MYSTĒRION

THE THEOLOGY JOURNAL OF BOSTON COLLEGE

VOLUME II — ISSUE I

MYSTĒRION: THE THEOLOGY JOURNAL OF BOSTON COLLEGE

VOLUME II, ISSUE I

MASTHEAD

Dennis J. Wieboldt III
Editor In-Chief

Megan Stevens
Managing Editor

Caroline Brewster, Conor McCormick, McCarthy Strachan
Associate Editors

Tiffany L. Lee, Sarah Livick-Moses
Graduate Advisors

Andrea Vicini, S.J.
Faculty Advisor

SPECIAL ISSUE TABLE OF CONTENTS

RELIGIOUS AND LEGAL PERSPECTIVES ON MIGRATION: A SYMPOSIUM ON *CHRISTIANITY AND THE LAW OF MIGRATION*

Migration and the Challenges of (Secular) Liberalism: An Opportunity for Renewed Theological Reflection?	Wieboldt III, Dennis J.	01
Anawim Economics: A Migrant-Centered Hermeneutic	Engelmann, Jack	09
Right-Wing Populism and Migrant Exclusion: A Christian Theological Critique	Brewster, Caroline E.	19
The Catholic Church and Migration: A Systematic Perspective	Halle, Olivia L.	30
Guelaguetza as a Religious Site of Identity: Construction and Defense of the Oaxacan Immigrant Community	Cisneros, Rene Sebastian	38
Keynote Address: Reflections on "Religious and Legal Perspectives on Migration"	Heyer, Kristin E.	49

Cover art courtesy of the Boston College Office of University Communications

Mystērion: The Theology Journal of Boston College

Volume II | Issue I

Migration and the Challenges of (Secular) Liberalism: An Opportunity for Renewed Theological Reflection?

Dennis J. Wieboldt III
Boston College, wieboldt@bc.edu

MIGRATION AND THE CHALLENGES OF (SECULAR) LIBERALISM: AN OPPORTNITY FOR RENEWED THEOLOGICAL REFLECTION?

DENNIS J. WIEBOLDT III *

In October of 1942, more than 1,400 high-profile lawyers and government officials descended upon Boston's Church of the Immaculate Conception to celebrate the annual Red Mass.[2] Only the second such liturgy to ever be held in New England, this Red Mass—celebrated eighty years ago this year—brought Catholics and non-Catholics together for a blessing at the start of the new judicial year. Although the tradition of the Red Mass had dated back to the Middle Ages to "invoke divine guidance in the administration of justice," its joint sponsorship by Boston College and the Archbishop of Boston offered a unique opportunity for the homilist to offer his reflections on the ongoing war in Europe to a captive audience of influential figures.[3] Surrounded by news of ethnic genocide and the imposing threat of totalitarianism, the homilist at the 1942 Red Mass was faced with the pressing question of how men and women of goodwill were called to respond to World War II.

The homilist that day was John C. Ford, a Boston College-educated Jesuit and professor of moral theology at Weston College, the Society of Jesus's house of studies in Massachusetts. Like the inaugural New England Red Mass homilist—William J. Kenealy, S.J., the then-dean of the Boston College Law School—Ford searched for a way to confront the serious perils of the twentieth-century liberal order that could be appealing to both Catholics and non-Catholics.[4] In fact, Ford was just one of many Catholic scholars at Boston College, Fordham, Georgetown, Loyola-New Orleans, and Notre Dame (among other Catholic institutions) who saw the war as the most serious threat to civilization in recent

---

* Dennis Wieboldt is the Editor In-Chief of *Mystērion*, a B.A./M.A. candidate in history, and a B.A. candidate in theology at Boston College. He would like to express thanks to James Keenan, S.J., and Andrea Vicini, S.J., for their comments on an earlier draft of this essay.

[2] *The Heights*, "Law School to Hold Red Mass," September 18, 1942.

[3] *The Heights*, "Solemn Mass Held Tomorrow," October 3, 1941.

[4] Delivered in October 1941, Kenealy's sermon was focused on the "philosophy of totalitarianism which was destroying Europe's civilization and its people." This philosophy, according to Kenealy, was produced by skepticism, cynicism, materialism, and pragmatism. See *The Heights*, "No Intellectual Leaders, Law Dean Tells Lawyers," October 11, 1946; *National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service,* "Many Legal Dignitaries at First Boston Red Mass," October 6, 1941.

memory. Represented most clearly in the genocide of the Jewish people, Ford, Kenealy, and their contemporaries believed that certain elements of liberal political philosophy unmoored from higher moral principles were bound to create an international order oriented around one belief: "might makes right."[5] This philosophy was the foundation of the Holocaust, they thought, and one that might similarly invade the United States.

Faced with the monumental threat of this subversive philosophy, Ford's 1942 sermon unsurprisingly exhorted attendees to reject Kantianism and re-commit themselves to the "three-fold law of God, conscience, and the land."[6] Despite attempts to infiltrate this tripartite system by pragmatic philosophers and legal theorists, Ford was hopeful that returning to once-commonly accepted methods of ethical decision-making (especially Natural Law philosophy) might offer an effective way to consistently defend human rights at home and abroad. In doing so, Ford believed that Americans could correct the challenges to fundamental human rights being spurred by certain aspects of twentieth-century liberal political philosophy.

Ford and Kenealy were not alone in this endeavor, making the products of this inter- and post-War movement to confront liberalism's challenges fruitful then, and yet still relevant today. Indeed, Jacques Maritain's well-studied involvement in post-War debates about the United Nations' Universal Declaration on Human Rights was unsurprisingly marked by a distinct emphasis on the Natural Law, not unlike Ford or Kenealy.[7] In the United States, an array of Catholic legal scholars similarly employed Natural Law philosophy as a way to combat the "philosophy of pure force" pervading American political thought at mid-century, one lending itself to tyranny if not diligently opposed.[8]

With the benefit of history and hindsight, the extent to which Maritain and these Catholic legal scholars were successful is certainly debatable, but the impetus for their efforts continues to prove interesting for scholars across academic disciplines. For example, the *Journal of Moral Theology* will mark the fiftieth anniversary of Maritain's death with a special issue on "Catholicism, Challenges to Democracy, and the Legacy of Jacques

[5] John Larner, "Lawyers Attend Red Mass Sung at Immaculate," *The Heights*, October 9, 1942.
[6] Larner, "Lawyers Attend Red Mass."
[7] See, e.g., Arthur Shenefelt, "Mankind Reappraised," *The New York Times*, February 26, 1950.
[8] William J. Kenealy, S.J., "The Majesty of the Law," *Loyola Law Review* 5, no. 2 (1950): 104. On the Catholic legal scholars involved in this effort, see John M. Breen and Lee J. Strang, "The Forgotten Jurisprudential Debate: Catholic Legal Thought's Response to Legal Realism," *Marquette University Law Review* 98, no. 3 (2015): 1203-1311.

Maritain."[9] And, recently, the *Journal of Catholic Legal Studies* hosted a symposium on the work of John M. Breen and Lee J. Strang, two legal scholars interested in how twentieth-century American Catholic thinkers and educational institutions responded to legal pragmatism.[10]

We certainly do not find ourselves today amidst the ethnic genocide that confronted Ford's generation, but we do inhabit an increasingly secular liberal political order that has repeatedly failed to fulfill the promises made by its champions: liberty, equality, and 'justice for all.' From another war in Europe to massive levels of economic inequality, global religious persecution, and ever-worsening climate disruptions, a new generation is being faced with many of the same questions as Ford's, albeit in different forms. As such, it should be unsurprising that some members of this new generation are searching for ways to confront these crises by looking outside of what they perceive as a failed liberal political tradition. During just the last few years, in fact, a variety of proposals—ranging from Patrick J. Deneen's 'post-liberalism' to Adrian Vermuele's 'common good constitutionalism'—have rightly attracted substantial critical and constructive engagement.[11]

Though many of the scholars involved in this contemporary movement to confront liberalism's challenges are not themselves theologians, they benefit from (and often explicitly acknowledge) religious thinkers and texts to which we can still look for insight. Like the famed American Jesuit John Courtney Murray, this generation of thinkers is involved in an interdisciplinary conversation about the future of political life inextricable from religious ideas. Just as Reinhold Niebuhr, Abraham Joshua Heschel, and other twentieth-century American Protestant and Jewish leaders, the question raised by Ford, Kenealy, Murray, and their Catholic contemporaries was how religious ideas, implicitly and explicitly connected to the formal discipline of academic theology, could be used to remedy the challenges created by certain aspects of modern political liberalism.

---

[9] *Journal of Moral Theology*, "CFP: Catholicism, Challenges to Democracy, and the Legacy of Jacques Maritain," https://jmt.scholasticahq.com/post/1243-cfp-catholicism-challenges-to-democracy-and-the-legacy-of-jacques-maritain (accessed April 27, 2022).
[10] For Breen and Strang's engagement with this symposium, see John M. Breen and Lee J. Strang, "A Light Unseen: The History of Catholic Legal Education in the United States: A Response to Our Colleagues and Critics," *Journal of Catholic Legal Studies* 59, no. 1 (2020): 1-49.
[11] See, respectively, Patrick J. Deneen, *Why Liberalism Failed* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2018); Adrian Vermuele, *Common Good Constitutionalism: Recovering the Classical Legal Tradition* (Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 2021).

In response to this question, Deneen and Vermuele have fled from political liberalism and looked instead to early Christian thinkers—especially Saint Thomas Aquinas—for guidance. This explicit abandonment of liberalism is a relatively novel move, but engaging in theological reflection or looking to religious thinkers and texts for a method of ethical decision-making was the starting-point for many of those who were struck by the horrors of World War II and the failure of liberalism to prevent such extreme forms of human suffering. Ford, Kenealy, Maritain, and Murray undoubtedly found themselves within this tradition.

The role of religious thinkers and texts in responding to the challenges of our international political order was the question that prompted this special issue of *Mystērion*. Indeed, the evident inadequacy of purely secular paradigms for confronting the crisis of human migration—just one of many contemporary global challenges situated within our hegemonic liberal political framework—offers a valuable, if unfortunate, opportunity for renewed theological reflection. Not unlike issues of economic inequality, religious persecution, or climate disruption, certain features of the liberal canon which have produced our global environment require new intellectual interventions if we hope to remedy the obvious perils with which the most marginalized members of society have been plagued. For self-identified 'post-liberals,' this endeavor offers a chance to replace our existing intellectual consensuses with classical sources of wisdom, many of which were once explicitly connected to religious thinkers and texts. For liberalism's supporters, however, considering how religious ideas can be used in response to modern challenges also invites a recovery of forms of theological reflection that can enhance liberal frameworks without necessarily replacing them. In other words, both sides of this philosophical coin stand to benefit from reintroducing sincere theological reflection into our political dialogue.

In spite of the dominant trends towards secularity in the United States, especially in the upper echelons of American politics and academia, this special issue of *Mystērion* invited undergraduate students to offer religious perspectives on migration, using the recently published *Christianity and the Law of Migration* as a shared text.[12] Co-edited by Silas W. Allard, Kristin E. Heyer, and Raj Nadella, *Christianity and the Law of Migration* offers

[12] On American secularity, see, e.g., Michelle Boorstein, "American Secularism is Growing—And Growing More Complicated," *The Washington Post*, January 14, 2022; Sarah Pulliam Bailey, "Church Membership in the U.S. Has Fallen Below the Majority for the First Time in Nearly a Century," *The Washington Post*, March 29, 2021.

eighteen essays on the relationship between law, religion, and migration from a diverse array of theologians and legal scholars.[13]

To provide an enhanced opportunity for dialogue about the role of religious ideas in our approach to the challenges of migration policy, *Mystērion* hosted an inaugural spring conference in March of 2022. Each of the contributors in this issue presented earlier drafts of their now-published articles at this conference.[14] Two doctoral students in Boston College's Theology Department—R. Zachary Karanovich and Brett O'Neill, S.J.—responded to the papers, posing questions to the issue's contributors and suggesting areas for further consideration. Heyer, a professor of theological ethics at Boston College, offered the keynote address at the conference's conclusion. After the in-person dimensions of the conversation concluded, all of the contributors revised their articles in light of the conference.

Each of the articles featured in this special issue addresses the question that vexed Ford in 1942, and that continues to represent a challenge to American political discourse today: What role should religious ideas have in responding to the challenges of (secular) liberalism? Though all of the articles approach this question with the tools of Christian theology, not all are written from a Catholic perspective, nor do they necessarily articulate one way to approach (or answer) this important question.

