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Abstract

Places of Sanctuary: Religious Revivalism and the Politics of Immigration in New Mexico

By Amy Villarreal Garza

This dissertation examines the overlapping dimensions of secular and religious sanctuary place making by comparing the faith-based Sanctuary Movement(s) of the 1980s with the rise of present-day local immigration policy activism in New Mexico and beyond. Placing immigrant rights activism alongside religious revivalism, I also examine how the contemporary immigrant rights movement intersects with Renovación Carismática, a transnational Catholic charismatic renewal movement that originated in Chihuahua, México, and is growing in popularity among Mexican immigrants in northern New Mexico and many other states in the Southwestern vicinity. Mexican migrants’ participation in both movements cultivates “communities of protection” that blur the lines between sacred and secular spaces, while also crossing ideological boundaries that separate legislating from evangelizing and legality from theology. Bringing different sites and configurations of sanctuary place making together in a historically contingent and comparative analysis, this research illuminates how new religious and political subjectivities are made in a changing post-migration landscape.

This dissertation contributes to studies of immigration, religion, and social movements incorporating both historical and ethnographic methods and analysis of diverse sets of data including archival materials, oral history interviews, and
contemporary ethnography. The first part of this dissertation is historical and traces the life of New Mexico's controversial sanctuary state declaration as a political theology that produced unexpected social and legal effects. I use the document to reconstruct a history of the sanctuary movement in the tri-state region and to narrate the events that led up to the dramatic 1988 Sanctuary Trial that defined the movement in New Mexico. Connecting the Sanctuary Movement(s) of the past with contemporary local immigration policy activism, the second part of this study focuses on the work of Somos Un Pueblo Unido, the leading immigrant rights organization in the state. Illuminating the interactivity between the immigrant rights movement and Renovación Carismática in the 2011 legislative battle over immigrant drivers' licenses, I show how the document became a "vibrant object," that materialized immigrants' local citizenship and legitimacy of presence. Finally, I uncover the transborder mobilities and secular and religious innovations of Renovación Carismática through the migration experiences of a family of talented lay preachers and musicians from Cuauhtémoc, Chihuahua who brought borderlands charisma to Our Lady of Guadalupe Church in Santa Fe and reignited the spirit of renewal.
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Introduction
Entering the Ethnographic Arena

In July of 2008, a caravan of devout Catholics embarked on a long-awaited pilgrimage from Santa Fe, New Mexico to Mexico City to retrieve a 4,000 pound bronze sculpture of the Virgin of Guadalupe. The enormous statue was commissioned from a Mexican sculptor\(^1\) to adorn the newly renovated courtyard in front of the Shrine of Our Lady of Guadalupe Church, located a few blocks south of the famed Plaza de Santa Fe. The caravan symbolically retraced the path of the Nuevomexicano participants’ own ancestors along the braided roads of El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro, the ancient highway that has connected Santa Fe, via Chihuahua, with Mexico City for over four hundred years (Preston and Esquibel 1998; Lamadrid 2007). After a warm reception in Mexico City in the artists' studio and special dedication Mass at the Basílica de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe, where the original La Guadalupana is kept, the monumental 12-foot statue was carefully loaded onto a flatbed truck in preparation for the long journey home.

The caravan made symbolic stops along the way, places historically connected to New Mexico by hundreds of years of migration and cultural exchange. The pilgrims stopped at churches in Zacatecas, Durango, and Chihuahua for special blessings. At each stop throngs of people gathered around the statue, reaching out to touch or kiss her bronze face, or pray before the Virgin of Guadalupe’s holy presence,

\(^1\) Georgina "Gogy" Farias, an artist based in Mexico City created the statue. She specializes in monuments and other large-scale sculptures in bronze and stone.

\(^2\) The Shrine of Our Lady of Guadalupe, the original adobe structure, was built in 1777 as an axillary
welcomed them with tearful jubilation. Deeply moved and inspired by the warm welcome they had been given and the ardent expressions of faith they witnessed at each station, the pilgrims finally reached the border city of Juárez and prepared for the final trek home to New Mexico. As the entourage was set to cruise over the international bridge into El Paso, Texas, the trip took an unexpected turn. The Virgin of Guadalupe was seized at the U.S. – Mexico border for lack of proper documentation and on the suspicion that the statue concealed contraband! The stunned parishioners from Our Lady of Guadalupe Church quickly organized a “rescue mission” to reclaim their sacred property from the warehouse in El Paso where she was unceremoniously detained. After two days suspended in bureaucratic limbo, the Virgin of Guadalupe was finally released and carted away to Santa Fe, where thousands of devotees welcomed her home. The sacred sentinel now stands overlooking a heavily trafficked intersection marking a long-standing, yet ever changing place of sanctuary along El Camino Real, a church that has always been the "immigrant church."  

