

A stylized illustration in orange and black ink on a red background. It depicts several people's faces and upper bodies. At the top, two chains of metal links are shown, one on the left and one on the right, with hands reaching up towards them. The central text is overlaid on the illustration. Below the text, there are several faces of diverse people, some with closed eyes, suggesting a state of peace or unconsciousness. Small pink butterflies are scattered around the faces. The overall style is graphic and expressive.

ABOLITIONIST

QUEER AND TRANS
MIGRANTS AGAINST THE
DEPORTATION STATE

INTIMACIES

EITHNE LUIBHEID

Abolitionist
Intimacies



Abolitionist Intimacies

*Queer and Trans Migrants
against the Deportation State*

EITHNE LUIBHÉID

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

Duke University Press *Durham and London* 2025

© 2025 DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS. All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ∞
Project Editor: Liz Smith
Typeset in Warnock Pro by Westchester Publishing Services

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Luibhéid, Eithne, author.

Title: Abolitionist intimacies : queer and trans migrants against the
deportation state / Eithne Luibhéid.

Description: Durham : Duke University Press, 2025. | Includes
bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2024033058 (print)

LCCN 2024033059 (ebook)

ISBN 9781478031239 (paperback)

ISBN 9781478028024 (hardcover)

ISBN 9781478060260 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Sexual minority immigrants—Political activity—
United States—History. | Immigrants—Political activity—United
States—History. | Noncitizens—Political activity—United States. |
Deportation—Government policy—United States. | Emigration and
immigration law—Social aspects—United States.

Classification: LCC JV6346.5 .L85 2025 (print) | LCC JV6346.5
(ebook) | DDC 325.73086/6—dc23/eng/20250225

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2024033058>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2024033059>

Cover art: Karla Rosas, *Manifest Beyond*, 2020. Courtesy of
the artist.

DUKE
UNIVERSITY
PRESS

Contents

A Note on Terminology :: vii

Acknowledgments :: xiii

INTRODUCTION :: 1

Against the Deportation State

1 :: PATHWAYS :: 33

Coproducing Citizenship and Deportation

2 :: LOVE, MARRIAGE, AND DEPORTATION :: 55

3 :: DRIVING WHILE UNDOCUMENTED :: 79

Circulating Fear and Fearlessness

4 :: CITIES AS CHOKEPOINTS AND RESISTANCE :: 101

CONCLUSION :: 123

"At the Edge of the Possible"

Notes :: 135

Bibliography :: 191

Index :: 225

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

Deportation

I use the term *deportation* to refer to a range of practices that states use to forcibly remove or expel noncitizens from their territory.¹ Adam Goodman explains that the US government typically relies on three main expulsion mechanisms: judicial processes leading to deportation orders; so-called voluntary departures that are usually made under conditions of coercion; and self-deportations.² These mechanisms are part of the modern nation-state immigration regime but have deep roots in histories and practices of expulsion through which the United States became the nation-state that it is today. As K-Sue Park shows, from the earliest days, colonists relied on both direct and indirect methods for ensuring the “mass removal of groups they viewed as outside their polity,” including the people of numerous Native nations whose lands were expropriated, as well as the poor and religious dissenters.³ After the abolition of slavery, lawmakers also explored possibilities for the mass removal of African-descended people.

Nathalie Peutz and Nicholas De Genova explain that deportation practices assert and enact the sovereignty of the US settler state and create citizenship norms through which legal citizens, migrants of various statuses, and deportees become constituted as legal, political, and social subjects.⁴ Scholars theorize that deportation coproduces nation-based citizenship not just as a legal status but also in terms of who is seen as “belonging” (and that, in a racist, settler, capitalist, and cisheteronormative nation-state, one’s legal status may not align with perceptions and experiences of belonging).⁵ De Genova underscores that deportation produces legal statuses and (un)belonging not just through actual deportations but also through “deportability”: the possibility of becoming deported. “It is deportability, and not deportation per se, that has historically rendered undocumented migrant labor a distinctly disposable commodity.”⁶ Deportability, which also affects those with precarious, uncertain, disputed, temporary, or transitional legal status, renders people vulnerable in all aspects of their lives. Deportability

and deportation are part of cycles of displacement and dispossession that often continue long after people have been expelled.

Deportation works hand in hand with major policies and programs that try to prevent people from entering the United States in the first place. These prevention strategies include invading other countries that are experiencing instability and crisis in order to preempt mass migration; enlisting other countries to prevent migration to the United States in return for aid, trade, and other benefits; interdicting migrant boats at sea before they reach US territory; containing and confining migrants in sites like Guantánamo that are not officially part of US territory; turning back migrants who want to claim asylum or requiring them to wait outside US borders; public messaging campaigns that stress the dangers of migration and the unlikelihood of getting legal status; and Prevention Through Deterrence policies at the southern border that route migrants into dangerous terrain that greatly heightens their risks of disappearing or dying.⁷ These policies and practices involve significant bilateral and multilateral agreements with nation-states and supranational bodies who take on immigration control functions on behalf of the United States in return for aid and other benefits, while deepening the rightlessness facing people in transit. I honor and grieve those who have disappeared or died in transit as a result of these practices.⁸

The expansion of deportation has been central to the growth of state power and the production of exploitable labor.⁹ Deportation has “fueled xenophobia and demonized” numerous communities and groups.¹⁰ Deportation has especially and disproportionately been directed at Mexicans, who “make up around half of the undocumented immigrant population in US history, but . . . account for nine out of every ten deportees.”¹¹ Tanya Maria Golash-Boza highlights that young men from Central America and the Caribbean are also disproportionately targeted.¹²

Bearing in mind that innumerable people have been prevented from entering the United States in the first place, this book centers people who have lived under the shadow of deportability or faced deportation from within the United States. The scale of deportation is enormous: Goodman calculates that some fifty-seven million people were deported from the United States between 1882 and 2018—which is more people than were granted permanent residence.¹³ Yet grasping the scope and impact of deportation remains challenging. By Goodman’s reckoning, 85 percent of these deportations occurred through voluntary departure, a process that “enable[s] low-level officials to use administrative orders to expedite the expulsion of people charged with immigration violations and other minor infractions” without due process.¹⁴

Yet voluntary departures, as well as self-deportations, generally leave no records. He asks, “How does one write a history of something designed to leave no paper trail,” even while its scale and impact are enormous?¹⁵ The impact of living under the shadow of deportability is also enormous but often unrecorded.

Queer, Trans, LGBTQ

In the book, I use *queer* and *trans* as umbrella terms for people who do not adhere to dominant sexual and gender norms. This includes people who may self-identify or be identified by others as queer, gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, gender nonconforming, nonbinary, two spirit, *loca*, *mati*, and many related terms. These identity categories are not essential, universal, or timeless. Rather, the terms emerged through and remain implicated in histories and geographies of power. They are tied to and uphold state regimes for making populations legible and governable, involve self-attribution or attribution by others, and offer compromised but important means for making claims. People claim, inhabit, give meaning to, and continually transform these categories, navigate state and other institutional demands in relation to the categories, and transit among the categories, too.¹⁶

When using *queer*, *trans*, or related terms as identity categories in reference to specific individuals, I do so based on available information about how people publicly represented themselves at that time. People’s self-identifications and public representations may switch over time and among possibilities. When discussing specific organizations or reports, I follow their uses of these terms while recognizing changes over time and differences in meanings. For example, differences between the US government’s use of *LGBT* and critical trans or queer organizations’ use of the term are evident in chapter 4.

As analytic rubrics, *trans* and *queer* may not refer to identities or identifications at all. Rather, they commonly “call[] into question the stability of any . . . categories of identity,” critically historicize the material and ideological work performed by all identity categories, and direct attention to questions of power, intersectionality, normalization, dispossession, and transformation.¹⁷ *Queer* and *trans* as analytic rubrics highlight the need to analyze how sexual and gender regimes differentially affect not just nonnormative subjects but everyone, though not in the same ways. Moreover, since whiteness, settler/colonialism, and capitalism are constitutive of sexual and gender normativity, an intersectional approach is always necessary. Many queer and trans analytic rubrics conceive political change as emerging from work

that is differential, coalitional, and transformative, and rooted not in demands for shared identity or history “but in our shared marginal relationship to dominant power that normalizes, legitimizes, and privileges,” beginning from the perspectives and priorities of those who are most harmed by the current system.¹⁸

Allies

In recent years, the construct of “allyship” has become critiqued on the grounds that it offers opportunities to pay lip service to progressive politics without showing up, engaging in action, or risking one’s privileges. The term *accomplice* was seen as underscoring that lip service was not enough; action, including action that required people to put something of value on the line, was required. In recent years, *coconspirator* has emerged as a term to describe people who work alongside marginalized communities, offering meaningful support and being accountable, without co-opting others’ struggles or using others’ struggles to enhance their own status. The term *coliberator* recognizes that “our freedom is intertwined” and that in working toward liberation for any group, “we will all benefit.”¹⁹ In this book, I use *allies* as a general term to describe migrants and citizens who offer a variety of kinds of support, including, in some cases, acting as accomplices, coconspirators, or coliberators.

Migrant

Rather than making distinctions based on people’s state-conferred legal statuses, this book generally uses the term *migrant* to refer to anyone (except tourists) who has crossed an international border. I follow this practice because legal statuses reflect not supposed types of migrants but the workings of power and knowledge that seek to differentiate among migrants, delimit rights and protections that they will have or be denied, and shape forms of surveillance, discipline, normalization, and dispossession to which they are subjected.²⁰ Thus, my use of the term *migrant* participates in the call by critical migration researchers to problematize scholarship that reifies and objectifies people on the move by uncritically recirculating the state’s categories for apprehending and managing them.²¹

Sometimes I use the terms *asylum seeker* or *refugee*. The terms emerged after World War II and commonly refer to people who have crossed an international border and who seek protection under international human

rights (rather than national immigration) law.²² People seeking or holding these statuses make claims and navigate jeopardies that somewhat differ from (yet overlap with) those who go through nation-state immigration systems. People may also transit between the immigration, refugee, and asylum systems.²³

Citizen and Noncitizen

Migration regimes operate around, reproduce, and normalize the distinction between citizens and noncitizens. This book treats “citizen” and “noncitizen” not as natural or ontological categories but as status distinctions that have been created and contested within histories of power involving settler colonial, capitalist, cisheteronormative, and racist nation-state formation processes (see the introduction for discussion). Immigration systems including deportation are critical loci where the practical and symbolic meanings of these status distinctions are continually contested and reconfigured. When referring to someone as a “citizen” or “noncitizen,” I do not presume to know anyone’s understanding of, investment in, or performance of that category; rather, my purpose is to mark that people carry and are navigating within the terms of this state-mandated status distinction. Deportation constitutes meanings of citizenship, so when—*when*—there is no more deportation, *citizenship* and *noncitizenship* will not mean what they mean now.

