



Cristina Beltrán

"UNDOCUMENTED, UNAFRAID, AND UNAPOLOGETIC"

DREAM ACTIVISTS, IMMIGRANT
POLITICS, AND THE QUEERING
OF DEMOCRACY

Join the system or burn it down: Scholars of political participation generally characterize young people's activities in terms of either citizenship or protest. Discussions of citizenship, focusing on questions of civic engagement and leadership, tend to look at how subjects learn the value of participation in the existing political system, with an emphasis on how youths enact democratic citizenship through institutional politics: joining and forming organizations, volunteerism, public service, and voting. By contrast, discussions of protest generally represent young people as subjects who seek to transform (rather than simply join) the current political system, seeking social change rather than mere membership in the status quo.

Yet within both types of discussions, citizenship itself is a given. The assumption is that the young people participating are legible and accepted members of the polity. But what if the question of citizenship is *itself* the subject of protest?

This essay is about such subjects: undocumented youth whose political activism demands a rethinking of the very category (citizenship) they both claim and seek to inhabit. Calling themselves DREAMers (based on their support for the DREAM Act),¹ this group of undocumented and often also LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender) youth has appropriated strategies of visibility developed during the gay rights movement and has chosen to "come out" and openly declare their undocumented status. This chapter argues that the politics of coming out, and linkages between sexuality and migration, now serve as a cultural touchstone for DREAM activists. Social media, which allow DREAM activists to speak to an imagined public of both allies and adversaries, have been critical to this development. Posting their stories online and announcing their status at rallies, marches, and conferences, DREAMers show how such acts of self-disclosure and risk taking are powerful enactments of political freedom. New forms of social media such

as YouTube, Twitter, Tumblr, and Facebook, the rise of open-source sites, and the increasing ease of generating original content have allowed DREAM activists to create an alternative public sphere. Beyond its creative component, social media's interactive and peer-based features allow DREAMers to circumvent traditional political elites and mainstream immigrant rights organizations. Finally, online communication channels such as e-mail and Skype have expanded the space of appearance for undocumented youth, whose ability to travel freely is limited, thus allowing them to participate in multiple publics in ways that were inconceivable prior to the Internet.

The creation of such publics and counterpublics has allowed DREAMers to challenge older forms of authority and representative speech, creating new spaces in which the undocumented are not objectified members of a criminalized population who are simply spoken about but instead are *speaking* subjects and agents of change. This proliferation of voices reveals heterogeneous views regarding the politics of incorporation and inclusion. While some DREAMers express familiar claims regarding nationalism, integration, and liberal recognition, the more radical are putting forward critiques of US policies regarding immigration, globalization, civic membership, and political engagement; these critiques are irreverent, audacious, and unapologetic. Such acts of humor, impudence, and invention share similarities with the online ethos of Chinese activists, as is discussed by Zuckerman in this volume. DREAM activism also shares many similarities to what Shelby defines in this volume as "politically impure dissent"—performative acts that assert a lack of respect for state and societal rules that marginalized youth of color deem unjust.

Emphasizing peer-to-peer forms of communication that mix newer technologies with older forms of mobilization, the use of new social media has facilitated what I want to characterize as DREAMers' "queer" vision of democracy—a participatory politics that rejects secrecy and criminalization in favor of more aggressive forms of nonconformist visibility, voice, and protest. Radical DREAMers have used new social media to queer the movement, expressing more complex and sophisticated conceptions of loyalty, legality, migration, sexuality, and patriotism than those typically offered by politicians, pundits, and other political elites. Yet alongside their defiant attitude toward state power, DREAM activism also humanizes the victims of a neoliberal political system that seeks to create "a borderless economy and a barricaded border."²

This ability to "queer" the politics of immigration—to operate successfully at the intersection of liberal inclusion and radical possibility—is so

far best epitomized by the DREAMers' successful pressuring of President Barack Obama to sign an executive order granting undocumented youth "deferred action." The implementation of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) has thus far been one of few policy victories for unauthorized individuals to have occurred in recent years—and its existence is due primarily to the activism of DREAMers. In getting this order passed, DREAMers not only confronted the president during his reelection campaign but took on traditional immigrant rights organizations that preferred a much more accommodationist approach. Activists used new social media to circumvent traditional gatekeepers on immigration policy, making direct demands on President Obama through a strategy of "participatory politics," or "interactive, peer-based acts through which individuals and groups seek to exert both voice and influence on issues of public concern" (defined and discussed by Kahne, Middaugh, and Allen in this volume).³ The interactive, peer-based acts that Kahne et al. identify as being at the center of participatory politics include just what DREAMers have been doing: "starting or joining a political group on a social network site; forwarding or posting someone else's political commentary; contributing their own article, opinion piece, picture, or video; commenting on a news story or blog read online; or participating in an event where young people express their political views."⁴

Their approach challenged the political assumptions of both liberals and conservatives and showed DREAMers to be engaged in a politics not of voice alone, but also of *influence*. Thanks to Obama's June 2012 order and his reelection that following November, not only is the DREAM Act closer to passing, but the question of comprehensive immigration reform is now back on the table. Equally important, for those undocumented youth who qualify, the passage of DACA provides work authorizations as well as meaningful (though temporary) relief from the daily threat of deportation. DREAMers' success in getting the president to grant deferred action shows how participatory online practices can promote success in traditional political domains.

Of course, DREAMers' use of new social media and their appearance on the public stage are risky. Using social media to name themselves publicly as undocumented makes activists vulnerable to an increased risk of detention or even deportation for themselves and their families. Yet, given the ongoing violence of our current immigration policy, DREAMers persuasively argue that the liberal language of privacy offers little haven for noncitizens. For these subjects, resisting publicity guarantees neither se-

curity nor freedom from interference; to be silent and faceless only enables conditions of exploitation and violence. Voice, for them, is a precondition of influence. The topic of how exactly they have come to cultivate influential voices will lead us to see that they also offer a radical, new "gothic" vision of democratic citizenship.

PROTECTION THROUGH COLLECTIVE ACTION: THE MARCHES OF 2006

Unauthorized immigrants have long engaged in widespread protests. Throughout the twentieth century, fights for worker rights and against anti-immigrant legislation produced forms of undocumented resistance and activism; consider the mass protests in 1994 against the passage of California's Proposition 187.⁵ But it was the immigrant rights protests of 2006 in which we saw a *nationwide* movement of undocumented subjects claiming visibility and giving voice to their dreams and frustrations. Across the country, the undocumented engaged in a wide array of mass actions, ranging from school walkouts to marches, street demonstrations, and work stoppages. Dressed in white and carrying multilingual signs with statements reading, "I Am a Worker, Not a Criminal," "Justice for All," and "Let Us Be a Part of the American Dream," immigrants sang the national anthem in both English and Spanish and waved the flags of their home countries alongside American flags.⁶

The immigrant rights marches in 2006 "were historic because of their size and because they took place in cities across the United States. An estimated 3 to 5 million people participated, with approximately 1.5 million people marching in 108 locations around the country between April 8 and April 10 alone. . . . In some cities, the immigration reform marches were the largest street demonstrations ever recorded."⁷

These massive marches of 2006 marked an important shift in immigrant rights politics and organizing. By refusing to obey the strictures of illegality, with its demands of silence and secrecy, the undocumented resisted the state's injunction that they remain unknown and faceless. Risking visibility and deportation in order to make their voices heard, they refused to participate in the economic and political logics that supported their exclusion and exploitation. Instead, protesters created an immigrant counterpublic where they enacted the very rights and standing they were demanding from the government. Moreover, by creating a space of appearance where new forms of action could occur, noncitizens were engaging in acts of political freedom—what Hannah Arendt has described as the capacity for new

beginnings. Arendt's focus on action as the uniquely human capacity to do the unexpected, helps to foreground what I take to be one of the demonstrations' most significant aspects: its power as a moment of *initiation* and an inaugural performance of the political. By taking to the streets and claiming space and rights, immigrants and their allies created spaces of political freedom and common appearance where none existed before.⁸