The recipient of the inaugural Macrina Award for Excellence in Theology, Jack Engelmann opens this issue with the construction of a theological framework for considering the humanity of those migrants trapped within our global "migrant economy." Focusing on the biblical notion of the *anawim*, who he describes as "those to whom care needs to be shown," Engelmann argues that the Gospels demand Christians take direct action to ameliorate the *anawim*'s suffering. Placing the *anawim* within the context of an international migrant economy, Engelmann demonstrates that singularly pragmatic calculus about the utility of migrant labor obscures the *imago Dei* of the human persons engaged in the

[13] See Silas W. Allard, Kristin E. Heyer, and Raj Nadella, eds., *Christianity and the Law of Migration* (New York: Routledge, 2021).

[14] For coverage of the conference, see Olivia Joung and Eliza Hernandez, "Undergraduate Theology Journal Hosts Inaugural Spring Conference," *The Heights*, April 9, 2022. On behalf of the Editorial Board, I express my thanks to the Robert J. Morrissey College of Arts and Sciences Dean's Office for financially supporting this conference.

migration process. By focusing on the biblical vision of the *anawim*, Engelmann suggests that we might be able to recover what has been lost in the contemporary political order's hyper-fixation on individual achievement and economic output.

Unlike Engelmann—who highlights the lack of theological insight in today's migration discourse—Caroline Brewster approaches the question of religion and politics through the lens of misguided public theology. Focusing particularly on shallow biblical interpretation, she argues that many prominent political figures often place temporal ends before eternal ones, therefore breaking from the true spirit of the biblical tradition, one that prioritizes human dignity. Offering numerous examples of conservative American politicians engaged in this 'interpretive' project, Brewster demonstrates how uncontextualized references to scriptural passages seem to support an exclusivist political theology that sanctions arbitrary differentiations between human persons on the basis of national origin. Instead of accepting the *de facto* prohibition on public religious discourse because of these misguided biblical appeals, however, Brewster asserts that Christians must focus even more intently on recovering religious themes in the public square.

With the benefit of the Catholic Church's rich catechetical tradition, Olivia Halle surveys many important pontifical and magisterial documents that provide a dignity-focused paradigm for thinking about human migration. Synthesizing statements from Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI, as well as the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops' "Position on Immigration Reform," she highlights the consistency of the Church's support for migrants. In concluding, Halle applies the insights gleaned from this catechetical tradition to the case of Filipino immigrants to the United States. By doing so, she suggests that the federal government's treatment of Filipino migrants can be reconciled with various aspects of the Catholic tradition.

Drawing from the richness of his identity as a descendent of Oaxacan Mexicans, Rene Sebastian Cisneros concludes this special issue with an exhortation that religious studies scholars' re-consider the role of auto-ethnography in making sense of lived religious practices. Highlighting the annual celebration of Guelaguetza in Oaxaca, Cisneros opines on the many ways in which religious traditions help Oaxaqueños in Mexico and the United States construct their identities. By acknowledging his own position within the Oaxacan community, he proposes that scholars can better understand heterogeneous experiences of

religion and migration through an analysis of ritual performance. This analysis, Cisneros suggests, might offer an insightful way for those interested in migration policy to appreciate migrants' diverse experiences, many of which are connected to religious symbols, practices, and beliefs.

Like Ford in 1942, our four contributors demonstrate that we must face the question of how theological reflection should be used in political discourse, especially during a time of increasing secularity and dissatisfaction with certain aspects of modern liberalism. Though the cover of this issue depicts the Areopagus—the supreme tribunal of Athens—Engelmann, Brewster, Halle, and Cisneros embody what Stephen R. L. Clark so presciently argued nearly four decades ago in his now-famous Gifford Lectures: Athens and Jerusalem, reason and faith, need not be so sharply divided after all.

Though not a particularly novel task, I am certain that bridging this divide between Athens and Jerusalem is the most important responsibility that the current generation of theologians must bear. Indeed, if not effectively reconciled with one another, our increasingly secular political order will be led ever closer to the utilitarian pragmatism that Ford decried, and authentic faith communities will be alienated from political discourse, unable to bring the wisdom of their religious traditions to bear on pressing social challenges. Under the leadership of next year's masthead, I hope that *Mystērion* will continue serve as one venue in which young thinkers can fulfill this responsibility.[15]

[15] After a recent vote of *Mystērion*'s outgoing and incoming editors, I am pleased to announce that the 2022-2023 masthead will be comprised as follows: Caroline Brewster (Editor in-Chief); McCarthy Strachan (Managing Editor); Emily Caffrey, Jerri Chung, John Kalil, Megan Stevens, Zachary Westen (Associate Editors); Tiffany Lee, Sarah Livick-Moses, Dennis Wieboldt (Graduate Advisors); Carlos Mendoza-Álvarez, OP (Faculty Advisor). On behalf of the entire 2021-2022 Editorial Board, I would like to express my thanks to outgoing Associate Editor Conor McCormick and Faculty Advisor Andrea Vicini, SJ, for all of their help in bringing the journal to fruition. None of *Mystērion*'s successes would have been possible without their tireless support.

Mystērion: The Theology Journal of Boston College

Volume II | Issue I Article 1

Anawim Economics: A Migrant-Centered Hermeneutic

Jack Engelmann
Boston College, engelmaj@bc.edu

ANAWIM ECONOMICS:
A MIGRANT-CENTERED HERMENUTIC

JACK ENGELMANN [*] [**]

Abstract: Looking particularly at migrants moving from Central America's Northern Triangle (El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras) to the United States, this paper will use Luke's Gospel and the Biblical concept of the *anawim* to argue that commonly used Christian anthropological considerations (i.e. Imago Dei), are not comprehensive or incisive enough to accurately reflect the situation of migrants. In reality, migrants are not always "choosing" to come to the U.S. at all, but rather merely reacting to both push and pull factors that are largely perpetuated by unjust economic policies. Migrants are not "stealing American jobs" but are forced into 3D jobs (dirty, dangerous, or difficult) for which they often work extensive hours for little pay, all while under the threat of deportation.

An economic consideration in which the anawim are the center allows for a much more honest and critical look at the state of the Southern border, something that is necessary when working towards integration that is based on hospitality. So long as rhetoric around the economics of migration places the blame on migrants instead of the underlying sinful structures, it will be easy to promote the idea that migrants pose a threat. Economic rhetoric focused on the world's most poor and vulnerable allows for greater strides towards fulfilling principles of Christian hospitality and achieving true integration. Failures in the migration system are not only a failure of imagination, but rather a failure to bother to love.

Introduction

> And Jesus said to him [the blind man], "Go; your faith has *saved* you." Immediately, the man regained his sight and began following him on the road. (Mk 10:52, emphasis added)
>
> You [speaking to the crowd] will be hated by all because of my name, but the one who endures to the end, he will be *saved* (Mk 13:13, emphasis added)

A mere three chapters apart from one another in the Gospel of Mark, Jesus tells two different figures that their faith has saved them. However, when more closely examining the

[*] Editor's Note: Per the recommendation of a faculty panel of the Boston College Department of Theology, "Anawim Economics: A Migrant-Centered Hermeneutic" was awarded the 2022 Macrina Award for Excellence in Theology. The Macrina Award, named after Macrina the Younger, a fourth-century Christian saint who devoted her life to spiritual education, recognizes the best article published in *Mystērion* during the academic year.

[**] Jack Engelmann is a B.A. candidate in theology at Boston College. His primary research interests lie in Christian Social Ethics as well as the interaction of politics and religion on a global scale. Upon graduation from Boston College, he will continue theological work and research in the M.A. program at the University of Notre Dame.

rest of each individual passage, it is clear Jesus that Jesus is talking about the idea of *saving* someone in two very different ways. In Mk 10, he is saving someone by directly and concretely healing their blindness, but in Mk 13, he is speaking about a much more abstract sense of saving: a salvation that is yet to come. This comparative example engages just two of the over hundred different uses of the verb to save (*sozo*) in the New Testament, with each application being used in a variety of ways throughout the biblical narrative.[3] The reality of Jesus's Incarnation and Resurrection, along with the centuries of fierce dialogue between Christian scholars about soteriology, all highlight the necessity of Christian engagement with the issue of *saving*. Indeed, thinking closely about *saving* in the biblical narrative and beyond must prompt Christians to consider how they are called to treat one another in both an individual and communal sense. In Christ's ministry, making others feel "cared for and made well" was similarly central to his earthly work and the transcendent promise of eternal salvation represented in the Resurrection.

The title of this article is "Anawim Economics," and its fundamental purpose is to propose a comprehensive hermeneutic regarding migration that is more attentive to the different understandings of salvation that Jesus articulates in the Gospels. As such, I plan to define and more greatly attend to each individual usage of the term in subsequent sections, along with the usages of *anawim* and "economics." For now, it will suffice to say that the *anawim* refers to migrant populations, those to whom care needs to be shown. Found in different texts throughout the Hebrew Bible, the *anawim* refers to "the poor ones," those who remained faithful to God even in times of great difficulty. The use of the term economics is equally intentional, as it is the study of how goods are produced, moved, and consumed throughout different levels of society. There very much exists a migration economy throughout the world, and a dutiful adherence to Christian principles of care and saving must necessarily consider the most marginalized in that economy, the *anawim,* in order to show them appropriate care. This paper will therefore begin with a fundamental assertion about the nature of borders and theological consideration of the *anawim* before engaging the Christian tradition presented in *Christianity in the Law of Migration*. In doing so, this article

[3] *Biblestudytools.com*, "Sozo Meaning in Bible - New Testament Greek Lexicon - New American Standard," www.biblestudytools.com/lexicons/greek/nas/sozo.html (accessed March 2, 2022).

will show that providing care to migrant populations is most effectively accomplished when they are provided a recognition of their own agency and individual self-worth.

The Historic Development of Migration Economies

Throughout the era of Westphalian sovereignty, borders have come to play an increasingly vital role in reinforcing the idea that a political entity's ability to control its own territory is directly tied to its ability to exert control over its own citizens. At a very fundamental level, borders serve to create two distinct groups: an "in-group" and an "out-group." Members of the "in-group" are those that live and work within the confines of the defined border, able to enjoy all the benefits that come with such membership. Members of the "out-group" therefore, are the much larger group of people who are not contained within the border, and are not allowed to access the people and resources inside, save for the discretion of the "in-group." Robert David Sack articulates this idea of territoriality, succinctly writing that "territoriality is the attempt by an individual or group to affect, influence, or control people, phenomena, and relationships by delimiting and asserting control over a geographic area.[4] In short, he argues that the "out-group" is not controlled through their inability to access the controlled territory, but rather that the "in-group" is controlled by a the cultivation of a nationalistic identity, one only understandable against the exclusion of those not able to live within certain borders.

Jean Gottmann also discusses this concept in *The Significance of Territory*. He builds upon Sack's idea of territoriality as a means of control, and expands it to add that borders exist as a means to facilitate trade and cultural exchange.[5] Those in the "in-group" are able to control the flow of capital through their borders, giving territory the added benefit of opportunity. The challenge, consequently, is to strike a balance between allowing enough cultural exchange and working interaction to capitalize on opportunity, but also restricting borders enough to enhance security.

The United States as a sovereign nation has had a long and complicated history with the realities of international migration, but in many ways, it can be classified as a continual leveraging of opportunity. Gottmann's musings on territoriality as a means of controlling opportunity are largely evident in American history because sentiments towards migrants in

[4] Robert David Sack, *Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
[5] Jean Gottmann, *The Significance of Territory* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2015).

popular culture have largely revolved around the idea of work (or economic output). While Northern and Western Europeans were some of the first to migrate to the United States, the Irish and other similar ethnic groups experienced religious persecution and were unable to find work in many urban areas.[6] Since that time, the United States has undergone different phases of migration, but has still had work at the center of the migrant exclusion. For example the Chinese Exclusion Act was passed in response to a popular narrative that Chinese workers were responsible for reducing wages and increasing economic hardships.[7]

Khalid Kosher has created the term "3D jobs" to refer to those jobs typically held by immigrants in American society. Often referred to by people in the United States as "unskilled labor" or agricultural work, these are jobs that often involve dirty, dangerous, or difficult work, and can pose an immediate or continuous threat to the worker's well-being.[8] While many of the jobs that would fall into one of these categories were historically held by migrants of Asian descent, the harsh immigration laws of the nineteenth century required the United States to tap into a new labor force. The "Bracero Program," an agreement between the United States and Mexico to bring hundreds of thousands of Mexican workers to the agricultural regions of the United States in exchange for a fair wage, decent food, and housing, was one such way to find a new labor source.[9]

The Bracero Program that laid the foundation for the context of modern migration in which this paper is written. In a vast departure from the historical norm, a 2017 Pew Research study found that from 2007 to 2015 the number of migrants coming from Mexico declined, and those from Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador experienced a drastic increase.[10] One other fact worth emphasizing is that in that same time period, the percentage of immigrants who entered through legal processes from the Northern Triangle increased by 24%, compared to an average national increase of 19%. Even more striking is the 26%

---

[6] Jeanne Batalova, Mary Hanna, and Christopher Levesque "Frequently Requested Statistics on Immigrants and Immigration in the United States," *Migrationpolicy.org*, February 9, 2021, www.migrationpolicy.org/article/frequently-requested-statistics-immigrants-and-immigration-united-states-2020#immig-now-historical.

