our lesbian discussion group.

Marta was quick to admit that the changes have been incremental and processual. But she also believed these particular shifts in awareness and representation were occurring in part because of her commitment and that of other sexual rights activists. Marta’s thoughts call attention to several key aspects of the social and political dimensions that are critical to the work of sexual rights activists. She highlights the ways in which ideas about sexuality are being transformed by the media; how everyday conversations about, and perceptions of, sexual identity are shifting; and, finally, the important role sexual rights activists see themselves playing as mediators who will help to establish a better future for sexually marginalized people in Nicaragua.

For as long as most Nicaraguans can remember, there have been *cochones* and *cochonas*. More recently, however, newer categories have become pervasive in the sexual lexicon of Nicaragua: *homosexuales* (or *gays*) and *lesbianas*. Many factors have led to this emergence, including international lesbian and gay rights movements, globally broadcast television

programs and films, increased flows of digital information, and people's migratory paths between the global North and Nicaragua. Nicaraguan advocates for sexual rights have also played an instrumental role in how same-sex sexuality is coming to be understood in both public culture and private interactions. In this book I follow the work of Nicaraguan sexual rights activists who, I argue, have served as key mediators in the transformation of ideas about, and experiences of, same-sex sexuality. Activists' interventions have grown out of a political and intellectual commitment to combine human rights, identity politics, and global discourses with the quotidian realities of sexuality that are specific to Nicaragua. In an era in which political practices—from communitarian impulses to liberal rights—move rapidly across borders, understanding activists as a class of mediators who actively craft and situate political ideals allows us to understand not only activists' values and the settings of their struggles but also the points of “friction” (Tsing 2004) at which globally disseminated rights and concepts of sexuality become reformulated in local contexts.

Nicaragua's Sandinista Revolution (1979–90) was one of very few successful social revolutions in Latin America. It brought together strands of Marxism, nationalism, and liberation theology to overturn the country's long-standing dictatorial regime. Because of the Sandinista experiment, Nicaragua was an iconic example of a “third world” country that dared to challenge U.S. hegemony in the final chilly years of the Cold War. What is perhaps less well known is that in 1992, during the U.S.-supported administration of President Violeta Barrios de Chamorro, Nicaragua instituted Article 204, the most repressive antisodomy law in the Americas. Article 204 mandated up to three years imprisonment for “anyone who induces, promotes, propagandizes or practices in scandalous form sexual intercourse between persons of the same sex.” It targeted not only men but also women. It was a law that threatened to incarcerate, potentially, anyone who wrote about, spoke about, or putatively propagandized the subject of homosexuality in any way. By the time the Sandinistas returned to power in 2006, Nicaragua was the only country in Latin America that criminalized same-sex sexual relations between consenting adults, male or female. Then, in 2007, in what a prominent Nicaraguan national newspaper called “a surprise decision,” the antisodomy law was repealed. Why Nicaragua “surprisingly” moved from an oppressive antisodomy regime to greater tolerance for same-sex sexuality remains, officially, an open question.¹ This book is an attempt to provide a partial answer by considering

the work of Nicaraguan sexual rights advocates whose campaigns were largely spurred by the antisodomy law, but whose activism has attempted to change not only policy but also culture. From my point of view, activists deserve credit and congratulations for the work they have done to overturn the antisodomy law. However, this book is not simply a celebratory reflection on a hard-won victory.

Rather than a retrospective of a successful social movement, this book is an ethnography of activism. It considers the intellectual and performative practices of advocates to better understand how they are attempting to transform culture through political means, from the inside, out. Sexual rights activists see themselves as participants in what they call *una lucha* (a struggle) to transform *la vida cotidiana* (daily life). The *lucha* for sexual rights, I argue, illustrates a pivotal moment in a continuum from revolution to rights as many activists who were revolutionaries, or who were influenced by the revolution's spirit, are now committed to more identity-based human rights projects. Their struggle for sexual rights illustrates some of the ways in which political objectives have changed from a revolutionary impulse to overturn the state to a set of political values aimed at protecting individuals from the state, and from national upheaval to a politics of personal transformation and securing rights.

