

QUEER/MIGRATION

An Unruly Body of Scholarship

Eithne Luibhéid

Most scholarship, policymaking, service provision, activism, and cultural work remain organized around the premise that migrants are heterosexuals (or on their way to becoming so) and queers are citizens (even though second-class ones). Where do queer migrants figure in these frameworks and activities? How do we conceptualize queer migration—which is at once a set of grounded processes involving heterogeneous social groups and a series of theoretical and social justice questions that implicate but extend beyond migration and sexuality strictly defined, and that refuse to attach to bodies in any strictly identitarian manner—in order to challenge and reconfigure the dominant frameworks? Queer migration scholarship, which has flourished since the 1990s, takes on these and other ambitious questions.¹

An unruly body of inquiry that is potentially vast in scope, queer migration scholarship participates in and contributes to wide-ranging debates that traverse multiple fields and disciplines. It has been fueled by the fact that international migration and related transnationalizing processes have transformed every facet of our social, cultural, economic, and political lives in recent decades. Sexuality scholarship has started to explore how “the age of migration” is centrally implicated in the construction, regulation, and reworking of sexual identities, communities, politics, and cultures.² At the same time, migration scholarship, which addresses immigration, emigration, transnationalism, diaspora, refugees, and asylum seekers, has begun to theorize how sexuality constitutes a “dense transfer point for relations of power” that structure all aspects of international migration.³ Queer migration scholarship, which explores the multiple conjunctions between sexuality and migration, has drawn from and enriched these bodies of research—as well as feminist, racial, ethnic, postcolonial, public health, and globalization studies, among other fields.

GLQ 14:2–3

DOI 10.1215/10642684-2007-029

© 2008 by Duke University Press

This special issue not only extends queer migration scholarship by reworking critical areas of research but also establishes directions for future research. One group of essays explores how insights gained from trans studies demand a rethinking of queer migration histories, theories, and methodologies. A second group argues for the importance of reconfiguring the temporalities and geographies within which queer migration is usually explored, by examining how five centuries of slavery, imperialism, forced transportation of prisoners, and exile leave legacies that shape present-day queer migration. A third group reroutes debates about queer complicities with neoliberalism into a careful consideration of the struggles that result for queer migrants.

Power, Knowledge, Identities, and Trans Scholarship

Queer migration scholarship has consistently explored how overlapping regimes of power and knowledge generate and transform identity categories. Several fundamental insights have guided the research. First, queer migration scholarship has been greatly enabled by understanding sexuality as constructed within multiple, intersecting relations of power, including race, ethnicity, gender, class, citizenship status, and geopolitical location. Second, rather than inscribe migrants from extraordinarily diverse backgrounds within a developmental narrative of LGBTQ identities, many scholars instead deploy the term *queer* to acknowledge that all identity categories are burdened by legacies that must be interrogated, do not map neatly across time and space, and become transformed through circulation within specific, unequally situated local, regional, national, and transnational circuits. Moreover, these transformations cannot be understood within progressive, unilinear, and Eurocentric models. Illustrating these insights, Martin Manalansan shows that queer migrants frequently arrive in nation-states not to begin “assimilation” but to experience continued though transformed engagement with nation-states and regimes of power that have already profoundly shaped their lives.⁴ Manalansan thus challenges the dominant, ethnocentric model that views queer migration as a movement from “repression” to “liberation,” instead highlighting the fact that migrants experience “restructured” inequalities and opportunities through migration. Moreover, as Bobby Benedicto argues in this volume, these transformations affect those who stay “at home,” not just those who migrate, and, in many instances, help to form transnational social fields, cultures, and politics.⁵

The concept of heteronormativity has proven particularly useful in untangling connections among power, knowledge, and queer migrant identities. Refusing a homo-hetero binary logic, this concept is valuable for its ability to articulate

how normalizing regimes produce heterogeneous, marginalized subjects and positionalities in relation to a valorized standard of reproductive sexuality between biologically born male-female couples who belong to the dominant racial-ethnic group and the middle class. Marginalized subjects include, but are not restricted to, lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, and transgender people.⁶ The analytic lens of heteronormativity thus enables queer migration scholars to negotiate complicated and competing theoretical and political mandates. These include analyzing migration by those who may identify as LGBTQ, but without treating these categories as essential or transhistorical, and without failing to consider the complex, multiple relations of power in which the categories are embedded; creating analytic space for those whose sexual and gender practices do not necessarily align with their sexual and gender identities; and critically addressing hierarchies including race, gender, class, and geopolitical location in experiences of migration, in a manner that does not always centralize—but that never leaves out—sexuality.

Drawing on these analytic tools, queer migration scholarship often engages in a double movement. On the one hand, scholars have contributed to understanding the experiences of migrants who identify, or become identified by others, as LGBTQ (or, as discussed by the authors in this volume, tomboys, queens, *matiss*, *malungos*, *novios*, and amigos, among others).⁷ Thus queer migration scholarship insists on recovering, theorizing, and valorizing histories and subjects that have been largely rendered invisible, unintelligible, and unspeakable in both queer and migration studies, and that reflect both “alienation from white gay communities” and “histories of multiple diasporas” forged through colonialism and capitalism.⁸ On the other hand, much of the scholarship also makes clear that “queer migrants” in many ways comprise “impossible subjects” with unrepresentable histories that exceed existing categories.⁹ This leads scholars to foreground and challenge regimes of power and knowledge that generate structures of impossibility where particular groups are concerned, and to examine how individuals negotiate them.

Lessons drawn from analyzing power, knowledge, and identity include the importance of refusing to treat queer migrants as discretely bounded groups to merely “add on” to existing sexuality or migration scholarship. Instead, scholars insist, sexuality scholarship must rethink the role of migration (including as it connects with transnational capitalism and neo-imperialism) in constructing sexual identities, communities, politics, and practices. Equally, migration scholarship must analyze how sexuality structures all migration processes and experiences—and how migration regimes and settlement policies contribute to producing not only those who become variously defined as “queer,” “deviant,” or “abnormal” but also those who become defined as normative or “normal” within a

binary structure intimately tied to racial, gender, class, cultural, and other hierarchies.¹⁰ Queer migration scholarship thus highlights the fact that normative sexualities (not just those who are deemed deviant) require historicization, are produced within relations of power, and change, including through migration.¹¹ The production of the valorized norm, however, is intimately tied to the abjection of queers and queerness.

