

PERSPECTIVAS

HISPANIC THEOLOGICAL INITIATIVE

SIXTEENTH ISSUE – 2019

EDITOR:

Néstor Medina

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

Ann Hidalgo

João Chaves

TRANSLATOR:

Néstor Medina

TECHNICAL SERVICES & CO-BOOK REVIEW EDITOR

Grace Vargas

CO-BOOK REVIEW EDITOR & COPY EDITOR

Francisco J. Peláez-Díaz

ADVISORY BOARD:

Mayra Rivera

Felipe Hinojosa

Carmelo Santos

Ulrike Guthrie

PUBLISHER:

Joanne Rodriguez, Executive Director, Hispanic Theological Initiative

*Perspectivas is a publication of the Hispanic Theological Initiative,
funded by Princeton Theological Seminary in New Jersey.*

PERSPECTIVAS

SIXTEENTH ISSUE, 2019

CONTENTS

Editorial [ENGLISH VERSION]	5
Editorial [SPANISH VERSION]	8
<i>Néstor Medina</i>	
Sacred Resistance: The Sanctuary Movement from Reagan to Trump [ENGLISH VERSION]	
<i>Co-authored by Lloyd Barba, PhD & Tatyana Castillo-Ramos</i>	11
Resistencia Sagrada: El Movimiento Santuario desde Reagan a Trump [SPANISH VERSION]	
<i>Autores: Lloyd Barba, PhD & Tatyana Castillo-Ramos</i>	37
What does the Paraclete have to do with Dreamers? A Pneumatological Paradigm for Latino/a Social–Political Advocacy	
<i>Rodolfo Estrada III</i>	66
Now That Latinxs Are the Largest Racialized Group in the U.S.A., What Can Be Learned from African Americans?	
<i>Philip Wingeier-Rayo</i>	81
SPECIAL EDITION: “Fake News vs. Good News: Texts, Tweets and Technology” – A Roundtable Conversation Organized by La Comunidad of Hispanic Scholars for Religion at the Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion (AAR) and Society of Biblical Literature (SBL) - November 2018, Denver, CO	
[ENGLISH VERSION]	
<i>Introduction by Loida I. Martell</i>	96

EDICIÓN ESPECIAL:

“Noticias Falsas vs. Buenas Noticias: textos, tweets y tecnología” - Una mesa redonda organizada por La Comunidad de Académicos Hispanos de la Religión durante la conferencia anual de la Academia Americana de Religión (AAR) y la sociedad de Literatura Bíblica (SLB) - noviembre 2018, Denver, CO

[SPANISH VERSION]

<i>Introducción por Loida I. Martell</i>	100
ROUNDTABLE ESSAY #1: The Bible and Global-Systemic Criticism in the Age of ‘Fake News’ <i>Jacqueline M. Hidalgo</i>	104
ROUNDTABLE ESSAY #2: “Competing Narratives, Memes, and Going Viral as Socio-Theological Reflection and Resistance for USA Latinxs communities: a Hebrew Bible Perspective <i>Corinna Guerrero</i>	110
ROUNDTABLE ESSAY #3: Speaking in Other Tongues: Fernando Segovia’s Contributions to Discerning ‘Fake News’ <i>Santiago Slabodsky</i>	119

P E R S P E C T I V A S

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

Ann Hidalgo
João Chaves

TRANSLATOR:

Néstor Medina

TECHNICAL SERVICES & CO-BOOK REVIEW EDITOR

Grace Vargas

CO-BOOK REVIEW EDITOR & COPY EDITOR

Francisco J. Peláez-Díaz

Perspectivas: Occasional Papers is a publication of the Hispanic Theological Initiative and is made possible by Princeton Theological Seminary.

To celebrate our online debut, we are currently waiving subscription fees for a limited time.
Happy reading and thank you for your support!

Editorial correspondence should be addressed to
The Hispanic Theological Initiative,
12 Library Place, Princeton, NJ 08540.

To Subscribe to the journal visit:
<http://perspectivasonline.com/subscriptions/>

Views expressed in this publication are those of the writers.
Publication does not necessarily signify endorsement by
the Hispanic Theological Initiative.

P E R S P E C T I V A S

SIXTEENTH ISSUE | 2019

Editorial [ENGLISH VERSION]

The speed at which social changes occur often leave theologians, scholars of religion, and church communities unable to respond in ways that are relevant to the current sociopolitical climate. The present context of increased targeted xenophobia—inside and outside the USA, of unmitigated racism which frequently characterizes entire communities as criminals, terrorists, or social threats, has conspired to create an environment of fear, heightened surveillance, and strategic sociopolitical maneuvering. Against this backdrop, targeted communities seek to resist oppression, marginalization, and discrimination. This strongly negative sociopolitical climate has failed to silence the impacted communities including Muslims, African Americans, and LatinaXos, among others. Instead, it has proven to be a fertile ground for multiple faith communities and individuals across the USA to come together to work to ameliorate the situation of many racialized people facing discrimination or deportation. At this critical historical juncture, this issue of *Perspectivas* is honored to include essays from multiple different academic, ministerial, and activist perspectives by varying scholars of religion and theology in their own attempt at responding to the present sociopolitical configuration faced by LatinaXo communities. The articles that follow and the presentations from a roundtable conversation showcase the rich creativity and relevance to these issues among scholars of religion and theology.

In the first article, Lloyd Barba and Tatyana Castillo-Ramos demonstrate how, in this most inhospitable social climate, church communities rise up prophetically in response to the present anti-immigrant policies in the United States of America. Their work traces the early emergence and development of the Sanctuary Movement during the 1980s which was spearheaded by church communities emboldened in their stance against policies that force individuals to risk their lives in the attempt to cross the USA-Mexico border. Barba and Castillo-Ramos aid us in understanding the level of engagement and commitment by entire church communities, counties, and municipalities in their attempt to create sanctuary spaces safe for undocumented immigrants. After a brief lull, they remind us, the movement seems to have regained energy with new strategies and actors involved since 2007, and a new label, the New Sanctuary Movement. But the authors also show the contested nature of the notion of “Sanctuary” and the multiple legal, social, political, and faith implications of its adoption by church communities, cities, counties, and municipalities. Crucial to this essay is the awareness of the growing involvement of LatinaXo church communities in Sanctuary efforts.

In the second article, Rodolfo Estrada III comes to us with a New Testament perspective. His biblical interpretive approach addresses the challenges and concerns faced by the DREAMER (Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors) generation, also known as those included in the DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals) immigration policy. Drawing on his Pentecostal tradition of understanding the Holy Spirit as active in the world, he takes the Johannine notion of the paraclete as it appears in Jesus' farewell speech, as a theological cue for engaging in advocacy for undocumented children. His aim is to apply a pneumatological approach in support of socio-political engagement and in order to articulate a model for LatinaXos to think about advocacy for DREAMERS and other undocumented children and youth among LatinaXo communities. With a prophetic voice, Estrada III interprets the notion of paraclete in the gospel of John to elucidate a distinct divine act of protection for the vulnerable and marginalized DREAMERS.

Philip Wingeier-Rayo takes on the question of LatinaXo sociopolitical activism, in the third essay. In view of the fact that LatinaXos have become the largest ethnic minoritized group in the USA, he raises questions as to how LatinaXos can, in this new context of enormous discrimination, come together to organize in order to effect social change for the benefit of LatinaXo communities. He points out that the demographic growth among LatinaXos has not translated into increased political power and mobilization. Moreover, the mobilization in places where LatinaXo workers are in the majority, and with substantial population of DREAMERS, has not resulted in lasting immigration reforms so needed by many LatinaXos. In light of this reality, Wingeier-Rayo explores social justice activism in African American communities in the search of models from which LatinaXos can learn as they engage in social justice activism in their own contexts. He is not oblivious to the multiple hurdles LatinaXos communities have to face due to their internal ethnocultural, historical, and religious diversity. Nevertheless, he is able to look into the future, to the emergence of a larger social movement that will cut across ethnoracial background. In such a social movement, he predicts, LatinaXos must play a central role and constitute a key piece of the puzzle for social justice due to their sheer numbers.

These three papers are followed by a roundtable conversation organized by La Comunidad of Hispanic Scholars for Religion this past November (2018). The meeting took place in Denver, Colorado, as part of the American Academy of Religion conference. At that meeting, La Comunidad invited three scholars to reflect on the academic legacy and contribution to the field of hermeneutics of Professor Fernando S. Segovia, in relation to the recent phenomenon of "Fake News." We are honored that the three presentations are published in this issue of *Perspectivas* and that the President of La Comunidad, Professor Loida Martell-Otero, has written a brief editorial introduction. Together these roundtable discussions provide readers with a sampling of the richness of this conversation and a celebration of Professor Segovia's work.

We, the team at *Perspectivas*, hope that this issue proves resourceful for LatinaXo scholars interested in some of the developments discussed in the papers here contained. Migration and sanctuary, LatinaXo biblical approaches to the question of DREAMERS,

and the intersection between marginalization and social activism are pressing issues in today's increasingly xenophobic reality. As shown here, LatinaXos scholars are the forefront of those debates.

Néstor Medina
Senior Editor

PERSPECTIVAS • 2019

P E R S P E C T I V A S

SIXTEENTH ISSUE | 2019

Editorial [SPANISH VERSION]

La velocidad en la que los cambios sociales ocurren a menudo deja a teólogos, estudiosos de la religión y comunidades de iglesias sin poder responder de manera relevante al clima sociopolítico. El contexto actual de aumento de la xenofobia—adentro y afuera de los EUA, de racismo descontrolado que frecuentemente caracteriza comunidades enteras como criminales, terroristas o como amenazas sociales, ha conspirado en crear un ambiente de miedo, vigilancia constante, y de maniobras sociopolíticas estratégicas. Dentro de este trasfondo, las comunidades afectadas buscan resistir su opresión, marginalización, y discriminación. Este clima sociopolítico fuertemente negativo no ha logrado silenciar las comunidades afectadas, incluyendo musulmanes, afroamericanos, y latinasXos, entre otros. En cambio, ha probado ser un terreno fértil para que muchas comunidades de fe e individuos a través del país se unan a trabajar para aliviar la situación de muchas de las personas que confrontan discriminación y deportación. En esta coyuntura histórica crítica, este tomo de Perspectivas se honra en incluir ensayos de diferentes perspectivas académicas, de ministerio y activistas por estudiosos de la religión y teología, en su intento de responder a la presente configuración sociopolítica que enfrentan las comunidades latinaxos. Los siguientes ensayos y las presentaciones de una mesa redonda muestran la rica creatividad y relevancia en la forma a la que estudiosos de la religión y teología responden a la situación contemporánea.

En el primer ensayo, Lloyd Barba y Tatyana Castillo-Ramos demuestran cómo, en este clima social tan inhospitalario, las comunidades eclesíásticas se levantan proféticamente para responder a las políticas actuales contra los inmigrantes en los Estados Unidos de América. Su trabajo traza el surgimiento temprano y desarrollo del Movimiento Santuario durante la década de 1980, que fue encabezada por comunidades eclesíásticas envalentonadas en su postura en contra de políticas que obligan a personas a arriesgar sus vidas en el intento de cruzar la frontera de EUA y México. Barba y Castillo-Ramos nos ayudan a comprender el nivel de participación y compromiso de las comunidades eclesíásticas, condados, y municipios enteros en su intento de crear espacios santuario seguros para los inmigrantes indocumentados. Después de una breve pausa, los autores nos recuerdan que el movimiento parece estar tomando nueva energía con nuevas estrategias y actores involucrados desde el año 2007, y una nueva etiqueta, como el Nuevo Movimiento Santuario. Pero los autores también muestran la disputada naturaleza de la noción “santuario” junto con las múltiples implicaciones

legales, sociales, y de fe al ser adoptado por comunidades de iglesias, ciudades, condados y municipios. Crucial para este ensayo es la conciencia de la creciente participación de las comunidades y actores/as latinaXos en los esfuerzos santuario.

En el segundo ensayo, Rodolfo Estrada III nos presenta una perspectiva del Nuevo Testamento. Su enfoque bíblico interpretativo aborda los desafíos y preocupaciones que enfrenta la generación de los Soñadores (DREAMER: Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors), también conocidos como aquellos/as incluidos/as en la política migratoria ADLI: Acción Diferida para los Llegados en la Infancia) (DACA: Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals). Recurriendo a su tradición pentecostal de entender el Espíritu Santo como activo en el mundo, Estrada III toma la noción joánica del paracleto como aparece en el discurso de despedida de Jesús, como una señal teológica para participar en la defensa de los/as niños/as indocumentados. Su objetivo es aplicar un enfoque neumatológico para apoyar el compromiso socio-político y para poder articular un modelo con el que latinaXs puedan pensar acerca de la defensa de los Soñadores y otros niños/as y jóvenes indocumentados en las comunidades LatinaXos. Con una voz profética, Estrada III interpreta la noción del paracleto en el evangelio de Juan para iluminar un claro acto divino de protección por los Soñadores vulnerables y marginados.

Philip Wingeier-Rayo aborda la cuestión del activismo sociopolítico latinaXo en el tercer ensayo. En vista del hecho que latinaXos se han convertido en el grupo minoritario étnico más grande de los EUA, el plantea preguntas sobre cómo LatinaXos pueden, en este contexto de enorme discriminación, organizarse para lograr juntos un cambio social en beneficio de las comunidades latinaXos. Él señala que el crecimiento demográfico entre latinaXos no se ha traducido en un aumento de poder político y movilización por esas comunidades. Además, la movilización en lugares donde los trabajadores latinaXos son la mayoría, e incluso con una población de Soñadores significativa, no ha resultado en reformas migratorias duraderas que tantos latinaXos necesitan. A la luz de esta realidad, Wingeier-Rayo explora el activismo de justicia social en las comunidades afroamericanas en la búsqueda de modelos a partir de los cuales latinaXos pueden involucrarse en el activismo de justicia social en sus propios contextos. El autor no es ajeno a los múltiples obstáculos que las comunidades latinaXos confrontan debido a su diversidad etnocultural, histórica, y religiosa interna. Sin embargo, puede mirar hacia el futuro, al surgimiento de un movimiento social mayor que trascenderá trasfondos etnoraciales. En tal movimiento, predice él, latinaXos pueden jugar un papel central y constituir una pieza clave del rompecabezas para la justicia social debido a sus grandes números.

Los tres ensayos anteriores son seguidos por una conversación de mesa redonda organizada por La Comunidad de Académicos Hispánicos de la Religión (La Comunidad of Hispanic Scholars for Religion) el pasado noviembre (2018). La reunión tomó lugar en Denver, Colorado, como parte de la conferencia de la Academia Americana de Religión. La Comunidad invitó a tres eruditos a reflexionar sobre el legado académico y contribución al campo de la interpretación del profesor Fernando S. Segovia, en relación al reciente fenómeno de las “Noticias Falsas.” Nos sentimos honrados que las tres ponencias sean publicadas en esta edición de Perspectivas y que la presidenta de La Comunidad, profesora Loida Martell-Otero haya escrito una breve introducción

editorial. Estas discusiones de mesa redonda juntas proveen para los/as lectores/as una muestra de la riqueza de esta conversación y una celebración del trabajo del profesor Segovia.

Nosotros/as, el equipo editorial de Perspectivas, esperamos que esta edición sea útil para académicos latinaXos interesados en algunos de los desarrollos discutidos por los ensayos que se encuentran en el mismo. La inmigración y santuario, enfoques bíblicos latinaXos a la cuestión de los/as Soñadores/as, y la intersección entre marginalización y activismo social son problemas urgentes en nuestra realidad actual cada vez más xenófoba. Como se demuestra aquí, los académicos latinaXos están a la vanguardia de esos debates.

Néstor Medina
Editor principal

Sacred Resistance: The Sanctuary Movement from Reagan to Trump¹

Lloyd Barba, PhD and Tatyana Castillo-Ramos

Amherst College

Abstract

From the origins of the U.S. Sanctuary Movement in the 1980s to the declaration of the New Sanctuary Movement (NSM) in 2007 and the new wave of NSM activism starting in 2016, sanctuary seekers, workers, and leaders have enacted various kinds of sacred resistance to respond to the shifting contexts of immigration crises. This article offers a conceptual framework to unpack the history and polyvalent meaning of the term “sanctuary” today. We argue that since Trump’s election, we are experiencing a second wave of the New Sanctuary Movement.

• VEA LA PÁGINA 37 PARA LEER ESTE ARTÍCULO EN ESPAÑOL •

At Southside Presbyterian Church in Tucson, Arizona, material reminders of the Sanctuary Movement from the 1980s filled the sanctuary. As we (the authors) walked into the kiva-inspired sanctuary in late August 2018, we were met with replicas of two banners that once graced the old sanctuary. The banners (pictured below) hung from the wooden rafters and draped onto the ground.

¹ We would like to thank the peer-reviewers and editors in facilitating this publication. We are especially grateful to the interviewees, specifically Anna Runion, Roberto Chao Romero, Bill Jenkins, and John Fife, who went the extra mile in supporting this project and pointing us to other key resources.



(Photograph by Lloyd Barba)

The banner on the left tells a tale that, almost four decades later, remains true: “*LA MIGRA NO PROFANA EL SANTUARIO*” (“Immigration Officers will not Profane the Sanctuary”) The banner on the right offers a proclamation of the past that has largely remained the case: “*ESTE ES EL SANTUARIO DE DIOS PARA LOS OPRIMIDOS DE CENTRO AMERICA*” (“This is the Sanctuary of God for the Oppressed of Central America”). These two are more than mere replicas of artifacts set up for a drama stage. The statements on the two banners, taken together, unfurl stories about the Sanctuary Movement, demonstrating both how it has remained the same and how it has changed from the past to the present.

Earlier that year, in June, I (Tatyana) stood in the clustered crowd of people gathered in downtown San Diego for a rally protesting the separation of children from their parents at the border. I was unable to see the faces of the speakers because of the sheer number of protestors. They had come prepared. They gathered with signs denouncing Donald Trump’s and his administration’s latest slanderous statements about Latinx communities. Some of those gathered wore jackets and wielded signs declaring that they “really do care”² about migrant children separated from their families. One sign in particular caught my eye, as it displayed a mosaic of fists raised in protest declaring “Sacred Resistance”. Another woman carried a large cross commemorating the many undocumented migrants who lost their lives on the dangerous trek through the desert. The Border Angels, a humanitarian nonprofit immigrant advocacy organization in San Diego that provides basic resources, such as

² This was in response to a PR provocation caused when First Lady Melania Trump wore a jacket with the words “I really don’t care. Do u?” printed on it. She wore it on June 21, 2018 as she boarded a plane to visit migrant children held in detention centers. She claims that she did not wear the jacket while visiting the children in detention, yet her actions sparked a host of speculation about the significance of the jacket’s message. See Betsy Klein, “Melania Dons Jacket Saying ‘I really don’t care. Do u?’ Ahead of her Border visit – and Afterward,” *CNN* (June 21, 2018), accessed September 28, 2018, <https://www.cnn.com/2018/06/21/politics/melania-trump-jacket/index.html>.

water, in the desert for undocumented migrants attempting the precarious journey, set up a table displaying their new mural. It portrays La Virgen de Guadalupe holding a jug of drinking water and is flanked by two other jugs of water, one of which reads “*Ni Una Muerte Mas*,” (“Not One More Death”) and the other “*El Amor No Tiene Fronteras*” (“Love Has No Borders”). I saw banners rising tall above the crowd from members of the interfaith community. Public displays of, and references to, various religions were all around me as I listened to an imam who came along with a rabbi and a pastor to address the crowd. He referenced the Qur’an using scripture to denounce the activities against families that the Trump administration has committed. He exclaimed into the microphone:

Did you hear me? I said Jesus, excuse me, I meant Jesús [pronounced in a Spanish accent, "heh-soos"] was an immigrant! Did you hear me? I said his father Joseph, I mean José, was an immigrant! Did you hear me? I said his mother Mary, I mean María, was an immigrant! They crossed the borders to Egypt, they were refugees, they were immigrants! And are we gonna cage our heroes and our loved ones? Even if you're not of the Abrahamic faith, even you understand just by simple logic.

The throng of resisters cheered at his message which transcends and crosses religious lines by urging listeners to exegete the story of the Holy Family’s flight into Egypt contextually. The presence of protesters from diverse religious, racial, and class backgrounds at the rally and in the lineup of speakers signal something new about the actors in this ever-thickening plot of immigrant rights in the Trump era. At the rally it became clear that this diversity of support, forged over the past decade, has significant implications for immigrant rights as well as the Sanctuary Movement today.

From the birth of the U.S. Sanctuary Movement in the 1980s to the declaration of the New Sanctuary Movement (NSM) in 2007 and the new wave of NSM activism starting in 2016, sanctuary seekers, workers, and leaders have enacted various kinds of sacred resistance to respond to the shifting contexts of immigration crises. Our study is based on interviews and ethnographic work carried out during the summer of 2018 in the border areas of southern California and Arizona, a synthesis of news coverage, and the growing literature on both the early years of sanctuary and the NSM. It offers a conceptual framework to unpack the history and polyvalent meaning of the term “sanctuary” today. This article begins by tracking the development of the Sanctuary Movement from the 1980s to the NSM organization in 2006 (officially declared in 2007).³ We argue that since Trump’s election, we are experiencing a second wave of the New Sanctuary Movement. According to Church World Service, within months of Trump’s election, the number of “sanctuary” churches in the U.S. doubled (from 400 to

³ David Van Biema, “A Church Haven for Illegal Aliens?” *Time* (July 19, 2007), accessed September 7, 2018, <http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1645169,00.html>; Puck Lo, “Inside the New Sanctuary Movement That’s Protecting Immigrants from Ice” *The Nation* (May 5, 2015), accessed August 24, 2018, <https://www.thenation.com/article/inside-new-sanctuary-movement-thats-protecting-immigrants-ice/>.

800) and by 2018 has now nearly tripled (reaching over 1,100).⁴ Furthermore, the number of sanctuary coalitions since Trump's election has also more than tripled. Today there are more individuals "taking sanctuary in congregations than at any time since the 1980s."⁵ To sustain this wave of sanctuary efforts, religious activists have mobilized a sacred resistance and new actors have stepped up. The second wave of the NSM is evidencing an increasing reliance on the 1980s Sanctuary Movement of harboring undocumented immigrants. While the term "sanctuary" has taken on new meanings, the tried-and-true practice of harboring is yet again being tested. Sanctuary today, though largely expanded in practice and in the demographics of its seekers, is still firmly grounded in the acts of sacred resistance that began with Central American sanctuary seekers and North American sanctuary workers.

Sanctuary: Literature Review

The 1980s U.S. Sanctuary Movement has enjoyed extensive coverage from a range of disciplines. First, insiders of the movement reported on it as it developed.⁶ These 1980s journalists wrote sympathetically about the movement and sought to ground sanctuary and asylum as legal (not economic) issues. The authors' positionalities reflected the broader movement: Golden and McConnell participated in the Chicago Religious Task Force on Central America and compiled firsthand accounts of the violence in Central America. Davidson's work, while centered largely on the philosophies of Jim Corbett, peered into the motivations of a broader cast of actors including women (Sister Darlene Nicgorski of the Chicago Task Force on Central America) and Mexican clergy (Father Ramon Dagoberto Quiñones).⁷

On the heels of the first Sanctuary Movement, a series of academic ethnographies in the early 1990s critically explored various branches and divisions within the movement.⁸ While Cunningham and Bibler Coutin still recognized Tucson as ground-zero, Bibler Coutin widened the geographical scope of scholarship on the movement by including San Francisco. Of the writers in this first wave of critical scholarship,

⁴ Myrna Orozco and Noel Anderson, et. al., "Sanctuary in the Age of Trump: The Rise of the Movement a Year into the Trump Administration" (January 2018), accessed January 13, 2019, https://www.sanctuarynotdeportation.org/uploads/7/6/9/1/76912017/sanctuary_in_the_age_of_trump_january_2018.pdf; for more on sanctuary responses to Trump's election and early executive actions see John Fife, "No Middle Ground Between Collaboration and Resistance," in Miguel A. De La Torre ed. *Faith and Resistance in the Age of Trump* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2017), 20-27.

⁵ Orozco and Anderson, "Sanctuary in the Age of Trump."

⁶ Ignatius Bau, *The Ground is Holy: Church Sanctuary and Central American Refugees* (Mahwah, NY: Paulist Press, 1985); Renny Golden and Michael McConnell, *Sanctuary: The New Underground Railroad* (Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis Books, 1986); Robert Tomsho, *The American Sanctuary Movement* (Austin: Texas Monthly Press, 1987); Miriam Davidson, *Convictions of the Heart* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1988); Ann Crittenden, *Sanctuary: A Story of American Conscience and the Law in Collision* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1988).

⁷ Miriam Davidson, *Convictions of the Heart* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1988)

⁸ Susan Bibler Coutin, *The Culture of Protest: Religious Activism and the U.S. Sanctuary Movement* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993); Robin Lorentzen, *Women in the Sanctuary Movement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991); Hilary Cunningham, *God and Cesar at the Río Grande: Sanctuary and the Politics of Religion* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995).

Lorentzen provided the most thorough sociological scaffolding for understanding the movement. Her particular focus on the gender dynamics of “free spaces” and the “humanitarian approach” to sanctuary (heavily emphasized in Tucson) versus the “political approach” (practiced more in Chicago) illustrated the fine nuances of internal and regional dynamics.⁹

Since the 1990s, scholars from multidisciplinary backgrounds have revisited the Sanctuary Movement of the 1980s. They have pushed the scholarship on the Sanctuary Movement to consider longer histories on the ground and broader geographical regions. Beyond examining key actors, Chinchilla, Hamilton, and Loucky demonstrated how Los Angeles, a major destination for Central Americans in the 1980s and 1990s, fostered the growth of advocacy networks.¹⁰ Perla and Bibler Coutin further complicated the origin story of the Sanctuary Movement in their examination of how Salvadorans laid the foundation for sanctuary action in California in the 1980s. The long-term unintended consequences of the Sanctuary Movement as well as the growth of transnational advocacy networks prompt us to consider how sanctuary lived on beyond landmark legal victories in the U.S. in the early 1990s.¹¹ Most recently, Mario T. García’s biography of Father Luis Olivares provides insight on the Sanctuary Movement in Los Angeles by using the histories of local Latinos, Catholic clergy, and sanctuary workers. García details the origins and preparatory work for the declaration of sanctuary at the historic *Placita Church* (Our Lady Queen of Angels Church). The large migrant population of Central Americans in Los Angeles bolstered the Catholic parish’s efforts. It later proved to be one of the largest and most successful sanctuary programs in the nation.¹² Cadava’s history of transnational sanctuary actors in the Arizona-Sonora borderlands provides the finest challenge to the received origin story of the Sanctuary Movement. His work situated sanctuary activism in the context of transnational grassroots advocacy for Central Americans already on the ground in the late 1970s.¹³ In contrast to these localized sanctuary movements, María Cristina García has rendered the most wide-ranging hemispheric study of how the U.S. Sanctuary Movement fits comparatively into the broader story of Central American (Guatemalan, Salvadoran, and Nicaraguan) refugees to Mexico, Canada, and the U.S.¹⁴ These works point to newer and more productive ways to investigate histories of sanctuary activism in the U.S. as stories of longer and localized resistance and comparative studies of sanctuary practices. Literature on the Sanctuary Movement in Los Angeles, for example, has shown how

⁹ Cunningham, *God and Cesar*.

¹⁰ Norma Stoltz Chinchilla, Nora Hamilton, and James Loucky, “The Sanctuary Movement and Central American Activism in Los Angeles” *Latin American Perspectives* 169, vol. 36, no. 6 (2009), 101-126.

¹¹ Perla and Bibler Coutin, “Legacies and Origins,” eds., Randy K. Lippert and Sean Rehaag, *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives: Migrations, Citizenship and Social Movements* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 82-86.

¹² Mario T. García, *Father Luis Olivares, A Biography: Faith Politics and the Origins of the Sanctuary Movement in Los Angeles* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2018); Mario T. García, *Católicos: Resistance and Affirmation in Chicano Catholic History* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008), 207-250.

¹³ Geraldo Cadava, *Standing on Common Ground: The Making of a Sunbelt Borderlands* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016), 172-211.

¹⁴ María Cristina García, *Seeking Refuge: Central American Migration to Mexico, the United States, and Canada* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006).

religious and immigrant activism on the ground intersected with sanctuary activism.¹⁵ Seattle, Washington D.C., Philadelphia, and the Texas borderlands are sites (to name a few) of 1980s Sanctuary activism that merit closer study.

María Cristina García's 2005 essay "Dangerous Times Call for Risky Responses" presciently queried as to whether a new Sanctuary Movement was on the horizon. The growing number of ICE apprehensions, stricter immigration policies, and the increased size and militarization of the border in the wake of 9/11 informed her suspicion about the groundswell of activism across the nation.¹⁶ Rabben offered an early investigation into the burgeoning NSM, arguing that it was highly decentralized and describing the expanded definitions of sanctuary which included churches and coalitions that did not offer traditional sanctuary. Rabben saw a close correlation between the NSM and the rising number of humanitarian aid groups in the Arizona borderlands.¹⁷ Yukich's study of the NSM as a "multi-target social movement" based on her fieldwork in New York and Los Angeles, has provided the most detailed analysis of the NSM from 2007 to 2009.¹⁸ Placing Chicago as the center of the NSM, Pallares' 2011 study on family activism in Chicago provides a trenchant critique of sanctuary mobilization around the politics of agency, representativity, and motherhood.¹⁹ This along with Yukich's work on the NSM's strategy and models of immigrant deservingness reveal some of the fundamental differences between sanctuary practices of the NSM and that from the 1980s.²⁰

U.S. Sanctuary in the 1980s: Its Heyday and Aftermath

The fact that sanctuary has assumed new and varied dimensions, to be sure, reflects its diverse origins in history. From the Egyptians to the Hebrews, Greeks, Romans, Karifs of the Hindu Kush in India, and Igbo in Nigeria the practice of sanctuary is a longstanding tradition with deep roots in religious and political centers. Indigenous groups, including the Hopi in the present-day U.S.-Mexico Borderlands, also maintained sanctuary type traditions.²¹ Notably, the borderlands would be ground zero of the U.S. Sanctuary Movement.

¹⁵ Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, *God's Heart Has No Borders: How Religious Activists are Working for Immigrant Rights*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 2008).

¹⁶ María Cristina García, "Dangerous Times Call for Risky Responses': Latino Immigration and Sanctuary 1981-2001," in Espinosa, Gaston, Virgilio Elizondo, and Jesse Miranda, *Latino Religions and Civic Activism*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

¹⁷ Linda Rabben, *Give Refuge to the Stranger: The Past, Present, and Future of Sanctuary* (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2011), 210-214; Linda Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum: A Social and Political History* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2016), 244-265.

¹⁸ Grace Yukich, *One Family Under God: Immigration Politics and Progressive Religion in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

¹⁹ Amalia Pallares, *Family Activism: Immigrant Struggles and the Politics of Noncitizenship* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2015), 38-61.

²⁰ Our own interviewees stressed the importance of taking up "winnable" cases so as to rectify popular ideas in the media about immigrants. See also Grace Yukich, "Constructing the Model Immigrant: Movement Strategy and Immigrant Deservingness in the New Sanctuary Movement" *Social Problems* 60, no. 3 (2013), 302-320; Pallares, *Family Activism*.

²¹ Linda Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum: A Social and Political History* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2016), 31-36.

The story of the U.S. Sanctuary Movement begins with a long tradition of immigrant advocacy in the Arizona-Sonora borderlands. The Tucson-based Manzo Area Council began working with (and sheltering) refugees from El Salvador and Guatemala as early as the mid-1970s. U.S. activists (mostly women) forged binational networks of support for Central Americans, thus laying the groundwork upon which clergy in Tucson would build the Sanctuary Movement and invite others across the U.S. to join.²² California advocacy groups were among the first to participate. Although often organizing surreptitiously or anonymously, Salvadoran immigrants and U.S.-born Salvadorans in the late 1970s began to forge important links with faith leaders (mostly Catholic) in the San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles, bringing to light the testimonies of many who had suffered from the widespread violence under U.S.-backed regimes. According to Perla and Bibler Coutin, Salvadorans in California “pioneered the strategy of immigrants approaching members of religious organizations to collaborate with them in an effort to mobilize the religious community.”²³ Groups such as El Rescate, the Central American Resource Center, and Centro de Refugiados Centroamericanos, would play a crucial role in the development of the national Sanctuary Movement. Central Americans, to varying degrees, would continue on as active participants in educating and organizing sanctuary in Washington D.C., Houston, New York City, Milwaukee, Philadelphia and throughout the country. Scholars would only later realize the robust transnational (that is, U.S.-Central American) linkages that sanctuary workers and Salvadoran activists would forge and operate out of places like California and Arizona.²⁴ Tucson, often conceived of as the birthplace of the U.S. Sanctuary Movement, ought to be understood in light of greater regional, national, and even transnational developments.

With the infrastructure of advocacy for Central Americans in place, watershed moments brought the plight of Central American refugees to national attention. First, the Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) attracted a wave of negative attention after the notorious 1981 arrest of an undocumented teenager that its agents chased through the streets of Los Angeles into the aisles of a church and ultimately arrested in the church gallery. The backlash from this event resulted in an order from the INS to not arrest “aliens” in churches, schools, and hospitals, and this has been their policy ever since.²⁵ The scandal of this arrest was compounded by the larger Central American crisis unfolding on U.S. soil. The increasing number of deaths of Central Americans trying to reach the U.S. became too great to ignore.

Moreover, the inadequacy and inappropriate response of the immigration courts drew many to decry the U.S. for both its role in Central America and how it attempted to deny that those who arrived (or died trying to arrive) in the U.S. were fleeing violent civil wars. These larger revelations compelled Quaker rancher Jim Corbett and Southside Presbyterian Church pastor John Fife to partner with migrant advocacy

²² Cadava, *Standing on Common Ground*, 198-202.

²³ Perla and Bibler Coutin, “Legacies and Origins,” 79.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 73-89.

²⁵ Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 132.

groups in Tucson. Rev. Fife and Corbett played a key role in bringing these issues to the attention of the Tucson Ecumenical Council (TEC). The TEC's participation and framing of the issue made Central American hospitality and advocacy an explicitly sacred cause. Members of the TEC formed a task force called the Tucson Ecumenical Council Task Force on Central America (TECTF). The task force partnered with Tucson-based Latin American and immigrant rights groups such as the Manzo Area Council and drew essential support from clergy in Nogales, Sonora, Mexico.

The work in Tucson went from covert to overt. In its early months, the TECTF worked to smuggle migrants across the border. To keep up with the growing number of refugees, clergy in Tucson urged Rev. Fife to publicly declare Southside Presbyterian Church to be a sanctuary church. Fife especially recalled how Corbett proposed sanctuary as a modern-day Underground Railroad: “[a]s we read history, they got it right. Those were the folks who were faithful.” To the TEC, sanctuary was “always a matter of faith.”²⁶ Thus, on March 24, 1982, the second anniversary of the assassination of Salvadoran Bishop Oscar Romero (whose martyrdom brought international scrutiny to the civil wars in Central America), five San Francisco Bay Area churches joined Southside Presbyterian Church in declaring their churches to be sanctuaries for Central Americans.²⁷ They reasoned that it was better to go public in order to both highlight the plight of Central Americans as well as to make their intentions known so as to build an aura of sacrality around their bold decree:²⁸

We are writing to inform you that the Southside Presbyterian Church will publicly violate the Immigration and Nationality Act Section 274(a). We have declared our church as a “sanctuary” for undocumented refugees from Central America...we believe that justice and mercy require that people of conscience actively assert our God-given right to aid anyone fleeing from persecution and murder. The current administration of U.S. law prohibits us from sheltering these refugees from Central America. Therefore, we believe the administration of the law to be immoral as well as illegal.²⁹

The declaration resounded across the country and the movement quickly gained support. The TECTF's criticism of the role of the U.S. in Central America resonated with members of the Chicago Religious Task Force on Central America (CRTF), a coalition formed in response to the murder of four American missionary women in El Salvador in 1980. These task forces combined efforts in 1982 and together constituted the bedrock of the Sanctuary Movement. Differences existed between the two task forces in matters regarding strategy directions, goals, structures, and procedures. Nevertheless, together they amplified the voices of Central Americans fleeing violence and sent delegations to El Salvador and Guatemala to give first-hand accounts of the widespread turmoil.

²⁶ John Fife, Interview with authors, Tucson, AZ, August 2018.

²⁷ García, *Seeking Refuge*, 98-99.

²⁸ Fife, Interview.

²⁹ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 48.

Within a year of Southside Presbyterian Church's declaration of sanctuary, forty-five faith communities followed suit and over 600 congregations cosponsored their efforts.³⁰

Sanctuary unfolded amid the United States' active role in the Cold War and civil wars in Central America. Cold War anxieties in the U.S. led various presidential administrations to intervene in Central America as early as the 1950s. The Reagan administration intended that its heavy-handed operations in El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Guatemala would stave off and undo leftist revolutions that started over disproportionate land ownership, power, and resources. The rampant kidnappings, murders, death squads, and threats endemic to these civil wars resulted in the severest displacement of people from those countries.³¹ Estimates show that by 1990 over one million Central Americans fleeing violence had reached the U.S., yet the U.S. maintained throughout the 1980s that the overwhelming majority did not qualify for asylum according to the 1980 Refugee Act, which had adopted the definition of refugee drafted by the 1967 United Nations Protocol. Asylum seekers had to demonstrate "a well-rounded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of particular social group, or political opinion."³² The evaluation of "well-rounded fear" became highly politicized (and remains so). Moreover, the Reagan administration could not afford to blow its cover on its foreign interventions in these countries and consistently maintained that those arriving from these countries were economic migrants and not political refugees. To classify them as refugees would be to admit to U.S. involvement in those countries. His administration refused to offer Guatemalans and Salvadorans Extended Voluntary Departure, claiming that the level of violence in those countries was insufficient to warrant such measures. These fateful decisions proved fatal for many who were deported.

Cold War imperatives strongly influenced who would be granted asylum, as the policies worked much more favorably towards granting asylum to refugees from countries hostile to the United States (the Soviet Union, Iran, Afghanistan, Poland, and Nicaragua). Whereas the U.S. granted asylum to 60.9% of Iranians and 40.9% of Afghans in 1984,³³ from 1983 to 1990 the Reagan and Bush administrations consistently and disproportionately denied asylum to individuals fleeing the U.S.-backed dictatorships in El Salvador (2.6% granted asylum) and Guatemala (1.8%).³⁴ The U.S., though loathe to admit it, had a refugee crisis from countries that they supported financially and militarily. Church leaders in the 1980s would be among the first and most vocal critics of U.S. involvement in Central America. The crisis quickly became manifestly visible on the border. Clergy took notice and began to act, prophetically denouncing the role of the U.S. abroad and at home.

The decade-long struggle of the Sanctuary Movement in the 1980s was marked with several victories that came in the 1990s. For example, congressional conferral of Temporary Protected Status (TPS) was granted to Salvadorans in the Immigration Act of

³⁰ Cunningham, *God and Caesar*, 35-43.

³¹ García, *Seeking Refuge*, 13-43.

³² García, "Dangerous Times," 159-161.

³³ Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 131.

³⁴ García, *Seeking Refuge*, 86-90.

1990. When TPS expired in 1992, Salvadorans became eligible for the new Deferred Enforced Departure (DED) (extended yearly until 1996) and thereby qualified for asylum under the terms of what is known as the ABC Agreement.³⁵ This agreement came as the result of a coalition of religious leaders and activists who, in 1985, filed a lawsuit against the INS, DOJ, and the Executive Office of Immigration Services. The *American Baptist Churches v. Thornburgh* case was settled out of court in 1991. This “ABC Agreement” allowed for over 150,000 Guatemalans and Salvadorans who had been discriminated against to (if eligible) receive a stay of deportation and a new (that is, fairer) asylum interview and decision.³⁶ Perla and Bibler Coutin understand the change of the legal landscape in the 1990s in favor of Central American refugees as a legacy of the Sanctuary Movement.³⁷ Rev. Fife shared that the main goal since the outset of the Sanctuary Movement of the 1980s was to win by reversing the course of U.S. policy and action towards Central Americans asylum seekers. With respect to the goals of the 1980s movement, Fife says, “we won;”³⁸ Corbett agreed;³⁹ and for many sanctuary seekers, workers, protestors, and legal counsel this all amounted to a “significant victory”.⁴⁰

Just when migrants’ access to asylum had been expanded in 1996 pursuant to the ABC agreement, the Clinton administration passed the landmark Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) that same year. IIRIRA had several implications for Central Americans and a decade later would kickstart the NSM. Most generally, it made asylum more difficult to attain, denying it to those who did not apply for it within a year of entering the U.S. Its mechanism for “expedited removal” allowed for immigration officers and border patrol officials to deport undocumented individuals without a hearing. Again, as in the 1980s, a credible fear of persecution was difficult to prove and increasingly politicized.⁴¹ With NAFTA in full swing and displacing large

³⁵ Under George Bush TPS was renewed in 2001 because the country would not be able to sufficiently handle the return of its nationals; it was renewed continuously until Trump’s administration decided to forego renewal, allowing it to expire in September of 2019. See “Secretary of Homeland Security Kirstjen M. Nielsen Announcement on Temporary Protected Status for El Salvador” *U.S. Department of Homeland Security* (January 8, 2018), accessed September 19, 2018, <https://sv.usembassy.gov/announcement-temporary-protected-status-el-salvador/>; “Temporary Protected Status Designated Country: El Salvador” *U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services*, accessed September 19, 2018, <https://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/temporary-protected-status/temporary-protected-status-designated-country-el-salvador>.

³⁶ The agreement further established detention restrictions in which eligible immigrants could only be deported if they had been convicted of a “crime involving moral turpitude” and received a jail sentence of more than six months or posed a national security risk to public safety. See Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 145-146, 292; The ABC agreement prohibited asylum officers from considering previous denials of asylum, a petitioner’s country of origin, or the State Department’s recommendations or opinions. They could, however, take into account reports from NGOs. According to García, at this time “Salvadoran” was essentially synonymous with “Central American” because of the sheer number of refugees that fled to the United States. Nicaraguans received more legal protections throughout the 1980s because of the communist Sandinista government which was deemed hostile to the U.S. Guatemalans remained in a precarious state since they were not offered TPS. See García, *Seeking Refuge*, 89-112.