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

Acknowledgments

This book is made possible by the courage of those who came before, extraordinary activists and theories that created building blocks, badass dreamers and fighters who inspire, and people who asked generative questions. It is fueled by uncountable acts of kindness, encouragement, and practical support from friends, family, and colleagues, as well as people who crossed my path. No words can convey how grateful I am.

A research fellowship at the Latino Research Institute (LRI) at the University of Texas at Austin provided time, resources, and congenial fellowship for drafting the book. I am especially grateful to LRI director Deborah Parra-Medina for this opportunity and making me feel welcome. I am also deeply grateful to Karma Chávez, the chair of Mexican American and Latino/a Studies, for her unflagging support, encouragement, and assistance during that time and throughout. Thanks to C. J. Alvarez for his interest and great conversations in the basement of the Gordon White Building.

A Benjamin Meaker Visiting Professorship at the University of Bristol, organized by Katharine Charsley, created opportunities for generous engagement with her and other amazing migration studies faculty at Bristol that made this book better. Anne-Marie D'Aoust at the Université du Québec à Montréal, and members of the Research Group on Managing Citizenship, Security, and Rights: Regulating Marriage Migration in Europe and North America that Anne-Marie convened, also provided invaluable feedback, comparative perspectives, and insight.

Míle buíochas to Rob Buffington, Karma Chávez, Adela Licon, and Erica Rand for careful, generous, and generative feedback about chapters (in Adela's case, the entire manuscript), constant encouragement, and practical assistance whenever needed. There would be no book without you. Huge thanks to Sylvia Organ and Reid Gómez, whose constant friendship, support, and humor kept life and the book ticking along. Huge thanks to Ronit Lentin, who deeply influenced my choice of materials and analytic strategy while always inspiring me. Warm thanks to Mengia Tschalaer, Ruben Zecena, Monisha Das Gupta, and Bridget Anderson for support and inspiration during the book's journey.

D

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

I am very grateful to many people who created generative and generous spaces for discussing ideas from the book with engaged audiences. These include Anouk de Koning, the principle investigator for the Reproducing Europe project, and students and faculty at Radboud University; a Centre for Research on Ethnic Relations and Nationalism research seminar organized by Saara Pellander at the University of Helsinki; the seminar “States of Intimacy: Gender, Sexuality, and Governance in Modern US History,” organized by Nancy F. Cott and Robert O. Self at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study; the symposium *A Different Dream: A Symposium on Undocumented Immigration, Gender, and Sexuality*, organized by Linda Greenberg at California State University, Los Angeles; the symposium *Human Rights and Carceral Sovereignties*, organized by Rachel A. Lewis at George Mason University; the panel “Gendering Migration,” organized by Jenna Loyd for the University of Wisconsin–Madison Latin American, Caribbean and Iberian Studies Program Migration Symposium; the “LGBT Immigrant Stories” roundtable and discussion, organized by Erika Lee for the University of Minnesota’s Immigration History Research Center; “Immigration, Family, and Sexuality,” organized by Bill Johnson González at DePaul University; the conference *Crossing Sexual Borders: Gender and Sexuality in Migration*, organized by Éric Fassin and Manuela Salcedo at Université Paris 8; the conference *Queer Displacements: Sexuality, Migration and Exile*, organized by Tina Dixson and Renee Dixson at Australian National University; the Borderlands Institute series *Responsibility and Immigration* organized by Francisco Lozada at the Brite Divinity School; copresenters at the *Queer Liberalisms and Marginal Mobility* series, organized by Bridget Anderson, Fadi Saleh, and Mengia Tschalaer and hosted by the Barnard Digital Humanities Center; presenters at the *Transforming Systemic Violence: Experiences of Female and Non-binary Identifying Queer Migrants* series, organized by Mengia Tschalaer and me, moderated by Ruben Zecena, and hosted by the Barnard Digital Humanities Center; Anouk de Koning and students and faculty at Leiden University; the workshop “When Justice Migrates: How Mobility across Borders Reconfigures Rights, Equity and Belonging,” organized by Sara Friedman, Jayanth Krishnan, and Irit Dekel at Indiana University; and the Queer Demography Summit organized by Kristopher Velasco at Princeton University.

The American Studies Association (ASA) enabled generative discussion spaces with wonderful copanelists and audiences. Particular thanks to presenters and audiences at the following panels: “Illegal Imaginaries” (organized by Armando Garcia for 2016), “Trafficking Theory, Migrating Method, and Cross-Disciplinary Pedagogy: Sex Trafficking and Queer Migration Schol-

ars in Conversation” (organized by Annie Hill and Karma Chávez for 2017), “No Borders, No Prisons, No Travel Bans: Emerging from the Settler-State Deportation Regime” (organized by me for 2018), and “Caring More for One Another Than for Nation-States: Love and Solidarity against the Deportation Regime” (organized by me for 2023). A shout-out to the fantastic “Undocumented Epistemologies” panel at ASA 2022. Thanks to speakers and audiences at the panels “Indigenous Futures and Settler Coloniality: Revisioning Migration Politics” and “Trans and Queer Migrant Organizing as Transnational Feminist Praxis” that Karma and I co-organized for the National Women’s Studies Association Annual Conference (2021).

Warmest thanks to those who generously made time for me to interview them for chapter 2 (their listed affiliations reflect their positions when I interviewed them in 2016): Yesenia Acosta, attorney, Law Offices of Scott Warmuth; Pamela Denzer, director of client programs, Immigration Equality; Sharita Gruberg, assistant director, LGBT Research and Communications, Center for American Progress; Jamila Hammami, executive director, Queer Detainee Empowerment Project; Jason Ortega, Equal Justice Works Fellow, Los Angeles LGBT Center; and Marco Antonio Quiroga, director of public policy, True Colors Fund.

Huge thanks to Courtney Berger, two anonymous reviewers who provided deeply helpful feedback, and the Duke University Press staff.

To Hai Ren, míle buíochas and a giant heart always.

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

INTRODUCTION

Against the Deportation State

On February 17, 2013, Osmani R. Alcaraz Ochoa, a queer person born in Jalisco, Mexico, who worked as an organizer with migrant families, day laborers, domestic workers, and detained LGBTQ asylum seekers in Tucson, Arizona, was bicycling to a meeting when he saw three Tucson Police Department (TPD) vehicles surrounding a car.¹ The driver, René Meza Huerta, was handcuffed and the children inside the car were crying frantically.² Huerta's partner, Perla López, was sobbing on the side of the road. Alcaraz Ochoa stopped, asked what was happening, and learned that the car had been pulled over after someone had called to incorrectly report that children were being abducted. After determining that no abduction was taking place, police officers asked Huerta for a driver's license, which he did not have. Suspecting that he was an undocumented migrant, they called Border Patrol.

Since childhood, Alcaraz Ochoa had witnessed this kind of scene play out countless times as family, coworkers, and community members were "pulled over by police and then handed over to Border Patrol and disappeared from their communities."³ Enough was enough. He rolled under the wheels of the Border Patrol vehicle, wanting to prevent them from wrenching another person away

D

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

from family and community for deportation. Border Patrol started taking pictures of him; he used his cell phone to reciprocate. He also messaged people to come to the scene. Border Patrol threatened to charge him with impeding the work of federal agents, which is a felony. Alcaraz Ochoa heard them discussing whether Tasing or using pepper spray to extricate him would cause the least harm to their vehicle. Eventually they pepper sprayed him, pulled him out, handcuffed him, and took him to the Border Patrol station with Huerta. A community rally the next day demanded the release of Alcaraz Ochoa and Huerta, an end to deportation, and an end to TPD's cooperation with Border Patrol. Alcaraz Ochoa was released, but Huerta was not—he was processed for deportation, leaving behind his children, whom his partner, US citizen Perla López, planned to care for, along with her children. Deportation did not end, and TPD did not stop cooperating with Border Patrol. Alcaraz Ochoa continued working for justice and dignity for everyone.

This incident captures the key concerns of the book, which centers writings by and about queer- and transgender-identified migrants of color and allies mobilizing intimacies to contest deportation, a system for forcibly removing people, while laying the groundwork for a future without deportation. As US deportations have skyrocketed, much has been written about the system. Yet little has been written about the diverse queer- and trans-identified people, many of them migrants, who participate in and often spearhead creative, critical antideportation actions.⁴ The gap is surprising. The United States has the largest migrant-detention system in the world and an enormous deportation apparatus.⁵ Unknown numbers of the estimated 1.3 million queer and trans migrants in the United States live in the system's shadow or within its walls, while still others have been deported.⁶ Although deportation scholarship has burgeoned, analyses of US deportation practices generally focus on normative families or, occasionally, on queer, trans, and sex worker migrants framed as vulnerable victims. With few exceptions, queer and trans studies scholarship also says little about deportation, although it increasingly addresses carcerality and prison abolition.⁷ This book begins to fill these gaps and builds bridges among deportation, queer, trans, and racial-/migrant-justice scholarship. It highlights new knowledge that emerges when we center the experiences and analyses of queer and trans migrants and allies who contest deportation.

Mainstream media, public discourses, and much scholarship minimize the significance of deportation by framing it as an unfortunate or deserved event that befalls individuals who have broken the law. This book, like Alcaraz Ochoa and numerous antideportation activists, organizers, scholars, and collectives, challenges these individualizing and ahistorical analyses by framing

deportation logics and practices as cornerstones of the US immigration system that emerged from histories of settler colonialism, empire, slavery, capitalism, and racialized gender and sexual normativity. That immigration system reproduces and normalizes global apartheid, the denial of Indigenous sovereignty, structural inequalities among the citizenry, and transnational circuits of displacement and confinement that strip people of social legibilities and rights claims while making them available for exploitation and the production of value for others.⁸

Deportation is never just a discrete event that removes someone from their country of migration to their country of citizenship; rather, it's a long process that unfolds over time and across transnational spaces while articulating multiple forms of violence. Furthermore, deportation often returns people to the situations of unemployment, displacement, political instability, and precarity that impelled their migration in the first place, and it negatively affects families and communities in the countries they are deported from and deported to.⁹ Those who had fled discrimination, violence, marginalization, and precarity based on their economic status, gender, sexuality, race/ethnicity/Indigeneity, and other systemic inequalities end up back where they fled from. Not surprisingly, many seek to remigrate.

While migrants who are undocumented or hold precarious legal status on US soil are obvious targets of the US deportation regime, the regime also coproduces the “good migrant,” the “normative citizen,” and the “marginalized citizen” as categories that relationally define one another in structures of inequality.¹⁰ This means that not just migrants but also citizens have important but varied stakes in the struggles over deportation. This includes marginalized citizens whose precarious standing is underlined by the threat or experience of having family and community members deported, or who get swept up in deportation proceedings despite being citizens; citizens who actively support deportation in order to imbue their own standing with greater meaning; citizens who resist state deportation; and many others.