[7] Batalova, Hanna, and Levesque, "Frequently Requested Statistics."

[8] Khalid Koser, *International Migration: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

[9] *Nps.gov*, "American Latino Theme Study: Immigration (U.S. National Park Service)," 2010, www.nps.gov/articles/latinothemeimmigration.htm.

[10] D'Vera Cohn, et al., "1. Recent Trends in Northern Triangle Immigration," *Pew Research Center's Hispanic Trends Project*, December 7, 2017, www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/2017/12/07/recent-trends-in-northern-triangle-immigration/.

increase in unauthorized migrant populations from the Northern Triangle, as compared to a 10% decline nationally. It is because of this demographic shift that rhetoric around 'illegal immigrants stealing jobs' and 'build the wall' have dominated national headlines in the United States. Nevertheless, looking at quantitative migration data is just one aspect of a much larger and much more complex system.

Who are the *Anawim*?

It is in through the lens of biblical concept of the *anawim* that the other side of economic migration coin in the United States begins to reveal itself. In 2001, Pope John Paul II gave an address to a general audience on Psalm 149. The fourth verse reads: "For the Lord takes delight in his people, he crowns the humble with victory."[11] It is this verse, in the context of the broader Psalm, in which the concept of the *anawim* is most clearly expressed. John Paul wrote that the *anawim* are the persecuted, the oppressed, the marginalized members of society who place their faith in God despite their situation. It is those who, even with all their worldly burdens, rejoice in the reality of their lives and the loving relationship they have with their Creator.

The pope is quite clear in attending to the fact that the *anawim* do not exist in a vacuum; they are not oppressed or marginalized in an abstract sense. Rather, John Paul writes that the concept of the *anawim* also "indicates not just the oppressed, the miserable, the persecuted for justice, but also those who, with fidelity to the moral teaching of the alliance with God, are marginalized by those who prefer to use violence, riches and power."[12] The *anawim* are therefore the people in whom God delights not only due to their fidelity to Him, but to their constant persistence even in the midst of sinfully oppressive societal structures.

The historical evolution of the migrant economy in the United States has led to the stage in which the country currently finds itself. Migrants from the Northern Triangle of Central America experience a particular kind of oppression that is structural, that often forces them to migrate whether they would like to or not. In a 2019 letter to Congress, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) urged federal lawmakers to more

---

[11] Ps 149:4

[12] John Paul II, "May 23, 2001 General Audience," at The Holy See, www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/audiences/2001/documents/hf_jp-ii_aud_20010523.html (accessed March 2, 2022).

comprehensively consider the root causes of underdevelopment and migration in the Northern Triangle. The letter addresses generalized violence in the region, perpetual underdevelopment, agricultural infertility, and corruption as several of the reasons that might force migrants to move.[13] Looking at these issues through a structural lens leads to the conclusion that migration is much more than an "individual choice," as it is so often framed. It is instead migrants seeking to achieve a bare-minimum quality of life to which all people are entitled. Migrants are persecuted at borders around the world, but perhaps most acutely so at the United States' southern border. Persevering through racism and violence in the United States, while only being here in the first place because they moved out of an economic or humanitarian necessity, is why migrants from the Northern Triangle can appropriately fulfill the lens of the *anawim*.

Engaging the Theological Tradition

Having described the migration economy and the theological concept of the *anawim*, we return to where the paper started: with the concept of salvation and saving. The reality of "anawim economics" proposes an interesting paradox that William Cavanaugh lays out well:

> Most significantly, capital is free to move across national borders, but labor is not. Indeed, the impermeability of border for laborers accounts for much of what we call "globalization". It is the very fact that workers south of the border can be paid a tenth of what workers a few miles north of the border that accounts for the phenomenon of factories in the U.S. shutting down and moving to Mexico. […] and yet the displacement of people has become a major phenomenon of a globalized world. Millions of "illegal aliens" live and work in the United States, coming mainly from south of the border. Borders regulate mobility, but they do not prevent it. Indeed, it is most accurate to say that the purpose of borders is to control the movement of labor, not stop it.[14]

What is striking about the paradox that Cavanaugh is addressing is how accurately it reflects the historical development of migration in the United States. We must be careful not overly generalize (since migration is an extremely complex and multifaceted concept), but the above description shows quite clearly the reality of an "in-group" leveraging the

[13] USCCB, "USCCB-CRS Letter to Congress on the US-Northern Triangle Enhanced Engagement Act," June 24, 2019, www.usccb.org/resources/usccb-crs-letter-congress-us-northern-triangle-enhanced-engagement-act-june-24-2019-0 (accessed March 2, 2022).
[14] William T. Cavanaugh, "Migrant, Tourist, Pilgrim, Monk: Mobility and Identity in a Global Age," *Theological Studies* 69 (2008): 344-345

opportunity created by their borders to the disadvantage of the "out-group." What makes this dynamic even more unjust is the reality that many of the factors driving the "out-group" to seek opportunity are created and perpetuated by the "in-group." It is in this juncture that we find the *anawim*, migrants who are victims of an unjust system yet still seek to glorify God through honoring their individual dignity and right to work.

How then should we engage the Christian tradition? To what are those who believe in the reality of Jesus's life, death, and resurrection called to do in response to the plight of migrants both in the United States and around the world? One of the most vocal Christian voices regarding migrants in recent years has been Pope Francis, who has been unequivocal in stating that honoring the transcendent idea of salvation means working to concretely care for and make others well in this life. His encyclicals such as *Laudato Si* and *Fratelli Tutti* pose an unequivocal call to action to Christians around the world to respond generously to those in need, while visits like is 2013 trip to the Mediterranean island of Lampedusa show him in close proximity to migrants in need. [15] In his analysis of Psalm 149, John Paul speaks very much to the same reality. The text reads that the faithful of God should praise His name through dancing, through taking up instruments.[16] There is a sense that worship and honoring God, and therefore his people, comes through concrete action in this life and is more than just words.

In *Christianity and the Law of Migration*, the themes discussed thus far well attended to by Gemma Tulud Cruz in her chapter on theological responses to unwanted migration. While not explicitly using the term *anawim*, her use of "migrants in search of a bare life" is a close analogue.[17] Migrants are not coming to the United States because of their selfish desire to steal American jobs or upset the status quo of the country, which is often the presumption of many who disparage their migration journey. Rather than seeking this "better life," Cruz asserts that the migrants are merely trying to survive, to gain access to the bare necessities of life that guarantee their survival. These needs cannot be met in their home

[15] Francis, "8 July 2013: Visit to Lampedusa - Holy Mass in the "Arena" Sports Camp," July 8, 2013, www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/homilies/2013/documents/papa-francesco_20130708_omelia-lampedusa.html.
[16] Ps 149:3
[17] Gemma Cruz, "When the Poor Knock on Our Door," in *Christianity and the Law of Migration*, eds. Silas W. Allard. et al. (New York: Routledge, 2021): Page 201

countries, so they must necessarily look for other options, most commonly resulting in a perilous migration journey.

Her analysis of the Christian body as "one people" is another helpful theological reflection that speaks to the systemically oppressive nature of the globalized market economy, and how Christians are called to respond. She discusses the Trinity is an inherently relational entity, which evidences the reality that the Christian God has concern and love for the "other" as an inherent part of God's substance. Believing themselves to be made in the likeness and image of this God, Christians must therefore hold themselves to the standard to recognizing the dignity and inherent worth of each other, and of every person they encounter.

Within the context of migration, recognizing the other is looking at the figure of the migrant as the *anawim,* as the other that has been systematically oppressed by a failure to love made manifest in structural systems. Cruz succinctly quotes Kristin Heyer in saying that "the subversive hospitality invited by a migrant God demands not only an orientation of operative frameworks but also a concrete praxis of kinship with the displaced."[18] This is exactly what both Pope Francis and John Paul are writing on in their reflections. To truly live a Christian life is to recognize the transcendent aspect of salvation, that humans are made in the *imago Dei* and will one day return to Him, and for that they rejoice in prayer. But there exists at the same time a concrete aspect, an analysis of economic structures that is accompanied by concrete action to aid the humanitarian needs of migrants. Christians are called to take up instruments, to take on substantive action, in rejoicing about God; the *anawim* remind us that to concretely rejoice in God is to honor the other, the oppressed in society.

Conclusion: "Go and Do Likewise"

These are not aspirational claims. They are not the "highest ideal" of what a Christian must constantly work to achieve. While the challenges of a globalized and interconnected world are by no means ignored by the Christian tradition, to look at the reality of migration through the lens of the *anawim* and then take direct action is a requirement that the Christian tradition calls upon its people to fulfill. The Christian tradition has long looked to the Parable of the Good Samaritan as a way to understand how to appropriately engage with others.

[18] Cruz, "When the Poor Knock on Our Door," 107.

Jesus instructs an expert on the law that to be a true neighbor exists not in enforcing boundaries and clinging to barriers, but in showing mercy to those around.[19] This message of "go and do likewise" never rings truer than when it is applied to those that are viewed as strangers, including and especially the *anawim*.

[19] Lk 10:30-37

Mystērion: The Theology Journal of Boston College

Volume II | Issue I Article 2

Right-Wing Populism and Migrant Exclusion: A Christian Theological Critique

Caroline Brewster
Boston College, brewstec@bc.edu

RIGHT-WING POPULISM AND MIGRANT EXCLUSION: A CHRISTIAN THEOLOGICAL CRITIQUE

CAROLINE BREWSTER *

Abstract: This article will attempt to explain how Right-wing American populists who often pride themselves on their "Judeo-Christian" values have arrived at non-Christian (if not anti-Christian) perspectives on migration. Utilizing Donald M. Kerwin's contribution to *Christianity and the Law of Migration*, this article suggests that we can better understand the method of constructing anti-immigrant rhetoric on a perceived Christian foundation through scriptural exegesis. Placing Kerwin's chapter alongside various scriptural passages and other scholars' work, this article will propose that Right-wing populists have constructed an ascriptural Jesus in order to justify certain tenets of the Right's political agenda. One primary tenant of this political agenda is the exclusivism and nationalism inherent in the Right's anti-immigration policy.

Right-wing populists' anti-immigration policies have demonstrated the centrality of nationalism, nativism, and isolationism to their contemporary political movement. These policies and their underlying philosophical rationale have created an increasingly uninviting environment for immigration to the United States, as reflected statistically in the 2015 and 2019 reports of the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX). According to the index, "which measures and compares the integration policies of 38 countries based on 167 policy indicators," the United States ranked ninth out of thirty-eight developed states for the effectiveness of integration policies. The MIPEX further noted that the United States had created a "slightly favorable path for *some* immigrants to fully participate in society and become like United States citizens."[2]

* Caroline Brewster is a second-year student at Boston College pursuing a B.A. in political science and theology. Caroline's research interests are in biblical studies and the intersection between religion and American public life. She would like to thank Dieter Roth for his course on the Historical Jesus which inspired many elements of this article. She would also like to thank Mark Massa, S.J., and the Boisi Center of Religion and American Public Life for helping incorporate her passions for religion and politics in her studies.

[2] Donald M. Kerwin, "Immigration, Integration, and Disintegration in an Era of Exclusionary Nationalism," in *Christianity and the Law of Migration*, eds., Silas W. Allard, et al. (New York: Routledge, 2021), 108-109 (emphasis mine).

Especially within the last decade, Right-wing populists' anti-immigration rhetoric has resulted in the promulgation of executive-branch policies which reflect skepticism about certain forms of immigration. From an administrative perspective, the Right's anti-immigration rhetoric has legitimized policies that burden migrants with disproportionately expensive fees, limited access to visas, multiyear court backlogs, and frequent deportations without extensive judicial review.[3] Ideologically, this rhetoric has helped to shape a national migration discourse that is increasingly unwelcoming to new citizens, even if many support bipartisan efforts that aim, for example, to legally protect those children brought to the United States as minors.[4]

For a political movement that often describes itself as "Christian" (or the "Religious Right") and that prides itself on appeals to "Judeo-Christian" American values, the Right's anti-immigration policy and rhetoric marks a substantial divergence from both American and biblical values, especially those offered by Christ in the New Testament. To understand how the Right has misinterpreted important aspects of the biblical tradition, I suggest we turn to a few examples of major Right-wing figures who have often used the Bible as the impetus for exclusion.[5] First, however, we will engage with other scholarship on this topic to help contextualize the figures we will encounter.

In his *Christianity and the Law of Migration* chapter on immigration, integration, and disintegration, Donald M. Kerwin highlights that the Trump Administration, like some before it, often explicitly claimed that immigrants undermine the success and life of the nation. This narrative provided the foundation for the restrictive immigration policies of Trump's term, policies which are widely shared within the Republican party (and especially Right-wing populist movement).[6] Kerwin terms Trump's anti-immigration rhetoric as a

---

[3] Kerwin, "Immigration, Integration, and Disintegration," 109.