The 2006 protests saw little discussion of social media as a mobilizing force. With YouTube still a fledgling site and Facebook not yet available to the general public, efforts to mobilize the undocumented stressed more traditional organizations and media outlets. The organizations and media outlets most responsible for mobilizing immigrants (including the undocumented) included Spanish-language media, including television and (more particularly) talk radio, community-based organizations, Chicano/Latino student and community organizations, labor unions, the Catholic Church, immigrant hometown associations, and immigrant sports leagues.⁹ In terms of the technology used to mobilize immigrant populations, organizers for the 2006 demonstrations were characterized as relying on "mass distribution of flyers, door-knocking, phone banking, and word of mouth." And while some encouraged the use of "web sites, e-mail, and faxes," activists used social media primarily to coordinate with those who were already members of community-based organizations. In general, when trying to spread information about the rallies and mobilize a mass base of participants, activists used social media less than more traditional forms of outreach such as ethnic media, "press conferences, radio, television, and newspapers."¹⁰

In entering the public realm and engaging in street protest, the undocumented faced significant risk; given this, protesters often sought to reduce the perils of publicity by mobilizing the power of the democratic crowd. Through large-scale mass actions, undocumented protesters found ways to be politically visible while also remaining obscure and hard to identify. For example, by gathering and intermingling their bodies in public acts of protest, mass demonstrations made it difficult to distinguish citizen from noncitizen. In this way, the marches were able to sustain forms of visibility that also protected unauthorized immigrants choosing to enter the public realm. William Flores has characterized this sort of activism as "protection through collective action."¹¹ Similarly, while various undocumented individuals spoke onstage at the 2006 rallies (or spoke to journalists at the events), the views and voices of the vast majority of the undocumented were mostly articulated through signs and chants.

As other scholars have noted, the 2006 marches displayed considerable ideological heterogeneity. Alongside signs stating, "Let Us Be Part of the American Dream," other marchers carried signs stating, "This is Stolen Land" and "Who's The Real Illegal Alien? . . . Pilgrim!"¹² Alongside chants such as, "Today we march, tomorrow we vote," other marchers chanted, "¡Aquí Estamos, y No Nos Vamos!" (Here we are, and we're not leaving!) and its rejoinder, "¡Y Si Nos Sacan, Nos Regresamos!" (And if they throw us out, we'll come right back!).¹³ Some marchers and organizers resisted the more insurgent political claims of the movement, emphasizing the marchers' peaceful, patriotic, and nonthreatening character. During the 2006 marches, for example, immigrants' symbolic performances were often policed; for instance, leaders of various immigrant rights organizations asked marchers to stop waving the flags of their home countries at rallies and instead wave only the American flag.¹⁴

Such simultaneous acts of policing and protection were understandable, considering the ongoing hostility aimed toward the undocumented, but they also limited the possibilities for the undocumented to articulate more potentially complex forms of belonging that exceed the nationalist logic of the US nation-state. The marches often reflected a "predominantly defensive character," visible in signs stating, "We Are Not Terrorists" and "We Are Not Criminals."¹⁵ Such beleaguered assertions reflected the dangers of responding in kind to nativist suspicions of immigrants. Both the waving of American flags and the assertions of noncriminality placed marchers within political logics that are "inherently compromised."¹⁶

While the 2006 marches involved powerful acts of political critique and resistance, they also made arguments that could be used to support more conservative ends. For example, a number of liberal immigrant rights organizations emphasized immigrants' "strong work ethic, deep religious faith, and commitment to family as proof that noncitizens sought to join and strengthen the United States rather than subvert its identity and institutions."¹⁷ By this logic, not only do immigrants pose no threat to America's identity and institutions, but they actually shore up the traditional values that the country increasingly lacks. Such depictions seek to reassure an anxious and xenophobic public that immigrants (particularly Latino immigrants) are a nonthreatening, inherently conservative civic presence.

Historically, portraying immigrants who aspire to citizenship as traditional, conservative, and nonthreatening has often been used to make immigrants appear civically valuable and worthy of membership. Yet this play of xenophobia and xenophilia actually helps to sustain the dynamic of

the foreigner as outsider: "Liberal xenophilic deployment of the foreigner as the truest citizen . . . actually feeds the xenophobic backlash against the nonconsenting immigrant."¹⁸ In other words, the very attributions used to make immigrants attractive (they work hard; they value family and tradition) can easily become the same qualities that make them threatening (they take our jobs; their patriarchal and homophobic traditions threaten our capacity for progress). Rendering immigrants forever foreign, the logic of xenophilia feeds into the xenophobia that pro-immigrant advocates are trying to overcome. Regardless of whether they are portrayed as "giving" or "taking" from the polity, immigrants remain "other," outside the boundaries of membership.

UNDOCUMENTED AND UNAFRAID: DREAMERS AND THE POLITICS OF COMING OUT

The fact that xenophilic strategies of praise fail to overcome nativist hostility can be seen in America's immigration politics since 2008. Under President Obama, a Democrat who engaged in xenophilic rhetoric in both his campaign and in office, the number of deportations actually increased: Since 2009, there have been more deportations than during the two full presidential terms of George W. Bush. For most of its first term, the Obama administration pursued comprehensive immigration reform far less aggressively than an enforcement-driven immigration policy characterized by increased ICE (immigration and customs enforcement) raids and deportations.¹⁹

With comprehensive reform increasingly unlikely, immigration rights activism has focused on passage of the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act. Introduced in 2001, the DREAM Act would extend a six-year conditional legal status to undocumented youth who meet several criteria. As a discrete piece of legislation that applies to a particular segment of the immigrant population, the DREAM Act hardly represents comprehensive reform. Yet with its emphasis on children who did not "choose" to immigrate illegally and whose opportunities are limited through no fault of their own, the DREAM Act is a deeply xenophilic piece of legislation. The act embodies liberalism's frequent deployment of the figure of the foreigner as "the truest citizen."²⁰ Patriotic, hardworking, and academically successful, DREAMers represent a population that is "innocent," upstanding, and assimilated. Stories of young people who would qualify for the DREAM Act often emphasize their academic success, involvement in community and

volunteer activities, and desire to engage in military service. Moreover, having come of age in the United States, these young people speak English (indeed, a number of DREAMers are English-dominant and are therefore characterized as less "foreign" than other segments of the unauthorized populations). Still, despite the many ways in which this population fits into liberal and xenophilic conceptions of the "good," assimilated immigrant whose success "gives" to the nation, anti-immigrant sentiment and rhetoric have only risen. Not only has Congress failed to pass the DREAM Act after more than a decade of activism and debate, but anti-immigrant legislation at the state level has actually grown more virulent.²¹ This combination of increased animosity toward immigrants at the state and local level, impatience with the inability to get the DREAM Act passed, and widespread congressional inaction are among the probable causes of the increasingly oppositional nature of DREAM activism.

Despite a legislative logic that seeks to frame undocumented youth in terms of nonthreatening innocence, actual DREAM activism is recognizable by its increasingly confrontational and creative character. Indeed, one of the most exciting and unanticipated aspects of DREAM activism has been the appropriation of strategies of visibility developed during the gay rights movement. The 2010 and 2011 "Coming Out of the Shadows" campaigns, for example, included a series of speeches by unauthorized youth who openly declared their undocumented status. Organized in an effort to build support for the DREAM Act, this campaign was explicitly modeled on National Coming Out Day, which was initiated in 1988 to promote LGBT rights.²² During these rallies, DREAMers declared themselves "undocumented and unafraid" (expanding the slogan in 2011 to "undocumented, unafraid, and unapologetic"). Since then, more and more unauthorized youth have chosen to reject secrecy in favor of claiming membership through a more aggressive politics of visibility and protest that includes cross-state pilgrimages, hunger strikes, bus tours, rallies, sit-ins, and other forms of direct action. Often LGBT youth themselves, many DREAM activists emphasize the linkages that exist between coming out as queer and coming out as undocumented.

For undocumented youth, coming out is an effort to become civically legible and politically speakable.²³ Not surprisingly, the practice of coming out as undocumented quickly became a staple of immigrant youth politics. Equally significant, unauthorized youth began posting videos online telling their stories and openly naming themselves as undocumented. Openly proclaiming their status, DREAMers queer the politics of migration in ways that resonate with Michael Warner's definition of "queer" as the rejection

of "a minoritizing logic of toleration or simple political-interest representation in favor of a more thorough resistance to regimes of the normal."²⁴ Understood in the context of traditional logics of sovereignty and kinship, queering the politics of immigration means opening up new possibilities to imagine political membership and political claim making. By refusing the politics of innocence, questioning the state-centered logics of citizenship, and reconfiguring the criteria for political membership, DREAMers are queering the movement in ways that can't be "delimited in advance."