As Nicaraguan activists have attempted to transform the moral terrain at home, many of them have looked beyond the country's borders to engage in a now global conversation about sexual rights.² Like many political actors, Nicaraguan activists are influenced by concepts of sexual subjectivity, ideals of romantic love, and international lesbian and gay rights movements. These political models, inherited from Enlightenment ideals of rational mutual understanding, are symptomatic of what Elizabeth Povinelli (2004: 6) has called the "liberal diaspora."³ A liberal logic of rights and movements has been persuasive in Nicaragua's postrevolutionary, neoliberal economic climate and has, in part, set the stage for cultural and political reconfigurations of sexuality. However, activists have not been bound by these logics. Instead, they have translated aspects of the country's revolutionary ethos into terms commensurate with the contemporary politics of sexual rights, often reconfiguring trans-local political practices so they resonate more profoundly with local political histories and priorities. The Nicaraguan struggle for sexual rights is, I believe, distinct from many other sexual equality movements around the world not only because activists have had to confront a formidable antisodomy law,

but also because activists themselves come armed with organizing experiences learned, and earned, during the revolutionary process. Just as the Sandinista Revolution was a mixture of political, social, and religious principles, sexual rights activists have developed a similar kind of bricolage, creatively appropriating and engaging a hybrid set of political approaches.

Nicaraguan sexual rights activists articulate their politics in multiple ways as they attempt to engage with the public and create a public sphere that recognizes and appreciates the values of sexual rights. Lesbian and gay discussion groups, public protests and street demonstrations, and social-justice radio and television programming are important arenas for advocacy, each representing a different dimension and scale of engagement. These are key *sites* of activists' interventions. However, equally important is the work that advocates do to create a *subject* for sexual rights. Whether on the street or on the airwaves, activists must calibrate their politics for their audience, the people of Nicaragua, as well as for each other. The debates that take place behind the scenes as activists prepare for public events and produce media materials, for instance, are not only illustrative of content, messaging, and strategizing; they also demonstrate how ideological negotiations inflect and inform the work that activists do. Conversations about how, or whether, to use particular political tropes—including *declaración* (outness), identity, sexual "options" or "orientations," "pride," or "sexuality free from prejudice"—become an experimental terrain for advocates to refashion and reposition transnational political values and notions of subjectivity. Translating the terms associated with sexuality, and the uneven ways they index identity and behavior, is not simply a linguistic exercise but also a conceptual one.⁴ These mediations, perhaps unsurprisingly, often have a gendered dimension. The contingencies of machismo, changing perceptions of women's sexual agency, and the social inequalities between women and men all indicate, in profound ways, how sexual subjectivity cannot be divorced from gender.

Although this book describes sexual rights activism on behalf of both women and men in Nicaragua, I focus somewhat more attention on *derechos lesbianos* (lesbian rights). In one sense, my subjectivity and the many years I spent in the "dyke scene" in California guided this decision.⁵ As a (bisexual) woman, I also probably had more access to the social world of lesbian politics than I would have had as a man (or, conversely, as a woman attempting to access the intimate domains of men's same-sex sexuality in Nicaragua). However, there is a more primary, political, and "Nica" rea-

son behind my focus on derechos lesbianos. While Nicaraguans have long been aware of la cochona, women's same-sex sexuality has never had the same degree of recognition as men's same-sex sexuality. La cochona has never been as visible as el cochón in Nicaraguan public culture. When sexual rights activists lobby for derechos lesbianos, they are therefore not only calling attention to a relatively new sexual subject in Nicaragua, the lesbian, but they are also highlighting the existence of women's same-sex sexuality as such.

The sexual rights advocates whose work and aspirations are reflected here are a diverse group; some are grassroots activists, and others are employed by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), health clinics, or other social service agencies.⁶ During my field research, I spent time with street protestors and feminist thinkers, university students and HIV-prevention educators, spectators of queer cinema and radio show hosts, discussion group participants and pride party attendees, soap opera screenwriters and attorneys who were well versed in the vicissitudes of human rights, sexual identity, and Nicaraguan law. Many sexual rights advocates were long-time Sandinista *militantes*, and others were neoliberal converts. Most were Nicaraguan, but a handful were foreign nationals and expatriates, some of whom had lived in Nicaragua since the revolutionary era.⁷ I also spent much of my time in Nicaragua with people who were known around the neighborhood as a cochón or a cochona and who increasingly were referring to themselves as gay (or *homosexual*) and lesbiana.⁸ Participating in meetings of the Women's Network against Violence, helping to plan the weeklong Sexuality Free from Prejudice (SFFP) events, joining lesbian discussion groups, attending HIV/AIDS-prevention events, and helping to create a database of Latin American gay and lesbian organizations all inform my understanding of sexual rights advocacy in Nicaragua. My networks and contacts expanded and deepened over time through overlapping personal and professional connections, or what social scientists like to call "snowball" sampling, although snowballs seem a strange methodological metaphor in the tropical swelter of Managua.

