

Repartitioning the National Community

Political Visibility and Voice for Undocumented Immigrants in the Spring 2006 Immigration Rights Marches

René Galindo

ABSTRACT: *The historic immigration rights marches of 2006 placed the plight of undocumented immigrants in the national spotlight. Competing interpretations of the marches focused in part on the waving of Mexican flags by marchers. While some English-language media critics saw the flags as expressing political disloyalty to the United States, the marchers and Spanish-language media said they stood for cultural identity and familial pride. Both of these interpretations obscured the political agency of the marchers, who sought to create visibility and political presence for undocumented immigrants and oppose their criminalization and political exclusion. This essay uses a performance perspective to analyze the Mexican flag as a visual symbol of the political agency, voice, and visibility of undocumented immigrants. Images of the flag in the media served as proxy for the visual emergence of undocumented immigrants from the “shadows of society” onto the national broadcast/political stage. Negative reactions against the Mexican flag responded to a repartitioning of the national community in the broadcast visual/political field, which French philosopher Jacques Rancière termed “the partition of the perceptible,” that presented undocumented immigrants not as a voiceless and faceless mass of laborers but as political agents engaged in the enactment of rights.*

Politics means precisely this, that you speak at a time and in a place you're not expected to speak.

—Jacques Rancière, “Our Police Order”

The immigrant rights marches in the spring of 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 (Cano 2006; Bada et al. 2006). In some cities, the immigration reform marches were the largest street demonstrations ever recorded.

The immediate trigger for the marches was the passage of the Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005 (HR 4437). Approved by the House of Representatives on December 16, 2005, this punitive bill would have further criminalized the status of undocumented immigrants. It followed a decade of other anti-immigrant federal legislation, including the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act, which limited due process in deportation hearings, and the 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, which restricted immigrants' eligibility for public benefits (Yates 2004). States and cities also enacted harsh laws, notably California's restrictionistic Proposition 187 of 1994. Bonnie Honig (1998, 5) contends that the real intent of Proposition 187 was not to prevent unauthorized immigration but rather to incite fear among the undocumented population in order to "render aliens politically invisible" and "quash their potential power as democratic actors, labor organizers, and community activists."

As the immigration reform marches unfolded in early 2006, the print and electronic media offered competing interpretations of their significance. There was particularly heated controversy over the symbolic functions of the Mexican flags that many marchers waved. Some media commentators offered harsh criticism, citing display of the Mexican flag as justification for broadly negative sentiments regarding immigration reform and undocumented immigrants (Pineda and Sowards 2007). In response, some organizers of the demonstrations recommended that marchers wave more U.S. flags, while others defended the marchers' right to wave the Mexican flag (Solis 2006). Competing interpretations of the flag illustrated the great contrast in perspectives between segments of the English-language media, on the one hand, and the marchers and the Spanish-language media, on the other. For critics from the English-language media, the display of the Mexican flag signaled immigrants' unwillingness to assimilate, their political disloyalty to the United States, and their presumed defiance of U.S. immigration law (Beltrán 2009). The marchers and the Spanish-language

RENÉ GALINDO is an associate professor in the School of Education and Human Development at the University of Colorado at Denver. His publications have appeared in *Latino Studies*, *Journal of Latinos and Education*, and the *Harvard Latino Law Review*. He can be contacted at rene.galindo@ucdenver.edu.

media stated that the flag represented a variety of meanings, including pride in one's family heritage and cultural roots.

Few commentators on either side addressed the real issue: that the political mobilization of undocumented immigrants and their supporters defied the "regime of enforced invisibility" under which undocumented immigrants were expected to remain (Beltrán 2009). Also not addressed was the appropriation of familiar symbols, such as the Mexican flag, in the creation of new political identities through the performances that the marches represented. The Mexican flag was interpreted as a visual symbol of the public presence of undocumented immigrants in the country. As such, it became a site for conflicting understandings of exclusionary versus inclusive notions of national membership, the latter based on the claiming of rights through democratic practices like street marches. The critics' objections to the Mexican flag (and to the use of Spanish in posters and chants) overshadowed the larger message of the demonstrations about immigration reform, the political agency and visibility of undocumented immigrants, and the affirmation of the human dignity of these immigrants (Beltrán 2009).

The 2006 immigration rights marches can be seen as performances in which the embodied actions of undocumented immigrants as political actors made visible both their plight and their dignity through the creation of a collective presence (Baker-Cristales 2009; Beltrán 2009; Taylor 2005). Saskia Sassen (2003, 62) defines "presence" as the political agency of those who lack power but who engage in a political process that "escapes the boundaries of the formal polity." The collective presence of undocumented immigrants created visibility that repartitioned the national media visual field (Rancière 1999) to include undocumented immigrants as political agents on a national stage for the claiming of rights. It also focused attention on the undocumented immigrant as an important political figure of our time, whose presence raises questions about rights within the nation-state (Agamben 1995, 2000; Arendt 1973). And it reminded the nation of the historic role of immigrants in renewing the country's democratic practices and principles, such as street demonstrations and the First Amendment right of free expression (Delgado 2009; Honig 2001).

The national political stage is a visual field because of the dominance of the broadcast media. The highly visible street marches, with the Mexican flag prominently displayed, thus effected the visual emergence of undocumented immigrants onto the national broadcast/political stage. Reactions against the flag were reactions against a repartitioning of the national visual

field, termed “the partition of the perceptible” by Jacques Rancière (1999), that presented undocumented immigrants not as a voiceless mass of laborers but as political agents. Until the 2006 marches, the role of undocumented immigrants as political actors had received minimal public attention (Flores 1997). Among the largest street demonstrations in the nation’s history, the marches reconfigured the national political landscape by introducing the images, voices, and actions of undocumented immigrants. By marching, undocumented immigrants and their supporters claimed political voice, human dignity, presence, and visibility as they engaged in “acts of citizenship” (Isin and Nielsen 2008) and the “enactment of rights” (Rancière 1999). Interpretations of the Mexican flag in the context of the marches should view the flag not as a static national symbol from the past but as conveying meaning within the dynamic and historic context of the marches themselves. The dynamic meaning of the Mexican flag can be understood by analogy with another important visual symbol in the 2006 marches, the Virgin of Guadalupe. Like the flag, the Virgin of Guadalupe is not restricted by national borders and has been used as a religious, national, and/or political symbol that combines disparate elements of identity to reaffirm Mexican immigrants’ presence in the United States (Cano 2004).

The appearance of undocumented immigrants on the national broadcast/political stage contrasted with the “regime of enforced invisibility” (Beltrán 2009, 599) that had excluded them from the polity and forced them to “live in the shadows” of society. The marches breached the boundaries of exclusion. Reactions against the flags waved by the marchers were also reactions against the visibility that the undocumented gained from the repartitioning of the national visual field (Rancière 1999) that affirmed their political agency. The recognition of the political agency of undocumented immigrants is critical, since it is the ground on which alternative conceptions of political belonging for these immigrants can be established, irrespective of immigration status (Flores 1997; McNevin 2007). Political belonging requires political agency, a trait that some consider undocumented immigrants and other semi-stateless people to lack (Agamben 2000; Arendt 1973).