In characterizing DREAMers as queering the politics of migration, my analysis aligns with the work of Nicholas De Genova and his claim that the more militant elements of the 2006 marches reflect a "radically open-ended politics of migrant presence" that displays parallels with the "destabilizing politics of queer presence."²⁵ At the same time, however, my reading of DREAM activism does not presume that queerness is *always* and *only* productively transgressive, or that queer politics inevitably "exceeds the normative confinements of citizenship."²⁶ Instead, my reading is indebted to Jasbir Puar's work on how normativities proliferate amid the complex and contradictory ways in which queer subjects relate to nation-states. The very concept of "being out" as undocumented is capable of challenging the logic of sovereignty while shoring up notions of American exceptionalism, producing what Puar calls "homonationalism"—"the emergence of national homosexuality . . . that corresponds with the coming out of the exceptionalism of American empire." By considering the unexpectedly "*convivial* relations between queerness and militarism," the logic of homonationalism serves to mark "the distance between barbarism and civilization."²⁷

The importance DREAM activists place on undocumented youth "coming out" and telling their own stories is connected to a larger politics that insists that immigrant-rights organizing must be part of a "migrant youth-led" movement. Previously, in the context of American politics, immigrant-rights organizing was defined primarily by advocates speaking on behalf of the undocumented. In the context of congressional hearings or other sites of advocacy, it was often academics, advocates, and activists—not the undocumented themselves—who testified about the population's conditions and concerns. The danger of deportation and language barriers combined to render visibility and voice as unworkable strategies. And when the undocumented *did* speak out regarding their experiences, it was often in a representational capacity: organizations engaged in a process of selection in order to single out subjects who organizers thought would be good at representing this controversial category. Today, while the need for exper-

tise, advocates, and allies continue to exist, immigrant rights politics is much more engaged in political actions in which the undocumented speak for themselves. This is even truer in the case of DREAM activists, a group whose sense of belonging and familiarity with American popular and political culture has led them to believe that it is they who should be determining this movement's direction and focus.

This emphasis on the political necessity of speaking for themselves and telling their own stories was clear during the "Coming Out of the Shadows" campaign in Chicago. Seeking to call attention and support to the DREAM Act, the 2010–11 campaign included a march concluding with a rally featuring a group of students publicly proclaiming their undocumented status.²⁸ Modeled on the National Coming Out Day initiated in 1988, "Coming Out of the Shadows" was inspired by the struggle for LGBT rights and the idea of "coming out" as a political strategy.²⁹ The movement was also inspired by the civil rights movement and its use of sit-ins, hunger strikes, freedom rides, and other forms of nonviolent civil disobedience. Using the slogan "Undocumented and unafraid" and chanting, "No papers, no fear! Immigrants are marching here!" Chicago participants made it clear that this new phase of the movement would center on speaking out and publicly defying the rhetoric of criminalization. In claiming an oppositional stance of fearlessness, DREAMers push back against the logic of "guilty" parents and "innocent" children, putting forward a more agonistic account of membership that argues that it is the law, not the undocumented, that is illegitimate.

DREAMERS ONLINE: MULTIPLE VOICES AND NEW AFFECTIVE TERRAIN

Much of the DREAMers' newfound visibility relies on forms of new social media such as YouTube and Facebook. This use of new social media might seem surprising, given that the undocumented are a predominantly minority community of low-income youth—precisely the population that experts have often worried are victims of a "digital divide." Yet empirical research has recently shown that the question of online access is becoming less of an issue for youth in the United States: "With the advances in technology and the resulting proliferation of both computers and mobile devices able to access the Internet, it is now rare that a young person does not own some device that can access the Internet"; "Data indicate that nearly all young people have access to a computer that connects to the internet. Strikingly, nearly 95 percent of all youth across racial and ethnic groups report

having access to a computer that connects to the internet."³⁰ Utilizing a wide array of social media sites, DREAMers have been creating online content that speaks to an imagined public of both allies and adversaries: Web series such as "Undocumented and Awkward" and "UndocuGribs" and Facebook groups such as UndocuQueer show the many ways in which social media operates as a space of confrontation, contemplation, and self-assertion as well as education, creative self-expression, and mass mobilization.

One of the most significant political effects of social media has been its capacity to pluralize the stories of DREAMers. Sites such as DreamActivist.org seek to "compile as many stories as possible to show the circumstances and factors that led us to this point in our lives, to share our immigrant experiences, stories of struggles and stories of success."³¹ Describing itself as a "multicultural, migrant youth-led, social media hub," DreamActivist.org claims to have collected "the biggest archive of undocumented youth stories on the web."³² Chronicling the stories and struggles of undocumented youth from Brazil, Mexico, Colombia, Ecuador, South Korea, Taiwan, Chile, Croatia, Fiji, Israel, Peru, France, Pakistan, Venezuela, Nigeria, Mali, Guatemala, Argentina, Haiti, Ghana, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Thailand, Bangladesh, Senegal, Lebanon, and the Philippines, DreamActivist.org and other organizations that solicit submissions seek to create an online community in which the undocumented speak for themselves.

By using the Internet to post first-person accounts of their political actions and life stories, immigrant youth are creating "cyber-testimonios"—a form of speech they hope will allow them to articulate political alternatives that can be shared across time and space. *Testimonio* can be defined as "a nonfictional, popular-democratic form of epic narrative . . . told in the first person by a narrator who is also the real protagonist or witness of the events he or she recounts, and whose unit of narration is usually a 'life' or a significant life experience."³³ In describing the quotidian experiences of a singular life, individuals are creating narratives that draw on this combination of the epic and the democratic. Moreover, such acts of speech share *testimonio's* "sense of urgency. . . . It must above all be a story that needs to be told, that involves some pressing and immediate problem of communication."³⁴

Open-content projects created by a multitude of users (such as Wikipedia) "eschew authority: its information is not authoritative and there are no authors."³⁵ In this context, "knowledge is not a zero-sum game because it is easily accessible to all: knowledge is not information but rather the ability to do creating things with information."³⁶ And while online testimonials

are not exactly akin to open-content projects such as Wikipedia, they are projects in which there is no single author—a multitude of users can post their individual stories. Proliferating in ways that resist being screened or controlled, the Internet is not simply a space of education and mass mobilization, but a space where both positive and negative affect can flourish. Not only patriotic and inspiring, the voices of the undocumented online are also sarcastic, angry, funny, ironic, enraged, and brash.

This profusion of cyber-testimonios, their voices and perspectives, reflects the political range of DREAM activism. For example, many activists have posted their stories online prior to committing acts of civil disobedience. The videos often open with a DREAMer stating his or her name and state of residence. A significant aspect of this sort of "coming out" online has been the practice of giving one's full name and naming one's "taboo" status (as undocumented, queer, or both). Some state, "If you are watching this, it's because I've been arrested." The videos are typically built around first-person narratives regarding the speaker's status, why he or she feels that coming out is important, and urging others to come out and join the movement. Georgina Perez, a member of the Georgia DREAMers, posted a video online in April 2011; in it, she states in full:

My name is Georgina Perez, I'm undocumented, and I am unafraid. I was brought to the US when I was three years old. Currently I'm twenty-one years old. I'm ready to stand up and fight back for my community. Throughout the last five years, as undocumented youth, we have done everything in order to get open dialogue with elected officials and politicians. In good faith, we've waited and waited, and instead we've been given the runaround. We've done the petitions, we've done the flyering, the lobbying, the protests, the rallies, and instead of our voices being heard, we're just not seeing any change. We're seeing that our communities are being criminalized; we're seeing racist legislation; we're seeing family separation. And that's why today I'm coming out as undocumented and unafraid. I will no longer stand and wait for someone to come and save me. I will no longer wait for someone to come dictate and tell me what to do while I'm being denied the access to higher education. I'm tired of politicians always using us as a scapegoat, always criminalizing us, in order for them to win a seat. I'm tired of that. I'm not going to apologize for my mother bringing me here. I'm not going to apologize for speaking my native language. I'm a proud Georgian; I'm a proud Mexicana.

I was brought to this country by a very, very courageous woman. She's my hero, my mother. And she left everyone and everything she knew behind in order for her to give me a better life. So I'm not going to let anyone or anything stop me from getting my higher education; I'm not going to let her sacrifices be in vain. I'm not, 'cause she's my hero. And I'm not going to blame her—I thank her for bringing me here.