[4] See, for example, Jens Manuel Krogstad, "Americans Broadly Support Legal Status for Immigrants Brought to the U.S. Illegally as Children," *Pew Research Center*, June 17, 2020, https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/06/17/americans-broadly-support-legal-status-for-immigrants-brought-to-the-u-s-illegally-as-children/.

[5] On the Right's appeals to religious values, especially 'Christian values,' see, for example, former President Donald Trump's 1776 Commission Final Report. Available at https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/The-Presidents-Advisory-1776-Commission-Final-Report.pdf.

[6] On the Right's post-Trump support for anti-immigration policies, see, for example, Michael Tesler, "Republican Views on Immigration are Shifting Even Further to the Right Under Biden" *FiveThirtyEight*, August 17, 2021, https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/republican-views-on-immigration-are-shifting-even-further-to-the-right-under-biden/.

"nativist script" to exclude certain types of migrants from what might otherwise be understood as humanitarian assistance to those most in need.[7] As such, Kerwin specifically discusses Trump's repeated insistence on "Building the Wall" along the United States-Mexico border and his efforts to remove forms of protective migrant status to conclude that Trump's immigration policies were ultimately aimed at "excluding large numbers of low-income, working-class immigrants from admission and adjustment to permanent residence."[8] The "nativist script" which defended these policies, Kerwin argues, prompted sharp condemnation from Trump and his allies around the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and Temporary Protective Status (TPS) programs. At the end of his article, Kerwin concludes that Trump and the Right's anti-immigration rhetoric was successful in instilling fear into Americans about immigrants, and into immigrants about their status in the United States. The effectiveness of this rhetoric, he further proposes, is due to this political movement's appeals to Christian identity.

In light of the frequency and poignancy of anti-immigration rhetoric amongst Right-wing leaders, Kerwin rightly suggests that resources from the Christian tradition can aid in healing the American people's relationship with immigration, especially because appeals to the Christian tradition can draw attention to Gospel-informed ethical concepts such as "human dignity, the common good, and reverence for the vulnerable."[9] Over against the Right's distortion of the Christian tradition and its goal to "Make America Great Again," Kerwin rightly notes that a return to a Christian worldview can refocus the nation on "safeguard[ing] the rights of all persons," a priority shared by most Christian ethicists.[10]

By turning to biblical narratives, Kerwin effectively challenges the demeaning labels like "illegal aliens" employed by Right-wing populists.[11] In his analysis, Kerwin encourages those interested in a Christian perspective on migration to consider how the Christian tradition can help us both understand the perversion of the Gospels necessary to craft these nativist tropes, and forge a new, more authentically Chrisitan approach to migration. Considering the fact that the populist Right in the United States—spearheaded perhaps most

[7] Kerwin, "Immigration, Integration, and Disintegration," 114.
[8] Kerwin, "Immigration, Integration, and Disintegration," 112-114.
[9] Kerwin, "Immigration, Integration, and Disintegration," 122.
[10] Kerwin, "Immigration, Integration, and Disintegration," 122.
[11] Kerwin, "Immigration, Integration, and Disintegration," 122.

famously by Trump—provides the most ardent political support for these nativist policies, turning in particular to the populist Right is a worthwhile endeavor for constructing a theological critique of migrant exclusion. Considering the centrality of scriptural appeals to American Protestant Christianity—which comprises the majority of Right-wing populists' faith affiliations—looking closely at how these populists use the Bible to their political advantage is where this critique must begin.[12]

One of the most obvious examples of how Right-wing populists selectively choose biblical narratives to create a perceived Christian defense of immigration restrictions is in the case of former Attorney General Jeff Sessions' citation of Romans 13:1 in a 2018 address.[13] This passage, well-known to those interested in the relationship between politics and religion, includes Paul's exhortation that "let every person be subordinate to the higher authorities, for there is no authority except from God, and those who have been established by God."[14] For Sessions (as other Right-wing populists), this uncontextualized and extremely brief citation to a scriptural narrative would seem to provide a justification of Trump-era anti-immigration policies. As Kerwin notes though, reading further into Romans 13 reveals that Paul actually provides a much more nuanced political theology. Specifically, in Romans 13:10, Paul says that "love does no evil to the neighbor," which, of course, Sessions fails to mention.[15]

Although not discussed in Kerwin's chapter, Right-wing populists' misuse of biblical passages has also been evident in the story of Nehemiah. Referenced by Sessions in a 2017 address to recall that Nehemiah returned to Jerusalem to build a wall to protect the city from outsiders, this story, in the Right-wing populist presentation, seems to justify Right-wing isolationism and anti-immigration policy.[16] Because Sessions and many other politicians lack robust theological training, however, Sessions's citation to the story of Nehemiah fails to capture the full breadth and nuance of the biblical narrative in which Nehemiah is situated.

[12] According to a Pew Research Center report, 85% of American conservatives identify as Christian, and 59% of those hold a range of Protestant identities. See, Pew Research Center, https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/religious-landscape-study/political-ideology/conservative/ (accessed May 4, 2022).
[13] For a recording of the address, see https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/video/jeff-sessions-cites-biblical-verse-defense-immigration-policies-55904368 (accessed May 4, 2022).
[14] Reproduced in Kerwin, "Immigration, Integration, and Disintegration," 123.
[15] Kerwin, "Immigration, Integration, and Disintegration," 123.
[16] See Jerome Socolovsky, "Jeff Sessions Needs a Sunday School Lesson on Immigration," *Religion News Service*, https://religionnews.com/2017/01/06/jeff-sessions-needs-a-sunday-school-lesson-on-immigration/.

For example, reading Nehemiah in light of Sessions's supposed Christian commitments should, at the least, prompt him to consider how Christ's message of love and compassion for even those on the margins in the New Testament can be placed in conversation with this story. Although it is true that the un-analyzed text of the story would seem to support the exclusivist notion of immigration restriction, the question to which Sessions never provides an answer is how to reconcile a passage such as this with other, seemingly contradictory facets of the biblical narrative.

Perhaps the most striking scriptural contradiction to Sessions's use of Nehemiah is Jesus's interactions with Samaritans. In the first-century Jewish-Palestinian context, it was widely-known that Jews and Samaritians were at odds with one another over irreconcilable religious disagreements. With this in mind, the parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10:25-37) and Jesus's interactions with the Samaritan woman at the watering hole (Lk 8:43-48), show, at their core, how Jesus distinctively calls his followers to put themselves in solidarity with those they have differences with—including on the bases of race, religion, ethnicity, and socio-economic status.[17] Instances of Jesus serving those who may have been deemed as 'unwanted' by Jewish-Palestinan standards—the poor and oppressed, women, the sick and unclean, to name a few—are sprinkled throughout the synoptic tradition. This acknowledgement is paramount to understanding the meaning and impact of Jesus's earthly ministry. Thus, with this broader biblical narrative in mind, Session's use of Nehemiah surely can surely be contrasted with scriptural narratives about Jesus, thus reflecting his inaccurate representation of the core tenets of the Christian faith.

Instead of having to cherry-pick one passage or the other, Sessions and others must instead attempt to understand how the broader arc of the biblical narrative can help us make sense of the issues involved in immigration policy. Especially considering New Testament writings on issues of exclusion, it is fair to conclude that greater attention must be paid to Nehemiah's particular historical context, for example, one which would place it on the periphery of a broader and much more compelling narrative that extends from the Hebrew Bible through the New Testament. This more compelling narrative prioritizes compassion for others, not mere restrictions for the sake of restriction. Applying this methodology to Nehemiah's case, for example, it is doubtful that Sessions would even acknowledge the

[17] The story of Jesus healing the woman who bled for twelve years is also discussed in Mt 9:20-22 and Mk 5:25-34.

particular Jewish context in which Nehemiah was authored—one which involved age-old issues of ritual purity that would seem to have justified exclusions on the basis of "cleanliness." Furthermore, such Right-wing appeals to certain passages have seemed to create a sort of "anti-immigration Bible," believed by some to be God's own W/word by many American Christians.[18] Especially considering Right-wing populist appeals to the Hebrew Bible/Christian Old Testament, there seems to be a sense of communal disregard for the fact that the Jewish and Christian traditions are deeply connected to themes of exile and exodus.[19] Context and nuance is key, both of which Right-wing slogans fail to value.

For self-identified Christians such as Trump and Sessions, an additional question can be asked about how they would navigate other passages from the New Testament, especially in the Gospel of John (e.g., 11:52, 17:21), which specifically discuss God's desire for His "scattered children" to be gathered together so that "all may be one." Placed in conversation with the Christian "Golden Rule" that one should love one's neighbor as one loves God, reading Paul's Letter to the Romans and John's Gospel would seem to suggest that the Christian must conclude that those policies which do evil to one's neighbor violate God's interest that all of His children be gathered together spiritually, even if not physically. In the migration context, policies that separate mothers from children, that discriminate on the basis of one's identity, or that unnecessarily prevent those in need of humanitarian assistance from accessing such assistance certainly violate this Golden Rule and the spirit of Christianity's biblical heritage.

Another helpful example that Kerwin offers of how Right-wing populists pervert scriptural passages is the story in Matthew 12 about 'rendering unto Caeser what is Caesar's.' Although some populists have used this passage to propose that Americans should simply obey Trump-style directives because he is the Caesarian authority, reading this passage in context reveals a far different, and much more nuanced, message. Indeed, placing Jesus (as described in Mt 12) in his historical and scriptural context, if Jesus would have opposed paying his taxes to Caesar, then he could have been senselessly killed as a political rebel or social revolutionary. In this context, then, this passage reveals that Jesus did not encourage

[18] See, for example, Robert L. Tsai, "The Anti-Immigration Bible," *Boston Review*, June 18, 2018, https://bostonreview.net/articles/robert-tsai-anti-immigration-bible/.
[19] Kerwin, "Immigration, Integration, and Disintegration," 122.

his disciples to merely abandon their faith in God for the purposes of pleasing a political ruler. Indeed, because we owe all that we are to God and thus must orient ourselves ultimately toward the Divine, rendering unto Caesar what is Caesar's does not remove us from the connections that we have to God, or the responsibilities that we have to take ever more full part in God's will for humanity. In the case of immigration restrictions, then, while the often-quoted passage about Caeser can be misused by Right-wing populists to demand total submission to governmental directives, this passage actually offers theological motivation to bring the political order into greater accordance with the eternal will of God. Given the excerpts that we have already explored, then, a central tenet of this more scripturally sound approach to migration would begin with the love of neighbor as we love God.

In his 2020 monograph *Republican Jesus: How the Republican Right has Re-Written the Gospels*, Tonny Keddie—a former believer in Christ—further explores how the populist Right has created a scriptural testament of its own that frequently looks foreign to the actual Christian Bible. In fact, Keddie proposes, because Right-wing populist leaders have effectively leveraged the power of appeals to scripture, they have seemingly convinced an entire political movement that its interpretation (or, at least, its presentation) of the Bible is the only legitimate interpretation.[20] This interpretation, of course, depends on traditional Right-wing talking points. In response to this historiographic analysis, Keddie encourages his readers to consider how some strands of Protestant theology have, over time, helped to 'mainstream' some of these ideas. One such example is Keddie's argument that Protestant thinkers, drawing on Martin Luther's belief in non-institutional forms of theological authority, have been able to create a framework in which appeals to traditional Christian doctrines and scriptural narratives seem to support a 'small government' perspective on politics.[21] Interestingly, this would seem to contradict the populist Right's notion that the government should be active in immigration restriction. This is a question that Keddie leaves unexplored, but perhaps it suggests the theological irrationality of the Right-wing populist movement's interest in maintaining some parts of their religious tradition in tension with

[20] Tony Keddie, *Republican Jesus: How the Right has Rewritten the Gospels* (Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 2020, 2.
[21] Keddie, *Republican Jesus*, 26.

others, such that some parts are nearly completed erased, instead of being considered in light of broader religious themes.

As we have seen, it is much more convenient in the immigration context for a Right-wing populist to claim that American citizens should render unto Trump what is Trump's—federal immigration policy—just as it is much more convenient in the economic sphere for a Right-wing populist to claim in light of Luther that "big government" should stay out of American business practices. References to scriptural passages are surely more universally recognizable than appeals to a sixteenth-century Reformation figure, but Keddie helps to further explain how even these very traditional theological strains of Protestantism have been incorporated into the mainstream American consciousness through figures like John Locke and Thomas Jefferson.[22] Consequently, this 'small-government' notion supposedly derived from Luther has lost any level of theological nuance, but nevertheless has retained additional appeal because this supposedly Christian ideal is incorporated through the American political tradition into the American consciousness. In other words, by taking two sources of authority—Christianity and major American political figures—and implicitly weaving them together, appealing to the derivative conclusion seems very likely to generate widespread interest, including when this conclusion is actually only supported some of the time, as in the case of immigration and business policies.