Previous Studies of the Marches

Before examining the marches as performances that repartitioned the national community, it is useful to consider previous scholarship on the marches, some of which analyzed reactions to the Mexican flag. For

some analysts, the marches were a counternarrative to the racial politics of immigrant scapegoating and to the criminalization of undocumented immigrants by laws like HR 4437. Rejecting criminalization, the marchers framed the plight of undocumented immigrants in terms of human rights and workers' rights and created a new narrative of belonging for immigrants that expanded the national metanarrative on immigration to include undocumented immigrants (Lazos 2007). Other investigators examined how participation was mobilized (Barreto et al. 2009) and asked whether the marches signaled the arrival of a new civil rights movement concerned with rights for undocumented immigrants (Johnson and Hing 2007). Yet another study focused on the contrasting metaphors used to portray the immigrant marchers in the print media. It found them mostly portrayed as criminals who drained the country's social services and deserved punitive treatment and only occasionally acknowledged as workers who were concerned with feeding their families and who deserved to be treated fairly (Santa Ana et al. 2007).

A number of academicians and columnists remarked on the negative reactions to the Mexican flag in the marches and explored the role of flags as visual symbols capable of arousing strong emotions. As visual ideographs, flags often have more power to move audiences than words do. In the context of the marches, Richard Pineda and Stacey Sowards (2007) claimed that flag waving had centered the immigration debates in ways that verbal expressions had not. They viewed the waving of various national flags as a visual argument that acknowledged immigrants' diverse backgrounds and celebrated the power of civic participation. Critics, however, saw the different flags displayed in the marches as symbolizing the diminishing national sovereignty of the United States and a lack of regard for existing laws. This interpretation positioned immigrants as lawbreakers and discredited their immigration reform message (Chander 2007). While flags from various Latin American, Asian, and other countries were displayed during the 2006 marches, it was the presence of the Mexican flag that caught the attention of media critics and reduced the national immigration policy debate to a Mexican immigration issue (Chander 2007).

Clarence Page (2006), a syndicated columnist, suggested that visual symbols take on importance when they are deployed in disputes over complicated policy issues, but not necessarily otherwise. He pointed out that Mexican flags are commonly flown during holidays such as Cinco de Mayo without attracting much notice or concern. Similarly, Puerto Rican flags are displayed during the annual Puerto Rican Day parade in New York,

serving as a symbol of cultural pride (Negrón-Muntaner 2004), much as the Irish flag is waved at St. Patrick's Day celebrations. Page suggests that there is an unwritten but strictly enforced rule in this country that immigrant ethnic groups may fly their ancestral flag only once a year, on occasions that are perceived as cultural celebrations rather than political events. He argues that the immigrant rights marches broke this unwritten rule and that this was the source of concern among media critics. However, other national flags, such as Cuban or Israeli flags, are displayed at political rallies and do not seem to attract the same criticism as the Mexican flag. Ruben Navarrette Jr. (2006) asks why it is that the Cuban and Israeli flags inspire while the Mexican flag only manages to inflame.

The negative reaction to the Mexican flag during the 2006 marches was prefigured during similar protests against California's Proposition 187 in 1994. The proposition's coauthor, Harold Ezell, stated that the protest marches actually worked in favor of the initiative: "I didn't know we'd have that much help from 70,000 people waving Mexican flags. . . . That didn't hurt us at all. It played right into our hands" (Comeaux 1994). John Keeley of the Center for Immigration Studies, which advocates reduced immigration, also saw the display of Mexican flags in 2006 as hurting the immigrant rights cause: "The mass sea of illegal aliens bearing foreign flags and hostile placards really produced a pronounced backlash, from which they've never recovered" (Watanabe 2006). The visibility that undocumented immigrants and their supporters gained in both the 1994 and 2006 marches and competing interpretations over the Mexican flag became the object of debates intended to establish prevailing interpretations of the marches. Stacy Takacs (1999, 609) noted, regarding the anti-Proposition 187 marches, "Ironically, at the most profound moment of public embodiment, these minoritized subjects were never more abstract, never less in control of the meaning of their own embodiment."

The negative reaction to the Mexican flag in immigration rights marches reflects the historical practice of questioning the political loyalty of immigrants and accusing them of split allegiance to the United States and their country of origin. A century ago, there was criticism of the hyphenation in compounds such as "German-American" (Gleason 1980, 40). Maintenance of an ancestral religion, language, or culture has been seen as a sign of disloyalty (Thernstrom 1980). The immigrant groups whose political allegiance to the United States has been questioned included, at one time, Irish Catholics and Japanese Americans (Gleason 1980). In 1924, approximately 10,000 Catholics marched and carried both "papal banners

and the United States flag” to demonstrate that loyalty to country and to Catholicism were not incompatible (Chander 2007, 2459). The political loyalties of Japanese Americans were questioned during World War II, and by August 1942 approximately 120,000 persons of Japanese descent had been placed in internment camps; 64 percent of them were U.S. citizens (Harrington 1980). Mona Harrington (1980, 685) stated that in the case of Japanese Americans, even more than for any other group, “the accusation of group disloyalty was a function of prejudice, of the intolerance of difference within American society.”

In interpreting the flag symbolism in the 2006 marches, the marchers and the Spanish-language media rejected the argument that immigrants were unwilling to assimilate; they instead relied on the interpretive narrative frame of cultural pride. But in so doing, they neglected the political agency of the immigrants. Undocumented immigrants are commonly perceived only as laborers and are rarely viewed as political actors due to their liminal status in society and their exclusion from the polity (Beltrán 2009). Latinos in general are often cast as passive political subjects, although the Latino population may be seen as a “sleeping giant” that occasionally awakens to engage in militant or radical acts (Ochoa and Ochoa 2007). This interpretation is belied by the emergence of Mexican immigrants as actors in U.S. civic and political life. They have developed at least 600 hometown associations to provide economic and political support to their hometowns in Mexico and mutual aid to their fellow immigrants living in the United States (Bada, Fox, and Selee 2006). But they have also challenged the image of immigrants as disengaged and insular by becoming active in U.S. churches, unions, and civil rights organizations, alongside Americans of diverse backgrounds. Rather than creating split political loyalties, these dual commitments tend to be mutually reinforcing, leading to what has been termed “civic binationality” (Bada, Fox, and Selee 2006).

Performing the Nation and Citizenship

The field of performance studies is broad and builds on contributions from various disciplines. Among its areas of interest are investigations of how performances create contexts for the elaboration and affirmation of new collective identities and how those new identities may be political statements in themselves. Elin Diamond (1996, 2) defined performances, such as popular entertainments and political demonstrations, as “the cultural practices that reinscribe or reinvent the ideas, symbols, and gestures that

shape social life.” Additionally, performances are creative and dynamic contexts for acts of meaning that enable new subject positions and new perspectives to emerge while simultaneously critiquing the conventions and assumptions of oppression (Diamond 1996). Performances employ multiple forms of expression, including narratives, images, and rituals, in the collective enactments of communities that create self-representations for the communities themselves, as well as for others (Myerhoff 1986). Communities use these forms of collective representation to communicate “actual and desired truths of themselves” and “the significance of their existence in imaginative and performative productions” (Myerhoff 1986, 261).

Performances are critical for the construction of collective representations, since they are self-reflexive processes in which actors construct and communicate self-images through the use of verbal and nonverbal symbols (Turner 1985). According to Barbara Myerhoff (1986), performances contribute to the continuous process of self-definition and make persuasive statements about who people think they are or who they would like to be. Among the various types of performances are definitional ceremonies that develop when a group is rendered invisible and held in disdain by dominant sectors of society. As a response to marginalization, definitional ceremonies are “strategies that provide opportunities for being seen and in one’s own terms, garnering witnesses to one’s worth, vitality, and being” (Myerhoff 1986, 267). Street demonstrations by marginalized communities may be considered definitional ceremonies since they function to create visibility, claim dignity and rights, and challenge oppressive conditions.