Two essays in this *GLQ* special issue importantly extend these insights, by exploring what trans histories and theories bring to queer migration scholarship. Thus, Clare Sears employs a “trans-ing” migration framework to interpret cross-gender practices among Euro-American migrant men in mid-nineteenth-century California, in the aftermath of its annexation from Mexico and the discovery of gold. According to Sears, cross-gender practices, which were most visibly manifested in cross-dressing, performed varied cultural work. They enabled Euro-American men not only to experiment with and sometimes challenge gender norms but also to assert racial dominance when cross-gender mimicry became deployed as racial parody. Moreover, she argues, even as some Euro-American men experimented with gender, others produced political narratives of feminized men and gender illegibility that centered on Chinese immigrants. These narratives, which naturalized the effects of structurally discriminatory laws, not only mobilized support for further anti-Chinese exclusion but also allowed Euro-Americans to “contain” gender trouble “in the body of a racialized other.” Trans-ing practices and discourses, in Sears’s account, therefore have multiple genealogies and involve not only moments of pleasure and experiences of profound dispossession but also the reworking of complicated, multiple hierarchies in the context of empire, warfare, annexation, nation (re)formation, and multiple migration.

Employing transgender, transnational, queer, and immigrant cultural logics, Kale Fajardo’s essay analyzes the coproduction of differently situated Filipino masculinities (queer, transgender, straight, Filipino, and Filipino American) in ports and at sea. Through the figure of the tomboy—a “male-identified and/or masculine female in the Philippines or diaspora who [has] sexual/emotional relationships with feminine females who identify as ‘women’”—Fajardo examines not only the moments when seamen identified Fajardo as a tomboy but also the stories they were inspired to recount and the interactions that occurred. Sea-based transportation between regions and nation-states emerges as a powerful mechanism that connects embodied movement to changing articulations of racialized and class-specific gender formations. The category of tomboy, which Fajardo traces through scattered sites, reveals these changing articulations and their links to diverse forms of power. Fajardo particularly problematizes how urban-based les-

bian feminists in Manila and the U.S. diaspora have appropriated the category in a gender-essentialist manner that constructs tomboys as women.

Other essays also articulate the concerns raised by these two authors. For example, Benedicto grounds his analysis in a discussion of how the Filipino category of *bakla* may be variously glossed as “gay” or “trans,” depending on who uses it and for what purpose. Like Fajardo, he delineates the relation between such categories and practices of colonialism, racialization, and nation formation. Both Benedicto and Fajardo also foreground questions about how the categories circulate (or do not); who takes up the categories, in what ways, and for what kinds of work; and what histories are thereby erased. Sears effectively sums up the contributions of these essays, writing that trans discourses and practices have multiple, disparate, and contradictory effects that require careful specification. The essays invite us to explore further what happens when we bring transgender and queer migration scholarship into critical conversation.

Reconfiguring the Temporalities and Geographies of Queer Migration

Queer migration scholarship has been enabled by and contributed to the growing scholarship on immigration, transnationalism, diaspora, and refugee movements, as well as scholarship about the role of space and spatiality, both material and virtual, in constructing queer identities and communities.¹² Such scholarship has particularly built on migration theory’s shift away from understanding migration as primarily driven by rational actors making cost-benefit decisions within a push-pull framework, toward an understanding that overlapping, palimpsestic histories of imperialism, invasion, investment, trade, and political influence create what Saskia Sassen calls “bridges for migration” between and among nation-states.¹³ This shift has somewhat altered the temporal and geographic frames within which queer migration is conceived.

The alteration is evident, for example, in the decentering of nationalist frameworks premised on space-time binaries, developmental narratives, and static models of culture, community, nation, race, gender, identity, and settlement.¹⁴ Instead, scholars increasingly attend to contradictions, relationality, and borders as contact zones, and the construction of identities, communities, practices, hegemonies, and alternatives linked to local, national, regional, and transnational circuits. The study of queer migration has participated in and enhanced scholarship about the emergence of multiple, hybrid sexual cultures, identities, identifications, practices, and politics. These are marked by power, contestation, and creative adaptation.

Although the nation-state, nationalism, and nation-based citizenship are

no longer the unquestioned horizon for analysis, these categories have not disappeared. Instead, scholars have theorized them as critical loci for upholding and contesting regional, transnational, and neo-imperial hierarchies, and for producing forms of exclusion, marginalization, and struggle for transformation.¹⁵ Indeed, sexuality scholarship has a rich history of engagement with questions of nationalism. Many scholars have characterized modern nation-states and citizenship as heteronormative in a manner that (as described above) involves hierarchies based on not only sex and gender but also race and class.¹⁶ The calculated management of migration comprises a critical technology for (re)producing national heteronormativity within global and imperial fields.¹⁷ Thus, throughout the first half of the twentieth century, nation-states including the United States and Australia implemented eugenic policies that encouraged migration and settlement by families that both conformed to the normative sexual order and were (or would become) “white.” Settlement and family formation by migrants from colonized regions, however, was generally barred (although in the United States, temporary labor for low wages was often permitted). Racial and neocolonial preferences have become less explicitly stated in recent decades, but actual migration policies display continuing anxieties (and encode punitive practices) where childbearing, cultural concerns, and possible economic costs among migrants racialized as minorities and from neocolonized regions are concerned. Furthermore, although most nation-states may no longer bar LGBTQ migrants, their presence nonetheless challenges and disrupts practices that remain normed around racialized heterosexuality. National heteronormativity is thus a regime of power that *all* migrants must negotiate, making them differentially vulnerable to exclusion at the border or deportation after entry while also racializing, (re)gendering, (de)nationalizing, and unequally positioning them within the symbolic economy, the public sphere, and the labor market. These outcomes, in turn, connect to the ongoing reproduction of particular forms of nationhood and national citizenship—which have ramifications for local, regional, national, transnational, and imperial arrangements of power.¹⁸

Heterosexuality is an unstable norm, however, which requires anxious labor to sustain.¹⁹ Public discourses, like migration policies, reflect heterosexuality’s instability.²⁰ Thus unwelcome migrants are often characterized as engaging in “unrestrained” childbearing, which is seen to reflect their deviation from or imperfect mastery over mainstream heterosexual norms, resulting in the birth of “undesirable” children. Or they are portrayed as the bearers of aberrant sexual practices, questionable sexual morals, and sexually transmitted diseases, including AIDS, that threaten to “contaminate” the citizenry. On the other hand, migrants are sometimes described as the upholders of family values that promise

to remoralize a citizenry that has lost its virtue.²¹ Or, within national heterosexual romance narratives, they are painted as passionately desiring the nation, as shown by their migration; thus citizens depend on migrants to show that the nation remains lovable.²² In these and other instances, heteronormativity animates both anti- and pro-immigrant imagery and discourses in ways that reiterate, yet continually recode, sexual, gender, racial, and class distinctions and inequalities in relation to constructs of nation-state, nationalism, and the citizenry.