Most chapters and the book as a whole center written materials by and about queer and trans migrants and allies who are organizing not just to prevent specific migrants' deportations, which is critical, but also to entirely end the deportation system and related systems of violent dispossession.¹¹ Efforts to abolish rather than reform deportation build on and contribute to the extraordinary activism ignited by BIPOC feminist, queer, trans, and anticapitalist organizers.¹² A. Naomi Paik explains, “Black-led abolitionist movements and organizations, like Critical Resistance and Black Lives Matter, and immigrant justice organizations like UndocuBlack, United We

Dream and Mijente together demand the simultaneous dismantling of police, ICE, CBP, military, and other institutions of state violence, as well as the ideologies of racism, imperialism, patriarchy and capitalism that undergird them. To achieve the goal of abolishing police and creating a new society where all can thrive, we need to make these connections and fight against all fronts of policing power.”¹³ Scholarly fields, including queer studies and trans studies, have been deeply engaged in conversations and activism about abolition. The introduction to a 2022 special issue of *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* asserts, “Prison abolition is a project of queer liberation and queer liberation is an abolitionist project. No ifs, ands, or buts.”¹⁴ Abolition work seeks not just to end interlocking systems of violence but also to rebuild the world anew from the conditions that we face now.

Abolition work requires navigating contradictions and ambiguities that are “located . . . between necessary responses to immediate needs and collective and radical demands for structural and ultimately revolutionary change.”¹⁵ Navigating these contradictions requires “letting go of the idea that anyone can have a definitive pathway for knowing how to rid ourselves of carceral logic” and, instead, experimenting, trying out new possibilities.¹⁶ The distinction between reformist versus nonreformist reforms—changes that reform but preserve the system versus changes that contribute to dismantling the system—offers valuable guidance for these efforts and experiments.¹⁷

The thought-work and actions at the center of the book, and the book itself, do not claim to offer a grand theory of how we can get rid of deportation or the migration-control system that depends on deportation to wreak multiple harms, or what life would be like without them. Instead, inspired by Ara Wilson’s suggestion that infrastructure conditions but does not determine intimacies, this book frames the US migration-control system, including its deportation logics and practices, as infrastructure.¹⁸ Chapters critically analyze materials showing how queer and trans migrants and allies experience that their intimacies are conditioned by migration-control infrastructure, including deportation, and how they countermobilize intimacies to challenge these arrangements. I use a broad understanding of *intimacies* as entailing “a sense of self in close connection to others.”¹⁹ I provide a fuller discussion of intimacies below. Queer, trans, and ally struggles against deportation exemplify that infrastructure involves numerous elements that interact with intimacies in shifting ways—which opens up multiple possibilities for contestation. Rather than offering a general theory of abolitionist intimacies, the book invites readers to consider how infrastructure and intimacies, when taken together, may open up possibilities for contestation and transformation in readers’ own contexts.

Not all of the work discussed is abolitionist—for example, chapter 2 shows the logics and compromises that may be required when working within the system to save a loved one from deportation. Yet, that information helps to clarify the necessity for abolition as a horizon for action. Without blueprints or guarantees, the queer and transgender migrant and ally antideportation work discussed in this book comprises “an incremental politics of small [and big] happenings, acts, and events which come to cohere and sustain a radical intent” to realize a different world.²⁰

The remainder of this introduction is divided into three sections. The first section provides historical and political context for understanding the struggles I discuss in the book. The section discusses, first, why I conceive migration controls that depend on deportation as an infrastructure of chokepoints; then, how deportation reproduces global apartheid, denial of Indigenous sovereignty, and inequalities among the citizenry; next, a brief history of the emergence of the US deportation system; and finally, how logics of criminalization, attrition, and national security have dispersed deportability throughout everyday life in recent decades. The second section discusses common conceptions of *intimacies* and how I use the term to understand writings about the work done by queer and trans migrants and allies who contest deportation. The final section describes the methods and materials on which the book is based and provides an overview of the upcoming chapters.

Historical and Political Context

US Migration Control as an Infrastructure of Chokepoints

Deportation is a critical element of the US migration-control system, which I characterize as infrastructure.²¹ The migration-control infrastructure includes individuals, institutions, discourses, laws, policies, practices, built environments, and funding streams.²² Federal laws and policies establish the infrastructure’s broad parameters, but migration control also works in tandem with state and local governments, private corporations, civil society, individual citizens, and shifting discourses to generate different configurations in specific locations.²³

Thinking of migration control as infrastructure not only highlights the multiple, interacting elements involved but also, as Lauren Berlant explains, “helps us see that what we commonly call ‘structure’ is not . . . an intractable principle of continuity across time and space, but is really a convergence of force and value in patterns of movement that’s only solid when seen from a

D

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

distance.”²⁴ When seen up close, gaps, sutures, corrosion, and parts that fit poorly become evident, presenting possibilities for contestation. For years, migrant-justice groups have focused on infrastructure: for example, they have analyzed the infrastructural arrangements that are steadily pipelining people into deportation, situated these infrastructures in historical context, provided resources that help individuals and organizations to resist, and demanded changes or an end to the infrastructures.²⁵

I conceive the migration-control system not just as infrastructure but as an infrastructure of chokepoints through which some noncitizens’ deportation and deportability—along with other noncitizens’ admission and conditional residence and citizens’ belonging or not—become produced and contested. I take the term *chokepoint* from Mark Krikorian, the former director of the right-wing Center for Immigration Studies. Krikorian narrowly understood chokepoints as institutional filters within social and economic life that enable the identification, criminalization, and deportation of undocumented people from the United States.²⁶ This book uses a broader conception than Krikorian’s, arguing that the migration-control system overall comprises an infrastructure of chokepoints that are expected to produce varied outcomes depending on the rules that govern noncitizens’ possibilities for legally entering and remaining and officials’ and others’ understanding and implementation of these rules.²⁷ As rules change, noncitizens often transit in and out of different statuses.²⁸ My conception of chokepoints builds on the scholarship about checkpoints and the relational understanding that state migration controls are never just about restricting some people’s movement but are also always about facilitating others’ while iterating citizenship norms.

I also conceive migration control as an infrastructure of chokepoints in order to highlight that the system is violent and continually generates violence. National and transnational migration controls that interact with global capitalism force many people into clandestine migration routes around which dense economies of violence have grown.²⁹ These economies generate enormous profit as migrants become “cargo to smuggle, bodies to prostitute, labor to exploit, organs to traffic, or lives to exchange for cash.”³⁰ Wendy A. Vogt emphasizes that “officials and criminals alike profit” from these economies of violence, which are kept in place by national and transnational migration controls.³¹ Migration controls also generate violence and death among people who are living and working without legal status, remain locked in detention, or are forcibly deported. Legally admitted migrants experience the violence of ongoing surveillance and governance that pipelines some into deportation and others into marginality based on class, gender, racialization, and other factors.

Michel Foucault's analysis of biopolitics informs how many scholars theorize the violence associated with migration controls. Foucault coined the term *biopolitics* to explore how life became the object and purpose of politics. According to Foucault, under liberalism, states sought as their *raison d'être* to foster the lives of (some of) the population, which concomitantly involved letting other populations die.³² "Letting die" speaks to the ways that, through failing to make available basic resources and creating hostile environments, many people are pushed into the realm of "let die" even when they are not explicitly targeted for death. In the United States, people who are Indigenous, Black, of color, low-income, queer, female, transgender, and disabled are consistently exposed to greater harm, deprivation, and risk of death. Moreover, these groups are more consistently killed outright in a process that Achille Mbembe theorizes as necropolitics.³³ Yet, under the imperative of fostering (some people's) lives, states generally claim deniability and lack of responsibility for (other people's) deaths.³⁴

Migration scholars theorize multiple connections between biopolitics and state migration controls. Some explore how migration controls continually generate deaths at sea, in deserts, and elsewhere even as states claim deniability. Scholars connect migrant deaths to state efforts to foster the lives of valued citizens. Jonathan Xavier Inda, for example, suggests that US migration policies enact "the idea that the elimination of the enemy—that is, the undocumented migrant—will make the body politic [citizens] stronger and more vigorous" and shows that these dynamics occur in racist and racializing ways.³⁵ Claudia Aradau and Martina Tazzioli suggest that in addition to generating elimination and death, biopolitical practices affect migrants in other ways.³⁶ Tazzioli proposes that choking offers a framework for understanding "political technologies that actively disrupt migrants' movements and their infrastructures of liveability, without necessarily killing or letting them die."³⁷ As Tazzioli explains, "choking" indicates on the one hand the physical cramping and suffocating of migrants—along the lines of an asphyxiatory power . . . —and on the other the constant disrupting of migrant movements and the dismantling of their spaces of life."³⁸ Migrants' movements are disrupted not just through forced containment but also through being forced to keep moving, being rerouted, and being chased away.³⁹ These processes continually strip away people's grounds for claiming rights that might mitigate against violence and death.⁴⁰ Tazzioli highlights that technologies of choking dismantle and destroy migrants' "infrastructures of liveability" and sociality, too.⁴¹

Focusing on choking does not ignore "power's grasp over life and death" or minimize that migration controls in some cases do directly "govern through

death.”⁴² On the contrary, innumerable migrants have choked to death while navigating US migration controls, whether from thirst and heatstroke while crossing the southern desert or from lack of oxygen in sealed, airless trucks and containers. Moreover, authorities count on would-be migrants knowing that the controls may be fatal in order to deter further migration.⁴³ Focusing on choking, however, expands the conversation to address forms of violence that not only kill people but also contain, injure, exhaust, and wear them out at every step. Moreover, scholarship underscores the connections between migration controls and other violent systems. Tazzioli suggests that attention to technologies of choking “enables tracing out multiple continuities between biopolitical tactics of choking migrants, the governing of colonised subjects and the racialised violent policing of black people.”⁴⁴ Her framing painfully evokes the racialized, cisheteropatriarchal violence endured by innumerable Black men and women whose anguished words, “I can’t breathe,” while being held by police in fatal chokeholds, resulted in deaths that have spurred mass protests and for which there has yet to be an accounting.⁴⁵

Describing migration controls as an infrastructure of chokepoints highlights not just violence but also the infrastructures that materially and ideologically generate, facilitate, and normalize the violence. Hannah Appel, Nikhil Anand, and Akhil Gupta make clear the intimate connection between visceral violence and infrastructure, writing that attention to “infrastructure forces us to rethink governance and citizenship not at a distance but pressing into the flesh. . . . [It] does not allow state power to disavow itself. On the contrary, it is an intimate form of contact, presence, and potential.”⁴⁶ In the context of migration-control infrastructure that chokes, harms, wears out, and generates deportation, queer and trans migrants and allies create intimacies that demand other ways of living.

