INTRODUCTION

Queering Migration and Citizenship
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International migration and related globalization processes have profoundly altered every aspect of U.S. social, political, economic, and cultural life in the past quarter century. Despite rich scholarship about the causes and consequences of international migration, there has been little consideration of how sexual arrangements, ideologies, and modes of regulation shape migration to and incorporation into the United States. Thus, important questions about sexuality and migration have yet to be addressed. These include: How does sexuality shape migration processes? How do concerns about sexuality shape U.S. immigration control strategies and constructions of citizenship? How has mass migration in the past quarter century transformed U.S. queer communities, cultures, and politics? In what ways is sexuality a source of conflict within migrant communities, and between migrant and U.S. communities? This collection, which focuses on queer of color migrants and communities in the United States, theorizes these and other questions.

Queers migrate from every region, but here we particularly address migration from Mexico, Cuba, El Salvador, and the Philippines. We do not claim to provide representational justice to the geographic regions from which queers migrate. Rather, the purpose of these essays—which utilize history, literary theory, cultural studies, queer and race theory, anthropology, women’s studies, sociology, and the visual arts—is to bring immigration scholarship and sexuality scholarship into productive dialogue, in ways that challenge existing frameworks in both fields while indicating how the lives of queer migrants can be usefully studied. Drawing
on the strengths of both immigration and sexuality scholarships, the essays also indicate new areas for research. For example, the essays participate in theorizing sexuality beyond the horizon of the nation-state by exploring how U.S.-based sexual politics and communities are imbricated in the dynamics of globalization and imperialism, and at the same time they analyze how nation-state and citizenship boundaries are continually redrawn, despite globalizing processes that challenge their salience, through practices of discipline and surveillance directed at migrants. By focusing on queer migrants, the essays conceive multiplicity and heterogeneity within queer communities and significantly open queerness to the transnational, the global, and the migrant, and to critical analyses of the impact of queer migrants on U.S. sexual, gender, racial, and ethnic communities, cultures, and politics. Moreover, the essays identify the U.S. immigration control apparatus as a crucial target for queer intervention because it significantly regulates sexuality and reproduces oppressive sexual norms that are gendered, racialized, and classed.

Until recently, exploration of these connections between sexuality and migration was greatly hindered by the fact that lesbians and gay men were legally barred from migrating to the United States. They came anyway, but most kept their lives and experiences hidden lest they face deportation. In 1990, the ban on lesbian and gay immigrants was finally lifted, and in 1994 Attorney General Janet Reno deemed that lesbians and gay men were eligible to apply for asylum if they had been persecuted for sexuality. Lesbian, gay, trans, and queer migrants to the United States continue to face substantial obstacles. But these changes, not to mention the significance of immigration and sexuality in contemporary U.S. politics, mean that a collection of essays about the experiences and impact of queer migration is both possible and timely.

Before proceeding further, a brief explanation of how I use the terms “queer” and “migrant” is necessary. “Queer,” a particularly contested term, is used here as a category that is intended to register several key ideas. First, according to Michael Warner, “‘queer’ rejects a minoritizing logic of toleration or simple political-interest representation in favor of a more thorough resistance to regimes of the normal.” This definition is particularly useful because it echoes this collection’s call to transform, rather than to seek accommodation within, existing social structures. The definition also underscores that transformation needs to occur across a wide range of regimes and institutions, not just the sexual—but not
without addressing the sexual, either. Therefore, “queer” must be “calibrated to account for the social antagonisms of nation, race, gender, and class as well as sexuality.” Finally, “queer” is used to mark the fact that many standard sexuality categories were historically formed through specific epistemologies and social relations that upheld colonialist, xenophobic, racist, and sexist regimes. Consequently, although the collection addresses varied migrant sexual practices and identities, these cannot necessarily be accommodated within institutional and socially sanctioned categories. The use of the term “queer” is also intended to register this difficulty.

Another category that I use throughout the essay is “migrant.” This category refers to anyone who has crossed an international border to reach the United States and makes no distinction among legal immigrants, refugees, asylum seekers, or undocumented immigrants. In my view, such distinctions do not reflect empirically verifiable differences among migrants, who often shift from one category to another. Rather, the distinctions are imposed by the state and general public on migrants in order to delimit the rights that they will have or be denied, and the forms of surveillance, discipline, and normalization to which they will be subjected. My use of the term “migrant,” then, rejects the claim that such distinctions refer to different “types” of migrants, and instead directs analytic attention to the ways that these distinctions function as technologies of normalization, discipline, and sanctioned dispossession.

This introduction has three major sections. First, I discuss how concerns about sexuality guided U.S. immigration control, which in turn connected to the production of exclusionary versions of nation and citizenship. Next, I describe how a small group of scholars have brought migration and sexuality scholarship into critical conversation and, in the process, created foundational research about queer migrants’ lives. Finally, I describe how each essay in the volume builds on this foundation while opening up new questions for consideration.

**Queer Immigration and Citizenship: A History of Exclusion**

 Immigration and citizenship controls function in a double sense: as the means to delimit the nation, citizenry, and citizenship and, conversely, as the loci for contesting and reworking these limits. Therefore, this section provides an overview of the history of how U.S. immigration control has provided a means to delimit the nation and citizenry, and how
the resulting immigration exclusions have their counterparts not only in exclusionary citizenship laws but also in symbolic exclusions that mark certain U.S. citizens as Others, despite their formal legal membership in the community. Their experiences make clear how thoroughly and complexly immigration and citizenship practices, policies, discourses, and norms implicate one another, in a continuously spiraling process.

In terms of immigration control as the means to delimit the nation, citizenry, and citizenship, we must differentiate between “regular” immigration control and the refugee/asylum system. Regular immigration control, which came under the management of the federal government in the late nineteenth century, remains guided by the plenary power doctrine, which holds that sovereign nations have the right to control the entry of noncitizens into their territories. This doctrine can usefully be read in light of Benedict Anderson’s argument that although nations appear to be timeless and eternal, in fact they are relatively recent historical forms that require continual labor to maintain and reproduce.⁵ The state’s ongoing efforts to control the entry of noncitizens into U.S. territory are among the key technologies through which the nation and its sovereignty get continually reconstructed in the present. Moreover, according to the plenary power doctrine, this process may be carried out in a discriminatory manner.⁶ Thus, U.S. immigration control has historically discriminated among potential immigrants based on sexuality, gender, race, class, and other factors.

For example, as mentioned earlier, lesbians and gays were barred for decades from entering the United States as legal immigrants. Some scholars date lesbian and gay exclusion from 1917, when people labeled as “constitutional psychopathic inferiors” were first barred from entering the United States. This category included “persons with abnormal sexual instincts” as well as “the moral imbeciles, the pathological liars and swindlers, the defective delinquents, [and] many of the vagrants and cranks.”⁷ The 1952 McCarran-Walter Act recodified exclusion categories to include a ban on psychopathic personalities. There is no doubt that lesbians and gay men were targeted: a U.S. Senate report related that “the Public Health Service has advised that the provision for the exclusion of aliens afflicted with psychopathic personality or mental defect which appears in the instant bill is sufficiently broad to provide for the exclusion of homosexuals or sex perverts.”⁸ Court cases from the 1950s
and 1960s show that the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) (which, on March 1, 2003, became divided into three agencies administered by the Department of Homeland Security) used the ban on psychopathic personalities as grounds for excluding men and women whom they thought were, or might become, homosexual. In 1965, when immigration law underwent another sweeping revision, lesbian and gay exclusion was again recodified, this time under the ban on “sexual deviates.”

In 1990, exclusion based on sexual orientation was finally removed from immigration law. But lesbian/gay migrants still face substantial barriers, which reveal the enormous gap between removing explicit discrimination from the law and ensuring that equal access can be realized in practice. For example, the two most common ways to become a legal permanent resident (LPR) are through direct family ties or sponsorship by an employer. But lesbian/gay relationships — unlike heterosexual ones — are not recognized as a legitimate basis for acquiring LPR status. This disparity was reinforced in 1996 by the Defense of Marriage Act, which defined marriage as a relationship between a man and a woman for domestic and immigration purposes. Thus, binational lesbian/gay couples must “rely on a wide variety of visas and artifices to keep them together,” including student, tourist, and work visas. But these are often difficult to get — especially for those without financial resources — and they expire. As a result, binational lesbian/gay couples continually face the prospect of separation and are unable to plan for the future. Some break up; others move to a third country; still others engage in sham heterosexual marriages to get legalized. Thus, as South Asian lesbian Grace Poore describes, a lesbian may experience the hypocrisy of “having left her home country to avoid marriage, only to end up marrying [a man] in the U.S. for the right to stay.” As researchers have documented, these sham marriages subject the migrant to great risk of exploitation and abuse. Lesbians and gays who seek residency through employer sponsorship, rather than family ties, may not fare much better than binational couples; they are often “exposed to the indignities and exploitation of employers who use the power imbalance [associated with legal status] to their advantage.”