³⁷ Perla and Bibler Coutin, “Legacies and Origins,” 82-86.

³⁸ Fife, Interview.

³⁹ Quoted in Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 145.

⁴⁰ García, *Seeking Refuge*, 112.

⁴¹ Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 198.

populations near Mexico's southern border economies, the general assumption was that migrants both from Mexico and Central America were entering the U.S. for mere financial gain.⁴² More broadly, IIRIRA imperiled many undocumented individual (and Green Card holders) in the U.S. by mandating detention and deportation for many minor offenses. This applied retroactively as well and, as a result, INS (and post-2003, ICE) agents tracked down thousands over the next two decades.⁴³

IIRIRA also set the stage for another round of religious and immigrant rights humanitarian work based out of the Tucson area. Provisions in the act allowed for the expansion and militarization of the border and an increase of Border Patrol agents, who, by the turn of the century, numbered over 10,000.⁴⁴ Since the passage of IIRIRA, immigrant death tolls continued to climb steadily as undocumented migrants took increasingly more dangerous routes to cross the border. Humanitarian aid groups such as Humane Borders organized in the summer of 2000 and began strategically placing large water barrels in hopes of preventing further deaths. Humane Borders claims that over 3,000 migrants have perished trying to cross the border since 1999.⁴⁵ Crossing the Border became even more perilous after 9/11. The Bush administration's response dramatically altered national security measures, especially on issues concerning the regulation of the border. With the continued spike in death tolls, more groups organized to provide various forms of relief. No More Deaths, The Samaritans, and a whole host of faith-based groups have organized based on religious "framework and justification for direct action."⁴⁶ Since 2005, and as recently as 2019, volunteers have been arrested and/or charged over the (il)legal nature of their humanitarian aid and how it is carried out.⁴⁷

Efforts to pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill during the Bush years from 2005 to 2006 spurred immigrant rights activists and sanctuary workers into action. The increase of raids, detentions, deportations, and the cases of one million people separated from their families since 1997 brought immigration to the forefront of the nation's discourse. In December 2005, the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Border Protection, Anti-terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act, more popularly known as the "Sensenbrenner Bill". The bill, which discursively tied immigration through the U.S.-Mexico border with terrorism, was met with massive resistance from activists and especially religious groups. The provocative provisions of the bill were numerous and, most relevant to sanctuary workers, included penalties to any person or group providing aid to undocumented immigrants. Largely due to public pressure in protests such as "A Day Without an Immigrant," the Senate did not pass the Sensenbrenner Bill. Shortly after, the Senate approved the Comprehensive Immigration

⁴² García, *Seeking Refuge*, 166.

⁴³ Yukich, *One Family*, 24, 104.

⁴⁴ García, *Seeking Refuge*, 160-161.

⁴⁵ Humane Borders tracks migrant deaths, see website, accessed January 20, 2019, <https://humaneborders.org>.

⁴⁶ Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 245-246.

⁴⁷ Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 246-248; Rafael Carranza, "Aid Volunteers Found Guilty of Dropping off Water, Food, for Migrants in Protected Park of Arizona Desert" *Arizona Central* (January 18, 2019), accessed January 20, 2019: <https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/2019/01/18/no-more-deaths-volunteers-found-guilty-dropping-water-food-migrants-cabeza-prieta-refuge-arizona/2617961002/>

Reform Act in 2006, which provided a pathway to citizenship for many undocumented immigrants and did not contain many of the tough provisions of the Sensenbrenner Bill. Pro-immigrant groups saw this change of tone as a decisive step in the right direction, but it ultimately died before it could be passed. A similar bill in the following year suffered the same fate.⁴⁸ Amid the debate of the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006 (and 2007), religious groups and immigrant rights advocates formed the New Sanctuary Movement.

The First Wave of the New Sanctuary Movement 2006-2016

Activist and faith communities mounted strong responses to the Sensenbrenner Bill. Notable among these was the Los Angeles-based Clergy and Laity United for Economic Justice (CLUE), which functioned as a “movement midwife” for the NSM.⁴⁹ Its leaders remained intent that, as people of faith, they could contribute something unique to the brewing national discourses on immigration.⁵⁰ As millions took to the streets to support immigrants, Interfaith Worker Justice, another L.A. faith-based group, sent out a mailer with the question, “A new movement, an old commandment, or both?” as a clear reference to the 1980s Sanctuary Movement. The Interfaith Worker Justice would later join CLUE that year and coordinated the NSM in Los Angeles.⁵¹ The kind of language that these faith groups leveraged amid the immigration debates from 2005 to 2007 made it clear that terms like “sanctuary” were part of the nation’s “cultural” or “religious repertoire”.⁵²

A watershed case in 2006 broke into the debate and effectively put the swelling NSM on the map. Elvira Arellano, who cleaned planes at O’Hare International Airport, was caught in a 2002 sweep (Operation Chicago Skies) of immigrants working with false papers. This raid had been carefully calculated in the immediate aftermath of 9/11, showing again that immigration and terrorism became conflated issues. She was sentenced to three years’ probation and given a notice of deportation. During her three stays from deportation, Arellano actively engaged with faith-based immigrant advocacy groups in Chicago. After years of fighting to stay in the U.S. in order to not be separated from her U.S.-born son Saul, Elvira Arellano had expended all her resources and in August of 2006, took sanctuary at Adalberto United Methodist Church in Chicago. Her decision to take sanctuary and be vocal about her case drew the attention of commentators on both sides of the issue and set into motion the first wave of the NSM.⁵³

⁴⁸ Other provisions in the bill included the significant expansion and fortification of the border, harder sentences for immigrant documentation fraud, and increased penalties for knowingly employing undocumented workers. See Yukich, *One Family*, 26-28.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 82.

⁵⁰ Grace Yukich, “I Didn’t Know If This Was Sanctuary: Strategic Adaptation in the US New Sanctuary Movement,” in eds., Randy K. Lippert and Sean Rehaag, *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives: Migrations, Citizenship and Social Movements* (New York: Routledge, 2013) 111-114.

⁵¹ Hondagneu-Sotelo, *God’s Heart*, 104-196.

⁵² Yukich, *One Family*, 78; Yukich, “I Didn’t Know,” 111.

⁵³ Political scientist Amalia Pallares discussed the sexist ways in which Arellano’s worthiness as an immigrant (she had a prior deportation with the conviction of using false documents) and mother (for

The debate on immigration reform and high-profile sanctuary cases flooded into the public sphere. In the summer of 2007, *Time* magazine launched into the debate on immigration, popularizing ideas that religious leaders and activists had been mobilizing for nearly a year. Cover stories of magazines at checkout stands in most chain-grocery stores set visual reminders of the color of the immigration debate. *Time* magazine portrayed on its June 18, 2007 cover brown, leathered, and physically weathered hands. Its featured article, “Immigration: Why Amnesty Makes Sense,”⁵⁴ led to a series of articles on immigration such as “A Church Haven for Illegal Aliens”⁵⁵ and “Does the Bible Support Sanctuary?”⁵⁶ These articles continued to popularize the term “NSM” (New Sanctuary Movement) and shed light on its many manifestations throughout the country. *Time* magazine listed Elvira Arellano in its annual honor of “People Who Mattered,” a list of over thirty of the year’s most influential figures worldwide in politics, sports, and entertainment.⁵⁷

Importantly, Arellano’s case set the tone for the NSM in that it would almost exclusively take on the cases of immigrants whose deportation would result in family separation. In this move, Sanctuary activists, who are generally left-of-center politically, sought to seize control of the robust family discourse that conservatives had built up and deployed effectively since the late 1970s with the rise of groups such as Focus on the Family, the Christian Right, and the Moral Majority.⁵⁸ NSM leaders also sought to make their cause an explicitly religious one, taking back the narrative of “religiosity” which over the past three decades had also been effectively leveraged by politically-conservative Christians. With policy, ideological, and religious goals in the mind, the NSM functioned as a “multi-target social movement”.⁵⁹ As such, the very term “sanctuary” assumed new meaning in the NSM, and herein lie key differences between the Sanctuary Movement of the 1980s and the NSM.

Although the NSM would still, on occasion, employ sanctuary harboring as a tactic, the movement was responding to a fundamentally different kind of crisis in which immigrants lived under heavier surveillance and most needed “papers” not a physical sanctuary for “harboring.”⁶⁰ This was due, in part, to the fact that, unlike the 1980s movement, the NSM was working not with recent arrivals, but with individuals and families who had lived in the U.S. for many years. This new need dramatically shifted

putting her son through this morass) were impugned during this time. Even those sympathetic to her case lamented that immigrant advocates had not propped up “a better spokesperson”. Her story reveals how the “gaze of the mainstream non-immigrant community” largely became the lens through which many viewed Arellano’s case. See Pallares, *Family Activism*, 38-61.

⁵⁴ “Immigration: Why Amnesty Makes Sense” *Time* (June 18, 2007), accessed September 7, 2018, <http://content.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,20070618,00.html>

⁵⁵ Van Biema, “A Church Haven for Illegal Aliens?”

⁵⁶ David Van Biema, “Does the Bible Support Sanctuary” *Time* (July 20, 2007), accessed September 7, 2018, <http://content.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1645646,00.html>

⁵⁷ Wendy Cole, “People Who Mattered: Elvira Arellano” *Time* (December 25, 2006), accessed September 7, 2018,

http://content.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,2019341_2017328_2017183,00.html

⁵⁸ Yukich, *One Family Under God*, 92-119.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, *God*, 69; Yukich, “I Didn’t Know,” 11-114.

the NSM's responses. According to Caminero-Santangelo, the NSM advances narratives of the human cost of current U.S. deportation policy, family separation, a broken immigration system, and the state of living in constant fear.⁶¹ Like the Sanctuary Movement of the 1980s, the NSM relies heavily on "faith-based and scriptural justification," but it does so by drawing more frequently from a different set of scriptural texts (e.g., reunification and the flight of the Holy Family into Egypt). More generally, the NSM advances a new set of relationships between undocumented individuals and their community. "The essence of sanctuary" in this new movement "would be the creation of intimate relationships between congregations and mixed-status families – often between nonimmigrants and immigrants."⁶² These new "sanctuary faith communities" primarily provided an array of support (financial, legal, spiritual, emotional, etc.) in order to best address the needs of immigrants in danger of being separated from their families, churches, and the places where they had built their lives and had come to call home.⁶³ Some leaders have dubbed this kind of sanctuary activism as "prophetic hospitality."⁶⁴ Whereas sanctuary in the 1980s was primarily a "tactic," that is, "a concrete practice used by movement activists to accomplish a set of goals," the NSM desired to effect change in both political and religious targets, and thus made a calculated decision to use the term "sanctuary" as a "moniker and core strategy."⁶⁵ The term had the discursive pliability to be both political and religious as a "crossover strategy," which Yukich describes as "a strategy with resonance and efficacy in multiple institutional settings."⁶⁶ While the new movement developed in hopes of influencing legislation (e.g., the 2006 and 2007 comprehensive immigration reform bills), its leaders needed to choose strategies that would outlive killed immigration bills.

The cases of sanctuary seekers since 2007 have differed in circumstances as compared to the large influx of asylum seekers in the 1980s. While the NSM has largely excluded individuals without family connections in the U.S., it has broadened its embrace to advocate for and provide shelter to those who historically would not qualify for asylum.⁶⁷ New sanctuary seekers include those who have fled due to local gang violence and failed economies. Also, unlike the refugees of the 1980s, migrants today have generally not been reporting directly to religious sanctuary centers; rather, they have been waiting, sometimes up to a decade, until they are detected by policing authorities, often being sought out for minor offenses (a move made possible by IIRIRA).⁶⁸

⁶¹ Marta Caminero-Santangelo, "The Voice of the Voiceless: Religious Rhetoric, Undocumented Immigrants, and the New Sanctuary Movement in the United States," in eds., Randy K. Lippert and Sean Rehaag, *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives: Migrations, Citizenship and Social Movements* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 82-103.

⁶² Yukich, *One Family*, 82.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 15.

⁶⁴ Hondagneu-Sotelo, *God's Heart*, 149.

⁶⁵ Yukich, *One Family*, 6.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 73-74.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 92-119; Pallares, *Family Activism*, 59-61.

⁶⁸ Noel Anderson, Interview with authors, Sahuarita, AZ, August 2018.

It is largely for these reasons that only a select few undocumented immigrants themselves have assumed major leadership positions in the NSM. Simply put: it is too risky. Elvira Arellano, for example, had become a high-profile case of sanctuary seeking and remained safe so long as she stayed within the church. After the first stop (*La Placita Church* in Los Angeles) of her sanctuary tour of the U.S. she was arrested, detained, and deported within hours. Many in sanctuary, furthermore, have ankle monitor bracelets, so that the panoptic digital eye of the state can track when and if they ever leave the houses of worship. Although some non-Latinas/os are at the helm of the NSM's high-profile cases, the conditions that propelled the NSM are similar in that they mostly concern the response of religious leaders to Latina/o migrants. Despite the change of conditions, the bravery of Central Americans in the 1980s and today continues to be a source of inspiration to leaders and those taking sanctuary.

A large-scale victory (like those in the 1990s) of the NSM has yet to be realized. Under the Obama administration, the NSM sought opportunities to win smaller battles. As deportations continued, the NSM fought for the implementation of prosecutorial discretion in June 2011. The "Morton Memo" enabled immigration enforcement agents to take into account on a case-by-case basis aspects of an undocumented individual's life (e.g., a child or spouse in the U.S., contributions and standing in the community, etc.). Later that year, due in large part to NSM activism and pressure, the Obama administration issued a "sensitive locations" memorandum, which sought to ensure that enforcement activity (e.g., "arrests; interviews; searches; and for purposes of immigration enforcement only, surveillance") would not occur in sites such as houses of worship, schools, weddings, or during public demonstrations.⁶⁹ While the Obama administration did not pass any comprehensive immigration reform bills, a series of memos announced in 2012 and the Executive Action on Immigration in 2014, in part, stayed the heavy and swift deporting hand of the state with respect to individuals brought over as children and the parents of U.S. Citizens. Sanctuary leaders were among the most vocal advocates for the president's actions.⁷⁰ The vulnerability and fragility of these actions, however, became apparent shortly after Trump took office.

The New Sanctuary Movement and Secular Sanctuary: A Second Wave

Just as the Sensenbrenner Bill and the comprehensive immigration reform acts of 2006 and 2007 galvanized the NSM, Trump's election in 2016 met resistance in what we are identifying as the second wave of the NSM. As of 2019 it continues to crest while public outrage at his inflammatory remarks about Latinx people and his new zero tolerance policy on undocumented immigration is in effect. As part of this second wave, religious leaders and activists are having to respond to political circumstances that, especially at the presidential level, vastly differ from the beginning of the NSM in the mid-2000s. In the remainder of this article we spell out the sea change of the NSM, particularly propelled by the second wave.

⁶⁹ For an exhaustive list see: John Morton "Enforcement Actions at or Focused on Sensitive Locations," accessed January 20, 2018, <https://www.ice.gov/doclib/ero-outreach/pdf/10029.2-policy.pdf>.

⁷⁰ Orozco and Anderson, "Sanctuary in the Age of Trump."

In the second wave of the NSM, the discourse of “sanctuary cities” has resurfaced with intensified debate. While the modern practice of U.S. cities declaring themselves to be “sanctuaries” dates back to the Vietnam-War era (in which Boston famously declared itself as such), in the 1980s the nation witnessed a swell of sanctuary cities in areas where immigrants regularly arrived (notably, San Francisco and Los Angeles) making similar declarations in hopes of protecting those fleeing the sanguinary regimes in Central America.⁷¹ Just as the NSM was developing amid national immigration debates, activists increasingly began to push for sanctuary jurisdictions. This was especially true since the passage of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 2006 (particularly the enforcement of section 287(g) which sought to expand and strengthen the deportation efforts of the state by authorizing police officers at local, state, and federal levels to arrest and hand over undocumented migrants to ICE). For example, in 2006, in Takoma Park, Washington the chief of police’s efforts to implement 287(g) failed in the city which, back in 1985, had declared itself a sanctuary city.⁷² Two years later the Bush administration implemented the “Secure Communities” program, a more comprehensive program than 287(g), which involved local, state, and federal police, ICE, and the Department of Homeland Security.⁷³ Under this program the country witnessed massive roundups of undocumented individuals. The Obama administration continued the program (but refocused it on deporting those deemed to be threats to communities) until his administration terminated it in 2014.

President Trump spared no time in bringing “sanctuary” to the national discourse. He renewed and redefined “secure communities” as one of his first executive orders, signed less than a week after he took office. He targeted “sanctuary jurisdictions,” which are cities, counties, and states that have arrangements of nondisclosure of immigration status and refuse to work with federal immigration authorities.⁷⁴ These sanctuary city designations have often worked to defy national policies as sanctuary status is obtained through one of three major sources: legislation through passage by a city council, bureaucratic initiative by a police department, or mayoral order.⁷⁵ Harkening back to threats made against cities in the 1980s,⁷⁶ the Trump administration has proposed withholding federal funding from cities, counties, and states that choose to keep old or pass new sanctuary measures, which has worked in intimidating certain jurisdictions away from passing public sanctuary measures even in places with a rather high proportion of immigrants.⁷⁷ These executive orders and his longstanding animosity

⁷¹ Cunningham, *God and Caesar*, 81.

⁷² Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 250.

⁷³ We maintain that the term “secure communities” rests on a longstanding notion of immigrants (especially the undocumented) as a lurching and ever-present threat to the U.S. body politic. See Leo R. Chavez, *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2008).

⁷⁴ This was one in a series of three executive orders he issued in his first week dealing with immigration. See Donald J. Trump, “Executive Order: Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States,” section 10(a), (Jan 25, 2017), accessed September 7, 2018, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-enhancing-public-safety-interior-united-states/>.

⁷⁵ Melvin Delgado, *Sanctuary Cities, Communities, and Organizations: A Nation at a Crossroads*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), 107.

⁷⁶ Chinchilla, Hamilton, Loucky, “The Sanctuary Movement in Los Angeles,” 117.

⁷⁷ A number of cities in California’s historically conservative counties (e.g., Kern and Orange) voted against designating their counties with sanctuary status. See Matt Boone, “Arvin City Council Votes

toward sanctuary jurisdictions motivated more people to join in on sanctuary efforts both in secular and religious settings.⁷⁸

Cities, counties, and states were not the only non-religious entities to mount resistance to Trump's rhetoric. College campuses swiftly responded to the election of Trump and what his rise as the head of the nation might mean for DACA students. The type of sanctuary afforded at school campuses is modeled on the sanctuary jurisdiction paradigm in that campus police and officials will not comply with ICE agents. Declaration of sanctuary at schools seems to differ little from official statements that offer support to undocumented students.⁷⁹ The term "sanctuary" on school campuses is certainly nebulous and many administrators refused to appropriate the language of sanctuary. Harvard President Drew G. Faust, for example, echoed concerns about the unclear meaning of what sanctuary actually means at college campuses, stating "Sanctuary campus status has no legal significance or even clear definition. It offers no actual protection to our students. I worry that in fact it offers false and misleading assurance."⁸⁰

That "false and misleading assurance," we maintain, is based upon an implicit comparison to the tried and true efficacy of houses of worship providing sanctuary (in the form of harboring) to individuals. Anna Runion, minister of social justice at Pilgrim United Church of Christ in Carlsbad, California expressed her concern with how the secular movement has strategically adopted the term "sanctuary". She believes the title is a misnomer due to the fact that sanctuary campuses and cities do not offer the same protections that sanctuary houses of worship do. She maintains that the term "sanctuary" carries with it a religious significance that has now become a broader cultural tradition.⁸¹ The term "sanctuary" is meant to invoke the weight of religious sanctuary's record as a discursive tool to signal the layers of "protection" in a sanctuary jurisdiction. There are cities, towns, and campuses that do not work with immigration authorities and function as sanctuary jurisdictions, yet they choose not to label themselves as "sanctuary". Some cities and towns may not specifically label themselves in any manner that implies they protect undocumented immigrants, while others may choose different labels such as "welcoming" cities or have no preference for which term is applied.⁸² Minister Runion's observation likely stems from the fact that many undocumented individuals have fallen victim to raids in "sanctuary cities," while houses

Against 'Sanctuary City' Status" *Eyewitness News* (February 22, 2017), accessed September 8, 2018, <https://bakersfieldnow.com/news/local/arvin-city-council-votes-against-sanctuary-status>; "3 More California Cities Vote to Opt Out of State's Sanctuary Law" *Fox News* (April 12, 2018), accessed September 8, 2018, <http://insider.foxnews.com/2018/04/12/13-california-cities-now-fighting-states-sanctuary-law>.

⁷⁸ Fife, "No Middle Ground," 20-27.

⁷⁹ For example see Natalie Gross, "UC David Center a 'Sanctuary' for Undocumented Students" Education Writers Association, (February 17, 2015), accessed September 20, 2018, <https://www.ewa.org/blog-latino-ed-beat/uc-center-sanctuary-undocumented-students>.

⁸⁰ Hannah Natanson, "Faust Says Harvard Will Not Be a 'Sanctuary Campus'" *The Harvard Crimson* (December 7, 2018), accessed September 20, 2018, <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2016/12/7/faust-sanctuary-campus-policy/>.

⁸¹ Anna Runion, Interview with Tatyana Castillo-Ramos, San Diego, CA, August 2018.

⁸² Delgado, *Sanctuary Cities*, 109.

of worship have not been compromised (despite some dubiously titled news reports claiming otherwise).⁸³ That the image and language of “sanctuary” is often misread in public outlets owes to several misunderstandings. Villazor argues that sanctuary since the 1980s has assumed an increasingly negative connotation among political conservatives and that many have failed to delineate between “public” (cities, states, etc.) and “private” (churches, synagogues, etc.) sanctuary.⁸⁴ Tramonte contends that the deployment of the term in these “public” spaces is largely a misnomer and instead is better described as “community policing policies.”⁸⁵ Other clergy, such as Rev. Francisco García, rector of the Episcopal Church in Holy Faith in Inglewood, disagree with the religious exclusivity of this term, as he views sanctuary as someone being safe in the community, not just inside of a house of worship.⁸⁶ While there is certainly no consensus on who should use the term, there is certainly a understanding of the efficacy of sanctuary in some contexts over others.

Secular, that is, “public,” sanctuaries are not necessarily safe havens and the limits of their safeguarding policies have been tested repeatedly. Whereas those actively taking sanctuary in houses of worship have always remained secure, those in sanctuary jurisdictions have not truly been safe. In order for a sanctuary jurisdiction to effectively function as “sanctuary” for undocumented immigrants, every institution within the jurisdiction must be in accordance with the declaration and must agree to abide by sanctuary-type policies (which is not always the case).⁸⁷ ICE agents have carried out large-scale apprehensions and deportations in California’s sanctuary cities since late 2017.⁸⁸ Rev. Fife maintains that sanctuary cities, counties, and states, are the new front of the movement, but religious sanctuaries continue to be the foundation and last resort. The roles have been reversed from the 1980s Sanctuary Movement when religious centers were the front lines and sanctuary cities supported them.⁸⁹ Moreover, as the Department of Justice continues to spar vigorously with sanctuary cities (believing that they harbor violent criminals), the security of religious sanctuaries remains intact and is probably the last frontier of sanctuary safety.⁹⁰

⁸³ Jack Jenkins, “ICE Agents Arrest 6 People Seeking Shelter from the Cold at a Church” *ThinkProgress* (February 16, 2017), accessed September 7, 2018, <https://thinkprogress.org/ice-agents-arrested-6-men-as-they-left-a-church-run-hypothermia-shelter-1d1c09f4c2b2/>; Meredith Hoffman, “US Immigration Sting on Church Breaks with Policy on ‘Sensitive Locations,’” *Vice News* (February 17, 2016), accessed September 7, 2018, <https://news.vice.com/article/us-immigration-sting-on-church-breaks-with-policy-on-sensitive-locations>.

⁸⁴ Rose Cuison Villazor, “What is Sanctuary?” *Southern Methodist University Law Review*, 61(133), 2008.

⁸⁵ Lynn Tramonte, *Debunking the Myth of “Sanctuary Cities”: Community Policing Protects American Communities* (Washington D.C: Immigration Policy Center, (2011).

⁸⁶ Francisco García, Interview with Tatyana Castillo-Ramos, Los Angeles, CA, August 2018.

⁸⁷ Delgado, *Sanctuary Cities*, 107.

⁸⁸ Joel Rubin, “ICE Arrests Hundreds of Immigrants in ‘Sanctuary Cities’ around the Nation, California” *Los Angeles Times* (September 28, 2017), accessed September 18, 2018, <http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ice-raids-sanctuary-20170928-story.html>.

⁸⁹ Fife, Interview.

⁹⁰ A recent study evidences a “null” and “negative” relationship between sanctuary cities and crime. See Daniel E. Martínez, Ricardo D. Martínez-Schuldt, Guillermo Cantor, “Providing Sanctuary or Fostering Crime? A Review of the Research on “Sanctuary Cities” and Crime, *Sociology Compass* 12, 1 (January 2018).

The root of sanctuary spaces are religious sanctuaries, be they in churches, temples, or, more recently, mosques. The religious nature of such spaces affords them a special status that no secular space seems to be able to attain. Formulations of the sacred space in places like religious sanctuaries remind us of ways in which American sanctuaries are “situational” sacred spaces, a term described by David Chidester and Edward Linenthal as sites which have “located the sacred at the nexus of human practices and social projects.”⁹¹ The labor of human undertaking through ritual consecration is what affords religious sanctuaries a unique status as sacred spaces. Sanctuaries, havens, places of refuge, etc., are cordoned off and made sacred not merely because “religious” people say so but because of profound cultural investments. These cultural investments, in the case of sanctuary, are further buttressed by appeals to higher/divine laws. According to Jonathan Z. Smith’s configuration of ritual theory of sacred space, “place is sacralized as the result of the cultural labor of ritual, in specific historic situations, involving hard work of attention, memory, design, construction, and control of place.”⁹² The reading of the declaration of sanctuary on March 24, 1982 was a ritualistic act in a historic situation in which sanctuary leaders, for the sake of the Central American immigrants, sought to “take control of place.” Declaring sanctuary is a contentious matter, and an example of sacred space as “contested space.”⁹³ The 1982 declaration spelled out the terms of contestation quite clearly: “The administration of U.S. law prohibits us from sheltering these refugees from Central America. Therefore, we believe the administration of the law to be immoral as well as illegal.” Sacred resistance was then mobilized in sacred space and continues to this day.

Trump’s threats against communities and cities have met a tidal wave of renewed sacred resistance. One example of religious sanctuary sparked by longstanding religious motivations and recent political ones is the activism at Pilgrim United Church of Christ in Carlsbad, California. This traditionally white congregational church is headed by Rev. Madison Shockley, a black pastor who has been involved with multiple social justice efforts. The church also has its own minister, who specializes in youth and social justice ministry, Anna Runion. I (Tatyana) first heard Runion at the aforementioned rally in San Diego. At this rally, she spoke out to the crowd in both English and Spanish, self-translating her statements in a specific effort to reach the Latinx population at the rally. Although the congregation has been active in immigrant rights work for more than twenty-five years, Runion shared that the church decided to officially offer sanctuary in 2016, largely as a response to Trump’s election. Runion cites the UCC’s history of social justice teachings as part of the reason that her congregation felt so compelled to offer sanctuary publicly. She further addressed the theological underpinnings that support her congregation’s actions:

A lot of people in the congregation have liberation theology backgrounds, or sort of grounding, so we understand that God is a god of justice, and that God is on the side of the people who are oppressed. We are God’s

⁹¹ David Chidester and Edward T. Linenthal, “Introduction” in eds. David Chidester and Edward T. Linenthal, *American Sacred Space* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1995), 5.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 6.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 15.

hands and feet and that it's not going to happen without us. And that if it's not a concrete response in our current context, it doesn't matter! Who cares if we go to heaven? If God isn't saving people now from oppression, what good is that?⁹⁴

However, no migrant has yet taken up Pilgrim United Church of Christ's offer of sanctuary (in the form of harboring). Runion believes that attorneys are hesitant to use sanctuaries in immigration cases for their clients, since it directly calls out and challenges the immigration system (one that is now particularly hostile) and isn't a "strategic" move. Nevertheless, she and her congregation remain confident that having the option of sanctuary during a time when immigration systems are in flux is the right (and righteous/just) thing to do.

In this second wave of the NSM, Trump's election has motivated congregations to act collectively and across parishes to mobilize sacred resistance. Episcopal priest Rev. Francisco García shared with me (Tatyana) that, in response to President Trump's election, he drafted a resolution so that the Los Angeles region Episcopal diocese could become a Sanctuary Diocese. Three weeks after the 2016 election, Rev. García shared this resolution at the L.A. diocesan convention, where he found that, after some debate, "there was unanimous support for adopting this resolution." He recalls "one of the most moving moments was when our first DREAMER priest shared her testimony in front of 1,000 people. And she really moved hearts and minds so that we could say yes, this is where we need to stand."⁹⁵ As a result of Trump's election, Episcopal clergy in the Los Angeles area launched a movement called "Sacred Resistance," which is committed to sanctuary across a wide array of practices.⁹⁶ Rev. Garcia now co-chairs this task force "in order to help all of our churches become sanctuaries in all sorts of different ways,"⁹⁷ whether that be through accompaniment, activism, or offering full sanctuary.

While it is true that, at any moment, ICE agents can legally arrest someone taking sanctuary, as it stands now, religious sanctuaries offer us an example of sanctuary as an "inversion of power"⁹⁸ in which the near omnipotent state's deporting hand is stayed or, to some extent, suspended. Religious centers, the "last resort" of the NSM, certainly have layers of history, memory, and sacredness afforded to them now by decades of consecration. Congregations offering sanctuary continue to grow in number, in part, because of the recent engagement of traditionally apathetic actors.

Engagement on the Evangelical Front

⁹⁴ Runion, Interview.

⁹⁵ García, Interview.

⁹⁶ See the LA Sacred Resistance Website, accessed February 7, 2019, www.lasacredresistance.org; "LA to Become an Sanctuary Diocese" *Episcopal Café*, accessed February 7, 2019, www.episcopalcafe.com/la-to-become-a-sanctuary-diocese/.

⁹⁷ García, Interview.

⁹⁸ Chidester and Linenthal, "Introduction," 19.

By emphasizing the centrality of keeping families together, the early NSM effectively began to build a bridge with Evangelicals, who have historically been proponents of anti-immigration measures. In this move, the religious left redefined what “being religious *should* mean” in the U.S. and showed that conservatives do not control the discourse on the family. This move especially resonated with Latina/o Evangelicals, and later pushed white Evangelical leaders such as Richard Land, the former Southern Baptist Convention leader, to move towards a more sympathetic pro-immigration stance, but they did so on their own terms.⁹⁹ In Los Angeles, for example, Evangelicals did not join the ranks of progressive movements such as CLUE or IWJ, but formed alliances to seek out immigration reform.¹⁰⁰ Today we see a larger number of Pentecostals and Evangelicals of Latin American origin taking sanctuary as well as Latina/o Pentecostal and Evangelical churches offering sanctuary at various levels, from official types of sanctuary to more *de facto* forms of hospitality and solidarity offered in the “public margins”.¹⁰¹

A bipartisan effort comprised of Sanctuary Movement veterans and newcomers, mainline and evangelical clergy, has crystallized in the age of Trump. Calling themselves the Matthew 25 Movement, its members “pledge to stand with and defend the vulnerable in the name of Jesus.”¹⁰² The Matthew 25 Movement seems to be offering Evangelicals a number of resources to reconceptualize sanctuary and overall advocacy for immigrants, traditionally “liberal” practices. Sanctuary, according to Rev. Alexia Salvatierra (“*Madrina*” or godmother of the Matthew 25 Movement) and Peter Heltzel, succeeded in the 1980s because it was founded on “a uniform set of humanitarian criteria that was developed and kept independent of political alliances.”¹⁰³

At the Matthew 25 conference this past August, 2018, organizers and activists met in a Los Angeles’ church to discuss their plan of action and activism in an increasingly hostile environment towards undocumented immigrants. The conference brought in a diverse audience and lineup of speakers and together they partook in hymns and liturgy in both English and Spanish. The prayers, songs, and sermons all reinforced the importance of “accompaniment,” a cornerstone of the NSM.¹⁰⁴ “Accompaniment” is a broad term, but it largely refers to being present to help undocumented immigrants,

⁹⁹ Yukich, *One Family*, 107-108.

¹⁰⁰ Hondagneu-Sotelo, *God’s Heart*, 124.

¹⁰¹ Ramírez reminds us of how Pentecostal congregations have offered a type of *de facto* solidarity (read: sanctuary) and how undocumented Latino Pentecostals live between two publics: the public margin (offered by the safe spaces of churches) and the general public (largely inimical to the undocumented). Latino Pentecostal churches since the 1980s have assisted congregants through a highly informal system of offering solidarity, safe places, hospitality, and evasion from enforcement authorities. See Daniel Ramírez, “Public Lives in Hispanic Latino Churches: Expanding the Paradigm” in Espinosa, Gaston, Virgilio Elizondo, and Jesse Miranda, *Latino Religions and Civic Activism*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 177-196; Gabriella Borter, “Under Trump, More Churches Offer Sanctuary but Few Seek Refuge” *Reuters* (August 1, 2017), accessed August 26, 2018, <https://www.reuters.com/article/usa-immigration-sanctuary/under-trump-more-churches-offer-sanctuary-but-few-seek-refuge-idUSL1N1KNODN>.

¹⁰² “What We Do,” *Matthew 25*, accessed September 8, 2018, <https://www.matthew25socal.org/whatwedo/>.

¹⁰³ Alexia Salvatierra and Peter Heltzel, *Faith-Rooted Organizing: Mobilizing the Church in Service to the World* (Downers Grove IL: InterVarsity Press, 2014), 22.

¹⁰⁴ Yukich, *One Family*, 82-87.

whether it means going with an immigrant to an immigration court hearing or showing a family that was just released from a detention center around the neighborhood. In short, accompaniment is a way of demonstrating support to immigrants on a personal, individual level. Additionally, conference speakers noted the difficulties of church engagement with sanctuary activism. Since Latina/o churches are impacted by harsh immigration policies, there is fear about speaking out and drawing attention to affected communities. This could be a risk, which leads to them generally being quieter voices in immigrant rights movements. One proposal discussed at the conference was to form intentional alliances between white churches and Latina/o churches, as white churches have the privilege of not being racially profiled by immigration authorities or directly affected by their policies, while Latinx churches are more impacted by the everyday realities of undocumented communities. It remains unclear as to whether this alliance between churches will result in greater dialogue in the U.S.

Partisan politics still influence how religious congregations choose to engage. For example, Samuel Rodriguez, the leader of the historically conservative National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference (NHCLC), has made his church a “safe haven,” not to be confused with a sanctuary. Rodriguez remarked in a March 1, 2017 *Time* magazine article: “The anxiety in Christian conservative, evangelical churches has grown exponentially, because many of our worshipers, many of the families we serve, many of the families in our pews, may very well lack the appropriate documentation, even though we have a don’t ask don’t tell policy.”¹⁰⁵ Rodriguez, now on Trump’s spiritual advisory board, seemingly is attempting to split the horns of the sanctuary dilemma. To offer sanctuary would appear to be a conflict of interest that would set him at enmity against Trump, and to not offer resources to Latina/o evangelicals would belie his and the NHCLC’s stated advocacy. These dilemmas are not necessarily new nor uniquely Christian ones. Rabbi Devorah Marcus, a vocal critic of the Trump administration’s practice of child separation and detention, shared that although her synagogue has many conservative members, she made it clear to her congregants that she continues to protest as a rabbi because “This is not a partisan issue, this is a human issue, this is a religious issue, and as Jews, this is a Jewish issue.”¹⁰⁶ Congregations often have to walk a fine line of wanting to help undocumented immigrants but also respecting conservative members whose political beliefs do not align with the values of the NSM.

Political and Religious Motivations

The lethargy with which the NSM has moved within Evangelical corners reminds us that sanctuary has never existed in a vacuum but that it is proclaimed and lived out in political contexts. In this second wave of the NSM, the anti-immigrant rhetoric of the Trump administration is compelling congregations to (re)act. All interviewees remarked that the current state of political affairs, particularly Trump’s inauguration and his anti-

¹⁰⁵ Elizabeth Dias, “Donald Trump’s Inaugural Pastor Creates ‘Safe Havens’ for Immigrants” *Time* (March 1, 2017), accessed September 8, 2018, <http://time.com/4686592/donald-trump-immigration-sam-rodriguez-church/>.

¹⁰⁶ Rabbi Devorah Marcus interview with Tatyana Castillo-Ramos, San Diego, CA, August 2018.

immigrant stances, compelled them (or redoubled their existing efforts) to participate in the NSM. Revs. Kathleen Owens and Tania Márquez stated that offering sanctuary was their way of sending a message of their disapproval of Trump's immigration policies.¹⁰⁷ It must be noted that sanctuary workers in the 1980s also conceptualized sanctuary as a form of resistance against the Reagan administration, leading to fundamental differences in how they approached sanctuary and questions as to whether the movement should be motivated by humanitarian (often times private) care or political efforts of public consciousness raising.¹⁰⁸

This leads us to consider the question about any congregation's motivations for offering sanctuary in the age of Trump: is the offering politically or religiously motivated, or both? Are they pro-immigrant or simply anti-Trump? The motivations to become involved in the NSM vary and exist on a spectrum rather than a dichotomous notion of either purely political or religious. While some emphasize that their faith is what prompted them to denounce current policies, others feel the need to leverage their social capital as a religious institution in order to make stronger public statements. Here, Yukich's conceptualization of the NSM as a "multi-target social movement" is particularly applicable in how NSM participants hope to influence a range of people and institutions, and it also provides a preliminary understanding of motivations for individuals to become involved. Ultimately, the action of public declarations of sanctuary at houses of worship is simultaneously a political and a faith-based move, though the underlying motivations of a congregation's offer of sanctuary may be more politically based than others.

Sanctuary Lite

Representatives from all over the country convened in Chicago in January 2007 to discuss what the "new sanctuary" might look like. Beyond the traditional method of harboring undocumented individuals as a tactic, leaders proposed an array of support including political advocacy, ministering, and assisting those taking up sanctuary in churches.¹⁰⁹ One of the most recent innovations to the Sanctuary Movement is the practice of "sanctuary lite". Sanctuary lite, as it is referred to by Rev. William "Bill" Jenkins in San Diego, is the act of providing housing to a migrant or a migrant family sponsored from a detention center. Often, migrants participating in sanctuary lite are asylum seekers who are detained despite the fact that they willingly turned themselves in at the border. In fact, sanctuary lite is not a viable option for undocumented immigrants who need more and immediate protection from the law. Rev. Jenkins' Safe Harbors Network is an example of expansion in what it means to provide sanctuary in

¹⁰⁷ Kathleen Owens and Tania Márquez, Interview with Tatyana Castillo-Ramos, San Diego, CA, August 2018.

¹⁰⁸ Bau, *This Ground is Holy*, 29-37; Cunningham, *God and Caesar*, 35-43. Fife also described to us the case of a young couple from Guatemala who had fled before witnessing much of the violence committed against indigenous people. Fife, wishing to keep them together, sent them to Chicago, but the CRTF showed some reluctance in providing sanctuary because of the couple's lack of eye-witness stories of the violence in the land and thus their testimonies could not be used effectively in the CRTFs efforts towards consciousness raising. See Fife, Interview.

¹⁰⁹ Pallares, *Family Activism*, 41.

the NSM. Rev. Jenkins noted that although he had presented the concept of sanctuary lite at religious conferences earlier in 2016, it was only after the election of Trump that the Safe Harbors Network received a new wave of support. The Safe Harbors Network sponsors migrants who are being held in detention centers. The average bond for a person in detention is \$3,000, an unreasonable amount for the average refugee. The cost varies depending on the perceived flight risk of the migrant, but it can cost upwards of \$20,000. Rev. Jenkins claims that many refugees and migrants in detention centers have less than \$5 in their pockets and are left simply unable to pay this bond by themselves. If they are fortunate enough, they will have family or friends in the U.S. who can sponsor them. But without that, they are stuck in the detention center until their case can be processed, which sometimes can take years. The Safe Harbors Network has a fund to sponsor migrants to release them from the detention center and provide accommodations for them. “To me, the first thing a refugee needs is a bed,” Rev. Jenkins explained, “because within twelve hours the sun is going to go down... And if you don’t have a bed, you’re in a world of hurt.”¹¹⁰

Sanctuary lite seeks to operate along the lines of collaboration and accompaniment. One of the differences between sanctuary lite and traditional sanctuary is that in sanctuary lite both churches and lay people offer space for migrants to stay, an increasingly more common strategy in the NSM. In the past when the Sanctuary Movement focused on undocumented immigrants who had just crossed the border, lay people could not claim the tradition of sanctuary in order to prevent INS (now ICE) from raiding their houses. It was largely due to their social status and capital that houses of worship were able to “draw a line around [their] building and say ‘This is God’s country here’” so “You can’t cross this line.”¹¹¹ However, due to the fact that those who utilize sanctuary lite are asylum seekers and are sponsored from detention centers, they are abiding with the law and therefore do not face the risk of deportation unless they miss a court date or violate some other condition of their release such as removing their ankle bracelet. Rev. Runion describes sanctuary lite as working with the law rather than against the law. This means that average citizens who want to become involved are able to offer space in their own homes to recent migrants. Houses of worship can and still participate in this same program by offering space, time, and energy to the asylum seekers or refugee families. Additionally, those who participate in the Safe Harbors Network are able to specify the duration of time they would like to host the migrant in their home or house of worship. This is different from churches that offer traditional sanctuary, where once a migrant enters sanctuary it is not safe for them to leave the house of worship until their case is settled. This can take a long time as court cases can drag on for years.

Sanctuary is a major commitment both for the undocumented immigrant taking sanctuary and for the congregation sheltering them. Rev. Jenkins advocates sanctuary lite as a way for a congregation to still help migrants by offering to host them in their house of worship but without the long-term commitment that full sanctuary (harboring) requires. This is also an option for congregations who have members that are concerned

¹¹⁰ William “Bill” Jenkins, Interview with Tatyana Castillo-Ramos, San Diego, CA, July 2018.