Although figures like Locke and Jefferson are sufficiently common in the American conscience for appeals to their likenesses to be effective, even more recent trends have allowed Right-wing populists to nationalize their faith. After World War II, for example, Keddie proposes that conservatives looked to the Christian faith and perceived the Christian foundations of American democracy as a foil to Nazi Germany.[23] In doing so, these mid-twentieth-century figures helped to bring religion and politics together, so much so that some scholars have argued that politics became a sort of religion: a civil religion. Retaining some apparent Christian roots (as in the case of Jeff Sessions appealing to the Bible selectively), it is this particular form of Christianity advanced by Right-wing populists that have been so effective in turning the message of the Bible into a tool of exclusion.

---

[22] Keddie, *Republican Jesus*, 29.
[23] Keddie, *Republican Jesus*, 87.

In the same way that Right-wing populists use Christianity to defend immigration restrictions, those who are interested in a more authentic faithfulness to the spirit of the Gospels should similarly embrace the Christian faith in their immigration-related advocacy. Although, at times, it can be difficult for political moderates and those on the Left-leaning side of the political spectrum to advance religious arguments in the mainstream culture, unless there is a concerted effort to recover the clarity of the Gospels on the issue of migration, Right-wing populists will be able to continue to misuse a Christ-like figure for political gain. This does no service to the faith, nor to God's people on earth. Just as much as the Right is concerned with preserving constitutional originalism within the American legal system—a methodology that prioritizes faithfulness to the original, contextualized meaning of a textual authority—should too they be concerned with being theologically faithful to scriptural narratives in their historical contexts.

Importantly, this faithfulness to Scripture does not obviate the possibility of dialogue between the two extremes of total inclusivism or total exclusivism. Indeed, the Christian tradition does not prescribe a certain set of rules that political leaders must enshrine into civil law, but rather offers tools for considering how best to respond to the practical circumstances in which we find ourselves. In the migration context, the scriptural narratives we have encountered today offer compassion and radical recognition of God's will that His people be "gathered together" as these two leading tools. For those on the Right, populist or otherwise, this provides an invitation to bring Right-leaning thinking about migration more closely in line with Leviticus 19:33-34: "When a foreigner resides among you in your land, do not mistreat them. The foreigner residing among you must be treated as your native-born. Love them as yourself, for you were foreigners in Egypt. I am the Lord your God."

While the correct application of biblical principles can help re-center Right-wing anti-immigration rhetoric around authentic faith and rectify the relationship between immigration and the American consciousness, the use of such a scripture-centered approach offers a complex constitutional challenge. It is likely that many would perceive this religion-based remedy as a violation of the First Amendment, which reads, in part: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." Although the extent of religious discourse within political rhetoric is a nuanced constitutional issue, Jesuit priest and theologian John Courtney Murray provides brilliant insight into this issue. Applying his thought to the current

American political landscape—especially in regards to migration—is a worthwhile pursuit, and can potentially provide an antidote to the divisiveness the country currently faces.

Murray's seminal work, *We Hold These Truths*, acknowledges that there are inherent contradictions in a Bible-centered hermeneutic and the First Amendment's religious disestablishment. Murray argues, however, that certain religious appeals in public square have the capability to build bridges within a diverse polity like the United States. Because various aspects of the Christian faith, for example, proceed from principles accessible through the mere use of human reason, those of different religious traditions are able to find consensus even amidst their other differences. For instance, the Christian call to 'love thy neighbor' and to service those in need are applicable to principles shared by Jews, Muslims, and even Agnostics. For Murray, it is essential that such values, many of which are particularly evident to persons of faith, are included in public discourse because: "Political freedom is endangered in its foundations as soon as the universal moral values, upon whose shared possession the self-discipline of a free society depends, are no longer vigorous enough to restrain the passions and shatter the self-inertia of men."[24]

For Murray, because American democracy is a "spiritual and moral enterprise," we must consider ethics—illuminated by religion—in our conversations about pressing moral issues like immigration.[25] Applying Murray's breathtakingly clear work to anti-immigration rhetoric in the United States, appeals to scriptural narratives offer one such way to integrate authentic religious discourse into the public sphere. This will not only confront failed exegetical efforts to defend political exclusivism, but might also build new, inter-religious bridges that have previously been unrealized.

[24] John Courtney Murray, SJ, *We Hold These Truths: Catholic Reflections on the American Proposition* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1960), 51.
[25] Murray, *We Hold These Truths,* 51.

Mystērion: The Theology Journal of Boston College

Volume II | Issue I Article 3

The Catholic Church and Migration: A Systematic Perspective

Olivia Halle
Saint Anselm College, ohalle494@anselm.edu

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND MIGRATION: A SYSTEMATIC PERSPECTIVE

OLIVIA HALLE [*]

Abstract: There are many different methodological avenues through which to study the Catholic Church's approach to migration. One of the most fruitful systematic methods, however, includes an analysis of official Church documents and pontifical writings. As such, this article explores official Church publications from the pontificates of Popes John Paul II and Benedict XVI, as well as other similar documents from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB). Applying the insights from these documents to a case study of Filipino immigration to the United States (c. 1980-present), this article will then assess whether the treatment of Filipino immigrants in the United States meets the standards outlined by the aforementioned Church documents.

Introduction

The Catholic Church has a wealth of official publications that define the faith and guidelines that pertain to the Catholic faith. These documents instruct the lay faithful, consecrated, and ordained alike on fundamental facets of the Church's theology and social ethic. Many of these documents, however, are also aimed at encouraging a wider, Catholic and non-Catholic audience, to adopt principles amenable to the Church's social vision. Indeed, Catholic Social Teaching (CST) instructs the faithful on how to engage the human world, one created by God but nevertheless impacted by the realities of human sinfulness. For example, Pope John Paul II's Encyclical on the Value and Inviolability of Human Life, *Evangelium Vitae*, discusses the Catholic Church's stance on the death penalty. Other similar documents, such as Pope Benedict XVI's Encyclical on Christian Love, *Deus Caritas Est*, articulate how Christians are called to love one another as Christ loves the Church.

Aside from papal encyclicals that address issues of CST, other magisterial documents provide a framework for how Catholics should approach important social questions. These documents include, but are not limited to, the 1983 Code of Canon Law (CIC) and the Catechism of the Catholic Church (CCC). Considering the fact that migration has long-been

[*] Olivia Halle is a second-year B.A. candidate in history and theology at Saint Anselm College. After completing her B.A., Olivia aspires to acquire her J.C.L. and M.A. in Systematic Theology to practice as a Canon Jurist for a Catholic diocese in the United States.

a critical part of the human experience, it is unsurprising that the Church has a vast array of documents addressing immigrants' rights, the law of migration, how immigrants should be treated, and how countries should respond to immigrants who wish to live within their borders.

Migration in the 1983 Code of Cannon Law

The 1983 CIC was drafted and revised during the Second Vatican Council to instruct the lay faithful and religious in greater depth and nuance than what was made available in the 1917 Code of Canon Law. In particular, the 1983 CIC more clearly discusses human rights: "The lay Christian faithful have the right to recognize the freedom which all citizens have in the affairs of the early city. When using that freedom, however they are to take care that their actions are imbued with the spirit of the gospel and are to heed the doctrine set forth by the magisterium of the Church…" (CIC 227).[2]

Of all the themes present in the 1983 CIC, the most clearly defined is the sanctity of human life, and the duty of Christians to uphold such sanctity. Indeed, the 1983 CIC makes clear that all human persons have certain inalienable rights regardless of nationality or country of origin. Applying this theological presupposition to migration then, it is clear that migrants have certain fundamental rights because migrants are as human persons. According to the 1983 CIC, it is the duty of the Christian faithful to recognize these rights and work for their protection. Many of these rights are drawn directly from the Beatitudes in Matthew's Gospel, which call the faithful to be infused with the spirit of the Gospel, especially in the Gospels' calls for Christians to be merciful and peacemakers (Mk 5:3-12 NABRE). Canon 227, though not all too specific, offers the preface for the Christian approach to migration, one which requires that Christians help migrants experience suffering regardless of country of origin. The CIC calls the Christian to look at other human persons as integral parts of the Mystical Body of Christ, not as aliens.

Migration in the Catechism of the Catholic Church

Perhaps even more well-known than the CIC is the Catechism of the Catholic Church. The CCC states how earthly governments and the Christian faithful should treat

[2] 1983 Code of Cannon Law, Vatican.va, Liberia Editrice Vaticana 1993, accessed February 9, 2022, https://www.vatican.va/archive/cod-iuris-canonici/eng/documents/cic_lib2-cann208-329_en.html#TITLE_I.

immigrants: "The more prosperous nations are obliged, to the extent they are able, to welcome the foreigner in search of the security and means of livelihood which he cannot find in his country of origin. Public authorities should see to it that the natural right is respected that places a guest under the protection of those who receive him" (CCC 2241).[3]

The Church exhorts wealthy governments to offer a place for migrants of safety and opportunity which they could not otherwise obtain in their home country. As stated in the CIC*,* every person has a unique dignity because they are a person made in the image and likeness of God; all earthly municipalities should thus respect the dignity of human life. Migrants should be seen as guests and should receive protection no matter their citizenship status. The Church also recognizes that it is the duty of the faithful to uphold the rights of migrants even when it is particularly difficult:

> The citizen is obliged in conscience not to follow the directives of civil authorities when they are contrary to the demands of moral order, to the fundamental rights of persons or the teaching of the Gospel. Refusing obedience to civil authorities, when their demands are contrary to those of an upright conscience, finds its justification in the distinction between serving God and serving the political community… (CCC 2242).

As stated here, when local authorities violate basic human dignity, Christians have a right to protect the dignity of every person regardless of their citizenship status or country of origin. As stated previously in the CIC*,* Christians should uphold the rights of humans in light of the spirit of the Gospel. Thus, they should cloth the naked, feed the hungry, and find shelter for the homeless (Mk 5:3-12).

Migration in the Thought of John Paul II

In his message to the 90th World Day of Migrants and Refugees in 2004, Pope John Paul II explained that the root of immigration is the desire of migrants to seek peace in their lives: "No one can deny that the aspiration to peace is rooted in the heart of a larger part of humanity. That is exactly the ardent desire that spurs people to seek a possible path to a better future for one and all."[4] The Holy Father makes this claim because most migrants

[3] Catechism of the Catholic Church, Vatican.va, Liberia Editrice Vaticana 1993, accessed February 9, 2022, https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/__P7W.HTM.

[4] John Paul II, "Message of the Holy Father John Paul II for the 90th World Day of Migrants and Refuges 2004," Vatican.va, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, accessed February 18, 2022, https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/messages/migration/documents/hf_jp-ii_mes_20031223_world-migration-day-2004.html.

immigrate to find more acceptable living conditions. Indeed, many immigrants find themselves in the process of migration because of unfavorable living conditions in their home countries, or because see better economic opportunities outside the borders of their home country. This reflects migrants' underlying desire to find peace in life for themselves and their families.

John Paul continued to explain that "No one should be indifferent to the conditions of multitudes of immigrants! They are at the mercy of events, often with dramatic situation behind them."[5] He urged Catholics to pay attention to immigrants' conditions in their new countries. The Magisterium of the Catholic Church states that fundamental rights should be afforded to all people of the world. The pope references claims because Christians are bound in conscience to advocate for adequate living conditions for all immigrants, legal and non-documented; after all, God creates every human being in His image and likeness.

Migration in the Thought of Benedict XVI

Benedict XVI echoed a similar view as his predecessor John Paul II. In his 2013 address during the World Day of Migrants and Refugees, Benedict stated that

> … on the one hand, she [the Church] witnesses the immense poverty and suffering entailed in migration, leading often to painful and tragic situations. That inspires the creation of programmes aimed at meeting emergencies through the generous help of individuals and groups, volunteer associations and movements, parochial and diocesan organizations in cooperation with all people of goodwill.[6]

In continuity with his predecessor, Pope Benedict urged the whole Christian community to protect the fundamental rights of migrants. In the United Nations' definition, these rights must include "… inclusive development, and committing to protecting the safety, dignity,… and fundamental freedoms of all migrants, regardless of their migratory status."[7]

The Catholic Church and the United Nations stand in solidarity with the fundamental human rights that all migrants deserve by virtue of their fundamental humanity. Both John

[5] John Paul II, "Message of the Holy Father John Paul II for the 90th World Day of Migrants and Refuges 2004."
[6] Benedict XVI, "Message of His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI For the World Day of Migrants and Refugees (2013), Vatican.va, Liberia Editrice Vaticana, last modified October 12, 2012, accessed February 18, 2022, https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/messages/migration/documents/hf_ben-xvi_mes_20121012_world-migrants-day.html.
[7] United Nations, "Peace, Dignity and Equality on a Healthy Planet," accessed February 18, 2022, https://www.un.org/en/global-issues/migration.