HIV/AIDS exclusions have also become an issue for all migrants. In 1987, U.S. immigration law added HIV to the list of dangerous, contagious diseases for which immigrants should be excluded and required
that all applicants for legal permanent residence must test negative for HIV. Although President Clinton pledged that he would end HIV immigration exclusion, congressional legislation in 1993 actually consolidated HIV exclusion, mandating “the exclusion of HIV-positive aliens applying for immigrant visas, refugee visas, and adjustment to permanent resident status.” The legislation further stated that as a matter of law, and regardless of medical opinion, HIV constituted “a communicable disease of public health significance.” As a result, the Immigration and Nationality Act was amended to exclude all HIV-positive noncitizens from the United States, except under very exceptional circumstances.

Finally, although lesbians and gays may no longer be explicitly excluded on sexuality grounds, their sexuality still makes them liable to be constructed as lacking good moral character or otherwise ineligible for residency and citizenship.

Lesbian and gay exclusion never functioned as an isolated system, but instead was part of a broader federal immigration control regime that sought to ensure a “proper” sexual and gender order, reproduction of white racial privilege, and exploitation of the poor. The 1875 Page Law, which mandated the exclusion of Asian women who were thought to be coming to the United States for “lewd and immoral” purposes, marked the beginning of this restrictive regime. Working-class Chinese women were particularly affected by the law, since after its passage immigration officials generally presumed that they were all entering the United States to work in the sex industry, and accordingly tried to exclude them.

The Page Law also provided the blueprint through which the U.S. immigration system became transformed into an apparatus for regulating sexuality more generally, in relation to shifting gender, racial, ethnic, and class anxieties.

Following passage of the Page Law, restrictive immigration legislation multiplied. For instance, Chinese exclusion became law in 1882, and by 1924 had been extended to prevent the entry of all Asians. Southern and Eastern European arrivals were also significantly reduced after 1924 because of racial and cultural concerns. Class restrictions multiplied, including bans on contract laborers and those deemed liable to become public charges.

At the same time, a preference for nuclear, heteropatriarchal families increasingly structured U.S. immigration law. As a result, in the early
decades of the twentieth century, women who were not excluded on racial and class grounds faced growing difficulties entering the United States unless they came under the protection of a male who seemed “respectable” and could provide support. Immigration law also expanded the provisions against women coming to the United States for prostitution, and added bans on polygamists and immoral women. Immorality encompassed a wide range of sexual (and other) behaviors, including cohabiting and having sex outside of marriage.

The focus on heteropatriarchy also legitimated the exclusion of gender-transitive people. Edward Corsi, an Italian immigrant who became the commissioner of immigration and naturalization at Ellis Island in New York, described the experiences of immigrant Alejandra Velas when she reached Ellis Island in the 1910s: “She proved to be, upon examination, despite her earlier insistence to the contrary, a young woman. Vehemently she insisted that her identity had not been questioned before. When Dr. Senner asked her why she wore men’s clothes, she answered that she would rather kill herself than wear women’s clothes.” Velas was denied entry, apparently on the grounds of cross-dressing, and was sent to England.

The immigration system’s anxious production of heteropatriarchal families became explicitly linked to the reproduction of racial and class exclusions. Asian wives, in particular, were continually singled out for investigation of possible sexual immorality. When not barred for alleged immorality, they were often barred on racial or class grounds. Exemplifying these restrictions was the 1920 Ladies Agreement, which ended the migration of Japanese brides joining husbands in the United States because restrictionists claimed that these brides’ childbearing rates threatened white supremacy. Poor and working-class wives of all backgrounds were increasingly refused entry on the grounds that they were “liable to become public charges,” such as through bearing children in publicly funded hospitals.

Revisions to immigration law in 1965 not only reaffirmed lesbian and gay exclusion but also further codified heterosexual, nuclear family relations as the primary basis for admission to the United States by reserving nearly three-quarters of all permanent immigration visas for people with those ties. As David Reimers’s research shows, these family preferences not only upheld patriarchal gender and sexual regimes but also were tacitly intended to perpetuate racial exclusion. Particularly since
Asians and Africans had been barred from immigrating for many decades, lawmakers calculated that they would lack the family ties necessary for legal immigration under the 1965 revisions. In 1996, further revisions to immigration law codified the neoliberal drive to create “responsible” immigrant families through exclusionary measures. Those whose incomes did not reach at least 125 percent of federal poverty guidelines became ineligible to sponsor family members for migration. Those who met income requirements had to sign a legally binding affidavit of support for each sponsored family member—even while the 1996 revisions also stripped legal immigrants of eligibility for many federal support programs. Representative Lamar Smith explained the rationale for the affidavits: “just as we require deadbeat dads to provide for the children they bring into the world, we should require deadbeat sponsors to provide for the immigrants they bring into the country.” As Kathleen M. Moore described, Smith’s rhetoric equates immigrant families with welfare users in a way that justified punitive policies toward both.

In short, since its inception in the late nineteenth century, federal immigration control centrally focused on sexuality as a ground for controlling newcomers’ entry. But sexuality always operated in tandem with gender, racial, class, and cultural considerations. As the immigration control apparatus evolved to address these interlocking concerns, it did not simply apply preexisting sexual, gender, racial, class, and cultural categories to individuals, but rather actively participated in producing these distinctions and linking them to broader processes of nation-making and citizenship. As the essays in this volume show, contemporary examinations of queer immigration must take this history and its legacies into account.

The immigration system, however, was not the only channel through which noncitizens sought to enter and often settle in the United States. Noncitizens' entry has also been structured through the refugee/asylum system, which developed after World War II. Unlike the immigration system, which frames entry as a privilege that can be granted in a discriminatory manner by a sovereign nation-state, the refugee/asylum system is underpinned by a different logic. Here, admission is supposed to be granted based on the United States' commitment to upholding international human rights laws, which provide asylum to those fleeing persecution on the basis of race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or
membership in a particular social group. This international standard, codified by the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees, was formally incorporated into U.S. law through the 1980 Refugee Act, which also systematized admission and resettlement procedures for refugees.  

Despite its grounding in international human rights regimes, refugee/asylum law has historically been interpreted in ways that presumed a male subject seeking to assert his individuality against an oppressive state. But in recent years, the refugee/asylum system has had to develop a more gender-sensitive process and interpretive framework. Competing claims about how to interpret “membership in a particular social group,” and about what counts as a legitimate “political opinion” for purposes of asylum, have also opened up the asylum process to new actors and issues. Moreover, since the 1990s courts have considered and issued contradictory rulings about the significance of gender and sexual identities and practices in establishing eligibility for asylum. In particular, courts have addressed persecution on account of sexual orientation, gender identity, and noncompliance with social gender norms. They have also addressed persecution that takes gendered or sexualized forms, including rape, FGM (female genital mutilation), forced sterilization or abortion, and domestic violence. Nonetheless, such cases remain difficult to win, and the asylum process is still most accessible to those who are male, heterosexual, economically privileged, and from particular “racial” and national origins (see Randazzo’s essay in this volume) — and most inaccessible for those whose persecution involved several intersecting axes of subordination (see Randazzo’s and Solomon’s essays). Thus, the refugee/asylum system also perpetuates exclusions similar to those that structure immigration control.