¹¹¹ Jenkins, Interview.

about the legality of harboring an undocumented immigrant, as this method complies with ICE standards. In fact, Rev. Jenkins noted that immigration authorities will sometimes contact his organization in special cases such as when a pregnant woman or a family is detained, in order for them to spend as little time in detention as possible.

Sanctuary lite is not without its own challenges: language barriers, financial commitments, shared living quarters, work-life-hosting balances, and emotional and psychological labors are all potential difficulties encountered when hosting a migrant. Without the support of a larger organization like the Safe Harbors Network, families and congregations who take in refugees may have their resources spread too thinly. One pastor's congregants (not affiliated with Safe Harbors Network) hosted two refugee families, and they noted that one of the most difficult yet most important parts of hosting is learning to set boundaries about the length of stay, the structuring of daily schedules, and living arrangements, making it, as one minister put it, like a "full-time job." Participation in sanctuary lite is a way of helping migrant families while still abiding by immigration laws. While not equivalent to sanctuary harboring as a direct form of state resistance, this does not minimize the commitment, effort, or intent of those who participate in sanctuary lite. Even though it differs from traditional sanctuary, it is a form of accompaniment that represents a massive commitment from the host and changes the lives of those it helps.

Conclusion

These reflections on the Sanctuary Movement of the 1980s, the NSM, and its second wave, take us back to the two banners at Southside Presbyterian Church in Tucson. The one on the left ("LA MIGRA NO PROFANA EL SANTUARIO") stands true in that sanctuaries have not been profaned by immigration officers. The banner on the right ("ESTE ES EL SANTUARIO DE DIOS PARA LOS OPRIMIDOS DE CENTRO AMERICA"), while still carrying a message that is the foundation of the U.S. Sanctuary Movement, has assumed a more capacious declaration. Sanctuary, although grounded in a history of Central Americans seeking safety, is now more diverse and more globalized as people from all around the world take part of its many forms of sacred resistance. An increasing number of Mexicans have taken sanctuary and there have been cases of Russians,¹¹² Indonesians,¹¹³ and Albanians,¹¹⁴ following suit as well.¹¹⁵ Latinxs, however,

¹¹² Dusty Christensen, "Northampton Unitarians Take in Russian Woman Facing Deportation" *Daily Hampshire Gazette*, (April 10, 2018), accessed April 15, 2018, <https://www.gazettenet.com/russian-immigrant-takes-sanctuary-in-northampton-unitarian-society-16773878>.

¹¹³ Sophie Nieto-Muñoz, "Meet the Immigrants Taking Sanctuary in a N.J. Church amidst an Ice Storm," *NJ Advance Media* (January 27, 2018), accessed September 7, 2018, <https://www.nj.com/news/index.ssf/2018/01/meet-the-immigrants-taking-sanctuary-in-a-nj-church-amid-an-ice-storm.html>.

¹¹⁴ Geneva Sands, "Undocumented Immigrant Takes Sanctuary in Church to Stop Deportation, Care for Wife" *ABC News* (January 23, 2018), accessed September 7, 2018, <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/undocumented-immigrant-takes-sanctuary-church-stop-deportation-care/story?id=52563493>.

¹¹⁵ Rev. Jenkins estimates the Safe Harbors Network is comprised of 30% West African, 30% Haitian, 30% Central American, and 10% European-Eurasian. Ver Jenkins, Interview.

still comprise the majority of sanctuary seekers and, increasingly so, are taking the helm as sanctuary leaders.

As the NSM continues to expand and until it can achieve decisive victories, it will continue to change in representation, voices, and faces. NSM leaders want those taking sanctuary to be the face and voice of the movement.¹¹⁶ This has somewhat been the case, but the NSM still wrestles with the contention of being characterized as “an immigrant rights organization without immigrants.”¹¹⁷ NSM leaders continue to navigate ways to bridge cultural and theological disconnects. Perhaps the bigger issue is the amount of risk involved for undocumented immigrants versus native-born supporters.¹¹⁸ As a result, today, the majority of sanctuary leaders identify as white or are white passing, but a much larger group of women and Latinx sanctuary leaders have risen in the NSM. Recognizing this, most sanctuary leaders note how important it is for those from affected communities to take the lead in the fight of sanctuary activism.¹¹⁹ The demographic of migrants involved in the NSM is in flux and will change as political climates shift but will likely remain a majority Latinx phenomenon.

The second wave of the NSM has continued to capitalize on the historical, cultural, and ritual elements imputed to religious centers that afford them a sacredness not declared by secular institutions. The new kinds of immigration debates have summoned a new cast of actors and strategies, resulting in a broadened definition of sanctuary. The similarities and differences pose challenges to sanctuary seekers and workers on many fronts. As in the early 1980’s when the U.S. Government would not heed sanctuary workers, the NSM of today finds itself rising in the age of Trump “because there is no middle ground between collaboration and resistance.”¹²⁰ The Trump Administration’s “zero-tolerance” policy puts the Sanctuary Movement in an entirely new position. To say that there is hope for those in sanctuary at this current moment would be to project an illusion, Rev. Fife reminded us.¹²¹ When policies such as the “zero tolerance” order are carried out, hope seems to vanish and all that one is left with is determination. Determination, in many cases of sanctuary, assumes a sacred dimension of resistance. That is how the earliest U.S. sanctuary seekers and workers operated. Although a number of non-Latin Americans continue to take sanctuary in places of worship, the Sanctuary Movement solidly has its origins in Latinxs migrants’ bravery to traverse unknown lands, over unforgiving terrain, and under precarious circumstances. It is the bravery of thousands of children, women, and men who crossed the treacherous U.S.-Mexico border that set into motion waves of sanctuary activism that have benefited thousands seeking reprieve from suffering. We have yet to see where the NSM will go and how it will stand the testing of its sacred resistance.

¹¹⁶ Anderson, Interview.

¹¹⁷ Pallares, *Family Activism*; Caminero-Santangelo, “The Voice of the Voiceless”; Yukich, *One Family*, 142.

¹¹⁸ Yukich, *One Family*, 142-158.

¹¹⁹ Sanctuary leaders are cautious, however, about seekers taking public roles, knowing that becoming the face of local movement could lead to more vulnerability (e.g. Elvira Arellano). Safety and protection are of utmost importance.

¹²⁰ Fife, “No Middle Ground,” 20-27.

¹²¹ Fife, Interview.

Resistencia Sagrada: El Movimiento Santuario desde Reagan a Trump¹

Lloyd Barba, PhD and Tatyana Castillo-Ramos

Amherst College

Resumen

Desde los orígenes del Movimiento Santuario en Los Estados Unidos de América en la década de los 1980s a la declaración del Nuevo Movimiento Santuario (NMS) en 2007 y la nueva ola de activismo del NMS en 2016, buscadores, trabajadores, y líderes de santuario han adoptado varias clases de resistencia para responder a los contextos cambiantes de las crisis migratorias. Este artículo ofrece un marco conceptual para desempacar la historia y el significado del término “santuario” hoy. Argumentamos que, desde la elección de Donald Trump, se está experimentando una segunda ola del Nuevo Movimiento Santuario.

• SEE PAGE 11 FOR ENGLISH VERSION •

En la Iglesia Presbiteriana de Southside en Tucson Arizona, los recordatorios materiales del Movimiento Santuario de la década de los 1980s llenaban el santuario. Mientras nosotros (los autores) entramos al santuario estilo kiva a finales de agosto del 2018, encontramos las réplicas de dos pancartas que una vez adornaron el santuario antiguo. Las pancartas (fotos abajo) colgaban de las vigas de madera adornando hasta llegar al suelo.

¹ Queremos agradecer a quienes evaluaron y a los editores que facilitaron la publicación de este artículo. Estamos especialmente agradecidos a los entrevistados, específicamente a Anna Runion, Roberto Chao Romero, Bill Jenkins, y John Fife, que hicieron un esfuerzo adicional apoyando este proyecto y señalarnos en la dirección de otros recursos clave.



(Fotografía por Lloyd Barba)

La pancarta a la izquierda narra un cuento que, aun casi cuatro décadas después permanece cierto: *“LA MIGRA NO PROFANA EL SANTUARIO”*. La pancarta a la derecha ofrece una proclamación del pasado que sigue siendo verdad en gran medida: *“ESTE ES EL SANTUARIO DE DIOS PARA LOS OPRIMIDOS DE CENTRO AMERICA”*. Estas dos pancartas son más que réplicas o artefactos puestos en una plataforma para un drama. Las declaraciones en las dos pancartas, tomadas juntas, despliegan historias acerca del Movimiento Santuario, de cómo ha permanecido el mismo y cómo ha cambiado del pasado al presente.

A principios de ese año, en junio, yo (Tatyana) estaba en medio de una multitud de personas reunidas en el centro de San Diego en protesta de la separación de los/as niños/as de sus padres-madres en la frontera. No podía ver la cara de los oradores debido al gran número de protestantes. Habían venido preparados/as. Estaban reunidos/as con carteles que denunciaban las últimas declaraciones difamatorias de Donald Trump y su administración acerca de las comunidades latinx. Algunos/as de los/as reunidos/as llevaban chaquetas y letreros que decían que “realmente les preocupan”² los niños/as migrantes que han sido separados de sus familias. Un cartel and particular me llamó la atención, porque mostraba un mosaico de puños levantados en protesta declarando “Resistencia Sagrada”. Otra mujer cargaba una cruz grande conmemorando los muchos migrantes indocumentados que han perdido sus vidas

² Esto era en respuesta a una provocación de relaciones públicas causada cuando la Primera Dama Melania Trump usaba una chaqueta con las palabras “Realmente no me importa. ¿Y a ti? impresas en ella. La usó and junio 21, 2018 cuando abordaba el avión para visitar a niños/as inmigrantes que estaban en centros de detención. Ella firma que no usó la chaqueta mientras visitaba a los/as niños/as, pero sus acciones provocaron una gran cantidad de especulaciones acerca del significado del mensaje de la chaqueta. Ver Betsy Klein, “Melania Dons Jacket Saying ‘I really don’t care. Do u?’ Ahead of her Border visit – and Afterward,” *CNN* (June 21, 2018), accessed September 28, 2018, <https://www.cnn.com/2018/06/21/politics/melania-trump-jacket/index.html>.

mientras hacían el peligroso viaje a través del desierto. Los Ángeles Fronterizos, una organización humanitaria en defensa de inmigrantes y sin fines de lucro en San Diego, que proporciona recursos básicos en el desierto como agua para inmigrantes indocumentados que intentan el viaje precario, había preparado una mesa con su nuevo mural. El mural es un retrato de la Virgen de Guadalupe sosteniendo un galón de agua potable y con otros dos galones de agua a su lado. Uno de los galones dice “*Ni Una Muerte Mas,*” y el otro dice “*El Amor No Tiene Fronteras*”. Yo vi pancartas siendo elevadas sobre la multitud por miembros/as de la comunidad interreligiosa. Muestras públicas de y referencia a varias religiones me rodeaban mientras escuchaba a un imam que había venido junto a un rabino y un pastor para dirigirse a la multitud. Él hizo referencia al Corán para denunciar escrituralmente las actividades cometidos en contra de las familias por el gobierno de Trump. El exclamó por el micrófono:

¿Me oyeron? ¡Yo dije Jesús—disculpen—quise decir Jesús [pronunciado con acento en español "heh-soos"] era un inmigrante! ¿Me oyeron? ¡Yo dije que su padre José era un inmigrante! ¿Me oyeron? ¡Yo dije que su madre María era una inmigrante! ¡Ellos cruzaron la frontera de Egipto, ellos eran refugiados, ellos eran inmigrantes! ¿Ahora, vamos a enjaular a nuestros héroes y nuestros seres queridos? Aun si ustedes no son parte de la fe Abrahámica, aún ustedes entienden esto por simple lógica.

La multitud de opositores aplaudió su mensaje que trascendía y cruzaba las líneas religiosas al instar a los oyentes a que hicieran una exégesis contextual de la historia de la huida de la sagrada familia a Egipto. La presencia de protestantes de diversos trasfondos religiosos, raciales, y de clase en la manifestación y la lista de oradores señalaba algo nuevo acerca de los actores en esta cada vez más densa trama de los derechos de los inmigrantes en la era Trump. En la manifestación se hizo claro que la diversidad de apoyo, forjada durante la última década, tenía implicaciones significativas para los derechos de los/as inmigrantes, así como para el Movimiento Santuario de hoy.

Desde el nacimiento del Movimiento Santuario en los Estados Unidos de América en la década de los 1980s hasta la declaración del Nuevo Movimiento Santuario (NMS) en 2007 y la nueva ola de activismo a partir de 2016, los buscadores, trabajadores, y líderes de movimiento santuario han efectuado varias clases de resistencia sagrada como respuesta a los contextos cambiantes de las crisis migratorias. Nuestro estudio está basado en entrevistas y trabajo de campo etnográfico efectuado durante el verano de 2018 en las regiones fronterizas del sur de California y Arizona, en una síntesis de cobertura de noticias, y en la creciente literatura sobre los primeros años de santuario y los NMS. Proporcionamos un marco conceptual para desempacar la historia y el significado polivalente del término “santuario” hoy. Este artículo comienza trazando el desarrollo del Movimiento Santuario desde la década de los 1980s hasta la organización del NMS en 2006 (declarado oficialmente en 2007).³ Argumentamos que, desde la

³ David Van Biema, “A Church Haven for Illegal Aliens?” *Time* (July 19, 2007), accessed September 7, 2018, <http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1645169,00.html>; Puck Lo, “Inside the New Sanctuary Movement That’s Protecting Immigrants from Ice” *The Nation* (May 5, 2015), accessed August 24, 2018, <https://www.thenation.com/article/inside-new-sanctuary-movement-thats-protecting-immigrants-ice/>.

elección de Trump, estamos experimentando una segunda ola del Nuevo Movimiento Santuario. De acuerdo a Church World Service (Servicio Mundial de Iglesias), meses después de la elección de Trump, el número de iglesias santuario en los Estados Unidos de América se duplicó (de 400 a 800) y para 2018 casi se había triplicado (alcanzando sobre 1,100).⁴ Además, el número de coaliciones santuario desde la elección de Trump también se ha triplicado. Actualmente hay más individuos “buscando santuario en congregaciones que en cualquier otro momento desde la década de los 1980s.”⁵ Para sostener esta ola de esfuerzos en el movimiento santuario, activistas religiosos han movilizado una resistencia sagrada y nuevos actores han aumentado. La segunda ola de los NMS demuestra una creciente dependencia en el Movimiento Santuario de los 1980 de albergar inmigrantes indocumentados. Mientras el término “santuario” ha cobrado nuevos significados, la práctica verdadera y probada de albergar inmigrantes está siendo nuevamente probada. La práctica de santuario hoy, aunque ha sido expandida grandemente en la práctica y en la demografía de sus buscadores, todavía está firmemente basada en los actos de resistencia sagrada que comenzaron con los buscadores de santuario de Centro América y los trabajadores en el movimiento santuario estadounidenses.

Santuario: Revisión literaria

El Movimiento Santuario estadounidense de los 1980, ha disfrutado de una amplia cobertura de una gran variedad de disciplinas. Primero, informantes del movimiento lo reportaron en el proceso de su desarrollo.⁶ Estos periodistas de la década de 1980 escribieron con simpatía acerca del movimiento e intentaron considerar el santuario y el asilo como temas legales (no económicos). Las posicionalidades de los autores reflejaban el movimiento en su amplitud: Golden y McConnell participaban en el Grupo Religioso de Trabajo de Chicago para Centroamérica (Chicago Religious Task Force on Central America) y recopilaron recuentos de violencia por testigos oculares en Centroamérica. El trabajo de Davidson, mientras estaba centrado en la filosofía de Jim Corbett, miraba hacia las motivaciones de una más amplia lista de actores incluyendo mujeres (la hermana Sister Darlene Nicgorski del Grupo Religioso de Trabajo de Chicago para Centroamérica) y sacerdotes (Padre Ramón Dagoberto Quiñones).⁷

⁴ Myrna Orozco and Noel Anderson, et. al., “Sanctuary in the Age of Trump: The Rise of the Movement a Year into the Trump Administration” (January 2018), accessed January 13, 2019, https://www.sanctuarynotdeportation.org/uploads/7/6/9/1/76912017/sanctuary_in_the_age_of_trump_january_2018.pdf; for more on sanctuary responses to Trump’s election and early executive actions see John Fife, “No Middle Ground Between Collaboration and Resistance,” in Miguel A. De La Torre ed. *Faith and Resistance in the Age of Trump* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2017), 20-27.

⁵ Orozco and Anderson, “Sanctuary in the Age of Trump.”

⁶ Ignatius Bau, *The Ground is Holy: Church Sanctuary and Central American Refugees* (Mahwah, NY: Paulist Press, 1985); Renny Golden and Michael McConnell, *Sanctuary: The New Underground Railroad* (Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis Books, 1986); Robert Tomsho, *The American Sanctuary Movement* (Austin: Texas Monthly Press, 1987); Miriam Davidson, *Convictions of the Heart* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1988); Ann Crittenden, *Sanctuary: A Story of American Conscience and the Law in Collision* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1988).

⁷ Miriam Davidson, *Convictions of the Heart* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1988)

Inmediatamente después del primer Movimiento Santuario, una serie de etnografías exploraron de manera crítica varias ramas y divisiones dentro del movimiento a principios de la década de los 1990.⁸ Mientras Cunningham y Bibler Coutin aun reconocían Tucson como punto de partida, Bibler Coutin amplió el alcance geográfico del estudio sobre el movimiento al incluir a San Francisco. De los escritores de esta primera ola de estudio crítico, Lorentzen proveyó el andamio sociológico más completo para comprender el movimiento. Su enfoque particular en las dinámicas de género de los “espacios libres” y el “enfoque humanitario” de santuario (fuertemente enfatizado en Tucson) frente al “enfoque político (practicado más en Chicago) ilustró las finas matices de dinámicas internas y regionales.⁹

Desde la década de los 1990, académicos de trasfondos multidisciplinarios han estudiado el Movimiento Santuario de la década de los 1980. Ellos han impulsado el estudio del Movimiento Santuario a que considere las más largas historias en las bases y más amplias regiones geográficas. Más allá de examinar actores clave, Chichilla, Hamilton, y Loucky demostraron cómo Los Ángeles, un destino preferido para centroamericanos en los años 80 y 90, fomentó el crecimiento de redes de abogacía para inmigrantes.¹⁰ Perla y Bibler Coutin complicaron más la historia de los orígenes del Movimiento Santuario al examinar cómo los salvadoreños asentaron las bases para el movimiento santuario en California en los 1980. Las consecuencias no intencionadas a largo plazo del Movimiento Santuario así como el crecimiento de redes transnacionales de abogacía, nos impulsan a considerar cómo santuario continuó viviendo más allá de victorias legales históricas en los Estados Unidos de América a principios de la década de los 1990.¹¹ Más recientemente, la biografía del Padre Luis Olivares por Mario T. García proporciona información sobre el Movimiento Santuario en Los Ángeles, utilizando las historias de latinos/as locales, clérigo católico, y trabajadores en el movimiento santuario. García detalla los orígenes y el trabajo de preparación para la declaración del santuario en la histórica *Iglesia de la Placita* (Iglesia de Nuestra Señora Reina de los Ángeles). La gran población migrante de centroamericanos en Los Ángeles apoyó los esfuerzos de la parroquia católica. Tiempo después, la misma probó ser uno de los programas santuarios más exitosos en la nación.¹² La historia de Cadava de actores en el movimiento santuario transnacional en las fronteras Arizona-Sonora ofrece el mejor desafío a la historia recibida de los orígenes del Movimiento Santuario. Su trabajo sitúa el activismo santuario en el contexto de abogacía transnacional de base por

⁸ Susan Bibler Coutin, *The Culture of Protest: Religious Activism and the U.S. Sanctuary Movement* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993); Robin Lorentzen, *Women in the Sanctuary Movement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991); Hilary Cunningham, *God and Cesar at the Río Grande: Sanctuary and the Politics of Religion* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995).

⁹ Cunningham, *God and Cesar*.

¹⁰ Norma Stoltz Chinchilla, Nora Hamilton, and James Loucky, “The Sanctuary Movement and Central American Activism in Los Angeles” *Latin American Perspectives* 169, vol. 36, no. 6 (2009), 101-126.

¹¹ Perla and Bibler Coutin, “Legacies and Origins,” eds., Randy K. Lippert and Sean Rehaag, *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives: Migrations, Citizenship and Social Movements* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 82-86.

¹² Mario T. García, *Father Luis Olivares, A Biography: Faith Politics and the Origins of the Sanctuary Movement in Los Angeles* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2018); Mario T. García, *Católicos: Resistance and Affirmation in Chicano Catholic History* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008), 207-250.

centroamericanos ya activa a finales de la década de los 1970.¹³ En contraste con estos movimientos localizados, María Cristina García ha presentado el estudio hemisférico más amplio sobre cómo el Movimiento Santuario estadounidense cabe comparativamente dentro de la más amplia historia de refugiados centroamericanos (guatemaltecos, salvadoreños, y nicaragüenses) a México, Canadá, y los Estados Unidos de América.¹⁴ Estas obras apuntan a formas más nuevas y productivas de investigar el activismo santuario en los Estados Unidos de América como historias de resistencia localizada y más extensa, y como estudios comparativos de las prácticas santuario. La literatura sobre el Movimiento Santuario en Los Ángeles, por ejemplo, ha mostrado como el activismo religioso e inmigrante se ha cruzado con activismo santuario en la práctica.¹⁵ Seattle, Washington D.C., Filadelfia, y las zonas fronterizas de Tejas son sitios (para mencionar unos pocos) de activismo santuario de los años ochenta que ameritan un estudio más detenido.

El ensayo del 2005 de María Cristina García titulado “Dangerous Times Call for Risky Responses” (Los tiempos peligrosos requieren respuestas riesgosas) preguntó a ciencia cierta si un nuevo Movimiento Santuario estaba en el horizonte. El creciente número de arrestos por ICE (ICA-Inmigración y Control de Aduanas), políticas de inmigración más estrictas, y el aumento en el tamaño y la militarización de la frontera a raíz de 9/11 informaron sus sospechas de una oleada de activismo en todo el país¹⁶ Rabben proporcionó una temprana investigación acerca del emergente NMS, insistiendo que era altamente descentralizado y describiendo las definiciones expandidas de santuario que incluían iglesias, y coaliciones que no ofrecían santuario de la manera tradicional. Rabben miraba una correlación cercana entre el NMS y el creciente número de grupos de ayuda humanitaria en la zona fronteriza de Arizona.¹⁷ El estudio del NMS de Yukich como una “movimiento social con múltiples objetivos” basado en su trabajo de campo en Nueva York y Los ángeles, ha provisto el análisis más detallado del NMS del 2007 al 2009.¹⁸ Colocando Chicago como el centro del NMS, el estudio de Pallares sobre el activismo familiar en 2011 ofrece una crítica incisiva de la movilización santuario en torno a políticas de agencia, representatividad, y maternidad.¹⁹ Este trabajo junto con el de Yukich sobre la estrategia y modelos de

¹³ Geraldo Cadava, *Standing on Common Ground: The Making of a Sunbelt Borderlands* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016), 172-211.

¹⁴ María Cristina García, *Seeking Refuge: Central American Migration to Mexico, the United States, and Canada* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006).

¹⁵ Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, *God's Heart Has No Borders: How Religious Activists are Working for Immigrant Rights*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 2008).

¹⁶ María Cristina García, “Dangerous Times Call for Risky Responses’: Latino Immigration and Sanctuary 1981-2001,” in Espinosa, Gaston, Virgilio Elizondo, and Jesse Miranda, *Latino Religions and Civic Activism*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

¹⁷ Linda Rabben, *Give Refuge to the Stranger: The Past, Present, and Future of Sanctuary* (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2011), 210-214; Linda Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum: A Social and Political History* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2016), 244-265.

¹⁸ Grace Yukich, *One Family Under God: Immigration Politics and Progressive Religion in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

¹⁹ Amalia Pallares, *Family Activism: Immigrant Struggles and the Politics of Noncitizenship* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2015), 38-61.

merecimiento migratorio revelan algunas de las diferencias fundamentales entre las prácticas del NMS y el de la década de los 1980.²⁰

Santuario estadounidense en la década de 1980s: Su apogeo y sus secuelas

El hecho que el movimiento santuario ha asumido nuevas y variadas dimensiones refleja ciertamente sus diversos orígenes históricos. Desde los egipcios a los hebreos, los griegos, los romanos, los Karifes del Kush hindú en India, y los igbos en Nigeria, la práctica de santuario es una larga tradición con raíces profundas en los centros religiosos y políticos. Grupos indígenas, incluyendo los Hopi en la zona fronteriza actual de los Estados Unidos de América y México también mantuvieron tradiciones de tipo santuario.²¹ Notablemente el área fronteriza sería la zona cero del Movimiento Santuario estadounidense.

La historia del Movimiento Santuario estadounidense comienza con una larga tradición de defensa por los inmigrantes en la zona fronteriza de Arizona-Sonora. El Consejo del área de Manzo con sede en Tucson comenzó a trabajar con (y albergar) refugiados de El Salvador y Guatemala a mediados de los 1970. Activistas estadounidenses (en su mayoría mujeres) forjaron redes binacionales de apoyo para los centroamericanos, asentando así las bases sobre las cuales el clero en Tucson edificaría el Movimiento Santuario e invitarían a otros en los EUA a unirse.²² El grupo de defensa por los inmigrantes de California estuvieron entre los primeros en participar. Aunque a menudo se organizaban a escondidas o de forma anónima, los inmigrantes salvadoreños y salvadoreños nacidos en los EUA a finales de la década de los 1970 comenzaron a forjar vínculos con líderes religiosos (en su mayoría católicos) en el área de la Bahía de San Francisco y Los Ángeles, haciendo público los testimonios de muchos/as que habían sufrido bajo la violencia generalizada en regímenes respaldados por EUA. De acuerdo a Perla y Bibler Coutin, los/as salvadoreños en California “fueron pioneros en la estrategia de los inmigrantes que se acercaban a miembros de organizaciones religiosas a colaborar con ellos en un esfuerzo por movilizar a la comunidad religiosa.”²³ Grupos tales como El Rescate, El Centro de Recursos de América Central, y el Centro de Refugiados Centroamericanos jugarían un papel crucial en el desarrollo del Movimiento Santuario nacional. Los centroamericanos, a diversos niveles, continuarían como participantes activos en la educación y organización de santuarios en Washington D.C., Houston, las ciudades de Nueva York, Milwaukee, Filadelfia, y a través de todo el país. Solo más tarde se darían cuenta los académicos de los robustos vínculos transnacionales (es decir, EUA-centroamérica) que los trabajadores del movimiento santuario y activistas salvadoreños habían forjado y operaron desde lugares como California y

²⁰ Nuestros propios entrevistados destacaron la importancia de adoptar los casos que pudiesen “ganar” para rectificar las ideas populares and los medios de comunicación sobre los inmigrantes. Ver también Grace Yukich, “Constructing the Model Immigrant: Movement Strategy and Immigrant Deservingness in the New Sanctuary Movement” *Social Problems* 60, no. 3 (2013), 302-320; Pallares, *Family Activism*.

²¹ Linda Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum: A Social and Political History* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2016), 31-36.

²² Cadava, *Standing on Common Ground*, 198-202.

²³ Perla and Bibler Coutin, “Legacies and Origins,” 79.

Arizona.²⁴ A menudo concebido como el lugar donde nació el Movimiento Santuario estadounidense, Tucson debe ser entendido a la luz de mayores desarrollos regionales, nacionales e incluso transnacionales.

Con la infraestructura de defensa por los centroamericanos en su lugar, momentos decisivos ayudaron a que la situación difícil de los centroamericanos cobrara atención nacional. Primero, the Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) (Servicios de Inmigración y Naturalización-SIN) atrajeron una ola de atención negativa luego del arresto notorio de un adolescente indocumentado en 1981, a quien persiguieron por las calles de Los Ángeles hasta los pasillos de una iglesia y finalmente lo arrestaron en la galería de la iglesia. La reacción violenta de este evento resultó en una orden del SIN de no arrestar “extranjeros” en iglesias, escuelas, y hospitales, y esta ha sido su política desde entonces.²⁵ El escándalo de este arresto se agravó por la mayor crisis centroamericana que se estaba desarrollando en el suelo estadounidense. El creciente número de muertes de centroamericanos intentando llegar a los EUA se hizo muy grande para no tenerlo en cuenta.

Además, la respuesta inadecuada e inapropiada de los tribunales de inmigración causó que muchos condenaran a los EUA por su papel en Centroamérica y por cómo intentaba negar que quienes llegaban (o que morían intentado llegar) a los EUA estaban huyendo violentas guerras civiles. Estas revelaciones más grandes provocaron que el rancharo cuáquero Jim Corbett y al pastor John Fife de la Iglesia Presbiteriana de Southside se asociaran con los grupos de defensa de migrantes de Tucson. El Reverendo Fife y Corbett desempeñaron un papel clave al llevar estos asuntos a la atención del Consejo Ecuménico de Tucson (CET). La participación del CET y la articulación de estos temas hicieron de la hospitalidad y la defensa de centroamericanos una causa explícitamente sagrada. Miembros de la CET formaron un grupo de trabajo llamado El Grupo de Trabajo del Consejo Ecuménico de Tucson para Centroamérica (GTCET). El grupo de trabajo se asoció con otros grupos de derechos latinoamericanos y de inmigrantes con sede en Tucson como el Consejo del Área de Manzo y obtuvo apoyo esencial del clero de Nogales, en Sonora, México.

El trabajo en Tucson cambió de ser encubierto a abierto. En sus primeros meses, el GTCET trabajó ayudando a inmigrantes a cruzar la frontera ilegalmente. Para mantener el ritmo del creciente número de refugiados, el clero en Tucson instó al Reverendo Fife a que declarara públicamente la Iglesia Presbiteriana de Southside como una iglesia santuario. Fife se recordó especialmente cómo Corbett propuso santuario como una expresión moderna del movimiento Underground Railroad: “cuando leemos la historia, nosotros sabemos que ellos hicieron lo correcto. Esas eran las personas que fueron fieles.” Para el CET, ofrecer santuario era “siempre una cuestión de fe.”²⁶ Así que, en Marzo 24 de 1982, en el segundo aniversario del asesinato del Obispo salvadoreño Oscar Romero (cuyo martirio trajo escrutinio internacional a las guerras civiles en América Central), cinco iglesias del Área de la Bahía de San Francisco se unieron a la Iglesia

²⁴ Ibid., 73-89.

²⁵ Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 132.

²⁶ John Fife, Interview with authors, Tucson, AZ, August 2018.

Presbiteriana de Southside declarando sus iglesias santuarios para centroamericanos.²⁷ Ellos razonaron que era mejor hacerlo público para resaltar la difícil situación de los centroamericanos, así como para hacer conocer sus intenciones a fin crear una aura de sacralidad en torno a su atrevido decreto:²⁸

Les escribimos para informarles que la Iglesia Presbiteriana de Southside violará públicamente la Sección 274 (a) de la Ley de Inmigración y Nacionalidad. Hemos declarado nuestra iglesia como un “santuario” para refugiados indocumentados de América Central...creemos que la justicia y misericordia requieren que las personas de conciencia afirmemos activamente nuestro derecho dado por Dios de ayudar a cualquier persona que huya de persecución y asesinato. La administración actual de la ley de los EUA nos prohíbe albergar a estos refugiados de Centroamérica. Por lo tanto, creemos que la administración de la ley es inmoral e ilegal.²⁹

La declaración resonó en todo el país y el movimiento recibió apoyo rápidamente. El criticismo del GTCET al papel de los EUA en Centroamérica resonó con el Grupo Religioso de Trabajo de Chicago para Centroamérica (GRTC), una coalición que se formó a raíz del asesinato de cuatro misioneras estadounidenses en El Salvador en 1980. Estos grupos de trabajo combinaron esfuerzos en 1982 y juntos constituyeron el fundamento del Movimiento Santuario. Diferencias existían entre los grupos de trabajo con respecto a estrategias de dirección, objetivos, estructuras y procedimientos. Sin embargo, juntos amplificaron las voces de centroamericanos que huían de la violencia y enviaron delegaciones a El Salvador y Guatemala para dar información ocular de la agitación generalizada. A un año de que la Iglesia Presbiteriana de Southside se declarara santuario, cuarenta y cinco comunidades habían seguido su ejemplo y más de 600 congregaciones copatrocinaban sus esfuerzos.³⁰

El Movimiento Santuario se desarrolló en medio del papel activo que jugó Estados Unidos de América en la Guerra Fría y en las guerras civiles en América Central. Las ansiedades de la Guerra Fría en los EUA llevaron a varias administraciones presidenciales a intervenir en América Central desde la década de 1950. El gobierno de Reagan tenía la intención de que sus operaciones de mano dura en El Salvador, Nicaragua, y Guatemala detuvieran y deshicieran las revoluciones izquierdistas que comenzaron a causa de la desproporcionada propiedad de la tierra, poder, y recursos. Los desenfadados secuestros, asesinatos, escuadrones de la muerte, y amenazas endémicas de estas guerras civiles resultó en el desplazamiento más severo de personas de esos países.³¹ Las estimaciones muestran que para 1990 más de un millón de centroamericanos que huían de la violencia habían llegado a los Estados Unidos de América, sin embargo, a lo largo de la década de 1980 los EUA sostuvieron que la gran mayoría no calificaba para el asilo según la Ley de Refugiados de 1980, que había adoptado la definición de refugiado redactada por el Protocolo de las Naciones Unidas

²⁷ García, *Seeking Refuge*, 98-99.

²⁸ Fife, Interview.

²⁹ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 48.

³⁰ Cunningham, *God and Caesar*, 35-43.

³¹ García, *Seeking Refuge*, 13-43.

de 1967. Solicitantes de asilo tenían que demostrar “un completo temor de persecución por razones de raza, religión, nacionalidad, pertenencia a un grupo particular, u opinión política.”³² La evaluación de un “temor completo” se politizó mucho (y sigue siéndolo). Además, el gobierno de Reagan no podía descubrirse acerca de sus intervenciones en el extranjero en estos países y consistentemente mantuvo que los que llegaban de esos países eran inmigrantes económicos y no refugiados políticos. El clasificarlos como refugiados políticos significaría admitir el involucramiento de los EUA en esos países. Su gobierno se rehusó a ofrecer a los guatemaltecos y salvadoreños una salida voluntaria extendida, alegando que el nivel de violencia en esos países no era suficiente para justificar dichas medidas. Estas decisiones desastrosas se probaron fatales para muchos que fueron deportados.

Los imperativos de la Guerra Fría influenciaron fuertemente quienes recibirían asilo, porque las políticas trabajaban mucho más favorablemente para otorgar asilo a refugiados de países hostiles a los Estados Unidos de América (La Unión Soviética, Irán, Afganistán, Polonia, y Nicaragua). Mientras EUA dio asilo a 60.9% de iraníes y 40.9% de afganos en 1984,³³ desde 1983 al 1990 los gobiernos de Reagan y Bush consistentemente y de manera desproporcionada negaron asilo a individuos que huían de las dictaduras apoyadas por los EUA en El Salvador (2.6% recibieron asilo) y Guatemala (1.8%).³⁴ Aunque detestaban admitirlo, los EUA tenían una crisis de refugiados de países que apoyaban financiera y militarmente. Los líderes de la iglesia en la década de 1980 serían los primeros y más críticos del involucramiento de los EUA en América Central. La crisis se hizo rápidamente visible en la frontera. El clero se dio cuenta y comenzó a actuar, denunciando proféticamente el papel de los EUA en el extranjero y en casa.

La lucha del Movimiento Santuario que duró una década durante los 1980 fue marcado por varias victorias que llegaron en la década de 1990. Por ejemplo, la concesión congregacional de Estatus de Protección Temporal (EPT) (Temporary Protected Status) fue otorgada a los salvadoreños en la Ley de Inmigración de 1990. Cuando el EPT expiró en 1992, los salvadoreños se convirtieron elegibles para la nueva Salida Forzosa Postergada (SFP) (Deferred Enforced Departure) (extendida anualmente hasta el 1996) y por lo mismo calificar para asilo bajo los términos de lo que se conoce como el acuerdo IBA (Iglesias Bautistas Americanas).³⁵ Este acuerdo vino como el resultado de una coalición de líderes religiosos y activistas quienes, en 1985, demandaron SIN (Servicios de Inmigración y Naturalización) y DDJ (Departamento de

³² García, “Dangerous Times,” 159-161.

³³ Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 131.

³⁴ García, *Seeking Refuge*, 86-90.

³⁵ (Bajo George Bush EPT fue renovado en 2001 porque los países no podrían manejar el retorno de sus ciudadanos; fue renovado continuamente hasta que la administración de Trump decidió no renovarlo, dejándola expirar en septiembre del 2019. Ver “Secretary of Homeland Security Kirstjen M. Nielsen Announcement on Temporary Protected Status for El Salvador” *U.S. Department of Homeland Security* (January 8, 2018), accessed September 19, 2018, <https://sv.usembassy.gov/announcement-temporary-protected-status-el-salvador/>; “Temporary Protected Status Designated Country: El Salvador” *U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services*, accessed September 19, 2018, <https://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/temporary-protected-status/temporary-protected-status-designated-country-el-salvador>.

Justicia), y las Oficinas Ejecutivas de Servicios de Inmigración. El caso *Iglesias Bautistas Americanas versus Thornburgh* fue resuelto afuera de las cortes en 1991. Este “acuerdo IBA” permitió que más de 150,000 guatemaltecos y salvadoreños que habían sido discriminados pudiesen (si eran elegibles) recibir la suspensión de su deportación y una nueva (es decir, más justa) evaluación y decisión de su petición de asilo.³⁶ Perla y Bibler Coutin entienden que el cambio en el panorama legal de la década de 1990 a favor de refugiados centroamericanos como parte del legado del Movimiento Santuario.³⁷ El Reverendo Fife compartió que su objetivo principal desde el principio del Movimiento Santuario de la década de 1980 era lograr retroceder el curso de la política estadounidense hacia centroamericanos buscando asilo. Con respecto a las metas del movimiento de los años ochenta, Fife dijo, “ganamos;”³⁸ Corbett estuvo de acuerdo;³⁹ y para muchos buscadores de santuario, trabajadores, protestantes y consejeros legales, todo esto significó una “gran victoria”.⁴⁰

Justo cuando el acceso de los inmigrantes a asilo había sido expandido en 1996 conforme al acuerdo IBA, el gobierno de Clinton aprobó la histórica Ley de Reforma de la Inmigración Ilegal y de Responsabilidad del Inmigrante (LRIIRI) ese mismo año. La LRIIRI tenía varias implicaciones para los centroamericanos y una década después pondría en marcha el NMS. Más generalmente, hizo que el asilo fuese más difícil de obtener, negándoselo a quienes no lo solicitaban después de un año de haber entrado a los EUA. Su mecanismo de “remoción acelerada” permitía que oficiales de inmigración y oficiales de las patrullas fronterizas deportaran a personas indocumentadas sin una audiencia. Nuevamente, en los años ochenta, un miedo creíble de persecución era difícil de probar y cada vez más politizado.⁴¹ Con el TLCAN (Tratado de Libre Comercio de América del Norte) en plena marcha y el desplazamiento de grandes poblaciones cerca de la frontera sur de México, lo que se supuso generalmente fue que los inmigrantes tanto de México como de América Central entraban a los EUA por mera ganancia financiera.⁴² Más ampliamente, la LRIIRI puso en peligro muchos individuos indocumentados (y muchos con tarjeta de residencia) en los EUA al imponer la detención y deportación de muchos por ofensas menores. Esto también se aplicó

³⁶ El acuerdo estableció, además, restricciones de arresto a inmigrantes elegibles que solamente podrían ser deportados si eran condenados de un “crimen que involucraba vileza moral” y recibían una sentencia de cárcel de más de seis meses y representaba un riesgo a la seguridad nacional o la seguridad pública. Ver Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 145-146, 292. El acuerdo IBA prohibía que los oficiales evaluando el caso tomaran en consideración negaciones de asilo previas, el país de origen de los solicitantes, o las recomendaciones u opiniones del Departamento de Estado. Ellos, sin embargo, podían tomar and consideración reportes por ONGs. Según García, “salvadoreño” era esencialmente un sinónimo de “centroamericano” por el sólo número de refugiados que huyeron a los Estados Unidos. Los nicaragüenses recibieron más protecciones legales a través de la década de 1980 debido al gobierno sandinista comunista que se consideraba ser hostil a los EUA. Los guatemaltecos permanecieron en un estado precario porque a ellos no se les ofreció EPT. Ver García, *Seeking Refuge*, 89-112.

³⁷ Perla and Bibler Coutin, “Legacies and Origins,” 82-86.

³⁸ Fife, Interview.

³⁹ Quoted in Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 145.

⁴⁰ García, *Seeking Refuge*, 112.

⁴¹ Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 198.