*Reproducing Global Apartheid, Inequalities among Citizens,
and Erasure of Indigenous Sovereignties*

The US migration-control infrastructure is rooted in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when the modern world order composed of sovereign nation-states took shape. That world order, and modern nation-states’ boundaries, emerged through processes of settler colonialism, colonialism, capitalism, and racial slavery. Control over movement became crucial to realizing and sustaining national boundaries that, in the case of the United States, were often inscribed on or cut through the boundaries of Indigenous nations.⁴⁷ Beginning in the late nineteenth century, nation-states stripped

private and local entities of the power to control people's movement across national boundaries and asserted the nation-state's power and authority to determine what counted as legitimate movement and by whom.⁴⁸

Possibilities for crossing international borders came to hinge on the distinction between citizen and noncitizen, which required the development of bureaucratic capacities to identify and designate every living person as being a citizen of somewhere.⁴⁹ Citizenship is commonly conceived in liberal thought as a universal and valorized status. Barry Hindess and others, however, characterize nation-based citizenship as a strategy for population management that upholds systemic inequalities.⁵⁰ The expectation that everyone should be a citizen of somewhere became the grounds for emplacing everyone within nation-states founded on settler colonial and imperial mappings.⁵¹

Controlling movement across borders based on citizen/noncitizen distinctions normalizes the fact that the material and symbolic value of people's nation-based citizenship statuses vary precisely because of the effects of colonialism, settler colonialism, racial slavery, heteropatriarchy, and global capitalism. Because of these histories and processes, an individual's legal citizenship "closely corresponds to strikingly different prospects for well-being, security, and freedom of individuals."⁵² This includes strikingly different prospects for being allowed to legally cross national borders. Thus, while unequal global relations generate mass displacement and migration, citizens of the Global South face numerous restrictions on travel across borders.⁵³ At the same time, citizens of Global North nation-states are often the recipients of visa waivers and other arrangements that facilitate their travel.⁵⁴ Scholars conceive that these interacting conditions reproduce global apartheid, which Joseph Nevins describes as follows: "The relatively rich and largely white of the world are generally free to travel and live wherever they would like and to access the resources they 'need.' Meanwhile the relatively poor and largely nonwhite are typically forced to subsist in places where there are not enough resources to provide sufficient livelihood or, in order to overcome their deprivation and insecurity, to risk their lives trying to overcome ever-stronger boundary controls put into place by rich countries that reject them."⁵⁵ Nandita Sharma underscores that global apartheid involves not only restrictions on movement across territorial borders that leave numerous people unable to move legally but also differential treatment toward all noncitizens living and working within the territorial space of the nation-state.⁵⁶ Sharma notes that these unequal conditions "are accepted as either perfectly legitimate or relatively unimportant by much of the population, including those who are otherwise critical of neoliberal state policies."⁵⁷

Deportation is the linchpin that keeps this interlocking system of inequalities in place. Tanya Maria Golash-Boza explains, “Global apartheid would not be feasible without deportation, as deportation is the physical manifestation of policies that determine who is permitted to live where.”⁵⁸ Deportation or its threat maintains the unequal global distribution of wealth and resources.⁵⁹

Deportation also reproduces inequalities among the citizenry. This occurs because the global histories and dynamics that generate inequalities between those who hold different national citizenship statuses also generate inequalities among those who hold shared national citizenship status. Scholars explain that nation-based citizenship is composed of two dimensions: legal status and normative belonging.⁶⁰ Each aspect coconstitutes yet is distinct from the other one.⁶¹ Since the inception of the United States, possibilities for accessing legal citizenship status have been economically based, racialized, heteropatriarchal, settler, and imperial, and legal citizenship has never guaranteed normative belonging. On the contrary, meaningful belonging has been restricted, denied, cramped, and under struggle for innumerable legal citizens. Moreover, US citizenship was imposed on Indigenous communities as a tool for further dispossession and elimination. United States migration controls, which are “foundationally constituted through and intertwined with anti-Indigenous, anti-Black, and imperialist warfare,” contribute to reproducing and normalizing marginalized citizens’ nonbelonging.⁶² This includes by firewalling against entry or settlement by migrants who were seen as outside of or directly threatening to settler colonial, imperial, white supremacist, anti-Black, heteropatriarchal, and capitalist norms.

Since legal status and belonging are intertwined, some marginalized citizens’ nonbelonging also puts their legal status at direct risk or under erasure. Mass deportations in the 1930s included innumerable US citizens of Mexican descent and Mexican migrants, which highlights that in a racist and settler colonial state, nonbelonging may invalidate legal citizenship. That history is not restricted to the past; every year, a number of legal citizens are denied permission to enter the United States or get deported because officials refuse to believe that they are citizens. Rachel E. Rosenbloom argues that these cases “compel us to reconceptualize citizenship as . . . a status that . . . is, in a functional sense, produced by [immigration] enforcement.”⁶³ Since 9/11, numerous citizens who identified as or were perceived to be of Middle Eastern descent (a vast, complex, and changing category) found that their legal citizenship mattered little as they were put under surveillance and detained without due process. Those who identified or were perceived as Latino/a/x (another vast and complex category)

also disproportionately experienced being treated as potentially deportable migrants. A continuous stream of bills that try to deny US citizenship to the children who are born on US soil to undocumented people announce not just that marginalized groups' legal citizenship is fragile but that it can be revoked. In 2020, under President Donald Trump, the Department of Justice launched an office dedicated to denaturalizing targeted citizens.⁶⁴

Struggles over belonging that implicate people's citizenship status occur not just at borders but also throughout the United States. This is because migration controls are infused through all aspects of society, continually profiling people and seeking to identify noncitizens for denial of rights and for detention and deportation. Thus, the controls affect not just migrants but also citizens, especially those who are racialized as likely foreigners, security threats, and criminals (further discussed below). These histories underscore that citizens, including marginalized citizens and all citizens committed to justice, have compelling reasons to challenge and demand an end to the US migration-control system that builds on, reproduces, and normalizes inequalities among the citizenry—while sanctioning discrimination toward noncitizens. This does not mean that migrants and citizens have the same histories, struggles, or stakes in abolishing the US migration-control system. Rather, it suggests that there exists much common ground around which migrants and citizens may—and do—organize to abolish migration controls, including deportation, which is this book's focus.

The US border controls, including deportation, also continually assert domination over Indigenous lands. Indeed, the controls' purpose is to normalize settler boundaries and state-making that emerged through genocide and land theft. Moreover, US border controls often further extend domination over Indigenous nations while pushing back on Indigenous sovereignties.⁶⁵ For example, the United States actively funnels migrants into the Tohono O'odham Nation, turning the nation into "the epicenter of death for the militarized border zone," where children and adults may encounter the remains of border crossers who have perished. At the same time, "in southern districts of the Tohono O'odham Nation forming the international border with Sonora, Mexico, O'odham communities in Chukut-Kuk and Gu Vo districts experience the loss of respect for their governing institutions, the maintenance of their social organizations, and the control of their communities and peoples."⁶⁶ Border Patrol fences traverse the O'odham Nation, watchtowers surveil people as they go about their everyday lives, and members of the nation endure threats and abuse at Border Patrol checkpoints on all roads leading

D

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

into and out of the Nation.⁶⁷ Border Patrol as an occupying force makes it dangerous or impossible to engage in traditional hunting, gather plants used for healing and prayer, or fulfill religious practices. It fails to respect or protect sacred sites and damages waterways. O'odham adults and children "are witnesses to violent acts, made to accept life in a militarized zone, as well as see physical damage caused by the Border Patrol to O'odham lands in order to sustain border militarization. No other jurisdiction in the United States, Indigenous or not, is exposed to such concentrated forms of ongoing violence to local populations."⁶⁸

Creating Deportation

Deportation builds on violent histories of peopling the United States and controlling people's mobilities to sustain white patriarchal settler hegemony and global apartheid. It was informed by practices of forcibly removing Indigenous communities, controlling the movement of enslaved and freed Black people through Fugitive Slave Acts and Black Codes, and expelling the poor. Deportation involved new innovations, too.

According to Kelly Lytle Hernández, the US state had to invent the power to deport since it was not written into the Constitution. Inventing that power unfolded after the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act—which was explicitly racist, Orientalist, heteropatriarchal, and capitalist—failed to exclude Chinese people on the scale that white nationalists had hoped for. This led to the passage of the Geary Act, which required all Chinese-born people who were legally present in the United States to register with the government or else be arrested, imprisoned for up to one year, and then deported. Hernández summarizes, "The act knotted immigration control to crime and punishment in historically unprecedented and constitutionally questionable ways."⁶⁹ Massive challenges to the act, which were spearheaded by the Chinese community, resulted in two key Supreme Court decisions that established the legal and institutional logics of deportation that still guide us today. In one decision, *Fong Yue Ting v. United States* (1893), the Supreme Court upheld Congress's power to expel any noncitizen for any reason, including racial animus, and justified that power as an expression of settler state sovereignty.⁷⁰ The 1896 *Wong Wing* decision established that people could be confined while the state tried to deport them but that this was supposedly not the same as criminal confinement.⁷¹ This opinion "invented immigrant detention as a veiled but valid practice of human caging in the United States."⁷²

Over time, the grounds for deportation steadily expanded. Moreover, although the law initially allowed only for deportation on grounds that existed before the person was admitted to the United States, in the 1910s, migrants became deportable for acts or circumstances that arose after their entry. The time limits within which a deportation could occur were expanded. Panic over migrant women's involvement in "white slavery" (i.e., sex work) particularly fueled these changes. European women became conceived as victims of white slavery, while Asian, Mexican, and Black women became constructed as "wayward" on racial, sexual, and gendered grounds, illustrating that deportation contributed to producing and enforcing racialized heteronormativity as the basis of belonging to the nation. These norms affected migrants' possibilities and the perception and treatment of marginalized citizens. In 1917, the two sets of deportation policies that had developed—one directed at Chinese laborers and the other directed at everyone else—became folded into one. By 1924, deportation became what Daniel Kanstroom describes as a mode of postentry social control over migrants that lasted until they departed, naturalized, or died.⁷³ That same year, the Border Patrol was created. Katy Murdza and Walter Ewing summarize, "Since its creation . . . the Border Patrol has been steeped in institutional racism and has committed violent acts with near impunity" as it engages in policing borders and expelling migrants.⁷⁴ Hernández notes that enduring racism grounds deportation: "Detention and deportation no longer explicitly target Chinese immigrants but the regime of immigration controls is no less racialized. . . . Latinos [currently] comprise 97% of all forced removals and deportations from the United States."⁷⁵ These racist and racializing dynamics inseparably intertwine with gender- and sexuality-norming for the capitalist settler state.

This history laid the groundwork for the post-1965 period on which this book focuses. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 and the Refugee Act of 1980 set the basic framework for admission today. Under contemporary federal law, permission to cross the border requires noncitizens to show that they fit into a narrow spectrum of state-recognized family ties, economic niches, state-approved protection needs, or short-term visa requirements.⁷⁶ These limited avenues for entry are administered in ways that reproduce global apartheid, white supremacy, settler colonialism, normative genders and sexualities, and the exclusion of poor and working people. Concomitantly, the laws exclude who cannot be admitted, whether because they are explicitly barred or because they are unable to affirmatively match admission requirements.⁷⁷ Deportation cements these interrelationships.