There were days when I shared *pinolillo*, a traditional drink made of corn and cacao, with my Nicaraguan friends and coworkers; but my conversations most often occurred over well-sugared lukewarm coffee. I was also more likely to hear the best anecdotes and the bawdier details after the bottle of Flor de Caña rum had gone around the table a couple of times and the Shakira song had subsided on the speakers at the *disco gay*. In the

relatively small world of activist networks, NGOs, social service agencies, and health centers in Managua, an interloping *gringa* is not unheard of.⁹ The country has a long history of *internacionalistas*, both those who came during the revolutionary period and those who continue to arrive in support of development projects around the country.¹⁰ My initial experiences in Nicaragua, living in a small town in the western highlands in the early 1990s, inspired my interest in sexual rights activism in the country. However, most of what I describe in this book derives from daily conversations and interactions with people during sixteen months of field research in 1999, 2000, and 2001, followed by several trips back since then, including as an international elections observer in 2006 when the Sandinistas returned to power. During the time that this field research took place, it was illegal to promote, propagandize, or practice homosexuality in Nicaragua. However, this is precisely what many activists were doing. To ensure complete confidentiality, I have used pseudonyms for all of the individuals whose stories and words are included here.¹¹ While Article 204 is no longer in effect and I do not expect any of the people represented in this book to be legally or personally endangered in the present, I have chosen to err on the side of caution for the sake of my friends and interlocutors. Maintaining this confidentiality is a long-standing anthropological convention, but it is also one that, in this case, seems especially warranted.

Thick Experience, Social Theories, and *la Vida Cotidiana*

Nicaraguan activists have what Clifford Geertz (1973) might have called “thick experience” with revolution, social change, and transnational political paradigms. The Sandinista revolutionary state was a polymorphous blend of political priorities and initiatives, ranging from land reform and workers’ cooperatives to literacy brigades and the prohibition of exploitative images of women. It was during the revolutionary era that Nicaraguan women became more fully politicized and North American and European allies traveled to the country in solidarity with the revolutionary project. The Sandinista state achieved some of its egalitarian goals. But the revolution was truncated and foiled by the U.S. covert war against the country, as well as by internal mismanagement and an increasingly neoliberal economic climate.¹² What followed was a series of socially conservative regimes and structural adjustment policies that relegated Nicaragua to the United Nations’ list of the world’s most highly indebted poor countries. By the late 1990s and early 2000s, Nicaragua was regularly

receiving more development aid per capita than any other country in the Americas. As one Nicaraguan diplomat put it in our conversation, “Our country is forced to go begging to the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.” Once a globally recognized symbol of revolution and resistance, Nicaragua had taken on a new “identity” as the second poorest country in the Western Hemisphere. Stranded on the margins of the global economy, Nicaraguan activists have had to craft their advocacy campaigns with limited resources, at best.

In response to deepening social conservatism and structural adjustment policies that made the Nicaraguan state much less able, and seemingly less willing, to provide even a modicum of social welfare, many social justice activists established new political venues in civil society. Gender and sexual rights activists founded an influential women’s movement, the *Movimiento Autónomo de Mujeres* (Autonomous Women’s Movement), national networks for violence prevention, grassroots initiatives for sexual rights, and organizations dedicated to HIV/AIDS prevention and education. In the early 1990s, the country underwent what Nicaraguans call *el boom* of NGOs, which became increasingly responsible for clinical services such as reproductive and sexual health and assumed many political tasks, including lobbying for human rights and social justice agendas (Molyneux 2003; Paley 2002, 2008). The politics of social transformation became, to a degree, institutionalized in NGOs, many of which have been dependent on the good graces of foreign governments, foundations, and nonprofit organizations for their funding. In this economically precarious situation, activists are acutely aware that their projects are vulnerable to the capriciousness of foreign capital. At the same time, they are also adamant that their projects remain their own; many advocates are vocal about the fact that their foreign support comes “with no strings attached.” The fact that some activists’ projects are funded and deemed worthy while other projects are not, however, suggests that financial strings are inherent in a context in which economic dependence is the starting point for political projects.