Exclusions are also generated because the refugee/asylum system involves an inherent tension between, on the one hand, providing protection to people who are persecuted by national governments and, on the other hand, respecting the sovereignty of individual nation-states. As a result, refugee/asylum determinations are often driven as much by U.S. foreign policy considerations as by the merits of individual claims (the disparate treatment of Haitian versus Cuban asylum seekers, historically, is an example). Furthermore, asylum adjudications provide opportunities for the construction or reiteration of racist, imperialist imagery that has material consequences on a global scale (see the essay by Cantú, Luibhéid, and Stern).
Finally, Jacqueline Bhabha suggests that the refugee/asylum system plays a crucial role in maintaining and legitimating exclusionary immigration regimes in so-called developed countries, including the United States. As is well documented, the United States in recent years has facilitated the ever-expanding flow of capital, goods, information, and technology across borders—while at the same time cracking down on immigration, especially by the poor. Bhabha suggests that because the refugee/asylum system is supposed to grant protection to persecuted people, "asylum...keeps migration exclusion morally defensible"—even when only a tiny fraction of the world’s persecuted people actually has the means to lodge an asylum claim, much less muster the resources needed to possibly win such a claim.35

The production of national sovereignty and citizenship through controlling the entry of refugees, asylum seekers, and immigrants has resulted in the proliferation of border zones and detention centers, where various categories of suspect people—legal immigrants, asylum seekers, the undocumented—are detained pending adjudication of their status. Located within U.S. territory, these are nonetheless "zones of exception" where a semblance of rights and protections rarely applies.34 Investigations of the U.S.–Mexico border have consistently documented a pattern of serious human rights abuses, including beatings, rapes, and deaths, which occur there.35 Similarly, those incarcerated in immigrant detention centers are often subjected to abuse, threats, coercion, and violence that they rarely have the means to challenge (see Solomon’s essay).36 Border zones and detention centers not only disrupt the presumed homology between territory, nation, and citizenship, but also highlight the structured exclusions, limits, and ongoing violence through which normative constructions of nation, citizenry, and citizenship are actively produced and contested.

Detention centers and border areas provide a means to understand how immigration control practices implicate citizens who have historically been excluded from full belonging in the nation-state. Addressing this issue takes us to the second sense in which immigration control functions: as a process through which the meanings and limits of nation, citizenry, and citizenship become contested and reworked. Many citizens’ bodies are, as Robert Chang expresses it, marked as racial, sexual, cultural, gender, and class outsiders, regardless of their formal citizenship...
status. In turn, these marked citizens are affected by immigration control in ways that reflect and reinforce, but sometimes provide an occasion to challenge, their subordinated status. One example of the ways that marked citizens become affected by immigration control is that slightly over half of all civil and human rights violations identified by the American Friends’ Service Committee in a five-year study of immigration control practices at the U.S.–Mexico border region were perpetrated against Latinos who were U.S. citizens or legal residents.

Citizens who are marked as outsiders are particularly affected by immigration control in two interrelated ways. First, the discriminatory immigration laws described above had their counterpart in discriminatory citizenship laws, and each reinforced the other. Thus, although citizenship involves rights and obligations that are supposedly available to all members of the national community, in practice, in the United States and elsewhere, citizens who were not white, male, able-bodied, property-owning, and sexually reproductive faced great struggle in becoming formally recognized as full, rights-bearing members of the national community. The 1790 naturalization law reserved U.S. citizenship for free whites only, and it was only in 1952 that all formal racial barriers to citizenship were dismantled. Citizenship was gendered, so that as men of different racial groups gained citizenship, women from these groups were also enfranchised, but as dependents of men rather than as equal citizens. Citizenship was bound up with class relations; “it was on the basis of property and wealth that citizenship rights, voting in particular, were first determined.” The intimate connections between citizenship and a patriarchal sexual order that sought to maintain “white” racial purity and related property relations have been well documented. Shane Phelan further characterizes U.S. citizenship as increasingly heterosexualized during the twentieth century. Lauren Berlant extends Phelan’s claim to examine how citizenship norms and practices became increasingly privatized after the late 1970s through the aggressive promotion of an idealized heterosexual family sphere. More generally, M. Jacqui Alexander argues that “heterosexuality is at once necessary to the state’s ability to constitute and imagine itself, while simultaneously marking the site of its own instability.” Clearly, the abstract ideal of universal citizenship, supposedly available to all, was in reality very unequally distributed. And these inequalities were mirrored in and reinforced by discriminatory immigration laws, which admitted immigrants based on
sexual, gender, racial, and class criteria. Changes in one area of law had ramifications in the other area. Moreover, as immigrants who did gain admission sought to become citizens, their possibilities for doing so were mediated by these exclusionary logics (see Somerville’s essay).

A second important way in which marked citizens are deeply affected by U.S. immigration control involves the symbolic realm. In addition to immigration control strategies and citizenship law, representational systems powerfully construct a sense of national belonging and identification. Stuart Hall elaborates, “people are not only legal citizens of a nation, they participate in the idea of the nation as represented in its symbolic culture.”47 Representations of immigration are one of the most important motifs through which the U.S. nation and citizenry get imagined; as Lauren Berlant suggests, “immigration discourse is a central technology for the reproduction of patriotic nationalism.”48 Yet, all representations of imagined national community also entail exclusions, and this is certainly true in regard to immigration. Mainstream representations of the United States as a nation of immigrants depend on expunging histories of genocide, slavery, racialized heteropatriarchy and economic exploitation, and these representations in turn contribute to a national culture that expels racialized queer migrants, metaphorically and often literally (see Rand’s essay).

Renato Rosaldo describes how the exclusions that founded normative constructions of U.S. citizenship and nation concomitantly “defined the parameters of dissident traditions that have endured into the present.”49 These dissident traditions provided a basis from which the meanings and limits of nation, citizenry, and citizenship have been fiercely contested and partly remade. All the essays in this volume, but especially the three ethnographies by Peña, Roque Ramírez, and Manalansan, provide rich, detailed analyses of efforts to contest and rework the limits of nation and citizenship, from the perspective of racialized queer migrants and the heterogeneous peoples with whom they live, work, mobilize, and love. Building on Rosaldo’s redefinition of citizenship as a category to be studied not from the top down, in terms of legal definitions of rights and obligations, but from the bottom up, in terms of everyday practices that inhabit, transform, and extend the meaning of citizenship, the essays make clear how complex citizenship actually is. They also underscore the necessity of moving beyond single-axis analyses that address only the citizen/alien dichotomy, or the experiences of citizens
subordinated along one axis, to theorize how aliens' and citizens' statuses complexly implicate one another, and how people who are multiply marginalized negotiate nationhood and citizenship. The essays ground dissident traditions not only in the legacies of U.S. exclusions but also in the cultural forms of other countries to which migrants have ties.

By centering racialized queer migrants, these essays both build on and usefully extend scholarship on immigration, sexuality, citizenship, nation-making, and racialization.

**Placing Migration and Sexuality Scholarship in Critical Conversation**

A small group of dedicated scholars including Martin F. Manalansan IV, Oliva Espín, and M. Jacqui Alexander has published pioneering studies of queer migration. Essays in a handful of special editions of journals, and some anthologies, have also broadened the scope of our knowledge. These include essays in “Thinking Sexuality Transnationally,” a special issue of *GLQ: Queer Transsexions of Race, Nation, and Gender,* a special issue of *Social Text,* Cindy Patton and Benigno Sánchez-Eppler’s collection *Queer Diasporas,* and anthologies such as David Eng and Alice Hom’s *Q & A: Queer in Asian America.* Personal accounts, too, contained in edited collections, have contributed to our knowledge. In various ways, these works have brought immigration and sexuality scholarship into critical conversation in a manner that resonates within theories of citizenship, nation-making, and racialization. Without wanting to oversimplify the vast literatures involved, some basic ideas in each area must be grasped in order to appreciate the essays that bring them together. I want to review these basic ideas briefly, then describe how some of the scholars listed above have linked them to create an important body of work on which this collection builds.