Another area of interest within performance studies has been the performance of the nation and citizenship. Ana Ramos-Zayas (2003) examines the political dimensions of performing the nation in everyday social practices of racial discrimination, residential displacement, and educational inadequacy, arguing that this involves the reconfiguration of racial, class, and spatial identities at the local political level. She discusses how the cultural and the political were conflated in the performance of anticolonial practices in the construction of Puerto Rican nationality in Chicago through alternative and public educational programs, media representations, and community-building efforts. In another example, Marcus Banks (2006) notes that the performance of nationalism can be carried out through command of a dominant language, as in the case of the English language in the performance of British national identity. He also identifies the recitation of narratives of descent as a mode of performance that documents the legitimate participation of one’s forebears in

the nation's founding. Diana Taylor (2005) also comments on the practice of claiming legitimate national membership by utilizing an appropriate performative model.

Others have looked specifically at the performance of citizenship. May Joseph (1999, 11) speaks of "the expressive stagings of citizenship" that immigrants undertake to reinvent the national community and to gain political visibility that addresses the political ambiguity they face as noncitizens. She situates citizenship within the cultural politics of postnationalism in order to link the narrative of immigration with the narrative of citizenship and underscore the political struggles of immigrants to gain membership in the nation. A postnational perspective differentiates the struggle for citizenship from the mythic assumptions of the homogeneity of the national community and draws attention to the transnational nature of the political struggles of immigrants, which extend beyond national borders. Joseph notes that traditional theories of citizenship do not adequately account for either the transnational and migratory situation of immigrants or the national history of nativism that negatively colors immigrants' reception in the receiving country. For this author, citizenship is a process of becoming through the performance of expressive enactments as much as it is an imagined national political destination. She views citizenship broadly, as engagement with the public realm. Questions arise concerning undocumented immigrants' engagement with the public realm because of their exclusion from the polity in a new society characterized by "the unfamiliar politics of place and arrival" (12) that includes exclusionary categories like "illegal alien." The plight of undocumented immigrants also raises questions regarding the intersection of the legal, political, and cultural arenas of citizenship.

The category of citizenship, broadly understood as legitimate societal membership, may be performed and enacted through public rituals and routines such as protest marches in which identities are created that link actors with desired forms of societal membership. Street demonstrations are collective performances in which slogans, posters, chants, and other symbols are not produced by "already-formed political subjects" but rather by actors who "interactively articulate and enact evolving political messages and identities" (Baker-Cristales 2009, 69). Performances enable the construction of desired identities through "embodied action" (Taylor 2003, xvi) that makes visible the invisibility experienced by immigrants. The crowds of marchers in the streets embody and make visible their own cause, which is transmitted across the nation through media outlets. In

street demonstrations, “histories and trajectories become visible through performance,” although competing interpretations may be offered as to what exactly has been made visible (Taylor 2003, 271).

Homi Bhabha (1990, 1994) has contributed to performance studies of the nation and citizenship by theorizing the tensions between the construction of novel, dynamic national hybrid identities that reconfigure membership in the national community, on the one hand, and reified notions of national identities guarded by rigid boundaries that restrict membership in the national community, on the other. He identifies this tension in the narrative performance of the nation, which he terms “narrating the nation,” through the twin notions of the performative and the pedagogical, which may be viewed as contrasting and competing narrative frames. In narrating the nation, these two narrative temporalities serve as reminders that the configuration of a nation’s “people” was never simply a historical event but the result of rhetorical strategies used to identify the group(s) considered to be representative of the nation (Bhabha 1994).

The pedagogical as an ahistorical narrative frame of rigid borders and membership establishes national unity on the basis of the exclusion of “others,” such as minoritized nondominant groups (Marx 1998). The concept of “illegal alien” operates within such a narrative frame, since it ignores historical developments such as labor agreements with the Mexican government for the recruitment of Mexican workers, notably the Bracero program of the 1940s (Calavita 1992). In contrast, the performative is a narrative frame that considers the nation a historically contested project shaped by internal pressures like civil rights movements and external pressures like transnationalism. The performative also addresses the creative, dynamic capacity of performances to create new and novel forms of subjectivity. The theory of the pedagogical and performative in the narration of the nation can be used to examine conflicting interpretations of the spring 2006 marches, particularly the significance of displaying the Mexican flag.

Competing Interpretations of the Mexican Flag in the Context of the 2006 Protests

On April 7, 2006, as the marches were gearing up nationwide, a newspaper columnist posed the question: “Who decides the symbolism of the flag? The bearer? Or the beholder?” (Sanchez 2006). The disputes over the presence of the Mexican flag in the marches were part of larger debates over the presence of undocumented immigrants within the nation. Competing sides

marshaled distinct national narratives, with some citing imagined origins to define the boundaries of national membership through the strict policing of symbols. Others called upon a national narrative of pride and cultural citizenship expressed through the symbols of the community. Differing interpretations of the symbolic function of the Mexican flag can be identified across three sectors: marchers, Latino public officials, and academicians; English-language visual media commentators; and Spanish-language print and online media.

MARCHERS, LATINO PUBLIC OFFICIALS, AND ACADEMICIANS

Marchers cited a variety of reasons for waving the Mexican flag. A sixteen-year-old marcher said that the flag represented his roots and was “a symbol of where we come from” (Rentería 2006). A seventeen-year-old stated that the flag symbolized the binational identity of many marchers: “We’re Mexicans and we’re in the U.S.A., too. I was born there [Mexico], but I’m living here since I was eleven” (Wingett and González 2006). Other marchers spoke of pride in their Mexican heritage (Vandenack 2006), a display of unity with fellow immigrants (Kim 2006), and a rejection of stigmatization in an era of anti-immigrant sentiment and policies (Portillo 2006; Soto 2006). A number of marchers emphasized that the Mexican flag had been misinterpreted as a symbol of political allegiance to a foreign country; to them, it was a symbol of cultural identity and pride and of immigrants’ sacrifices and struggles to overcome prejudice (Wingett and González 2006). For some marchers and organizers, reactions against the flag represented fear of cultural difference, a fear fueled by racism and intensified by the massive size of the demonstrations (Kim 2006). John Garcia, a political scientist at the University of Arizona, blamed an “us-versus-them” political climate stemming from nativism, nationalism, and patriotism in the post-9/11 era (*Arizona Daily Star* 2006).

Latino elected officials reaffirmed the Mexican flag as a symbol of pride in their heritage and roots (*Arizona Daily Star* 2006; Quan 2006) and as a reaction against the societal marginalization that immigrants experienced (Salinas 2006). An official from a Latino national advocacy group responded to the misinterpretation of the flag: “It’s not an expression of nationalism. It’s an expression of connection and solidarity because this debate has become about the U.S.-Mexico border” (Kim 2006). Another spokesperson for an advocacy group stated, “They’re carrying that as a sign of cultural pride like people wrapping themselves in the Irish flag on

St. Patrick's day" (Rentería 2006). A Latino former elected official agreed that the Mexican flag was a symbol of pride but felt that it should not be displayed at the marches, since the marches were concerned with establishing a political presence (Wingett and González 2006).