I'm tired of students like Jessica [Colotl, then a Kennesaw State University senior facing deportation] being persecuted for trying to get a basic education. When Jessica's case went public here in Georgia, a lot of us, a lot of us went deeper into the shadows. And we became scared. Many allies told us to be quiet, to take a step back, you know, because the environment is not good—just be quiet. But I've come to the realization that in order for us to beat this, we have to show them that we're more unafraid than ever before. I want to stand up and ask these legislators, Do you really, really want to be on the wrong side of history?

I want to . . . I stand here. I ask these legislators to stop criminalizing our communities, because the more you do this, we're not going to stay quiet anymore. We're tired of that. We're not going to stand back. We're not going to be silent. We're not going to be in the shadows. We're not going to let this happen any longer. We're going to step up and fight for our communities.

So I'm asking you—my ally, my friend, my fellow undocumented student, youth—are you going to be on our side? Or which side are you going to be on? Because me, as an undocumented youth, I know where I stand; I know on which side of history I'm going to be on. My name is Georgina Perez, I'm undocumented, and I am no longer afraid.³⁷

North Carolina DREAM Team member Viridiana Martinez posted another video on the same April 2011 day; it states in full:

My name is Viridiana Martinez; I am undocumented. If you're watching this video, I've been arrested. I grew up in the small town of Sanford, North Carolina. I'm a proud North Carolinian. I'm a taxpayer. But most importantly, I am a human being whose dreams have been denied. Why did I take part in an act of civil disobedience, putting my freedom on the line? Why would I willingly face deportation, risking my future in my own home? Because I've had enough. My people are being criminalized for crossing borders to seek a better life while the industries that drove us here are not being held accountable. My com-

munity is under attack by legislation that strips people of their humanity. Our human right to an education is under attack and has been for years because our own senator, Kay Hagan, has denied the dreams of 51,000 North Carolinian youth. Remaining in the shadows is no longer acceptable. Protesting, rallying, and lobbying is no longer enough. If you're watching this and have not spoken out, it's time you come out and declare yourself undocumented and unafraid. If you tirelessly pushed for the DREAM Act last year and feel like giving up, don't. It's time to escalate. So which side are you on? There is no neutral ground. Will you speak out with me or silently join our oppressors?³⁸

The videos are powerful in their complex and audacious claims to membership and rights. Martinez claims rights as a "taxpayer" even as she also names herself a "proud North Carolinian," while Perez states that she is "not going to apologize for speaking my native language" and that she is a "proud Georgian" as well as "a proud Mexicana." In a similar vein, Martinez describes Kay Hagan as "our own senator" while Perez claims that elected officials and politicians have given petitioners "the runaround." Both of these DREAMers claim themselves as Southerners who have the authority to criticize and make demands on elected representatives. In this way, their affective ties to the South also represent acts of resistance—both women are asserting their rights as deserving members of a polity that refuses to claim them. In their refusal to "apologize" for their actions, both fight any characterization of the undocumented as unlawful subjects who have committed an offense. Instead, they name immigration policies, the US political process, and the misdeeds of politicians as the sites of wrongdoing and offense.

Even more significantly, both Perez and Martinez refuse to accept the criminalizing logic of unauthorized border crossings. For Perez, this refusal is tied to her identity as a daughter and her relationship to her mother. Rather than blaming her mother for her own status as undocumented, Perez tearfully expresses love, respect, and gratitude for her mother's choices, saying, "I'm not going to blame her for bringing me here" and calling her "a very, very courageous woman" and "my hero." In a more structural vein, Martinez situates unauthorized migration within a critique of the neoliberal policies of globalization. As she states, "my people are being criminalized for crossing borders to seek a better life while the industries that drove us here are not being held accountable." Refusing to ignore the economic factors that integrate economies but segregate populations, Martinez boldly rejects the logic of guilt and criminalization, offering instead

a call to mass protest that is both angry and determined ("which side are you on? There is no neutral ground"). Perez and Martinez's speech regarding the structural and the affective dynamics of immigration explodes the simplistic logic of "legal/illegal" and puts a human face on the complex dynamics of migration as the space of economic arrangements, human desire, and community building.

Refusing to abide by nationalist scripts that demand that immigrants express only love and gratitude toward the United States, both young women express anger and frustration with the US political system, calling for an intensification of mass actions (Perez: "In order to beat this, we have to show them that we're more unafraid than ever before"; Martinez: "It's time to escalate"). Such actions reflect a new spirit of freedom on the part of DREAMers that is collective but not representative. Refusing allies' advice to "be quiet," Perez refuses to "wait for someone to come dictate and tell me what to do," stating that "I will no longer stand and wait for someone to come and save me." Calling on her fellow DREAMers and allies to join her, she argues that "in order for us to beat this, we have to show them that we're more unafraid than ever before."

In recording themselves prior to potential arrest and deportation, DREAM activists such as Perez and Martinez hope to turn the politics of surveillance upside down. "Surveillance is a discourse. . . . The various techniques of surveillance—identification, monitoring, analysis and response—are routinized, regulated, and institutionalized practices that produce and circulate knowledge."³⁹ By creating cyber-*testimonios* that give their names and status, undocumented youth seek to turn the surveillance state against itself, producing forms of visibility that are not a trap but instead serve as a form of protection. Moreover, by going online and proclaiming themselves undocumented, activists expose the limits of liberal notions of privacy. As an antidote to surveillance, "privacy has proved an insufficient response, intellectually, rhetorically, and legally. . . . Privacy protects the autonomous individual," but practices of surveillance "are fundamentally about the creation of social knowledge, social positions, and social order."⁴⁰ Because of DREAMers' social position as "undocumented," the private realm serves as the site of a social order characterized by secrecy, exploitation, and fear. In this way, DREAM activists' use of the Internet highlights privacy's failure as a form of protection. At the same time, however, engaging the politics of surveillance is a dangerous and uncertain game. Publicly naming oneself online could easily lead to arrest, deportation, and other forms of state violence. Moreover, vulnerability and visibility is reenacted on the

Internet: One's visibility now has a kind of permanence, as your online presence retains a life beyond the initial post.

As noted earlier, new social media allow for the proliferation of expressive practices and critiques produced by a diverse group of undocumented youth. Given this, the Internet shows not only the agonistic critiques of women like Perez and Martinez but more liberal depictions of DREAM activism. Consider the website *We Are America: Stories of Today's Immigrants*, which presents posts drawing on more liberal narratives of service and membership. An example:

My name is Carlos Roa, and I am America. My family and myself came to the United States back in 1989. I was only two years old. My grandfather came to this country in 1948, a US citizen since 1958. And he had the opportunity to realize his American dream. My dad tried year after year to get us legalized and spent tens of thousands of dollars for lawyers, and still, nothing. It's been twenty years. People think it's as easy as getting behind a line; it's not like that . . .

I graduated in 2005 from high school, and I wanted to get into college; I wanted to join the military. And those options weren't—I couldn't do any of that. And so it's frustrating—the fact that I wanna give back and I'm willing to serve this country in military service, and I don't even have the option to do so. When you're shooting down people's dreams, that's bad. It's bad for everyone. . . .

If you work hard and if you try and you strive and you can realize your potential and you can be a contributing member to society—that's something that this country has prided itself on. And we've seen that—at the turn of the century, we saw how immigrants changed this nation for the better. Of Irish, of Polish, of Italian descent—how they were able to shape . . . very much change this nation for the better and make this country better. We are no different than the immigrants of the past.⁴¹

Roa, a student studying architecture at Miami Dade College, is a DREAM activist—he was one of four students who in 2010 walked 1,500 miles to Washington, DC, as part of the "Trail of Dreams." Yet alongside his activism, Roa's testimonial hews to a xenophilic narrative of the good and "giving" foreigner. Unlike Perez and Martinez, who criticize American policies and name themselves "undocumented and unafraid," Roa states that "I am America" and characterizes himself as a patriotic subject willing to serve in

the military during wartime.⁴² Here we can see an example of the homonationalism Puar discusses. While risking deportation in order to “come out” as undocumented, Roa’s act of visibility is premised on his willingness to serve as an exceptional patriot, a “tolerable ethnic” willing to serve in the military and protect Americans from various “intolerable ethnics” such as terrorists.⁴³ In a similar vein, in speaking of the United States as a land of hard work and opportunity, Roa tries to locate his own family’s story within the larger story of European immigration in America (“We are no different than the immigrants of the past”). While such efforts are understandable, they also work to sustain the binary of “good immigrants” versus “bad immigrants”—those who are worthy of “being folded (back) into life” and those whose lives are understood to be of less value.⁴⁴

In contrast to the homonationalist logic of Roa’s more liberal narrative, the group DREAMers Adrift has pursued on a more agonistic approach that uses humor and irony to critique US immigration policy. As an online media project “by undocumented youth and for undocumented youth,” DREAMers Adrift features a series of skits entitled “Undocumented and Awkward,” highlighting the many ways in which being young and undocumented can be humiliating and/or frustrating. The skits also often take on the issue of being queer as yet another way in which one’s marginal status renders one a second-class subject. In using skits, blogs, and raps, DREAMers Adrift posts stories that are more oppositional, angry, and funny than traditional, familiar forms of immigrant testimony.