D

UKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

Logics and practices of crimmigration, attrition, and national security have proven critical for dispersing deportability into all aspects of everyday life, thereby shaping the events described in upcoming chapters. Data capitalism that captures, packages, and sells massive amounts of personal information that gets used for surveillance and predictive policing has turbocharged these dynamics.⁷⁸

In the 1980s, the legal grounds and practical mechanisms for detaining and deporting migrants began proliferating through “crimmigration.”⁷⁹ Crimmigration entails “the intertwining of crime control and migration control” in a spiraling process that continually deepens the equation between migrants and crime and functions to justify detention and deportation.⁸⁰ Crimmigration draws heavily on, and further entrenches, histories of criminalization and mass incarceration that target Black and other marginalized citizens.⁸¹

Crimmigration vastly expanded the deportation of noncitizens who committed crimes and minor offenses. As the War on Drugs funneled vast numbers of Black and brown people and people experiencing poverty to prison, the state faced a shortage of detention beds. Patrisia Macías-Rojas describes how the shortage prompted authorities to explore expelling noncitizens who were convicted of crimes in order to free up bed space to incarcerate marginalized citizens. The 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act introduced the Criminal Alien Program to deport noncitizens who were convicted of felonies.⁸² That same year, the Anti-Drug Abuse Act expanded mandatory sentencing for drug offenses, which further exacerbated shortages of prison bed space.⁸³ The 1988 Anti-Drug Abuse Act again expanded penalties for drug offenses and included a provision for deporting noncitizens convicted of aggravated felonies.⁸⁴

These dynamics further exploded in 1996, when the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act mandated the deportation of both authorized and unauthorized migrants who are convicted of any “aggravated felony.” The law, however, redefined and vastly expanded what constituted an aggravated felony such that it encompassed even minor violations like theft or failure to appear in court. Moreover, the law applied these revised standards retroactively so that anyone who ever had minor brushes with the law, even long in the past, suddenly found themselves deportable.⁸⁵ That same year, the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act made any act of moral turpitude (a vaguely defined concept that may be applied to actions

as diverse as driving under the influence and mass murder) into grounds for deportation.⁸⁶ States and municipalities added a host of laws and ordinances, such as antiloitering, to facilitate the criminal prosecution of unauthorized migrants.⁸⁷ These dynamics vastly expanded deportation. The growing detention of asylum seekers further added to the numbers.

Crimmigration also involved the enhancement or literal creation of criminal penalties for immigration-related acts such as crossing the border without authorization or reentering after being deported. Macías-Rojas highlights that at the southwest border, those most likely to be prosecuted are people who reenter after deportation—vast numbers of whom have long histories of settlement and deep ties to families and communities in the United States.⁸⁸ Macías-Rojas further highlights that these prosecutions overwhelmingly affect people from Mexico and, increasingly, Central America and their US citizen and legal resident families and communities.⁸⁹ Prosecutions for unauthorized (re)entry have become the single most prosecuted federal crime, and it has vastly swelled federal prison populations where prosecuted migrants now serve time before being deported for reentry.

Significantly increased cooperation between federal immigration officials and state and local law enforcement, including through data sharing, provided the practical means for transforming these changes into growing numbers of migrant detentions and deportations. The Criminal Alien Program, the 287(g) Program, and Secure Communities were key.⁹⁰ These programs vastly expanded the numbers of law enforcement authorities and mechanisms that monitored not just possible criminal activity but everyone's immigration status, and they multiplied the chokepoints in everyday life where migrants risked capture and being turned over to immigration authorities. Harsha Walia highlights that the "devolution to state and local enforcement not only mimics the design of anti-Black laws, but also disproportionately impacts Black migrants."⁹¹

CHOKEPOINTS THAT MAY LEAD to deportation also became embedded into everyday life through logics and practices of attrition. *Merriam-Webster* defines *attrition* as "the act of wearing or grinding down by friction; the act of weakening or exhausting by constant harassment, abuse, or attack."⁹² Michele Waslin explains that, when used as a tool of migration control, attrition involves doing everything possible to make it "difficult, if not impossible, for unauthorized immigrants to live in American society," including by turning everyday activities that are required to survive into chokepoints that may

lead to deportation.⁹³ Ubiquitous digital tracking that is embedded into all aspects of daily life has strengthened the attritionary dragnet.⁹⁴

K-Sue Park explains that contemporary strategies of attrition have deep roots in colonial conquest and settlement. According to Park, when colonists could not engage in outright warfare, they sought to create conditions that forced Native people from lands that colonists then expropriated for themselves. Colonists targeted everyday life in order to achieve these goals: “They quickly realized their own settlement created hostile conditions that caused native peoples to remove themselves without always being legible as an assault on tribes that would lead them to declare war. Colonists therefore pursued an indirect removal policy by passing laws and building institutions that had the effect of attacking native people’s lives from every angle, impacting their health, safety and freedom of mobility, and their ability to find food, shelter, and maintain kinship bonds and political orders.”⁹⁵

Contemporary attrition strategies draw from these histories. The Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986 multiplied the chokepoints around paid employment by requiring everyone—migrants and citizens alike—to document their identities and eligibility for paid employment. The IRCA did not actually prevent migrants from working, but it did make paid employment harder and more expensive to get, and migrant workers more exploitable and vulnerable, while increasing employment-based racial and gender profiling for everyone, including citizens. Raids on workplaces and day laborer pickup sites, the use of E-Verify, and other initiatives sought to further ensure that undocumented migrants’ efforts to secure paid employment instead channeled them into deportation.

In the 1990s, federal law sought to turn childbearing, health care, schooling, and other aspects of social reproduction into chokepoints, too. Through these systems, documented migrants were to be disciplined into self-sufficiency or else risk losing their legal status, while undocumented migrants were to be identified and targeted for detention and deportation.⁹⁶ California’s Proposition 187, the so-called Save Our State initiative that passed in 1994, offered a template on which federal (and much state and local) legislation subsequently built. These efforts drew from, and further strengthened, laws that targeted marginalized citizens’ access to social supports.⁹⁷ Disgusted and sickened by Proposition 187, Mexican American cultural workers Lalo Alcaraz and Esteban Zul launched a satirical campaign that included faxing media outlets fake news releases that extolled the benefits of (imaginary) “self-deportation centers” and talking up an (imaginary) group, Hispanics against Liberal Takeover, or HALTO.⁹⁸ Their satirical concept of “self-deportation,” however,

swiftly became part of Republican commonsense justifications for attrition policies that targeted everyday life.

Children attending school were also targeted. In *Plyler v. Doe* (1982), the Supreme Court ruled that all children under eighteen are entitled by law to receive public K–12 education, regardless of their legal status. Yet schools became pipelines to deportation as struggling students, particularly in low-income and minoritized communities, became tracked into the juvenile (in) justice system.⁹⁹ Parents picking up children from school were sometimes detained and deported, too, even though areas around schools are officially designated as protected areas where immigration authorities are not supposed to operate.¹⁰⁰

Supporters like Mark Krikorian expect attrition to generate deportation in three ways: by multiplying the choke/checkpoints through which everyone's legal standing gets checked and those unable to prove legal presence get turned over to Border Patrol; by ensuring that the multiplication occurs in ways that target all aspects of everyday life, thereby choking off migrants' possibilities for subsistence and living; and by calculating that these dynamics will compel migrants who are not captured by the state to self-deport anyway. In the face of this kind of systemic violence, undocumented people can call on neither legal citizenship nor universal human rights to defend themselves. Instead, Alicia Schmidt Camacho suggests that the situation "renders the undocumented vulnerable to an almost total social abridgement of their social relatedness as materialized in actual kinship ties and communal belonging."¹⁰¹ Documented migrants and citizens are affected by being required to prove their status to racist, settler, cisheteronormative institutions when seeking employment or vital support and by being disciplined into exploitative work conditions and diminishing or nonexistent social supports under a system of neoliberal capitalism that treats poverty as an individual failing rather than as stemming from systemic inequality. Through these practices, deportation has become a further entrenched part of all aspects of everyday life.

Living under conditions of deportability means navigating relentlessly attritionary conditions while trying to survive and build life. Becoming deported after living in the United States furthers the experience of attrition as social and cultural capital that people gained and time that they invested in creating a future are forcibly stripped away.¹⁰² Moreover, people are generally deported without any of the assets that they worked so hard to accumulate.¹⁰³ Deportation also strips resources and possibilities from families, friends, and communities in countries migrants are deported from and countries migrants are deported to. Deportation as part of neoliberal global capitalism

emerges as an important instrument of attritionary stripping away that operates across multiple scales and temporalities.

THE EVENTS OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001, further multiplied chokepoints and dispersed deportability through concerns about national security. National security is not self-evident, objective, or universal but, rather, a shifting discourse that has been fundamental to the foundation of the United States as a white, settler colonial, and heteropatriarchal nation. National security concerns ensured that racial, gender, Indigenous, and other marginalized “others” became targets of surveillance and control in order to maintain the status quo.¹⁰⁴ For example, “eighteenth century New York City adopted lantern laws that required Black, mixed-race, and Indigenous enslaved persons to carry candle-lit lanterns if they walked around the city unaccompanied by a white person after sunset. The law’s intent was to ensure that persons covered by the law could be ‘seen, located, and controlled at all times.’”¹⁰⁵ Surveillance and control measures were also incorporated into the immigration-control system from its inception. When granting Congress broad powers to regulate immigration, the Supreme Court “compared Chinese immigrants arriving in the United States to a hostile army invading its shores” and “rationalized that the power to regulate immigration was a necessary part of the power of a sovereign state to defend itself.”¹⁰⁶ The idea of immigration control as a matter of national security informed immigration legislation and practices, including deportation, throughout the twentieth century. At the same time, invoking national security significantly shielded discriminatory and abusive practices from being challenged.

After September 11, 2001, the discourse on migrants in general, and undocumented migrants and borders in particular, as potential security threats “set off a self-feeding chain reaction of enforcement . . . [and] contributed to a range of restrictive policies aimed at banishing undocumented immigrants from the national territory.”¹⁰⁷ In a move that further conflated migration control with national security, immigration and border control functions were relocated into the newly created Department of Homeland Security, and massive resources were poured into reconceived screening and tracking systems. Information technologies that promised to accomplish “what ICE, the border patrol, white nationalists, English-only policies, Proposition 187, and voters in the borderlands could not accomplish over centuries” played a significant role.¹⁰⁸ Ruja Benjamin explains that expanding technology enables both obvious and less visible yet insidious harms.¹⁰⁹ The United States negotiated new

migration and border control arrangements with Mexico, Canada, and many other countries, enforcement at the southern border reached unprecedented levels, enforcement within the boundaries of the nation expanded, and possibilities for challenging abuse remained daunting in the face of government invocations of national security. In new ways, people from Muslim, Middle Eastern, and Arab backgrounds were singled out, surveilled, incarcerated, and otherwise targeted. Young men from majority Muslim and Arab countries became required to register with the government and found themselves subjected to interrogation and, in some cases, detention for reasons that were rarely explained. “Of the 83,000 men who came forward, 13,000 were deported,” even though “none were charged with terrorism related crimes.”¹¹⁰

A spate of legislation reflected and resourced the framework of the “immigrant as threat.” Key laws included the USA PATRIOT Act (2001), the National Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act (2004), and the Real ID Act (2005). Immigration and Customs Enforcement released Operation Endgame, a plan to detain and deport every single migrant who was deportable on any grounds whatsoever.¹¹¹ Anna Sampaio argues that these laws, practices, and security logics, which combined “masculine protectionism and racialized demonization,” provided “a template to scrutinize, harass, and encumber immigrants while also reconfiguring citizenship.”¹¹² Detention and deportation numbers continued to skyrocket.¹¹³

Funding for the migration-control infrastructure skyrocketed too, even while social spending drastically declined. According to the American Immigration Council, from 1993 to 2021, “the annual budget of the U.S. Border Patrol has increased more than ten-fold, from \$363 million to nearly \$4.9 billion.”¹¹⁴ After 2003, Border Patrol (now called Customs and Border Protection, CBP) and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) became part of the new Department of Homeland Security (DHS). From 2003 to 2021, under DHS, ICE spending nearly tripled “from \$3.3 billion to \$8.3 billion,” much of this devoted to detention.¹¹⁵ In the same time period, “the budget of CBP, which includes both the Border Patrol and operations at ports of entry, has also nearly tripled, rising from \$5.9 billion in FY 2003 to a high of \$17.7 billion in FY 2021.”¹¹⁶ The budget underwrote enormous changes in the built environment and massively expanded personnel and technology.