Paul II and Benedict XVI declared in their addressees to the World Day of Migrants that immigrants should be afforded fundamental human rights. The popes call on the Christian faithful in their parishes and communities to uphold the dignity of migrants by providing them with the services and supplies they need to adapt to their new homes.

Migration and the USCCB

In 2013, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) released a statement on new migration reforms entitled the "Catholic Church's Position on Immigration Reforms."[8] This statement outlines six ways to understand immigration in light of CST. The first way is to help immigrants earn their citizenship while they work in live in the United States: "An earned legalization program would allow forging nationals of good moral character who are living in the United States to apply to adjust their status to obtain lawful permanent residence."[9] Underlying this encouragement is the USCCB's agreement with the aforementioned Church documents written by John Paul II and Benedict XVI, which identify a desire for better living conditions as the primary impetus for migration. From the USCCB's perspective, this must prompt a sincere, case-by-case evaluation of migration applications.

The second measure that the USCCB endorses is the Future Worker Program: "A worker program to permit foreign-born works to enter the country safely and legally would help reduce illegal immigration and the loss of life in the American desert."[10] This is an unsurprising move as both John Paul II and Benedict XVI continually emphasized that migration is an inherently treacherous journey only undertaken to improve one's living conditions. Here, the USCCB promotes having legal foreign worker program to deter people from making a dangerous trek in an already dangerous world of migration.

The third approach that USCCB encourages is the establishment of a more holistic immigration process, one that prioritizes family-based immigration reforms. In fact, the USCCB states, "It currently takes years for family members to be reunited through family-based legal immigration system… [which] in some cases, illegal immigration."[11] Family is

[8] USCCB, "Catholic Church's Position on Immigration Reform," United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, last modified 2022, accessed February 21, 2022, https://www.usccb.org/issues-and-action/human-life-and-dignity/immigration/churchteachingonimmigrationreform.
[9] USCCB, "Catholic Church's Position on Immigration Reform."
[10] USCCB, "Catholic Church's Position on Immigration Reform."
[11] USCCB, "Catholic Church's Position on Immigration Reform."

the core of Christian theology. The sacrament of Matrimony is the love of Christ represented in the marred couple, each called to love each other as Christ loves His Church. John Paul II, in his work, *Migration With a View to Piece,* emphasizes that most immigrants migrate to a new country to seek peace and stability for themselves *and their families*. If families are separated, they could take dangerous measures to reunite, legally and illegally.[12]

The fourth route the USCCB endorses is to restore due process rights for undocumented persons caught entering the United States in an unverified way. As of now, the punishment for entering the United States illegally is three to ten years in prison. Affording basic due process rights to migrants is the minimum required to safeguard and uphold the dignity of the migrant at the border.

The fifth section of the USCCB's analysis states that counties should address the root causes of migration: "Congress should examine the root causes of migration such as under-development and poverty in sending countries and seeking long-term solutions."[13] This is very faithful to Benedict XVI's notion that Christians should seek programs that find and address the root causes of migration.[14]

The sixth step that the USCCB endorses involves border protection; in fact, the USCCB stands "with United States Border protection in securing the borders by intercepting illegal immigrants, increasing lawful immigration, and focusing on the criminal who tries to enter the country (e.g., drug and human traffickers, smugglers, and terrorists)."[15] The Magisterium of the Catholic Church promotes a respectful position with respect to migrants, but not one that endangers others' safety. Here, the Church and USCCB state there needs to be a balance between assisting those individuals who genuinely come to improve their conditions and those of their families. As such, if some intend to harm the new country they call "home," they should not be permitted entry.

Practical Application: Filipino Migration (c. 1980-Present)

Historically, immigration from the Philippines to the United States began in the late-nineteenth century, fueled by political, educational, and military ties between the United

---

[12] John Paul II, "Message of the Holy Father John Paul II for the 90th World Day of Migrants and Refuges."
[13] USCCB, "Catholic Church's Position on Immigration Reform."
[14] Benedict XVI, "Message of His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI For the World Day of Migrants and Refugees."
[15] USCCB, "Catholic Church's Position on Immigration Reform."

States and the Philippines. Many waves of Filipino migrants came to the United States during this period. Most recently, in 2018, 2,000,000+ Filipinos were recorded as living in the United States.[16] According to the Migration Policy Institute, most Filipino migrants who gain access to the United States do so legally through relatives who are American citizens or obtain green cards for employment. Filipino immigrants have a higher level of English skills and are more likely to gain American citizenship than other migrant groups. They also have a higher income rate and are less likely to be finically uninsured.[17]

Given the historical status of Filipinos in the United States, it would seem as though this particular community has been treated justly by the standards of Catholic Social Teaching. This is certainly not to say that Filipino-Americans, however, have not faced some challenges, regarding the third approach that the USCCB outlines for family-based immigration reform. Indeed, Bill Ong Hing's chapter in *Christianity and the Law of Migration* offers a compelling defense of "chain migration," the type of family-based process in which many Filipinos have been engaged.[18] As Hing notes in his chapter, however, it may take years before those living in the United States with family can obtain their citizenship.[19]

Immigrants waiting years to gain citizenship is contrary to what the USCCB, *CIC*, *CCC*, John Paul II, and Benedict XVI articulate as a just approach to migration. Not only do these unduly long waits often violate the right to due process rights that the USCCB outline, but it is also contrary to Benedict's exhortation that nations create programs that assist migrants in their adjustment to a new country. These delays, therefore, embody a cruel facet of the migration process that Catholic Social Teaching not only condemns, but also responds to with a constructive path forward.

---

[16] Hassan Batalova, "Filipino Immigrants in the United States," *Migration Policy Institute*, last modified 2022, accessed February 22, 2022, https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/filipino-immigrants-united-states-2020.
[17] Batalova, "Filipino Immigrants in the United States."
[18] Bill Ong Hing, "In Defense of Chain Migration," in *Christianity and the Law of Migration*, eds., Silas W. Allard, et al. (New York: Routledge, 2021), 51.
[19] Hing, "In Defense," 51.

Mystērion: The Theology Journal of Boston College

Volume II | Issue I Article 4

Guelaguetza as a Religious Site of Identity: Construction and Defense of the Oaxacan Immigrant Community

Rene Sebastian Cisneros
Bowdoin College, rcisnero@bowdoin.edu

GUELAGUETZA AS A RELIGIOUS SITE OF IDENTITY: CONSTRUCTION AND DEFENSE OF THE OAXACAN IMMIGRANT COMMUNITY

RENE SEBASTIAN CISNEROS *

Abstract: This article attempts to explore new techniques in how religious studies scholars study religious communities. Leveraging theoretical engagement with the religious practices and celebrations of Oaxacan Mexicans, as well as my own experiences in this community, this article will explore how Oaxacan Mexicans in Mexico and diasporic Oaxacans experience faith. This article will conclude by proposing that auto-ethnographic engagement with religious studies is a fruitful scholarly method that can help scholars make sense of lived religious practices.

Published over a decade ago, Kimerer L. LaMothe's groundbreaking article in the *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, "What Our Bodies Know About Religion and the Study of It," unveils a tension in religious studies scholarship.[2] LaMothe attempts to navigate the differences between purely empirical methods of religious studies, and an alternate model that emphasizes religious experience *sui generis*—that is, as an irreducible phenomenon instead of a product of other social processes. For LaMothe, this is a dynamic of pushing and pulling, movements and reactions that lead to a fuller understanding of religion and its practice. On top of this, the article emphasizes how scholarship on religious practice and belief still has not fully articulated how scholars should place their own body and experience into the work that they do. This theoretical space offers an opportunity for historically underrepresented researchers, a community I feel firmly part of, to situate their undervalued and silenced experiences into the common scholarly pursuit for a fuller understanding of what religion is and how people participate in it. As such, to create an intellectually robust understanding of Oaxacan Mexican religiosity, I suggest that we first explore the essential role of religious practice to the communal cohesion of the Oaxacan

* Rene Sebastian Cisneros is a B.A. candidate in religion at Bowdoin College. His research interests include the sociology of religion, religious affective space, and critical cultural studies. He would like to like to thank his family for their invaluable experiences which inform his research and Professor Joshua Urich for his guidance and support.

[2] Kimerer L. LaMothe, "What Bodies Know about Religion and the Study of It," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 76, no. 3 (2008): 573–601.

diaspora. Afterward, we can turn to the role that religiosity has as a site of communal defense and self-reliance for Oaxacans.

Guelaguetza is an annual religious celebration that takes place in Oaxaca City, Mexico, one that offers a shared link between Oaxaqueños and reminder of the community's boundaries and histories. The Oaxacan dance festival, called colloquially 'Lunes del Cerro,' is a term that captures a wide array of different events occurring in the middle of July in Oaxaca City, including dances that Mexican government and the Oaxaqueños alike call Guelaguetzas. A Guelaguetza is a ceremonial dance performance hosted both in the Auditorio Guelaguetza, a designated arena on top of one of the surrounding hills of the city, but also in various public venues scattered throughout the city. This leads to abrupt morning dance performances in front of cafes or in the narrow colonial-era streets late into the night.

Both the official performance of the Guelaguetza and the various dances in the Oaxacan City streets combine cultural elements of indigenous religion, such as the appropriation of the Aztec God Centeotl, and the lived Catholic practice of Mexico. It is in this intersection where the Oaxaqueños who participate in the dance, and those in attendance, label the different events as a distinctly Oaxacan practice. Much of the scholarship heretofore published on Catholic Christian practice in Mexico centers on the different saint venerations that researchers often see as the crux of Catholic lived practice there.[3] While this has certainly been true in my personal experiences, there are other influential and visible currents of religion in Oaxaca that merit study. Cultural ceremonies such as Guelaguetza become centers of identity formation and sites of intimate engagement with religion and Catholic and pre-Colombian beliefs and practices. Through the study of lived religion, scholars can uncover how people construct, understand, and defend the imagined communities that everyday practice and cultural performance bring to life.

Discussions of religious syncretism fail to fully capture the religiosity of transnational communities like the Oaxacan diaspora. Research on the creation of a national Mexican identity is always one step behind the colloquial practices of people like my parents who might label themselves as "not the best Catholics," but who are nevertheless informed

[3] Here I am referencing academic work done particularly on the various interactions between Spanish Catholicism and Indigenous Mexican religion. Some notable work in this space includes Jennifer Scheper Hughes' *Biography of a Mexican Crucifix*; John A. Ingram's *Mary, Michael and Lucifer*; Cristián Parker's *Popular Religion and Modernization in Latin America* and Matthew D. O'Hara's *A Flock Divided*.

by religious discourses that make celebrations like Guelaguetza 'legible.' My family comes from the village of Tezoatlan de Segura y Luna, a small merchant center in the northwest valleys of the Alta Mixteca region. My experience with the Oaxacan culture of Mexico is different from the readily available academic work done on the Oaxacan immigrant experiences, most of which focus on diasporic Oaxacan communities in California and other parts of the West coast. Contrary to the scholarly consensus, I feel a sense of personal connection to the state of Oaxaca and my parents' home village through my own memories of visitation and the stories my parents have often shared. Most immigrants from my home village moved to the metropolises of New York City and Chicago; however, it is in New Jersey where my family ultimately settled. It is a combination of these different contexts that also include the immigrant experience that inform how I see a Oaxacan identity, as held together by bonds we may label as religious.

Religion, if we take note of Jonathan Z. Smith's work in *Map is Not Territory*, is similar to how a farmer orders his farm by constructing boundaries between home and his fields. Ritual initiation is the act of dirtying one's hand in dirt to mark the moment the farmer becomes part of this second world.[4] The farmer understands his field as a cosmology of zones with meanings that supersede any visual or scientific reason. Words like immanence and transcendence have little meaning for this farmer, who still understands that moving from one world to another requires a new set of rules that abide by logics out of reach from a sociological or anthropological lens. Similarly, initiation into the Oaxacan community encompasses meanings that researchers cannot understand through social theory or empirical data alone. Religion looks different depending on where you are and carries power that merits a study of its own. The question for my research, therefore, becomes: What does religion, seen in the mix of Catholic saint veneration and "Oaxacan" indigenous culture, do for those who talk about this mixture, such as when my mom talks about her upbringing, or when a Guelaguetza dancer re-enacts Aztec religious stories?

I have never attended a Guelaguetza performance in its official venue, though I do have many family members who have contributed to it. Consequently, I come at both the topic of a Oaxacan identity and of the festival of Guelaguetza through my experiences as a

[4] Discussed in in Donovan O. Schaefer, *Religious Affects: Animality, Evolution, and Power* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015), 4–5.

son of immigrants, having witnessed the every-day performances of the dance festival, my family members' retelling of its performance, and its intimate effect on my family here in the United States. A distance appears between the cultural practices and values that my parents talk about and my own experiences, a space that is open for academic and self-reflexive research into what still makes me Oaxaqueño.