The heteronormative governance of migrants implicates the status of groups who hold official citizenship but are nonetheless marked as suspect, subaltern, and second-class members of the nation. For example, in the United States, same-sex partners still cannot legally immigrate under the existing spousal reunification provisions of immigration law, and couples where one or both partners are transgender experience extraordinary difficulties. *Family, Unvalued* describes how current laws impugn the status of citizens who are lesbian, gay, or trans: “Solely because of their sexual orientation or gender identity, they find their relationships unrecognized, their families endangered, their lives shadowed by dislocation and separation.” The report concludes that these practices “assault human dignity in an essential way.”²³ The assault is part of a wider network of queer experience involving the “social and political costs of partial citizenship and the psychic and bodily costs of violence, which the habits of heterosexual privilege” produce.²⁴ Given the diversity of queer couples, these assaults materially articulate histories of racialization, sexism, neo-imperialism, and classism, too.²⁵ Similarly, U.S. public representations of Mexican-origin women as unrestrained “breeders” of welfare-consuming children, which consistently animate anti-immigrant discourses, not only racialize and heterosexualize them within colonialist imagery that legitimizes violence but also deeply affect U.S. citizens of Mexican descent, who are continually treated as “aliens” even though they hold national citizenship.²⁶ As Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo describes, these representations — materialized in punitive public policies in the areas of welfare, health care, voting, education, and law enforcement, as well as immigration control — reject people of Mexican and Latino/a descent “as permanent members of U.S. society” and reinforce “a more coercive system of labor.”²⁷ They also legitimize racialized homophobia and transphobia. In these and other instances, the ongoing imbrication of exclusionary forms of national citizenship with immigration control is laid bare.

The anxious, ongoing (re)production of national heteronormativity — including through border controls and immigrant management — is connected with wider neocolonial and neo-imperialist processes, historically and at present, as queer migration studies has started to document.²⁸ Historically, for example, “simultane-

ous efforts to shore up and bifurcate categories of race and sexuality in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were deeply intertwined.”²⁹ According to Emma Pérez, these efforts were also centrally connected to the intensified policing of the U.S.-Mexico border—which itself was an outcome of colonial relations, war, and annexation.³⁰ At present, immigration policies in neo-imperial countries link efforts to produce properly privatized, heteronormative families with strategies for securing cheap migrant labor; for fighting the “war on terror” through linking sexual “perversity,” enemy status, and orientalism; for manufacturing loyal heterosexual soldiers who participate in global warfare; and for building the prison-industrial complex and extrajudicial detention regimes.³¹ Heteronormativity in the global south also results in complicated complicities with these relations of power while also shaping migration circuits in particular ways.³²

Four essays in this volume rethink these concerns by further reconfiguring the temporalities and geographies within which queer migration is usually explored. These essays suggest that five centuries of colonialism, capitalist expansion, slavery, forced transportation, and exile have left legacies that painfully shape present-day queer migrations. Thus Omise'eke Natasha Tinsley's essay argues that a black queer Atlantic history emerged during the Middle Passage experience of slavery. Through rich readings of Ana-Maurine Lara's *Erzulie's Skirt* and Dionne Brand's *A Map to the Door of No Return*, Tinsley suggests that within the sex-segregated holds of slave ships, captured people formed affective bonds. These bonds, she argues, were queer, “not in the sense of ‘gay’ or same-sex loving identity waiting to be excavated from the ocean floor,” though this possibility is not ruled out. Rather, they were queer because they challenged the commodifying logics of capital accumulation and asserted captured peoples' humanity. They entailed “loving your own kind when your own kind was supposed to cease to exist, forging interpersonal connections that counteract imperial desires for Africans' living deaths.” The history of transportation for slavery in the New World, Tinsley argues, connects to the contemporary diaspora of Haitian refugees, Dominican laborers, and other migrants who experience conditions that constitute “a contemporary middle passage” that remains “drowned out.” Pushed by economic difficulties to migrate and forced by restrictive immigration laws into the hands of smugglers, untold numbers of today's migrants die in transit while others become exploited or trafficked workers. Tinsley's article lays the groundwork for a queer black Atlantic framework that bridges the persistent theoretical polarization between “the ‘choice’ of black queerness and the forced migration of the Middle Passage,” creating a meeting ground for queer, diaspora, and African diaspora studies to engage productively.

Kath Weston's essay, which foregrounds the centuries-long history of forced transportation and exiling of prisoners within European empires, also builds theoretical bridges. Focusing on the British penal settlement of Port Blair in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Weston explores how a politics of surmise, and the transformation of everyday activities into actionable offenses, shaped the colonial administration's policing of "unnatural offences." Moreover, she traces how such policing reconfigured the political ecology of the entire archipelago, in ways that connect the queered bodies of prisoners to transformations in bodies of land, water, labor, and administration. Weston acknowledges differences between colonial detention regimes in the Andaman Islands and present-day strategies legitimized by the so-called war on terror, but nonetheless insists that "contemporary security states trail behind them a history" that must be engaged. Weston concludes by calling for critical dialogue between LGBTQ studies and political ecology studies, to enable a more capacious understanding of how disciplinary formations directed at (queered) bodies can reshape, even devastate, the environments in which they operate.

Also working within expanded geographic and temporal frameworks, two further essays explore how contemporary nation-states and national regimes become contested and reconfigured in the face of queer migration. Audrey Yue describes how Australian immigration policies have historically encoded a preference for "family," which enabled the reproduction of heterosexualized, racialized, and colonialist forms of the nation-state and the "good citizen." In 1985 Australia became one of the first countries to allow migration by same-sex couples. Yet the logic of "intimacy" that guided these efforts was expected to assimilate admitted lesbians and gay men into transnational capitalism while sustaining the core values of Eurocentric nationalism. Gay Asian men, who make up the largest regional group of entrants under Australia's provisions for same-sex couples, must negotiate these logics. Their efforts are partly shaped by the fact that most enter as the partners of significantly older Caucasian men. Stereotyped as rice and potato queens, these couples simultaneously conform to and unsettle dominant norms of intimacy. As Yue argues, they show the gap between official representations of normatively intimate families and the realities of creative survival strategies for diasporic gay Asian men. They thereby raise important questions about when and how intimacy may provide opportunities to reconstruct or subvert dominant forms of nationalism and citizenship, which remain embedded within wider relations and longer histories of inequality between Australia and Asia.