To begin, immigration scholarship has undergone vast revision in recent decades, impelled in part by the enormous growth in migration worldwide. Traditionally, studies of immigration have been framed by a view of migrants as individual actors making rational choices based on cost-benefit analysis, the horizon of the nation-state, and models of assimilation. The contemporary reorganization of capitalism, growing globalization, and increased worldwide migration have forced a rethinking of these frameworks, however. Thus, scholars such as Saskia Sassen have posited that immigration to the United States is not only driven by
cost-benefit analysis at the individual level. It is also driven by historic and ongoing linkages that have been crafted between the United States and other countries, which create “bridges for migration.”\textsuperscript{53} Substantiating Sassen’s argument that large structural relations significantly contribute to migration is the fact that it is not usually people from the poorest countries who migrate to the United States, but rather people from countries with which the United States has had close historic ties. This includes people from Mexico, the Philippines, and South Korea, who have steadily migrated in the past quarter century, even during periods of economic growth in their own countries. Sassen’s argument challenges not only the reduction of migration to individual cost-benefit decisions,\textsuperscript{54} but also frameworks that treat the sovereign nation as an unquestioned horizon of analysis without consideration of wider, unequal global relations.\textsuperscript{55}

If scholarship like Sassen’s has greatly complicated traditional models of why people migrate, others have similarly challenged traditional models of assimilation. Assimilation describes a process whereby migrants are expected gradually to alter their beliefs and cultural forms to conform to the mainstream United States. Of course, many scholars have convincingly argued that this model only works for “whites”; as race theorists Michael Omi and Howard Winant describe, communities of color historically found that adopting mainstream ways did not appreciably alter the racial discrimination to which they were subjected.\textsuperscript{56} Challenges to assimilation models have emerged in contemporary immigration scholarship, too, including through the work of scholars Nina Glick Schiller, Linda Basch, and Cristina Blanc-Szanton, who have developed an influential model of transnationalism. Transnationalism views migrants as individuals who “take actions, make decisions, and develop identities within social networks that connect them to two or more societies simultaneously.”\textsuperscript{57} Thus, growing familiarity with and involvement in U.S. society and culture does not necessarily result in withering ties to home countries, nor does it presuppose a unilinear process of assimilation. Patricia Pessar has outlined structural factors that often contribute to sustaining such home country ties. According to Pessar, changes in the structure of capitalism on a global scale “contribute to deteriorating social and economic conditions in both home and host societies with no locale being, necessarily, a secure site of permanent settlement.” Moreover, institutional racial discrimination dis-
courages “immigrants of color” from “pursuing long-term or permanent settlement in the United States.” Finally, nation-building projects in both host and home societies solicit migrants’ loyalties. President Aristide’s efforts to draw on the resources of overseas Haitian migrants, whom he characterized as Haiti’s “Tenth Department” and integral to Haiti’s future, is just one among many examples of how “sending” countries continue to solicit migrants’ loyalties. Such contemporary immigration scholarship on transnationalism—not to mention the vast literature on diaspora—radically revises assimilationist understandings of how and why migrants form identities and communities or take action. Moreover, it relates these processes to social institutions, ideologies, and local/global arrangements of power in ways that have enormous implications for the theorization of race, sexuality, gender, class struggle, and citizenship at different scales.

Since the 1970s, immigration scholarship has variously addressed how race, class, and gender relations and ideologies structure migration processes. But it has not generally addressed sexuality, which tends to be deemed unimportant or equated with gender. However, as Eve Sedgwick cogently explains, “the question of gender and the question of sexuality, inextricable from one another though they are . . . are nonetheless not the same question.” Furthermore, Sedgwick warns, “a damaging bias toward heterosocial or heterosexist assumptions inheres unavoidably in the very concept of gender.” Her argument suggests that migration scholarship’s attention to gender cannot substitute for an analysis of sexuality as a crucial, related, but distinct axis that structures all migration processes.

An analysis of sexuality begins from the understanding that sexuality is not the last bastion of the “natural” or the biological in an increasingly technological world. Biology certainly plays a role, but biology is always experienced through cultural mediation. Consequently, sexual norms, identities, experiences, and arrangements vary historically and culturally. Efforts to regulate sexuality have been important in all societies, perhaps because sexuality is situated at the juncture of two major axes of concern: the individual, who must be “properly” formed; and society, including “the future growth, well-being, health, and prosperity of the population as a whole.” In the United States in the nineteenth century, sexual regulation underwent a significant change as the locus of control shifted from families and churches to the medical profession.
and state, including its developing criminal, health care, education, and welfare systems. Shifts in sexual regulation were also evinced by the development of sexual typologies, with particular attention to "deviant" or "dangerous" sexualities. Deviant sexuality was no longer viewed as simply involving undesirable acts, but rather as a marker of individual identity. Foucault's most famous illustration of these changes concerns homosexuality. According to Foucault, although sodomy had long been prohibited as an immoral or criminal act, persons who engaged in sodomy were not necessarily considered distinct types of persons. That changed in the nineteenth century when "the homosexual became a personage, a past, a case history, and a childhood, in addition to being a type of life, a life form. . . . The homosexual was now a species." Homosexuals and other "deviants" were the first groups to be delineated by sexologists, but heterosexuality as a normative and desirable identity became elaborated, promoted, and consolidated by the 1920s. These sexual typologies became incorporated into immigration law, as described earlier.

Efforts to regulate sexuality have been inextricable from racial, gender, and class controls. These interconnections have been richly documented by scholars in many disciplines, including ethnic studies, women's studies, queer theory, sociology, history, and literature. Scholars have also theorized how sexual regulation facilitated imperial projects. According to Ann Laura Stoler, "the regulation of sexual relations was central to the development of particular kinds of colonial settlements and to the allocation of economic activity within them." Indeed, "the very categories of 'colonizer' and 'colonized' were secured through forms of sexual control." As discussed earlier, the regulation of sexuality, carried out in tandem with immigration control, has also been a central technology for continually reconstructing the nation-state and citizenry within particular limits, historically and at present.

Finally, scholarship by feminists of color and queers of color emphasizes that interconnections among sexuality, race, class, gender, nation, and imperialism transform each category, necessitating new modes of theoretical engagement. Thus, Eng and Hom's analysis of queer Asian Americans stresses:

We are not delineating an additive model of social inequity. . . . Sexuality and race cannot be brought into symmetrical alignment with each other. They are not commensurate oppressions easily catalogued or equated.
Instead, the two share a constitutive and dynamic relationship, one whose dialectical combination often yields unrecognized, unacknowledged and understudied configurations. These rich analyses of how sexuality is implicated in multiple relations of power, domination, and resistance provide valuable tools for the study of queer migration, on its own terms and in relation to nation-making and citizenship processes.

Liberationist Narratives and Revisions

Despite pioneering research about queer migrants' lives, which has brought sexuality and migration scholarship into productive dialogue, the majority of accounts of queer migration tend to remain organized around a narrative of movement from repression to freedom, or a heroic journey undertaken in search of liberation. Certainly, it is appropriate to describe and appreciate the struggles and fierce dreams that have impelled queer migration. Queer migrants—not only those seeking asylum from persecution, but also those whose stories are more quotidian—often describe their experiences using precisely these terms. Scholars and activists also often use the terms. The difficulty arises, though, when the search for "freedom" and new possibilities become the only elements of queer migration that are addressed. When that happens, complex migration processes become reduced to oversimplified dynamics that reinscribe dominant nationalist myths of the United States as a land of freedom and democracy and erase the struggle, suffering, and resistance experienced by subordinated groups. Furthermore, queer migrants' experiences risk becoming appropriated to serve foreign policy objectives, and their subjectivities and histories become represented within colonialist, racist understandings of culture and identity. I want to briefly address these points, drawing on the work of many of the scholars mentioned earlier, who provide ways to study queer migration without becoming enmeshed in these difficulties.

Martin F. Manalansan IV has built on transnational, diasporic, and other models that reject strictly nation- and state-centered analyses in favor of analyses that highlight the salience of historical and ongoing links among different regions. In a 1997 essay, he highlights these linkages in order to underscore that while queer Filipino migrants may be searching for freedom from oppression, their oppression has been significantly shaped by the legacies of U.S. colonization and by ongoing...
economic and political relationships between the United States and the Philippines. Under these circumstances, queer Filipinos' migration emerges not simply as a search for freedom in the United States, but also as a search for alternatives to circumstances in the Philippines in which the United States is centrally (though not solely) implicated. Consequently, queer Filipino immigration cannot be read as a comfortable reiteration of dominant U.S. nationalist myths.

By stressing historical and ongoing connections between the United States and the Philippines, Manalansan makes clear that queers migrate not simply as sexual subjects, but also as racialized, classed, gendered subjects of particular regions and nations that exist in various historic relationships to U.S. hegemony. In this way, he echoes a crucial thread of sexuality scholarship that insists on treating queers not solely as sexual subjects, but in relation to multiple identities that directly affect them. At the same time, he revises that scholarship by transporting it to a global field structured by historic legacies and contemporary forms of inequality and exploitation between and among nations and regions. He also revises migration scholarship by centering sexuality as a critical structuring factor.