⁴² García, *Seeking Refuge*, 166.

retroactivamente, y como resultado, los agentes de SIN (y después del 2003, ICA) rastrearon a miles de personas durante las próximas dos décadas.⁴³

La LRIIRI preparó el escenario para otra ronda de trabajo humanitario de derechos religiosos y de inmigrantes con sede en el área de Tucson. Las disposiciones de la ley permitieron la expansión y militarización de la frontera y un aumento de agentes de Patrulla Fronteriza, quienes, a finales del siglo eran más de 10,000.⁴⁴ Desde que la LRIIRI fue aprobada, el número de muertes de inmigrantes ha aumentado constantemente debido a que inmigrantes indocumentados han tomado rutas cada vez más peligrosas para cruzar la frontera. Grupos de ayuda humanitaria como Humane Borders (Fronteras Más Humanas) se organizaron durante el verano del año 2000 y comenzaron a colocar estratégicamente grandes barriles de agua con la esperanza de prevenir más muertes. Humane Borders afirma que más de 3,000 inmigrantes han perecido intentando cruzar la frontera desde 1999.⁴⁵ Cruzar la frontera se hizo aún más peligroso después del 9/11. La respuesta del gobierno de Bush alteró dramáticamente las medidas de seguridad nacional, especialmente en asuntos relacionados con la regulación de la frontera. Con el aumento continuo de muertos, más grupos se organizaron para proveer varias formas de ayuda. No More Deaths (No Más Muertes), Los Samaritanos, y una gran cantidad de grupos se han organizado en base al “marco y justificación religiosa para acción directa.”⁴⁶ Desde el 2005, hasta recientemente en el 2019, voluntarios de dichos grupos han sido arrestados y/o acusados por la naturaleza (i)legal de su ayuda humanitaria y cómo se lleva a cabo.⁴⁷

Los esfuerzos de aprobar un proyecto de ley de reforma migratoria comprensiva durante el gobierno de Bush en los años 2005 al 2006 estimularon iniciativas por activistas de los derechos de los inmigrantes y trabajadores en el movimiento santuario. El aumento de redadas, arrestos, deportaciones, y los casos de un millón de personas separadas de sus familias desde 1997 puso el asunto de la inmigración al frente del discurso nacional. En diciembre del 2005, la Cámara de Representantes de los EUA aprobó la Ley de Control de Fronteras, Antiterrorismo, e Inmigración Legal, conocida más popularmente como la “Ley Sensenbrenner”. El proyecto de ley, que vinculaba de manera discursiva la inmigración por la frontera EUA-México con terrorismo, recibió resistencia masiva de activistas y especialmente grupos religiosos. Las disposiciones provocativas del proyecto de ley eran numerosas e, más relevante para los trabajadores del santuario, incluían sanciones para cualquier persona o grupo que proporcionara ayuda a inmigrantes indocumentados. Mayormente debido a la presión pública en protestas tales como “Un día sin los inmigrantes”, el Senado no aprobó la ley Sensenbrenner. Poco después, el Senado aprobó la Ley de Reforma Migratoria Comprensiva en 2006, que proporcionó un camino a la ciudadanía para muchos

⁴³ Yukich, *One Family*, 24, 104.

⁴⁴ García, *Seeking Refuge*, 160-161.

⁴⁵ Humane Borders tracks migrant deaths, see website, accessed January 20, 2019, <https://humaneborders.org>.

⁴⁶ Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 245-246.

⁴⁷ Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 246-248; Rafael Carranza, “Aid Volunteers Found Guilty of Dropping off Water, Food, for Migrants in Protected Park of Arizona Desert” *Arizona Central* (January 18, 2019), accessed January 20, 2019: <https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/2019/01/18/no-more-deaths-volunteers-found-guilty-dropping-water-food-migrants-cabeza-prieta-refuge-arizona/2617961002/>

inmigrantes indocumentados y no contenía muchas de las disposiciones fuertes que tenía el proyecto de ley Sensenbrenner. Los grupos pro-inmigrantes vieron este cambio de tono como un paso decisivo en la dirección correcta, pero finalmente murió antes de que pudiera ser aprobada. Un proyecto de ley similar el siguiente año sufrió la misma suerte.⁴⁸ En medio del debate sobre la Ley de Reforma Migratoria Comprehensiva del 2006 (y 2007), grupos religiosos y defensores de los derechos de los inmigrantes formaron el Nuevo Movimiento Santuario.

La primera ola del Nuevo Movimiento Santuario 2006-2016

Activistas y comunidades de fe montaron fuertes respuestas al proyecto de ley Sensenbrenner. Notable entre estos estaba el grupo Clergy and Laity United for Economic Justice (Clérigos y Laicos Unidos por la Justicia Económica) (CLUJE) con sede en Los Ángeles, que funcionó como “movimiento partera” para el NMS.⁴⁹ Sus líderes mantuvieron la intención de que, como personas de fe, podían contribuir algo único a los discursos nacionales de inmigración que se fermentaban.⁵⁰ Cuando millones salieron a las calles a apoyar a los inmigrantes, Interfaith Worker Justice (Trabajadores Interreligiosos por la Justicia-TIJ) otro grupo religioso con sede en Los Ángeles, envió un correo con la pregunta: ¿Un nuevo movimiento, un viejo mandamiento? como clara referencia al Movimiento Santuario de la década de 1980. Más tarde, el grupo Interfaith Worker Justice se uniría al CLUJE ese año y coordinarían el NMS en Los Ángeles.⁵¹ El tipo de lenguaje que estos grupos religiosos utilizaron en medio de los debates de inmigración del 2005 al 2007 dejó claro que términos como “santuario” eran parte del “repertorio religioso” o “cultural” de la nación.⁵²

Un caso decisivo en 2006 irrumpió en el debate y puso efectivamente al creciente NMS en el mapa. Elvira Arellano, que limpiaba aviones en el Aeropuerto Internacional O’Hare, fue aprehendida el año 2002 en una redada (Operation Chicago Skies- Operación Cielos de Chicago) de inmigrantes trabajando con papeles falsos. Esta redada había sido calculada cuidadosamente inmediatamente después del 11 de septiembre, demostrando nuevamente que la inmigración y el terrorismo eran vinculados por el gobierno. Ella fue sentenciada a tres años de libertad condicional y recibió un aviso de deportación. Durante las tres veces que su deportación fue postergada, Arellano participó activamente con grupos religiosos de defensa de los inmigrantes en Chicago. Después de años de pelear por quedarse en los EUA para no ser separada de su hijo nacido en los Estados Unidos de América, Elvira Orellano había gastado todos sus recursos y en agosto del 2006 buscó santuario en la Iglesia Metodista Unida Adalberto en Chicago. Su decisión de buscar santuario y de expresar su caso llamó la atención de

⁴⁸ Otras disposiciones en el proyecto de ley incluían la expansión y fortificación elevada de la frontera, sentencias más duras por fraude de documentación de inmigrantes, y mayores multas por emplear a sabiendas a trabajadores indocumentados. Ver Yukich, *One Family*, 26-28.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 82.

⁵⁰ Grace Yukich, “I Didn’t Know If This Was Sanctuary: Strategic Adaptation in the US New Sanctuary Movement,” in eds., Randy K. Lippert and Sean Rehaag, *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives: Migrations, Citizenship and Social Movements* (New York: Routledge, 2013) 111-114.

⁵¹ Hondagneu-Sotelo, *God’s Heart*, 104-196.

⁵² Yukich, *One Family*, 78; Yukich, “I Didn’t Know,” 111.

comentaristas de ambos lados del asunto y puso en movimiento la primera ola de NMS.⁵³

El debate sobre la reforma migratoria y los casos santuario de alto perfil inundaron la esfera pública. En el verano del 2007, la revista *Time* se lanzó al debate de inmigración, popularizando ideas que líderes religiosos y activistas habían estado movilizando durante casi un año. Las historias principales en las revistas que se encuentran cerca de las cajas de pago en la mayoría de los supermercados servían de recordatorios visuales del color del debate sobre la inmigración. La portada de la revista *Time* de junio 18, 2007, mostraba unas manos marrones, de piel gruesa por el trabajo, y físicamente desgastadas. Su artículo principal, “Inmigración: por qué la amnistía tiene sentido,”⁵⁴ causó una serie de artículos sobre la inmigración, tales como “Una iglesia, paraíso para extranjeros ilegales”⁵⁵ y “¿Apoya la biblia el santuario?”⁵⁶ Estos artículos continuaron popularizando el termino NMS (Nuevo Movimiento Santuario) y arrojaron luz sobre sus múltiples manifestaciones en todo el país. La revista *Time* incluyó a Elvira Arellano en su lista de honor anual de “Personas que importaban,” una lista de más de treinta de las figuras mundiales más influyentes del año en política, deportes, y entretenimiento.⁵⁷

De manera importante, el caso de Arellano estableció el tono para el NMS en el sentido que se encargaría casi exclusivamente de casos de inmigración cuya deportación resultaría en separación familiar. Al hacer esto, los activistas del santuario, que generalmente son políticamente de izquierda, buscaron tomar el control del discurso familiar robusto que los conservadores habían construido y utilizado efectivamente desde finales de la década de 1970 con el surgimiento de grupos tales como Focus on the Family (Enfoque en la Familia), The Christian Right (La Derecha Cristiana), y la Moral Majority (Mayoría Moral).⁵⁸ Los líderes del NMS también trataron convertir su causa en una causa explícitamente religiosa, recuperando la narrativa “religiosa” que en las últimas tres décadas había sido aprovechada efectivamente por los cristianos políticamente conservadores. Con objetivos políticos, ideológicos y religiosos en mente, el NMS funcionó como un “movimiento social con múltiples objetivos.”⁵⁹ Como tal, el término “santuario” asumió un nuevo significado en el NMS, y es aquí que se encuentran las diferencias entre el Movimiento Santuario de los ochenta y el NMS.

⁵³ La científica política Amalia Pallares discute las formas sexistas en que la dignidad de Arellano como inmigrante (ella tenía una deportación previa con una convicción por usar documentos falsos) y madre (por poner a su hijo en esa situación) fueron impugnados durante ese tiempo. Incluso aquellos que simpatizaban con su caso lamentaban que defensores de los inmigrantes no hubieran escogido “una mejor portavoz”. Su historia revela como la “mirada de la comunidad no inmigrante en general” se convirtió en el lente a través del cual muchos vieron el caso de Arellano. Ver Pallares, *Family Activism*, 38-61.

⁵⁴ “Immigration: Why Amnesty Makes Sense” *Time* (June 18, 2007), accessed September 7, 2018, <http://content.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,20070618,00.html>

⁵⁵ Van Biema, “A Church Haven for Illegal Aliens?”

⁵⁶ David Van Biema, “Does the Bible Support Sanctuary” *Time* (July 20, 2007), accessed September 7, 2018, <http://content.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1645646,00.html>

⁵⁷ Wendy Cole, “People Who Mattered: Elvira Arellano” *Time* (December 25, 2006), accessed September 7, 2018,

http://content.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,2019341_2017328_2017183,00.html

⁵⁸ Yukich, *One Family Under God*, 92-119.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

Aunque el NMS en ocasiones emplearía albergar a inmigrantes como táctica de santuario, el movimiento estaba respondiendo a una clase de crisis fundamentalmente diferente a la que inmigrantes vivían bajo una vigilancia más estricta y en la que la mayoría necesitaba “papeles” y no un santuario físico para “albergarse”.⁶⁰ Esto se debía, en parte, al hecho que, a diferencia del movimiento de los años ochenta, el NMS estaba trabajando no con inmigrantes recién llegados, sino con individuos y familias que habían vivido en los EUA por muchos años. Esta nueva necesidad cambió drásticamente la respuesta del NMS. Según Caminero-Santangelo, el NMS promueve narrativas sobre el costo humano de la política actual estadounidense de deportación, separación familiar, un sistema migratorio roto, y el estado de vivir con temor constante.⁶¹ Al igual que el Movimiento Santuario de los ochenta, el NMS depende fuertemente de “justificación basada en la fe y en las escrituras,” pero lo hace tomando más frecuentemente de un conjunto de textos de las Escrituras (por ejemplo, la reunificación y la huida de la Santa Familia a Egipto). De manera más general, el NMS promueve un nuevo conjunto de relaciones entre individuos indocumentados y sus comunidades. “La esencia de santuario” en este nuevo movimiento “sería la creación de relaciones íntimas entre congregaciones y familias con estatus mixtos—a menudo entre no inmigrantes e inmigrantes.”⁶² Estas nuevas “comunidades religiosas santuario” brindaron principalmente una gama de apoyo (financiero, legal, espiritual, emocional, etc.) para mejor responder a las necesidades de los inmigrantes con el peligro de ser separados de sus familias, iglesias, y de los lugares donde habían construido sus vidas y habían llegado a llamar su hogar.⁶³ Algunos líderes han denominado esta clase de activismo santuario como “hospitalidad profética”.⁶⁴ Mientras el santuario durante la década de 1980 era principalmente una “táctica,” es decir, “una práctica concreta utilizada por los activistas del movimiento para lograr un conjunto de objetivos,” el NMS deseaba efectuar cambios tanto en los ámbitos políticos como en los religiosos, y por lo tanto hizo una decisión calculada de usar el término “santuario” como “apelativo y estrategia central”.⁶⁵ El término tenía flexibilidad discursiva para ser tanto político como religioso, como una “estrategia de convergencia,” lo que Yukich describe como “una estrategia que resuena y tiene eficacia en múltiples entornos institucionales.”⁶⁶ Mientras el nuevo movimiento se desarrolló con la esperanza de influenciar la legislación (por ejemplo, los proyectos de ley de reforma migratoria comprehensiva de los años 2006 y 2007), sus líderes tuvieron que escoger estrategias que sobrevivieran proyectos de ley de inmigración muertos.

Desde el 2007 los casos de buscadores de santuario han cambiado de circunstancias comparado al gran influxo de buscadores de asilo en la década de los 1980. Aunque el

⁶⁰ Ibid., *God*, 69; Yukich, “I Didn’t Know,” 11-114.

⁶¹ Marta Caminero-Santangelo, “The Voice of the Voiceless: Religious Rhetoric, Undocumented Immigrants, and the New Sanctuary Movement in the United States,” in eds., Randy K. Lippert and Sean Rehaag, *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives: Migrations, Citizenship and Social Movements* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 82-103.

⁶² Yukich, *One Family*, 82.

⁶³ Ibid., 15.

⁶⁴ Hondagneu-Sotelo, *God’s Heart*, 149.

⁶⁵ Yukich, *One Family*, 6.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 73-74.

NMS ha excluido en gran medida a las personas sin conexiones familiares en los EUA, ha ampliado su alcance para abogar por y brindar refugio a aquellos/as que históricamente no calificarían para el asilo.⁶⁷ Los/as nuevos/as buscadores/as de santuario incluyen aquellos/as que han huido debido a la violencia de pandillas locales y economías fracasadas. Además, a diferencia de los refugiados de la década de 1980, los inmigrantes hoy generalmente no se han reportado directamente a los centros religiosos de santuario; más bien, han esperado, a veces hasta una década, hasta que son detectados por las autoridades policiales, a menudo buscados por ofensas menores (una medida hecha posible por la LRIIRI).⁶⁸

Es en gran parte por estas razones que solo unos pocos indocumentados inmigrantes han asumido importantes posiciones de liderazgo en el NMS. En pocas palabras, es demasiado arriesgado. Elvira Arellano, por ejemplo, se había convertido en un caso santuario de alto perfil y se mantuvo segura mientras permaneció dentro de la iglesia. Después de la primera parada (La Iglesia La Placita en los Ángeles) de su recorrido de iglesias santuario en los EUA, ella fue arrestada, detenida, y deportada en cuestión de horas. Además, muchos en los santuarios tienen brazaletes monitores en los tobillos, para que el ojo panóptico digital del estado pueda rastrear cuándo y si salen de las casas de culto. Aunque algunos no-Latinas/os dirigen los casos de alto perfil del NMS, las condiciones que impulsaron al NMS son similares porque mayormente tienen que ver con la respuesta de líderes religiosos a inmigrantes latinas/os. A pesar del cambio de condiciones, la valentía de los centroamericanos en la década de 1980 y hoy continúa siendo una fuente de inspiración para los líderes y quienes buscan santuario.

Aun no se ha realizado una victoria a gran escala (como aquellas en los 1990) del NMS. Bajo la administración de Obama, el NMS buscó oportunidades de ganar batallas más pequeñas. A medida que las deportaciones continuaron, el NMS luchó por la implementación de la discreción de la fiscalía en junio del 2011. El “Morton Memo” (memorando Morton) permitió que agentes de inmigración, caso por caso, tomaran en cuenta los aspectos de la vida de las personas indocumentadas (por ejemplo, un niño/a o conyugue en los EUA, contribuciones a y posición en la comunidad, etc.). Más tarde ese año, debido en gran parte al activismo y presión del NMS, el gobierno de Obama emitió un memorándum de “lugares sensibles,” que buscó asegurarse que dichas actividades (por ejemplo, “arrestos, entrevistas, registros; y solo con fines de control migratorio, vigilancia”) no ocurrieran en sitios tales como casas de culto, iglesias, matrimonios, o durante manifestaciones públicas.⁶⁹ Si bien el gobierno de Obama no aprobó ningún proyecto de ley de reforma migratoria comprensiva, una serie de memorándums anunciados en el 2012 y la Acción Ejecutiva sobre Inmigración en el 2014, parcialmente detuvieron la pesada y rápida mano del estado de deportar a personas que llegaron cuando eran niños/as y a padres de ciudadanos estadounidenses. Líderes del movimiento santuario se encontraban entre los defensores más fuertes de

⁶⁷ Ibid., 92-119; Pallares, *Family Activism*, 59-61.

⁶⁸ Noel Anderson, Interview with authors, Sahuarita, AZ, August 2018.

⁶⁹ For an exhaustive list see: John Morton “Enforcement Actions at or Focused on Sensitive Locations,” accessed January 20, 2018, <https://www.ice.gov/doclib/ero-outreach/pdf/10029.2-policy.pdf>.

las acciones del presidente.⁷⁰ Sin embargo, la vulnerabilidad y fragilidad de esas acciones se hicieron evidentes poco después que Trump asumiera el cargo.

El Nuevo Movimiento Santuario y el Santuario Secular: Una segunda ola

Así como el proyecto de ley Sensenbrenner y las leyes de reforma migratoria comprehensiva del 2006 y 2007 galvanizaron el NMS, la elección de Trump en el 2016 encontró resistencia en lo que estamos identificando como la segunda ola del NMS. A partir del 2019, este continúa creciendo debido a la indignación pública por sus comentarios inflamatorios en contra de las comunidades latinx, y mientras su política de cero tolerancia con respecto a la inmigración indocumentada está en efecto. Como parte de esta segunda ola, líderes religiosos y activistas han tenido que responder a las circunstancias políticas que, especialmente en los niveles presidenciales, difiere enormemente de los orígenes del NMS a mediados de la década del 2000. En lo que queda de este artículo, intentamos describir ese cambio de marea en el NMS, impulsado particularmente por la segunda ola.

En la segunda ola del NMS, el discurso de “ciudades santuario” ha resurgido con un debate intensificado. Mientras la práctica moderna de las ciudades estadounidenses declarándose “santuarios” se remonta a la era de la Guerra de Vietnam (durante la que Boston famosamente se declaró ser una de ellas), en la década de 1980 la nación fue testigo de una oleada de ciudades santuario en áreas donde inmigrantes llegaban regularmente (en particular San Francisco y Los Ángeles) haciendo declaraciones similares con la esperanza de proteger los regímenes sanguinarios en América Central.⁷¹ Justo cuando el NMS se estaba desarrollando en medio de debates nacionales sobre inmigración, los activistas comenzaron a presionar cada vez por jurisdicciones santuario. Esto fue especialmente cierto a partir de la aprobación de la Ley de Reforma de Inmigración Ilegal y Responsabilidad del Inmigrante del 2006 (particularmente la implementación de la sección 287(g) que buscaba expandir y fortalecer los esfuerzos de deportación del estado autorizando a oficiales de la policía a nivel local, estatal, y federal de poder arrestar y entregar inmigrantes indocumentados a ICA). Por ejemplo, en el 2006, en el parque Tacoma, en Washington, los esfuerzos del jefe de la policía de implementar la sección 287(g) fracasaron en la ciudad que, en 1985, se había declarado ser una ciudad santuario.⁷² Dos años después, el gobierno de Bush implementó el programa “Comunidades Seguras”, un programa más completo que la sección 287(g), que involucraba a la policía local, estatal, y federal, ICA, y el Departamento de Seguridad Nacional.⁷³ Bajo este programa, el país fue testigo de redadas masivas de personas indocumentados. El gobierno de Obama continuó el programa (pero lo reenforzó

⁷⁰ Orozco and Anderson, “Sanctuary in the Age of Trump.”

⁷¹ Cunningham, *God and Caesar*, 81.

⁷² Rabben, *Sanctuary and Asylum*, 250.

⁷³ Sostenemos que el término “comunidades seguras” descansa en una vieja noción de que inmigrantes (especialmente los indocumentados) son una amenaza siempre presente en el cuerpo político de los EUA. Ver Leo R. Chavez, *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2008).

deportando a personas consideradas una amenaza a las comunidades) hasta que su gobierno terminó en el 2014.

El presidente Trump no desperdició tiempo para colocar “el santuario” en el discurso nacional. El renovó y redefinió el significado de “comunidades seguras” como una de las primeras órdenes ejecutivas que el firmó menos de una semana después que asumió su cargo. Él se dirigió a las “jurisdicciones santuario,” que son ciudades, condados, y estados que tienen acuerdos de no divulgar el estatus migratorio de las personas y se rehúsan a trabajar con las autoridades federales de inmigración.⁷⁴ Estas designaciones de ciudades santuario a menudo han funcionado para desafiar las políticas nacionales, ya que el estatus de santuario se obtiene a través de tres fuentes principales: por legislación aprobada por un consejo municipal, por iniciativa burocrática por el departamento de la policía, o por una orden de la alcaldía.⁷⁵ Recordando las amenazas hechas en contra de las ciudades en la década de 1980,⁷⁶ el gobierno de Trump ha propuesto retener el subsidio federal de las ciudades, condados y estados que elijan preservar antiguas y nuevas medidas santuario, lo cual ha servido para intimidar ciertas jurisdicciones y evitar que aprueben medidas santuario incluso en lugares con una proporción bastante alta de inmigrantes.⁷⁷ Estas órdenes ejecutivas y su larga animosidad hacia las jurisdicciones santuario motivó que más personas se unieran a los esfuerzos del movimiento santuario, tanto en entornos seculares como.⁷⁸

Las ciudades, condados, y estados no fueron las únicas entidades no religiosas que montaron resistencia a la retórica de Trump. Los campus universitarios respondieron rápidamente a la elección de Trump y lo que su ascenso como la cabeza de la nación significaba para los estudiantes de DACA (ADLI-Acción Diferida para los Llegados en la Infancia). El tipo de santuario que se ofrece en los campus escolares se basa en el paradigma de la jurisdicción santuario en que la policía y los oficiales del campus no cumplen con los agentes de ICA. La declaración de santuario en las escuelas parece diferir poco de las declaraciones oficiales que ofrecen apoyo a estudiantes indocumentados.⁷⁹ El término “santuario” en los campus escolares es ciertamente

⁷⁴ Este fue una de las tres órdenes ejecutivas emitidas en su primera semana de tratar con el asunto de inmigración. See Donald J. Trump, “Executive Order: Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States,” section 10(a), (Jan 25, 2017), accessed September 7, 2018, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-enhancing-public-safety-interior-united-states/>.

⁷⁵ Melvin Delgado, *Sanctuary Cities, Communities, and Organizations: A Nation at a Crossroads*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), 107.

⁷⁶ Chinchilla, Hamilton, Loucky, “The Sanctuary Movement in Los Angeles,” 117.

⁷⁷ Un número de ciudades en los condados históricamente conservadores de California (por ejemplo, Kern y Orange) votaron en contra de designar a sus condados con estatus de santuario. Ver Matt Boone, “Arvin City Council Votes Against ‘Sanctuary City’ Status” *Eyewitness News* (February 22, 2017), accessed September 8, 2018, <https://bakersfieldnow.com/news/local/arvin-city-council-votes-against-sanctuary-status>; “3 More California Cities Vote to Opt Out of State’s Sanctuary Law” *Fox News* (April 12, 2018), accessed September 8, 2018, <http://insider.foxnews.com/2018/04/12/13-california-cities-now-fighting-states-sanctuary-law>.

⁷⁸ Fife, “No Middle Ground,” 20-27.

⁷⁹ Por ejemplo ver Natalie Gross, “UC David Center a ‘Sanctuary’ for Undocumented Students” Education Writers Association, (February 17, 2015), accessed September 20, 2018, <https://www.ewa.org/blog-latino-ed-beat/uc-center-sanctuary-undocumented-students>.

nebuloso y muchos administradores se niegan a apropiarse del lenguaje de santuario. Por ejemplo, el presidente de Harvard, el profesor Drew G. Faust reiteró las preocupaciones acerca del significado poco claro de lo que realmente santuario significa en los campus universitarios, diciendo que “el estatus de un campo santuario no tiene significado legal ni una definición clara. No ofrece protección real a los estudiantes. Me preocupa que de hecho ofrece una garantía falsa y engañosa.”⁸⁰

Mantenemos que, esa “seguridad falsa y engañosa” está basada en una comparación implícita con la verdadera y ya probada eficacia de las casas de culto que brindan santuario (en la forma de albergue) a individuos. La ministra de justicia social en la Pilgrim United Church of Christ (Iglesia Unida Peregrina de Cristo) en Carlsbad, California Anna Runion, manifestó su preocupación con la forma en que el movimiento secular había estratégicamente adoptado el término “santuario”. Ella cree que el nombre es inapropiado por el hecho que campus y ciudades santuario no ofrecen las mismas protecciones que las casas de oración santuario. Ella sostiene que el término “santuario” lleva consigo un significado religioso que se ha convertido en una tradición cultural más amplia.⁸¹ El término “santuario” intenta invocar el peso del historial de santuario religioso como herramienta discursiva para señalar las capas de “protección” en una jurisdicción santuario. Hay ciudades, pueblos y campus que no trabajan con las autoridades de inmigración y funcionan como jurisdicciones santuario, pero eligen no etiquetarse como “santuario. Algunas ciudades y pueblos pueden no etiquetarse así mismas de una manera que implique que protegen a inmigrantes indocumentados, mientras que otras pueden elegir diferentes etiquetas como ciudades “acogedoras” o no tienen preferencia por el término que se aplica.⁸² La observación de la ministra Runion probablemente se debe al hecho de que muchas personas indocumentadas han sido víctimas de las redadas en las “ciudades santuario,” mientras las casas de culto no han sido comprometidas (a pesar de que algunos dudosos informes titulados como noticias dicen lo contrario).⁸³ Que la imagen y lenguaje de “santuario” a menudo se malinterprete en los medios públicos se debe a varios malentendidos. Villazor sostiene que el santuario desde la década de 1980 ha asumido una connotación cada vez más negativa entre los políticamente conservadores y que muchos han fallado en delinear la diferencia entre santuarios “públicos” (ciudades, estados, etc.) y “privados” (iglesias, sinagogas, etc.).⁸⁴ Tramonte contiene que el desarrollo del término en estos espacios “públicos” es mayormente un nombre inapropiado, y que mejor se describe como

⁸⁰ Hannah Natanson, “Faust Says Harvard Will Not Be a ‘Sanctuary Campus’” *The Harvard Crimson* (December 7, 2018), accessed September 20, 2018, <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2016/12/7/faust-sanctuary-campus-policy/>.

⁸¹ Anna Runion, Interview with Tatyana Castillo-Ramos, San Diego, CA, August 2018.

⁸² Delgado, *Sanctuary Cities*, 109.

⁸³ Jack Jenkins, “ICE Agents Arrest 6 People Seeking Shelter from the Cold at a Church” *ThinkProgress* (February 16, 2017), accessed September 7, 2018, <https://thinkprogress.org/ice-agents-arrested-6-men-as-they-left-a-church-run-hypothermia-shelter-1d1c09f4c2b2/>; Meredith Hoffman, “US Immigration Sting on Church Breaks with Policy on ‘Sensitive Locations,’” *Vice News* (February 17, 2016), accessed September 7, 2018, <https://news.vice.com/article/us-immigration-sting-on-church-breaks-with-policy-on-sensitive-locations>.

⁸⁴ Rose Cuison Villazor, “What is Sanctuary?” *Southern Methodist University Law Review*, 61(133), 2008.

“política de vigilancia comunitaria.”⁸⁵ Otro miembro del clero, Reverendo Francisco García, de la Iglesia episcopal Holy Faith (Santa Fe) en Inglewood, no está de acuerdo con la exclusividad religiosa del término, ya que considera santuario cuando alguien está seguro/a en la comunidad, y no solamente adentro de la casa de adoración.⁸⁶ Mientras ciertamente no hay consenso sobre quien debería de usar el término, hay ciertamente un entendimiento sobre la eficacia de santuario en unos contextos sobre otros.

Los santuarios seculares, es decir “públicos,” no son necesariamente refugios seguros, y los límites de sus políticas de protección han sido probadas repetidamente. Mientras que aquellos que activamente buscan santuario en casas de oración siempre han permanecido seguros, aquellos en jurisdicciones santuario realmente no han estado seguros. Para que una jurisdicción santuario funcione efectivamente como “santuario” para los inmigrantes indocumentados, cada institución dentro de la jurisdicción debe de estar de acuerdo con la declaración y debe aceptar cumplir con las políticas de tipo santuario (lo cual no siempre es así).⁸⁷ Los agentes de ICA han llevado a cabo detenciones y deportaciones a gran escala en las ciudades santuario de California desde finales del 2017.⁸⁸ El Reverendo Fife sostiene que las ciudades santuario, condados, y estados son el nuevo frente del movimiento, pero que santuarios religiosos continúan siendo el fundamento y último recurso. Los roles se han invertido desde el Movimiento Santuario de la década de los 1980 cuando centros religiosos estaban al frente y las ciudades santuarios les apoyaban.⁸⁹ Además, a medida que el Departamento de Justicia continúa luchando vigorosamente con las ciudades santuario (creyendo que albergan criminales violentos), la seguridad de los santuarios religiosos permanece intactos y es probablemente la última frontera de seguridad del movimiento santuario.⁹⁰

La raíz de los espacios santuario son los santuarios religiosos, ya sean iglesias, templos, o, más recientemente, mezquitas. La naturaleza religiosa de dichos espacios les otorga un estatus especial que ningún espacio secular parece poder alcanzar. Las formulaciones del espacio sagrado en lugares como los santuarios religiosos nos recuerdan de las formas en las que santuarios estadounidenses son espacios sagrados “situacionales,” un término descrito por David Chidester y Edward Linenthal como sitios que han “localizado lo sagrado en el nexo entre prácticas humanas y proyectos sociales.”⁹¹ El trabajo de la empresa humana a través de la consagración ritual es lo que otorga a los santuarios religiosos su estatus único como espacios sagrados. Santuarios,

⁸⁵ Lynn Tramonte, *Debunking the Myth of “Sanctuary Cities”: Community Policing Protects American Communities* (Washington D.C: Immigration Policy Center, (2011).

⁸⁶ Francisco García, Interview with Tatyana Castillo-Ramos, Los Angeles, CA, August 2018.

⁸⁷ Delgado, *Sanctuary Cities*, 107.

⁸⁸ Joel Rubin, “ICE Arrests Hundreds of Immigrants in ‘Sanctuary Cities’ around the Nation, California” *Los Angeles Times* (September 28, 2017), accessed September 18, 2018, <http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ice-raids-sanctuary-20170928-story.html>.

⁸⁹ Fife, Interview.

⁹⁰ Un estudio reciente evidencia una relación “nula” y “negativa” entre las ciudades santuario y el crimen. Ver Daniel E. Martínez, Ricardo D. Martínez-Schuldt, Guillermo Cantor, “Providing Sanctuary or Fostering Crime? A Review of the Research on “Sanctuary Cities” and Crime, *Sociology Compass* 12, 1 (January 2018).

⁹¹ David Chidester and Edward T. Linenthal, “Introduction” in eds. David Chidester and Edward T. Linenthal, *American Sacred Space* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1995), 5.

paraísos, lugares de refugio, et., son acordonados y hechos sagrados no solamente porque personas “religiosas” lo dicen, sino por profundas inversiones culturales. Estas inversiones culturales, en el caso de santuario, se refuerzan aún más mediante apelaciones a leyes superiores / divinas. De acuerdo a la configuración de Jonathan Z. Smith de teoría ritual del espacio sagrado, “el lugar es sacralizado como resultado de la labor cultural del ritual, en situaciones históricas específicas, que requiere un arduo trabajo de atención, memoria, diseño, construcción, y control del lugar.”⁹² La lectura de la declaración del santuario en Mayo 24 de 1982 fue un acto ritual en una situación histórica en la que líderes del santuario, por el bien de inmigrantes centroamericanos, buscaron “tomar control del lugar.” Declarar santuario es un asunto polémico, y un ejemplo de espacio sagrado como “espacio disputado.”⁹³ “La declaración de 1982 describió los términos de la disputa con bastante claridad: La administración de la ley de EUA prohíbe albergar a estos refugiados de América Central. Por lo tanto, creemos que la administración de la ley es inmoral e ilegal.” Entonces, la resistencia sagrada se movilizó en espacios sagrados y continúa hasta hoy.

Las amenazas de Trump en contra de las comunidades y ciudades han encontrado una ola renovada de resistencia sagrada. Un ejemplo de santuario religioso provocado por motivaciones religiosas antiguas y políticas recientes es el activismo de la Pilgrim United Church of Christ en Carlsbad, California. Esta congregación tradicionalmente blanca es dirigida por el Reverendo Madison Shockley, un pastor negro que ha estado envuelto en múltiples esfuerzos de justicia social. La iglesia también tiene su propio ministro que se especializa en el ministerio de jóvenes y de justicia social, Anna Runion. Yo (Tatyana) escuché por primera vez a Runion en la manifestación antes mencionada en San Diego. En esta manifestación, ella habló desde dentro de la multitud en ambos inglés y español, traduciendo ella misma sus declaraciones para alcanzar especialmente a la población latinx en el mitin. Aunque la congregación ha estado activa en el trabajo por los derechos de los inmigrantes por más de veinticinco años, Runion compartió que la iglesia había decidido ofrecer santuario oficialmente en el 2016, en gran parte como respuesta a la elección de Trump. Runion cita la historia de enseñanzas de justicia social de la United Church of Christ (UCC) (Iglesia Unida de Cristo) como parte de la razón por la cual su congregación se sintió obligada a ofrecer santuario públicamente. Ella, además, abordó los fundamentos teológicos que apoyan las acciones de su congregación:

Mucha gente en la congregación tiene trasfondo de la teología de la liberación, o una especie de fundamento, por lo que entendemos a Dios como dios de justicia, y que Dios está del lado de las personas que son oprimidas. Nosotros somos las manos y los pies de Dios y eso no va a suceder sin nosotros. Y qué si no es una respuesta concreta en nuestro contexto actual, ¡no importa! ¿Qué importa si vamos al cielo? Si Dios no está salvando a las personas ahora de la opresión, ¿de qué sirve eso?⁹⁴

Sin embargo, ningún/a inmigrante ha aceptado la invitación de santuario en la Pilgrim United Church of Christ (en la forma de albergue). Runion cree que los

⁹² Ibid., 6.

⁹³ Ibid., 15.

⁹⁴ Runion, Interview.

abogados están reacios a usar santuarios en casos de inmigración para sus clientes, porque directamente denuncia y desafía el sistema de inmigración (uno que es ahora particularmente hostil) y no es una medida “estratégica”. Sin embargo, ella y su congregación permanecen confiados que teniendo la opción de santuario durante un tiempo cuando los sistemas de inmigración están en proceso de cambio es la cosa correcta (y justa) de hacer.

En esta segunda ola del NMS, la elección de Trump ha motivado las congregaciones a actuar colectivamente y en todas las parroquias para movilizar la resistencia sagrada. El sacerdote episcopal Reverendo Francisco García compartió conmigo (Tatyana) que, en respuesta a la elección del presidente Trump, el redactó una resolución para que la diócesis episcopal de la región de Los Ángeles se pudiese convertir en santuario. Tres semanas después de la elección en el 2016, el Reverendo García compartió la resolución en la convención diocesana de Los Ángeles, donde descubrió, después de un debate, “que había un apoyo unánime para adoptar esta resolución.” Él se recuerda que “uno de los momentos más conmovedores fue cuando la primer sacerdote DREAMER compartió su testimonio en frente de mil personas. Y ella verdaderamente conmovió los corazones y las mentes para que pudiéramos decir sí, aquí es donde debemos estar de pie.”⁹⁵ Como resultado de la elección de Trump, el clero episcopal en el área de Los Ángeles lanzó un movimiento llamado “Resistencia Sagrada”, que está comprometido a ofrecer santuario a través de una amplia gama de prácticas.⁹⁶ El Reverendo García ahora copreside este grupo de trabajo “para poder ayudar a nuestras iglesias a ser santuarios en todo tipo de formas diferentes,”⁹⁷ ya sea a través de acompañamiento, activismo, y ofrecer santuario completo.

Mientras es verdad que, en cualquier momento, los agentes de ICA pueden legalmente arrestar a alguien tomando santuario, tal como está ahora, santuarios religiosos ofrecen un ejemplo de santuario como una “inversión de poder”⁹⁸ en la que se detiene la mano que deporta del casi omnipotente estado, y, en cierta medida, se le suspende. Centros religiosos, el “último recurso” del NMS, ciertamente tiene capas de historia, memoria, y carácter sagrado que se les otorga ahora por décadas de consagración. Las congregaciones ofreciendo santuario continúan creciendo en número, en parte, debido a la reciente participación de actores tradicionalmente apáticos.

Involucramiento en el frente evangélico

Al enfatizar la centralidad de mantener las familias juntas, al principio el NMS comenzó efectivamente a establecer un puente con los evangélicos, quienes históricamente han sido defensores de medidas contra la inmigración. Al tomar esta medida, la izquierda religiosa redefinió lo que “*debería* significar ser religioso” en los

⁹⁵ García, Interview.

⁹⁶ See the LA Sacred Resistance Website, accessed February 7, 2019, www.lasacredresistance.org; “LA to Become an Sanctuary Diocese” *Episcopal Café*, accessed February 7, 2019, www.episcopalcafe.com/la-to-become-a-sanctuary-diocese/.

⁹⁷ García, Interview.

⁹⁸ Chidester and Linenthal, “Introduction,” 19.

EUA y mostró que los conservadores no controlan el discurso sobre la familia. Esta medida resonó especialmente con los Evangélicos latinos/os, y después presionó a líderes evangélicos blancos como Richard Land, el exlíder de la Convención Bautista del Sur, a moverse a una postura más simpatética a favor de la inmigración, pero lo hicieron en sus propios términos.⁹⁹ En Los Ángeles, por ejemplo, los evangélicos no se unieron a las filas de los movimientos progresivos como CLUJE o TIJ, pero sí formaron alianzas de reforma migratoria.¹⁰⁰ Hoy vemos un gran número de pentecostales y evangélicos de origen latinoamericano buscando santuario como también Iglesias pentecostales y evangélicas latinas ofreciendo santuario a varios niveles, desde tipos oficiales de santuario hasta formas de hospitalidad y solidaridad más *de facto* ofrecidas en los “márgenes públicos”.¹⁰¹

Un esfuerzo bipartidista compuesto de veteranos y recién llegados del Movimiento Santuario, y clero de iglesias protestantes antiguas y evangélicas, se ha cristalizado en la era de Trump. Llamándose así mismo el Movimiento Mateo 25, sus miembros/as “se comprometen a apoyar y defender el vulnerable nombre de Jesús.”¹⁰² El Movimiento Mateo 25 parece ofrecer a los evangélicos un número de recursos para conceptualizar santuario y abogacía general por los inmigrantes, prácticas tradicionalmente liberales. Santuario, según la Reverenda Alexia Salvatierra (“madrina” del Movimiento Mateo 25) y Peter Heltzel, tuvo éxito en la década de 1980 porque fue fundado sobre “un conjunto uniforme de criterios que fueron desarrollados y preservados independientemente de las alianzas políticas.”¹⁰³

En la conferencia del Movimiento Mateo 25 en agosto pasado del 2018, los organizadores y activistas se encontraron en una iglesia de Los Ángeles para discutir su plan de acción y activismo en un ambiente cada vez más hostil hacia los inmigrantes indocumentados. La conferencia atrajo a una audiencia y una lista de oradores diversos, y juntos participaron de himnos y liturgia en inglés y español. Las oraciones, canciones, y sermones reforzaron la importancia de “acompañamiento,” una piedra angular del NMS.¹⁰⁴ “Acompañamiento” es un término amplio, pero en gran parte se refiere a estar presente para ayudar a los inmigrantes indocumentados, ya sea que se trate de ir con un

⁹⁹ Yukich, *One Family*, 107-108.

¹⁰⁰ Hondagneu-Sotelo, *God's Heart*, 124.

¹⁰¹ Ramírez nos recuerda de como las congregaciones pentecostales han ofrecido un tipo de solidaridad *de facto* (lean: santuario) y como pentecostales latinos indocumentados viven entre dos públicos: el margen público (ofrecido por los espacios seguros de las iglesias) y el margen general público (generalmente hostil hacia los indocumentados). Desde la década de los 1980, las iglesias pentecostales latinas han asistido a feligreses por medio de un sistema altamente informal de ofrecer solidaridad, lugar seguro, hospitalidad, y evasión de las autoridades migratorias. Ver Daniel Ramírez, “Public Lives in Hispanic Latino Churches: Expanding the Paradigm” in Espinosa, Gaston, Virgilio Elizondo, and Jesse Miranda, *Latino Religions and Civic Activism*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 177-196; Gabriella Borter, “Under Trump, More Churches Offer Sanctuary but Few Seek Refuge” *Reuters* (August 1, 2017), accessed August 26, 2018, <https://www.reuters.com/article/usa-immigration-sanctuary/under-trump-more-churches-offer-sanctuary-but-few-seek-refuge-idUSL1N1KNODN>.

¹⁰² “What We Do,” *Matthew 25*, accessed September 8, 2018, <https://www.matthew25socal.org/whatwedo/>.

¹⁰³ Alexia Salvatierra and Peter Heltzel, *Faith-Rooted Organizing: Mobilizing the Church in Service to the World* (Downers Grove IL: InterVarsity Press, 2014), 22.

¹⁰⁴ Yukich, *One Family*, 82-87.

inmigrante a una audiencia de la corte de inmigración o mostrarle el vecindario a una familia que acaba de salir del centro de detención. En resumen, acompañamiento es una manera de demostrar apoyo a los inmigrantes a un nivel personal e individual. Además, los oradores en la conferencia notaron las dificultades con el involucramiento de la iglesia con el activismo de santuario. Ya que las iglesias latinas son impactadas por las duras políticas de inmigración, hay temor de hablar y de llamar la atención a las comunidades afectadas. Esto podría ser un riesgo que las puede llevar a ser voces más calladas en los movimientos de derechos de los inmigrantes. Una de las propuestas discutidas en la conferencia fue formar alianzas intencionales entre las iglesias blancas e iglesias latinas, ya que las iglesias blancas tienen el privilegio de no ser catalogadas racialmente por las autoridades de inmigración o de ser directamente afectadas por sus políticas, mientras que las iglesias latinas son mucho más impactadas por la realidad cotidiana de comunidades de indocumentados. No queda claro si esta alianza entre estas iglesias dará como resultado un mayor diálogo en los EUA.