For example, Jesus Iñiguez, a cofounder of DREAMers Adrift, uses rap to offer critique and create political community. Recorded while driving in his car, his March 2011 rap “To All My DREAMheads” addresses allies and aims to create community among fellow activists across the state and nation:

ESL in the flesh comin’ through
With another fresh DREAM Act sesh for my cats and ladies
Allies, undocumented folks, anchor and terror babies
Like that senator from Texas said
Too many conspiracy theories get into his head, y’all
And he’s in a position where he could be votin’
On some pretty cool decisions
Affecting our communities
Acting without impunity
But he ain’t foolin’ me

’Cause I grew to be
Skeptical of politicians
’Cause lately they be actin’ vicious and brainless and shameless
The type of shit they be pullin’ in Congress is heinous
No taxation without representation
They don’t even know the type of shit that we be facin’ on the day to day
Livin’ on a daily basis
Havin’ to deal with these elephant nutcases
Makin’ us out to be one of the main rivals
Feelin’ entitled ’cause they be skimmin’ through the Bible
But that’s not what Jesús would do
I gotta make a move ’cause I’m through payin’ dues
And I’m through being used and abused and refused
This is the true here: Fuck Fox News
I got nothin’ to lose
That’s why I’m politickin’
You’re trippin’ if you’re thinkin’ that I’m gonna shut my mouth
Undocumented and proud and unafraid
On a legal crusade to get paid
Don’t hate
I’m tryin’ to get my paperwork straight
And get all my documents in order
I’m only gettin’ older
And I’m tryin’ to kick it on this side of the border
’Cause life expectancy on the other side is shorter
It’s a sad reality but shit is crazy
But the threat of goin’ back don’t faze me
It makes me wanna organize
You best to recognize right propaganda lies
So I hope it opens your eyes and we can stick together
This endeavor bonded us forever
Remember: If we can stick together then we’ve already won
DREAM Act now two-zero-one-one

This goes out to DREAM Team L.A. and the O.C. DREAM Team, FUEL from Long Beach, and all the other DREAM Act organizations around this nation organizing around this legislation.⁴⁵

In contrast to Roa’s effort to create a narrative of immigration that links the undocumented to earlier waves of “good” immigration, Iñiguez uses

phrases such as “anchor and terror babies” to mock those who would accuse the undocumented of being takers and terrorists. Using humor, anger, and irony, Iñiguez’s rap aggressively criticizes politicians (who are characterized as vicious, brainless, and shameless). Iñiguez is particularly harsh toward right-wing media and politicians, referring to “those elephant nutcases” and telling his listeners to “fuck Fox News.” Yet despite its agonistic words, the rap maintains a playful and hopeful tone, telling Iñiguez’s fellow DREAMers that “this endeavor bonded us forever” and that “if we can stick together then we’ve already won.” Moreover, with its concluding shout-out to various Southern California DREAM organizations, the rap is clearly aimed not at skeptical citizens, but at undocumented youths themselves—those who see themselves as part of the fight for immigrant rights. And finally, the fact that Iñiguez is rapping while driving is politically significant: Because California does not grant the undocumented driver’s licenses, the act of driving in the video is a quotidian and unspoken act of defiance that frames the rap as a whole.

UNDOCUQUEER: SOCIAL MEDIA AND DIRECT ACTION

Drawing on the precedent of the gay rights movement, DREAMers have queered the politics of migration by seeking transformation of existing social structures rather than merely accommodation within them. Demanding an intersectional politics of migration and sexuality has been critical to this development. Just as with immigration activism, “there has been a proliferation of queer communication, community, and activism online since the emergence of the commercial web.”⁴⁶ LGBT youth have been particularly active online. According to one of the largest online surveys of LGBT youth, two-thirds of the respondents said that being online helped them accept their sexual orientation; 35 percent said that being online was crucial to this acceptance. Many of the respondents said they came out online before doing so in “real life”; this was especially true for men (57 percent) but also for many women as well (38 percent).⁴⁷ Not surprisingly, then, for queer youth, who “often feel isolated and rarely have access to a supportive queer community in their vicinity. . . . going online offers many folks an opportunity to shed the mask they wear in their ‘real lives’—at home, at school, and at work.”⁴⁸ These issues of isolation and lack of support can be even more intense for undocumented youth, whose status makes it even more difficult to seek out a supportive community of similarly situated youth.

The National Immigrant Youth Alliance (NIYA) established an UndocuQueer website on which queer undocumented youth can post their stories online. In doing this, these youth draw on their lived experience to build “visibility and explore the intersections between mainstream immigrant rights and queer rights organizing spaces.” The emergence of such subjects was unexpected—particularly since, as Eithne Luibhéid argues, the very presence of queer undocumented youth challenges the longstanding tendency “to presume either that all queers are legal citizens or that all immigrants are heterosexual.”⁴⁹ In contesting this assumption, queer undocumented youth often frame their activism in terms of the intersections between a politics of migration and a politics of sexuality. Describing this dynamic on the NIYA website, activists identifying themselves as UndocuQueer wrote:

We are queer undocumented youth. We cannot afford to be in either the queer or undocumented closet. We cannot and will not hide; we cannot and will not let those who haven’t been in our shoes decide and tell us how to act, how to feel and that this isn’t our home. We have the right to be whoever we want to be and love whoever we want to love. It is a shame that the only path we have to legalization is to lead a heterosexual lifestyle. We shouldn’t and won’t conform to such ideas. We have a right to live and love to the full extent of our capacity.

We urge you to come out! Now is the time to come and proclaim that you’re UndocuQueer, Unafraid and Unashamed!⁵⁰

In stating that they “shouldn’t and won’t conform” to the idea that “the only path to legalization is to lead a heterosexual lifestyle,” queer DREAMers force the immigrant-rights movement to consider how sexuality has served as grounds for controlling what sorts of newcomers are allowed to enter the country. As scholars of migration and sexuality have noted, because until 2013 the US government did not recognize lesbian and gay relationships as a legitimate basis for acquiring permanent resident status, lesbian/gay couples were long denied access to one of the most common ways to become a legal permanent resident: through direct family ties.⁵¹ Moreover, 1965 revisions to immigration law “not only reaffirmed lesbian and gay exclusion but also further codified heterosexual, nuclear family relations as the primary basis for admission to the United States by reserving nearly three-quarters of all permanent immigration visas for people with those ties.”⁵² By denaturaliz-

ing the limited and heteronormative logic of family defining immigration policy, queer critiques of immigration exposed how the US immigration-control apparatus "significantly regulates sexuality and reproduces oppressive sexual norms that are gendered, racialized, and classed."⁵³ In doing this, queer DREAMers made explicit the connections between various forms of being "unauthorized."⁵⁴

NO DEFERENCE: CONFRONTING OBAMA AND THE FIGHT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF

If we define queer as the space of transformation rather than accommodation and build on Michael Warner's earlier claim that a "queer" politics draws on a "dissatisfaction with the regime of the normal in general," we can make sense of how DREAM activists have worked to challenge the "normal business" of immigration advocacy in Washington, DC.⁵⁵ When the DREAM Act failed to pass Congress yet again in December 2010, and anti-immigrant efforts continued to increase at the state level, acts of civil disobedience grew in size and intensity. The practice of "coming out" as undocumented was also gaining momentum, most notably in June 2011, when Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist Jose Antonio Vargas came out as undocumented in a *New York Times Magazine* essay. Headlined "My Life as an Undocumented Immigrant," the Filipino's story of coming out as both gay and undocumented reflected the democratic desires and frustration of immigrants and their allies.⁵⁶