Opposing the antisodomy law has been an ongoing battle for many activists, but sexual rights advocates also see themselves as struggling against what they call *fundamentalismo cristiano* (Christian fundamentalism). *Fundamentalismo cristiano* appears in anti-abortion campaigns by religious institutions, biased sexual education in schools, “fiscal terrorism” against women’s organizations,¹³ and attacks on the leadership of

health clinics and progressive NGOs. The majority of Nicaraguans identify as Catholic, and the church has an enormous amount of influence in Nicaraguan politics and public opinion. Public commentaries by representatives of the Catholic church are regularly featured in the national newspapers, and Nicaraguan Catholic clergy historically have functioned as key arbiters in national politics.¹⁴ Evangelical denominations, which have grown across the country, also leverage ideological and moral influence in the country. Church doctrine that designates homosexuality sinful, and the widely held opinion among Nicaraguans that homosexuality is a sickness, have both proved to be difficult obstacles in activists' work.

Antisodomy laws and powerful church lobbies do not, however, tell the whole story of sexuality in contemporary Nicaragua. The weekly magazine *Salud y Sexualidad* (Health and Sexuality), a colorful insert in the national newspaper *El Nuevo Diario* (New Daily), often runs features on sexuality, including same-sex sexuality, making these topics a regular part of quotidian dialogues.¹⁵ Political scandals, such as the accusations of incest and rape leveled against (former and current) President Daniel Ortega by his adopted stepdaughter, offer salient, if salacious, moments for the body politic to reflect on sexuality as a social and political phenomenon. Popular television shows featuring gay characters, such as *Betty la Fea* (Ugly Betty), have opened new spaces to discuss sexuality, if in stereotyped forms. Increasing access to the Internet has meant that (primarily urban) Nicaraguans can find material about sexual behavior, health, and rights from around the world. Changes such as these have allowed some Nicaraguans to claim lesbian, gay, or homosexual identities in very public, vocal, and visible ways. Others have depended on tacit recognition, claiming instead, "I am neither in the closet nor on the balcony" (Babb 2003, 2009). There are still others who are *cuidadosa* (careful, mindful) and perhaps even suspicious of sexual-identity categories and the meanings they are believed to embody. This book closely considers these dynamics, assessing the ways in which the ongoing work of sexual rights activists has transformed how Nicaraguans talk about and perhaps, think about sexuality.

From Revolution to Rights

When I first lived in Nicaragua in the early 1990s, I knew I had just missed the revolution, as people were quick to lament. However, the ease with which just about anyone on the street discussed the finer points of heralded communist tracts such as Karl Marx's *The Eighteenth Brumaire* or

Antonio Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks* made it seem as though the revolution was not that far gone. By the time I returned to do fieldwork in the late 1990s and early 2000s, the intellectual heroes of aspiring communists were much less a part of the public repertoire. When political theory did arise, it was no longer people in the street who did most of the talking. Instead, an educated, progressive, and often middle-class cohort of political actors was engaged in these conversations, and the theory I was beginning to hear was Foucault's. Ernesto, a member of the Men's Network against Violence, put it this way one afternoon, "You see, Cymene, it is like Foucault says: power moves in incremental ways, moves in language, and it is all about discourse." Times had changed and they had stayed the same: Nicaragua was still a country actively engaged with social theory, but the theoretical repertoire had changed, as had the subject of political struggles.¹⁶

The ways in which Nicaragua has moved from Marx and Foucault to liberal paradigms and human rights illustrate not only how the country as a whole has engaged with political theorizing and practice, but also how advocates themselves—their interventions and their thinking—have been influenced by them. Partially due to the relatively short time horizon between the Sandinista Revolution and other struggles for equality in Nicaragua, individual advocates have, for example, been revolutionaries in the late 1970s, Sandinista supporters in the 1980s, feminist leaders in the 1990s, and sexual rights proponents in the early part of the twenty-first century. Activists who have opposed socially conservative values and the coercive force of the antisodomy law find resonance in Gramsci's proposition that power is enacted through dominant culture, normative hegemonies, and state coercion. Advocates who have focused their attention on sexual subjectivity find themselves engaged with what Foucault understood as a proliferation of sexual discourses and diffuse operations of power. Therefore, it is not that Gramsci and Marx are no longer useful in a Foucauldian Nicaragua; indeed, many activists describe their current work as a continuum in which the political expertise they gained during the revolution is coupled with recent lessons learned on the geopolitical world stage. However, if Marx and Gramsci influenced an earlier revolutionary impulse, and Foucault partly conditioned Nicaragua's postrevolutionary era, human rights have become, as one activist pithily put it, *de moda* (in style).¹⁷