Raul Ramos, a professor of Texas history, said that flying both flags was a common practice dating back to 1910 and that most Mexican Americans saw no contradiction in doing so (Radcliffe 2006). John Laslett, also a history professor, noted that the waving of flags by immigrant groups at political rallies was not new; after all, in the mid-nineteenth century, Irish and German immigrants had marched with their national flags (Soto 2006). Joseph Palacios, a sociologist at Georgetown University, indicated that the use of flags reflected nostalgia for the country left behind and that waving a flag from one's country of origin was a celebration of cultural identity and not a display of political loyalty (Montgomery 2006). Rodolfo de la Garza, a political scientist at Columbia University, recalled that the debate over the Mexican flag also occurred in 1994 during protests in California against Proposition 187. His own position was that the Mexican flag conveyed the wrong message during the immigrant reform marches, although he supported the marchers' freedom of expression (Solis 2006). Academicians were also quoted in the Spanish-language press. Chon Noriega of the UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center noted that it is common practice among immigrant groups to display flags from their country of origin during holidays and that for some immigrants, the flag is an honored symbol of their ancestors' country of origin (Truax 2006). For Isidro Ortiz, professor of Chicano studies, the flag as a symbol of pride expressed dissatisfaction with the current treatment of immigrants and with the exclusion they continually faced (Erbez 2006).

ENGLISH-LANGUAGE MEDIA CRITICS

Images of the marches broadcast across the nation drew the attention of media commentators, many of whom interpreted the symbolic function of the Mexican flag. Fox News commentator Robert Novak highlighted a seeming contradiction when he asked, "Why wave a flag from a country other than the one where you are asking for rights?" (Media Matters 2006b). Another commentator agreed that it did not make sense for the marchers to wave Mexican flags when they were talking about rights in the United States. Novak interpreted the waving of the Mexican flag as a sign of national identity and divided political loyalties:

What really got my attention in L.A. was the omni presence of the flags of a foreign government, the Republic of Mexico. Red, white, green, Mexican flags were carried, waved, and draped about the bodies of the young people, some of whom were natural-born American citizens. . . . I am no hard-liner on immigration who wants to expel 11 million illegal immigrants, but flags are a symbol of national identity. The student brandishing the Mexican flag signals divided loyalty or perhaps loyalty to a foreign power. (Media Matters 2006b)

The massive crowds of immigrants and their supporters, some waving Mexican flags, evoked particularly hostile reactions from commentators who linked the flag to the notion of “illegality.” Fox News analyst Newt Gingrich stated, “The American people, frankly, when they see a huge crowd in a city carrying flags other than the U.S., I think they’re pretty unimpressed, and frankly, a little bit irritated by the idea of people who are here illegally telling us they’re going to blackmail our politicians into passing bad laws.” Television commentators also expressed surprise that undocumented immigrants, who were not hiding their presence, would make public demands for immigration reform even though they were in the country illegally. One commentator even stated that the marches were “on behalf of illegal immigration and against the idea that America should enforce its own laws.” Another challenged the rights and presence of the marchers themselves in light of their undocumented status: “You see half a million people show up in L.A. and they were waving Mexican flags. And they’re saying, ‘Hey, we have a right to be here.’ No, you don’t. If you’re illegal, you don’t have a right to be here. But they don’t see it that way” (Media Matters 2006b).

CNN anchor Jack Cafferty reasoned that the sight of Mexican flags in the streets would alienate some television viewers and antagonize anti-immigrant groups in particular:

The Mexican flag has become a source of irritation to a lot of Americans during the immigration debate that’s heating up in this country. Carried as a source of pride by demonstrators, the idea could backfire. You see, this isn’t Mexico. Mexican demonstrators blocking southern California freeways and other streets around the country while waving the Mexican flag in the faces of U.S. citizens is probably not going to win them a lot of friends here. (Media Matters 2006b)

Another commentator considered the flags an “ominous” sign of “a large, unassimilated population existing outside America’s laws and exhibiting absolutely no sheepishness about it.” Sean Hannity of Fox News

characterized the protestors' actions, including waving the Mexican flag, as "outrageous." Brit Hume, also of Fox News, was even more blunt: "tens of thousands of people demonstrating, waving foreign flags . . . a repellent spectacle" (Media Matters 2006b). According to another commentator, the visual impact of hundreds of thousands of flag-waving marchers would not help their call for immigration reform and instead would serve as a visual reminder of their "illegal" status and the illegitimate basis of their request.

The negative media reaction to the display of the Mexican flag led some of the organizers of the marches to call for the U.S. flag to be carried at future marches. This strategy did not go unnoticed by media commentators: "It appears that the people protesting kind of got the message that Mexican flags don't go on too well here on television" (Media Matters 2006a). Other commentators questioned the sincerity of switching flags and labeled it as "just a cover" to conceal the marchers' "real intention" and as "a ploy to win America's support." One added that "it's as if a PR consultant said, 'Guys, lose the Mexican flags. Let's use the American flag'" (Media Matters 2006a).

RESPONSE FROM THE SPANISH-LANGUAGE MEDIA

The U.S.-based Spanish-language media presented its own analysis that countered the charges of political disloyalty leveled by some of the English-language commentators. The Spanish-language media contextualized the critique against the flag within a broader historical pattern of criticisms directed against Latino immigrants in general, criticisms based on the continued use of the Spanish language, the display of symbols of Mexican nationality, and the formation of a transnational political identity. All these had long been used as grounds for questioning the political loyalty of Mexican immigrants.

Sergio Muñoz Bata (2006) noted that charges of political disloyalty leveled against Latinos were not new. In the past, critics had complained about immigrants' participation in elections of their country of origin, the spread of the Spanish language into new areas of the United States that had no prior Latino presence (at least in the modern era), and the adoption of dual nationality by some immigrants. Recognizing the level of effort required to survive in a hostile anti-immigrant climate, Bata raised the question of whether it was time to stop questioning the political loyalty of those who undertook to speak two languages while living in the shadows of society. He also suggested that it was time to stop counting Mexican

flags when people marched in protest against an injustice. In a humorous tone, he noted that as soccer fans, immigrants should not have to defend their preference for the national team from their country of origin over the national team of the United States.

E. Stanley (2006), writing in the Los Angeles–based *Oaxaqueño News*, interpreted the flags as reactions against marginalization and racism rather than as a sign of political disloyalty. In addition to rejecting the disloyalty charge, the Spanish-language media, along with many marchers, asserted that the Mexican flag was primarily a symbol of pride in cultural heritage (Chirinos 2006) and cultural unity (Erbez 2006). The display of pride in one's heritage was not a hostile display, nor did it indicate a lack of political loyalty (Chirinos 2006; Erbez 2006). Latino activists and academicians supported the Spanish-language media's interpretations, although they recognized that the display of the Mexican flag irritated some onlookers (Chirinos 2006; Truax 2006).

An editorial in the Dallas paper *Al Día* (2006) expressed disagreement with English-language media commentators regarding the symbolic function of the Mexican flag in the marches. It stated that the general public lacked a cultural context for interpreting the flag's use, noting the wide gap between the perspectives of those who waved the flags in the streets and those who observed the event from a distance. The editorial lamented that the negative focus by some of the media on the Mexican flag had eclipsed the immigrant rights message of the marches. It challenged the notion that the flag represented anti-American sentiment and emphasized that it was a symbol of pride in Mexican identity, which was under attack by the proposed HR 4437 legislation. The editorial noted the lack of criticism regarding the waving of the Mexican flag at other events such as soccer games and concerts. While acknowledging that sports events and concerts are not political protests, the editorial asserted that public displays of identity should never draw a negative reaction in a country that valued tolerance and respect.