Immigration activists and advocates were also becoming increasingly alarmed over the Obama administration's extraordinarily high rates of deportation—a record that includes about 1.1 million deportations, more than those under any president since the 1950s.⁵⁷ In 2011, DREAMers began calling on Obama to issue an executive order to stop deportations and allow undocumented youth the opportunity to obtain work permits, driver's licenses, and other forms of documentation. This increasingly confrontational approach can be seen in a DREAMers Adrift video uploaded to YouTube on Oct. 1, 2011, in which DREAM activists take turns aggressively confronting the president. Accusing Obama of showing "no leadership . . . in the protection of our civil liberties," DREAMers accuse him of standing on the sidelines while millions of undocumented are criminalized and deported.⁵⁸ Claiming that it is their "duty" to confront the president, DREAMers state that "presidents in the past have signed executive

orders," and demand that Obama "grant administrative relief to all DREAM Act-eligible youth."⁵⁹

Mainstream immigrant-advocacy groups did not embrace this confrontational approach. "Worried about the effect of pushing Obama publicly on the contentious issue in the midst of his re-election campaign," traditional organizations were "angry at Obama but terrified of Mitt Romney." Many advocates were afraid to lean on the White House publicly for fear of hurting the president's electoral chances and electing a Republican who had already publicly stated that he would "veto any DREAM Act that reached his desk."⁶⁰ In the face of such electoral anxiety, it fell on DREAMers to take the lead on making demands on the White House. DREAMers were the first group to ask the president to take administrative action—a request that leaders of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus made only *after* DREAMers had made a similar request to Obama senior adviser Valerie Jarrett earlier that year.⁶¹

Ultimately, it was DREAM activists outside Washington who developed their own plan to pressure Obama. In early June, Veronica Gomez and Javier Hernandez, undocumented immigrant activists with the National Immigrant Youth Alliance, occupied the president's Denver campaign office, staging a six-day hunger strike while camped inside the Obama for America offices.⁶² The action effectively closed the campaign's office to visitors and volunteers. Following the Denver action, DREAM activists pledged to carry out acts of civil disobedience in Democratic campaign offices across the country. If Obama refused to pass administrative relief, his campaign would face a summer of direct-action protests just as he was working to secure the Latino vote in swing states such as Colorado, Nevada, and Florida. DREAMers put out statements saying that unless Obama took major action, mass protests would continue until the November election.

Frustrated, angry, and savvy, DREAM activists echoed the political logic of groups, such as ACT UP and Queer Nation, that challenged the government's decision to view AIDS as not "an emergency" but "merely a permanent disaster."⁶³ Let down by both parties, undocumented youth refused to behave like typical Washington-based advocacy groups and wait until after the election to make their voices heard. Unwilling to engage in business as usual, DREAMers sought to queer the "normal business" of immigration politics, with its criminalization of families and its daily politics of state violence and mass deportation. Instead, in the summer of 2012, DREAMers approached the ongoing attacks on the undocumented as an emergency rather than as a permanent disaster.

DESIRE AND AVERSION: GOTHIC MEMBERSHIP IN A XENOPHOBIC AGE

On August 14, 2012, San Antonio Mayor Julian Castro became the first Latino to deliver a keynote address at the Democratic National Convention. That same day, a group of undocumented immigrants arrived at the DNC in Charlotte, North Carolina. Part of the "No Papers, No Fear" Ride for Justice, these activists had been on a cross-country tour since July, traveling on what they called the UndocuBus. Dissatisfied by the deferred-deportation order, the riders continued to criticize the Obama administration and draw attention to what they characterized as the president's "flawed and unjust immigration record." Gathering on a main route leading to the Time Warner Cable Arena, the activists entered the center of the intersection, where they knelt on a colorful banner that read "Sin papeles, sin miedo" ("No papers, no fear") and held signs above their heads reading "Undocumented." After ignoring a bilingual dispersal order, ten protesters were handcuffed one at a time and placed into police vans, where they continued to chant, "Undocumented, unafraid!" When all ten arrestees were released the following morning without having been processed by Immigration and Customs Enforcement, UndocuBus riders celebrated their release while tweeting, "We know this is not the norm, that every day [they] separate families."⁶⁴ This same day, the DNC made history by inviting an undocumented immigrant (Benita Veliz) to address the delegates.

These contemporaneous inaugural acts are striking: Within a two-day period, the first Latino gave the keynote address inside the DNC while outside the hall, undocumented activists protested the president's immigration record. The next day, these same DREAMers used Twitter to publicize their arrest and release, while a fellow DREAMer gave a speech praising Obama at the DNC. Such acts vividly illustrate how DREAMers' engagement with media both confirm and challenge traditional expressions of loyalty and membership. Putting a human face on neoliberal approaches to state power, DREAMers are neither solely grateful nor perpetually disaffected. Instead, undocumented youth are more akin to what Bonnie Honig refers to in *Democracy and the Foreigner* as "gothic subjects." In these final pages, I want to suggest that by queering immigration activism, DREAMers demonstrate a productively democratic and gothic definition of political membership.

Asking, "Through what genre should we read texts of democratic theory?" Honig argues that most democratic theorists read democracy "through the

mode of romance. . . . Obstacles are met and overcome, eventually the right match is made and the newlywed couple is sent on its way to try to live happily ever after."⁶⁵ But what if we read democracy through a different genre? For Honig, the most apt genre would be gothic romance, which "trades on the reader's uncertainty as to whether that apparently rescuing foreigner is really a hero or villain."⁶⁶ Reading democracy through "a gothic lens" enables us to cultivate forms of civic passion and involvement that also allow us to "nurture some ambivalence"⁶⁷ regarding leaders, ideals, and institutions:

Often in gothics, it turns out that . . . the nice guy and the scary one are often the same person. The president who introduces vast new social welfare programs is the same one who escalates the war in Vietnam. . . .⁶⁸

Gothic readers know that we may passionately support certain heroes (or principles or institutions) in political life while also knowing that we ought not take our eyes off them for fear of what they might do to us if we did. They know that one can be passionately attached to something—a nation, a people, a principle—and be deeply and justifiably (and even therefore!) afraid at the same time . . . democratic subjects related ambivalently, gothically, and, yes, passionately, to their leaders, their nations, their state institutions, and all their sites of belonging.⁶⁹

DREAMers' relationship to both President Obama and the United States reflects this sort of ambivalent and affectively complex passion. Rather than seeing immigration as a xenophilic celebration of patriotism, thinking about it through a gothic lens helps us develop a richer and more complex approach to membership. As gothic subjects, for example, DREAMers "do not expect power to be granted to them by nice authorities . . . with their best interests at heart." Instead, such subjects "know that if they want power they must take it. . . . [and] know that such takings are always illegitimate from the perspective of the order in place at the time." For Honig, gothic subjects "experience the law . . . as a horizon of promise but also as an alien and impositional thing."⁷⁰

Since Obama's re-election, such gothic voices have grown even louder. In December 2012, DREAMers have moved their focus beyond the DREAM Act, calling for comprehensive immigration reform. In late November, more than six hundred representatives of America's two million undocumented youth gathered for the United We Dream (UWD) 2012 National Congress in Kansas City, Missouri. The congress also included a large na-

tional representation of queer and undocumented, or UndocuQueer, immigrant youth.⁷¹ On the last day of the conference, six immigrant parents joined a “coming out” ceremony in which they proclaimed their undocumented status and spoke in public for the first time.⁷²

The ongoing struggle for comprehensive immigration reform is far from over. Whether Congress and the Obama administration will be able to pass immigration reform anytime soon is far from certain.⁷³ And even if legislation passes, the results are likely to be less just and fair than these communities deserve. Yet despite these setbacks, we have reason for cheer because this time around, unauthorized activists are a significant presence in the debate. As their voices proliferate on the Internet, in the streets, and in the halls of power, today’s challenge lies in creating a civic culture capable of recognizing the power and value of such complex civic attachments. Demanding membership in the context of desire and skepticism, such gothic subjects deepen our conceptions of citizenship, reminding us that democratic membership is a fraught and spirited enterprise. And as the struggle for a just form of political community continues, immigrants and their allies will be drawing on both grassroots organizing and new digital technologies to cultivate queer democratic sensibilities that are unrepentant, audacious, and fearless.



Wendy Chun

THE DANGERS OF TRANSPARENT FRIENDS

CROSSING THE PUBLIC AND
INTIMATE SPHERES

What is the role of “friending” in negotiating online publics? What is the role of transparency? What if having lots of transparent friends, identified by their names, and creating enclosed, seemingly private spaces akin to gated communities have made us more vulnerable, not safer?