Scholars such as Manalansan document that although queer migrants may be searching for multiple forms of freedom, that does not mean they will find it. For the narrative of the United States as a land of freedom and opportunity, which often implicitly guides writings about queer and other migrations, represses the long history of how freedom and opportunity for some has generally been purchased at the expense of the many. This includes subordinated racial and ethnic groups, women, poor and working people, and queers. When queers migrate to the United States, they become inserted into that history and inherit its many legacies. The fact that lesbians and gays were barred from even legally entering the United States as immigrants until 1990, and still face forms of subtle and not-so-subtle discrimination in the immigration system, clearly challenges any simple claim that migration to the United States involves the attainment of freedom.

Oliva Espin has provided a detailed examination of how homophobia, racism, sexism, language, and legal status affect Latina lesbian migrants in the United States. According to Espin, Latina migrants frequently find themselves caught "between the racism of the dominant society and the sexist expectations of [their] own communit[ies]" as they strug-
gle to negotiate identity and community. Since women are typically constructed as the repositories of cultural tradition, their sexual behavior tends to become viewed—by both migrant communities and dominant cultures—as “evidence” of the worth of the group, and policed accordingly. Of course, contestations about the worth of particular migrant groups cannot be separated from the global histories and linkages that Manalansan has described. For Latinas in the United States, these factors make claiming a lesbian identity particularly complicated. Moreover, they underscore the need to revise triumphal stories based on assimilationist models.

Espin not only speaks to issues described in migration and sexuality scholarship, but also raises questions for each of them. For instance, while migration scholars have examined conflicts between migrants and various U.S. communities, they have paid little attention to sexuality as a particular area of conflict. Moreover, centering migrant homosexuality as a site of conflict suggests that accounts of migrants’ settlement, community formation, and cultural transmission are organized around implicitly heterosexist norms that require significant revision. At the same time, the ways that heterosexuality itself becomes reconstructed through migration also requires critical attention.

Anne Maguire’s “The Accidental Immigrant” affirms the difficulty of creating a sense of “home” for lesbian migrants in the United States—even those who are white and English speaking—with the resulting turn by some toward political activism. The Irish Lesbian and Gay Organization (ILGO) was founded to address the specific concerns of immigrant Irish lesbians and gays. Yet, as Maguire describes, the question of whether ILGO should be allowed to participate in New York City’s St. Patrick’s Day parade soon overshadowed all other functions of the group. The U.S. Supreme Court eventually affirmed ILGO’s exclusion from the parade. As Maguire sums up, the parade “is where our ‘coming out’ took place in Irish America and where we were told that we did not belong, nor were we welcome.” These struggles also affected St. Patrick’s Day parades in other U.S. cities, including Boston and San Francisco, and in Ireland. As Maguire describes, “the greeting, ‘Hello New York’ jumped out at us from a photograph of the thirty lesbians and two gay men who marched in the St. Patrick’s Day parade in Cork [Ireland] in 1992. This brave act of solidarity and support caused much joy, pride, amusement, and a little sadness in ILGO.” ILGO’s struggle also resonated
with struggles over "out" lesbian, gay, bi, trans, and queer participation in other major ethnic and national parades, such as the India Day Parade.

Maguire's essay certainly suggests that sexuality scholars' accounts of queer activism need to be revised to understand and account for the forms of activism and specific political concerns of queer migrants. Echoing Maguire, Grace Poore describes how fear of the immigration control authorities leads some queer immigrants to restrict their associations and activities: "We understand why some of us never march on the outside of Gay Pride contingents in case of cameras. Why many of us fear going into bars in case of a raid. Why we only do radio interviews, never have our photographs taken." At the same time, Poore describes how she negotiated these restrictions: "If I couldn't sign petitions, I distributed them; if I couldn't lead meetings, I organized them; if I couldn't do civil disobedience, I wrote." But these forms of activism, which represent migrants' creative adaptation to their circumstances, remain liable to misinterpretation by individuals and activists who privilege only one form of "being out," and see other forms as betrayal, inauthenticity, or lack of developed political consciousness. For these reasons, queer migrants' contributions to political activism have only recently begun to be appreciated and analyzed.

Queer migrants' contributions to cultural work, like Guillermo Reyes's play *Deporting the Divas*, have also largely remained "undocumented and unexamined," according to David Román. Román's critical analyses felicitously combine José Muñoz's framework of "queer acts" with Lisa Lowe's theorization of "immigrant acts" to suggest that queer migrants' cultural works constitute "queer immigrant acts" that both expand theatrical representation and demand critical interrogation of race, gender, and sexuality as these intersect with histories of displacement and migration.

Other scholars have problematized how the U.S. state appropriates queer migrants' presence for foreign policy objectives. Lourdes Arguelles and B. Ruby Rich have charted "the construction of an anti-Castro campaign [in the United States] predicated on Cuba's repression of homosexual-rights," which oversimplified and misrepresented gay Cuban migrants' experiences and the larger circumstances of their journeys. This campaign substantially reinforced and shored up the U.S. government's policies toward Cuba. As a result, many gay and lesbian Cuban migrants felt themselves to be torn between "total integration..."
into the American gay (frequently racist and classist) mainstream or an all-Cuban émigré existence,” neither of which seemed like adequate alternatives. They struggled to craft other options, although some did not survive the process.

Arguelles and Rich call for further investigation into and critique of the “U.S. use of émigré communities in foreign policy and domestic control initiatives.” Such an investigation would need to address not only the points raised by Arguelles and Rich, but also how queer asylum seekers’ testimonies are elicited in ways that reinforce dominant nationalism and imperialism without necessarily leading to sanctuary for the individuals concerned.

These scholarly writings make clear that migration rarely represents a clear-cut resolution to the difficulties that queers face. Rather, they must deal with racial, gender, class, cultural, sexual, and language barriers that are inextricable from global histories of imperialism and exploitation that link the United States to other countries and regions. Queer migrants also experience jeopardy based on their status as noncitizens—a jeopardy that has significantly intensified since the events of September 11, 2001. By highlighting these issues, a foundational body of queer migration scholarship has revised the liberationist narrative of queer migration as a heroic personal search for freedom—celebrating personal actions, but placing them in a larger critical context.

Several scholars, while not explicitly concerned with queer migration across international borders, have advanced arguments that are very useful. One important area of research concerns patterns of queer migration within national borders. Carl Stychin observes, “the significance of [internal] migration in the constitution of lesbian and gay subjectivities is increasingly documented, particularly from within the discipline of geography.” Historian John D’Emilio has drawn attention to the significance of internal migration, especially after World War II, when demobilization, new employment opportunities, and the increased sexualization of commerce drew tens of thousands of gay men and lesbians to major U.S. cities. In subsequent decades, as Kath Weston describes, the “Great Gay Migrations” to cities continued. In the process, gays, lesbians, and others crafted identities structured around “a symbolic of urban/rural relations [that located] gay subjects in the city” while transforming cities into sites of community and political power. Such scholarship, which attends to the ways that mobility within countries has been
central to the constitution of lesbian, gay, and queer identities, interrupts monolithic nationalist narratives of the United States and fragments the United States into spaces of both freedom and oppression, possibility and constraint. It also invites us to consider possible linkages among U.S. and migrant queers, based on histories of mobility.

Another valuable area of emerging scholarship examines how identities—such as queer, lesbian, gay, bi, and trans—circulate in local and global contexts, including through queer tourism, and are variously claimed, inhabited, and rearticulated. This scholarship builds on several sources, including analyses of globalization and theories that situate cultural changes within relations of power and inequality. Lisa Rofel, writing on men in Beijing, China, who call themselves gay, offers an example of this scholarship and its use for the study of queer migrants. Rofel begins by noting that claims of gay identity by men who are not white, Western, and middle-class tend to be conceptualized as evidence that globalization has modernized, Westernized, and homogenized various cultures. The result, according to some scholars, is the emergence of global gay identity. But Rofel challenges the equation of globalization with Westernization and homogenization. As she suggests, globalization is never simply a matter of Western standards entering China or other countries “as an unimpeded cultural flow” that results in homogenization. Rather, gay men in China actively engage Western (and other) models of gayness, but in the process transform and rework them.