Adi Kuntsman's essay engages with the migration of Russian Jews to Israel across a long history of forced displacement, exile, and death to explore how

nationalism becomes reconstructed. Kuntsman focuses on one ethnographic incident: an antigay poem published in a leading Russian Israeli newspaper, condemning the 2002 Pride parade in Jerusalem for allegedly endangering the Israeli nation. The poem achieved its rhetorical effect by evoking Soviet criminal jargon and gulag memoirs that describe same-sex relations as disgusting and monstrous. Gulags, Kuntsman argues, influenced Russians' views of same-sex relationships, although that history has yet to be systematically examined. Following Judith Butler, Kuntsman theorizes the poem's homophobic speech as a form of performative violence that constituted, rather than simply expressed or devastated, the subjectivities of "queers," "Russian immigrants," "Jews," and "Israelis." At the same time, she complicates the performative by routing it through Avery Gordon's notion of haunting. In the interchange between Russian queers and nonqueers about the poem, she suggests, the histories of the Soviet gulags and the Nazi death camps were evoked and deployed, showing how the affective presence of ghosts "meddles" with queer and nonqueer migrants' struggles to construct their belonging to Israeli nation and citizenship. Kuntsman concludes that hate speech must be understood as a form of affective sociality that entails living with and speaking through ghosts. (Kuntsman's examination of how ghosts unsettlingly reveal the sedimented, violent histories that subtend the present is, from a different perspective, explored by Benedicto.)

Taken together, the essays foreground how geographies and histories of empire, global capitalism, slavery, coerced labor, forced transportation, and exile have materially shaped queerness, migration, and queer migration, both past and present, including through the effects of haunting. In the process, nationalisms and nation-states emerged and continue to be dramatically reconfigured. A crucial implication of these essays is that the distinction between "freely chosen" economic migration and "coerced" migration by political refugees, which continues to underpin migration scholarship and policy in the global north, urgently needs to be rethought to account for how most migrations in fact straddle choice and coercion.

Queer Complicities

The final group of essays works within these expanded temporalities and geographies to explore how queer complicities with neoliberalism affect contemporary queer migration.³³ Lisa Duggan's concept of homonormativity has shaped recent debates on queer complicity; according to Duggan, homonormativity is "a politics that does not contest dominant heteronormative assumptions and institutions, but

upholds and sustains them, while promising the possibility of a demobilized gay constituency and a privatized, depoliticized gay culture anchored in domesticity and consumption.”³⁴ As Duggan describes, homonormativity is intimately connected with neoliberal capitalism and associated modes of governmentality that operate through economy and culture as linked domains. Jasbir K. Puar extends Duggan’s formulation by showing that homonormativity colludes with hegemonic forms of nationalism, including as it is deployed for capitalist profiteering and neo-imperialism. For example, U.S. nationalist discourses claim exceptional openness, tolerance, and sexual liberation. According to Puar, these “highly contingent forms of nationalism” accrue their “greatest purchase through comparative transnational frames rather than debates within domestic realms.”³⁵ Many U.S. queers support this nationalist discourse, which seems to promise inclusion in the nation-state. Yet the discourse is being used to authorize imperialism, warfare, and torture in the Middle East. Moreover, since queers of color and those perceived as “foreign” experience heightened surveillance and violence under these nationalist rubrics, this kind of homonationalism (as Puar describes it) both reflects and reinforces racial, cultural, and other hierarchies within queer communities, with significant consequences on local, national, and transnational levels. Other dominant nationalisms, not only in the global north but also in the south, selectively use LGBTQ issues to reposition themselves within transnational circuits, global hierarchies, and dominant relations of rule.³⁶

U.S. homonationalist discourses of sexual freedom position queer migrants in complex ways. As Chandan Reddy describes, the LGBTQ migrant finds herself or himself situated “in the contradiction between the heteronormative social relations mandated for immigrants of color by the state’s policies and the liberal state’s ideology of universal sexual freedom.”³⁷ The LGBTQ person seeking asylum because of persecution on account of sexual orientation, gender identity, or HIV status faces even more acute contradictions. This is because asylum involves “a moment of transnational judgment when the decision-makers of one nation decide not only on the credibility of the individual asylum claimant, but on the errors or strengths of the protection of rights in the country from which the claimant flees.”³⁸ Successful asylum claims generally require generating a racist, colonialist discourse that impugns the nation-state from which the asylum seeker comes, while participating in an adjudication process that often depends on constructs of “immutable” identity refracted through colonialist, reified models of culture shorn of all material relations.³⁹ The queer asylum seeker’s contradictory positioning is further exacerbated by the fact that “asylum . . . keeps migration exclusion morally defensible” in the global north.⁴⁰ In other words, the grant-

ing of asylum to select individuals—who must be few enough in number not to threaten dominant systems, but sufficient to lend credence to claims of first-world humanitarianism and democratic freedom—legitimizes exclusionary, repressive immigration control systems. The system thus positions queer asylum seekers in conflict with those seeking admission through the immigration system. Moreover, it “reinforces the self-congratulatory posture inherent in the geopolitics of asylum” while erasing the fact that the global south is actually host to a majority of the world’s refugees and asylum seekers.⁴¹

Gay asylum claims have been taken up by mainstream LGBTQ and human rights organizations in sometimes problematic ways, including to reinforce their claims for civic status and legal protections within liberal, neoliberal, or homonormative frameworks.⁴² This process reflects a larger problem about how queers with relative privilege may appropriate queer migrant figures to serve various agendas, without understanding or critically engaging with the politics of contemporary migration. In these cases, queer migrants provide the material ground for dialogue among others, while becoming silenced. Thus, queer migrants disappear “in the very exchange that depends on [them] for its moral weight.”⁴³

Asylum issues thus exemplify how homonormativity—queer complicities with dominant neoliberal, imperial, nationalist, racialist, and heterosexist logics—generates acute dilemmas where queer migration is concerned. Yet asylum also makes plain that these issues have to be addressed. Quite simply, queers facing violence and persecution demand justice and transformation.