La política partidista todavía influye en cómo las congregaciones religiosas escogen involucrarse. Por ejemplo, Samuel Rodríguez, el líder de la Conferencia Nacional de Liderazgo Cristiano Hispano (CNLCH) históricamente conservadora, ha hecho de su iglesia un “refugio seguro,” que no debe confundirse con santuario. Rodríguez comentó en un artículo del primero de marzo de 2017: “La ansiedad en las iglesias conservadoras y evangélicas ha crecido exponencialmente, porque muchos de sus feligreses, muchas de las familias que servimos, muchas de las familias en nuestras bancas, bien puede que no tengan la documentación apropiada, a pesar de que tenemos una política de no preguntar y no decir,”¹⁰⁵ Rodríguez, ahora en el consejo de asesoramiento espiritual, parece estar intentando dividir los cuernos del dilema en santuario. Ofrecer santuario parecería ser un conflicto de intereses que lo pondría en una enemistad contra Trump, y no ofrecer recursos a los evangélicos latinos lo haría traicionar la defensa declarada por él y por la CNLCH. Estos dilemas no son necesariamente nuevos ni únicamente cristianos. La rabina Devorah Marcus, una fuerte crítica de la práctica de separación y detención de niños/as por el gobierno de Trump, compartió que aunque su sinagoga tiene muchos miembros conservadores, ella le aclaró a los congregantes que ella continúa protestando como rabina porque “este no es un asunto de partido político, este es un asunto humano, este es un asunto religioso, y como judíos, este es un asunto judío.”¹⁰⁶ A menudo, las congregaciones tienen que caminar una línea fina de querer ayudar a inmigrantes indocumentados pero también respetar los miembros conservadores cuyas creencias políticas no se alinean con los valores del NMS.

Motivaciones políticas y religiosas

El letargo con el que el MNS se ha movido dentro de las esquinas evangélicas nos hace recordar que santuario nunca ha existido en el vacío, sino que se proclama y se vive en contextos políticos. En esta segunda ola del NMS, la retórica antiinmigrante del

¹⁰⁵ Elizabeth Dias, “Donald Trump’s Inaugural Pastor Creates ‘Safe Havens’ for Immigrants” *Time* (March 1, 2017), accessed September 8, 2018, <http://time.com/4686592/donald-trump-immigration-sam-rodriguez-church/>.

¹⁰⁶ Rabbi Devorah Marcus, Interview with Tatyana Castillo-Ramos, San Diego, CA, August 2018.

gobierno de Trump está obligando a las congregaciones a (re)accionar. Todos/as los entrevistados/as señalaron que el estado actual de los asuntos políticos, particularmente la inauguración de Trump y de sus posturas antiinmigrantes, les obligó a participar (o a redoblar sus esfuerzos) en el NMS. Las Reverendas Kathleen Owens y Tania Márquez declararon que ofrecer santuario era su forma de enviar un mensaje de su desaprobación de las políticas de inmigración de Trump.¹⁰⁷ Cabe notar que los trabajadores en los santuarios en la década de 1980 también conceptualizaron santuario como una forma de resistencia al gobierno de Reagan, que los llevó a diferencias fundamentales en la forma en que abordaron santuario y preguntaron si el movimiento debería ser motivado por esfuerzos de cuidado humanitarios (a veces privado) o esfuerzos políticos de sensibilización pública.¹⁰⁸

Esto nos lleva a considerar la pregunta sobre las motivaciones de cualquier congregación para ofrecer santuario en la era de Trump: ¿Se ofrece santuario por motivaciones políticas o religiosas, o ambas? ¿Son las congregaciones a favor de los inmigrantes o anti-Trump? Las motivaciones para involucrarse en el NMS varían y existen dentro de un espectro mayor que en una noción dicotómica de ser puramente políticas o religiosas. Mientras algunos enfatizan que su fe es lo que les empujó a denunciar las políticas actuales, otros sienten la necesidad de aprovechar su capital social como institución religiosa para hacer declaraciones públicas más firmes. Aquí, la conceptualización de Yukich del NMS como un “movimiento social con múltiples objetivos” es particularmente aplicable en la forma de la que los participantes en el NMS esperan influir a una gama de personas e instituciones, y también proporciona un entendimiento preliminar de las motivaciones por las que individuos se involucran. En última instancia, la acción de declaraciones públicas de santuario en casas de adoración es simultáneamente un acto político y basado en la fe, aunque las motivaciones subyacentes por las que una congregación ofrece santuario puedan tener una base más política que otras.

Sanctuary Lite (Santuario ligero)

Representantes de todas partes del país se reunieron en Chicago en enero del 2007 para discutir qué incluiría el “nuevo santuario”. Más allá del método tradicional de albergar personas indocumentadas como una táctica, los líderes propusieron varias formas de apoyo incluyendo abogacía política, ministración, y asistencia a las personas tomando santuario en las iglesias.¹⁰⁹ Una de las más recientes innovaciones del Movimiento Santuario es la práctica de “Sanctuary lite,” Sanctuary Lite, como lo describe el Reverendo William “Bill” Jenkins en San Diego, es el hecho de proveer

¹⁰⁷ Kathleen Owens and Tania Márquez, Interview with Tatyana Castillo-Ramos, San Diego, CA, August 2018.

¹⁰⁸ Bau, *This Ground is Holy*, 29-37; Cunningham, *God and Caesar*, 35-43. Fife también nos describió el caso de una pareja guatemalteca joven que huyeron al ser testigos de mucha violencia cometida en contra de los pueblos indígenas. Deseando mantenerlos juntos, Fife los envió a Chicago, pero el GRTC mostró reticencia para proporcionar santuario a la pareja debido a la falta de historias por testigos oculares de la violencia en la tierra y porque sus testimonios no podían ser usados efectivamente en los esfuerzos del GRTC de sensibilización pública. Ver Fife, interview.

¹⁰⁹ Pallares, *Family Activism*, 41.

hospedaje a un migrante o a una familia migrante patrocinada desde un centro de detención. A menudo, los/as migrantes participando en Sanctuary Lite son aplicantes de asilo quienes son detenidos a pesar del hecho que se entregan voluntariamente en la frontera. De hecho, Sanctuary Lite no es una opción viable para inmigrantes indocumentados que necesitan más protección inmediata de la ley. La Safe Harbor Network (Red de Puertos Seguros) del Reverendo Jenkins es un ejemplo de la expansión de lo que significa proveer santuario en el NMS. El Reverendo Jenkins señaló que, aunque él había presentado el concepto de Sanctuary Lite en las conferencias religiosas a principios del 2016, fue solamente después de la elección de Trump que la Safe Harbors Network recibieron una nueva ola de apoyo. La Safe Harbors Network patrocina migrantes que están detenidos en centros de detención. El promedio de la fianza para una persona en detención es de \$3,000, una cantidad irrazonable para el refugiado promedio. El costo varía según como se percibe el riesgo de escaparse del migrante, pero puede costar hasta \$20,000 dólares. El Reverendo afirma que muchos de los refugiados y migrantes en centros de detención tienen menos de \$5.00 dólares en sus bolsillos y simplemente no pueden pagar esta fianza por sí solos. Si son lo suficientemente afortunados, ellos tendrán familia o amigos en los EUA can pueden patrocinarlos. Pero sin eso, ellos están atrapados en los centros de detención hasta que su caso pueda ser procesado, que algunas veces puede tomar años. La Safe Harbors Network tiene un fondo para patrocinar a los migrantes para ser liberados de los centros de detención y proporcionarles alojamiento. “Para mí, lo primer cosa que un refugiado necesita es una cama,” explicó el Reverendo Jenkins, “porque dentro de doce horas el sol se pondrá...y si uno no tiene una cama, estará en un mundo de dolor.”¹¹⁰

El Sanctuary Lite busca operar siguiendo las líneas de colaboración y acompañamiento. Una de las diferencias entre Sanctuary Lite y santuario tradicional es que en Sanctuary Lite tanto las iglesias como laicos ofrecen espacio donde los migrantes se puedan quedar, una estrategia cada vez más común en el NMS. En el pasado, cuando el Movimiento Santuario se enfocó en inmigrantes indocumentados que acababan de cruzar la frontera, los laicos no podían clamar la tradición de santuario a fin de prevenir que el SIN (ahora ICA) entrara a sus casas. Fue en gran parte por su estatus social y su capital que las casas de adoración pudieron “trazar la línea alrededor [de sus] edificios y decir, ‘este es terreno de Dios’” así que “ustedes no pueden cruzar esta línea.”¹¹¹ Sin embargo, debido a que los que utilizan Sanctuary Lite son aplicantes de asilo y son patrocinados desde los centros de detención, ellos/ellas están cumpliendo con la ley y por lo mismo no corren el riesgo de ser deportados a menos que se pierdan una cita con la corte o infrinjan alguna otra condición de su libertad, como quitarse el brazaletes del tobillo. La Reverenda Runion describe el Sanctuary Lite como trabajar con la ley en lugar de contra la ley. Esto significa que ciudadanos ordinarios que quieren involucrarse pueden ofrecer espacio en sus hogares a migrantes recién llegados. Casas de adoración aún pueden participar en este mismo programa ofreciendo espacio, tiempo y energía a los aplicantes de asilo y familias de refugiados. Además, aquellos que participan la Safe Harbors Network pueden especificar cuanto tiempo ellos/as hospedarán migrantes en sus hogares o casas de adoración. Esto es diferente a las iglesias que ofrecen santuario

¹¹⁰ William “Bill” Jenkins, Interview with Tatyana Castillo-Ramos, San Diego, CA, July 2018.

¹¹¹ Jenkins, Interview.

en forma tradicional, donde una vez un/a migrante entra ya no es seguro que salgan de la casa de adoración hasta que su caso ha sido resuelto. Esto puede tomar un largo tiempo porque los casos en la corte pueden prolongarse por años.

Santuario es un gran compromiso tanto para los inmigrantes indocumentados buscando refugio como para las congregaciones que les albergan. El Reverendo Jenkins aboga por Sanctuary Lite como una manera de la que una congregación puede aún ayudar a los migrantes al hospedarlos en sus casas de adoración, pero sin el compromiso (de albergar) a largo plazo que el santuario completo requiere. Este es una opción para congregaciones que tienen miembros que están preocupados de la legalidad de albergar inmigrantes indocumentados, porque este método cumple los estándares de ICA. De hecho, el Reverendo Jenkins notó que las autoridades de inmigración a veces contactan su organización con casos especiales, como cuando una mujer está embarazada o una familia está detenida, para que estos/as gasten el menos tiempo posible en detención.

Sanctuary Lite tiene sus propios desafíos: las barreras del idioma, compromisos financieros, el compartimiento de viviendas, el mantener el balance entre trabajo, vida, y ser anfitrión, y la labor emocional y psicológica, son todas las dificultades que potencialmente se pueden encontrar cuando se hospeda a un migrante. Sin el apoyo de una organización mayor como la Safe Harbors Network, las familias y las congregaciones que reciben refugiados pueden tener sus recursos demasiado esparcidos. Los feligreses de un pastor (no afiliados con la Safe Harbors Network) recibieron a dos familias de refugiados, y señalaron que una de las partes más difíciles, pero más importante del hospedaje es aprender a establecer límites sobre la duración de la estadía, la estructuración de los horarios diarios, y los arreglos de vida, convirtiéndolo, como un ministro lo puso, en un “trabajo de tiempo completo.” La participación en el Sanctuary Lite es una manera de ayudar a familias migrantes mientras cumplen las leyes de inmigración. Mientras no es equivalente al santuario de albergue como una forma directa de resistencia al estado, eso no minimiza el compromiso, esfuerzo, o la intención de quienes participan en el Sanctuary Lite. Aunque difiere del santuario tradicional, es una forma de acompañar que representa un compromiso enorme por el/la anfitrión/a, y cambia la vida de quienes son ayudados.

Conclusión

Estas reflexiones sobre el Movimiento Santuario de la década de 1980, el NMS y su segunda ola, nos llevan de regresos a las dos pancartas en la Iglesia Presbiteriana de Southside en Tucson. El de la izquierda (“LA MIGRA NO PROFANA EL SANTUARIO”) es cierto en que los santuarios no han sido profanados por oficiales de inmigración. La pancarta a la derecha (“ESTE ES EL SANTUARIO DE DIOS PARA LOS OPRIMIDOS DE CENTRO AMERICA”), aunque todavía lleva un mensaje que es la base del Movimiento Santuario en los EUA, ha asumido una declaración más amplia. Santuario, aunque basado en la historia de los centroamericanos buscando seguridad, es ahora más diverso y más globalizado a medida que personas de todo el mundo participan de sus muchas formas de resistencia sagrada. Un creciente número de mexicanos han buscado

santuario y ha habido casos de rusos,¹¹² indonesios,¹¹³ y albaneses,¹¹⁴ que también siguen su ejemplo.¹¹⁵ Sin embargo, los latinx aun constituyen la mayoría de los buscadores de santuario y, cada vez más, están tomando la dirección como líderes del movimiento santuario.

A medida que el NMS continúa expandiéndose y hasta que pueda lograr victorias decisivas, seguirá cambiando en representación, voces, y rostros. Los líderes del NMS quieren que aquellas personas que piden santuario sean el rostro y la voz del movimiento.¹¹⁶ En cierta manera este ha sido el caso, pero el NMS todavía lucha con la afirmación de ser caracterizado como una “organización de derechos de inmigrantes sin inmigrantes.”¹¹⁷ Los líderes del NMS continúan buscando formas de salvar las desconexiones culturales y teológicas. Quizás el problema más grande es la cantidad de riesgos involucrados para inmigrantes indocumentados en comparación a simpatizantes nativos.¹¹⁸ Como resultado, hoy en día, la mayoría de los líderes del santuario se identifican como blancos o pasan como blancos, pero un grupo mucho más grande de mujeres y de líderes santuario latinx se han levantado en el NMS. Reconociendo esto, la mayoría de los líderes del santuario notan cuán importante es para aquellas comunidades afectas tomar el liderazgo en la lucha del activismo de santuario.¹¹⁹ La demografía de los inmigrantes involucrados en el NMS está cambiando y cambiará a medida que el clima político cambie, pero es probable que siga siendo un fenómeno con una mayoría latinx.

La segunda ola del NMS ha continuado capitalizando los elementos históricos, culturales, y rituales imputados a centros religiosos que les otorga un carácter sagrado que las instituciones seculares no pueden declarar para sí. Las nuevas clases de debates de inmigración han convocado un nuevo reparto de actores y estrategias, que han resultado en una definición más amplia de santuario. Las similitudes y diferencias plantean desafíos a buscadores de santuario y a trabajadores en el movimiento santuario en muchos frentes. Como ocurrió a principios de los 1980, cuando el gobierno

¹¹² Dusty Christensen, “Northampton Unitarians Take in Russian Woman Facing Deportation” *Daily Hampshire Gazette*, (April 10, 2018), accessed April 15, 2018, <https://www.gazettenet.com/russian-immigrant-takes-sanctuary-in-Northampton-unitarian-society-16773878>.

¹¹³ Sophie Nieto-Muñoz, “Meet the Immigrants Taking Sanctuary in a N.J. Church amidst an Ice Storm,” *NJ Advance Media* (January 27, 2018), accessed September 7, 2018, <https://www.nj.com/news/index.ssf/2018/01/meet-the-immigrants-taking-sanctuary-in-a-nj-church-amid-an-ice-storm.html>.

¹¹⁴ Geneva Sands, “Undocumented Immigrant Takes Sanctuary in Church to Stop Deportation, Care for Wife” *ABC News* (January 23, 2018), accessed September 7, 2018, <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/undocumented-immigrant-takes-sanctuary-church-stop-deportation-care/story?id=52563493>.

¹¹⁵ El Reverendo Jenkins estima que la Safe Harbors Network constituye 30% oeste africano, 30% haitiano, 30% centroamericano, y 20% euroasiático. Ver Jenkins, Interview.

¹¹⁶ Anderson, Interview.

¹¹⁷ Pallares, *Family Activism*; Caminero-Santangelo, “The Voice of the Voiceless”; Yukich, *One Family*, 142.

¹¹⁸ Yukich, *One Family*, 142-158.

¹¹⁹ Sin embargo, los líderes del movimiento santuario son cautelosos acerca de buscadores de santuario que asumen roles públicos, sabiendo que convertirse en el rostro de un movimiento local podría llevar a más vulnerabilidad (por ejemplo, Elvira Arellano). La seguridad y protección son de suma importancia.

de los EUA no prestaba atención a los trabajadores en el movimiento santuario, el NMS actual se encuentra en alza en la era de Trump “porque no hay punto medio entre colaboración y resistencia.”¹²⁰ La política de “cero tolerancia” del gobierno de Trump coloca el Movimiento Santuario en una posición completamente nueva. El Reverendo Fife nos recordó que, decir que hay esperanza para aquellas personas en santuario en este preciso momento sería proyectar una ilusión.¹²¹ Cuando se llevan a cabo políticas como “cero tolerancia,” la esperanza parece desvanecerse y todo lo que le queda a uno es determinación. La determinación, en muchos casos santuario, asume una dimensión de resistencia sagrada. Así es como operaban los primeros buscadores de santuario y trabajadores en el movimiento santuario en los EUA. Aunque un número de no latinoamericanos continúan refugiándose en lugares de adoración, el Movimiento Santuario tiene sólidamente sus orígenes en la valentía de los migrantes latinx que atraviesan tierras desconocidas, sobre terrenos implacables, y bajo condiciones precarias. Es la valentía de miles de niños/as, mujeres, y hombres que cruzaron la traicionera frontera entre EUA y México que puso en movimiento las olas de activismo que han beneficiado a miles que buscan alivio del sufrimiento. Aún nos queda por ver en dónde terminará el NMS y como soportará la prueba de su resistencia sagrada.

[This article was translated into Spanish by Néstor Medina]

¹²⁰ Fife, “No Middle Ground,” 20-27.

¹²¹ Fife, Interview.

**What does the Paraclete have to do with Dreamers?
A Pneumatological Paradigm for Latino/a
Social–Political Advocacy**

Rodolfo Estrada III

LABI College

Abstract

This article explores the relationship between social–political activism for Dreamers and the Johannine Spirit–Paraclete. It seeks to answer the question: what does the Paraclete have to do with Dreamers? The article proposes that we reconsider Johannine pneumatology for social–political activism by reimagining the Paraclete’s forensic identity and activity. In particular, I explore how the Farewell Discourse of the Fourth Gospel describes the Paraclete within a literary context of child abandonment and need for advocacy. In addition, the metaphor for “orphan” in antiquity illuminates further aspects of the Paraclete’s role as an advocate for the defenseless. The Paraclete’s activity is not only applicable to the disciples, but also to Dreamers who are legislatively orphaned and abandoned by their own “fatherland” today. Finally, I explore how the Paraclete paradigm is reflected in the life of Sayra Lozano, a Pentecostal Latina advocate and Dreamer.

The Spirit of God was my advocate at all times. Going before me and softening hearts. Preparing every door and opportunity. Giving me spiritual guidance and strength to act. Even when I failed, God’s grace was sufficient to continue the work I was called to do. This is God’s work, not mine. God is in action, using people and events to help my marginalized group. I am simply one part of this mission and all it took was obedience to the Spirit’s guidance.”

-Sayra Lozano¹

¹ I want to thank Sayra Daniela Garcia Lozano for the opportunity to share her story and experiences as an advocate for Dreamers. Sayra earned an Associate degree in Bible and Ministry from LABI College, a bachelor’s degree in business, and an MBA from Southeastern University. She is currently an Adjunct Professor of Business at Southeastern University and an Immigration rights advocate. She has published editorials in major national newspapers including the Washington Post, Los Angeles Times, and the New York Times.

Since Trump's emergence to the presidency, politics has become an ever-present reality that cannot be avoided in American life. Even more, the continual evangelical support of the Trump presidency has left many Christians and non-Christians with cognitive, moral, and biblical dissonance. How can evangelicals continue to demonstrate unwavering support of a person who represents the antithesis of Jesus' social teachings in the gospels?² In the midst of these living contradictions, where truth is stranger than fiction, it is easy for Latino/a Pentecostals in the U.S. to eschew political and social engagement and withdraw into enclaves, waiting for the eschatological renewal of the world. Certainly, Pentecostals in the U.S. and global south have been criticized for failing to engage society and for spiritualizing social problems.³ More recently however, this is not always the case as we observe in the U.S. and Central America.⁴ Pentecostals have developed a social-political awareness and are proclaiming a gospel that addresses both physical and spiritual needs. Indeed, Gastón Espinosa asserts that Latinos/as in the U.S. have been involved in social, civic, and political action throughout the twentieth century.⁵ Phillip Wingeier-Rayo finds that Pentecostalism in Mexico has made a social

² Daniel Miller explains that evangelical support for Trump is a convergence of a single religious identity that is both evangelical and political. See "The Mystery of Evangelical Trump Support?," *Constellations* (2018): 1–16; David Gushee notes that there were a variety of factors that attracted White Evangelicals to Trump. But he insists that regardless if the majority of White Evangelicals do not believe that they hold racist views, they are complicit with what he said about minorities and immigrants. See "Why Trump, and What Next? An (Ex-) Evangelical Response," in *Faith and Resistance in the Age of Trump* (ed. Miguel De La Torre; Maryknoll: Orbis, 2017), 99–106; Racial sentiment against minorities nonetheless played a factor in Trump supporters. See David Norman Smith and Eric Hanley, "The Anger Games: Who Voted for Donald Trump in the 2016 Election, and Why?," *Critical Sociology* 44.2 (2018): 195–212; Thomas Pettigrew, "Social Psychological Perspectives on Trump Supporters," *Journal of Social and Political Psychology* 5.1 (2017): 107–116; See also Randall Balmer, "Under Trump, Evangelicals show their True Racist Colors," *Los Angeles Times*. August 23, 2017, accessed April 22, 2019, <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-balmer-evangelical-trump-racism-20170823-story.html>. Pew Research center finds that Trump still receives strong support from White Evangelicals (80% approval). See Gregory A. Smith, "Among White Evangelicals, Regular Churchgoers are the Most Supportive of Trump." Pew Research Center, Washington, D.C., April 26, 2017, accessed April 22, 2019, <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/04/26/among-white-evangelicals-regular-churchgoers-are-the-most-supportive-of-trump/>. For recent but similar results see also Alec Tyson, "Disagreements about Trump widely Seen as Reflecting Divides Over 'Other Values and Goals'." Pew Research Center, Washington, D.C., March 15, 2018, accessed April 22, 2019, <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/03/15/disagreements-about-trump-widely-seen-as-reflecting-divides-over-other-values-and-goals/>.

³ Jürgen Moltmann, *Spirit of Life: A Universal Affirmation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 186; Eldin Villafaña, *The Liberating Spirit: Toward an Hispanic American Pentecostal Social Ethic* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 195–202; Daniel Alvarez, "Honduran Pentecostalism: An Identity Crisis," in *Global Renewal Christianity: Latin America*, eds. Vinson Synan, Amos Yong, and Miguel Álvarez (Florida: Charisma House, 2016), 39–53.

⁴ Donald Miller and Tetsunao Yamamori remark that "Pentecostals are the new kids on the block" who have started to "move out of their otherworldly bunkers and into the world" in *Global Pentecostalism: The New Face of Christian Social Engagement* (Berkeley, CA: University of California, 2007), 66; Miguel Álvarez, "A Century of Pentecostalism in Latin America," in *Global Renewal Christianity: Latin America*, eds. Vinson Synan, Amos Yong, and Miguel Álvarez, (Florida: Charisma House, 2016), xlv–xlvi; Allan Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism* (New York: Cambridge, 2004), 261–278.

⁵ Gastón Espinosa, *Latino Pentecostals in America: Faith and Politics in Action* (Massachusetts: Harvard, 2014), 322–360.

impact by contributing to the democratization and pluralism of society.⁶ In Guatemala, Néstor Medina points out that theological understandings of salvation and eschatology have been reconfigured to include a more holistic approach to ministry and participation in the world.⁷ James Huff identifies Pentecostal organizations and institutions that take the movement beyond the church and into the public sphere of El Salvador.⁸ And as Douglas Petersen states about Pentecostals in Costa Rica and Nicaragua, “Pentecostals don’t have a social program... they are a social program.”⁹

Today, Latino/a Pentecostals are positioned within a politically and socially charged moment in American history where the country’s divisions are not simply along political party lines, but represent different ways of seeing society’s problems and solutions. However, Espinosa finds that the moderate position of Pentecostal Latinos/as—their bipartisanship approach to politics, moral conservatism, and democratic leanings—has led to “criticism by extremist and activists on both sides.”¹⁰ Social–political engagement does have its challenges, and Pentecostal Latinos/as are often caught between the polarizing extremes. Therefore, articulating a pneumatological paradigm that further undergirds social–political engagement is imperative. This paper thus aims to do just that. That is, to provide another pneumatological lens that has been neglected in theological articulations of social–political engagement. In exploring the various pneumatological paradigms, we commonly find the utilization of Lukan or Pauline conceptions of the Spirit.¹¹ While I do not aim to undervalue Lukan or Pauline pneumatological paradigms, I argue that the Fourth Gospel provides another model to think about engagement with the world. More specifically, the engagement of Latinos/as who are concerned about undocumented Latino/a children and youth, who are known through the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program (DACA), and will be referred to in this article as Dreamers.

⁶ Philip Wingeier–Rayo, “A Third Phase of Christianity: Reflections on One Hundred Years of Pentecostalism in Mexico,” in *Global Renewal Christianity: Latin America*, eds. Vinson Synan, Amos Yong, and Miguel Álvarez (Florida: Charisma House, 2016), 14–15.

⁷ Nestor Medina, “The New Jerusalem Versus Social Responsibility: The Challenges of Pentecostalism in Guatemala,” in *Perspectives in Pentecostal Eschatologies*, eds. Peter Althouse and Robby Waddell (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2010), 334–335; “Renovación/Renewal and the Social Context in Guatemala: The Changing Theological Tides,” in *Global Renewal Christianity: Latin America*, eds. Vinson Synan, Amos Yong, and Miguel Álvarez (Florida: Charisma House, 2016), 30–34.

⁸ James Huff, “Pentecostal Socialities and Transforming Rural El Salvador,” in *Global Renewal Christianity: Latin America*, eds. Vinson Synan, Amos Yong, and Miguel Álvarez (Florida: Charisma House, 2016), 57.

⁹ Douglas Petersen, “Pentecostals in Costa Rica and Nicaragua: A Historical/Theological Perspective,” in *Global Renewal Christianity: Latin America*, eds. Vinson Synan, Amos Yong, and Miguel Álvarez, (Florida: Charisma House, 2016), 91.

¹⁰ Espinosa, *Latino Pentecostals in America*, 404.

¹¹ Primary pneumatological passages include Luke 4:18–19; Gal 5:25; Eph 4:30; 5:1–2; See Cecil Robeck Jr. “Pentecostals and Social Ethics,” *Pneuma* 9.2 (1987): 103–107; Murray Dempster, “Pentecostal Social Concern and the Biblical Mandate of Social Justice,” *Pneuma* 9.2 (1987): 129–153; Although Dario López Rodríguez focuses on Lukan foundations for social ethics, the final chapter that addresses further biblical foundations does not engage the Fourth Gospel but only focuses on the Synoptic Gospels and the Pauline letters. See *The Liberating Mission of Jesus: The Message of the Gospel of Luke* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012), 125–137; Jose Comblin also reviews Johannine pneumatology, but fails to address the role and identity of the Paraclete in *The Holy Spirit and Liberation* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004), 6–7; Villafaña mentions the Spirit as “helper” in passing in *Liberating Spirit*, 172, 183, 187, 200, 210–211.

This article will explore the relationship between social–political activism in support of Dreamers, and the Spirit–Paraclete of the Fourth Gospel. Moreover, it seeks to answer the question: what does the Paraclete have to do with Dreamers? I propose that we consider a new way of thinking about Johannine pneumatology. Specifically, reimagining the Paraclete as a social–political advocate that is made manifest in the support and defense of Dreamers, children who are legally orphaned from their own homeland. My proposal will consist of three parts. First, I will review the current political situation and context of Latino/a Dreamers. I will then explain why the Johannine Paraclete provides a distinct pneumatological lens for understanding Dreamer advocacy. Finally, I will observe how the Paraclete as an advocate for Dreamers is exemplified in the life of Sayra Lozano, a current Dreamer and Pentecostal Latina social justice advocate. This biographical narration includes how her life reflects, is inspired by, and emulates the Paraclete activity of advocacy on behalf of Dreamers.

The Context of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and Dreamers

Before we discuss the social–political pneumatology that undergirds advocacy for Dreamers, it is important to understand the difference between Dreamers and those within the DACA program. The term “Dreamers” comes from the U.S. legislative bill S.1291 (2001), which was introduced by Senators Orrin Hatch (R) and Patrick Leahy (D).¹² Later legislative bills such as the S.2205 (2007) and the S.3992 (2010) also used a similar acronym: Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (D.R.E.A.M.). These bills aimed to cancel all deportation procedures of undocumented people under 30 years of age and who entered the U.S. before the age of 16. It would also adjust their status from “undocumented” to “temporary residents,” with ongoing renewals every 10 years. Importantly, these young people would have been granted authorization to work and gain access to higher education.¹³ These laws, however, never passed. They failed in the Senate with the help of several Democrats who broke rank to join the Republicans in defeating the bills.¹⁴ The political impasse between the House and the Senate prompted the Obama administration to create the “Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals”

¹² U.S. Congress, Senate, *Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM ACT) Act of 2001*, S. 1291, 107th Cong., 2d sess., introduced in Senate August 1, 2001, accessed April 22, 2019, <https://www.congress.gov/107/bills/s1291/BILLS-107s1291rs.pdf>.

¹³ See also U.S. Congress, Senate, *Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM ACT) Act of 2007*, S. 2205, 110th Cong., 1st sess., introduced in Senate October 19, 2007, accessed April 22, 2019, <https://www.congress.gov/110/bills/s2205/BILLS-110s2205pcs.pdf>; U.S. Congress, Senate, *Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM ACT) Act of 2010*, S. 3992, 111th Cong., 2d sess., introduced in Senate November 30, 2010, accessed April 22, 2019, <https://www.congress.gov/111/bills/s3992/BILLS-111s3992pcs.pdf>.

¹⁴ Joyce Adams, “The DREAM Lives On: Why the Dream Act Died and Next Steps for Immigration Reform,” *Georgetown Immigration Law Journal* 25.2 (2011): 545–549; For a brief history of the DREAM act see also Mariela Olivares, “Renewing the Dream: Dream Act Redux and Immigration Reform,” *Harvard Latino Law Review* 16. (2013): 79–125.

program (also known as the DACA) through an executive order on June 15, 2012.¹⁵ The DACA program imitated many aspects of the various DREAM legislative bills, but without the pathway to citizenship.¹⁶ It halted deportation proceedings and granted temporary work permits. Dreamers were thus understood to be those undocumented minorities who would have benefited from the DREAM legislative bills. Yet many of these Dreamers were absorbed into the new DACA program of the Obama administration. It is because of this legislative association and history that the terms DACA and Dreamers are considered synonymous.

However, The DACA program, approved by the Obama administration, was immediately met with hostility by the Trump administration. As early as June 16, 2017, the Trump administration aimed to rescind DACA. Following that, on September 5, 2017, an arbitrary expiration date was announced in order to put pressure on Congress to pass an immigration legislative bill, but that too failed.¹⁷ Then, through a series of legislative debates, lawsuits, and a Supreme Court ruling, the DACA program was reinstated and allowed to continue but without further expansion.¹⁸ The emotional, social, and political upheaval created by the Trump administration and Congress' failure to pass any legislative bill crushed Dreamers' hopes to become accepted as citizens.

The experience of Dreamers is unlike the experience of the first-generation migrants. The Center for American Progress and Tom K. Wong of the University of California San Diego find that the average age that Dreamers came to the U.S. is six years old.¹⁹ According to the Brookings Institute, almost one-third were five years or younger and more than two-thirds were 10 or younger when they arrived.²⁰ Their early arrival means that Dreamers are educated within American public schools. In fact, another 72% of Dreamers are enrolled in American colleges pursuing a bachelor's

¹⁵ Yamiche Alcindor and Sheryl Gay Stolberg, "After 16 Futile Years, Congress Will Try Again to Legalize 'Dreamers'," *New York Times*. September 5, 2017, accessed April 22, 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/05/us/politics/dream-act-daca-trump-congress-dreamers.html>.

¹⁶ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals who came to the United States as Children*, by Jane Napolitano. Memorandum, Washington, D.C., June 15, 2012, accessed April 22, 2019, <https://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/s1-exercising-prosecutorial-discretion-individuals-who-came-to-us-as-children.pdf>. See also "Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals," uscis.gov, accessed October 7, 2018, <https://www.uscis.gov/archive/consideration-deferred-action-childhood-arrivals-daca>.

¹⁷ Michael D. Shear and Julie Hirschfeld Davis, "Trump Moves to End DACA and Calls on Congress to Act," *New York Times*. September 5, 2017, accessed April 22, 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/05/us/politics/trump-daca-dreamers-immigration.html>.

¹⁸ Adam Liptak and Michael D. Shear, "Supreme Court Turns Down Trump's Appeal in 'Dreamers' Case," *New York Times*. February 26, 2018, accessed April 22, 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/26/us/politics/supreme-court-trump-daca-dreamers.html>.

¹⁹ Tom K. Wong, et. al., "DACA Recipients' Economic and Educational Gains Continue to Grow," Center for American Progress, accessed February 8, 2019, https://cdn.americanprogress.org/content/uploads/2017/11/02125251/2017_DACA_study_economic_report_updated.pdf.

²⁰ Nicole Prchal Svajlenka and Audrey Singer, "Immigration Facts: Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA)," Brookings Institute, accessed February 8, 2019, <https://www.brookings.edu/research/immigration-facts-deferred-action-for-childhood-arrivals-daca>.

degree or higher.²¹ This also suggests that many Dreamers have lived in the U.S. the majority of their lives.

However, the Trump administration's hostility toward immigrants has taken a toll on the psychological well-being of Dreamers. Later field surveys conducted by the Center for American Progress with the United We Dream, and the National Immigration Law Center found that since Trump's presidency, Dreamers have experienced additional emotional distress given the new fear of being deported.²² Luz Garcini, a postdoctoral fellow in the psychology department at Rice University, found that 63% of undocumented young people between the ages of 18 to 25 are showing signs of psychological distress. She notes that this is the highest percentage of any age group of all people. They not only experience chronic stress, fear of deportation, feel voiceless and invisible, but also an inner conflict as they contend with the reality that the U.S. does not want them even though they view the U.S. as their home.²³

Dreamers are legislatively orphaned from their own land. Their home country which they have known their entire lives has rejected them, abandoned them, used them for political votes, and ultimately desires to exile them as we have witnessed under the Justice Department of the Trump administration. Strikingly, the language for country in Greek is *patris*, which means to have a native land, hometown, or country. The term comes from the Greek word *patēr*, which is translated as "father." In antiquity, it was understood that to have a native land is to have a fatherland.²⁴ Thus, to be without a native land is akin to being fatherless, metaphorically orphaned without a place to call home. Jesus also knew what it meant to be a Dreamer. He knew what it meant to be orphaned from his own hometown. He called himself a prophet without a *patris*, rejected by his own people of Galilee (Matt 13:54–57; Mark 6:1–4; Luke 4:23–24; John 4:44). We also find the writer of Hebrews metaphorically describing all the Jewish patriarchs as being orphaned from their own land. The writer affirms that they all died in faith as "strangers and exiles" even while they sought "a *patris* that they could call their own" (Heb 11:13–16). Thus, the experiences of Dreamers in the U.S. are not without precedent. The biblical literature includes people who, having dwelled and lived upon the land their entire lives, were denied a homeland. What, then, does the Paraclete have to do with Dreamers, those children who have now been orphaned from their own land? Does the identity and activity of the Paraclete have any bearing on the current situation of Dreamers?

²¹ Tom K. Wong, et. al., "Amid Legal and Political Uncertainty, DACA Remains More Important Than Ever," Center for American Progress, accessed February 8, 2019, <https://americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/news/2018/08/15/454731/amid-legal-political-uncertainty-daca-remains-important-ever>.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ Cecilia Ballí, "Research: The psychological distress of Dreamers," *Houston Chronicle*. August 11, 2017, accessed April 22, 2019, <https://www.houstonchronicle.com/local/gray-matters/article/Dreamers-at-high-risk-of-psychological-distress-11747768.php>.

²⁴ Homer, *Od.* 10.236; 20.193; 24.322; *Il.* 12.243; 24.500; Hesiod, *Scut.* 1, 2; Aristophanes, *Thesm.* 859; Aeschylus, *Sept.* 585; Demosthenes, *Cor.* 18.296; Plato, *Pol.* 3081.

The Spirit–Paraclete and Orphans

When we explore the Spirit in the gospels, what clearly separates Johannine pneumatology from the Synoptic tradition is the rare use of the word “Paraclete.” The Fourth Gospel furnishes us with a portrait of the Spirit that is distinguishable but not too far detached from the perspectives found in the Synoptic Gospels.²⁵ The term is found on four occasions within the gospel (14:16; 14:26; 15:26; 16:7) and once in the letter (1 John 2:1). The introduction of the Spirit as Paraclete is couched within the context of Jesus’ final words, also known as the Farewell Discourse in John 14-17. Scholars notice the difficulties in translating the term.²⁶ Otto Betz remarks that the term originates from a forensic context, even though it is not akin to the Latin *advocatus*.²⁷ Kenneth Grayston asserts that it is often translated as an advocate, helper, or counselor, and appears in a legal context.²⁸ He insists that since the term is not used in reference to a legal title or official, its forensic meaning should be dismissed.²⁹ Frederick Harm states that the term is used to describe an advocate in a court of law, an intercessor or defender, and a person who pleads another’s cause. He does not find this meaning crucial to the gospel’s perspective of the Spirit but prefers to explore how “Paraclete” is characterized as a helper, teacher, witness, and judge.³⁰ Although Grayston and Harm explore non–forensic and contextual meanings, Johannes Behm finds that the history and concept of the term show that all subsidiary meanings were interwoven into the primary sense of advocate.³¹ He agrees that “Paraclete” is not used as a title for a professional legal adviser, yet this should not suggest that the forensic meaning is absent. Behm proposes that the non–forensic meanings are to be understood in light of the primary legal sense. A Paraclete is thus a “person called in to help, summoned to give assistance,” or “helper in court.”³²

We notice this forensic meaning in the writings of Philo. The “Paraclete” terminology is used to alleviate fears of retribution when Philo retells the story of Joseph and his experience with his brothers who sold him into slavery (*Ios.* 1.239). Philo also utilizes an advocacy sense of the term to describe the priests and people who come before the temple (*Mos.* 2.134–135; *Spec.* 1.237). Philo’s use of Paraclete is found when describing key figures who intervene in punishments and act on behalf of others. Reconciliation with God is brought forth through the intervention of a Paraclete (*Praem.* 1.166). Marco is described as a Paraclete and chief advisor to the emperor

²⁵ For a helpful analysis of the similarities and differences of the Spirit in the gospel tradition see Craig Keener, *The Spirit in the Gospel’s and Acts* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997).

²⁶ For example, the NRSV, NET, NLT, and NAB translate the term as “advocate.” The NASB, NKJ, and ESV prefer “helper.” The NIV and CSB translate παράκλητος as “counselor.” The NJB prefers the transliteration “Paraclete” although the term is not an English word.

²⁷ Otto Betz, *Der Paraklet* (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 1; He insists that it “stammt aus der forensischen Sphäre” and is in reference to “den herbeigerufenen, Mann, der vor dem Richter für den Angeklagten spricht, den Fürsprecher, den Anwalt.”

²⁸ Kenneth Grayston, “The Meaning of Paraklētōs,” *JSNT* 13 (1981): 82.

²⁹ Grayston, “Paraklētōs,” 71; See Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Anti rom.* 11.37.1.

³⁰ Frederick Harm, “Distinctive Titles of the Holy Spirit in the Writings of John,” *CJ* (1987): 119–135; Andreas Hoek makes a similar observation but proposes a Christocentric Paraclete who clarifies the truth of Christ in “The Johannine Paraclete: Herald of the Eschaton,” *JBPR* 4 (2012): 23–37.

³¹ Johannes Behm, “παράκλητος,” *TDNT* 5:814.

³² Behm, “παράκλητος,” 801–803.

Tiberius (*Flacc.* 1.13, 22). The Egyptian people reminded Flaccus that the city of Alexandria itself would be a Paraclete on his behalf to Gaius (*Flacc.* 1.23). And when Flaccus was exiled, it was Lepidus who interceded as a Paraclete to help alleviate his banishment (*Flacc.* 1.151, 181).

According to Philo, Paraclete takes a legal and advocacy role. Primarily, it refers to those who need forensic help and require assistance, whether the individual is in the temple or in dire need for reconciliation. Exploring the significance of the Paraclete expression therefore requires that we consider its legal background. In fact, Lochlan Shelfer argues that the term was developed as a precise equivalent to the Latin term *advocatus*, contrary to Betz's claim.³³ Shelfer finds that a Paraclete is someone of an elevated status who speaks and acts on behalf of someone who is in danger before a judge.³⁴ He agrees that the legal terminology and background of the term is not exhaustive in the depiction of the Spirit's duties within the Fourth Gospel. He does, however, presuppose that a judicial context is woven throughout the Farewell Discourse.³⁵ As Behm points out, the only difference is that the Spirit in Johannine literature is not the defender of the disciples before God, but their counsel in relation to the world.³⁶

This does not mean that we should exclude the different nuances and additional activities of the Paraclete when we approach the Farewell Discourse. The Spirit as Paraclete is promised to be with the disciples forever, abiding with them and being in them (14:16–17). The Paraclete will also teach and remind the disciples (14:26), testify (15:26–27), and convict the world (16:7). These communicatory activities and movement of the Spirit–Paraclete are however not limited to the disciples. We cannot ignore the forensic activity and description of the Paraclete as an advocate of the disciples in an unjust world full of hatred (15:19) and violence (16:2). Furthermore, when Jesus promises to send the Paraclete to the disciples, the context is one of a pending abandonment. The metaphor Jesus uses to illustrate their reality after his departure is that of an orphan (14:18)—the most vulnerable and defenseless person in Greco–Roman antiquity.