Rofel not only challenges notions of globalization as homogenization and Westernization, but also refuses the colonialist models of culture on which such notions implicitly hinge. As she explains, the belief that claiming gay identity is a consequence of Westernization participates in colonialist models that view non-Western culture “as timeless, bounded, homogenous, and unchanging.” Moreover, “there appears to be a ‘stepladder’ version of culture and modernity here such that the more one looks like the West, the more one sheds any markers of culture.” According to Rofel, such models of culture have been roundly critiqued in anthropology. Nonetheless, they continue to implicitly and explicitly structure scholarship about gays in other countries and cultures, such that “gay men in Asia can be either universal or Asian but not both, even as their Asianness continues to leave them in the place of otherness to global gayness.”
Rofel’s analysis of the ways that men engage and rework various models of gayness that circulate through Beijing leads her to conclude that “what gay identity ends up looking like in any one place in the world today is not a foregone conclusion; certainly, it is not a straightforward matter of joining the global gay human race.” Similarly, when migrants in the United States claim gay, queer, or other identities, these claims do not simply reflect assimilation to dominant Western sexuality norms. Rather, they reflect complex processes of cultural transformation that occur within relations of power. When migrants claim queer identity, they strategically invoke, inhabit, and transform the term in relation to these wider cultural and historical processes.

These scholarly works have reformulated “migration as liberation” narratives along more complex lines and, in the process, offered valuable tools for the continued study of queer migrants. The essays in this volume build on that foundation, while extending the debates into new realms.

**Disciplining Queer Migrants and Queering Racial/Ethnic Communities**

The essays in this volume are divided into two thematic groups. “Part I: Disciplining Queer Migrants” provides historical, cultural, and structural analyses of norms, institutions, and discourses that affect queer (and other) migrants in the United States. “Part II: Queering Racial/Ethnic Communities” offers rich ethnographic and sociological studies of queer migrants’ lives and communities in Miami, New York, and San Francisco, which are key settlement cities for contemporary U.S. migrants.

Scholars in the first group of essays historicize the multiple modes of regulation and discipline to which migrants are subjected, including practices that have made them into one of the fastest-growing incarcerated groups in America. Alisa Solomon’s essay focuses on the experiences of Cristina Madraso, a Mexican transsexual woman who sought asylum in the United States but was instead locked up at the Krome Detention Center in Florida, where she was raped twice by a guard. Solomon’s analysis examines how guards and other officials use gender and sexual violence to informally demarcate who, in their view, does and does not belong within the U.S. nation. She also urgently problematizes how multiply subordinated people like Madraso remain literally
“illegible” within rights regimes that are supposed to offer protection. At the same time, Solomon details how Madraso has challenged these violent erasures, seeking to craft her own “American dream.”

Carceral practices involve not only the institutions in which migrants become detained, but also the immigration control apparatus, the judicial system, Congress, and public discourses used to frame, explain, and legitimize migrants’ treatment. Tim Randazzo’s essay offers insight into this more expansive version of the carceral network by providing a history of how, in 1994, persecuted lesbians, gay men, and transgender people came to be designated as eligible to apply for asylum. Although the asylum system offers protection to some people, Randazzo shows it also significantly participates in multiplying distinctions and inequalities among queers based on gender, race, class, and national origin.

Cantú, Luibhéid, and Stern provide a case study of how the asylum system multiplies inequalities not only on a national but also an international scale. The case study was initially composed by Cantú. After his sudden death in 2002, Luibhéid and Stern revised his draft to clarify the theoretical questions he wanted to raise. Focusing on cases involving Mexican-origin queers, the essay shows how the discourses and practices for processing asylum claims perpetuate essentializing, colonialist, and binarized conceptions of sexual, racial, gender, and national identities—even while transnational processes weave U.S. and Mexican people, communities, and cultures into ever closer contact. Thus, there exists a contradiction between colonialist models of hermetically sealed identities and cultures, and the reality of increasing trade, contact, and cultural and population exchange between Mexico and the United States. As these authors suggest, the asylum system’s role in perpetuating colonialist imagery has material consequences for U.S.–Latin American relations, U.S. Latinos, and Latin Americans seeking asylum in the United States.

The perpetuation of inequalities through the asylum system echoes the history of disparate citizenship possibilities for peoples within the United States, as Siobhan Somerville addresses. Focusing on the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952, which established the framework through which immigration and naturalization remain controlled today, Somerville inquires into the shifting links between racial and sexual controls in the production of U.S. citizens through naturalization. Somerville draws on congressional testimonies, letters from the public, court documents,
and other materials to suggest that sexuality exclusions in the McCarran-Walter Act provided lawmakers with a means to reinvigorate a hegemonic national fantasy of “pure blood,” with its associated property relations, in the absence of an explicit discourse of race. Somerville’s “queer” analysis of the heterosexual and racial imaginaries that undergird the production of American citizenship valuably theorizes race, sexuality, and citizenship as thoroughly intertwined in one another.

Erica Rand concludes the first group of essays. Drawing on popular and commodity cultural materials, her playful veneration of the Statue of Liberty as an erotic icon both recuperates a hegemonic national symbol into queer history and resituates queerness at the center of mainstream immigration narratives. Her analysis of the ceremonies and celebrations staged around Lady Liberty’s restoration in 1986 reveals the systemic occlusions of gender, sexual, racial, and class oppression that underpin dominant discourses of America as a melting pot and bastion of liberty, and render racialized queer migrant subjects literally unthinkable. Rand’s expository style, as much as her analysis, insists on queering traditional scholarly studies of immigration.

Part II complements the first part by providing complex analyses of how queer migrant individuals and communities negotiate disciplinary and regulatory structures while simultaneously crafting identities, communities, cultural forms, and political activism. The essays establish central linkages among sexuality and other modes of regulation in migrants’ lives. Not just economics, but gender, national origin, racialization, and class processes, as these intersect with sexuality, are addressed. While the essays remain grounded in specific communities, they make abundantly clear how transnational communities, relations, and processes continually reconfigure these locales. The essays also document histories that have been literally ignored and unexplored. These include the lives of queer migrants, to be sure, but more specifically histories such as queer Salvadorans negotiating identities in relation to Mexican and Chicano queer communities in the San Francisco Bay Area. In these ways, the essays document struggles not only within communities, but also across communities and locales that reveal points of alliance, collaboration, and transformation. They enormously complicate our understanding of citizenship as lived practice versus legal rights and obligations and the dynamic interplay between these forces. The focus on migrants’ lives within cities is particularly apposite because significant numbers
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of contemporary migrants live in cities and because, as Holston and Appadurai argue, cities "are especially privileged sites for considering the current renegotiation of citizenship."

Cuba and Miami, Florida, emerge as crucially linked locales in Susana Peña’s essay. Peña analyzes the 1980 Mariel exodus from Cuba as a means for understanding both how queer migrant histories become silenced within official records and how queer migrant cultures develop. Prior to their migration, gay Marielitos had experienced repression for engaging in “ostentatious” public displays of homosexuality through transgressions of gender codes of dress, style, and conduct. Yet, the U.S. media extended Castro’s logic of erasing homosexuality from the public sphere by rarely acknowledging the presence of these gay men among the Mariel arrivals. When serious discussion about gay Marielitos appeared in the media, it was quickly silenced and delegitimated through statements issued by a prominent U.S. immigration scholar, Cuban American Alejandro Portes, and others. Peña’s essay traces how one of this century’s significant queer migrations has been rendered invisible and unspeakable by media, scholars, local communities, and queers themselves.

Although the Cuban state and U.S. forces worked in tandem to render the men invisible, the Mariel migrants had a palpable impact on Cuban American culture that was substantially organized around visible gender transgression. Cuban American men in Miami, then, negotiate their sexual and cultural identities within the competing logics of silence and visibility and in relation to a circuit of Cubanidad that implicates the island and Miami in continually changing ways.

Martin Manalansan uses ethnographic techniques to examine the private spaces and everyday lives of queer Filipino migrant men living in another major migrant city, New York. He shows that while engaged in mundane activities, such as dressing for work and using the telephone, his informants confront and negotiate transnational structures of imperialism, racism, and gender and class oppression that are lived with local, everyday immediacy. The everyday, then, provides a site for understanding how diasporic queers of color forge selves, intimacy, and home in the face of these multiple displacements and forms of violence. Manalansan convincingly argues that diasporic Filipino gay men live an alter-
native modernity that is neither dependent on Western mainstream queer culture nor reducible to an assimilative framework, but rather demands new methodologies and theories—which Manalansan’s essay models—in order to be understood. For these men, Manalansan argues, citizenship is not a matter of birthright or of romantic dissidence, but about survival.