Crimmigration, attrition, and discourses of national security thoroughly infuse everyday institutions that are increasingly networked through information technology with the migration-control infrastructure. These logics and practices ensure that everyone, but especially precarious migrants and marginalized citizens, continually navigate violence and that migrants face

deportability. Deportability has also been further dispersed globally as the US Border Patrol exports its logics and practices through “an interconnected network of partnerships, funding, multinational industries, and international agreements, stretching across every continent and saturating the world.”¹¹⁷

Intimacies

This book explores writings by and about queer migrants’ and allies’ struggles against deportation and deportability through the lens of intimacies that involve “a sense of self in [close] connection to others.”¹¹⁸ Intimacy is a tricky concept with multiple meanings. It is commonly understood as involving family ties, sexual relationships, familiarity, deep knowledge, or proximity/closeness.¹¹⁹ Intimacy is especially associated with the private home, which, in the United States, is seen as separate from the state and market, and connected with domesticity, whiteness, patriarchy, and the civilizing mission.¹²⁰

Feminist, Black, queer, trans, and decolonial scholarship have significantly challenged these common perspectives and offered important insights that inform this book. The insights include that, first, intimacy does not have a preset domain or normative form but instead is produced in changing ways within multiple relations of power.¹²¹ Second, intimacy is a crucial nexus through which states exercise governance in order to reproduce exclusionary nationalisms and unequal transnational fields structured around hierarchies of settler colonialism, empire, race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, and ability—often using discourses of family. Third, anti-Blackness, dehumanization, and violence have been critical to producing normative intimacies.¹²²

Slavery required what Christina Sharpe calls “monstrous intimacies” that transformed stolen African people into “things” that could be bought, sold, traded, and abused while reserving concepts of “the human” for those who were white, male, and propertied.¹²³ Against this backdrop, Ann Laura Stoler shows that calculations about and control over intimacies provided the material means through which imperial states and colonial administrators created multiple distinctions among populations and tied these distinctions to enduring inequalities.¹²⁴ At the same time, intimacies became the basis on which marginalized people challenged these distinctions and the inequalities that they upheld. After the imperial order became rescaled into a global order of nation-states that began to assert and enact sovereignty by controlling immigration, states institutionalized efforts to govern migrants through their intimate ties, and these efforts drew on and repurposed older racist, colonial logics and practices while contributing to nation-making in new ways.¹²⁵

Family became a crucial intimacy through which noncitizens claimed rights to admission and settlement, yet *family* was understood and administered by the US state in ways that, as Nayan Shah shows, produced and naturalized the white, settled, “respectable, propertied, conventionally gendered and sexualized family household” as the model for nation-building that was tied into state-sanctioned forms of paid employment, social welfare, and political participation.¹²⁶ The model thoroughly shaped the distribution of material and symbolic resources, while rendering illegible and illegal other forms of sociality and intimacy and nullifying innumerable noncitizens’ possibilities for claiming admission and long-term residence.

Family remains a key intimacy through which states enact violent migration controls, including deportation, and through which people contest that violence. Thus, this book pays attention to intimacies that are referenced under the term *family*. This includes nuclear families that are normalized by the state, nonnuclear families and kinship forms that affirm Indigenous, Black, POC, and two-spirit presence in the face of histories of violent erasure, and “families we choose.” “Families we choose” reflects that queer and trans people, who often experience violence and rejection from biological and legal families, have rich histories of creating alternative families and intimacies that are often illegible under law and social policies or used as weapons against queer and trans folks, yet offer psychological and material support.¹²⁷ William N. Eskridge Jr. describes these “families we choose” as composed of “consent-based intimacy among friends, partners, former lovers, children, and others.”¹²⁸

While weaponizing intimacies to govern migration and generate deportation, however, the state never restricts itself to family. The previous discussion of attrition highlighted a wide range of intimacies and ties that have been deliberately instrumentalized to serve the state’s deportation goals. These include employer/employee relations and ties involved in schooling, health care, renting, and all manner of service provision and community building. Equally, people challenging deportation mobilize intimacies that include but extend beyond family. This book makes space for all of these intimacies. In doing so, it moves away from binary debates about whether queer and trans people should or should not support same-sex marriage toward exploring how a wide range of intimacies—that include but extend beyond those recognized by the state—figure in the production and contestation of deportation.

The book is guided by Ara Wilson’s argument that infrastructure—which “conjures up quite physical things” but remains a “fuzzy” construct—and intimacy should be considered together.¹²⁹ Wilson suggests that infrastructures “enable or hinder” specific formations of intimacy and that attention

to infrastructure allows us to analyze the “concrete forces of abstract fields of power” and the operations of “actually existing systems” that condition intimacies.¹³⁰ The book’s chapters center on aspects of the deportation infrastructure around which queer and trans migrants and allies have especially mobilized intimacies to contest deportation: the promise of legalization, same-sex marriage, traffic enforcement that pipelines people to deportation, and transgender migrant detention.

The book does not offer a positivist (or necessarily positive) depiction of intimacies; rather, intimacies are understood as emergent, always in process, and multifaceted. Intimacies assuredly include violence, but I focus on intimacies oriented toward enabling survival and livability in the present and animated by a vision of future thriving. Effectively, I’m interested in materials by and about queer and transgender migrants and allies who, centering on deportation, seek to transform the balance between “what forms of life are supported to persist, alter and thrive, and what forms of life are destroyed, injured and constrained” with the goal of creating a future without deportation that supports life and livability for all.¹³¹

The traffic stop that opens this introduction shows some ways that intimacies get mobilized in the context of the infrastructure of chokepoints. The stop was prompted by an anonymous call claiming that a man was abducting children; this claim evoked long-standing narratives of migrant men of color as dangerous to normative family intimacies. Details of the call were conveyed to law enforcement, who made a traffic stop. The officers did not rescue abducted children; instead, after local police called Border Patrol, they threatened to utterly transform or completely sever the established intimacies among those in the car. The stop turned Huerta into a father who was on track to lose intimate ties to his children and partner (not to mention to his coworkers and communities), ensured that the children’s ties to their father were going to be forever affected, and left Huerta’s partner, US citizen Perla López, crying on the roadside as she wondered what to do. Media reported that after the stop, López assumed responsibility for Huerta’s children in addition to her own.¹³² Effectively, Huerta’s deportation reconstituted her as a single parent and provider.¹³³ These experiences—and the vast scholarship on the struggles facing mixed-status families composed of citizens and migrants—underscore that deportation violently restructures or entirely terminates many intimacies and ramifies in numerous ways that reiterate yet traverse citizen/noncitizen status distinctions. Such terrible experiences also show that deportation struggles involve relations between migrants and citizens that are multiple and intersectional

rather than binary and that connect through the norm of good citizenship that produces differential dispossession among interconnected migrants and marginalized citizens.¹³⁴

Alcaraz Ochoa's response mobilized intimacy very differently than the state. His response expressed a deeply felt sense of identification and solidarity with a stranger who publicly experienced being routed into deportation—and with the children and partner who cried as someone they loved was being disappeared into the deportation system, and quite possibly from their lives. Alcaraz Ochoa's sense of identification across lines of sexual or gender identity or parental status challenges bounded conceptions of LGBTQ people as existing in one world and presumably normative heterosexual individuals and families in another one. We can conceive his response through the lens of stranger intimacy, which Shah, building on Michael Warner and others, describes as “another model of ‘human closeness’ that was distinct from family and institutional relationships” and has the potential to “recast the values and practices of association . . . [in ways] that can bring democratic community into being.”¹³⁵ Shah's conceptualization of stranger intimacy questions the normalization of racialized heteronormativity that underpins public spheres and expected civic intimacies and insists on the possibility or active presence of other, queer intimacies.¹³⁶ Queer intimacies include not just intimacies among self-identified queer people but also intimacies that refuse to adhere to normative boundaries, as was evident when Alcaraz Ochoa identified with and acted in solidarity with Huerta and his family.

Shah argues that racialized cisheteronormativity as the model for civic life “aggravate[s] the experience of estrangement for transient migrants” and enhances their vulnerability.¹³⁷ The concept of estrangement is especially helpful for grasping the dynamics of the situation into which Alcaraz Ochoa intervened: “‘Estrangement’ is an active process of forcible dislocation, removing people from ‘an accustomed place or set of associations,’ souring the grounds of shared ‘membership’ by sowing feelings of hostility, distrust, and ‘unsympathetic and indifferent’ regard.”¹³⁸ Huerta's, López's, and the children's experiences reflect the continual working of deportation logics and processes that actively estrange and remove people from places and associations. For such estrangement to become normalized requires people to buy into and participate in models of racialized cisheteronormativity and the associational ties that these models presume, promote, and enforce. When Alcaraz Ochoa turned toward Huerta and identified with his terrible predicament, he refused dominant associational models that position Huerta as estrangable

D

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

and disposable. Alcaraz Ochoa's refusal insisted on the possibility of other, queer kinds of associational models where undocumented migrants, racialized citizens, and mixed-status families are not disposable.

Alcaraz Ochoa's turn toward Huerta and the terrified family on the side of the road involved not just identification but action. He tried intervening into the infrastructure of enforcement that "sour[s] the grounds" among people while promoting hostility, indifference, and a lack of sympathy toward situations like Huerta's. His strategy for disrupting the unfolding deportation was simple but effective: he rolled under the wheels of the Border Patrol van, preventing it from leaving. His cell phone offered a critical technology for documenting what was happening and summoning witnesses and supporters. Alcaraz Ochoa's intervention can be conceived as acting in solidarity; solidarities, in turn, both stem from and continually produce intimacies.¹³⁹ As Kate Siegfried explains, "Intimacy . . . gestures beyond the individual to a shared relationship," and to feel intimate involves "turning toward" objects, people, or relationships, including those based on political solidarities.¹⁴⁰ Alcaraz Ochoa's work in Tucson had deeply immersed and continually involved him in extending solidarities that problematized the material and symbolic relations of force and violent intimacies that undergirded that traffic stop.