The Farewell Discourse includes Jesus' final words. Jesus exhorts the disciples not to allow their "hearts to become troubled" (14:1). He reminds them that if he were to leave and prepare a place for them, this also means that he would return (14:3). It is within this context of Jesus' coming death, a sense of physical abandonment and departure, that Jesus promises to send another Paraclete who will primarily remain with the disciples forever (14:16–17). The emotional tone is not solely of a cherished rabbi leaving his disciples; it is portrayed with the language of child abandonment.³⁷ Undeniably,

³³ Lochlan Shelfer, "The Legal Precision of the Term 'παράκλητος,'" *JSNT* 32.2 (2009): 131.

³⁴ Shelfer, "Legal Precision," 141.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 146–147.

³⁶ Behm, "παράκλητος," 803–804.

³⁷ Contrary to Gary Burge who interprets the "orphan" imagery in terms of desolation. He views the promise of the Paraclete as an attempt to dramatically heighten the eschatological dimensions of the resurrection appearance and the coming of the Spirit (*The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987]), 138); Craig Keener on the other hand notices that

when Jesus promises to send the Paraclete, he does so to comfort the disciples with the idea that he would not leave them as orphans. Jesus states, “I will not leave you orphaned, I will come to you” (14:18). These final words are thus given so that the disciples would not despair, they will have a Paraclete. But more specifically, the Paraclete is the one who comes to the disciples so that they would not presume that their experiences—the loss of their rabbi—would be akin to an orphan’s loss of a father.

We must recognize that from 13:33 the disciples are also described as “little children” who are about to experience the most drastic event that can happen to a child: becoming orphaned. Although Jesus is not the Father, the narrative is woven in kinship imagery that portrays Jesus as a father who speaks to his children, warning them about his coming death and the responsibilities thereafter. John Stube in fact remarks that calling the disciples “children” in 13:33 is affectionate language.³⁸ But this language is not a new metaphor for believers or the Johannine community. In the prologue (1:12), those who believe in Jesus are given the right to be a “child of God.” We also find that the child imagery is used in John 11:52 to explain how the death of Jesus would gather all the “children” who are scattered throughout the Diaspora. Leon Morris argues that although this statement refers to the Jews of the Diaspora, it is arguably referring to Gentile Christians.³⁹ In other words, the “children” imagery is the narrator’s description of the Johannine community’s identity. This also suggests that understanding the community as “children of God” was already familiar to the readers, as is observable in the Johannine letters.⁴⁰

The use of the “child” imagery from the prologue to the Johannine letters expands our imagination of what it means to be a member of God’s household. This language provokes the Johannine community to understand its identity, not solely in terms of Jewish, Greek, or Samaritan ethnic ideologies and privileges, but also as newly-born children of God. We are thus pressed to theologically reimagine the sending of the Spirit as a sending of a forensic advocate to a child who has lost a father through tragic means. More specifically, the promise of the Spirit is a promise to always have a legal defender who resides within and with the children of God who have become orphaned due to Jesus’ death. But what, then, does it mean to become orphaned in antiquity, and how does this metaphor assuage the pending experiences of the disciples?

The status of widows and orphans was a visible reality in the ancient world. We may assume that orphans were those who only lost both parents, but this was not so in antiquity. Losing solely one’s father would have classified a child as an orphan even though the mother was still alive.⁴¹ Sabine Hübner and David Ratzan also point out that there were many fatherless children given the high mortality rate and a tendency of men

the image of orphans may relate to the context of the Paraclete as a forensic intercessor given that orphans were indeed oppressed (*The Gospel of John* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003], 973).

³⁸ John Carson Stube, *A Graeco–Roman Rhetorical Reading of the Farewell Discourse* (New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 98.

³⁹ Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 505.

⁴⁰ 1 John 2:1, 12, 28; 3:1–2, 7, 10, 18; 4:4; 5:2, 21; 2 John 1:1, 4, 13; 3 John 1:4.

⁴¹ J. T. Fitzgerald, “Orphans in Mediterranean Antiquity and Early Christianity,” *AcT* 23 (2016): 30.

to marry late in life.⁴² In fact, Walter Scheidel finds that about one–third of all children within the Greco–Roman period would have lost their father by the age of fifteen.⁴³ Losing one’s father brought economic disruption, placed one’s inheritance in jeopardy, caused undue hardship and grief for the mother, and led to the possibility of becoming vulnerable to oppression and exploitation.⁴⁴ These challenges motivated many widows to immediately remarry. But Hübner finds that in Roman law the stepfathers were depicted as legacy hunters who aimed to embezzle their stepchildren’s inheritance.⁴⁵

Although guardians, older siblings, and extended kin often took it upon themselves to care for orphans, the harsh consequences of being orphaned were difficult to alleviate. Within the Homeric epics, Georg Wöhrle finds that an orphaned child was often put in a precarious and sometimes fatal situation.⁴⁶ When Hector of Troy died in his fight with Achilles, his wife Andromache does not immediately become aware. She runs to the walls of Troy, looking over to see her husband’s body dragged through the dirt. As she bursts into tears, the impact of his death upon their son emerges within her lament. She states,

“And your son, the child of doomed parents, our child, a mere babe, can no longer give you joy, dead Hector: nor can you give joy to him. Even if he survives this dreadful war against the Greeks, toil and suffering will be his fate, bereft of all his lands. An orphaned child is severed from his playmates. He goes about with downcast looks and tear–stained cheeks, plucks his father’s friends by the cloak or tunic, till one, from pity, holds the wine–cup to his lips, but only for a moment, enough to wet his lips but not his palate. And some lad with both parents alive strikes him with his fist and drives him from the feast, jeering at him in reproach: ‘Away with you, now! You’ve no father here.’ So my child will run in tears to his widowed mother, my son Astyanax, who sat on his father’s knee eating the rich fat and the sheep’s marrow, and when he was sleepy and tired of play, slept in his nurse’s arms in a soft bed, his dreams sweet. Now, with his dear father gone, ills will crowd on him” (trans. A. S. Kline; Homer, *Ill.* 22.484–505).

The dire fate of Hector’s son is not lost in Andromache’s words. She realizes that her orphaned son’s life has drastically changed because of Hector’s death. Her son, who was once eating in luxury, will be cast out from the tables, beaten by strangers with no one to

⁴² Sabine Hübner and David Ratzan, “Fatherless Antiquity? Perspectives on ‘Fatherlessness’ in the Ancient Mediterranean,” in *Growing Up Fatherless in Antiquity*, eds. Sabine Hübner and David Ratzan (New York: Cambridge University, 2009), 9.

⁴³ Walter Scheidel, “The Demographic Background,” in *Growing Up Fatherless in Antiquity*, eds. Sabine Hübner and David Ratzan (New York: Cambridge University, 2009), 31–40.

⁴⁴ Hübner and Ratzan, “Fatherless Antiquity,” 10–13.

⁴⁵ Hübner, “Callirhoe’s Dilemma: Remarriage and Stepfathers in the Greco–Roman East,” in *Growing Up Fatherless in Antiquity*, eds. Sabine Hübner and David Ratzan (New York: Cambridge University, 2009), 64–67.

⁴⁶ Georg Wöhrle, “Sons (and Daughters) without Fathers: Fatherlessness in the Homeric Epics,” in *Growing Up Fatherless in Antiquity*, eds. Sabine Hübner and David Ratzan (New York: Cambridge University, 2009), 174.

protect him, ridiculed, deprived of his land, and socially ostracized from his friends. Certainly, Wöhrle finds that in this lament, Andromache recognized the genuine danger that her son would encounter, especially since he would now be deposed of his inheritance.⁴⁷

Although not all orphans were neglected, all of them, both the wealthy and poor, faced economic and social challenges.⁴⁸ The dire situation confronting orphans emerges in Greek mythology, in which Zeus was known to be a god who watched over orphans.⁴⁹ As we find in the case of Euripides' *Ion*, Apollo commissions Hermes to bring the orphan child Ion to the temple at Delphi where a priestess could raise him.⁵⁰ Orphans were truly the most vulnerable in antiquity. Even if their mothers remarried, their stepfathers were not legally obliged to provide for them and there was always a danger that their stepfathers would rob their inheritance.⁵¹ The threat of social and economic instability caused by losing one's father was a dire problem in antiquity.

When we turn to biblical literature, a similar situation for orphans also emerges. Marcus Sigismund notes that the central characteristic of orphans in the Old Testament is the lack of rights and their defenseless position in society.⁵² This is notable in the various injunctions to care and protect orphans, especially since they are most susceptible to being oppressed, murdered, sold as slaves, denied justice, and experience theft and financial distress.⁵³ Due to these harsh experiences, God emerges as their surrogate father and protector. God promises to hear the cries of the orphan and avenge them (Exod 22:22-27). God is described as executing justice for orphans (Deut 10:18). The Psalmist also portrays God as a "helper of the orphan... who inclines his ear to vindicate the orphan and oppressed" (Ps 10:14, 17-18). Or as more poignantly described, "He is a father to the fatherless" (Ps 68:5). Likewise, in Hosea, the prophet claims "For in you the orphan find mercy" (14:3). God in the Old Testament is deeply concerned about the status and welfare of orphans and is depicted as their defender. Moreover, the Israelite community is given an injunction to protect and provide for them, not causing them any more undue hardship.

Although the New Testament rarely mentions orphans, the same command to care for orphans is assumed. Jesus demonstrates his ability to raise a dead orphan boy who was the only son of a widow in a town called Nain. This miracle led many to affirm that God has come to help his people, thus truly caring for orphans (Luke 7:11-16). James describes true religion as "caring for the orphans and widows in their misfortune" (Jas

⁴⁷ Wöhrle, "Sons (and Daughters) without Fathers," 163-164.

⁴⁸ Hübner remarks that it was the wealthy aristocrats who were able to provide guardians that served as father figures over the orphan's property. In other occasions, stepfathers would adopt orphans, welcome them into their homes, and protect them. See "Remarriage and Stepfathers," 80-81.

⁴⁹ Hesiod, *Op.* 327-334.

⁵⁰ Euripides, *Ion*, 25-35.

⁵¹ Hübner, "Remarriage and Stepfathers," 81.

⁵² Marcus Sigismund, "'Without Father, without Mother, without Genealogy': Fatherlessness in the Old and New Testament," in *Growing Up Fatherless in Antiquity*, eds. Sabine Hübner and David Ratzan (New York: Cambridge, 2009), 87.

⁵³ Exod 22:22; Deut 10:18; 14:28-29; 24:17-22; 26:12-13; 27:19; 2 Kgs 4:1; Job 24:9; 29:12; 31:17-22; Ps 94:6; Prov 23:10; Isa 1:17, 23; Jer 5:28; 7:6; 22:3; Ezek 22:7; Zech 7:10; Mal 3:5.

1:27). This same exhortation to care for orphans is found within the context of caring for widows in Paul's letter to Timothy. Paul exhorts Timothy to make sure that the real widows who need assistance are taken care of, which presumes that these widows have orphan children and no extended kin to help care for them (1 Tim 5:1–16).

Turning back to the Fourth Gospel, the reality of being orphaned would have been a vivid metaphor that illustrated the grave consequences of abandonment that would befall the disciples. How then does Jesus mitigate the pending orphaning caused by his death? How does Jesus assuage the fear of total abandonment that will result from his departure and return to the Father? Or asked another way, how can the disciples and Johannine community view themselves as “children of God” although it may appear that they have been abandoned by Jesus—the only person who made visible the Father on earth? Simply put, it is through the presence of the Paraclete. The sending of the Spirit as Paraclete, therefore, compels us to reimagine and bring to the forefront of our pneumatological imagination the role of advocacy for the defenseless—especially Dreamers. The distressing experiences of the orphaned disciples, their fear of abandonment, and disassociation from their kinship group is mitigated by the sending of the Spirit—advocate. The forensic terminology does not emerge by accident in the Johannine discourse. Being orphaned within antiquity was a dire predicament, and so too was the situation of the Johannine community. The Paraclete imagery communicates to the disciples a pneumatological advocacy for those who are orphaned and abandoned, excommunicated, on the verge of poverty, and with one's land and inheritance in jeopardy.

The Spirit–Paraclete in Pentecostal Social–Political Activism

In light of Johannine Paraclete, how then does it shape our understanding of social–political advocacy within a Latino/a context? Or more specifically, how does the Johannine pneumatological activity as Paraclete shape our understanding of the orphaned Dreamers today, including migrant children in internment camps within the deserts of Texas? Simply put, the Paraclete is a defender of children, the most vulnerable in society. The Paraclete is made manifest in the activity of advocacy and must not only inform our pneumatological imagination, it must also shape how we view all social–political advocacy for the defenseless today. There are too many children who are denied their legal rights of asylum and opportunity to become citizens in the land in which they have lived their entire lives. Like the vulnerable experiences of orphans of antiquity, Dreamers today are legislatively orphaned and abandoned by their fatherland. Indeed, the U.S. is their fatherland, it is the only land they know. But they are not considered true children of this nation. The U.S. is a dead father who has failed to provide Dreamers the same economic benefits and opportunities that are given to all children who are born on the land. And it is also this current political climate that continues to leave them vulnerable to exploitation and oppression, a situation that also befell orphans in antiquity.

But how specifically can we see the activity of the Paraclete today? To understand the role of the Paraclete we must also look to those who advocate for Dreamers today,

and it is most notable in the life of a young Dreamer, a Latina Pentecostal, social-political advocate, and U.N. Youth Delegate of Mexico, Sayra Lozano. Sayra was raised in California after she came to the U.S. at the age of 5 from Mexico. Her entire life she “felt like a fugitive, terrified at the sight of police officers.” Growing up, she did not know what it meant to be an immigrant, an experience akin to many Dreamers who have lived in the U.S. their entire lives. But after DACA was enacted in 2012, she felt that the documents now protected her from deportation and gave her a “sense of humanity and existence” that she never had before. Given that it was a temporary fix, she became “personally invested in working towards a permanent solution, not only for [her], but for [her] community.” This included opportunities to intern with local and federal government, including the U.S. House of Representative through the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute. After she graduated from LABI College, she continued into a graduate program at Southeastern University in Lakeland, Florida. It was during her time in Florida that she became more aware of the hostile tensions toward the immigrant community. Then she felt “a strong pull from the Holy Spirit to act,” and her advocacy activity started with a letter to her congressional representative.

Drawing from her legislative experiences, she wrote a letter to her representative and explained why they should support the Dream Act. But after she received a generic response from her congressional representative, she knew that her letter was not personally read. As a result, she started to share her story publicly and advocate for Dreamers throughout her community. She published multiple opinion pieces in the Washington Post, Miami Herald, Florida Today, and the Los Angeles Times so that her story would be known.⁵⁴ Her advocacy for Dreamers was motivated by a strong sense that the Spirit was guiding her. In particular, the role of the Spirit-Paraclete activity in her life is notable in the language she uses in her opinion piece to the Washington Post. She states,

“We have done nothing more than try to contribute to the nation we love. Why must our communities be ‘punished’ for Republican elected officials to feel better about ‘helping’ us? Let *me* pay the fine, let *me* risk my security by advocating publicly, let *me* bear the burden of this broken immigration system, not my community. I’ll do it all if it means I get to call the United States home.”

⁵⁴ See Sayra Lozano, “I’m a ‘Dreamer.’ If Someone Must Be Punished, Let It Be Me,” *Washington Post*. October 12, 2017, accessed April 22, 2019, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/im-a-dreamer-if-someone-must-be-punished-let-it-be-me/2017/10/12/4c006392-aebc-11e7-be94-fabb0f1e9ffb_story.html?utm_term=.07120cdef071; “Congress Should Protect Dreamers For The Good Of Florida, Country,” *Miami Herald*. December 8, 2017; “Time Is Now to Act on Deal To Help ‘Dreamers,’” *Florida Today*. January 5, 2018, accessed April 22, 2019, <https://www.floridatoday.com/story/opinion/2018/01/05/opinion-time-now-act-deal-help-dreamers/1007677001/>; “Dreamers are Still Here and We’re Still Waiting for a Fix,” *Los Angeles Times*. July 17, 2018, accessed April 22, 2019, <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-lozano-dreamer-20180717-story.html>; See also Emily Donovan, “DREAM Act recipient stands out on Capitol Hill,” *Desert Sun*. July 21, 2015, accessed April 22, 2019, <https://www.desertsun.com/story/news/2015/07/21/dream-act-recipient-stands-capitol-hill/30491567/>; Agencia Notimex, “Dos ‘Dreamers’ Mexicanos Representan A México Ante La Onu,” *Net Noticias*. October 4, 2018, accessed April 22, 2019, <https://www.mexicanal.com/noticias/2018/10/08/dos-dreamers-mexicanos-representan-m%C3%A9xico-ante-la-onu>.

Sayra, as a Dreamer, is advocating for Dreamers, even to the point where she recognizes that her advocacy would entail suffering on their behalf. This opinion piece propelled Sayra into the public light which soon led to further news stories, interviews, and opportunities that gave her chance to call out congressional representatives' blatant failures to keep their promises. As she continued to advocate for Dreamers within her community in Florida, views about the Latino community began to change. She noticed that "putting a face to an issue [made] a difference." Even more, she found that people had "changed their perspective on the issue" simply by knowing her story.

Her advocacy, however, did not always change opinions or sway congressional representatives. During one Thanksgiving break, I had an opportunity to meet with Sayra. It was during a conversation that she shared a disheartening lobbying experience at the U.S. Congress. Congressional representatives failed to take seriously the case for Dreamers and some even implicitly berated her for being a "lawbreaker." One representative even brazenly raised the prospect that she and others like her "should be punished before [they] could be helped." Sayra's rebuttal however was swift. She retorted, "while I understand we are a nation of laws, we are also a nation of compassion. The two are not mutually exclusive to each other, and I hope you can consider this when you consider Dreamer legislation."

It was during this lobbying experience that Sayra felt powerless and all the feelings of rejection, abandonment, and even doubt about her mission to advocate for Dreamers resurfaced. But it is also during these experiences that the presence of the Paraclete was most evident. The Paraclete was with her, and even gave her the right words to defend Dreamers. This experience also propelled her to continue to seek God's guidance. She certainly felt disillusioned and thought that her time and period of advocacy was coming to an end because of her experiences with hostile congressional representatives. But it was also during these moments that other opportunities were being prepared.

Sayra's goal was to "humanize [the] issue that had been politicized for far too long" and to advocate for Dreamers by restoring their "human dignity." Not only did she have the opportunity to return to Congress and lobby a second time where she found a more receptive tone, but she later found herself becoming a Youth Delegate for the United Nations. This was the first time that two U.S. Dreamers were chosen to represent Mexico at the United Nations General Assembly. Her opportunity to advocate for Dreamers was at the local, national, and international level. Sayra found that it was a "tremendous honor to advocate for [her] community at a global level." While using the platform to represent Mexico as a U.S. Dreamer in New York, she was internationally advocating on behalf the Latino/a community while also calling the U.S. to account for their failure to do justice and mercy.

What then does the Spirit-Paraclete have to do with Dreamers? The presence and activity of the Paraclete are made manifest in the lives of advocates like Sayra Lozano, a Latina Pentecostal undocumented Dreamer who is a U.N. Youth Delegate representing Latinos/as and Dreamers. The Paraclete is sent to defend those abandoned in their native land. The Paraclete is promised to always be with those who are defenseless and

without advocates. And this also means that to see Dreamers, the legislatively orphaned children amongst us, is to find the presence of the Paraclete. To join those who defend Dreamers is also to engage in this pneumatological activity that was promised by Jesus in the Johannine Farewell Discourse. For it is in the context of child abandonment that the Spirit emerges as an advocate. And it is in the activity of advocacy that the Paraclete's presence emerges as a defender of the vulnerable and oppressed amongst us, as we see manifested in the life of Sayra Lozano.

Conclusion

This article has aimed to provide a new pneumatological paradigm for social-political advocacy by utilizing the imagery of the Johannine Paraclete. The tendency to solely focus on the revelatory activities of the Paraclete severely limits the forensic implications within the Johannine Farewell Discourse. It is only when we explore the significance of orphans in antiquity, the context of the Farewell Discourse, and the forensic significance of "Paraclete" that we can move beyond the terminological impasse that has troubled Johannine scholars. It is with a forensic understanding of the Paraclete that we can understand more clearly the situation and need for Dreamer advocacy because they too are orphaned from their own land. Just as Jesus is the Paraclete for Christians before God (1 John 2:1), the Spirit is the Paraclete for Dreamers before a hostile world. We must not only recognize that social-political advocacy is something that we do, it is something that is motivated and inspired by the presence of the Paraclete as we observe in the life of Sayra Lozano.

**Now that Latinx Are the Largest Racialized Group in the US,
What Can Be Learned from African Americans?**

Philip Wingeier-Rayo

Wesley Theological Seminary

Abstract

Over the last few years the Latinx population has surpassed African Americans as the largest ethnic minority group in the United States. In spite of its numerical growth, the Latinx communities have less political power than African Americans. In spite of efforts by a few activists, the broader Latinx communities are not as politically active due to internal divisions such as country of origin and immigration status. The Latinx community can learn from the political activism of African Americans, who are more united with a common experience. Younger generations of people of color are already doing this through intersectionality.

It was a long trip. Most people thought we were crazy for driving instead of flying, but something about long voyages allows one to reflect on life transitions more fully than a quick flight across international borders. My family and I decided to drive the 2,100-mile trek from Cuernavaca, Mexico to Monroe, North Carolina. Along the way we made many stops to see friends and do some sightseeing. We stopped to see Guanajuato with its beautiful Spanish architecture and the “*callejón del beso*.” We stopped to visit a friend on the border near Brownsville and another in Dallas, Texas. Another major geographical landmark on the journey along I-20 was the Mississippi river, so we stopped at an IHOP restaurant just across the bridge in Vicksburg. Outside the restaurant was a newspaper vending machine and the front-page headlines caught my eye: “39 Million Make Hispanics Largest U.S. Minority.”¹ So, I inserted two quarters and bought the paper to read the full article, which began with the following lines:

The U.S. Census Bureau's announcement Wednesday confirmed what many have treated as fact for some time. Even so, it's a symbolic milestone for a nation whose history has been dominated by black-white racial dynamics.²

¹ Haya El Nasser, “39 Million Make Hispanics Largest U.S. Minority,” *USA Today*, June 19, 2003, http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/nation/census/2003-06-18-Census_x.htm.

² El Nasser, “39 Million Make Hispanics.”

The article stated that the Hispanic population had grown to 38.8 million and therefore surpassed African Americans as the largest ethnic-minority group in the United States.³ This news was particularly relevant because of our current life-transition and immediate circumstance. My wife and I had been living and working in Latin America for the previous 15 years until my wife received an invitation to serve the Latinx community in North Carolina. One of the Anglo pastors in Monroe, NC had noticed the growth of the Latinx community, and knew that the church needed to reach out to the growing Latinx community but did not know how or where to begin. The pastor had been on several short-term mission trips to Latin America, so he had an interest serving the Latinx community but seeing the need in his home town presented a new opportunity.⁴ So, the pastor sent us an email to consider moving to North Carolina to start a Spanish-speaking church.

Living outside the U.S. for so many years, one misses seeing the gradual cultural and demographic shifts. I left the United States in 1988 when Hispanics were a small minority and racial dynamics were very much based on a White-Black binary.⁵ So reading this newspaper article in the *USA Today* was eye opening and marked a more nuanced and complex racial reality in the United States.⁶

Growth of Latinxs in the South

We arrived in North Carolina in the summer of 2003 to find an extremely marginalized Latinx community in a very segregated, rural, southern area of Union County, North Carolina—southeast of Charlotte. This county borders South Carolina and has a very painful racial history that includes the Civil War, the Jim Crow era of segregation, and the ubiquity of the Confederate flag. During the decade of the 1990s,

³ According to the U.S. Census Bureau, there were an estimated 58.8 million Latinx people (of Hispanic origin) in the United States in 2017. See “Hispanic Population to Reach 111 Million by 2060,” accessed April 12, 2019, <https://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/2018/comm/hispanic-projected-pop.html>.

⁴ I choose to use the term Latinx to refer to the Hispanic/Latino/a population. This is intentional to be gender inclusive and avoid the generic “Latino.” Another possible term that is often used is Hispanic, which refers to those who come from a Spanish-speaking background. The term “Hispanic” was coined by the U.S. Census in 1970 as a category to count people from Spanish-speaking origins. However, it is not a race. There can be blacks, whites, and indigenous races that come from Spanish-speaking countries. Latino, on the other hand, refers to those who come from countries colonized by Latin countries in southern Europe, namely Portugal and Spain. So Latino is inclusive of Brazilians whereas Hispanic only refers to those who are descendants of Spanish speaking Latin Americans. The “x” at the end of Latin is to be inclusive of both Latinos and Latinas, as well as those who identify as LGBTQ. In this article I will use the term Latinx to be as inclusive as possible, but I am clear that both Hispanic and Latinx are identity constructs that are part of an effort to quantify, label, categorize, and racialize people.

⁵ For more background on racism in the U.S. and the Black-White binary, see Linda Martín Alcoff, “Latinos/as, Asian Americans, and the Black-White Binary,” *The Journal of Ethics* 7, no. 4 (2003): 5–27.

⁶ According to a 2017 estimate by the U.S. Census Bureau, 18.1% of the United States population are of Hispanic origin compared to 13.4% of African Americans. See QuickFacts, accessed April 12, 2019, <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/RHI125217#RHI125217>. For more on changing U.S. demographics and the diversification of the ethnic minority population see the work of David A. Hollinger, *Protestants Abroad: How Missionaries Tried to Change the World but Changed America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2017).

North Carolina had the highest percentage increase of the Latinx population of all 50 states, yet this community was underprivileged in many ways.⁷

Most Latinx people in North Carolina during the rapid population growth in the early 2000s were undocumented young men who came seeking construction work—provoked by an economic boom fueled by the financial centers of Bank of America and Wachovia in Charlotte.⁸ This, coupled with the steady work in the traditional southern industries of agriculture and poultry, created a magnet incentivizing the growth of the Latinx population. It did not take long for the word to reach rural regions of central Mexico, especially the states of Michoacán and Jalisco, that there was work in Monroe, NC. The economy needed more labor to grow, but federal immigration laws lagged behind the economic rule of supply and demand. This massive unauthorized immigration flow was the result of powerful transnational economic forces largely due to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).⁹ First, young men immigrated for work and eventually many of the wives and girlfriends, as well as children, joined the men, although some men started new families in their new home. Over time, there was as much growth in the Latinx population by births as there was from immigration.¹⁰ The sudden increase of the Latinx community made many people in rural North Carolina uncomfortable and created tensions with local law enforcement. Of course, there were some real social problems, such as alcohol, drugs, and prostitution, but there were also misinformation, cultural differences, and just plain racism.¹¹

On one occasion in the city of Monroe, NC, Earl Brown, the owner of a local furniture store located a block from our Hispanic mission church put up a sign that read, “Honk if you hate Spanish,” “Honk if you loath (sic) Mexico & its flag,” and “Honk if you’re tired of hearing Spanish.” When a local journalist asked Mr. Brown why he put up the signs he responded: “Every time a house has been empty, it’s gone Latino. The dynamics of this area has changed so much.”¹² Incidents such as these made the Latinx community feel vulnerable to hate crimes.

On another occasion my wife and I were returning from the movies when we received an urgent call to go to the church. The church youth group that consisted of Latinx teens was scheduled to have an activity, but they arrived early before the church

⁷ Jie Zong and Jeanne Batalova, “Frequently Requested Statistics on Immigration in the United States,” Migration Policy Institute, April 14, 2016, <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/frequently-requested-statistics-immigrants-and-immigration-united-states>. See also “The Hispanic Population: Census 2000 Brief,” U.S. Census Bureau, May 2001, <https://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-3.pdf>.

⁸ Wachovia changed its name to Wells Fargo on December 31, 2008. “Wachovia Is Now Wells Fargo,” Wells Fargo, accessed April 11, 2019, <https://www.wellsfargo.com/about/corporate/wachovia/>.

⁹ For more discussion on the economic forces behind Hispanic immigration to the U.S. see David Bacon, *Illegal People: How Globalization Creates Migration and Criminalizes Immigrants* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2008).

¹⁰ Gustavo Lopez and Eileen Patten, “The Impact of Slowing Immigration: Foreign-Born Share Falls Among 14 Largest U.S. Hispanic Origin Groups,” Pew Hispanic Center, September 15, 2015, <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2015/09/15/the-impact-of-slowing-immigration-foreign-born-share-falls-among-14-largest-us-hispanic-origin-groups/>.

¹¹ Martín Alcoff, 2003.

¹² “Owner Slams Stores Serving Hispanics,” *Star-News*, May 23, 2007, <https://www.starnewsonline.com/news/20070523/owner-slams-stores-serving-hispanics>.

was unlocked and waited in their cars. A neighbor saw two cars in the church parking lot with Latinx youth and called the police. We arrived to find the young people handcuffed and lying in the grass while the police were searching their cars. We explained to the officers that the youth were here for a church activity. They listened but continued an unauthorized search of the vehicles. When they did not find any illegal drugs, they let the youth go free. Fortunately, the police did not have the authorization to check the youth's immigration statuses because they would have found out that they were undocumented. Certainly, this was unsettling and made the youth feel vulnerable to law enforcement and distrusting of the neighbors who had reported them.

The “Latino” Ferguson

Although not in North Carolina, there was an incident in Pasco, Washington when Antonio Zambrano-Montes was gunned down by police on February 10, 2015 for allegedly throwing rocks at passing cars. The police fired 17 shots at Zambrano killing him point blank. The police officers involved were not charged; in fact, they were not even interviewed until three months after the incident. Some people have called this incident the “Latino Ferguson,” however, there has been very little national attention and no protests despite being captured on video and having two million YouTube views.¹³ The video is very graphic, yet the number of viewings has not translated into the same level of protests, mobilization, or publicity in the news that we have seen with the shootings of unarmed African Americans.¹⁴

The death of unarmed teenager Trayvon Martin, the fatal shooting of Michael Brown by Ferguson, Missouri police officer Darren Wilson, and other incidents of excessive police force have sparked a national *#BlackLivesMatter* movement. On June 17, 2015, Dylann Roof entered a prayer meeting in Charleston, SC and shot nine African Americans at Emmanuel AME Church during a prayer service. This was the most sacrilegious of hate crimes perpetrated against African Americans. With each successive incident of racially motivated violence, hate-crimes, and police brutality, the *#BlackLivesMatter* movement has grown in political power and numbers. At the same time, Latinx people have been killed by the police at nearly the same rate as African Americans, and yet when a Latinx individual is killed, there is less resistance.¹⁵ This leads to a motivational question behind this article: why is it that in spite of its numeric growth, the Latinx community does not wield the same organizing power and influence as the African American community? This article will explore some of the factors that may limit the ability to organize and protest such injustices and explore what the Latinx community can learn from the history of the African American community.

¹³Michael Martinez and Jacqueline Hurtado, “Migrant Laborer's Death in Hail of Police Bullets Roils Family, Leaves Questions,” CNN, March 1, 2015, <http://www.cnn.com/2015/02/28/us/police-shooting-mexican-laborer/>.

¹⁴ See the Youtube video of the death of Antonio Zambrano-Montes. “Death by Officer: An American Epidemic of Police Shootings and Brutality,” February 10, 2015, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s2ghdM66U4Y>.

¹⁵ As this article goes to print, there have been 813 fatal police shootings with 190 African American victims and 158 Hispanic victims according to the *Washington Post*. “Fatal Force,” accessed October 31, 2017, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/national/police-shootings-2017/>.

Divisions between the African American and Latinx Community

From the perspective of an outside observer, it seems that the Latinx community is not as united as the African American community. Tragically, over the past several years there have been several shootings of unarmed Black men at the hands of law enforcement. Seemingly within hours, the African American community organizes a protest—many times through the convocation network of *#BlackLivesMatter*. There is a comparable number of fatal police shootings of unarmed Latino men, but we rarely hear of them in the news because there is not the same level of resistance and protests from the Latinx community as there is from the African American community. According to a study by Washington University in St. Louis, the percentage of unarmed Blacks and Latinx persons killed by police is 20 and 18.8 percent, respectively.¹⁶ In spite of a similar percentage of unarmed Blacks and Hispanics who are killed by police, there is greater resistance from African Americans when such an excessive show of force is perpetrated against a member of the Black community. The deaths of African Americans Trayvon Martin, Eric Garner, Freddie Gray, Philando Castile, and Sandra Bland, among others, have prompted national protests and resistance; however, the wrongful deaths due to police brutality of members of the Latinx community barely make the news. The Latinx community is not nearly as well organized, and there is not much collaboration with the African American community over common injustices.

Of course, the governance tactic of divide and conquer has been around since the Spanish collaborated with the Tlaxcaltecan and Texcocans peoples to defeat the Aztecs in 1521. Social scientist Hubert Blalock named the theory of minority-group relations, in which different groups compete for scarce economic resources in the late 1960s.¹⁷ In American racial politics, it is common for politicians to pit one group against another by framing the other group as competition or as those who are “taking one’s jobs.”

Claudia Sandoval researches and writes about the lack of collaboration between the African American and Latinx communities in political activism. In her article “Citizenship and the Barriers to Black and Latino Coalitions in Chicago,” Sandoval writes about the different interpretations of Elvira Arellano’s challenge to a deportation order while receiving sanctuary—along with her U.S. born son—at Adalberto United Methodist Church in Chicago.¹⁸ In addressing the media Arellano made a comment that particularly angered her African American critics: “I’m strong, I’ve learned from Rosa Parks—I’m not going to the back of the bus. The law is wrong.”¹⁹ In response a *Chicago Sun-Times* columnist wrote: “Arellano is pimping the system. She is using Rosa Parks’

¹⁶ Odis Johnson, Jr., Keon Gilbert, and Habiba Ibrahim, “Race, Gender, and the Contexts of Unarmed Fatal Interactions with Police,” Washington University Institute for Public Health, Fatal Interactions with Police database, accessed April 11, 2019, <https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/sites.wustl.edu/dist/b/1205/files/2018/02/Race-Gender-and-Unarmed-1y9md6e.pdf>.

¹⁷ Hubert Blalock, *Toward a Theory of Minority-Group Relations* (New York: Wiley, 1967).

¹⁸ Claudia Sandoval, “Citizenship and the Barriers to Black and Latino Coalitions in Chicago,” *NACLA Report on the Americas* 43, no. 6 (November 8, 2010): 36-39.

¹⁹ Sandoval, “Citizenship and the Barriers.”

name to buy herself more time [in the United States], and that disgusts me.”²⁰ Timothy Thomas, Jr. also wrote a letter to the *Sun-Times* stating, “The difference in the actions and backgrounds of the two women are glaring. Parks was a U.S. citizen.” He went on to drive a wedge between the two activists: “On the other hand, Arellano’s entire history with our country has been under the shroud of illegality: illegal documents and now refusal to follow a court order to surrender herself and leave the country.”²¹

There is also some research indicating that African Americans fear that the Latinx population will leapfrog African Americans in the racial stratification in the U.S. socio-economic reality. African Americans historically have experienced the arrival of new immigrants that initially have been marginalized, yet eventually assimilate and surpass African Americans in social class. Edward Telles expressed the concern that while currently marginalized, Latinos will eventually self-identify as white and move up the socio-economic class scale.²²

Internal Divisions within the Latinx Community

In addition to divisions between African Americans and the Latinx community, there are also internal divisions *within* the Latinx community. Here are four possible and plausible explanations for the lack of unity or the less visible resistance from the Latinx community. One possible factor that has made organizing the Latinx community difficult is cultural difference based on country of origin. A person from Cuba does not have the same cultural background as a person from Mexico or El Salvador. There is even the challenge of nomenclature and categorization. There is a total of 21 countries that speak Spanish including Spain. All of them have different cultures and speak the language slightly differently with a different vocabulary. There are also very large cultural and linguistic differences within various regions of Latin American countries. For example, there are differences in the accent between Chihuahua and Chiapas, Mexico. In fact, there are seventy-two recognized indigenous languages and cultures in Mexico alone. This does not even begin to analyze the diversity of cultures and linguistic differences across various Latin American and the Caribbean. As a result, a person in Honduras, for example, does not consider herself initially to be “Latina,” but rather considers herself first and foremost to be Honduran.

Moreover, there is no natural connection between a person, for example, from Honduras and one from El Salvador. In fact, quite to the contrary: these two countries have had historic rivalries and disputes. They even fought a war in 1968 that began after a soccer game! The same can be true of rivalries between countries such as Colombia and Venezuela, Nicaragua and Costa Rica, and Brazil and Bolivia that have had tensions

²⁰ Mary Mitchell, “Immigrant Activist Holed Up in Church Is No Rosa Parks,” *Chicago Sun-Times*, August 22, 2006. Also cited in Sandoval (2010).

²¹ Timothy Thomas Jr., “You Are No Rosa Parks,” letter to the editor, *Chicago Sun-Times*, August 21, 2006. Also cited in Sandoval (2010).

²² Edward Telles, Mark Q. Sawyer, and Gaspar Rivera-Salgado, *Just Neighbors? Research on African-American and Latino Relations in the United States* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2011), 5.

and conflicts in recent years. The fact that there is an increase in the Latinx population in the U.S.A, does not necessarily mean that people from Honduras, El Salvador, Mexico, Puerto Rico, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Colombia, Bolivia, or Brazil have a common history or affinity and experience to forge a collective identity. There are historical differences and tensions that have socialized persons from Latin American countries to be competitors and rivals.

Another one of the factors that limits the political power of Latinxs is the recent and rapid growth in regions of the country not traditionally associated with Latinx presence. While certain states such as Texas, California, and Florida have had historical Latinx presence going back to the colonial era, the growth in the rural south is relatively new.²³ Macro-economic factors such as industrialization, the decline of the family farm, and the ascent of agribusiness have created a magnet for immigrant workers.²⁴ These relatively new migration patterns have not existed long enough to forge cohesive regional collective identities or political organizations among Latinxs.

A third explanation for the lack of political clout among the Latinx population is that many do not consider the U.S.A. as their home. Many immigrants are here to earn money and to acquire enough wealth to build a home or start a business in their home country, and therefore do not intend to stay long-term. Many workers do not want to risk getting involved with political movements as they could get laid off and sidetrack their goal of accumulating capital for their long-term dream of returning to their country of origin. A Pew Research Center report revealed that “Higher levels of engagement with the home country are associated with weaker attachment to the U.S.”²⁵ The report found that 51% of all Latinx immigrants send remittances to their home country and 41% talk by telephone with a relative or friend there at least once a week. These numbers are higher for recent immigrants and decline over time, as to be expected. Similarly, only 51% of Latinx immigrants say they plan to stay in the U.S. for good, yet this number increases to 85% after people have been here for more than 30 years.²⁶ According to this report, new immigrants are more likely to have plans to return to their home country, and thus feel less engaged with U.S. politics.

A fourth reason that Latinxs are less likely to engage in politics in the U.S.A. is immigrant status. Of the 55 million people of Latinx origin in the U.S. as of 2014, 19.4 million were immigrants. As of January 2012, it was estimated that the number of unauthorized immigrants present in the U.S. was 11.4 million, of whom approximately 7.8 million were from Mexico and Central America, and 690,000 from South America.²⁷ Obviously undocumented immigrants cannot vote in the U.S. and they assume greater risk of drawing attention to their immigration status when participating in any political

²³ Robert Aponte and Marcelo Siles, “Latinos in the Heartland: The Browning of the Midwest,” *JSRI Publications*, Julian Samora Research Institute, Research Report No. 5, November 1994, <https://jsri.msu.edu/upload/research-reports/rr05.pdf>.

²⁴ Aponte and Siles, “Latinos in the Heartland.”

²⁵ Roger Waldinger, “Between Here and There: How Attached Are Latino Immigrants to Their Native Country?” Pew Resource Center, October 25, 2007, <https://www.pewhispanic.org/2007/10/25/between-here-and-there-how-attached-are-latino-immigrants-to-their-native-country/>.

²⁶ Waldinger, “Between Here and There.”

²⁷ Waldinger, “Between Here and There.”

actions or rallies. This is also true to a certain extent of legal immigrants, such as permanent residents, who are not yet U.S.A. citizens. So, when the Latinx community confronts police brutality, there is a fear of deportation, which leads to greater reluctance to engage.

History of Resistance among Latinxs

The Latinx community has not always been divided and unengaged politically. In the 1950s, Cesar Chavez began organizing farm workers in Arizona, and in 1962, he co-founded a union with Dolores Huerta using the non-violent methods for social change of Gandhi to struggle for better wages and working conditions. In 1966 Chavez' union joined with a California group to later become the United Farm Workers, which led a nation-wide boycott of grapes in the 1960s and early '70s. The boycott was successful forcing the state of California to pass the first collective bargaining agreement in the U.S. outside of Hawaii. A national poll estimated that 17% of Americans stopped buying grapes as a result of the boycott, which exerted economic pressure on the growers to negotiate with the farm workers.²⁸ Cesar Chavez died in 1993 at the age of 66, and some speculate that his premature death was the result of a 36-day hunger strike a few years prior.²⁹

Similarly, the Farm Labor Organizing Committee (FLOC) began in the 1960s when Baldemar Velásquez convinced a group of farm workers in Ohio that they could have more power united than divided. FLOC organized a successful strike for higher wages for 2,000 farm workers in 1978, a march to the Campbell Soup headquarters in Camden, NJ in 1986 resulting in a better contract for tomato and pickle growers in Michigan and Ohio, and a successful 5-year boycott that brought Mt. Olive Pickles of North Carolina to the negotiating table in 2003.³⁰ In a related effort, the Coalition of Immokalee Workers led a successful campaign against Taco Bell to increase the wages for tomato growers in Florida.³¹ While the overwhelming majority of these farm workers are Latinxs, not all Latinxs are farm workers. These efforts to organize the Latinx population for better wages and working conditions in one economic sector and region of the U.S. does not necessary transfer over to power to organize against racism and police brutality in other regions of the country. Moreover, many organizing efforts concentrate on employees of one company or one industry, for example hotel maids or fast-food workers, and the mobilizing power is often limited to one particular sector.