Through my own experiences of Guelaguetza, I perceive a site of performance of a Oaxacan identity that incorporates, whether consciously or through subtext, the Oaxacan migrant experience. This is tangible in the way that immigrants travel back from the United States to Oaxaca, creating both a touristic market for the exchange of cultural artifacts (often with a unique aesthetic which immigrants and foreign tourists alike label as "Oaxacan"), but more importantly in the every-day interactions that occur in festivals of mass influx into the state, one such festival being Guelaguetza. Here, we again arrive at the idea of boundaries, suggesting that "religion" includes the concept of experiencing (or as LaMothe might phrase it, 'feeling'), these boundaries that make up a shared communal identity.

Researchers, especially sociologists and political scientists located in the critical theory tradition, may seek to understand the relationship between nation-states and religion through ideas of civic religion. One of the intoxicating strengths of such an approach is its ability to unearth hidden assumptions that we might have in what a nation-state is and what a nation's borders represents. Returning to LaMothe's article, we can try focusing her lens on how immigrants feel towards borders and the different "maps" that Oaxacan migrants may deploy to understand their circumstances.

As well-articulated in Silas W. Allard's chapter, "Borders: Sites of Exclusion; Sites of Engagement," borders constitute more than just the ways that states use power to exclude humans from their protection.[5] We can deploy Giorgio Agaben's concept of *Homo Sacer* to see that a sovereign's power manifests, in our contemporary age, to separate migrants from their political being. This allows the United States to deny groups of people the rights protected by citizenship.[6] The numerous social interactions that Oaxacan work-migrants experience on the path to the United States represent immigrants' experiences with the many

---

[5] Silas W. Allard, "Borders: Sites of Exclusion; Sites of Engagement," in *Christianity and the Law of Migration*, eds., Silas W. Allard, Kristin Heyer, and Raj Nadella (New York: Routledge, 2021), 87–104.

[6] Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998).

borders that make up this unique and often dangerous experience of immigration. In such confrontations with the many borders of their every-day lives, I see echoes of Allard's usage of Balibar's idea of the heterogeneity of the border. Indeed, Allard's focus turns to how different boundaries are experienced and felt throughout different socio-political landscapes.[7] The ubiquity of the border follows the feeling that, from the perspective of an undocumented immigrant (as was the case for my parents until 2006), the border manifests itself not just in the physical "line in the sand," but in the many institutional lines that immigrants feel when navigating the unemployment process or even just dropping off one's child at school in fear of being stopped by ICE agents.

In another sense, we may look at the Guelaguetza festival as one that often attracts immigrants who live in the United States and have documentation to see the cultural and religious landscapes that also present unique experiences with state borders. The cultural construction of a Oaxacan identity stretches across national borders; yet, the immigrant experience is one that is ingrained in the way that immigrants talk to locals. In the case of my mother, this manifests in how she greets members of our home village, with warm embraces and the transaction of often sad or cheerful conversations. Migrants like my mother undergo a process of self-reflection after these conversations that involves an internal struggle between what it means to have left family members in Mexico for so long and being in the process of constructing new homes in the United States. This is where a Oaxacan identity is both challenged and persistently re-articulated.

The social significance of ceremonies like Guelaguetza highlight the importance of a geographic center for a Oaxacan diaspora. In my own experience of walking the streets of Oaxaca City, I have seen how intertwined culture, religion, and this Oaxacan identity are in cultivating an imagined community. Whenever I go back to visit the capital city, I make sure to visit at least two cathedrals, the first being El Templo de Santo Domingo. At this cathedral, I have had the honor to witness my cousin's wedding in the same week as the Guelaguetza, seeing professional dancers perform on the steps of the cathedral, blending both traditional Catholic customs and indigenous aesthetics of colors, form, and dance, to create a Oaxacan atmosphere that fills the streets. La Iglesia de la Soledad, on the other hand, makes up one of the sides of the Central Park of the city (*el Zocalo*) that is home to endless stands where

[7] Allard, "Borders: Sites of Exclusion; Sites of Engagement," 94-95.

artisans from largely indigenous communities sell ceramic cookware, mugs, *revosos*, and dresses that are colored in the mystic dyes that forcefully capture the eye.

For my immigrant family, this is yet another border we contemplate as we decide what to bring back home to the United States. A border uniquely attentive to the history and social realities of Mexico today appears between my family and these markets. The way that my parents understand the Oaxacan imagined community is imperfect and often glosses over or diminishes the real material suffering of indigenous communities. How much are these mystic dyes and 'othered' aesthetics that tourists and Oaxacan migrants alike label 'Oaxacqueño' also products of a capitalistic enterprise that often veils the hands that produce them? Instead of addressing how religious studies scholarship might uncover these hidden undercurrents of exploitation, I would like to focus on identifying a possible solution for the way that scholars can approach this unique case of lived religion.

Religious studies, through theories of social cohesion, offers us a way to see lived religion, or the way that people and communities live out religious practice in every-day life, as fluid and reactive to the pressures and coordinated efforts of those who can read cultures' oblique (and yet far-spanning) languages. The imagined Oaxacan community becomes a site where those who can read its significations can also affect and be affected by different cultures. The study of culture becomes a space for tangible social, political, and economic change on both sides of the Mexican-American border, and in the many frontiers whose ubiquity immigrants are experts in.

The questions I hope to pose here are: What steps should researchers take to incorporate more marginalized voices into the on-going pursuit of a more complete understanding of religious life? How should we apply the scholarly achievements of Robert Orsi and other theoreticians to other settings?[8] How might we further develop appreciative and transformative theories of what religion is and what it does? How are such questions inseparably bound to the communities of immigrants that live with religion and express their deepest sentiments through it?

Heeding LaMothe's call for a fuller understanding of a researcher's place in their research, I hope to describe what is at stake for me and how my body and mind feel the

[8] See, for example, Robert A. Orsi, *The Madonna of 115th Street: Faith and Community in Italian Harlem*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988).

different textured landscapes of the Oaxacan community. As I write and read about the community of Oaxacan immigrants in the United States, as well as those I have left back home, I must remember to read my unique coordinates in the social institution of higher education in the United States, seeing myself as an outsider within the walls of a historically privileged social institution. I am then led, by these acknowledgments, to question what my place is here.

My goal in describing the Mexican city which my family still calls home is not aimed at legitimizing a strictly Oaxacan aesthetic that includes "indigenous" colors or designs or sounds or people. There is yet to be an all-inclusive Oaxacan community because of the historical, social, and economic consequences of events such as the Spanish conquest of Meso-America. What makes Guelaguetza a perfect example for identity-making, however, is in how it captures continual re-articulations of what being Oaxacan means, akin to how a dancer learns to perform their dance in different rhythms, compiling different techniques into fluid performances and embodiments of history and experience into one cohesive display. A Oaxacan community undergoes, in different historical moments, different movements of inclusion and exclusion, similar and often intersecting with the history of the construction of a Mexican national identity. If we consider Claudio Lomnitz's *Deep Mexico, Silent Mexico*, we see a similarly ongoing apparition and disappearance of a Mexican identity whose constituents and characteristics depend on the conjurer who invokes a Mexican history out of a wide breadth of narratives at one's disposal.[9]

It is in the same process depicted by God's creation of existence in the first lines of the Book of Genesis, and God's verbal act of "speaking into existence" the universe, that Oaxacan Mexicans use to construct and defend their imagined community. (Gen 1:1-26 RSV). The Oaxacan imagined community celebrated in the festival of the Guelaguetza, through the traditional clothing worn by its dancers, the music played on so-called "traditional" instruments, and the colors of the skins of both performers and attendants, rely on a shared and agreed upon notion of Oaxacan identity. One way to translate such an utterance as "soy Oaxacaqueño" is to say, "this is my lot, this is my field." Smith's analogy becomes even more suitable when we consider the centrality of agricultural life in Oaxaca

[9] Claudio Lomnitz, *Deep Mexico, Silent Mexico*, First edition (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2001).

and the idea of the *campesino* (the laborer) that forces one to return to an image of a brown farmer whose clothes are often worn by Guelaguetza dancers. What matters in the dancers' attire is not the historical accuracy of what indigenous farmers wore but the dancers' understanding of the centrality of maize and agriculture to a Oaxacan identity. Further, the focus of this identity-making process is in the depth of cultural signs that represent a reservoir of social histories waiting to be evoked through identification as Oaxaqueño.

I am told by my parents that I am Oaxaqueño because of my heritage. My mom once told me that she is proud to be from Oaxaca, no matter what other Mexicans think of her, because she sees her skin and sees beauty. I hope to untangle what this means and to see the continual processes of racial formation that occurs in the construction of a Oaxacan identity. I hope to ask how such racialized ideals are transmitted through generations of immigrants and their families here in the States. The focus of this inquiry is to reveal how the transformative nature of lived religion may enable the reversal of racialized ideals from Mexico, and a newly found appreciation of beauty in Brownness. Indeed, here, at the intersection of sacred ideals and material realities, scholars may ask: How can celebrations that are not overtly or theologically *religious* still be examples of engagements with religious vernaculars? How can religious languages of meaning, or the way that people come to live out religion, create connections that supersede material borders?

By looking at how people on the ground talk about religion and identity, or in this example, how Oaxaqueños define the practices and beliefs that tie them to their villages and to a Oaxacan identity, we can read the vital principles of religious practice in the age of modernity. Studying religion, as well-articulated in *Christianity and the Law of Migration*, is made more fluid and dynamic in the time we might label the 'modern age of immigration.' In the context of transnational cultural exchanges, I raise the question of: How is religious life fundamentally changed, and how does it adapt to, technological, political, economic, and social movements brought on by the modern form of capitalism and liberal democracy?

The lived religious practices of migrant communities can be seen in events such as Guelaguetza that incorporate the religious themes of Catholic saint-veneration and Catholic Cathedrals that stand alongside the indigenous pantheon of deities and ways of approaching the environment of Oaxaca. This offers scholars a view into the dynamic and creative practices of communities in need. Contrary to commonly accepted notions of religion being

traditional, steadfast, stubborn, and ancient, it is instead a practice of ongoing construction and redefinition. To be Oaxacan means to partake in this process of religious redefinition that mirrors the ubiquity that Allard attributes to national borders.

The religious rituals that belong within the festival of Guelaguetza do not fully make-up the whole of the celebration. There remains space for political, ethnic, racial, gendered and other powerful discourses that attach individuals to a community. Religious ritual, in this light, is what I ascribe to the process of social cohesion that leads people who live thousands of miles away from the state of Oaxaca to identify with and feel in coordination with the Oaxacan community. The movements of meaning and of different cultural signs that migrants carry across the United States-Mexico border have constituted a tangible community of Oaxaqueños. The movement of embodied stories and religious meaning that constitute the migrant experience has opened space for me to write: Soy Oaxacaqueño.

Beneath the level of discourse, or the way that Oaxaqueños talk about their upbringing or their ties to the state, lie powerful presuppositions about what makes a person, an event, an aesthetic, or an experience sufficiently Oaxacqueño. The fabrics that Guelaguetza dancers wear, the religious myths they deploy, the color of their skin, the layout of the city grid, all weave into a religious landscape of performances that construct a total and unified experience of the city. The city of Oaxaca can perhaps only be fully appreciated when Guelaguetza dancers animate the Catholic cathedral plazas and blur lines between secular sidewalks and sacred spaces. The city takes on a religious immanence, where divine presence takes over public space for a few days in mid-July.

We must also be careful not to concretize what a united and timeless image of Oaxacan identity is. Walking through the city of Oaxaca in the time of Guelaguetza offers fleeting and turbulent glimpses of social histories. Much in the same way that Claudio Lomnitz describes the continual construction and conjuring up of a national Mexican identity throughout the country's history, when Oaxaqueños articulate a Oaxacan identity, they tap into a depth of different narratives that include religious discourses and practice to momentarily construct meaning. The emphasis throughout Lomnitz's monograph is the cacophony of different voices that can be called upon depending on the setting and one's intentions. A more cynical view might see national identity as always determined by the power of the hegemonic order of one's time and place.

Instead, I invite a more open-ended reading of identity construction, where subaltern communities may find space to practice solidarity and democratic communal identity construction. Having explored the de-humanizing events that make up the many borders of the migrant experience, we might also see a fountain of hope revealing itself, sprouting opportunities for radical empathy with other communities in need. Redefining what makes the Oaxacan community succinct involves articulating ethical values that can be changed and summoned from the past. Oaxaqueños might even recover lessons from generations of migrants past to form communal myths that transcend generations.