Through the lens of queer migration, four essays in this volume analyze queer complicities with contemporary neoliberal logics, and the multiple registers of violence and inequality that they uphold. In my essay, I interrogate neoliberal accounts that construct “illegal” immigrants simply as individual lawbreakers and undesirable people. Instead, I argue that illegality is a political status produced and imposed through shifting relations of power embedded in histories of empire, capitalist expansion, racism—and heterosexism. Focusing on same-sex couples’ efforts to have their relationships recognized as a basis for legal immigration to the United States, I highlight the central role of sexual regimes in constructing the distinction between legal and illegal; explore how sexual regimes always function in relation to hierarchies of race, gender, class, and geopolitics in producing the il/legal distinction; and argue that these intersections must be addressed by the campaign for recognition of same-sex couples. I also examine how recognized couple relationships provide a technology for the state and its assemblages to manage the risks associated with immigration and to transform legally admitted immigrants into “good” neoliberal citizens—while threatening those who do

not measure up with potential illegalization. These dynamics enable the further reconceptualization of the il/legal distinction as an ongoing (rather than one-time) production and raise important questions about citizenship, surveillance, discipline, and normalization for those struggling for the recognition of same-sex couples within immigration law. I conclude by questioning whether and to what extent sexuality may provide a locus for renegotiating the distinction between legal and “illegal” immigrants and its associated logics of violence.

Benedicto’s exploration of queer complicities with neoliberal logics that produce violence is routed through a global analysis, which scrutinizes the role of location—and spectralization—in constructing sexual identifications, identities, communities, and politics. His article examines how young, urban, middle- and upper-class Filipinos living in Manila are “marked by a longing for and a sense of belonging to an imagined gay globality.” As Benedicto argues, these men’s desired relationship with global gay modernity is haunted by the specter of the *bakla*, a highly contested identity category that is “sometimes read as a synonym for gay but is more accurately, though no less problematically, depicted as a sexual tradition that equates homosexuality, transvestitism or effeminacy, and lower-class status.” His subjects’ “arrival . . . in the present of gay globality . . . [is] predicated on the abjection of the *bakla* and on the wishful relocation of its image to a different space-time.” Benedicto argues that these efforts at banishing the *bakla* are haunted by colonial desire and enact class and gender violence while extending neoliberal logics and relationships to construct an exclusionary form of global gayness in Manila. By contrast, Filipino gay men who migrate to New York City find that systemic racism excludes them from Western gay globality. In that situation, recuperating the figure of the *bakla* enables them to create spaces of belonging and world making. Benedicto concludes that for elite gay men in Manila, affective understandings of global space-time, underpinned by dreams of mobility and imaginative planetary geographies, remain haunted by the spectral presence of the *bakla* as a “past” that needs to be continuously exorcised—but that persists in returning. The men’s experience of being haunted, Benedicto suggests, presents an ethical demand to step off “the linear path” and address “the violent hierarchies we ourselves reproduce in the process of gay world making.”

Contesting neoliberal exclusions from a different angle, Carlos Decena draws on ethnographic work with Dominican immigrant gay men living in New York City to challenge the ways that “coming out” is frequently harnessed to neoliberal constructions of the sovereign, individual, self-realized gay subject—while refusal to follow the normative model of coming out remains perceived as “backwardness” and “lack of liberation,” which is stereotypically associated with com-

munities of color. Decena posits an alternative framework for theorizing coming out, through the concept of the “*sujeto tácito*” (tacit subject). In Spanish, the *sujeto tácito* is not spoken but can be ascertained through the conjugation of the verb in any particular sentence. Using interviews to develop his theoretical framework, Decena argues that coming out includes not simply spoken disclosure but also information that gets read off bodies, social networks, and other sites. Moreover, he recognizes that others’ readings of these sites may exceed the intentionality of any of his informants’ strategies for trying to manage that information. He shows that his informants negotiate their presentation of self within opportunities and constraints that include racism, class position, gender, and geopolitics, and, often, the structure of the public secret collectively maintained for varied reasons. Ultimately, the concept of *sujeto tácito* shifts the analysis of queer migrants’ identities and subjectivities away from individualizing, developmentalist narratives that serve neoliberal logics and toward an investigation of the “complicities,” “asymmetrical power relations,” and jeopardies that structure social relations. Decena concludes that “in a neo-liberal world that exalts the atomized and unmoored individual and in LGBTQ communities that celebrate self-making by clinging to the promise of coming out as the romance of individual liberation, tacit subjects may make us more aware that coming out is always partial, that the closet is a collaborative social formation, and that people negotiate it according to their specific social circumstances.”

Maja Horn’s essay also intervenes in dominant paradigms that normalize certain forms of queer life while rendering other queer lives as invisible, unthinkable, or merely symptomatic of “lagging development.” She focuses on the exhibition *El doble*, which took place in the Dominican Republic and showcased the collaborative work of Nelson Ricart-Guerrero, a Dominican living in Paris, and his French partner, Christian Vauzelle. As Horn explains, the Dominican Republic is frequently characterized as “lacking” in development, when measured according to LGBT rights, public presence, and institutions. Although Horn does not minimize the struggles of Dominican LGBTQ people, she insists that such developmentalist and Eurocentric measures do not allow us to conceive other forms of resistance, activism, and social justice. Moreover, they do not allow us to apprehend why a queer migrant like Ricart-Guerrero would return from France to the Dominican Republic, or how his return might contribute to queer transformation within the Dominican Republic. The *El doble* exhibition provides an opportunity to explore these questions. As Horn explains, in this exhibit the artists examined experiences of otherness that were represented through same-sex relationships but had relevance for everyone. They drew audiences into scenes of same-sex desire,

without compelling alignment or identification. At the same time, by insisting on the other as a fleshly body, not just a soul, the artists forestalled efforts to generalize same-sex experiences. Their strategies posited queer subjects as “neither fundamentally different from nor inherently the same as heterosexual subjects” while negotiating constraints placed on the expression of homosexuality in the public sphere. The exhibit’s enormous success, and its exemplification of how migrants often remain deeply engaged with their countries of origin, compels us to rethink models of queer migration as simply a linear movement from “repression” to “liberation,” and of queer Caribbean subjects as invariably having an adversarial relation to their national “home” communities.

Taken together, these four essays theorize queer complicities with dominant neoliberal logics and associated structures of violence, particularly as they affect queer migration. In so doing, the essays interrogate key theoretical categories within migration, sexuality, racial, ethnic, and allied bodies of scholarship; propose inventive new possibilities for retheorizing queer lives and experiences; and explore the limits and possibilities of intervention.