Growth of Latinx Immigrants in the U.S.A.

²⁸ Robert Lindsey, "Cesar Chavez, 66, Organizer of Union for Migrant, Dies," April 24, 1993, New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/learning/general/onthisday/bday/0331.html>.

²⁹ United Farm Workers website, accessed May 16, 2016, http://www.ufw.org/_page.php?menu=research&inc=history/07.html.

³⁰ Farm Labor Organizing Committee, accessed May 14, 2016, <http://www.floc.com/wordpress/about-floc/>.

³¹ Evelyn Nieves, "Accord with Tomato Pickers Ends Boycott of Taco Bell," *Washington Post*, March 9, 2005, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A18187-2005Mar8.html>.

During the 1990s and early 2000s, there was a dramatic increase in undocumented Latinx immigrants in the United States—largely as a response to the economic changes resulting from the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). While there was growing dissatisfaction with the federal immigration policy, it wasn't until the report that the 9/11 terrorist attacks were carried out by legal immigrants belonging to an Al Qaeda cell that certain sectors of the U.S.A. population began expressing anti-immigrant sentiments. In fact, the week of September 11, 2001, President Vicente Fox of Mexico was scheduled to travel to Washington to meet with President George Bush to discuss immigration reform. The attacks obviously diverted Bush's attention and created an anti-immigrant backlash.

In response, the Latinx community began its own push for immigration reform. On May 1, 2006 there was a national-wide "Day without an immigrant" strike, where Latinxs held protest rallies in major cities, such as Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, Washington, and Miami.³² The purpose of the strike was to highlight the economic contributions that immigrants make to the U.S. economy. The idea came from the 2004 movie "A Day without a Mexican," directed by Sergio Arau, that depicted thousands of Mexican workers mysteriously disappeared one day, basically shutting down the country.³³ While this nation-wide day of protest began with a lot of energy, it has not translated to consistent political pressure on the federal government to pass immigration reform, nor to prevent police brutality against the Latinx community.

More recently, a younger generation of undocumented Latinx immigrants has been losing the fear of speaking out and has been participating more in the political process. This group of young Latinxs were brought to the U.S. as young children by their parents and are now known as "dreamers," which is based on the acronym from an immigration reform bill introduced to Congress in 2001 and stands for Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors. Eventually the House of Representatives approved the Dream Act in 2010, but it was defeated in the Senate. After this bill failed to become law, President Obama signed an executive order in 2012 creating a two-year protected status called Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) for young undocumented immigrants who fulfill certain requirements.³⁴ Similarly Obama signed a second executive order for parents of U.S.A. citizen children entitled Deferred Action for Parents of Americans (DAPA), but this order was defeated in court by detractors who successfully argued to the Supreme Court that the executive order oversteps presidential authority.³⁵

³² "Thousands March for Immigrant Rights," *CNN*, May 1, 2006, <http://www.cnn.com/2006/US/05/01/immigrant.day/>.

³³ See the website A Day without a Mexican, <http://www adaywithoutamexican.com/>.

³⁴ For requirements, see the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services official page: <https://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/consideration-deferred-action-childhood-arrivals-daca>.

³⁵ Andrew Rudalevige, "Supreme Court Asks Its Four Questions on Obama's Immigration Initiative, Well, Two of Them," *Washington Post*, April 21, 2016, <https://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/consideration-deferred-action-childhood-arrivals-daca>.

One of the reasons that the Dream Act did not pass in the Senate was that the Latinx community, in spite of its numerical growth, still does not represent a large voting constituency. Nationwide Latinxs represent 17.4% of the total population,³⁶ but were only 10% of the U.S. electorate in the 2012 national elections.³⁷ The Pew Research Center reports that this percentage of eligible Latinx voters increased to 12% for the 2016 elections, but still does not represent a significant political block in most states.³⁸ Moreover, the national differences among the Latinx population often express themselves in the elections and different constituencies often cancel out each other's votes. For example, in the 2016 elections the pro-Republican Cuban constituency ignored candidate Trump's anti-immigrant rhetoric and helped him win the state of Florida. However Pew estimates that there are 800,000 U.S. born Latinxs living in various states across the country who turn 18 every month.³⁹ This demographic sector could have a major impact on future elections if they register and vote—although early indications is that this sector of young Latinx U.S.A. citizens are just as likely to vote as their non-Latinx peers. In 2012 only 37.8% of Latinx millennials (between the ages of 18 and 35) voted in the general elections.⁴⁰ A key challenge for the future of Latinx influence in the U.S. political situation will be to get young people to register and turn out to vote. This brings our focus back to my thesis statement. Namely, even though Latinxs are the largest ethnic minority in the U.S., this numerical growth has not translated to a proportionate political power.

What Latinxs Can Learn from African Americans

I submit that the Latinx population in the U.S. can learn a great deal from the history and struggle of African Americans. Without diminishing the accomplishments of the aforementioned movements and organizing efforts of the UFW, FLOC, and the Dreamers, they were specific movements advocating for certain sectors of the population that have not created the deep tradition and collective narrative of African American movements. Throughout their 400-year history in North America, African Americans have faced tremendous challenges, such as slavery, segregation, Jim Crow laws, mass incarceration, and police brutality, among others. Through the struggles against these injustices, the African American community has found creative resistance efforts, such as the Underground Railroad, abolitionism, the civil rights movement, and *#BlackLivesMatters*. Each successive struggle builds on the prior, creating a legacy of resistance and persistence. There is a long tradition of heroes, heroines, and Black

³⁶ "Quick Facts," U.S. Census Bureau, accessed May 16, 2016, <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/00>.

³⁷ Cindy Y. Rodriguez, "Latino Vote Key to Obama's Re-election," *CNN*, November 9, 2012, <http://www.cnn.com/2012/11/09/politics/latino-vote-key-election/>.

³⁸ Jens Manuel Krogstad, "Key Facts about the Latino Vote in 2016," Pew Research Center, October 14, 2016, <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/10/14/key-facts-about-the-latino-vote-in-2016/>.

³⁹ Mark Hugo Lopez *et. al.*, "Latino Voters and the Mid-term 2014 Elections," Pew Research Center, October 16, 2014, <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2014/10/16/latino-voters-and-the-2014-midterm-elections/>.

⁴⁰ Daniel Bush, "Latino Millennials Could be Major Voting Bloc—If turnout is high enough," *PBS*, January 20, 2016, <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/updates/latino-millennials-could-be-major-voting-bloc-if-they-vote/>.

intellectuals, including Harriet Tubman, Frederick Douglass, WEB Dubois, Rosa Parks, and Martin Luther King, Jr., to name a few, who have created a prophetic tradition of resistance.

Martin Luther King was very effective at drawing upon this tradition of resistance and weaving in a theological narrative, even into secular marches, to give political power and determination to the Civil Rights movement. In his book *Martin Luther King and the Rhetoric of Freedom: The Exodus Narrative in America's Struggle for Civil Rights*, Gary Selby argues that Dr. King drew upon the story of the Exodus to create a compelling narrative during the Civil Rights movement:

The Exodus Story, continually recounted in the movement's oratory and its music, gave protesters a powerful motivation for continuing the marches. But it also imbued the act itself with symbolic meaning as the representation of blacks' progress toward the "freedom land."⁴¹

Selby analyzes Dr. King's sermons and speeches to discover that the image of the Exodus was central to the strength, unity, and perseverance of the movement. By incorporating the Exodus into the struggle, Dr. King was also invoking the tradition of how this story had been told and re-told by the African American community for 150 years.⁴² According to Selby, the narrative of the Exodus story helped African Americans feel that God and justice was on their side, and that in spite of obstacles and detours, ultimate victory was inevitable.

Within the Latinx community in the United States, there is no parallel story that creates collective identity. If Latinxs were to attempt to copy this example from African Americans, the narrative would break down because many Latinx immigrants identify more with their country of origin than with the U.S.A.⁴³ The Exodus story could suggest to Latinxs that their home countries represent bondage when they have deep ties there and many long to return to be reunited with their families. The flip side of the story is that the U.S. represents the Promised Land; however, many Latinxs are the victims of racism, unjust immigration and labor laws in the U.S.A., and often take the blame for job shortages in the current economic and political climate.⁴⁴ Rather than the Promised Land, some Latinxs may perceive the U.S. to be the "belly of the beast" and long to return to their countries of origin where they feel welcome and are not the victims of discrimination. In other words, the Exodus story can be interpreted differently by members of the Latinx community who come from a variety of countries and life experiences. The solution is not that Latinxs copy the African American story, rather

⁴¹ Gary S. Selby, *Martin Luther King and the Rhetoric of Freedom: The Exodus Narrative in America's Struggle for Civil Rights* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008), 157.

⁴² Selby, *Martin Luther King*, 27.

⁴³ Waldinger, "Between Here and There."

⁴⁴ Conor Friedersdorf, "What Right-Wing Populist Movements Share: Blaming Immigrants," *The Atlantic*, June 29, 2017, <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/06/what-right-wing-populist-movements-share-blaming-immigrants/532023/>.

than they learn to create their own narrative that is empowering and uplifting. This narrative could actually come from a broader understanding of the connections between Latinx and African American experience in the United States.

In the late 1990s, Anthony Pinn and Benjamin Valentin recognized the similarities between the experiences and the need for greater dialogue between African American and Latinx theologians and religion scholars. They see how the onslaught of European colonialism allowed for the creation of African American and Latinx realities: “The experiences and identities of these two groups are linked by a unique web of historical relations that began to develop even before the invention of the United States of America.”⁴⁵ They further argue that the African American and Latinx cultures and identities are the result of the “fusion” of Iberian, Amer-Indian, African, and Euro/American cultures.⁴⁶ As these groups resisted Euro-American domination, their identities were further linked by similar struggles. Many Africans were captured, brought to the Americas, and sold into slavery, while indigenous peoples in the Americas were enslaved and colonized by Europeans on land traditionally held by their ancestors. More recently under the socio-economic and political realities of the United States, Pinn and Valentin argue that both groups have been similarly affected:

Both African Americans and Hispanic/Latino/a populations living in the United States have had to contend with the reality of disproportionate poverty and unemployment levels; of limited or poor education, income, housing, and health opportunities; of the hurtful experiences of racist attitudes and negative stereotypes; and of the pervasive limitation of life choices and of hope itself. Thus, both of these groups share a parallel history of struggle in the United States.

In spite of similar experiences, Pinn and Valentin acknowledge the lack of understanding that scholars have about the other group’s reality. They express a desire for dialogue between African American and Latinx intellectuals in general, and theologians and religious scholars in particular, before they can work together: “How can we cooperate and collaborate with each other when we hardly know each other?”⁴⁷ In response to this concern, Pinn and Valentin created a forum for dialogue between African American and Latinx scholars that resulted in two edited volumes. The first book focused more on theology, whereas the sequel discussed popular culture and religious expression more broadly defined. The project brought religion scholars representing both African American and Hispanic/Latino/a traditions into dialogue. The books had contributions from such as scholars as Traci West, Mayra Rivera, Justo González, Dwight Hopkins, Harold Recinos and Ada Maria Isasi-Díaz, among others.

⁴⁵ Anthony B. Pinn and Benjamin Valentin, eds., *The Ties that Bind* (New York and London: Continuum, 2001), 14.

⁴⁶ Pinn and Valentin, *Ties that Bind*, 15.

⁴⁷ Anthony B. Pinn and Benjamin Valentin, eds., *Creating Ourselves: African Americans on Popular Culture and Religious Express* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2009), 3.

In their first edited volume, *The Ties that Bind*, Pinn and Valentin each wrote chapters reflecting on the origins and major themes of the religious identity and theology of Blacks and Hispanic/Latinos/as respectively. They identified both similarities and differences in their experiences. They discovered that both ethnic groups do theology together (*teología en conjunto*), reflect on common experiences (i.e. history of slavery and discrimination), reflect on “popular” religion (*lo cotidiano*), have a cultural hybridity (*mestizaje*), and are oriented toward the “ultimate concern.”⁴⁸ They found similarities in their theological method to reflect on praxis, so that theology was a “second act.”⁴⁹ It was noted that both African American and Latinx religious experience have a historical link to African-based *Santería*.⁵⁰ Areas of concern and further growth were the observations that both theologies are heavily Christian-centric, male-dominated, and homophobic. The authors noted that Womanist theology emerged within Black theology and *Mujerista* theology within Hispanic/Latino/a in response to sexism and based on the experiences of women of color.⁵¹ Pinn and Valentin concluded their remarks calling for further dialogue and understanding between both ethnic groups.

It is revealing that the name for the current *#BlackLivesMatter* movement was not coined by an African American, rather by a Latina. Following the July 13, 2013 acquittal of George Zimmerman of the murder of unarmed teenager Trayvon Martin, workers’ rights activist Alicia Garcia tweeted: “Black people. I love you. I love us. Our lives matter.”⁵² It was her friend Patrice Cullors who added the hashtag. This is revealing because the *#BlackLivesMatter* movement is very integrated—even more than the Civil Rights movement toward its later years. This solidarity among young people across racial lines may be the way to overcome racial barriers and to transfer the history and experience of African American resistance to other people of color who suffer from the same oppressive systems.

In her article “This ‘New’ Feminism Has Been Here All Along,” Dani McClain argues for an “intersectionality” within resistance movements. McClain cites the experience of Haitian American feminist activist Joanne Smith, who sees the intersection between being a black woman and a second-generation immigrant. Smith calls this intersectional feminism. Similarly, the *#BlackLivesMatter* movement is crossing over traditional racial categories and engaging the participation of other oppressed groups such as the LGBTQAI+ community.

It turns out that McClain was right about intersectionality being here all along. Perhaps the term “intersectionality” is new, but the concept is old. During the Civil Rights movement, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) was founded at Shaw University in April of 1960 with a vision of the knowledge that

⁴⁸ Anthony Pinn, *The Ties that Bind: African American and Hispanic/Latino/a Theologies in Dialogue* (New York: Continuum, 2001), 54-56.

⁴⁹ Pinn, *Ties that Bind*, 54.

⁵⁰ Pinn, *Ties that Bind*, 56.

⁵¹ Pinn, *Ties that Bind*, 55.

⁵² Alex Altman, “Black Lives Matter: A New Protest Movement is Turning a Protest Cry into a Political Force,” *Time Magazine*, December 21, 2015, 118.

economic power could be used as a weapon against racial discrimination. The SNCC discovered this during the sit-ins at Woolworth in Greensboro, NC, and their movement continued to fight for greater racial equality through sit-ins, marches, and voter registration.⁵³ As they worked among African Americans, the community organizers observed how racism and poverty were intertwined. Martin Luther King, Jr. famously wrote in *Letter from the Birmingham Jail* that “Injustice anywhere was a threat to justice anywhere.”⁵⁴ This idea links the treatment of Black sharecroppers in the Deep South to that of Mexican American farmworkers in California.⁵⁵ Mike Miller, a White SNCC field secretary from San Francisco, noticed that African American and Mexican American laborers faced similar racial discrimination and economic challenges.⁵⁶ In 1965 the SNCC reached out to the National Farmworkers Association and the two groups continued to support each other’s causes and strategies, such as non-violence, voter registration, and rent strikes.⁵⁷ This is an example of intersectionality at its best.

Conclusion

In conclusion, a lot has transpired in race relations since our return to the United States from living abroad in 2003. It seemed like fate that I happened to see the headlines of that *USA Today* article after just crossing the U.S. border to begin living in rural North Carolina in close contact with the realities of the Latinx community. Although I became aware of the numerical growth of the Latinx community in the U.S.A., this demographic growth has not translated into political power and mobilization of the Latinx community. In spite of attempts to organize labor movements in certain sectors of the economy where Latinx workers are prevalent and a movement of Dreamers, there has been no sweeping immigration reform that so many Latinx immigrants desired. The thousands of deportations that separate families have continued.⁵⁸ There is police brutality against people of color—inclusive of Latinx persons—in our cities. President Trump was elected despite making disparaging remarks against Mexicans and undocumented people on the campaign trail. Yes, the Latinx population is the largest racial ethnic group numerically in the U.S.A., but it can benefit from learning the history of African American resistance, as well as building relationships and alliances with the African American community. And, there is hope.

What is emerging is not nation-wide Latinx identity or movement, but rather another expression of resistance. There is a broad intersectional coalition where experiences and strategies are shared between ethnic groups and other oppressed peoples. There are many young people who have grown up together with friends of

⁵³ Lauren Araiza, *To March for Others: The Black Freedom Struggle and the United Farm Workers* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 12-13.

⁵⁴ Martin Luther King, Jr., “Letter from a Birmingham City Jail,” in *Political Philosophy: The Essential Texts*, ed. Steven M. Cahn, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 830-39.

⁵⁵ Araiza, *To March for Others*, 13.

⁵⁶ Araiza, *To March for Others*, 15.

⁵⁷ Araiza, *To March for Others*, 20.

⁵⁸ President Obama deported more undocumented immigrants than any previous president. See Mike Coronas, “Tracking Obama’s Deportation Numbers,” *Reuters*, February 25, 2015, <http://blogs.reuters.com/data-dive/2015/02/25/tracking-obamas-deportation-numbers/>.

different ethnicities and have created a solidarity that crosses over ethnic differences. At the moment of penning this article, it is difficult to say how the movement will turn out, yet it is fair to say that the Latinx sector will continue to grow numerically, and hopefully become “woke.” While I am not in a position to judge as an outsider, I can encourage people to look at injustices systematically and ask the question: who benefits when the African American and Latinx communities are separated? Also, as an outsider and an observer of U.S.A. history, I can state the obvious fact that U.S. citizens have the right to vote, and hopefully the Latinx community can be in relationship, learn from African Americans’ history of resistance, and build alliances with the African American community.

P E R S P E C T I V A S • 2019

SPECIAL EDITION:

“Fake News vs. Good News: Texts, Tweets and Technology” – A Roundtable Conversation

**Organized by La Comunidad of Hispanic Scholars for Religion at
the Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion (AAR)
and Society of Biblical Literature (SBL) - November 2018,
Denver, CO**

ROUNDTABLE CONTRIBUTORS:

Jacqueline M. Hidalgo, Corinna Guerrero, Santiago Slabodsky

INTRODUCTION BY:

Loida I. Martell

Lexington Theological Seminary

On November of 2018, La Comunidad of Hispanic Scholars of Religion gathered during the annual meeting of the American Academy of Religion (AAR) and Society of Biblical Literature (SBL) in Denver, Colorado. La Comunidad (literally, “the community”) is the oldest organization of Latinx scholars recognized by AAR/SBL, founded in 1989.¹ During the 2018 gathering, La Comunidad presented Dr. Fernando S. Segovia with the Lifetime Achievement Award in recognition of his “lifetime of scholarship and service on behalf of the Latinx community.”² In light of this award, and to highlight Segovia’s hermeneutical and methodological approaches to Scripture, particularly in postmodern and postcolonial critical analysis, panelists were invited to speak on “Fake News vs. Good News: Texts, Tweets and Technology,” from scholarly and grassroots perspectives. The meeting was sponsored in collaboration with the Latina/o and Latin American Interpretation Group, and co-presided by Dr. Ahida Pilarski (St. Anselm College) and Dr. Loida I. Martell (Lexington Theological Seminary). This issue of *Perspectivas* is proud to include the papers presented by the panelists in 2018.

Scripture is an important interlocuter in the elaboration of faith and practice in the Latinx community, and thus in the articulation of their theologies and ethical principles. Latinx scholars have long noted the way the community reads Scriptures

¹ For a synopsis of the history of La Comunidad of Hispanic Scholars, go to <https://sites.google.com/site/lacomunidadonline/history>. I use the “x” ending rather than Latina or Latino to indicate inclusive language that transcends cis-gendered categories.

² <https://sites.google.com/site/lacomunidadonline/awards>

in an organic way, becoming a “living” and a lived word. Over the years Catholic and Protestant scholars have reiterated this organic approach to Scripture. In 2013, Efrain Agosto published the findings from a comprehensive study that he and others undertook, interviewing various Protestant, Catholic, and Muslim groups to determine how grassroots communities used and read Scripture. Their findings indicate that Scripture was invariably authoritative for these varied Latinx religious communities—however differently they might define “authoritative.”³ Nevertheless, given the current political, social, and religious environment, texts, including biblical texts, have taken on a degree of “elasticity” in meaning. Social media has contributed to this phenomenon. As such, the veracity and value of what had been identified as “authoritative texts,” however one defines these, are being questioned in new ways. The terminology of “fake news”—begun as a self-serving means to justify illicit behavior—has now entered the popular lexicon and led to the need to discern the veracity of heretofore unquestionable, or at the very least, valued source material. To this end, we invited our panelists to speak on these issues. While each approached the general theme in different ways, there are two points that all three underscore. First, they recognize that the term of “fake news” is a politically expedient one that hides from view the colonization and marginalization of communities, and their urgent issues. “Fake news” is, in effect, a camouflage that hides “non-news”—the unreported crises, calamities, and tragedies that face oppressed communities in the United States of America and the world.⁴ Our panelists thus insist on broadening the term “fake news” to re-examine it through the lenses of postcolonial critical analysis. Fernando S. Segovia’s methodology proves to be fruitful for them in this regard. Second, precisely because of this silencing and invisibilization, our panelists seek the voices of others, whether through “collaborative plurality,” grassroots memes, or by ensuring that we create a world where “many worlds” fit and “different tongues” can be spoken. It is in the dialogical process of plurality where we can allow ourselves to be interrogated critically for the “blind spots” of bias as well as interrogate others and be assessed through a hermeneutical method that to some extent guards against the creation of “fake news,” “alternative facts,” and tools for oppression.

The first essay titled “The Bible and Global-Systemic Criticism in the Age of ‘Fake News’” is presented by Dr. Jacqueline M. Hidalgo, associate professor of Latina/o Studies and Religion at Williams College in Massachusetts. In her essay, Hidalgo celebrates the work of Fernando S. Segovia by broadening the terminology of “fake news” from its narrow interpretive confines that limits the interrogation of news to determine veracity or falsehood for political ends. Rather, she proposes that

³ Efraín Agosto, “Reading the Word in America: US Latino/a Religious Communities and their Scriptures,” in *MisReading America: Scriptures and Difference*, edited by Vincent L. Wimbush (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

⁴ A good example of this is found in Mitzi J. Smith, *Womanist Sass and Talk Back: Social (In)Justice, Intersectionality, and Biblical Interpretation* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2018), in her discussion of the Samaritan woman and the injustice of water services being denied to poor people of color in Detroit. The story of how the Detroit Water and Sewerage Department privatized water services, and denied service to those owing more than \$150 after unconscionable increases in service fees has not been reported in major news outlets—who instead dedicate their space to report entertainment “news” or on the current administration’s most recent picadilloes.

Segovia's critical analyses of hermeneutical process itself, as well as of texts, provides us a different way of approaching texts—to wit, to interrogate the perspective and location of the interpreter and demand a process of “collaborative plurality”. This process is even more critical given the fact that, fake news has been used historically to advance the purposes of those in power and to dominate, marginalize, and erase others. Indeed, biblical texts such as those in the book of Revelation are attempts to respond to imperial “fake news” about Roman *pax et securitas* by offering a counternarrative about One who commands the world who is greater than Caesar. Offering such a counternarrative is part of a process of “crisis and catharsis” that Hidalgo considers congruent with Segovia's postcolonial analysis because it is attentive to power dynamics. Nevertheless, simply posing a counternarrative is insufficient. Hidalgo notes how Empire has used even biblical counternarratives for its own end, and thus the Bible itself has become “fake news,” used to justify enslavement and genocide of whole peoples. Hidalgo thus suggests that Segovia's methodology is critical because it acknowledges 1) that all worlds are constructed, 2) that the hermeneut must always also be critical of who they are and their social location, and 3) and therefore that this demands a collaborative plurality that allows us to become aware of our limitations.

The second essay is written by Dr. Corinna Guerrero, a lecturer in the Religious Studies Department at Santa Clara University in San Francisco.⁵ Guerrero's article, titled “Competing Narratives, Memes, and Going Viral as Socio-Theological Reflection and Resistance for USA Latinxs communities: a Hebrew Bible Perspective,” draws an intriguing and creative parallel between the meme's of social media and how Scripture, particularly Hebrew Bible (First Testament) texts play similar roles. She begins by contrasting the apparent lack of familiarity of, and interaction with, Scripture demonstrated by Latinx Christians (and Jews) versus their familiarity with social media, and particularly their access to messages conveyed by memes. She defines a meme as “a visio-textual image or video that presents and counter-presents or re-presents at the same time.” Guerrero's primary argument is that as memes are used as the sites of resistance and counter-narrative that resist imperial, colonizing, and oppressive social forces and stereotypical narratives couched in racial, heterosexist, and otherwise demeaning forms, so biblical pericopes, particularly those found in First Testament, are often used “as a newly reimagined place for socio-theological reflection [that] can offer US Latinxs resistance building strategies grounded in a biblical faith.” She concludes, on one hand, with an exhortation to evaluate how we can further integrate the use of social media in the face of shifting social and political conditions, particularly those that threaten U.S.A. Latinx agency; and, on the other, to encourage greater utilization of Scripture, especially Hebrew Bible as an intersecting conversation partner.

In the last essay of this roundtable, Dr. Santiago Slabodsky continues with Hidalgo and Guerrero's challenge to hear not simply alternative voices, but more importantly diverse voices in his essay titled “Speaking in Other Tongues: Fernando Segovia's Contributions to Discerning ‘Fake News.’” Slabodsky, the Florence and

⁵ Guerrero can be followed on social media through the handle *#costlyscripture*.

Robert Kaufman Endowed Chair in Jewish Studies at Hofstra University in New York, uses Segovia's analysis of Acts 2:4–5 to underscore the importance of a multitude of diverse voices that arise from marginalized and invisibilized groups who have been stereotyped as “barbaric,” and thus considered to be of no consequence. These diverse voices are characterized by the fact they do not seek uniformity nor do they impose a singular “truth.” In contemporary times, these voices often use social media and the internet networks. Slabodsky contrasts such movements that speak to power with those that espouse “fake news.” The latter arise from centers of power, whether it be voices from imperial Roman forces, or in the contemporary landscape from neofascism, Trumpism, or neoliberal capitalism. One must be careful, avers Slabodsky, not to confuse the Islamophobic, anti-Semitic, misogynist voices who use the same networks of democratizing multitudes and who purport to speak on behalf of the disenfranchised and powerless. While they have “appropriated the typical narratives of marginalized communities” to raise the specter of “white genocide,” their “alternative facts” only function synergistically with narratives of “fake news” conveyed by those in power to further suppress the truly marginalized. Contrary to the truth they purport to convey, in reality what they seek is to control the message, to reduce it to a univocal truth, and to elevate a messiah-like figure. Thus we must hold in suspicion movements that claim to speak from the margins but ultimately, silence the diversity of democratizing voices that arise from it. Supporting a multitude of diverse voices is crucial because they serve to counter totalitarianism and monopolies on power. Slabodsky concludes by citing a rallying call of the Zapatista movement: “*Vamos a crear ‘un mundo donde quepan muchos mundos’*(let us create a world where many worlds can fit).”

It is the hope of La Comunidad in collaboration with the editors of *Perspectivas* that, these essays can provide a means to engage in conversations about how to critically gauge texts—not just biblical texts but oral and written texts. Amid competing voices, Pontius Pilate asked Jesus, “What is truth?” (John 18:38). Perhaps, as Latinx scholars, what we can provide are better questions: “what is right, and good, and life-giving?” and thus provide guidance to the Church, and a society at large that seeks “good news.”

EDICIÓN ESPECIAL:

**“Noticias Falsas vs. Buenas Noticias: textos, tweets y tecnología”
- Una mesa redonda organizada por La Comunidad de
Académicos Hispanos de la Religión durante la conferencia
anual de la Academia Americana de Religión (AAR) y la sociedad
de Literatura Bíblica (SLB) - noviembre 2018, Denver, CO**

CONTRIBUYENTES A LA MESA REDONDA:

Jacqueline M. Hidalgo, Corinna Guerrero, Santiago Slabodsky

INTRODUCCIÓN POR:

Loida I. Martell

Lexington Theological Seminary

En noviembre del 2018, La Comunidad de Académicos Hispanos de la Religión se reunió durante la conferencia anual de la Academia Americana de Religión (AAR) y la sociedad de Literatura Bíblica (SLB) en Denver Colorado. La Comunidad es la organización más antigua de académicos Latinx reconocida por la /AAR/SLB, y fundada en 1989.¹ Durante la reunión en el 2018, La Comunidad le presentó al Dr. Fernando S. Segovia el Premio de Logros de Toda una Vida en reconocimiento de “toda su vida académica y servicio en nombre de la comunidad Latinx”² A la luz de este premio, y para resaltar los enfoques hermenéutico y metodológico de Segovia a las escrituras, particularmente en el análisis crítico posmoderno y poscolonial, se invitó a panelistas a hablar sobre “Noticias Falsas vs. Buenas Noticias: textos, tweets y tecnología”, de perspectivas académicas y de base. La reunión fue patrocinada en colaboración con el Grupo de Interpretación Latina/o y América Latina, y copresidida por la Dra. Ahida Pilarski (St. Anselm College) y Dra. Loida I. Martell (Lexington Theological Seminary). Esta edición de *Perspectivas* se enorgullece de incluir las ponencias de estos panelistas en 2018.

Las escrituras son un interlocutor importante en la elaboración de la fe y la práctica en las comunidades latinx, y por lo tanto en la articulación de sus teologías y principios éticos. Los académicos latinx han notado durante mucho tiempo que la comunidad lee las escrituras en una forma orgánica, convirtiéndose en un “vivir” y una palabra vivida. A lo largo de los años, estudiosos católicos y protestantes han reiterado este enfoque

¹ For a synopsis of the history of La Comunidad of Hispanic Scholars, go to <https://sites.google.com/site/lacomunidadonline/history>. Use the “x” in lugar de Latina o Latino para indicar un lenguaje inclusivo que trasciende las categorías cis-género.

²<https://sites.google.com/site/lacomunidadonline/awards>

orgánico a las escrituras. En el 2013, Efraín Agosto publicó los resultados de un estudio comprensivo que él y otros emprendieron, entrevistando varios grupos protestantes, católicos y musulmanes para determinar cómo las comunidades de base usan y leen las escrituras. Sus hallazgos indican que las escrituras invariablemente eran consideradas autoritativas por estas diversas comunidades religiosas latinx—como quiera que ellas definan “autoritativo.”³ Sin embargo, dado al actual entorno político, social, y clima religioso, textos, incluyendo textos bíblicos, han cobrado un grado de “elasticidad” en significado. Las redes sociales han contribuido a este fenómeno. Como tal, la veracidad y valor de lo que se consideraba como “textos autoritativos”, como quiera que estos sean definidos, están siendo cuestionadas de nuevas maneras. La terminología de “noticias falsas”—que comenzó como un medio interesado de justificar comportamientos ilícitos—ahora ha entrado el léxico popular y ha llevado a la necesidad de discernir la veracidad de lo que hasta aquí había sido incuestionable, o al menos, material de fuentes valiosas. Con este fin invitamos a nuestros panelistas a hablar sobre estos temas. Mientras cada uno/a de ellos/as abordó el tema en general de diferente manera, hay dos puntos que los/as tres subrayan. Primero, ellos/as reconocen que el término “noticias falsas” es políticamente conveniente que esconde de la vista la colonización y marginación de las comunidades y sus problemas urgentes. “Noticias falsas” es, en efecto, un camuflaje que esconde las “no-noticias”—las crisis, calamidades, y tragedias no reportadas que enfrentan las comunidades oprimidas en Los Estados Unidos de América y el mundo.⁴ De manera que nuestros/as panelistas insistieron en ampliar el término “noticias falsas” para reexaminarlo a través de los lentes del análisis crítico poscolonial. La metodología de Fernando S. Segovia resultó fructífera para ellos/as en este sentido. Segundo, precisamente por el silenciamiento e invisibilización, nuestros/as panelistas buscaron las voces de otros/as, ya sea por medio de “pluralidad colaborativa”, memes de base, o asegurándose de crear un mundo donde “muchos mundos” caben y “diferentes idiomas” puedan ser hablados. Es en el proceso dialógico de la pluralidad donde podemos permitirnos ser interrogados críticamente por nuestros “puntos ciegos” de nuestra parcialidad, como también interrogar a otros/as y ser evaluados a través de un método hermenéutico que, en cierta medida, protege en contra de la creación de “noticias falsas”, “hechos alternativos”, y herramientas para la opresión.

El primer ensayo “La Biblia y el Criticismo Sistémico Global en la era de ‘noticias falsas’” es presentado por la Dra. Dr. Jacqueline M. Hidalgo, Profesora asociada de estudios latinos y religión en Williams College en Massachusetts. En su artículo, Hidalgo celebra el trabajo de Fernando S. Segovia al ampliar la terminología de “noticias falsas” desde sus estrechos confines interpretativos que limitan la interrogación de noticias

³Efraín Agosto, “Reading the Word in America: US Latino/a Religious Communities and their Scriptures,” in *MisReading America: Scriptures and Difference*, edited by Vincent L. Wimbush (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

⁴Un buen ejemplo de estos se encuentra en Mitzi J. Smith, *WomanistSass and Talk Back: Social (In)Justice, Intersectionality, and Biblical Interpretation* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2018), en su discusión de la mujer samaritana y la injusticia de los servicios de agua negados a las personas pobres de color en Detroit. La historia de cómo el Departamento de Agua y Alcantarillado privatizó los servicios de agua, y negó servicio a las personas que debían más de \$150.00 después de aumentos exorbitantes en las tarifas de servicios no ha sido reportado en los medios noticieros principales—que en su lugar dedican espacios para reportar “noticias” de entretenimiento o sobre los más recientes pecadillos de la administración actual.

para determinar su veracidad o falsedad con fines políticos. Más bien, ella propone que los análisis críticos de Segovia del proceso hermenéutico mismo, tan bien como de textos, nos proporciona una manera diferente de abordar los textos—a saber, de interrogar la perspectiva y la ubicación del/de la intérprete y exigir un proceso de “pluralidad colaborativa.” Este proceso es aún más crítico dado al hecho de que, falsas noticias han sido usadas históricamente para avanzar los propósitos de aquellos/as que están en el poder y para dominar, marginar, y borrar a otros/as. Ciertamente, textos bíblicos como como los que se encuentran en el libro del Apocalipsis son intentos de responder a las “noticias falsas” imperiales sobre la *pax et securitas* romanas al ofrecer una contra-narrativa sobre Uno que manda al mundo que es más grande que el César. Ofrecer semejante contra-narrativa es parte de un proceso de “crisis y catarsis” que Hidalgo considera congruentes con el análisis poscolonial de Segovia porque es atento a las dinámicas de poder. Sin embargo, no es suficiente con proponer una contra narrativa. Hidalgo señala cómo el Imperio ha usado incluso las contra-narrativas bíblicas para sus propios fines, de manera que la Biblia misma se ha convertido en “noticias falsas”, usada para justificar la esclavitud y el genocidio de pueblos enteros. Hidalgo sugiere que la metodología de Segovia es crítica porque reconoce 1) que todos los mundos son contruidos, 2) que el/la hermeneuta debe siempre ser crítico/a de quién es y de su ubicación social, y 3) y, por lo tanto, que esto demanda una pluralidad colaborativa que nos permita tomar conciencia de nuestras limitaciones.

El segundo ensayo es escrito por la Dra. Corinna Guerrero, profesora en el Departamento de Estudios Religiosos en la Universidad Santa Clara en San Francisco.⁵El artículo de Guerrero, titulado “Narrativas en competencia, memes, y volverse viral como reflexión socio-teológica y resistencia para las comunidades latinx en USA: Una perspectiva de la Biblia hebrea”, dibuja un paralelismo intrigante y creativo entre los memes de los medios sociales y como las escrituras, particularmente textos de la Biblia hebrea (El Primer Testamento) desempeñan un papel similar. Ella comienza contrastando la aparente falta de familiaridad e interacción con las escrituras demostradas por los/as cristianos latinx (y judíos) con su familiaridad con las redes sociales, y en particular su acceso a los mensajes transmitidos por los memes. Ella define un meme como “una imagen visio-textual o video que presenta y contra-presenta o re-presenta al mismo tiempo.” El argumento principal de Guerrero es que en la manera que memes son usados como sitios de resistencia y contra-narrativa que resisten fuerzas sociales imperiales, colonizadoras y opresivas, y narrativas estereotipadas expresadas en formas raciales, también pasajes bíblicos, particularmente aquellos que se encuentran en el Primer Testamento, son usados “como un nuevo lugar reimaginado para reflexión socioteológica [que] puede ofrecer a los/as latinx estadounidenses estrategias de construcción de resistencia basadas en la fe bíblica.” Ella concluye, por un lado, con la exhortación de evaluar cómo podemos integrar más el uso de las redes sociales frente a las cambiantes condiciones sociales y políticas, particularmente aquellas que amenazan la agencia de los/as latinx en los EUA; y por el otro lado, animar una mayor utilización de las escrituras, especialmente la Biblia hebrea, como compañera de conversación.

⁵Pueden seguir a Guerrero en las redes sociales a través de su nombre (handle) #costlyscripture.

En el último ensayo de esta mesa redonda, el Dr. Santiago Slabodsky continúa con el desafío de Hidalgo y Guerrero de escuchar no solamente voces alternativas, sino más importantemente voces diversas en su ensayo titulado “Hablando en otras lenguas: Las contribuciones de Fernando Segovia para discernir ‘noticias falsas’.” Slabodsky, quien ocupa la Cátedra Florence y Robert Kaufman en estudios judíos en la Universidad Hofstra en Nueva York, usa el análisis de Segovia en Hechos 2:4–5 para subrayar la importancia de una multitud de voces diversas que surgen de grupos marginados e invisibilizados que han sido estereotipados como “bárbaros”, y, por lo tanto, no tienen ninguna consecuencia. Estas voces diversas son caracterizadas por el hecho que no buscan uniformidad ni buscan imponer una “verdad” singular. En los tiempos contemporáneos, estas voces a menudo usan los medios sociales y las redes de Internet. Slabodsky contrasta tales movimientos que hablan al poder con aquellos que defienden las “noticias falsas.” Los últimos surgen de los centros de poder, ya sean voces de las fuerzas imperiales romanas, o en el pasaje contemporáneo del neofascismo, el Trumpismo, o el capitalismo neoliberal. Uno debe tener cuidado, afirma Slabodsky, de no confundir voces islamofóbicas, antisemíticas, y misóginas que usan las mismas redes de las multitudes democratizadoras y que pretenden hablar en nombre de los/as desfavorecidos/as e impotentes. Si bien se han “apropiado de las narrativas típicas de las comunidades marginadas” para elevar el espectro de “genocidio blanco”, sus “hechos alternativos” solamente funcionan de manera sinérgica con las narrativas de “noticias falsas” transmitidas por los/as que están en poder para suprimir aún más a los/as que son verdaderamente marginados/as. Contrariamente a la verdad que pretenden transmitir, en realidad lo que buscan es controlar el mensaje, y reducirlo a una verdad unívoca, y elevar una figura parecida a un mesías. Por lo tanto, debemos sospechar de movimientos que dicen hablar desde los márgenes pero que, en última instancia, silencian la diversidad de las voces democratizantes que se levantan de la misma. Apoyar una multitud de voces diversas es crucial porque sirve para contrarrestar el totalitarismo y los monopolios del poder. Slabodsky concluye citando el llamado del movimiento zapatista: “*Vamos a crear ‘un mundo donde quepan muchos mundos’*”

Es la esperanza de La Comunidad, en colaboración con los editores de *Perspectivas*, que estos ensayos puedan proporcionar un medio para entablar conversaciones sobre cómo evaluar textos críticamente—no solamente textos bíblicos sino los textos orales y escritos. En medio de voces que competían, Poncio Pilato le preguntó a Jesús, “¿Qué es la verdad?” (Juan 18:38). Quizás, como académicos latinxs, lo que podemos ofrecer son mejores preguntas: “¿qué es correcto, y bueno, y vivificante?” y así brindar guía a la iglesia, y a una sociedad en general que busca “buenas nuevas.”

ROUNDTABLE ESSAY #1

The Bible and Global-Systemic Criticism in the Age of “Fake News”¹

Jacqueline M. Hidalgo

Williams College

In early August of 2018, a series of news stories spread virally across different social media platforms, especially facebook and whatsapp. Using photos from a local punk rock concert that took place more than two years before, one of the posts claimed a migrant community was burning the nation’s flag; another story claimed that among these migrants were agents of a foreign military; yet another claimed that specifically transgender migrants were receiving special access to government services that citizens do not receive. On August 18, 2018, the outcome of this circulation of false reports was a right-wing protest in the Capitol, with hundreds marching to a park where migrants were known to gather in order to chant for their removal. Some migrants were beaten to the point of hospitalization.²

You may not be sure which country I am talking about. This dynamic—the affective economy of right wing xenophobia and/or racism stoked further by the spread of clearly false and manufactured news across social media platforms—has become a common enough aspect of political life in several different countries.³ Discussions of fake news have focused on its power to shape elections and politics in large and globally powerful nations, such as Great Britain, France, Germany, Brazil, and of course the United States of America. Often, in the USA context, Russian agents are blamed for this fake news. But what I describe above, this set of false news reports that culminated in xenophobic

¹ An abbreviated version of this essay can be found at *Point of View Publishing*, <https://www.pointofviewpublishing.com/product-page/reading-the-bible-in-the-age-of-fake-news-jacqueline-m-hidalgo>.

² Silvia Artavia, “Ola de noticias falsas antecedió agresiones xenófobas en San José,” *La Nación*, 18 August, 2018, <https://www.nacion.com/el-pais/politica/ola-de-noticias-falsas-antecedio-agresiones/KAC4GDBPIBGSXG5RQ4GACQGTYA/story/>. For an English-language summary with fewer details about the “fake news” that preceded the riot, see Joshua Partlow, “They fled violence in Nicaragua by the thousands. What awaits them in Costa Rica?” *The Washington Post*, September 2, 2018, https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/the_americas/they-fled-violence-in-nicaragua-by-the-thousands-what-awaits-them-in-costa-rica/2018/09/01/51d3f7ee-a62c-11e8-ad6f-080770dcddc2_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.d25d321d35a5.