Alcaraz Ochoa's turn toward Huerta and efforts to interrupt the deportation machine were further significant because Alcaraz Ochoa was a legal resident, not a citizen. Norms of racialized, cisheteronormative, good citizenship expect legal residents to distance and dissociate themselves from situations such as Huerta's—not express and enact identification. By acting in support of Huerta and his family, Alcaraz Ochoa not only enacted identification but risked bodily harm. He also risked being charged with obstructing official efforts to arrest and deport a migrant.¹⁴¹ This is a felony; noncitizens, including legal residents like Alcaraz Ochoa, may face serious immigration consequences, including deportation, for such charges. This risk shows that normative good citizenship is partly compelled by threats of criminalization and deportation directed at noncitizens, which makes Alcaraz Ochoa's actions even more extraordinary.

Methods, Materials, and Upcoming Chapters

This book builds on my previous works, which put Michel Foucault's scholarship in dialogue with critical ethnic, queer of color, and migration studies in order to theorize sexuality as a key axis of struggle among states, migrants, and citizens in the context of migration controls.¹⁴² Together, the works refuse dominant narratives that posit state migration regimes as natural, self-

evidently justifiable, and without history and use queer of color and other theory to historicize the emergence of these state regimes, grasp the multiscalar relations of power and violence in which they are implicated, underscore that migrant struggles are integrally related to nation-state citizenship regimes, and demand other ways of organizing the world.

This book continues that trajectory while engaging and extending deportation scholarship, specifically. I incorporate materials by and about queer- and transgender-identified migrants into deportation scholarship that frequently ignores questions of how sexual and gender logics, in their intersections with racial, capitalist, and geopolitical hierarchies, shape deportation regimes. The materials offer snapshots of and information about queer- and trans-identified migrants' experiences of deportation, which I contextualize through reference to broad-ranging scholarship about the migration and deportation systems overall. The book's main purpose, however, is not to provide a representation of individual or collective queer and trans migrant lives. Rather, centering materials by and about queer and trans migrants, the book sketches an argument about the necessity of abolishing the deportation system. To make that argument, I center material by and about queer and trans migrants for several reasons.

First, the materials offer insight, information, and knowledge about contesting and abolishing deportation that deserve serious consideration, which I provide. Second, the book explores insights that emerge when queer and trans people are centered rather than sidelined in discussions of deportation—centered in a manner that does not silo them from everyone else yet does not ignore the ways that self-identifying or being perceived by others as queer or trans makes material differences to one's life and possibilities. By taking this approach, the book refuses to essentialize modernist sexual and gender identity categories that serve the state, including its migration regimes, or to silo people based on state categories; at the same time, the book acknowledges that the categories have deeply meaningful material, symbolic, and psychic effects and honors that people variously claim and mobilize these categories for important, life-building reasons. As chapters show, states also mobilize these categories for outcomes that range from repressive to reformist.

Third, the book offers “infrastructures” and “intimacies” as broad heuristics through which to grasp important work that has been done to contest deportation and to explore various possible interventions. Its analysis draws from well-established migration scholarship concerning the intimacies of families/kin, domestic work, and sex work, but it extends scholarship by centering materials by and about queer- and trans-identified migrants and allies contesting

deportation through varied intimacies while inviting readers to imagine and work toward abolition. This approach builds on histories whereby queer- and trans-identified people's intimacies have provided the basis for stigma, criminalization, policing, incarceration, abandonment, and discrimination—and resistance and transformative world-making. Centering intimacies while highlighting writings by and about queer- and transgender-identified people's mobilizations against deportation does not mean replacing a focus on sexualities and genders with a focus on intimacies; rather, it tracks all these together to build bridges between scholarship and broaden how issues are framed. Since few of us live outside the prison house of normative genders and sexualities, the analysis applies not just to queer and trans folks but to people more generally. As Sarah Haley underscores, “Abolition incorporates critique of the heteronormative and white supremacist notions of gender and sexuality that slavery instantiated and that carceral discourses and modes of policing and containment have reproduced and entrenched,” including about intimacies.¹⁴³

Each chapter centers key configurations of intimacies on which deportation systems—and related migration-control and citizenship regimes—depend and ways that people have sought to mobilize intimacies to challenge these. In the process, activists and theorists have advanced new visions and configurations of possible intimacies that not only challenge deportation but also rework what migration control and citizenship could mean. This is queer work, where *queer* is understood not as a personal identity or identification but as an analytic and political horizon.

Queer analytics have been rightly critiqued for often ignoring, eliding, or being actively hostile to trans experiences and priorities. Yet *queer* has also been used in trans-affirming and inclusive ways. Marquis Bey and Jesse A. Goldberg's introduction to the special issue of *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* “Queer Fire: Liberation and Abolition” offers a generative example. These authors explain that the special issue articulates abolition and queerness in a radical manner “where abolition is not affixed to certain ‘bad’ institutions but is a pervasive call for the eradication of carcerality; where queerness is not merely non-het, non-cis ‘identity’ but a political posture subversive of normativity, hegemony, and power.”¹⁴⁴ Bey and Goldberg continue, “Abolition and queerness, taken together, name the eradication of the current terms of order imposed by racial capitalism as ongoing settler-colonial structure,” including “the end of gender, sexuality, class, and race as structures of the world as such.”¹⁴⁵ In other words, their vision of queerness does not depend on but seeks to dismantle gender and sexual norms that articulate racial capitalist and settler colonial systems. Echoing their framing, this book comprises

a queer studies project framed in a trans-inclusive way that interrogates normalized binary genders and pays close attention to not only links between but also distinctions among queer and trans histories of migration. More explicitly than my two previous books, this book argues that abolition rather than reform of the system offers the only possible horizon for a livable future that allows thriving not just for migrants but also for citizens.

I write as a white, queer migrant who came to the United States from the Irish Republic in the 1980s. I had the privilege of legal status while many of my peers struggled with being undocumented, exploitable, and deportable. In an assertion of control over who counted as properly “Irish” that reiterated white, patriarchal gender and sexual norms, queer-identified Irish migrants were barred by establishment Irish Americans from Saint Patrick’s Day parades in New York and elsewhere. In the 1990s, lobbying by the Irish government in conjunction with white backlash in the United States opened pathways for undocumented Irish migrants, but relatively few others, to legalize in large numbers. The creation of legalization possibilities underscored that migrant statuses are products of changing configurations of politics and power rather than reflective of essential qualities or characteristics of migrants themselves. The legalization programs, which allowed substantial numbers of Irish but not Mexican or Filipino or many other migrants to legalize, also highlighted the enduring racism that undergirds US migration regimes.

The ways that Irish government lobbying converged with and supported rather than challenged US white backlash underscored that racist migration policies are reproduced through transnational, as well as national and local, relations. The multiscale injustices that render people undocumented, exploitable, and deportable were illustrated and challenged by Justice for the Undocumented, a campaign by undocumented migrants in Ireland that highlighted that even while Irish politicians lobbied for legalization of Irish migrants in the United States, they failed to create pathways for legalization among diverse undocumented migrant communities in Ireland. In 2015, as an expression of solidarity, undocumented migrants in Ireland participated in a group photograph with a banner that wished happy Saint Patrick’s Day to all undocumented migrants, including those from Ireland living in the United States.¹⁴⁶ This book grows from my embeddedness in these histories and my conviction that the (settler) colonial, racist, capitalist, patriarchal relations that undergird settler state migration controls, making people undocumented, exploitable, and deportable, must end.

The book draws primarily on materials from the public domain. Chapter 2 also draws on interviews with six national-level policy and legal experts about

the challenges of securing legal immigration status through same-sex marriage. These interviewees provided generous assistance for which I am deeply grateful. Yet, the process led me to decide to not seek further interviews—neither from people enduring the violence of detention and deportation nor from activists, advocates, and policymakers who were frequently overwhelmed by requests to both assist migrants facing peril and provide information to researchers.¹⁴⁷ Instead, I embarked on a deliberate journey to find and showcase materials about queer and transgender migrants contesting deportation that exist in the public domain.

This approach allowed me to grasp how the availability of information about queer and trans migrants has changed over time. Until the late 1990s, it was very difficult to find information about queer and transgender migrants—much less information or accounts *by* queer and transgender migrants—because being known to the immigration service as queer or transgender could disastrously affect one’s legal status and future possibilities. How disastrously partly depended on one’s gender, economic situation, place in the racial order, and country of origin, among other factors. In 1990, however, the United States repealed its ban on gay migrants. Subsequently, queer and trans migrants became inscribed into asylum and refugee law, the ban on migrants living with HIV was repealed in 2010, and laws began to recognize same-sex and transgender marriage as a ground for rights claims, including admission. A small but significant number of organizations headed by and dedicated to serving queer and transgender migrants emerged, working in tandem with other social justice groups that also incorporated attention to queer and trans migrant issues. Scholarship by M. Jacqui Alexander, Martin F. Manalansan IV, and a handful of others laid the groundwork for queer and trans migration scholarship to grow.¹⁴⁸ The available information has expanded, as Ari Shaw and Namrata Verghese capture in their description of sources of information about queer and trans refugees and asylum seekers: “We comprehensively searched legal and social science research databases including Lexis Advance, Westlaw, EBSCOhost, Melvyl, JSTOR, Hein Online, PsycINFO, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar. We also searched the websites of international organizations, national governments, and prominent civil society organizations that work with LGBTQI+ refugees and asylum seekers.”¹⁴⁹

At the same time, significant gaps, deep silences, and deliberate obfuscation structure what we know. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Customs and Border Protection practices of obfuscation and outright refusal to provide basic information about many aspects of their operations

are among the biggest causes of gaps and silences. Practices of obfuscation—which are extended to shield private contractors who detain migrants under abusive conditions—directly enable the ongoing, systemic abuses of migrants and marginalized citizens. Further contributing, ICE has sought to ensure that records of assaults, abuse, and deaths that have occurred at their hands are destroyed.¹⁵⁰ For ICE, nontransparency and obfuscation also fuel individual deportations (as when individuals cannot get copies of their case files in order to appeal a deportation order).¹⁵¹ Official information about queer and trans experiences remains elusive and opaque; chapter 2 notes that the government does not collect or provide such basic data as the numbers of people who receive legal status through a same-sex marriage. Martha Balaguera problematizes the way that immigration officials seek to control who counts as LGBTQ, which raises further questions.¹⁵² Lawyers, human rights groups, and others have employed multiple strategies to compel ICE to turn over records and to collect firsthand testimonies of queer, trans, and other migrants, including in detention. Migrants have also stepped forward to provide critical information, often at great risk.

