

possible connections that are not apparent elsewhere? Or is there a deeper affinity at work? To be sure, the close sequencing of Boston's gay marriage movement and immigrant rights rallies made connections easier, but we have come to understand that there is more than historical coincidence at work here. We have come to see a connection between sexuality and migration that, once understood, allows us to appreciate the larger significance of the Boston immigrant-gay rights coalition. If we are to take full advantage of the political opportunities ahead, it is crucial that this deeper connection be understood.

Classic histories of the gay rights movement in the United States have long noted that many gays and lesbians were drawn to San Francisco and New York in the hope of finding safety and community in numbers in large metropolises (Chauncey 1995; D'Emilio 1983; Weston 1995). We have begun to see a parallel process at the international level in which many gays and lesbians move around the world in order to escape the strictures of heteronormative regimes at home. From this perspective, heteronormativity generates queer migrations both within the nation-state and around the globe. If we are right here, the emergence of Mass Equality and immigration politics in Boston over the last half-decade harbors an important lesson for opposition movements around the world.

But leaving our account of sexual orientation and migration here is somewhat misleading: one additional step in the argument is needed. The problem lies in the implication that Boston and other U.S. cities are beacons of tolerance and openness on *both* the national and international level. But this is not so: there is a crucial difference in terms of openness when one shifts from the national to an international frame. U.S. immigration policy, after all, is deeply restrictive. Moreover, the limitations to entry are themselves replete with deep heteronormative assumptions, thereby creating important asymmetries between the role of American cities at the level of the nation and globe. Siobhan Somerville's brilliant re-reading of the 1952 Immigration Act in which she traces the sexual politics contained within American immigration law, and specifically within the family reunification provisions, makes

plain the strictures America places on queer migrations. The restrictions are not accidental, but rather stem from assumptions about who is family both at home and abroad (Luibheid 2002; Somerville 2005).

The limits of American cities as havens for queer migrants quickly became apparent after the Massachusetts Supreme Court legalized gay marriage. Perhaps somewhat naively, some same-sex, binational couples hoped that *Goodridge* would allow *them* to change the immigration status of a non-U.S. partner. Activists had to mobilize quickly to inform binational, same-sex couples that *Goodridge* did not protect them because federal immigration law would trump state marriage law. Thus undocumented immigrants who wished to wed under the newly established same-sex marriage law still risked deportation under federal immigration policy. The danger of deportation was conveyed to a group of binational gay couples at Northeastern University in Boston when the Gay and Lesbian Advocates and Defenders organization (GLAD) held events to elaborate the consequences of the Massachusetts Supreme Court ruling for gay binational couples (Thomson 2005).²² This double jeopardy of immigration and marriage law has gathered little attention in mainstream media because as yet few advocacy groups address the complex intersection of sexuality and immigration.

It is precisely these tensions between immigration and sexuality, and efforts to bridge them, that we saw many activists trying to navigate in our Boston fieldwork. How these conflicting pressures are negotiated in the near future will be of great consequence to the contours of immigrant politics for years to come.

PROSPECTS FOR A NEW POLITICS OF OPPOSITION

We draw two broad conclusions from our research. First, we have been impressed by the length and robustness of immigrant rights politics in Boston. Several organizations have been in operation for more than a decade, some for two—evidence of considerable staying power in a world known for the fragility and transience of its organizations. Moreover, we have been struck by the importance of broad coalition building as a central goal of many organizations and activists work-

ing in the Boston area. To be sure, the precise contours of the different umbrella organizations vary with each envisioning rather different coalitions: MIRA and GBIO, for example, have both worked hard to bring a wide range of organizations into a progressive coalition. But which groups they tap, and how they envision the frontiers of change, are quite different. Thus, the pressing issue is not so much whether to form coalitions; the political arithmetic makes the power of numbers an appealing strategy across the board. The contentious issue is which coalitions to join and on what terms. Coalitions are clearly forming; the question is on whose term.

Second, we have been impressed by emerging collaborations between immigrant and gay rights organizations. It is too early to tell whether deep and enduring identifications are being reworked into new political formations, since much of the evidence comes from opposition to these very same collaborations. Tensions between faith-based and gay rights mobilizations have been readily apparent, suggesting that historical tensions between these two groups might thwart the emerging collaborations. Nevertheless, synergies from joint mobilizations between gay and immigrant rights activists persist; whether they will be sustained and institutionalized in the decade ahead is what bears watching. Whether immigration and sexual politics play out as complementary or divisive forces will set the parameters of immigrant politics in the foreseeable future.

NOTES

1. For accounts of anti-immigrant politics, see the Carlos Sandoval and Catherine Tambini documentary *Farmingville* (2000); Ostendorf (2001 and 2005); ; and Cummings (2005). For passage of local anti-immigrant ordinances, Kotlowitz (2007). Perhaps two of the most prominent anti-immigrant local ordinances were passed in Hazleton, Pennsylvania and Carpentersville, Illinois. For two important accounts of immigrant day laborers, see Fine (2006) and Gordon (2005).
2. For a full account of H.R.4437, see <<http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d109:h.r.04437>>. The bill was eventually defeated in the Senate.