Unequal Regimes of Living and Dying

The essays included in this special issue rigorously and imaginatively extend the scholarship on queer migration by opening up the promises and possibilities of further research into the critical areas described above. They provide innovative methodological tools, conceptual vocabularies, and research and writing strategies to enable the work. They suggest that as long as the control of sexuality and the control of migration remain lashed together in service to dominant regimes of power, queer migration scholarship must continue to explore lives that have become ignored, invalidated, or violently abrogated so that the privileged may continue to garner privilege. As each essay in a different way argues, what is fundamentally at stake in queer migration scholarship and activism is the mandate to challenge and transform the relations of power that operate through migration regimes to generate unequal regimes of living and dying at multiple scales.⁴⁴

Notes

1. Equally, there has been a modest but discernible growth in institutions and activisms, mainly grassroots, that address queer migration issues.
2. Stephen Castles and Mark J. Miller, *The Age of Migration*, 3rd ed. (New York: Guilford, 2003).

3. Michel Foucault, *An Introduction*, vol. 1 of *The History of Sexuality*, trans. Robert Hurley (1978; New York: Vintage, 1990), 103.
4. Martin F. Manalansan IV, *Global Divas: Filipino Gay Men in the Diaspora* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003), 13.
5. On the effects of migration on those who “stay,” see, for example, Jennifer Hirsh, *A Courtship after Marriage: Sexuality and Love in Mexican Transnational Families* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003); and Breda Gray, *Women and the Irish Diaspora* (London: Routledge, 2004).
6. See Cathy Cohen, “Punks, Bulldaggers, and Welfare Queens: The Radical Potential of Queer Politics?” *GLQ* 3, no. 4 (1997): 437–65.
7. Queer migration scholarship has particularly theorized the experiences of migrants who could be described as LGBTQ and nonheteronormative. Key texts include M. Jacqui Alexander, *Pedagogies of Crossing: Meditations on Feminism, Sexual Politics, Memory, and the Sacred* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); Monisha Das Gupta, *Unruly Immigrants: Rights, Activism, and Transnational South Asian Politics in the United States* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006); Olíva Espín, *Latina Realities: Essays on Healing, Migration, and Sexuality* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1997); Espín, *Women Crossing Boundaries: A Psychology of Immigration and Transformations of Sexuality* (New York: Routledge, 1999); Gayatri Gopinath, *Impossible Desires: Queer Diasporas and South Asian Public Cultures* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); John Hart, *Stories of Gay and Lesbian Immigration: Together Forever?* (New York: Harrington Park, 2002); Eithne Luibhéid, *Entry Denied: Controlling Sexuality at the Border* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002); Manalansan, *Global Divas*; Erica Rand, *The Ellis Island Snow Globe* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); Nayan Shah, *Contagious Divides: Epidemics and Race in San Francisco’s Chinatown* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001). Other book-length studies of queer migration are in press: Lionel Cantú, *Border Crossing: Mexican Men and the Sexuality of Migration*, ed. Nancy A. Naples and Salvador Vidal-Ortiz (New York: New York University Press); and Lawrence La Fountain Stokes, *Queer Ricans: Cultures and Sexualities in the Diaspora* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press). Other book manuscripts on queer migration are well under way. Three edited collections have been published: Brad Epps, Keja Valens, and Bill Johnson González, eds., *Passing Lines: Sexuality and Immigration* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, 2005); Eithne Luibhéid and Lionel Cantú Jr., eds., *Queer Migrations: Sexuality, U.S. Citizenship, and Border Crossings* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005); and Cindy Patton and Benigno Sánchez-Eppler, eds., *Queer Diasporas* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000). Numerous papers, essays, book chapters, and several PhD dissertations-in-progress address LGBTQ and nonheteronormative migration. Cultural workers have also engaged with queer migration using various narra-

tive and media techniques. See, for example, Jaime Cortez, *Sexile/Sexilio*, www.apla.org/publications/publications.html (accessed May 18, 2007); *Del Otro Lado* (dir. C. A. Griffith, Crystal Griffith, USA; 1999); *Innocent* (dir. Simon Chung, Canada/Hong Kong; 2005); *Maple Palm* (dir. Ralph Torjan, USA; 2006); Tim Miller, “Glory Box,” in *Body Blows: Six Performances* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2002); Achy Obejas, *Memory Mambo* (Pittsburgh: Cleis, 1996); Obejas, *We Came All the Way from Cuba So You Could Dress Like This?* (Pittsburgh: Cleis, 1994); Monique Truong, *The Book of Salt* (New York: Mariner Books, 2003); *Unveiled* (dir. Angelina Maccarone, Germany; 2005). Of course, as an area of scholarship focused more on opening up critical questions than on delimiting “proper” subjects and objects of study, this list could easily be expanded in many directions.

8. Das Gupta, *Unruly Immigrants*, 176. Thus queer migration scholarship has inspired new pedagogies in some colleges and universities. See, for example, Horacio N. Roque Ramírez, “Borderlands, Diasporas, and Transnational Crossings: Teaching LGBT Latina and Latino Histories,” *OAH Magazine of History* 20 (2006): 39–43; Emma Pérez, “Queering the Borderlands,” *Frontiers* 24, nos. 2–3 (2003): 122–31.
9. I borrow this term from two scholars but give it my own spin. In *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), Mae Ngai explains, “Immigration restriction produced the illegal alien as a new political and legal subject, whose inclusion within the nation was simultaneously a social reality and a legal impossibility. . . . The illegal alien is thus an impossible subject, a person who cannot be and a problem that cannot be solved” (4–5). “Impossible subjects” is also used by Gopinath in *Impossible Desires* to challenge scholarship primarily organized around the logic of recognition and visibility (16), resulting in “the unthinkability of a queer female subject position within various mappings of nation and diaspora” (15), as well as within some gay male and liberal feminist scholarship (19).
10. Thus queer migration scholarship calls for rethinking foundational assumptions, theories, and methods in the study of immigration. See Eithne Luibhéid, “Heteronormativity and Immigration Scholarship: A Call for Change,” *GLQ* 10, no. 2 (2005): 227–35; Martin F. Manalansan IV, “Queer Intersections: Sexuality and Gender in Migration Studies,” *International Migration Review* 40, no. 1 (2006): 224–49.
11. See Gloria Gonzalez-López, *Erotic Journeys: Mexican Immigrants and Their Sex Lives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005); Hirsh, *Courtship after Marriage*. This issue is also richly developed in the scholarship on the sexualities of second-generation girls, who must negotiate between the patriarchies of ethnic communities and the racialized patriarchy of the mainstream. For example, see Yen Le Espiritu, “‘We Don’t Sleep Around Like White Girls Do’: The Politics of Home and Location,” in her *Home Bound: Filipino American Lives across Cultures, Communities, and Countries* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).