Despite very useful developments, citizenship scholarship still tends to presume either that all queers are legal citizens or that all immigrants are heterosexual. Horacio Roque Ramírez’s essay bridges that gap and illuminates the experiences of queer Latino migrants who negotiate citizenship and social membership in the San Francisco Bay Area through cultural work. Roque Ramírez situates the production and reception of two cultural works—the Salvadoran-based play El Corazón Nunca Me Ha Mentido (1984) and the film Del Otro Lado (1998)—in relation to transformations wrought by migration, AIDS, and anti-immigrant organizing in San Francisco neighborhoods. As he beautifully shows, these cultural works constituted important sites through which community identities, histories, memories, and collective action became contested and reworked within those changing neighborhoods and in relation to larger transnational circuits.

As a collection, the essays establish queer migration as central in the making of migrant, racial, ethnic, and sexual communities, politics, cultural work, and struggles for social justice—historically and at present. Building on foundational work, as well as the best in contemporary sexuality and immigration scholarship, they open up multiple, pressing questions for further analysis. In particular, the authors urge that sexuality scholarship closely attend to the dynamics of past and contemporary immigration, and that immigration scholarship attend to the dynamics of sexuality—in all its forms—in structuring migration.

Notes

For assistance with conceptualizing this introduction, many thanks to Rob Buffington, Lionel Cantú, Hai Ren, Val Rohey, and Siobhan Somerville. For further revision suggestions, I am very grateful to Arlene Keizer, Susana Peña, Radhika Gajjala, Vicki Patraka, and John Warren.

1. Several essays that we solicited, which addressed lesbian migration, the reconstruction of heterosexuality through migration, and HIV and migration, were unavailable as this collection went to press. Future collections will have to address these important subjects. On the difficulties of generating scholarship about lesbians


4. Take the example of paid employment. Most migrants contribute to the U.S. economy through paid employment. Yet, legal distinctions have enormous consequences for migrants’ employment possibilities. Legal immigrants may work without hindrance, except in certain federal jobs, and are technically eligible for the same protections (or lack thereof) as their citizen counterparts. Refugees may also work and are eligible for federally funded job training and placement assistance. Asylum seekers cannot legally work for at least six months (longer if the government has detained them) and must then apply to the government for permission. The undocumented are not supposed to hold paying jobs, but, given employers’ demands for their labor, they often work anyway, under conditions of great exploitation and at continual risk of deportation. These contrasts make clear that legal status distinctions significantly shape conditions and possibilities for migrants.


6. Thus, the production of U.S. nation, citizenry, and citizenship through immigration control operates through multi-axial differentiations that not only contrast citizens with noncitizens (or “aliens”), but also make differentiations among aliens. As we will see later, the differentiations among aliens both stem from and further reinforce actual differentiations that continue to shape life possibilities for U.S. citizens, too.


10. Grace Poore, “Three Movements in A Minor: Lesbians and Immigration,” *Off Our Backs*, August–September 1996, 12. On Valentine’s Day 2000, Representative Jerrold Nadler introduced the *Permanent Partners Immigration Act (HR 690)*, which was intended to enable migrants in binational lesbian/gay relationships to receive U.S. residency, but the bill has not yet received a hearing. Thus, binational couples remain a largely invisible constituency, who “keep their mouths shut” for fear of attracting INS attention and investigation (Donayre, “Binational Couples,” 25). The Lesbian and Gay Immigration Rights Taskforce (LGI RTF), with fifteen chapters in the United States, has, however, provided a forum for binational couples. Additionally, according to Donayre, “the internet has [also] provided this community with a tremendous tool” (25).


16. Luibhéid, Entry Denied, chapter 3.

17. Filipinos were the only group exempted from Asian exclusion since the United States had acquired the Philippines. Nonetheless, the Tydings McDuffie Act of 1934 reduced Filipino migration to fifty people a year. See Bill Ong Hing, Making and Remaking Asian America through Immigration Policy (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993), 35.


23. The preference system describes family relationships that qualify for immigrant visas and sets limits for how many visas may be issued each year for each category. Moreover, certain relatives qualify as "immediate relatives," and are exempt from annual numerical limitations. The exempt categories are currently spouses, unmarried children under twenty-one, and parents of adult U.S. citizens. Other family relationships that qualify for an immigrant visa, but within quota limits, are described at http://uscis.gov/graphics/services/imm_visas.htm.

24. David Reimers, Still the Golden Door: The Third World Comes to America (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992). The 1965 emphasis on family also had an economic dimension; families were expected to generate growth through consumption.


27. Ibid., 139.

28. At the same time, migrants, migrant communities, sending-country officials, and various U.S. constituencies have contested and renegotiated these distinctions.

29. For an overview of the history of the refugee/asylum system in the United States, see Norman L. Zucker and Naomi Flint Zucker, The Guarded Gate: The Reality of American Refugee Policy (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanvich, 1987); and Philip Shrag, A Well-Founded Fear: The Congressional Battle to Save Political Asylum in America (New York: Routledge, 2000). Technically, the distinction between a refugee and an asylum seeker is that refugees have been preapproved for admission, based on human rights criteria, before they ever arrive in the United States. Asylum seekers, by contrast, seek asylum from within the United States’ borders, having entered in some other way.


31. See Luibheid, Entry Denied, 105-18.


34. See Giorgio Agamben, Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life, trans. Daniel Heller Roazen (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998), including his discussion of World War II concentration camps as "states of exception" that remain outside of, but at the same time foundational for, national sovereignty. Moreover, according to Agamben, "the camp is the very paradigm of political space at the point at which politics becomes biopolitics" (171), and thus the camp represents "the political space of modernity itself" (174). His analysis questions how "human beings could be so completely deprived of their rights and prerogatives that no act
committed against them could appear any longer as a crime," a question that demands urgent consideration in terms of detained migrants, too (171).


37. Robert S. Chang, Disoriented: Asian Americans, Law, and the Nation-State (New York: New York University Press, 1999). In regard to citizenship, as James Holston and Arjun Appadurai explain, “Since the eighteenth century, one of the defining marks of modernity has been the use of two linked concepts of association—citizenship and nationality—to establish the meaning of full membership in society. Citizenship rather than subjectship or kinship or cultship has defined the prerogatives and encumbrances of that membership, and the nation-state rather than the neighborhood or the city or the region established its scope. What it meant to be a member of society in many areas of the world came to be understood, to a significant degree, in terms of what it means to be a rights-bearing citizen of a territorial nation-state.” See James Holston and Arjun Appadurai, “Cities and Citizenship,” Public Culture 8, no. 2 (Winter 1996): 187.


39. Moreover, citizenship law has been a site where individuals contested, and the courts imposed, particular definitions of who was white. See Ian Haney Lopez, White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race (New York: New York University Press, 1996).


46. T. H. Marshall's foundational work conceived citizenship as involving an evolutionary succession of rights: civil or legal, political, and social. See, for example, T. H. Marshall, *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950). Recent scholarship also addresses consumer rights and cultural rights as dimensions of citizenship.
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51. GLQ 5, no. 4 (1999); Social Text, no. 52–53 (Fall–Winter 1997); Patton and Sánchez-Eppler, eds., Queer Diasporas; David Eng and Alice Hom, eds., Q & A: Queer in Asian America (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998).


54. This cost-benefit framework reaffirms dominant nationalist narratives that suggest that migrants come because the United States is simply “better” than wherever they are from. Lauren Berlant has described how such narratives construct the immigrant as “someone who desires America” in a manner that validates dominant North American nationalist identity. See Berlant, The Queen of America Goes to Washington City: 195. See also Bonnie Honig, Democracy and the Foreigner (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001).

55. Moreover, Sassen and a group of other scholars argue that the government’s control of migration actually provides the means through which nation-states continue to constitute themselves as nation-states precisely at a moment when globalization is reworking the salience of the nation-state. For example, see Roxanne Lynn Doty, “The Double Writing of Statecraft: Exploring State Responses to Illegal Immigration,” Alternatives 21 (1996): 171–89; Nevzat Soguk, States and Strangers: Refugees and Displacements of Statecraft (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999).


63. Foucault, The History of Sexuality, 1: 43.


66. Manalansan, “In the Shadows of Stonewall.” Moreover, when situated within Sassen’s framework, Filipino migration is clearly connected to the imperial, economic, and military ties that exist between the United States and the Philippines.