Al Día further stated that the Mexican flag was a symbol of cultural identity that was independent of a person's national origin. It contested the idea that U.S. and Mexican identities were an either-or proposition and provided two examples of hybrid identities that bridged cultural and national affiliations. First, taking the loyalty oath required for U.S. citizenship did not make anyone any less Mexican. Second, the Stars and Stripes design of the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) logo exemplified both pride in Latino identity and an embrace of U.S. ideals.

The editorial encouraged marchers to carry the U.S. flag during future marches while also pointing out that the Mexican flag would continue to fly in places like shopping centers, used-car lots, and restaurants.

The Immigration Rights Marches as Performances

The spring 2006 marches featured the banners, chants, posters, and speeches commonly associated with street demonstrations, in this case including flags from many countries; texts in Spanish, English, and other languages; and visual symbols from previous political struggles, such as the Virgin of Guadalupe. These various images and expressions merged cultural, national, and political arenas in the struggle of the undocumented for a legitimate home within the nation (Ramos-Zayas 2003). Street demonstrations are usually an appropriate performance model for seeking redress for political concerns (Taylor 2005). However, the undocumented were criticized for engaging in this type of performance by those who believed that their exclusion from the polity meant that they did not hold the right to public protest. In addition to expressing their concerns about anti-immigrant policies and laws with slogans such as “Queremos leyes justas” (We want just laws), the undocumented communicated self-images that affirmed their human dignity, claimed membership in the national community, and rejected their criminalized status. As a definitional ceremony (Myerhoff 1986), the marches provided a context for the expression of how undocumented immigrants viewed themselves and how they wished to be viewed in the national community. Marchers chanted slogans that rejected a negative identity, such as “No somos criminales” (We are not criminals), and affirmed a desired identity, like “Somos América” (We are America).

Bhabha’s (1990, 1994) performative and pedagogical narrative frames address conflictual processes of exclusion and inclusion by describing competing national narratives that become the basis for national membership. Viewed in a performative narrative frame, the street demonstrations were a time/space/event in which relations between peoples and nation were transformed by the emergence of novel identities of political belonging for the undocumented that did not merely reproduce preexisting national or cultural identities (Baker-Cristales 2009; Bhabha 1994). The marchers’ embodied actions “created relational spaces of freedom and common appearance where none existed before” (Beltrán 2009, 3). In support of these novel identities of political belonging based on the claiming of rights, immigrants and their supporters created new meanings for familiar

symbols. Through performance, the bits and pieces of everyday life—many of them, such as the Mexican flag, imbued with symbolic value—became symbols of something new (Bhabha 1994). A visible collectivity formed from disparate groups that marched in protest and claimed rights. Flags as familiar symbols may take on new meanings and “semiotic potentialities” in performances like street demonstrations (Veltrusky 1981, 228). Those new meanings must be understood in combination with other signs, actors, and slogans that were also present in the performances.

Performative national narratives forged in the marches challenged predefined national boundaries of exclusion and called for new forms of political belonging for the undocumented (McNevin 2007). In contrast, pedagogical national narratives of origin used to criticize the marches created distinctions and barriers between those counted as “the people” of the nation and those excluded from the nation. Drawing arbitrary distinctions between “insiders and outsiders” created a foreign-alien “other” that was targeted by the nativism endemic to defensive nationalism (Behdad 2005). The pedagogical national narrative of boundaries was used to police internal national borders between insiders and “foreigners,” to level charges of split political loyalties, and to divert attention away from the call for just immigration laws. By casting the marchers as illegitimate political actors with divided political loyalties who transgressed national borders, critics could contain their immigration reform message.

Pedagogical national narratives of origins and boundaries also described the symbols of Mexican-origin communities as “foreign” and influenced the English-language media’s interpretation of the Mexican flag. In Mexican-origin communities of the Southwest, the Mexican flag has historical precedence over the U.S. flag and has flown alongside the Stars and Stripes for many decades (Radcliffe 2006). However, in 2006, some media commentators interpreted the Mexican flag as a foreign symbol and expressed surprise that young Latinos—many of whom, they suspected, were born in the United States—chose to drape themselves in it. This difference in historical perspective between the marchers and their detractors also colored attitudes toward the use of Spanish in the marches. English-language commentators interpreted the use of the Spanish language and the display of Mexican flags as expressing contempt and defiance of the law (Beltrán 2009). As in other political struggles, immigrants in the 2006 marches identified their own symbols and political discourse in calling for immigration reform (Cano 2004; Flores 1997, 263). The Mexican flag and the Spanish language were symbols that immigrants

used to contest boundaries and invisibility in their political struggle against HR 4437. The use of these symbols destabilized the expectations of some media commentators regarding the grounds on which political claims for immigration reform could be made (McNevin 2007). These symbols and others, such as images of the Virgin of Guadalupe, inserted the transnational and hybrid lives of immigrants into national politics and linked the narrative of Mexican immigration with the narrative of citizenship (Cano 2004; Joseph 1999).

The policing of boundaries through pedagogical national narratives was intended to prevent the linking of citizenship with immigration because such a link raises questions about the ongoing marginalization of a large segment of the country's residents: undocumented immigrants who provide needed labor but are deprived of a pathway to citizenship. The pedagogical national narrative of boundaries considered the categories of "Mexican" and "American" to be mutually exclusive, an argument that evoked concerns over "hyphenated" immigrants in the early 1900s (Gleason 1980). The linking of immigration and citizenship in the political advocacy of Latinos had previously been captured through the term "Latino cultural citizenship," which described the efforts of Latinos to affirm a unique cultural identity within the nation while attaining legitimate national membership (Flores 1997). Latino cultural citizenship was also concerned with conceptualizing new forms of national membership, irrespective of immigration status, for members of Latino communities historically excluded from the nation through residential, labor, and educational segregation (Gonzales 1990; San Miguel 1987).

The Repartitioning of the National Community

The immigration rights marches were historic not only because of their size and distribution across the nation but also because of the public manner in which they challenged the "regime of enforced invisibility" that undocumented immigrants face (Beltrán 2009, 599). The marchers' embodied actions on the streets created presence and public visibility for the undocumented that directly challenged their symbolic invisibility. These embodied actions can be viewed as "the enactment of rights" (Rancière 1999) and as "acts of citizenship," defined as acts that transform modes of political belonging by introducing "activist citizens" as new actors in the creation of new sites of struggle (Isin and Nielsen 2008, 39). From this perspective, the focus shifts from the immigration status of the actors

to their actions of democratic performance and to questions regarding the grounds for exclusion/inclusion in the national community.

The visual metaphor of “living in the shadows” is popularly used to describe the invisibility and criminalization of undocumented immigrants. After the marches, several public officials used this phrase to describe the plight of undocumented immigrants. Then—Colorado senator Ken Salazar stated that the aim of proposed immigration reform legislation was to move the undocumented “from the shadows of society into the sunlight of society” (Mulkern 2007). Similarly, President Barack Obama stated that immigrants who were longtime residents but lacked legal status needed to “have some mechanism over time to get out of the shadows” (Preston 2009). The metaphorical movement from the invisibility of exclusion and criminalization to a proposed visibility based on open participation in society symbolized a shift in immigration and political status. In the marches, the undocumented stepped out from the shadows of the margins into the visual field of the nation’s streets and into the center of the media’s attention. Many media commentators alluded to this emergence of the undocumented and their symbols into the national visual field: “waving . . . in the faces,” “an ominous sign,” “when they see a huge crowd,” “Mexican flags . . . on television,” and “you see half a million people.” One particularly strong reaction to the visual impact of the Mexican flags on the national stage was Hume’s reference to a “repellent spectacle.”