Thus, the book builds on information that is publicly available while wrestling with silence and unknowability. Chapters especially highlight what queer and trans migrant individuals and organizations have said through press releases, media interviews, reports, and biographies about detention and deportation, treating these materials as key information to which scholars must attend. This approach responds to queer and trans migrants' calls to listen to and be guided by their analysis (similar to calls by abolitionist and other scholars for shifts in what gets recognized as knowledge and who is affirmed as a knowledge producer).¹⁵³ Materials also include congressional debates, hearings, and briefings related to detention and deportation; implementation memos, training handbooks, and policy documents that describe how to operationalize current detention and deportation policies; press releases, reports, websites, social media posts, and YouTube videos by queer and transgender migrant individuals and groups challenging detention and deportation; materials by major pro- and anti-immigrant groups; news articles; reports about detention conditions; and information from lawsuits against the government. Chapter 1 is also informed by the year that I spent as a volunteer instructor for a citizenship course at Pima Community College in Tucson, Arizona. Creative and artistic works remain largely beyond the book's scope. Rather than claiming to represent anyone or reveal personal experiences, the book seeks to raise questions and reframe critical debates.

D

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

The chapters particularly center materials by and about queer and trans migrants from Mexico and Central and South America, while making reference to migrants from other regions. That focus reflects the fact that, from 2014 to 2018, when I drafted most of the book, materials that were most visible and available in the public domain particularly concerned deportable queer and trans migrants from Mexico and the Americas. That does not mean that queer and trans migrants from other regions were not also enduring the struggles described in this book; they were. Emerging activism and scholarship—such as the work by the Black LGBTQIA+ Migrant Project and reports on the racist abuse, detention, and deportation of Black migrants who do not conform to or identify with gender binaries—contribute knowledge about other histories and their connections to and differences from the histories described in this book.

The overrepresentation of materials about migrants from Mexico and the Americas also reflects that, historically, US deportation has overwhelmingly focused on people from these regions and the Caribbean. Immigration laws since the 1920s and asylum laws since the 1980s have made it especially difficult for people from these regions to get legal status, while at the same time, the deportation system further developed racist, repressive, and abusive norms by targeting them—not just at the borders but also from within the United States.

The vast amount of materials in the public domain concerning migrants from Mexico, the Americas, and the Caribbean, and the fact that deportation has disproportionately fallen on these groups, reflects interlinked processes; media and politicians continually focus on Mexicans and people from the Americas and Caribbean as constituting what Mae M. Ngai describes as “iconic illegal aliens,” which keeps enforcement and deportation especially focused on these groups in a self-perpetuating, racializing, and neocolonial spiral that gets extended to other groups, too.¹⁵⁴ The materials most available to me reflect these dynamics—and from within these, I selected materials that engage the dynamics.

A note of caution is warranted, however: people coming from Mexico, the Americas, and the Caribbean are included in official records, most media, and congressional materials based on their countries of origin and state-generated racial/ethnic taxonomies. As Shannon Speed describes, this approach “disappears” the fact that the migrants include people from Indigenous nations: “The erasure of Indigenous migrants’ identity as Indigenous people is one of a long series of technologies used by settler states to eliminate Indigenous people.”¹⁵⁵ The materials I used for the book have, in some instances, likely encased Indigenous and other histories within settler nation-state categories, and future work will urgently need to address how to critically open up this issue.

Chapters in the book center on key chokepoints in the migration-control infrastructure around which queer and trans migrants and allies have particularly mobilized to contest deportation while revisioning intimacies. Chapter 1 analyzes a 2013 bipartisan proposal to provide a pathway to citizenship to many of the estimated 11 million undocumented migrants living in the United States at that time. I argue that the proposed pathway, as a cultural logic and material infrastructure, seemed generous but nonetheless cemented interconnections between citizenship as an imagined intimacy among strangers and mandatory migrant deportability. The *Blue Ribbon Commission Report on Deportation*, which was produced by undocumented and formerly undocumented migrants, including queer people, comprised a queer counterproposal that refused the logic of a linear pathway toward an imagined future of citizenship that would likely never come for most people, while demanding an immediate end to deportations.¹⁵⁶ As pathway proposals continue being debated in Congress, the *Report's* arguments remain critical.

Chapter 2 focuses on marriage, a privileged and recognized intimacy that the state actively fosters to reinforce normative citizenship and nation-making. Centering a citizen man (Tom Swann) trying to prevent the deportation of his undocumented husband (Guillermo Hernández), the chapter extends marriage migration scholarship by exploring how immigration laws mandating that marriages must be grounded in love enable attrition, detention, and deportation logics and infrastructures to flourish. The Swann/Hernández case, which involved the first-ever same-sex wedding in an immigrant detention center, highlights that deportation logics differently affect migrant and citizen spouses within a marriage and that married love often does not prevent deportation.

Chapter 3 explores traffic-related interactions, which have become key infrastructures through which vast numbers of people become routed into deportation. Drawing on Sara Ahmed's concept of an affective economy, the chapter explores how attrition and deportation logics turn driving into an experience of risk and jeopardy that fosters fear, isolation, and hopelessness while materially wearing down bodies and stripping away ties and resources.¹⁵⁷ In response, undocumented migrants, many of them queer-identified youth of color, innovated a logic of "undocumented and unafraid" to counter experiences of fear and terror while driving and undertaking other activities in the public sphere. The UndocuBus project, in which more than forty undocumented people rode a bus from Arizona to the Democratic National Convention in Charlotte, North Carolina, in the summer of 2012, used both the bus and riders' bodies to circulate "undocumented and unafraid" as a framework

that summoned new, queer, affective economies, intimacies, and collectivities into being.

Chapter 4 analyzes a 2016 public hunger strike that demanded the closure of the government's LGBT immigrant detention pod in Santa Ana, California, and the release of all detained transgender and queer migrants around the United States. Centering migrant transgender women of color, the hunger strikers connected the abusive conditions that detained migrants endure with the suffering and deprivation experienced by many Santa Ana residents in their everyday lives. They further identified city officials and institutions as having a critical role in addressing these interlinked struggles. This chapter takes up the protestors' questions about what cities can do to foster intimacies that allow thriving rather than only exhaustion, wearing down, expulsion, or death for migrants and marginalized citizens.

The conclusion offers final reflections on deportation infrastructures, queer and trans intimacies, and future directions in the struggle to end deportation and realize a different world.

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

A NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

- 1 Nathalie Peutz and Nicholas De Genova define *deportation* as “the compulsory removal of ‘aliens’ from the physical, social, and juridical space of the state.” Peutz and De Genova, “Introduction,” 1.
- 2 Goodman, *The Deportation Machine*.
- 3 Park, “Self-Deportation Nation,” 1887.
- 4 Peutz and De Genova, “Introduction,” 2. Moreover, Shahram Khosravi highlights that the terminology commonly associated with deportation—such as *return*, *home*, *homeland*, *country of origin*, and *reintegration*—“naturalises the nation state system,” pathologizes movement, depoliticizes deportation, and moralizes. Khosravi, “Introduction,” 10–11.
- 5 See, for example, Anderson, Gibney, and Paoletti, “Citizenship, Deportation and the Boundaries of Belonging.”
- 6 De Genova, “Migrant ‘Illegality’ and Deportability in Everyday Life,” 438.
- 7 Prevention Through Deterrence became the national Border Patrol strategy in 1994. In 1993, a study commissioned by the Office of National Drug Control Policy described how the southwest border was “being overrun” and how drug smuggling was a serious threat (Haddal, *Border Security*, 4). The study recommended that what was then the INS should switch its focus from apprehending people after entry to preventing their entry in the first place. Prevention strategies drew on Operation Gatekeeper in California and Operation Blockade (later renamed Operation Hold the Line) in Texas. The basic concept involved trying to make it impossible to cross at major urban centers by deploying hundreds of agents and surveillance technology and equipment. This meant that migrants were funneled into crossing through more hostile and difficult terrain, such as the Sonoran Desert. Policymakers understood that migrants would face increased injury and sometimes “mortal danger.” These increased dangers, in turn, were expected to deter others from trying to cross, eventually reducing undocumented migration significantly. Prevention Through Deterrence strategies have been widely shown not only to fail in their objective of preventing unauthorized migration but also to increase injury or death and to make migrants who succeed in crossing even more exploitable. See Nuñez-Neto, *Border Security*.
- 8 Organizations like the Colibrí Center for Human Rights address the missing and disappeared. See Colibrí Center for Human Rights, “About Us.”

- 9 Goodman, *The Deportation Machine*, 6.
- 10 Goodman, *The Deportation Machine*, 6.
- 11 Goodman, *The Deportation Machine*, 6.
- 12 Golash-Boza, *Deported*.
- 13 Goodman, *The Deportation Machine*, 1. Goodman explains that judicial deportations (now called “removals”) have been the most visible means through which the state has expelled noncitizens. “But formal deportations represent only a small sliver of the total. More than 85 percent of all expulsions throughout US history have been via an administrative process euphemistically referred to as ‘voluntary departure.’”
- 14 Goodman, *The Deportation Machine*, 4.
- 15 Goodman, *The Deportation Machine*, 7. Since 1996, with the introduction of expedited removal, reinstatement of removal, and stipulated removal, deportation processes and associated records have changed. “Migrants whom officials would have once expelled via voluntary departure now found themselves subject to formal deportation, bans on reentry ranging from five years to life, and possible felony criminal charges for returning to the United States.” Goodman, *The Deportation Machine*, 177.
- 16 Material in this section includes wording and concepts from Chávez and Luibhéid, “Introduction,” and Luibhéid, “Queer/Migration.”
- 17 Somerville, “Queer,” 203. See also Cohen, “Punks, Bulldaggers, and Welfare Queens.”
- 18 Cohen, “Punks, Bulldaggers, and Welfare Queens,” 458.
- 19 Clairborne, “Anyone Can Be an Ally.”
- 20 Luibhéid, “Introduction,” xi.
- 21 Casas-Cortes et al., “New Keywords,” 63–64.
- 22 See Malkki, “Refugees and Exile.”
- 23 People who have been granted refugee status by the UNHRC or its representatives are eligible for resettlement, including in the United States. People who arrive at US borders without holding refugee status, but who are seeking protection nonetheless, may apply for asylum, which is granted on the same basis as refugee status. People may also apply for asylum from within the United States. The refugee/asylum process depends on and reproduces a binary distinction between forced (political) and voluntary (economic) migration, even though such distinctions may not be clear-cut in migrants’ lives.

INTRODUCTION

- 1 In “Op Ed,” Alcaraz Ochoa describes himself as a “queer man born in Jalisco, Mexico.” Elsewhere, he shares that his pronouns are he/they/él.
- 2 Some media accounts give his name as “Huertha,” but most say “Huerta,” so I use the latter.
- 3 Woodhouse, “Waging the Fight for Migrant Justice.”
- 4 A handful of book-length works and special issues of journals address conjunctions between queer and transgender migrants and state deportation regimes: Lewis and Naples, “Queer Migration, Asylum, and Displacement”; Luibhéid and Chávez, *Queer and Trans Migrations*; Das Gupta, *All of Us or None*. See also Balaguera, “Trans-Migrations.”