69. Chandan Reddy and Javid Syed valuably note that even gaining legal residence or citizenship need not be read within a linear narrative of assimilation to dominant national culture, for acquiring the documents that accompany these statuses may be migrants' primary goal. Such documents help "to ward off violences committed to immigrants here in the U.S." See Chandan Reddy and Javid Syed, "I Left My Country for This?" *Rice Combo* 20 (April–May 2001), at www.apiwellness.org/v20/ricecombo/mycountry.html.

70. See Gloria González López, "Beyond the Bed Sheets, Beyond the Borders: Mexican Immigrant Women and Their Sex Lives" (Ph.D. diss., University of Southern California, 2000).


75. Carl Stychin has analyzed how the figure of the homosexual as a threat gets used in the service of nation-building, particularly in times of crisis: "homosexuality has been associated with Communism, fascism, bourgeois capitalism, colonialism, the West and north, the east and south, environmentalism, Europe, and North America. In the project of nation building, homosexuality is a ready discursive tool that can be conflated with any enemy of the state, in the process of becoming the enemy within." See Carl R. Stychin, *A Nation by Rights: National Cultures, Sexual Identity Politics, and the Discourse of Rights* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998), 194.

Conversely, other scholars have analyzed how the figure of the homosexual gets strategically deployed as a sign of a nation-state's claim to modernity and democracy. Such uses are intended to alter nation-states' position within the hegemonic "family of nations," but are not necessarily indicative of progressive agendas on gay/
lesbian/queer matters. For example, Gabriel Giorgi suggests that the Spanish government deployed images of Chueca, Madrid’s new gay quarter, as “an example of the new openness that allegedly characterizes Spain today” (60). This deployment reveals the Spanish government’s wish to be seen as aligned with “older, so-called advanced democracies” (61), and its repudiation of selective aspects of Spain’s past.

Significantly, however, Giorgi also describes how the gays that populate Checua are discursively constructed and governed in ways that oppose them to Third World immigrants, who are associated with dangerous “tradition.” Thus, the gay citizen or tourist and the Third World immigrant function as binary figures through which Spain’s modernity gets constructed. Needless to say, the Third World queer immigrant becomes literally inconceivable. Moreover, it is evident that governments’ utilization of gay figures to signal modernity and democracy replicates, remakes, and/or complicates hierarchies among queers based on race, gender, class, and nationality and, in the Spanish case, positions queers and immigrants as hostile. See Gabriel Giorgi, “Madrid en Tránsito: Travelers, Visibility, and Gay Identity,” in “Queer Tourism: Geographies of Globalization,” special issue, GLQ 8, no. 1–2 (2002): 57–79. See also Cindy Patton, “Stealth Bombers of Desire: The Globalization of ‘Alterity’ in Emerging Democracies,” in Queer Globalizations: Citizenship and the Afterlife of Colonialism, ed. Arul D. Cruz-Malavé and Martin F. Manalansan IV (New York: New York University Press, 2002), 195–218.

76. Lourdes Arguelles and B. Ruby Rich, “Homosexuality, Homophobia, and Revolution: Notes toward an Understanding of the Cuban Lesbian and Gay Male Experience, Part II,” Signs 11, no. 1 (Autumn 1985): 134. While the article’s analytical framework has been strongly questioned by some scholars, the issue that the authors raise about how the U.S. state uses queer migrants’ presence to advance foreign and domestic policy remains significant. Moreover, the article represents one of the earliest scholarly analyses of queer migrants, and merits attention for that reason, too. For a summary of controversies generated by this article, see Lawrence La Fountain-Stokes, “De un pájaro las dos alas: Travel Notes of a Queer Puerto Rican in Havana,” GLQ 8, no. 1–2 (2002): 26–27n4.


78. Ibid., 135.

79. Moreover, scholarship has shown that, after a number of years, many migrants who are considered people of color within the U.S. racial order develop increasingly negative and pessimistic perceptions of their possibilities in the United States—even when their earnings improve. For example, see Alejandro Portes and Robert L. Bach, America in the Eyes of the Immigrants,” in their Latin Journey (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985). In regard to gender, Tienda and Booth summarized the results of a wide range of studies of how immigration affected women’s gendered positions, roles, and possibilities. Rather than finding that women experienced “liberation” from gender oppression through migration—which is the common assumption—they found that women generally confronted “restructured asymmetries.” In other words, some aspects of gender oppression lessened, others worsened, and some new forms of oppression emerged. See Marta Tienda and Karen Booth, “Gender, Migration, and Social Change,” in International Sociology 6, no. 1 (1991): 51–72.

80. As Muneer Ahmed describes, “Among the enormous violence done by the United States since the tragedies suffered on September 11 has been an unrelenting,
multivalent assault on the bodies, psyches, and rights of Arab, Muslim and South Asian immigrants. Restrictions on immigration of young men from Muslim countries, racial profiling and detention of 'Muslim looking' individuals, and an epidemic of hate violence against Arab, Muslim, and South Asian communities' have occurred (Muneer Ahmed, "Homeland Insecurities: Racial Violence the Day after September 11," Social Text, no. 72 [Fall 2002]: 101). There has also been an increased focus by police and immigration officials on noncitizens from Muslim and South Asian countries, "incommunicado detention, deporting citizens from those countries before citizens from elsewhere, and special admission and registration procedures for noncitizens from those countries" (Hiroshi Motomura, "Symposium on Confronting Realities: The Legal, Moral, and Constitutional Issues Involving Diversity, Panel II: Immigration Policy, Immigrants, and We the People after September 11," Albany Law Review 66 [2003]: 420).

Terrorists have also been portrayed as fanatics driven by their inappropriate masculinities and sexualities; "posters that appeared in midtown Manhattan only days after the attacks show a turbaned caricature of bin Laden being anally penetrated by the Empire State Building. The legend beneath reads, 'The Empire Strikes Back' or 'So you like skyscrapers, huh, bitch?'" (Jasbir K. Puar and Amit S. Rai, "Monster, Terrorist, Fag: The War on Terrorism and the Production of Docile Patriots," Social Text, no. 72 [Fall 2002]: 127). Conversely, most public expressions of grief relied on images of heterosexual families (usually white, not particularly poor, not evidently immigrant, and apparently models of approved gender and sexuality) as the primary victims of the attacks of September 11 and the means through which a response should be organized. The politics of sexuality, gender, race, ethnicity, and class, as these shape possibilities for migration and migrant life within the United States, have been radically restructured once more in the wake of September 11.


84. Of course, gender, racial, and class factors deeply shape opportunities for mobility, as many scholars have pointed out. The emerging scholarship on queer tourism valuably extends these analyses to show how differential access to mobility reconstitutes neocolonial relationships and imaginaries. See "Queer Tourism: Geographies of Globalization," ed. Jasbir Kaur Puar, special issue, GLQ 8, no. 1–2 (2002).

85. For discussions of globalization and culture, see Arjun Appadurai, Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996); Fredric Jameson and Masao Miyoshi, eds., The Cultures of Globalization (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998); Lowe and Lloyd, eds., The Politics of Culture in the Shadow of Capital. For models of culture that reject ideals of purity and evolutionary/assimilationist frameworks, see, for example, writings on mestizaje (Gloria Anzaldúa, Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza [San Francisco: Aunt Lute, 1987]; Jose Vasconcelos, La Raza Cósmica [Mexico: Espasa-Calpe, ...

88. Rofel describes her model as one of discrepant transcultural practices. She “emphasizes articulation, between Chinese gay men’s desires for cultural belonging in China and transcultural gay identifications, in which these men nonetheless continuously discern and imagine differences compelled by China’s colonial and socialist political histories with other nations. Transcultural practices resist interpretation in terms of either global impact or self-explanatory indigenous evolution. Instead, they open inquiry into contingent processes and performative evocations that do not presume equivalence but ask after confrontations charged with claims to power” (ibid., 457).
89. Ibid., 455.
90. Ibid., 470.
91. Manalansan’s Global Divas most thoroughly addresses this issue in terms of gay Filipino migrant men in New York City, who craft identities through “complex engagements with temporality and spaces” of diaspora (180). For a literary analysis of migrant queers that employs a transculturation model, see Kate McCollough’s “Marked by Genetics and Exile: Narrativizing Transcultural Sexualities in Memory Mambo,” GLQ 6, no. 4 (2000): 577–607. Her analysis examines how writer Achy Obejas negotiates Cuban and American histories in the life of her lesbian heroine, Juani Casas.