For some, in particular corporations, transparency and friending have been crucial to building a safe and secure Internet by transforming it from a public anonymous “cyberspace” into one more tightly tied to offline spaces and identities. Randi Zuckerberg, marketing director of Facebook.com, argued in 2011 that, for the sake of safety, “anonymity on the Internet has to go away.” Eric Schmidt, CEO of Google, made a similar argument in 2010 stating, “In a world of asynchronous threats, it is too dangerous for there not to be some way to identify you.” These arguments were not new or specific to web 2.0: Ever since the Internet emerged as a mass medium in the mid-1990s, corporations have argued that securing identity is crucial to securing trust.¹ Two simple assumptions drive this argument: that accountability breeds responsibility (in Zuckerberg’s words, “People behave a lot better when they have their real names down”), and that the worst dangers stem from strangers rather than friends. But are these assumptions true?

This linking of trust and security has been challenged by many scholars, in particular by Helen Nissenbaum, who noted in 2001 that although security is central to activities such as ecommerce and banking, it “no more achieves trust and trustworthiness online—in their full-blown senses—than prison bars, surveillance cameras, airport X-ray conveyor belts, body frisks, and padlocks, could achieve offline. This is so because the very ends envisioned by the proponents of security and e-commerce are contrary to core meanings and mechanisms of trust.”² Trust, she insists, is a far richer concept that entails a willingness to be vulnerable. As she also points out, the reduction of trust to security assumes that danger stems from outsiders rather than from “sanctioned, established, powerful individuals and organizations.”³

This article expands upon the concerns outlined by Nissenbaum by focusing on the work that friends and friending do. Although introduced as a way

careers, large numbers of young people who gained exposure to media production through experiments with new media went on to professional media work. This included media careers in the realm of art and literature, as well as in politics.

CHAPTER TWO

1. For a history of the development of this meme, as well as a collection of images, see <http://knowyourmeme.com/memes/casually-pepper-spray-everything-cop>.
2. Hartley (2010) argues that citizen disillusionment with broadcast media coverage of the political sphere due to perceived influence of political elites in controlling the narrative has led to a shift towards DIY/DWO (do-it-yourself/do-it-with-others) models of citizenship in which citizens are relying more frequently on communications to shape narratives than on elite guided action. Jones (2013) suggests that within such a context, satire becomes a more desirable form of "truth creation" as it allows citizens to construct critical narratives and encourage circulation of information. Jones argues that this is a particularly important form of expression in a context where "serious" political talk is viewed with skepticism and is therefore less likely to be attended to and circulated.

CHAPTER THREE

1. King Jr. 1958; Robinson 1987.
2. Lott 1992; Rose 1994; and D with Jah 1997.
3. This theme is explored in the documentary *Uprising: Hip Hop and the L.A. Riots*, 2012.
4. These diametrically opposed, even Manichean, assessments of hip hop are helpfully reviewed and incisively critiqued in Rose 2008.
5. For more nuanced discussions of the meaning of urban riots, see Gooding-Williams 1993.
6. For brief overviews of this debate, see Dawson 2001, 74–82, and Jeffries 2011, 10–15.
7. See Boyd 2003.
8. For further reflections on the limits of the civil rights paradigm of political dissent, see Beltrán, this volume.
9. For a discussion of some of the ways adults have historically sought to supervise and shape youth's political development and civic engagement, see Light, this volume.
10. See Jargowsky 1997, 12–17.
11. See Shelby 2007.
12. Forman 2002 and Perry 2004.
13. See Watkins 2009 and Cohen and Kahne 2012.
14. Allen elaborates this point in her chapter in this volume. Also see Young 2000.
15. Mansbridge 1994 and Fraser 1997, chapter 3.
16. Spence 2011, pp. 8–11.
17. Warner 2002.
18. Boyd 2010 and Varnelis 2008.
19. Ogbar 2007, chapter 5.
20. For discussion of this issue, see Dean 2003.
21. In this volume, Wendy Chun explores the concerns connected to the monetizable status of culture products that circulate digitally.

22. The difference between a motive and an intention can be distinguished in terms of two questions: What is the agent trying to achieve (intention), and why is he or she trying to achieve this objective (motive)?
23. Kelley 1994 and Hanchard 2006.
24. See Scott 1990, chapter 7. Impure hip hop dissent within repressive regimes does often take the form of infrapolitics, as dissidents can be jailed, raped, maimed, or killed for open dissent.
25. West 1993, chapter 1.
26. http://www.contactmusic.com/news/reverend-jackson-blasts-nas-for-controversial-album-title_1046952.
27. <http://www.datpiff.com/Nas-The-Nigger-Tape-mixtape.15983.html>.
28. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Mfz7wVxzuoE>; and <http://www.myspace.com/nas/music/songs/be-a-nigger-too-9659882>.
29. See, for example, Weiss 2008; Hintz 2008; and Caramanica 2008.
30. Reed 2000, pp. 167–70.
31. Reed 2000, p. 170. For a similar point of view, see Bynoe 2004.
32. Baraka 1999.
33. Hirschman 1970.
34. See, for example, Schochet 1971.
35. See Morgan 2009.
36. Hill 1979.
37. These are not the only reasons why marginalized black youth might find intrinsic value in impure symbolic dissent. This type of dissent can also be a way of affirming one's moral worth in the face of injustice, a way of preserving one's self-respect. I develop this point in "Liberalism, Self-Respect, and Troubling Cultural Patterns in Ghettos," in *The Cultural Matrix: Understanding Black Youth*, ed. Orlando Patterson and Ethan Fosse (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, forthcoming).
38. Lawson (2005) argues that political rap artists, in light of continuing injustices against blacks, view the social contract in America as voided.
39. See Shelby 2007.
40. In her insightful discussion of the ethics of symbolic communication, Danielle Allen emphasizes sincerity as a condition for just "culture jamming." See Allen, "Political Equality and Communicative Action" (unpublished manuscript).
41. For a helpful analysis of the role of personas in hip hop and the challenge this poses for extracting the meaning of rap messages, see Thompson 2005.
42. For helpful comments on previous drafts of this chapter, I thank the participants at the Youth, New Media, and Citizenship workshops at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, and especially Danielle Allen and Jennifer Light. I also thank Harry Brighthouse, Christopher Lebron, Neil Roberts, Jessie Scanlon, Brandon Terry, Erik Olin Wright, and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions. I benefited from feedback from audiences at Morgan State University, Amherst College, the University of Wisconsin–Madison, and the National Institutes of Health.

CHAPTER FOUR

1. The DREAM Act stands for the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act. Introduced in 2001, the act would extend a six-year conditional legal status to undocumented youth who meet several criteria, including: "entry

into the United States before age 16; continuous presence in the United States for five years prior to the bill's enactment; receipt of a high school diploma or its equivalent (i.e., a GED); and demonstrated good moral character. Qualifying youth would be authorized to work in the United States, go to school, or join the military. If during the six-year period they graduate from a two-year college, complete at least two years of a four-year degree, or serve at least two years in the U.S. military, the beneficiary would be able to adjust from conditional to permanent residence status." See Perez, *We Are Americans*, pp. xxi-xxii.

2. Nevins 2001, p. 135.
3. Cohen, Kahne et al. 2012, p. vi.
4. Ibid, 25.
5. Garcia 1991; Flores 2003; Weber 1996.
6. Portions of this section are drawn from my essay "Going Public: Hannah Arendt, Immigrant Action and the Space of Appearance."
7. Galindo 2010, pp. 37-38.
8. Beltrán 2009, p. 596.
9. Barreto et al. 2009; Pallares and Flores González 2010.
10. Barreto et al. 2009, p. 744.
11. Flores 2003, pp. 276, 273. See also Beltrán 2009, pp. 609-10.
12. Beltrán 2009, p. 607.
13. De Genova 2010, p. 101.
14. Galindo 2010, p. 38.
15. De Genova 2010, p. 113.
16. Galindo 2010, p. 113.
17. Beltrán 2009, p. 596.
18. Honig 2003, p. 78.
19. "Obama's Deportation Record Worse Than Bush," 2012.
20. Honig 2003, p. 78.
21. In April 2010, Republican Governor Jan Brewer of Arizona signed into law SB 1070, which expanded the powers of state police officers to ask about the immigration status of anyone they stop, and to hold those suspected of being illegal immigrants. The legislation requires police officers, "when practicable," to detain people they reasonably suspect are in the country without authorization, and to verify their status with federal officials unless doing so would hinder an investigation or emergency medical treatment. The law also makes it a state crime—a misdemeanor—to not carry immigration papers. In a similar vein, in June 2011 Alabama passed HB 56 (the Hammon-Beason Alabama Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act), which requires public schools to collect the immigration status of new students and their parents and makes it a felony for anyone to transport or house an undocumented immigrant. HB 56 was signed into law by Republican Governor Robert Bentley on June 9, 2011. Both provisions are currently blocked by federal courts pending a ruling.
22. <http://www.hrc.org/ncod/>.
23. According to Diana Fuss, the process of coming out can be understood as "a movement into a metaphysics of presence, speech and cultural visibility." In this way, to be out "is really to be in—inside the realm the visible, the speakable, and culturally intelligible." See Fuss 1991, p. 4.
24. Warner 1993, p. xxvi. In a similar vein, David Halperin argues that queer "demarcates not a positivity but a positionality vis-à-vis the normative. . . .