The state of invisibility that characterizes undocumented immigrants results from a symbolic distribution of bodies into two categories, “those that one sees and those that one does not see” (Rancière 1999, 22). In the case of the undocumented, invisibility becomes a critical metaphor for their perceived lack of political presence and agency, often described as a life lived in the shadows. In short, it is a reflection of the dehumanization that undocumented immigrants experience due to their criminalized status in society. As semi-stateless economic refugees, they are not considered to have the capacity for political agency or to enjoy the right to inclusion in the national community (Agamben 2000; Arendt 1973). Instead, undocumented immigrants are considered useful only for activities judged by some as menial, such as low-wage labor (Beltrán 2009). The political invisibility of undocumented immigrants also stems in part from their facelessness and anonymity as “mere laborers”; as Rancière (1999, 23) noted, “whoever is nameless cannot speak.” Challenging the invisibility of the excluded is the beginning of politics: “Politics begins when it becomes apparent that the debate is about something that has not been noticed, when the person

who says so is a speaker who has not been recognized as such and when, ultimately, that person's very status as a speaking being is in question" (35). Questions regarding the status of undocumented immigrants as speaking beings arise anew every time these immigrants and their supporters challenge anti-immigrant legislation, as they did in the demonstrations against California's Proposition 187 as well as in the spring 2006 marches.

Rancière (1999) further described the plight of those who are politically excluded from society as the count of the uncoun­ted and the part of those who have no part. These groups do not count or have a part since they are considered beings without a name—that is, they are of no account. Excluded from the polity because of their criminalized identity, the undocumented are not expected to speak or act. Rather, they are expected to remain invisible in the "shadows of society" and live in the margins as faceless and nameless people where "they are deprived of the symbolic enrollment in the city" (Rancière 1999, 93); as a result, their calls for comprehensive immigration reform are not heard. The television footage of the demonstrations presented undocumented immigrants in a mode of being as political agents and in forms of visibility that made use of icons such as Mexican flags, which breached the national boundaries of exclusion that kept the undocumented in the shadows of society. In reaction to this breaching of boundaries by the political agency of undocumented immigrants and their symbols, some commentators stated that undocumented immigrants did not have the right to march for their rights. In general, the political agency of immigrants can always be questioned, given their status as newcomers. In the context of the national immigration myth, immigrants are expected to act as polite guests who do not make demands of their hosts (Honig 2001).

Rancière (1999, 24) uses the phrase "the partition of the perceptible" to describe the basis for inclusion or exclusion in political life conducted in common spaces, such as on the streets or on national television. He is referring to the political sensory order that organizes domination by defining who can be politically seen and heard and who remains politically invisible. When they engage in acts of democratic practice like street marches, the excluded claim voice and visibility in the naming of a wrong; the action of naming helps establish the collectivity of the group that was wronged. Additionally, the collectivity naming the wrong gives form to the dispute by personifying and embodying the wrong—as in the case of undocumented immigrants, who inserted a human face and bodily presence into an anti-immigrant policy debate that was based on the reproduction of their

anonymity and criminalization. The naming of those who suffer from an inequity exposes the wrong and creates a collectivity around the particular dispute. It makes visible the liminal status of exclusion of the named collectivity. The naming of a wrong is not the solution to a problem as much as it is a reconfiguration of worlds of inclusion and exclusion, what can be termed the repartitioning of the perceptible. Acts of democratic practice that name a wrong produce paradoxical scenes that bring out the contradictions between the opposing logics of exclusion and inclusion by positing an existence in light of a nonexistence; such acts include the exercise of rights by those whom some consider not to have rights, or public displays by those who have been relegated to the shadows of society (Rancière 1999, 41). The spring 2006 marches repartitioned the perceptible of the national community by creating visibility for the invisible through the emergence of millions of undocumented immigrants and their supporters onto the national broadcast/political stage.

Challenging the inequity represented by the partition of the perceptible calls for political activities that shift a body from an assigned place of exclusion to a place of visibility. The performance of political activities makes visible that which under the current partition of the perceptible “had no business being seen” (Rancière 1999, 30) and makes intelligible as a political discourse that which had previously only been heard as noise. The repartitioning of the perceptible involves a shift in the visual and auditory field so that the faces of the excluded are seen and their discourse begins to be considered as an intelligible political argument that arises from legitimate political actors. The partition of the perceptible demarcates the basis on which boundaries of political inclusion and exclusion are drawn. The immigration rights marches breached those boundaries by creating visibility for undocumented immigrants as they stepped out of the shadows of society and onto the streets of the nation, as human beings and, importantly, as political agents. Up to then, Latino immigrants had never so convincingly taken the national stage in political action (Lazos 2007), and questions quickly arose regarding the legitimacy of undocumented immigrants as political actors. Those questions revolved in part around the images of the Mexican flag.

The disruption of the partition of the perceptible requires questioning the very basis of exclusion from political life. In the case of undocumented immigrants, this is metaphorically expressed through the image of shadows, invisibility, and anonymity that minimize their human dignity, presence, and labor. Such a challenge entails performative acts that create new

modes of sense perception in which the invisible gain visibility and novel forms of political subjectivity are created for those who face possible legal sanctions for their mere presence within the nation. New forms of visibility that reconfigure the partition of the perceptible are tied to new modes of political belonging for those engaged in the enactment of rights to challenge forms of exclusion.

Negative reactions to the Mexican flag were reactions to shifts in the partition of the perceptible that resulted from the inclusion of undocumented immigrants and their symbols on the national political stage. Undocumented immigrants were no longer merely an undifferentiated mass of low-wage laborers, invisible and anonymous. The performance of the immigration marches created a stage for the argumentation of immigration reform and for the visibility/recognition of undocumented immigrants as valid participants in public life. In politics, subjects act to create a stage on which problems can be made visible in full view of a partner (Rancière 1999). While the stage may be in full view, such as the stage provided by national media coverage of the marches, the political partner does not automatically see or recognize the subjects. Ironically, much as happened during the protest marches against Proposition 187 (Takacs 1999), at the very moment that undocumented immigrants had created greater political visibility through the spring 2006 marches, they were marginalized and misinterpreted by segments of the English-language media that objected to their symbols and embodiment as political actors.

Denationalizing Democratic Activism

The immigration rights marches of spring 2006 are the latest chapter in the long history of immigrants' engagement in democratic practices like street demonstrations, in which they have operated as legitimate members of society (Chander 2007; Honig 1998; Joseph 1999). Historically, immigrants who exercised democratic rights often encountered nativist charges of operating as "alien" political subversives (Higham 1999). Similarly, in 2006 some media commentators described the immigrant marchers as foreigners and interlopers and asserted that "illegals" should not be demonstrating in public. According to this view, the immigrant population consists of low-wage laborers who neither have a right to nor are capable of political action (Arendt 1973; Beltrán 2009). However, media criticism directed at the marchers over the Mexican flag as a national icon disregarded a vital national principle, the marchers' First

Amendment rights to public protest and free expression (Delgado 2009). By exercising their First Amendment rights, the immigrant marchers in 2006 helped renew the country's democratic practices and principles of public protest and free expression.