³ Here I am inspired by Shantee Rosado’s use of Sara Ahmed’s notion of “affective economies” in order to understand how anti-blackness circulates among varying Puerto Rican and Dominican populations in Central Florida. Shantee Rosado, “*Blanco y Negro: Anti-Blackness and the Language Practices of 1.5 and Second Generation Puerto Ricans and Dominicans*” (paper presented at the 3rd Biennial Conference of the Latina/o Studies Association, Washington, D.C., July 2018). Also see Sara Ahmed, “Affective economies,” *Social text* 22, no. 2 (2004): 117-139.

violence in August took place in a small country of around five million people, with no military and no vested Russian interests in purportedly disrupting democracy. When I landed in Costa Rica, the country in which I was born, on August 21, 2018, observing the aftermath of this right-wing protest and violence, I was reminded that no society is immune to the affective power of fear and false stories that stoke xenophobia.

I start with my Tica experience of fake news because it allows us to think about how global a phenomenon “fake news” really is. Although I prefer to avoid the term “fake news” because President Donald J. Trump seems to apply it to almost any news he doesn’t like,⁴ “fake news” has become a term that can help us think about a global host of political narratives. What can a biblical scholar possibly have to say about this contemporary topic?

When I was initially asked to speak on this panel, I wasn’t sure what I could add to already existing discussions. Revisiting the work of Fernando F. Segovia allowed me to recontextualize fake news, albeit by broadening its definition. Here I am thinking of “news” in a much more general sense. I also think that Segovia’s critical model provides tools that could help people to both reframe and confront fake news on different terms. As I want to suggest, Segovia’s work gives us tools to confront fake news as a global crisis by contextualizing its far broader history, but more importantly, his approach to criticism pushes us—or at least pushes me—to ask different questions. He pushes us not to ask necessarily about the truth or falsity of news but about the power of interpretive place and perspective in producing and consuming news. He also pushes us to always have these conversations together, among diverse scholars from all over the world.

In his 2014 presidential address to the Society of Biblical Literature, Segovia called on biblical interpreters to take on a new, broad-angled and interdisciplinary scope of criticism, what he has dubbed the global-systemic. It is an ambitious project, calling on scholars from around the world to come together to think about the crises we confront. As he says,

The scope is expansive: the world of production (composition, dissemination, interchange) as well as the world of consumption (reception, circulation, discussion). It would thus encompass the following foci of attention: (1) the texts and contexts of antiquity; (2) the interpretation of these texts and contexts, and the contexts of such interpretations, in the various traditions of reading the Bible, with a focus on modernity and postmodernity; and (3) the interpreters behind such interpretations, and their corresponding contexts. The lens is wide-angled...The proposed undertaking demands a critical movement... [that is] as diverse as possible.⁵

⁴ See the CNN video story, “A year of ‘fake’ complaints about real news,” *CNN Business*, December 23, 2018, <https://www.cnn.com/videos/media/2018/12/23/a-year-of-fake-complaints-about-real-news-rs.cnn>.

⁵ Fernando F. Segovia, “Criticism in Critical Times: Reflections on Vision and Task,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 134, no. 1 (2015): 26.

Most of these steps would be familiar to anyone who has read Segovia's earlier work on biblical interpretation and postcolonial biblical studies. Segovia takes the object of study to be much more than the simple illumination of the meanings found in some passage in the Bible. He also refuses to treat the Bible as merely means to the ancient world or medium of communication, though it can be both at times. He admits that any one interpreter will provide too narrow a perspective. In refusing the possibility of interpretive objectivity, he demands a practice of collaborative plurality with people from all over the world and embodying different perspectives working together. But the real object of study is us, our present global crises, structures of power, and the place of textual production and consumption in this mess with which we all live.

As someone who has been inspired by the work of Segovia and others since I was a MA student, I generally do not start in the ancient world, but the modern one. I do not think one has to, or even should, follow Segovia's steps in a chronological order. Indeed, it is wisest to begin with the present world so that we know the crises that motivate us and the ideological histories of the categories and practices of analysis we employ.⁶ However, if we start with the ancient world by looking at the circulations of narrative and power in that context, a critic can clarify that fake news is not in fact the product of some postmodern non-attachment to truth or the proliferation of multicultural, perspectival epistemologies.⁷ Depending on how we define news, the problem of fake news is rather old. Stories representing events that did not happen but were mobilized to stoke particular affective registers that perpetuate the domination of some groups over others can be found throughout history and across geographies. Moreover, struggles over the meaning we make of events, over the stories we tell, the events we remember, and how we remember them, also date back a long time.

As a student of Christian scriptures, I can point to early "Christian" literary texts, their production, and the fake news to which they respond. Richard A. Horsley and other members of the empire-critical school of the Christian bible have long emphasized the production of gospels as a response of colonized subjects to the lies of an occupational empire. The ancient Roman Empire liked to circulate a gospel, a εὐαγγέλιον, Rome's "good news" about the peace of Caesar and the role of the Roman emperor and its imperial power structures in providing peace, security, and salvation.⁸ Rome also often misrepresented its subjects through visual media on city buildings and official temples, such as the Sebasteion in Aphrodisias.⁹

⁶ At the 2018 La Comunidad panel in which this essay was given (as part of the American Academy of Religion/Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meetings in Denver, CO), Segovia responded that one should start with the present, because it is in the present that we must reckon with the modern histories of the categories we bring to our constructions of the past.

⁷ Of course, there is much evidence for this problem in the modern world. Segovia's response highlighted the CIA's use of "disinformation" campaigns throughout Latin America in the mid-20th century. Other critics have pointed to the long-standing epistemological problems of "truth" that have grounded "truth" in networks of power. See Steve Fuller, *Post Truth: Knowledge as a Power Game* (London: Anthem, 2018).

⁸ For instance, see his discussions in Richard A. Horsley, *Jesus and Empire: The Kingdom of God and the New World Disorder* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002).

⁹ See, for instance, discussions in Davina C. López, *Apostle to the Conquered: Reimagining Paul's Mission* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008).

Some early Christian literature may have specifically challenged Roman good news as fake news. As a student of the Book of Revelation in particular, I can point to the work of scholars such as Harry O. Maier who suggest that the apocalypse reveals the structures “of empire and one’s place within it.”¹⁰ Thus the violent imagery of the Book of Revelation, particularly its portrayals of Babylon and her destruction (Rev 17-18) on one level, uncover the lies of Roman *pax et securitas* by exposing the violent foundations and perpetual insecurity of Roman subjects.¹¹ Revelation does not refuse the Roman εὐαγγέλιον by simply offering “alternative facts” about Caesar. Instead the Apocalypse proffers its own form of good news about the bigger Caesar—a God who commands the universe as opposed to the Roman emperor who is the agent of Satan. Besides disputing the fake news of Roman peace, Revelation offers an alternative narrative structure for interpreting the world, a structure Adela Yarbro Collins described as a method of crisis and catharsis.¹² Thus, Revelation works on the affective economy of those who heard it; moreover, much early Christian literature, like today’s fake news, relied on a revolution in communication—the codex as well as the social networks of the ancient Roman world to circulate it.

The approach I just summarized might fulfill one of Segovia’s steps in that it attends to power dynamics, particularly the dynamics of a repressive global imperial state power and the responses of colonized subjects. This approach weighs the production and consumption of ancient texts. But there are two limits here that Segovia might catch. First, the summary I have provided is far from the only way to read the conjunction of fake news and early Christian literature. Segovia would demand a conversation among competing, diverse interpretations here. Second, for Segovia, part of that interpretive problem must be addressed by not leaving our analyses strictly resident in our constructed ancient world. Segovia has always drawn our attention to how and why we as interpreters construct narratives of the past. We thus have to engage in a deeper reading of history, one that attends to the power games that have shaped the interpretation and spread of the Bible in modernity.

We cannot simply categorize the Christian Bible as resistance literature, though it has served that purpose in many circumstances in both the ancient and modern world. We also have to reckon with the ways that the “good news” of the Christian bible was implicated in the fake news that European modernity circulated about the others under imperial control.¹³ I imagine I don’t need to rehearse this history for this room and this panel, but I bring it up to remind us that the Christian bible was implicated in imperial modernity’s fake news—fake news Europeans told themselves about the conquest and

¹⁰ Harry O. Maier, *Apocalypse Recalled: The Book of Revelation after Christendom* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 2002), 37-38.

¹¹ In other work, I describe how representations of sexual violence are used in order to underscore the insecurity of Rome. See Jacqueline M. Hidalgo, *Revelation in Aztlán: Scriptures, Utopias, and the Chicano Movement* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 188-193.

¹² Adela Yarbro Collins, *Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1984).

¹³ I provide a fairly rapid summary of some of these modern uses of the Christian bible in my book. See for instance Hidalgo, 7-8, 105-112, 175-176, and 261-271.

fake news that denied the histories and humanity of African and Native American peoples.

Of course, we still live out the violence of that brand of imperial fake news. Particularly since I spent part of my childhood just east of Denver (where this paper was delivered) in Arapahoe county, I have to recognize that we met in a place we call Denver, land that was stolen from the Hinono'eiteen, otherwise known as the Arapahoe nation. We met in land that was also once dominated by Spain and Mexico, and fifty years ago, in March of 1969, perhaps as many as 1500 people, mostly of Mexican descent, gathered in Denver in order to craft a narrative and a practice that refused dominant USA historical amnesia about the colonization and conquest of the West. Although I would argue that those activists riffed on the Bible at that conference, they notably crafted their own text, *El Plan de Aztlán*, and they circulated it through their own media and activist networks, reading it aloud at different gatherings.¹⁴

Our contemporary moment might learn something valuable from this strategy—those activists knew they could not simply dispute the false claims of dominant USA society by offering up the truth. That is not to dispute that there are facts, some things that did happen and some things that didn't. But we as humans never really encounter “just the facts.” Indeed, in February 2018, the *American Sociological Review* carried an essay examining how supporters of a leader can know their leader is lying, and those supporters find those lies emotively convincing because they think the leader is lying in the face of an already failed and false system.¹⁵ The issue is less about what facts are true or false, but more the bigger picture story we are telling and how the smaller stories we hear fit into those larger narratives. One strategy is to tell a more powerful story. Chicano/a/x activists in Denver in 1969 challenged false dominant narratives by crafting their own counter-narratives.

Yet, I know the limits—especially the limits of racialized nationalism and heteropatriarchy found in *El Plan de Aztlán*—so is it enough to simply craft our own alternative narratives? Here I find crucial the third aspect of Segovia's form of criticism. Since the early 1990s, Segovia's work has particularly called critics to attend to their own place, to provide a critical reading of who they are, from where they are reading, with whom they are reading, and to what ends they are reading. Living as a diasporic subject between two cultures taught him that all worlds are constructed, and all constructions have their own limits.¹⁶ We must always confront the place from which we read with a measure of epistemic humility about the limits of our own line of sight. As he notes in the conclusion of his 2014 presidential address, we must bring many different critics from vastly different backgrounds together, in part, because any one perspective is limited and must be challenged by conflicting points of view.

¹⁴ Hidalgo, 29-74.

¹⁵ Oliver Hahl, Minjae Kim, and Ezra W. Zuckerman Sivan, “The Authentic Appeal of the Lying Demagogue: Proclaiming the Deeper Truth about Political Legitimacy,” *American Sociological Review* 83, no. 1 (2018): 1-33.

¹⁶ Fernando F. Segovia, “Two Places and No Place on which to Stand: Mixture and Otherness in Hispanic American Theology,” *Listening* 27 (Winter 1992): 26-40.

Perhaps our current crisis around fake news comes because too few humans have learned the best lessons from standpoint epistemologies—those lessons are not necessarily that there are no truths, but that we must be careful in how we evaluate our own feelings about truth claims.¹⁷ Here, I think minoritized biblical criticism has developed a set of methods and questions to offer interpreters well beyond biblical studies. Besides resisting historical amnesia by providing a critical reading of the past, and of how others narrate the world, we must also take careful stock of our own place, our own position, and why some narratives may appeal to us when others don't. Studies suggest that we often make shortcuts in evaluating narratives by trusting experts, our own social networks, and racial biases.¹⁸ What if instead we always asked, who does this narrative serve? What power is left unchecked in this narrative? Who is pushed to the margins and the edges of this news story? News that suits our desires could still be true enough, even though many such news stories will have their narratives transformed if we truly work collaboratively. Russian agents may still be behind much fake news in the U.S.A. even if that narrative also serves a dominant national narrative of self-interest. Yet we should train ourselves and our students to always ask self-critical questions about the narratives they encounter in order to test the reliability of those narratives. We should train ourselves and our students to read broadly and diversely, and to be open to learning from critical questions that others ask about our perspectives. Such a process takes time and requires conversation with others.

Segovia's multifaceted critical process requires that scholars, particularly scholars who read from a privileged position, engage in a critique not just directed at the ancient world and not just directed at the modern world but also a critique that calls readers to account for themselves. More than that, he emphasizes that we must surround ourselves with other diverse and self-reflective critics whose interpretations diverge from our own. In a world where diversity is increasingly feared, Segovia's model might seem utopian, but it still is the best set of tools I can imagine turning to in confronting a global crisis. So, thank you Fernando Segovia for sharing them with us.

¹⁷ Sandra Harding, "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What Is 'Strong Objectivity'?" *The Centennial Review* 36, no. 3 (1992): 437-470.

¹⁸ See, for instance, Teun Lucassen and Jan Maarten Schraagen, "Propensity to Trust and the Influence of Source and Medium Cues in Credibility Evaluation," *Journal of Information Science* 38, no. 6 (2012): 566-577; Robin Lin Miller, "How People Judge the Credibility of Information Lessons for Evaluation From Cognitive and Information Sciences," *Credible and Actionable Evidence: The Foundation for Rigorous and Influential Evaluations*, Second Edition (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc, 2015), 39-61; Damian A. Stanley, Peter Sokol-Hessner, Mahzarin R. Banaji, and Elizabeth A. Phelps, "Implicit Race Attitudes Predict Trustworthiness Judgments and Economic Trust Decisions," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 108 (2011): 7710-7715.

ROUNDTABLE ESSAY #2

Competing Narratives, Memes, and Going Viral as Socio-Theological Reflection and Resistance for US Latinxs communities: a Hebrew Bible perspective

Corinna Guerrero

Santa Clara University

This article calls scholars and people of the faith communities to look at the ways USA Latinxs imbibe information and how Hebrew Bible/Old Testament can be used as a tool to strengthen biblical education for the purposes of critical political engagement in the age of Trump.

Data

According to the 2014 Pew Research Center’s *Religious Landscape Study*, 77% of USA Latinxs surveyed identify as of a Christian denomination.¹ If broadened out, to gain a general pulse, more than 3 out of 4 Latinxs in the USA are Christ-identified. From the same *Religious Landscape Study*, over 45% of those Christ-identified claim to read scripture “at least once a week”, 33% claimed they “seldom to never” read scripture. Additionally, 50% of USA Latinxs indicated that they “seldom to never” participate in prayer, scripture study, or religious education groups. This means that of the 3 out of 4 Latinxs that are Christ-identified, most “seldom to never” participate in traditional spaces for encountering scripture.

Most significant to this paper, there is no survey data to draw from, thus, illuminating the low percentage of USA Latinxs that are Old Testament or Hebrew Bible literate. This is not surprising because a walk-through of online discussion boards and groups for preachers, pastors, and priests reveals a relevant and debated question. *Why don’t pastors or priests preach from the Old Testament regularly?* Church leaders themselves recognize a nervousness or unwillingness on their part to engage their Old Testament regularly.

For centuries Christ-identified communities cultivated collective sacred spaces in church and home for education and edification. With Old Testament prioritized minimally from clergy, Christ-identifiers do not know how to plumb its pages for the reflection, resilience, and resistance necessary for times such as these.

¹ “Religious Landscape Study”, Pew Research Center, accessed November 1, 2018, <http://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/>.

Of the other 1 out of 4 USA Latinxs, it can be estimated that approximately 200,000 of them are Latinxs Jews; according to a 2015 study “[...] carried out by David Ayon, senior strategist for the opinion research group Latino Decisions. Requisitioned by an arm of the American Jewish Committee (AJC) and underwritten by the Ford Foundation [...]”.² With the strongest surveyed identity marker, 95% of Latinxs Jews in the USA prefer to self-identify first as Jews. Many having undergone a “double-diaspora” with family migrating to Latin America from Europe in the late 19th-century, then migrating to the United States of America only a few generations later.³ Similarly reported in the aforementioned Pew study, 62% of USA Jews “seldom to never” “participate in prayer, scripture study, and religious education groups.”⁴ More specifically, 65% reported that they “seldom to never” read scripture. This data suggests that USA Latinxs have a limited engagement and likely limited literacy in the Hebrew Bible and Old Testament.

SOCIAL MEDIA

According to the 2018 Nielsen report *Descubrimiento Digital: The Online Lives of Latinx Consumers*, “US Hispanics are digitally empowered and rapidly moving to the forefront of technology adoption.”⁵ The community is ‘pacesetter’ in the “[...] media universe with social media/apps/mobile video usage, digital music consumption, radio listening, TV viewing, gaming and web activities.”⁶ This is not surprising because 60% of the USA Hispanic population, according to the report grew up in the Digital Age. The USA Latinx and Hispanic population is a digitally conversant population. Anecdotaly speaking, even though my mother still calls DVDs “CDs” and can’t trouble shoot on the family PC, doesn’t mean her emoji, GIF, and Facetime game are not fierce.

Basic Terminology:

² “[A] study carried out in late 2015 by David Ayon, senior strategist for the opinion research group Latino Decisions. Requisitioned by an arm of the American Jewish Committee (AJC) and underwritten by the Ford Foundation, the survey probed focus groups of Latino Jews who live in five U.S. cities — Los Angeles, Miami, New York, Chicago and Houston. Ranging in age from 22 to 78, more than 60 participants were asked in-depth questions about identity, national attachments and community engagement [...]” Roberto Loiederman, “Surprising results revealed in survey of Latino Jews living in the U.S.”, *Jewish Journal*, accessed November 1, 2018, <https://jewishjournal.com/news/nation/217785/surprising-results-revealed-survey-latino-jews-living-u-s/>.

³ Lauren Markoe, “Shalom, amigo! New Study Sheds Light on Latino Jews in the US”, *Religion News Service*, accessed November 1, 2018, <https://religionnews.com/2016/04/14/shalom-amigo-a-new-study-sheds-light-on-latino-jews-in-u-s/>.

⁴ “Religious Tradition: Jewish”, *Pew Research Center*, access November 1, 2018, <http://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/religious-tradition/jewish/>.

⁵ “*Descubrimiento Digital: The Online Lives of Latinx Consumers*”, *The Nielsen Company*, accessed November 1, 2018, <https://www.nielsen.com/content/dam/corporate/us/en/reports-downloads/2018-reports/the-online-lives-latinx-consumers.pdf>.

⁶ *Ibid.*

Meme is a term established by Richard Dawkins in his 1976 book *The Selfish Gene* addressing the way cultural information spreads. As internet parlance, it refers to a *visio-textual image or video that presents and counter-presents or re-presents at the same time* [definition mine]. As early as 1994, Jeff Godwin described in *Wired Magazine* the process of a meme as “[...] an idea that functions in a mind the same way a gene or virus functions in the body. And an infectious idea, (call it a “viral meme”) may leap from mind to mind, much as viruses leap from body to body.”⁷ To give a brief analogy, if in academic and church circles we talk about a community espousing a high-Christology or a low-to-no-Christology, then in knowledge acquisition meme are low-level knowledge acquisition. The encounterer of a meme needs no formal education to comprehend a meme because memes build off general cultural engagement. Encounterers do not have to work for the information. In fact, to make one work *too* hard to comprehend a meme is detrimental to the meme’s ability to “go viral”—meaning to be easily shared and enjoyed throughout demographic stratum. It’s a cheap education. That is why it is important to bring the strengths and weakness of USA Latinxs together for the education and edification of our people.

BBQ BECKY

Here are a few starter memes to transitioning from statistics to engaging visio-textual images.

IMAGE ONE:



IMAGE SOURCE: Closed Facebook Group for Society of Biblical Literature

⁷ Mike Godwin, “Meme, Counter-Meme”, *Wired Magazine*, accessed November 1, 2018, <https://www.wired.com/1994/10/godwin-if-2/>.

IMAGE TWO:

Teacher: When Christopher Columbus discovered...

Baby Belcalis: My mommy says Christopher was a comemierda who didn't discover shit.



IMAGE SOURCE: <http://www.latina.com/10-best-young-cardi-memes-prove-everyone-needs-little-cardi-b>

Both memes have their humor rooted in the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. In both cases there is an image of a child expressing an age appropriate reaction or motion. The text offers a nuance to the visualized expression. In the case of image one, excitement and joy. In the case of image two, in Oakland, Calif. we call it a “snatch and educate”; derived from the colloquialism and action of snatching a wig off someone’s head. A “snatch and educate” is a swift uncovering of the unrevealed and replaced with educative retort.

Psalm 8 houses the much-lauded biblical phrase, “Out of the mouth of babes.” Psalm 8:1-2 (NRSV) states, “O LORD, our Sovereign, how majestic is your name in all the earth! You have set your glory above the heavens. ²Out of the mouths of babes and infants you have founded a bulwark because of your foes, to silence the enemy and the

avenger.” The verse has been reduced in colloquial parlance to singularly, “*out of the mouth of babes*” leaving behind the structural emphasis praising God.⁸

Many Christ-followers and non-Christ-followers alike have heard and/or used this expression to emphasize a situation or moment when a child has cut right to the point about a circumstance, comment made, event, etc. It is plausible that the prevalence of the colloquial usage is due to poor scriptural education, but potentially equally likely that this sub-category of meme has greater shareable value absent of the requisite indication that the child’s words praise God. Nevertheless, both images present variant options for “easy knowledge” with a laugh, about the capacity of children: excitement on one end; critical look at ethnicity or race, colonization and education, possibly even social justice on the other.⁹

Having completed our starter memes, we are now primed to think about the intersection of three categories: 1) social media content and culture; 2) Hebrew Bible/Old Testament; and 3) and reflection and resistance.

IMAGE THREE:



IMAGE SOURCE: <https://www.ebaumsworld.com/pictures/racist-oakland-lady-has-become-a-meme/85657295/>

⁸ Judah Kraut, “The Birds and the babes: The Structure and Meaning of Psalm 8”, *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. 100, No. 1 (Winter 2010), 12-13.

⁹ For more on this see “Out of the Mouths of Babes, Quotes” on Pinterest. Linda tfaasen, Pinterest.com, accessed November 1, 2018, <https://www.pinterest.com/lindatfaasen/out-the-mouth-of-babes-quotes/?lp=true>.

Image three juxtaposes two stills from the April 29, 2018 video recorded by Michelle Snider of a Jennifer Schulte, aka BBQ Becky, waiting for Oakland PD to show up to resolve a debate-turned-altercation regarding where charcoal BBQ pits can be set up at historic Lake Merritt. Categorically, the BBQ Becky memes are “narrative and counter-narrative” memes—meaning they visually present an event through a single image or juxtaposed images, with foregrounded text presenting a counter-narrative, regularly for the purposed of humor, mocking, or shaming. In the case of image three, the counter-narrative juxtaposes the gravity of calling the OPD against a debatable cultural taboo of placing raisins in potato salad, a common dish served at BBQs; thus keeping the meme in contextual alignment with the original event.

Since the Oscar Grant murder New Year’s Day 2009, Oakland residents have been in an ongoing struggle with OPD about lethal use of force disproportionately used against black and brown residents and the flood of new white residents coming in from other Bay Area cities, and in particular San Francisco, as the cost of living rises in the Bay Area. The effects have created numerous instances of police being called in non-emergent situations by new white residents. At one point the OPD received over 700 calls a day for non-emergent situations about black and brown residents “walking down the street, knocking on a door, not picking up dog poop, [...] sales persons knocking on doors, US postal service delivery [...]”, and my personal favorite for standing at a bus stop.¹⁰

IMAGE FOUR:



IMAGE SOURCE:

https://www.reddit.com/r/PoliticalHumor/comments/8yr11i/collect_em_all/

¹⁰ A.R. Shaw, “Whites who gentrified Oakland are calling the police on innocent Black residents”, Rolling Out, accessed November 1, 2018, <https://rollingout.com/2015/10/16/whites-gentrified-oakland-calling-police-innocent-black-residents/>.

Jennifer Schulte was the first of a series of incidents of similar non-emergent police calls made across the USS Spring and Summer 2018. Each receiving an internet hashtag and pithy pseudonym as an uptick of “existing while black” events went viral. Within only days, social critique developed and surfaced on Twitter.

IMAGE FIVE:



IMAGE SOURCE: <https://www.bbc.com/news/newsbeat-44167760>

What emerged were threads of historic moments, culturally significant spaces, and notable entertainment media for black Americans with BBQ Becky photoshopped into the image. The threads as evolving counter-narratives transform BBQ Becky from her Spring 2018 reception as gentrifier with overtones of racist and general fun-hater, to a stand in for colonialism, Jim Crow, and white supremacy. BBQ Becky memes almost “broke the internet” because of their capacity to critique the subaltern black American political existence while laughing at the absurdity of Trump-era “existing while black” events without ever looking away from growing threats against black life.

Intersecting Bible:

The Hebrew Bible and Old Testament differ categorically as theological literature. Canonical arrangement of the Hebrew Bible for example tells a story that ends at the book of Chronicles with Israel outside of their land. The Old Testament, on the other hand, tells a story that ends with the book of Malachi anticipating the coming “Day of the Lord”. Canonical arrangement, with some help from internet parlance, functions like a thread with each work having its own construction and context, but also responding to

the presence of other works. At a macro-level canonical structure mimics the theological narratives which are fully differentiated in the lived religions of Judaism and Christianity.

Jewish and Christ-identified USA Latinxs have lived different socio-political narratives. Yet, in each case, being forced to negotiate the terrain of “foreignness” or “perceived foreignness” with relation to USA soil. Using Hebrew Bible/Old Testament as a newly reimagined place for socio-theological reflection can offer USA Latinxs resistance building strategies grounded in a biblical faith. For example, the book of Nahum is a 7th c. BCE work which celebrates the destruction of the Assyrian city of Nineveh. At least two hundred years later, the book of Jonah emerges as a 5th c. BCE work, though set in the 8th c. BCE, that calls the prophet to bring an oracle of salvation to the same Ninevites. Each work negotiating the place of empire, power, and most pertinent to this paper, foreignness and foes. Similarly, the books of Ezra and Ruth, this time as products of the same period—that is, post-exilic age of temple reconstruction—negotiate empire, power, and the debated status of foreign wives for Israelites. Starter reflection questions could be: *How ought we act toward those we perceive as a threat socio-politically? How ought we act toward those we perceive as a threat at the heart of our self-identification?*

IMAGE SIX:



IMAGE SOURCE: <https://thesocietypages.org/socimages/2018/05/29/summer-reading-with-bbq-becky/>

Image six is a meme with no words. BBQ Becky was photoshopped into a still from the movie Black Panther, directed by Oakland native Ryan Coogler. The mythical land of

Wakanda at the heart of the Black Panther comics and movie, visualize an African country never touched by European colonialism, a unicorn of nationhood. Juxtaposition of these two images empowered the counter-narrative action undertaken by Oakland residents and organized via social media in the days following this event. The imaginative space of self-definition, where a false narrative is rejected emerged as communal resistance, as celebration. Oakland held a city BBQ to celebrate its rich black heritage in the exact spot at Lake Merritt where the altercation happened.

Similar strategies were used by USA Latinxs weeks later, when on May 16, 2018 Aaron Schlossberg, aka Taco Tom, of Manhattan accosted two Latinxs for speaking Spanish in the United States of America and threatened to call immigration, essentially threatening forced deportation. Celebration as resistance strategy was deployed swiftly via food, music, and dancing in front of his apartment building, inverting the threat of displacement.

As the “pacesetters” in the “media universe” and as a digitally conversant population, we learned how to strategize deployment of an imaginative space of self-definition, where a false narrative is rejected for the emergence of communal resistance as celebration. We need to track and integrate social media into how we evaluate shifts in our political threats and agency; noting rather than dismissing the quick lessons USA Latinxs are encountering, consuming, and promulgating in the viral spread of these stories leading to action. Hebrew Bible/Old Testament at its macro-levels offers an underutilized conversation partner for critical events of today. USA Latinxs are not learning our theological lessons at church or synagogue at the rate they had in the past. At this moment I am reminded of one thread contributing to the rise of biblical wisdom literature, a need to not completely lose our youth to the culture of our oppressors.

ROUNTABLE ESSAY #3
Speaking in Other Tongues
Fernando Segovia's Contributions to Discerning "Fake News"

Santiago Slabodsky

Hofstra University

La Comunidad met in November of 2018 to honor Fernando Segovia to celebrate his academic integrity, scholarly innovation, and political interventions. In this context, the brave leaders of the organization, Loida Martell and Ahida Pilarski, invited wonderful speakers (and myself) to address a timely issue: the contributions that Fernando's scholarship can make to elucidating "Fake News" in the U.S. in particular and, considering the deep diasporic horizon of our honoree, in the Caribbean, Latin America, and the globe.¹ My co-panelists were without a doubt excellent choices for this panel. Both Jacqueline Hidalgo and Corinna Guerrero are wonderful Latinx scholars trained in Biblical studies. Furthermore, they are wonderful companions to Fernando since both of them have a solid background in a rather traditional area of scholarship and have explored beyond this training to innovate with the most cutting-edge tools enriching, in this way, both Biblical studies and Religious Studies as a whole.²

However, I was, one could say, an odd choice. I was happy and honored to participate but an odd choice nonetheless. Attendants of the meeting could wonder how a sociologist of knowledge trained in Jewish thought could do justice to the work of Fernando. Yet, my participation shows precisely how our honoree's work reaches interlocutors well beyond what are considered his formal fields. This essay, which expands on my presentation last November, will not attempt to showcase Fernando's contribution to Biblical scholarship. I have decided to spare my reader from reading such an amateurish piece. Instead I will explore how the work of Fernando has contributed, and can contribute, to elucidating the phenomenon of "Fake News" well beyond Biblical scholarship, Christianity, and even Latinx thought. This is not to say that his work is not a turning point in the above cited fields. What I am suggesting is that the significance of Fernando's work can be seen beyond the realms of what Africana thought calls "disciplinary decadence."³

¹ Fernando Segovia's contribution is truly broad. In this essay I will focus on one of his works, *Decolonizing Biblical Studies: A View From the Margins* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 2000).

² See for example Jacqueline Hidalgo, *Revelation in Aztlan: Scriptures, Utopias and the Chicano Movement* (New York: Palgrave Macmillian, 2016) and Corinna Guerrero, "Encountering Trauma in the Bible," *America: The Jesuit Review* (Oct 26, 2015).

³ See Lewis Gordon, *Disciplinary Decadence: Thought in Trying Times* (New York: Routledge, 2016), 1-12.

How, then, can Fernando's work contribute to elucidating Fake News? While I have been reading Fernando's work for years, I only had a chance to understand its impact when I assigned one of his texts to Muslim students in a summer course that I regularly teach in Spain. The title of this article was "And They Began to Speak in Other Tongues."⁴ I imagine now that my Pentecostal Latinx readers are having a ball with this situation. A Jew assigns to Muslim students a text written by a scholar of Catholic background about speaking in tongues. I ask my readers then to enjoy their ball but also to keep reading for a little bit longer. It is useful to remember that Fernando's innovative approaches to reading texts is a solid confrontation with what many of us understood as dead-ends of difficult writings. So the question is, what does Fernando mean when he alludes to "speaking in other tongues" in this article's title?

In this text, Fernando explores paradigmatic shifts in Biblical interpretations across different scholarly models and generations. His interpretation, as has been the case for decades, intentionally shocks literalist and simplistic interpreters. For many of us, "speaking in tongues" evokes a group of chosen individuals who are infused by the divine spirit. This authority grants these individuals the power to lecture to the multitudes about revelation, evangelizing them from an allegedly gained authority. Fernando, however, reads Acts 2:4-5 carefully and interprets "speaking in other tongues" in a very different way. It is not, he argues "that the same group" of those chosen, "now [once in power] speaks in other tongues to the multitudes at large" and that they can claim divine authority. But, guided by liberationist and decolonial interpretations, he argues that it is "rather that the multitudes at large have begun to speak in other tongues, in their tongues."⁵

In Fernando's interpretation of the text, the multitudes speak in their tongues. They speak back. They speak to authority. They challenge authority. The multitudes, if we practice a *drash* (a Jewish exegetical discursive method) of Fernando's work, are not looking for the authority of universal truth. They do not appoint themselves evangelizers of a supreme authority. On the contrary, they form a different community. This is what the text will call this community a "diverse city of critics." The multitudes who speak in tongues do not look for unicity and uniformity. Their speaking in plural tongues means, above anything else, diversity and the potentiality of critically confronting totalitarian discourses of authority when they take shape within the community. This confrontation with totalitarianism is precisely what resides at the core of the revolutionary potential of Latin American, Latinx, and Caribbean communities. Communities confront the totalitarianism of Eurocentric thought by speaking languages categorized as barbaric and destined to disappear. The city of barbaric critics, then, confronts the core of the modern project: the wound of coloniality.

The decolonial reading put forward by Fernando "speaks" to the core of the modern and hemispheric problem. It was only in relation to the totalitarian discourses of some trends of Christian thought that European discourses were able to portray themselves as the only possibility for speaking, behaving, acting, redeeming, civilizing, developing, or

⁴ Fernando Segovia, "And They Began to Speak in Other Tongues," in *Decolonizing Biblical Studies: A View From the Margins* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 2000), 3-32.

⁵ Ibid.

democratizing. The totalitarian evolutionism of Euro-Christianity and its heirs in the settler-colonies speak in unison in a single tongue posting themselves as owners of the redeemed truth, negating and invisibilizing other alternatives and restricting the access to a monochromatic (monocultural, monolingual) path they uphold as redeeming or liberationist. A path that, tragically, may have even influenced some revolutionary projects in Fernando's homeland. In his work, the multitudes who speak in tongues take on a different function. They confront these unique paths by presenting possibilities (languages, cultures, histories) that have been negated, rejected, invisibilized because they were not functional to the totalitarian process (whether that process took the form of Christian redemption, neo-liberal development, liberal democracy, or even in some cases left-wing revolution). These communities were, first, categorized as barbarians, as a threat, by Eurocentric thought because of their refusal to cease to exist and their growth through their resistance to the blindness of totalitarianism. If evangelization of a single and universal truth requires the invisibilization of alternatives, then the plurality of tongues challenge totalitarianism favoring multiplicity. Multiplicity of languages, multiplicity of voices, of histories, multiplicity of narratives, and ultimately multiplicity of meanings.⁶

Where can we then hear people speaking “in other tongues” outside a normative center of thought and even censorship? A priori the current media context indubitably exhibits features that Fernando's interpretation had anticipated. Only a few years ago, media critics have been pointing out the uniformity of major media outlets (CNN, New York Times, Washington Post, etc.), claiming that they uncritically shone the spotlight on a limited number of issues and perspectives reproducing the basic tenets of Eurocentric capitalism without attempting to question its role. Since the media was owned by such a very small part of the population interested in reproducing the status quo, the habitual style of media (even when presented in nominally other languages and using strategies specific to the internet— CNN en Español, etc.) could be likened to the traditional interpretation of tongue-speaking: a minority of chosen ones arrogating to themselves the monopoly over objective transcendental truth and evangelizing the multitudes with cultural Eurocentrism, economical capitalism, and geopolitical neoliberalism.

Yet, at that time, other internet networks started to speak in other tongues. Communities lacking the large budgets of big corporations began to produce a multiplicity of media. The messages spoke in a variety of different languages about, among others, social justice, intersectional struggles, structural violence, and alternative conceptions of liberation and revolution. These communities seemed to gather multitudes that were speaking to power from different positionalities, challenging the status-quo, and producing upheavals at different levels. Such “barbaric” communities, it is important to point out, have been resisting from their own languages for centuries and have achieved major successes. Internet was offering them the possibility of speaking from non-privileged positions and this is why various governments of nation-states across the world, cognizant of the potentiality of these new alternatives, started to

⁶ I further explore this issue in a number of texts including Santiago Slabodsky, *Decolonial Judaism: Triumphal Failures of Barbaric Thinking* (New York: Palgrave, 2015), 17-65.

persecute leakers, censor the internet, intentionally order shutdowns, and challenge net neutrality. Movements such as the Arab Spring, Occupy Wall Street, Standing Rock, or Black Lives Matter, just to name a few, were undoubtedly diverse. But they all use new media spaces to generate the possibility of doing what the text was teaching us all along: critical multitudes speaking in tongues to authority.

This pluricultural context created by the communities' speaking in their tongues to authority confronted a real problem. We have learned that these platforms were also used in the context of the 2016 election by Islamophobic, racist, anti-Semitic, and misogynist groups in their efforts to challenge the status quo achieved in the marriage of neoliberal economics with liberal social values. The ensuing problems were multiple. First, alternative totalitarian forces invested resources to "troll" these networks. Second, the platforms were constructed in such a way that communities were kept segregated from each other; as a result of this, much of the early discussions did not typically appear in our social media feeds. Yet presenting themselves as an alternative to the "consensus of 'liberal media'," these groups found their messianic figure by confusing reality TV with their contextual reality. This enabled them to emerge as a power that provoked capable of conquering state power not only in the U.S.A. but also throughout the world from Europe to Latin America to South Asia. The discourse of these totalitarian forces became particularly powerful when they appropriated the typical narratives of marginalized communities and attacked the system by proclaiming representation of the "invisible working men and women," portraying themselves as defenders against the "disintegration of culture," and ultimately raising the demographical danger of "white genocide." This multifaceted process that gave raise to "alternative facts" and eventually crossed accusations of "fake news" was quickly conflated with the emergence of a revolutionary form of contesting and these discourses ended up attempting to eliminate the same pluricultural voices that tragically may have enabled their development.

As a consequence, some have not only questioned the role of the emergence of pluricultural voices on the current scene, they also became nostalgic of the status quo that was, until very recently, insisting that only a few chosen ones could carry out the representation of objective history, thus making it totalitarian. The problem is that, a priori, the discourses of the alt-right and the new revolutionary movements seem to be proclaiming similar rhetorical moves: elevate to consciousness of the marginalized populations who were unable to make their voices heard because of a bureaucratic consensus that portrayed the marriage between economic neo-liberalism and social liberalism as the only alternative. This reading "fueled" by the old corporative guard cautions about hearing the peoples speaking in tongues because of the "radical" dangers they can allegedly bring about. Their proposal was nothing more, and nothing less, than a return to the long-standing totalitarian concentration of media power in established media, restoring Eurocentrism, capitalisms and racism... but with a human face.

The new Fascist confrontation with the established media calling it "Fake News"; it is clearly a political maneuver. Yet, it is equally problematic as the old guard's response that lumps together very distinct projects that challenge their hegemony, categorizes them as "radical movements" and calls for an end to "all extremes", leaving once again

the marriage between neo-liberal economy and liberal politics as the only option. The existence of an apparent new enemy should not make us forget that up until a few years ago, the center of criticism was the concentration of power of the corporate media that now seems an ally. We should not become uncritical just because another, different danger has surfaced. This is especially true when the two dangers, Fascism and neoliberalism, may be two sides of the same coin. It was toward the end of the Second World War that Frankfurt School theorists proclaimed that “Fascism” and “Nazism” were nothing else than capitalism without a human face. These Jewish scholars, writing from the U.S.A. after fleeing Germany, explained that what unified the new stage with the last one was no more, and no less, than an attempt to standardize the world in a totalitarian regime in which everything belonged to a hierarchical structure that was reified and naturalized without contestation. Fascism, therefore, was corporate capitalism through other means.⁷

If we read the current context under Fernando’s guidance we can recognize how current Trumpism and neoliberal Capitalism may overlap with one another more than with the new revolutionary movements. In both cases these are self-appointed evangelical movements that arrogate to themselves the ownership of truth and speak from their illumination to the masses. Both cases represent an attempt to organize society hierarchically under the pretense of a totalitarian framework. They both proclaim the existence of self-selection and offer a messianic mechanism that sets participants on a unique path toward ultimate redemption. The one, with a human face, seems to be worn down after decades of hypocrisy. The second, the extension without a human face, has dangerously taken control of state power. The one intends to assimilate and flatten difference in order to eradicate diversity. The latter rises when the former fails and works to eliminate difference altogether. Our confrontation is not with the particular mask or strategy the system is employing. It is with the totalitarian system that both of them represent.

Fernando’s text does, however, foresee an alternative. There is the possibility that communities can speak in other tongues without there being a need for them to assimilate or for difference to be eliminated. The system profiting from totalitarianism starts to crumble precisely when communities speak to power and insist on the need of existence of diverse languages, paths, cultures, and meanings. There is no need for the mask of a human face when there are humans speaking in a city of critics. There is no need to choose between abrasive and inclusive liberalism and genocidal, exclusive neo-Fascism when there is an alternative that does not proclaim itself as owning messianic truths. The possibility of multitudes speaking in other tongues counters the monopoly of power that we habitually naturalize in our system. This is precisely one of Fernando’s contributions to a decolonial horizon. The key is to recognize that the options with which the political presents us are two sides of the same coin because they are based on messianic discourses speaking to the people. It is only when we recognize that the ability of the same people to speak in tongues stemming from the expressions of the multiplicity of invisibilized communities of critics that we can create what the Zapatistas

⁷ Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno, “Elements of Anti-Semitism” in *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002), 137-146.

have been offering with their practice for over 500 years and which some of us have been learning to hear for the last quarter of century. *Vamos a crear “un mundo donde quepan muchos mundos.”* Let’s create a world where many worlds can fit.⁸

⁸ EZLN, “Cuarta Declaración de la Selva Lacandona” (1/1/1996):
<http://enlacezapatista.ezln.org.mx/1996/01/01/cuarta-declaracion-de-la-selva-lacandona/>