As demographics reflect a decrease in the rate of migration from Mexico to the United States, and as generations of migrant workers slowly undergo the sociological processes of cultural and socio-economic assimilation, it becomes a strenuous effort to maintain a sense of Oaxacan identity. I experienced how it may also become harder to orient this identity towards lived experiences of precarity. At the same time, the depth of the immigrant experience, with the stories of crossing the Sierra desert or crawling through drainage beneath an Arizonan highway, can always be invoked.

I find myself in a privileged position to apply new hermeneutics of religious experience to better understand critical dimensions of the immigrant experience. Familial stories convey more than just a linguistic transmission of communal values and narratives. These stories share the way that bodies feel when they cross the border, not just in the literal words that come out of migrants' mouths. These stories may be written down in ethnographic manuscripts, but it is through the calculated retellings of border-crossing experiences, or the imagery and emotional significance of postcard-sized images of the Virgen de Guadalupe, for example, that they become meaningful. There remains ample unexplored territory for scholars to show us how such images can help make sense of the heterogeneous experiences that are then recalled through religious performance.

Mystērion: The Theology Journal of Boston College

Volume II | Issue I

Keynote Address: Reflections on "Religious and Legal Perspectives on Migration"

Kristin E. Heyer
Boston College, heyerkr@bc.edu

KEYNOTE ADDRESS:

REFLECTIONS ON "RELIGIOUS AND LEGAL PERSPECTIVES ON MIGRATION"

KRISTIN E. HEYER [*] [**]

Thanks to Dennis Wieboldt for the invitation to be with you today, and to Andrea Vicini, S.J.; Professor Jeffrey Cooley; Tiffany Lee and the other organizers for today's inaugural undergraduate *Mystērion* conference. Thanks too to today's presenters: Olivia Halle, Jack Engelmann, Rene Sebastian Cisneros, and Caroline Brewster for your engaging presentations. I am also grateful to theology doctoral students R. "Zac" Karanovitch and Brett O'Neill, S.J., for their thoughtful responses. I will just offer some brief remarks in light of the book project, the papers we have heard today, and the context in which we find ourselves in the wider world.

Just a word about *Christianity and the Law of Migration*. The book brought together a group of legal scholars with scholars of religion and theology to try to bridge the disciplinary silos that weaken reflection on complicated issues like migration. The interdisciplinary approach allowed us to contextualize migrations, reveal ideological drivers of policy, and the role of power, as well as new understandings of citizenship "from below." Putting Christian theology and practice in dialogue with law and policy (like a double major) can unmask and challenge operative agendas. The book focuses on policies and attendant rhetoric during the Trump Administration; but one year into the Biden administration, I think much of the critiques stand. Brewster's reflections on nativism and isolationism, like similar themes in our volume, continue to hold relevance. As she observed, patterns that instill fear reflect tendencies to approach migration primarily as a matter of crisis management; this neglects transnational political and economic forces as well as histories of relationships between sending and receiving countries.

---

[*] Editor's Note: This address was delivered to the "Religious and Legal Perspectives on Migration" conference, hosted by *Mystērion* on March 19, 2022. It has been lightly edited for publishing.

[**] Kristin Heyer (A.B., Brown University; Ph.D. Boston College) is Professor of Theological Ethics and Director of Graduate Studies in the Boston College Department of Theology.

A few months ago on the island of Lesbos, Pope Francis lamented how the Mediterranean is becoming a cemetery due to illusory narratives of personal and national self-interest. He has repeatedly drawn attention to the forces impacting so many people on the move, expanding the migration question to consider the impact of populism, neoliberal economics, and virulent individualism. This scope shifts the narrative we might say, offering a welcome reorientation to discussions that often focus on states' rights or on border crossers alone. As O'Neill emphasized, Francis stresses the humanity of migrants and the gifts they bring. But Francis's broader emphases reveal how barriers to reception and humane policy are not limited to matters of border fortification and refugee policies alone, but include pervasive tendencies toward isolationism. So whereas Halle rightly indicated obligations in conscience according to the *Catechism*, Francis has been focusing on what shapes (or often malforms) our conscience and hardens our hearts.

The Christian story that insists we fundamentally belong to one another. This can serve as an antidote to the individualism and indifference that harm persons on the move. In contrast to standard models that tend to address rights to individual freedom of movement, or the self-determination of political communities, these relational commitments underscore social dimensions of justice and sinful complicity alike. The universal destination of created goods in the Catholic tradition similarly accents social constraints on market freedom (unlike the double standard Engelmann highlighted).

I am glad to see attention here today to these broader emphases that our book and the present pope emphasize, revealing how barriers to reception include pervasive tendencies toward isolationism and populist ideologies. Recent years have witnessed a rise in nativist populism fueled, in part, by anxieties about the impact of globalization. In the U.S. context, our immigration debates have long been framed by narratives emphasizing security threats and social costs, despite rhetoric about liberty and hospitality.[i] The last administration's more than 400 executive actions on immigration (from border and interior enforcement, to the asylum system, to DACA) to ostensibly "Make America Safe Again" followed from its law-and-order mantle, even as studies regularly indicate higher rates of immigration correlate with lower rates of violent and property crime.[ii] Migrants from the Northern Triangle countries in Central America flee homes with the world's highest number of homicides per capita, where gang members murder with impunity—the threat driving many

such migrants is precisely the breakdown of the rule of law at home. Another populist script casts newcomers as economic threats, a perception historically fueled in times of economic downturn. Beyond studies that show that immigrant laborers provide a net benefit to the U.S. economy, the detention industry profits from irregular migrants, further confounding the frame of economic threat. The multibillion dollar, transnational "immigrant industrial complex" raises serious questions about the financial stakes in the broken immigration system, diminished public oversight, and accountability. These are all themes that Engelmann works out very well in his paper.

Finally, tapping into anti-immigrant sentiment provokes the demonization of racial, ethnic, and religious minorities. Representations of the outsider as a social menace signal the function of racism and xenophobia in the national imaginary. We have continued to see high rates of anti-immigrant/anti-Asian hate crimes in recent years that are reflect and shape attitudes toward migrants. Hence fear-mongering scripts that mislead to consolidate power (like Brewster showed), making people more susceptible to the predominant crisis-management approaches to migration.

These tactics ignore structural relationships impacting migration. Reducing immigration matters to the locus of border crossers in the Mediterranean or our desert Southwest eclipses transnational actors from view, much less blame—it refuses to consider those responsible for "push factors" like violent conflict, economic instability, or climate change. And whereas Christian migration ethics regularly emphasizes the humanity of migrants in this vein, renewed attention to *social* dimensions of Christian ethics can expand consideration beyond the dignity of individuals who cross borders to consider the global contexts and operative interests that compel migration.

As Halle discussed, Christian migration ethics draws on traditions of biblical hospitality, social doctrine, and human rights, focusing on the plight and agency of migrants and relative duties of reception. The tradition establishes persons' rights not to migrate—to fulfill human rights in their homeland—or to migrate if they cannot support themselves or their families in their country of origin. Hence, in situations where individuals face pervasive gang violence or desperate poverty, as Engelmann highlighted, the Catholic tradition supports the right to freedom of movement so that persons can live free from credible fears of violence or severe want. I would add to today's reflections that the impact of Pope John Paul II is

rooted in his labor legacy: he condemned the exploitation of migrant workers based on the principle that ". . . capital should be at the service of labor and not labor at the service of capital." This idea that the economy should serve the person raises serious concerns not only about the freedom of markets compared to people, but also about the significant financial stakes in the broken immigration system—detained immigrants fill beds, deportations fill private buses.

Yet becoming a neighbor to the migrant through a social vision of the person and the good requires meeting basic responsibilities of justice, not charity or hospitality alone, particularly given the role that receiving nations play in shaping conditions that directly contribute to irregular migration.[iii] A global vision of social responsibilities helps re-contextualize migration in the face of tendencies to locate responsibility solely with a migrant's choice to cross borders.

The Christian category of social sin explicitly connects these structural relationships with their harmful consequences and abetting ideologies.[iv] Distinct elements of social sin—dehumanizing trends, unjust structures, and harmful attitudes—shape complex dynamics that perpetuate inequalities and influence receptivity. Whether in forms of cultural superiority or profiteering, social inducements to personal sin in the immigration context abound.

Fratelli Tutti, Pope Francis's recent encyclical on human fraternity, repeatedly underscores other pervasive ideological threats to our social instincts, as well, convincingly indicating how self-absorption fuels both apathy and hardened insulation or group preservation. Francis elaborates how a culture of consumerist comfort abetted by social media distractions incubate false ideologies that can manipulate consciences and insulate them from different perspectives. (During the lockdown, we watched *The Social Dilemma* docudrama on Netflix—offering an eerie window into the complex manipulations of social media and surveillance capitalism along these lines!). Migration discourse often focuses on political and economic considerations alone, yet social sins like racism or a sense of invulnerability tempt us to exclude. So the concept of social sin offers a framework for critiquing histories of unequal relationships between countries, such as proxy wars, as well as harmful ideologies, from xenophobia to meritocracy. And it orients us toward shared accountability with and across borders.

Reflecting on Engelmann's focus on the *anawim*, we see Francis drawing near to migrants, whether on the island of Lampedusa in that first trip as Pope, bringing home refugees from Lesbos, or his mass in Cuidad Juárez. This week, he sent Cardinal Michael Czerny, S.J., to the Ukraine-Slovakian border to express his closeness to the people fleeing Ukraine, reiterating the pope's words that the border should be "a place of encounter and not of division." His attentiveness to the forces that marginalize the *anawim* as well as his willingness to go to the peripheries stands in sharp contrast to politicization of cherry picked scripture passages that Brewster profiles. Keeping the whole picture in view—our complicity in pushing and pulling folks across borders—and drawing near to the *anawim* not withdrawing to cultures of comfort, are key.

This attention to community and to ritual are key not only to sustaining connections to countries and cultures of origin but also reshaping harmful mindsets on immigration. Cisneros's reflections on Guelaguezta remind me of the community-building rituals that give life to migrant and diaspora communities and those who accompany them, whether liturgies at the border fence, reimagined *posadas*, or parish-based cultural festivals. Moreover, it is precisely because of religious commitments (reaffirmed through rituals) that some citizens take risks to accompany migrants: we profile the work of Scott Warren (arrested for "harboring and transporting undocumented migrants" via his No More Deaths work offering them food, water and medical aid in the Sonoran desert) in two chapters of the volume in this regard.

In light of these complex influences on moral agency, formulating human rights arguments remains necessary but insufficient. Art can function similarly—those of you who saw the Angels Unawares statue that visited our campus last year may recall how Sculptor Timothy Schmalz incorporates Muslims escaping Syria beside Jews escaping Nazi Germany beside an Irish boy escaping the potato famine; one could be an Eritrean attempting Lampedusa. When I took my students, several instantly recognized their own family histories, their very identities. Like art, religious practices, narratives, and symbols hold potential to (re)shape moral imagination—book calls attention to the urgency of this formation task, which is distinct from humanitarian outreach or advocacy.

Finally, we need only turn on the news to see the urgency of justice for migrants and refugees. Some three million refugees have already been forced to flee Ukraine, while an

additional 1.85 million people have been displaced internally within the country. The escalation of conflict has triggered a steep rise in humanitarian needs, both within the country as well as in the neighboring countries receiving refugees. Seven years after the 2015 refugee crisis, Europe still lacks an agreed-upon approach both for taking in its share of refugees and for processing asylum seekers who make it onto the continent. I fear that without major efforts to receive/integrate the millions who have already fled, we face not only a human rights crisis for the refugees themselves but also the risk of repressive nationalistic responses like we witnessed in 2015. At the same time, the coverage of Ukraine reminds us of another theme of the book, the racism and xenophobia so often operative in migration and refugee contexts. Already we hear descriptions of "real refugees," characterizing Ukranains as "just like us" evoking contrasts to Syrian refugees or Latin Americans at the southern border. I hope the day's reflections help us think about responses marked by justice and hospitality in Europe as well as at the US-Mexico border as well as new ways of imagining belonging in our current contexts.

---

[i] For a further elaboration of these narratives and their impact, see Kristin E. Heyer, "Internalized Borders: Immigration Ethics in an Age of Trump," *Theological Studies* 79/1 (March 2018): 146–64. The discussion of social sin in this chapter also draws in part from "Internalized Borders."

[ii] Walter Ewing, Daniel E. Martínez, and Rubén G. Rumbaut, "The Criminalization of Immigration in the United States," American Immigration Council, July 13, 2015, https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/research/criminalization-immigration-united-states.

[iii] John J. Hoeffner and Michele R. Pistone, "But the Laborers Are . . . Many? Catholic Social Teaching on Business, Labor and Economic Migration," in Kerwin and Gerschutz, *And You Welcomed Me*, 55–92, at 74.

[iv] I further elaborate connections between social anthropology, social sin, and global solidarity in *Kinship Across Borders: A Christian Ethic of Immigration* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2012).