Honig, in *Democracy and the Foreigner* (2001), discusses the role of immigrants as “foreigners” in renewing a nation's democratic practices by appropriating them. The politics of national origins are always the politics of refounding or, put another way, the politics of renarrating. Immigrants have played an important role in the narration of national origins as well as in the revitalization of democracy, though the latter contributions have not always been recognized. Immigrants hold a special place in the Euro-mythic history of the United States, in which the country is described as a “nation of immigrants” and the ideal citizen is held to be the assimilated naturalized immigrant, especially of the rags-to-riches type. According to Honig, the immigrant in the national myth operates as a refounder of a nation of immigrants and helps the country return to its original principles of economic opportunity and communitarian values. In this role, the immigrant reinforces the exceptionalist belief that the United States is a distinctly consent-based regime based on choice and not inheritance, and on civic rather than ethnic ties.

While immigrants from previous eras have been appropriated in founding myths for nationalist projects, immigrants of the current era are often mistreated (Behdad 2005; Honig 2001). The opposite of the assimilated immigrant as ideal citizen is the undocumented immigrant, who in spite of being an immigrant in a “nation of immigrants” is rendered invisible and faceless and assigned a criminalized identity that facilitates economic exploitation. The nation's love/hate relationship with immigrants is reflected in their critical role in the national founding myth, on the one hand, and the virulent waves of nativism that have targeted them throughout the nation's history, on the other (Perea 1997). In spite of immigrants' historic role in the national myth, current immigrants continue to be considered threats due to the perceived foreignness that clings to them and their symbols. This perceived threat is magnified when immigrants become politically active. In the national myth, the expectation is that immigrants will busy themselves with pursuit of the American economic dream and not become politically active. When they seek rights, which is a basic democratic practice, immigrants may be perceived as ungrateful guests, and historically their demands have often been resisted, denied, misunderstood, or greeted with violence (Honig 2001).

In contrast to national immigration myths, Honig (2001) proposes a narrative of immigrant democratic activism whose heroes are not nationals of the regime but who insist nonetheless on exercising democratic rights. The narrative of immigrant democratic activism should be considered not primarily a nationalist narrative but rather a democratic narrative of demands placed on the nation by those excluded from it. Consequently, a narrative of immigrant democratic activism denationalizes democratic practices and the claiming of rights so that democratic practices are not the exclusive rights of those who hold formal citizenship. In the context of the spring 2006 immigration reform marches, the claiming of democratic rights by undocumented immigrants in street demonstrations was not based on a particular set of symbols, national or otherwise, but on the performance of the democratic practice itself.

Works Cited

- Agamben, Giorgio. 1995. "We the Refugees." *Symposium* 49: 114–19.
- . 2000. *Means without End: Notes on Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Al Día*. 2006. "Nuestra voz: Dos banderas, una sola libertad." Editorial, April 3, A6.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1973. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Arizona Daily Star*. 2006. "Waving Mexican Flag Gave the Wrong Message." April 3, 6.
- Bada, Xóchitl, Jonathan Fox, and Andrew Selee, eds. 2006. *Invisible No More: Mexican Migrant Civic Participation in the United States*. Washington, DC: Mexico Institute, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
- Bada, Xóchitl, Jonathan Fox, Elvia Zazueta, and Ingrid García. 2006. "Immigrant Rights Marches, Spring 2006." Database. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/topics/docs>.
- Baker-Cristales, Beth. 2009. "Mediated Resistance: The Construction of Neoliberal Citizenship in the Immigrant Rights Movement." *Latino Studies* 7: 60–82.
- Banks, Marcus. 2006. "Performing 'Neo-nationalism': Some Methodological Notes." In *Neo-nationalism in Europe and Beyond: Perspectives from Social Anthropology*, ed. Andre Gingrich and Marcus Banks, 50–58. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Barreto, Matt A., Sylvia Manzano, Ricardo Ramírez, and Kathy Rim. 2009. "Mobilization, Participation, and *Solidaridad*: Latino Participation in the 2006 Immigration Protest Rallies." *Urban Affairs Review* 44, no. 5: 736–64.
- Bata, Sergio Muñoz. 2006. "Lealtades incomprendidas." *La Prensa Gráfica* (San Salvador), July 13. <http://archive.laprensa.com.sv/20060713/opinion/543086.asp>.

- Behdad, Ali. 2005. *A Forgetful Nation: On Immigration and Cultural Identity in the United States*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Beltrán, Cristina. 2009. "Going Public: Hannah Arendt, Immigrant Action, and the Space of Appearance." *Political Theory* 37: 595–622.
- Bhabha, Homi K., ed. 1990. *Nation and Narration*. New York: Routledge.
- . 1994. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Calavita, Kitty. 1992. *Inside the State: The Bracero Program, Immigration, and the I.N.S.* New York: Routledge.
- Cano, Gustavo Hernández. 2004. "The Virgin, the Priest, and the Flag: Political Mobilization of Mexican Immigrants in Chicago, Houston, and New York." Paper presented at the 62nd Annual Conference of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April 15. <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/9nx130m2>.
- . 2006. "Movilización política de los inmigrantes mexicanos." *Migración y Desarrollo*, no. 6: 160–84. <http://redalyc.uaemex.mx/redalyc/src/inicio/ArtPdfRed.jsp?iCve=66000607>.
- Chander, Anupam. 2007. "Flying the Mexican Flag in Los Angeles." *Fordham Law Review* 75: 2455–68.
- Chirinos, Carlos. 2006. "Ondean las diferencias." BBCmundo/Internacional.com, April 3. http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/spanish/international/newsid_4873000/4873932.stm.
- Comeaux, M. 1994. "Proposition 187 Galvanizes Latinos: Measure Expected to Fuel Strong Voter Turnout." *Los Angeles Daily News*, October 18, N4.
- Delgado, R. 2009. E-mail to author, November 27.
- Diamond, Elin. 1996. Introduction to *Performance and Cultural Politics*, ed. Elin Diamond, 1–12. New York: Routledge.
- Erbez, José Manuel. 2006. "EEUU: Bandera mexicana es símbolo de orgullo, no separatismo." Blog post, April 7. <http://driza.blogspot.com/2006/04/eeuu-bandera-mexicana-es-smbolo-de.html>.
- Flores, William V. 1997. "Citizens vs. Citizenry: Undocumented Immigrants and Latino Cultural Citizenship." In *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights*, ed. William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor, 255–77. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Gleason, Philip. 1980. "American Identity and Americanization." In *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, ed. Stephan Thernstrom, 31–58. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University.
- Gonzalez, Gilbert G. 1990. *Chicano Education in the Era of Segregation*. Philadelphia: Balch Institute Press.
- Harrington, Mona. 1980. "Loyalties: Dual and Divided." In *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, ed. Stephan Thernstrom, 676–86. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University.
- Higham, John. 1999. "Instead of a Sequel, or, How I Lost My Subject." In *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, ed. Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasinitz, and Josh DeWind, 383–89. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Honig, Bonnie. 1998. "Immigrant America? How Foreignness 'Solves' Democracy's Problems." *Social Text*, no. 56: 1–27.
- . 2001. *Democracy and the Foreigner*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Insin, Engin F., and Greg M. Nielsen, eds. 2008. *Acts of Citizenship*. London: Zed Books.
- Johnson, Kevin R., and Bill Ong Hing. 2007. "The Immigrant Rights Marches of 2006 and the Prospects for a New Civil Rights Movement." *Harvard Civil Rights–Civil Liberties Law Review* 42: 99–138.
- Joseph, May. 1999. *Nomadic Identities: The Performance of Citizenship*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kim, Myung Oak. 2006. "Foreign Flags Create Flap: Mexican Banners at Recent Rallies Prompt Backlash." *Rocky Mountain News*, March 30, 6A.
- Lazos, Sylvia. 2007. "The Immigrant Rights Marches (Las Marchas): Did the 'Gigante' (Giant) Wake Up or Does It Still Sleep Tonight?" *Nevada Law Journal* 7: 780–825.
- Marx, Anthony W. 1998. *Making Race and Nation: A Comparison of South Africa, the United States, and Brazil*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McNevin, Anne. 2007. "Irregular Migrants, Neoliberal Geographies and Spatial Frontiers of 'the Political.'" *Review of International Studies* 33: 655–74.
- Media Matters for America. 2006a. "Immigration protesters can't win with Fox's Asman and Cavuto: Waving Mexican flag shows 'antagonistic edge,' waving U.S. flag 'just a cover' and 'a ploy to win America's support.'" Blog post, April 12. <http://mediamatters.org/items/200604120002>.
- . 2006b. "Media figures attacked Mexican-flag-wavers, but not those waving Irish, Italian, or Israeli flags." Blog post, April 3. <http://mediamatters.org/items/200604030012>.
- Montgomery, David. 2006. "A Banner Day on the Mall; for Most Marchers, Stars and Stripes Speak Loudest about Loyalties." *Washington Post*, April 11, C1.
- Mulkern, Anne C. 2007. "Plan Offers a Path to Legality." *Denver Post*, May 18. http://www.denverpost.com/ci_5923165.
- Myerhoff, Barbara. 1986. "Life Not Death in Venice': Its Second Life." In *The Anthropology of Experience*, ed. Victor W. Turner and Edward M. Bruner, 261–88. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Navarrette, Ruben, Jr. 2006. "Good Flags and Bad Flags." *San Diego Tribune*, August 6. http://legacy.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20060806/news_mz1ed6navarr.html.
- Negrón-Muntaner, Frances. 2004. *Boricua Pop: Puerto Ricans and the Latinization of American Culture*. New York: New York University Press.
- Ochoa, Gilda O., and Enrique C. Ochoa. 2007. "Framing Latina/o Immigration, Education, and Activism." *Sociology Compass* 1: 701–19.
- Page, Clarence. 2006. "Nothing New about Foreign Flag Waving." Real Clear Politics, April 13. http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2006/04/nothing_new_about_foreign_flag.html.
- Perea, Juan F., ed. 1997. *Immigrants Out! The New Nativism and the Anti-immigrant Impulse in the United States*. New York: New York University Press.