12. For a succinct review of how diaspora has been taken up in queer theory, see Anne-Marie Fortier, "Queer Diaspora," in *Handbook of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, ed. Diane Richardson and Steven Seidman (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2002), 183–97. See also Gopinath, *Impossible Desires*.
13. Saskia Sassen, "Why Migration?" *NACLA Report on the Americas* 26, no. 1 (1992): 14–15. Note that neoclassical economic theories are particularly dominant in the United States; in Asia and Europe, by contrast, various versions of labor migration theory are widely used. Additionally, although many migration scholars work within a global framework that is attentive to histories of imperialism and capitalism, they have nonetheless sought to correct models that posit migrants as purely "victims" of global forces and, instead, examine how migrants' agency and subjectivity interact with larger constraints and possibilities.
14. On methodological nationalism in immigration scholarship, see, for example, Andreas Wimmer and Nina Glick Schiller, "Methodological Nationalism, the Social Sciences, and the Study of Migration: An Essay in Historical Epistemology," *International Migration Review* 37 (2003): 576–610; on the ways that nationalist horizons historically have framed sexuality scholarship, see Elizabeth A. Povinelli and George Chauncey, "Thinking Sexuality Transnationally: An Introduction," *GLQ* 5, no. 4 (1999): 439–49.
15. In accordance with this critical approach, I use the term *migrant* (rather than make distinctions among legal immigrants, undocumented immigrants, refugees, asylum seekers, or short-term visitors) when referring to anyone who has crossed an international border. In my view, such distinctions are less reflections of empirically verifiable differences among queer migrants, who often shift from one category to another, than techniques of nation-state power that remain centrally implicated in neocolonial hierarchies and that classify migrants in order to delimit the rights that they will have or be denied, and the forms of surveillance, discipline, normalization, and exploitation to which they will be subjected. See Eithne Luibhéid, "Introduction: Queering Migration and Citizenship," in Luibhéid and Cantú, *Queer Migrations*, xi.
16. See, for example, M. Jacqui Alexander, "Erotic Autonomy as a Politics of Decolonization: An Anatomy of Feminist and State Practices in the Bahamas Tourist Economy," in *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*, ed. M. Jacqui Alexander and Chandra Talpade Mohanty (New York: Routledge, 1997), 63–100; Lauren Berlant, *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City: Essays on Sex and Citizenship* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997); Roderick Ferguson, *Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer of Color Critique* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004); Shane Phelan, *Sexual Strangers: Gays, Lesbians, and Dilemmas of Citizenship* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001).
17. See, for example, Martha Gardner, *The Qualities of a Citizen: Women, Immigration, and Citizenship, 1870–1965* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005); Luibhéid,

- Entry Denied*; Shah, *Contagious Divides*; Ann Laura Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Yue, this issue.
18. Scholars suggest that migration control remains a crucial locus for the production and performance of national sovereignties and nation-statehoods at this moment of intensified transnationalization. See, for example, Virginie Guiraudon and Christian Joppke, eds., *Controlling a New Migration World* (New York: Routledge, 2001); and Saskia Sassen, *Losing Control? Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996).
 19. As Alexander aptly observed, “Heterosexuality is at once necessary to the state’s ability to constitute and imagine itself, while simultaneously marking a site of its own instability” (“Erotic Autonomy,” 65).
 20. Bonnie Honig argues that representations of foreigners show a continual, unstable play of xenophobia and xenophilia. This occurs because the representations perform varied ideological work. Consequently, “the facts can inform but they cannot resolve the question of whether immigrants are good or bad for the nation because the question is not, at bottom, an empirical question” (Honig, *Democracy and the Foreigner* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001], 6).
 21. Honig, *Democracy*, 88; Francis Fukayama, “Immigrants and Family Values,” in *The Immigration Reader*, ed. David Jacobson (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1998), 388–401.
 22. Berlant, *Queen of America*, 195, 196; Honig, *Democracy and the Foreigner*, 92.
 23. Human Rights Watch and Immigration Equality (HRW&IE), *Family, Unvalued: Discrimination, Denial, and the Fate of Bi-National Same-Sex Couples under U.S. Law* (New York: HRW&IE, 2006), 14.
 24. Alexander, *Pedagogies of Crossing*, 218.
 25. For example, according to the 2000 census, “one fourth of individuals in same-sex couples in California are Latino/a and one third of California’s same-sex couples include at least one Latino/a (due to interethnic couples).” Moreover, the significance of immigration is clear: “Latino/as in same-sex couples are much less likely [than non-Latino/as in same-sex couples] . . . to be U.S. citizens (58% v. 94%)” (Gary Gates and R. Bradley Sears, *Latino/as in Same-Sex Couples in California: Data from Census 2000* [Los Angeles: Williams Institute, 2005], 1).
 26. See Ngai, *Impossible Subjects*.
 27. Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, “Women and Children First: New Directions in Anti-Immigrant Politics,” in *American Families: A Multicultural Reader*, ed. Stephanie Coontz with Maya Parson and Gabrielle Raley (New York: Routledge, 1999), 288, 297. See also Dorothy Roberts, “Who May Give Birth to Citizens?” in *Immigrants Out!* ed. Juan F. Perea (New York: New York University Press, 1997), 205–19.
 28. Alexander theorizes that “the shared violence of heterosexualization . . . provide(s) the connective web within and among colonial, neocolonial, and neo-imperial social

formations” (*Pedagogies of Crossing*, 194). Similarly, Andrea Smith asserts that “heteropatriarchy is the building block of U.S. empire. In fact, it is the building block of the nation-state form of governance. Christian Right authors make these links in their analysis of imperialism and empire” (“Heteropatriarchy and the Three Pillars of White Supremacy: Rethinking Women of Color Organizing,” in *Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology*, ed. Incite! Women of Color Against Violence [Cambridge, MA: South End, 2006], 71). See also Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* (Cambridge, MA: South End, 2005).