Human rights arrived in Nicaragua through the usual channels: inter-

national organizations, development projects, and Nicaraguan advocates' participation in transnational politics. Since the early 1990s, human rights discourses have become de rigueur in funding proposals to organizations in the global North, and they have become an integral part of activists' knowledge regimes. At face value, human rights appear to be a relatively straightforward proposition: a formula for equality based on what Hannah Arendt (1958: 299) called "the assumed existence of a human being as such." However, following a longer tradition in Western political philosophy from Aristotle on, human rights have also been a provocation, questioning what it means to be human and ultimately how humanity can achieve a "common standard of decency" (Nagengast and Turner 1997: 269).¹⁸ Human rights and, in turn, sexual rights are not a transparent set of practices; they are a social and historical process rather than an innate set of values (Žižek 2005). For many activists in Nicaragua, human rights offer a space to collectively safeguard people's lives and dignity and to call attention to how, as Judith Butler (2004: 32) has put it, "certain lives are vulnerable and worthy of protection, [and] certain deaths are grievable and worthy of public recognition." As advocates lobby for policy change, they are aiming to legitimate sexual rights as a political project. At the same time, as activists designate sexual difference "worthy of protection," they are also participating in a deeper set of philosophical queries about the qualities of freedom.

As in many places around the world where liberalism and rights-based values are increasingly hegemonic, human rights approaches have multiplied in Nicaragua as the "concept of choice" (Boellstorff 2003a: 24). However, human rights have not entirely replaced other political frameworks. In their work to construct a hybrid politics of sexual rights, activists explicitly incorporate the political values of liberalism, rights, and identity. But in the interest of tactical expediency, they also actively edit, alter, or dismiss elements of these political approaches.¹⁹ The concept of Sexuality Free from Prejudice, for instance, insists that when laws such as Article 204 are in place, everyone's sexuality—not just that of lesbians and gays—is at risk. Imagining the possibility of a sexual worldview that is "free from prejudice" also parallels Sandinismo's communitarian impulse to transform all of society, not just individuals' subjectivity. Campaigns such as "We Are Different, We Are Equal" draw on multiculturalist notions of protecting and promoting difference and tolerance. Rhetorical approaches that emphasize a biological rationale for sexuality, rather than

simply questioning social norms, find their roots in developmental narratives and a biopolitical body of knowledge. As with many contemporary political projects, particularly in the developing world, Nicaraguan activists must mediate between ideological paradigms, financial contingencies, and local political histories and priorities (Hale 2006; Speed 2007). These efforts have resulted in a multidimensional and continually negotiated set of principles that combine liberal strands of politics—such as human rights, multiculturalism, and development—with the country’s Marxian history.

From Movements to Struggles

In the second half of June one will find rainbow flags fluttering over many of Managua’s main thoroughfares. During the time of my fieldwork I found banners proclaiming “Los Derechos de Homosexuales y Lesbianas Son Derechos Humanos” (The Rights of Homosexuals and Lesbians Are Human Rights) posted at intersections next to posters peppered with pink triangles. These were, I thought, sure signs of a vibrant lesbian and gay movement. I was therefore a little surprised, I have to admit, when in my early conversations with Nicaraguan sexual rights activists I was told, “No hay un movimiento gay aquí” (There is not a gay movement here). As someone who had been involved in lesbian and gay political movements in the United States—helping to organize the annual Dyke March in San Francisco, for example—I was baffled that Nicaraguan activists were so quick to reject the existence of a movement that seemed so apparent. I offered a little convivial protest: “But you have a whole week of ‘sexuality free from prejudice’ events here in Nicaragua, whereas in the United States, we have only one weekend for Lesbian and Gay Pride. And you have lesbian and gay publications like *Fuera del Closet* (Out of the Closet) and lots of NGOs that do work on sexual health and rights. And . . .” My interlocutors patiently assured me, “Yes, we have all of that. . . . But it’s not a ‘movement.’” “What we have,” they said, echoing the language of Latin American leftists, “is a *lucha* (struggle).” My friends explained that, for them, there were qualitative differences between a “movement” and a “struggle.” They elaborated that some challenges, such as overcoming machismo, were based more in culture than in policy. The social conditions that sustained machismo and *heterosexismo* at times seemed intractable, requiring the laborious and fine-grained daily remediation of struggle. And then there was the ques-