- Pineda, Richard D., and Stacey K. Sowards. 2007. "Flag Waving as Visual Argument: 2006 Immigration Demonstrations and Cultural Citizenship." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 43: 164–74.
- Portillo, Ernesto, Jr. 2006. "Mexican Flags Draw Defense by Marchers Waving Them." *Arizona Daily Star*, April 7, B1.
- Preston, Julia. 2009. "Obama to Push Immigration Bill as One Priority." *New York Times*, April 8, A1.
- Quan, Douglas. 2006. "Mexican Flag Use Defended by Some; Angry Americans Say It's Inappropriate Not to Show the Red, White, and Blue." *Press-Enterprise* (Riverside, CA), April 8. http://www.pe.com/localnews/inland/stories/PE_News_Local_C_flags08.143d1b81.html.
- Radcliffe, Jennifer. 2006. "Opinions Split over Red, White, and Green: Mexican Flags Divisive Topic as Principal Shows His Support for Student Protests." *Houston Chronicle*, March 30, A1.
- Ramos-Zayas, Ana Y. 2003. *National Performances: The Politics of Class, Race, and Space in Puerto Rican Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rancière, Jacques. 1999. *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*. Trans. Julie Rose. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 2006. "Our Police Order: What Can Be Said, Seen, and Done." Interview by Truls Lie. *Eurozine*, August 11. <http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2006-08-11-lieranciere-en.html>. Orig. pub. in *Le Monde diplomatique* (Oslo), August 2006.
- Rentería, Ramón. 2006. "Mexican Flag Gets Negative Attention of Protest Critics." *El Paso Times*, March 31, A12.
- Salinas, Claudia Meléndez. 2006. "Some Protesters Think Twice about Carrying Mexican Flags." *Monterey County (CA) Herald*, April 1, A1.
- Sanchez, Mary. 2006. "No Disrespect Meant by Mexican Flag." *Anniston (AL) Star*, April 7.
- San Miguel, Guadalupe, Jr. 1987. *"Let All of Them Take Heed": Mexican Americans and the Campaign for Educational Equality in Texas, 1910–1981*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Santa Ana, Otto, Sandra L. Treviño, Michael J. Bailey, Kristen Bodossian, and Antonio de Necochea. 2007. "A May to Remember: Adversarial Images of Immigrants in U.S. Newspapers during the 2006 Policy Debate." *Du Bois Review* 4: 207–32.
- Sassen, Saskia. 2003. "The Repositioning of Citizenship: Emergent Subjects and Spaces for Politics." *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3, no. 2: 41–66.
- Solis, Dianne. 2006. "Planners Want Old Glory Only at Local Immigrant Rally." *Dallas Morning News*, April 4. <http://www.dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dws/dn/latestnews/stories/040406dntexflag.cd8c2b9.html>.
- Soto, Hiram. 2006. "Mexican Flag Kindles Passions Pro and Con." *San Diego Union-Tribune*, April 8, B1.
- Stanley, E. 2006. "El poder de una bandera." *El Oaxaqueño News* (Los Angeles), April 29.
- Takacs, Stacy. 1999. "Alien-nation: Immigration, National Identity and Transnationalism." *Cultural Studies* 13: 591–620.

- Taylor, Diana. 2003. *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- . 2005. "The Theatre of Operations: Performing Nation-ness in the Public Sphere." In *Internationalizing Cultural Studies: An Anthology*, ed. Ackbar Abbas and John Nguyet Erni, 132–44. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Thernstrom, Abigail M. 1980. "Language: Issues and Legislation." In *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, ed. Stephan Thernstrom, 619–28. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University.
- Truax, Eileen. 2006. "Banderas mexicanas en las marchas: El uso de la tricolor en las manifestaciones por la legalización de indocumentados genera comentarios encontrados." *La Opinión* (Los Angeles), April 9.
- Turner, Victor. 1985. "The Anthropology of Performance." In *On the Edge of the Bush: Anthropology as Experience*, ed. Edith L. B. Turner, 177–204. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Vandenack, Tim. 2006. "Display of Mexican Flags Based on Pride, Not Show of Disrespect." *Hutchinson (KS) News*, April 30.
- Veltrusky, Ji i. 1981. "The Prague School Theory of Theater." *Poetics Today* 2: 225–35.
- Watanabe, Teresa. 2006. "Latino Activists Put Faith in Ballots." *Los Angeles Times*, September 10. <http://articles.latimes.com/2006/sep/10/local/me-latino10>.
- Wingett, Yvonne, and Daniel González. 2006. "Mexican Flags Draw Dissent." *Arizona Republic*, April 5, A1.
- Yates, Laura S. 2004. "Plyler v. Doe and the Rights of Undocumented Immigrants to Higher Education: Should Undocumented Students Be Eligible for In-state College Tuition Rates?" *Washington University Law Quarterly* 82: 585–609.