- 'Queer' . . . describes a horizon of possibility whose precise extent and heterogeneous scope cannot in principle be delimited in advance." Halperin 1995, p. 62.
25. De Genova 2010, p. 101.
 26. Ibid, pp. 101, 105, 106.
 27. Puar 2007, pp. 11, 20.
 28. To see videos from the Coming Out of the Shadows Campaign of 2010 and 2011, see http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HS93wb_jpAg&feature=related and http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MQOOvtn21_Q&feature=related.
 29. <http://www.hrc.org/ncod/>.
 30. Cohen et al. 2012, p. 20.
 31. <http://www.dreamactivist.org/about/our-stories/>.
 32. <http://www.dreamactivist.org/about/>.
 33. Beverley 2004, pp. 33, 31.
 34. Ibid, p. 61.
 35. Chun 2006, p. 170.
 36. Ibid, p. 170.
 37. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mTeh1moqiEU&feature=youtu.be>.
 38. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4Fbo4NT_p5M&feature=youtu.be.
 39. Phillips and Cunningham, "Queering Surveillance Research," p. 34.
 40. Ibid, p. 33.
 41. <http://weareamericastories.org/videos/carlos-the-story-of-an-undocumented-student/>.
 42. <http://www.trail2010.org/about/>.
 43. Puar 2007, 25.
 44. Ibid, p. 35.
 45. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SvVGLSgAHMU> Or see DREAMers Adrift Channel: http://www.youtube.com/user/dreamersadrift?feature=results_main.
 46. O'Riordan 2007, p. 24.
 47. The 2000 study was the largest online survey ever conducted for LGBT youth. Conducted by OutProud and Oasis magazine, the survey was completed by 6,872 respondents aged twenty-five or under. See Gross 2007, pp. xiii-ix.
 48. Gross 2007, p. ix.
 49. Luibhéid 2005, p. xxxv.
 50. <http://theniya.org/undocuqueer/>.
 51. This changed on June 26, 2013, when the Supreme Court ruled that the federal Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) was unconstitutional. DOMA had defined marriage as a union between one man and one woman. Following the June 26 ruling, same-sex couples can apply for green cards. See Julia Preston, "For Gay Immigrants, Marriage Ruling Brings Relief and a Path to a Green Card," *New York Times*, June 27, 2013.
 52. Luibhéid 2005, pp. xiii-xv. See also Cantú 2009. Lesbians and gays were barred for decades from entering the United States as legal immigrants. In 1990, exclusion based on sexual orientation was finally removed from immigration law.
 53. Luibhéid 2005, p. x.
 54. In a 2009 post entitled "Gays and Undocumented/Immigrants-Nativists and Homophobes: Two Sides of the Same Coin," blogger and activist Prerna Lal explores the potential links between these categories:

Status quo civil marriage and immigration laws often target and constrict behavior that is neither criminal nor wrong. Put under the lens, nativists and homophobes are two-sides of the same coin—the coin that hates, otherizes, marginalizes and oppresses the Other . . .

With-holding a . . . tool of governmentality. . . . In the case of immigrants, that would be 'citizen.' For the LGBTQ community right now, that would be 'marriage'—Both are arbitrary constructs, backed by the state that have evolved over time. At one point, only white property owning males were considered citizens and there was a time not too long ago that inter-racial marriages were illegal. Now we have gay and undocumented individuals who are fighting for the certain benefits not made available to them.

Homosexuals have to do without marriage because they are homosexuals.

Illegal Aliens have to do without citizenship because they are illegals. . . .

A sentence to describe our situation . . .

"We are here. We work alongside you, raise our kids alongside your kids, walk the same path, shop at the same stores, drive on the same highways, breath from the same air supply and drink from the same water source. The only difference is that we are treated as second-class in our own country, because we are (gay/without papers)."

Here we see the significance of what it might mean for undocumented activists to queer the politics of migration. As Luibhéid argues, this definition of queer is valuable in its call "to transform rather than seek accommodation within existing social structures." Such a definition "underscores that transformation needs to occur across a wide range of regimes and institutions, not just the sexual—but not without addressing the sexual, either." See <http://prernalal.com/2009/03/gays-and-undocumented-immigrants-nativists-and-homophobes-two-sides-of-the-same-coin/>.

55. Warner 1993, p. xxvii.
56. Vargas 2011. A year later, Vargas (along with a number of other undocumented individuals) graced the cover of *Time Magazine* with the title, "We Are Americans." Vargas also wrote a follow-up essay for *Time* under the title "Not Legal, Not Leaving."
57. Preston and Cushman 2012. See <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/16/us/us-to-stop-deporting-some-illegal-immigrants.html?pagewanted=all>.
58. President Obama: Administrative Relief NOW!! http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ycK_j3MHGtA&feature=relmfu.
59. Ibid.
60. Ross 2012. See http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/08/19/deferred-action-immigration-program_n_1786099.html.
61. Ross 2012.
62. Hing 2012. See http://colorlines.com/archives/2012/06/dreamers_planned_obama_campaign_office_sit-ins_force_deportation_standoff.html.
63. Crimp 1993, p. 304.
64. Knefel 2012. See <http://nopapersnofear.org/blog/post.php?s=2012-09-06-no-papers-no-fear-risking-deportation-at-the-dnc>.
65. Honig 2003, p. 109.
66. Ibid.

67. Ibid, pp. 112, 118.
68. Ibid, p. 119.
69. Ibid, pp. 120–21.
70. Ibid, pp. 114–15.
71. As the UWD press release noted, "The immigrant youth movement has learned from past mistakes and will not leave LGBTQ families behind." Demanding an "inclusive pathway to citizenship," DREAMers are demanding the legalization not just of themselves, but of their families and the larger communities of which they are a part. As DREAMer Ulises Vasquez stated: "Our families' dreams were to get a better future . . . but our future is with our families together." See Preston 2012.
72. Preston 2012.
73. For more on the Congressional effort to overhaul immigration in 2013, see chapter 6 of *Reform without Justice: Latino Migrant Politics and the Homeland Security State* by Alfonso Gonzales.

CHAPTER FIVE

1. Bosker 2011; Bosker 2010; Bynum 1997.
2. Nissenbaum 2001, p. 121.
3. Ibid, p. 128.
4. Derrida 2006.
5. Chun, "Habitual New Media." working manuscript). Also see <http://bcrw.barnard.edu/videos/wendy-hui-kyong-chun-habitual-new-media/>.
6. Collin 2009; Kate E. Schwartz 2010; and Associated Press 2008.
7. Giacobbe 2010.
8. Foderaro 2010.
9. Wolak, Finkelhor, and Mitchell 2012.
10. Kimpel 2010.
11. US Congress 2011.
12. Schworm 2011.
13. Zernike 2012.
14. Chun 2006, chapter 2, pp. 77–128.
15. There was initially great uncertainty as to whether or not a market for information could be established on the Internet, not only because sending one's credit card online was considered unsafe, but also because the dominant ethos at the time agreed that information should be free. After the CDA, pornography websites seemed socially responsible, rather than greedy, for demanding credit card verification as "proof" that their users were not minors (even though minors can easily acquire credit cards).
16. Chun 2006, chapter 2, pp. 77–128.
17. Wolak, Finkelhor, Mitchell, and Ybarra 2008.
18. Rooney 2002.
19. boyd 2008.
20. Ibid.
21. Mieszkowski 2003.
22. boyd and Heer 2006.
23. Provenelli 2006, p. 190.
24. Derrida 2006.

FROM VOICE TO INFLUENCE

UNDERSTANDING
CITIZENSHIP IN A
DIGITAL AGE

EDITED BY
DANIELLE ALLEN AND
JENNIFER S. LIGHT

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
Chicago and London