29. Siobhan Somerville, *Queering the Color Line: Race and the Invention of Homosexuality in American Culture* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000), 3.
30. Pérez, “Queering the Borderlands.”
31. For a discussion of heteronormativity and the production of migrant labor, see, for example, Grace Chang, *Disposable Domestic: Immigrant Women Workers in the Global Economy* (Boston: South End, 2000); and Chandan Reddy, “Asian Diasporas, Neoliberalism, and Family,” *Social Text*, nos. 84–85 (2005): 101–19. For a discussion of how the war on terror has linked sexual perversity, enemy status, and orientalism, see Alexander, *Pedagogies of Crossing*, 241; Jasbir Puar and Amit S. Rai, “Monster, Terrorist, Fag: The War on Terror and the Production of Docile Patriots,” *Social Text*, no. 72 (2002): 117–48; Jasbir Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007). For discussions of heteromascularity and the military, see, for example, Janet E. Halley, *Don't: A Reader's Guide to the Military's Anti-Gay Policy* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999); Gary Lehring, ed., *Officially Gay: The Political Construction of Sexuality by the U.S. Military* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2003). See also Janet R. Jakobson, “Sex, Secularism, and the ‘War on Terrorism’: The Role of Sexuality in Multi-Issue Organizing,” in *A Companion to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Studies*, ed. George E. Haggerty and Molly McGarry (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007), 17–37, which explores how “the politics of war and the politics of economics are mutually constituted in and through sexuality” (18). For a discussion of the prison-industrial complex, see, for example, Ruth Wilson Gilmore, *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007). See also American Friends Service Committee, *Corrupting Justice: A Primer for LGBT Communities on Racism, Violence, Human Degradation, and the Prison Industrial Complex*, www.afsc.org/lgbt/documents-corrupting-justice.pdf (accessed July 30, 2007). As the demand for facilities for incarcerating immigrants and asylum seekers skyrocketed, “the stocks of private prison companies began to surge, rising as much as 300 percent ‘in anticipation of internment camps and new prisons’” (Rachel Kamel, “After September 11: Standing on the Brink of a ‘Brave New World,’” www.afsc.org/community/911updt.pdf [accessed April 2, 2007]). Alexander suggests that an actuarial logic of “propensity” links together, and justi-

- fies, the increased incarceration of queers, immigrants, people of color, the poor, and asylum seekers, separately and as intersecting groups (*Pedagogies of Crossing*, 243).
32. Scholars have posited various connections among postcolonial nationalism, heteronormativity, and queer migration, although they stress that the connection articulates with other economic, political, and cultural forces (see Horn, this volume).
 33. For a thorough consideration of the concept of complicity across a range of theoretical debates and scholarly fields, see Miranda Joseph and David Rubin, "Promising Complicities: On the Sex, Race, Globalization Project," in Haggerty and McGarry, *Companion*, 428–49.
 34. Lisa Duggan, *The Twilight of Equality? Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics, and the Attack on Democracy* (Boston: Beacon, 2003), 50. See also Diane Richardson, "Desiring Sameness? The Rise of a Neoliberal Politics of Normalisation," *Antipode* 37 (2005): 515–35; Carl Stychin, *Governing Sexuality: The Changing Politics of Citizenship and Law Reform* (Oxford: Hart, 2003).
 35. Jasbir K. Puar, "Mapping U.S. Homonormativities," *Gender, Place, and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 13 (2006): 85.
 36. For discussion of how various nation-states may selectively use homosexuality to support neoliberal capitalism and governance, as well as for "rearticulations of cultural hierarchies on a postcolonial map" (Gabriel Giorgi, "Madrid en Tránsito: Travelers, Visibility, and Gay Identity," *GLQ* 8, nos. 1–2 [2002]: 59), see, for example, Alexander, *Pedagogies of Crossing*; Giorgi, "Madrid en Tránsito"; Neville Hoad, *African Intimacies: Race, Homosexuality, and Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007); Cindy Patton, "Stealth Bombers of Desire: The Globalization of 'Alterity' in Emerging Democracies," in *Queer Globalizations: Citizenship and the Afterlife of Colonialism*, ed. Arnaldo Cruz-Malavé and Martin F. Manalansan IV (New York: New York University Press, 2002), 195–218.
 37. Reddy, "Asian Diasporas," 113.
 38. Alice Miller, "Gay Enough? Some Tensions in Seeking the Grant of Asylum and Protecting Global Sexual Diversity," in Epps et al., *Passing Lines*, 143.
 39. As Miller explains, sexualities do not map neatly onto identity categories; yet coherent identities connected to experiences of persecution are required in order to gain asylum; thus problematic regimes of knowledge are deployed to generate legible models of identity. In the process, people who do not fit into these models are left out from accessing asylum, even though they may have experienced persecution. The concept of immutability in refugee and asylum law generally refers to characteristics that someone cannot, or should not be required to, change.
 40. Jacqueline Bhabha, "Boundaries in the Field of Human Rights: International Gatekeepers? The Tension between Asylum Advocacy and Human Rights," *Harvard Human Rights Law Review* 15 (2002): 161.
 41. Miller, "Gay Enough?" 146.

42. Miller, "Gay Enough?" 161–64.
43. Hoad, *African Intimacies*, xxxi.
44. My concept of unequal regimes of living and dying draws from Foucault's conceptualization of biopower as that which "brought life and its mechanisms into the realm of explicit calculation" (*History of Sexuality*, vol. 1, 143). Scholars have importantly expanded on Foucault's formulation by making clear that biopolitical projects for fostering life are unequally distributed and frequently replicate existing inequalities at various scales (e.g., Lauren Berlant, "Slow Death (Sovereignty, Obesity, Lateral Agency)," *Critical Inquiry* 33 [Summer 2007]: 754–80; Achille Mbembe, "Necropolitics," *Public Culture* 15 [2003]: 11–40). Although the explicit language of biopolitics is relatively uncommon within immigration scholarship, significant bodies of work support the contention that international migration regimes are thoroughly implicated in unequal regimes of living and dying. For instance, world systems theory connects international migration flows to unequal capitalist development and colonial and neocolonial regimes that hugely affect life chances (e.g., Jim Mac Laughlin, *Ireland: The Emigrant Nursery and the World Economy* [Cork: Cork University Press, 1994]). Scholarship on "illegal" immigration suggests that first-world migration regimes *construct* migrant illegality in ways that rearticulate global capitalist and (neo)colonial inequalities and justify violence, exploitation, and even death, which is then blamed on the migrants rather than on larger systems of violence (see my essay in this volume; see also Nicholas De Genova, "Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31 [2002]: 419–47). Other scholarship has traced how refugees and asylum seekers have become constructed as "bare life" that can be let die with little protest (e.g., Prem Kumar Rajaram and Carl Grundy-Wan, "The Irregular Migrant as Homo-Sacer: Migration and Detention in Australia," *International Migration* 42 [2004]: 33–64). Essays in this volume variously imply the relevance and urgency of such concepts as biopolitics, necropolitics, and slow death for the analysis of international migration, and the reproduction of unequal regimes of living and dying, where queers are concerned.