Since her unveiling on August 15, 2008, the statue has become a local landmark and tourist attraction, but also a site of public devotion. A constant flow of visitors and offerings of roses and other tokens of adoration collect around the statue daily. More importantly, as the first large-scale representation of the Virgin of Guadalupe in Santa Fe, she stands as a symbol of the resurgence of Mexican

---

2 The Shrine of Our Lady of Guadalupe, the original adobe structure, was built in 1777 as an axillary to the Cathedral of Saint Francis de Assisi. The shrine largely served lower class mestizos. After the U.S. occupation of the region, Archbishop Lamy remodeled the church in the 1850's and designated it as a parish for Anglo Catholic settlers to the region. Therefore, the Shrine has been the "immigrant church" at least since the 19th century.
migration to northern New Mexico. I use the term "resurgence" to refer to the most recent wave of migration from Mexico. Migration is cyclical and New Mexico, as a border state, has an enduring connection to Mexico's northern frontier and to the sending states of Chihuahua, Zacatecas and Durango in particular (Mora 2011). However, describing these locations as sending states is a misnomer given that New Mexico, until 1848, was part of Mexico's northern hinterlands, *La Gran Chichimeca*, as it was once called.

In addition, New Mexico is a majority-minority state with a deeply rooted Hispanic population some of whom can trace their ancestry to the first waves of Spanish colonizers who settled in the region during sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Chávez 1992; Kessel 2008). The majority of Nuevomexicanos (or local Hispanics) are *mestizos*. There is a long history of intermarriage and interdependency among Hispanics, Native Americans, and Anglos throughout the Southwestern vicinity (Deutsch 1987; Gutiérrez 1991). Nuevomexicanos have ancestral ties to northern Mexico, and according to historian, Anthony Mora (2011), both Hispanos and Pueblo Indians strategically asserted claims to Mexican identity and nationality, particularly during the Mexican period (1821 - 1848) and the US occupation of the territory. However, time and other destructive forces tend to altar historical memory. Identification with Mexico and *Mexicanidad* has been overshadowed and obscured in

---

3 The descents of the first waves of Spanish/Mexican settlers have been identified as an ethnic group, but this population is very diverse and is not unified in how they identify themselves. Nuevomexicano, Hispanic, Hispano, Spanish-American, Chicana/o have been used as ethnic identifiers. I have chosen the terms "local Hispanics" or Nuevomexicanos to refer to this population in order to distinguish them from more recent Mexican immigrants who continue to identify with their country of origin, but who have begun to claim local citizenship as Nuevomexicanos.
northern New Mexico by the dominant narrative of Hispanic heritage that celebrates Spanish origins and military conquests (Montgomery 2002).

The narratives and imagery of New Mexico's Spanish colonial past have colonized every possible mode of representation in Santa Fe, from tourism promotions, religious iconography and salvation histories, museum displays and traditional arts, to public monuments, architecture, and also community celebrations and civic identity (Horton 2010; Montgomery 2002; Rodríguez 2003; Wilson 1997). Therefore, Nuevomexicanos generally perceive the recent wave of Mexican migration to the region as "new" and see Mexican immigrants as outsiders. My use of the term "resurgence" underscores New Mexico's longstanding cultural ties to northern Mexico and our historical and continued transnational connections. To be clear, Santa Fe is not an insular city of three cultures (Native American, Hispanic, and Anglo). It is a multicultural and transnational urban locality that masquerades as a provincial historic site with a distinctive colonial flare.

Returning to the border incident that delayed the statue of the Virgin of Guadalupe's arrival to Santa Fe, the event is symbolic of the everyday enactments of violence at the US-Mexico border, the criminalization of migration and is paring with the war on terrorism (Inda 2006; Nevins 2010). The Virgin of Guadalupe's encounter with the border patrol also presented a perfect opportunity for religious leaders to comment on immigration, while being careful not to alienate local Hispano-Catholics. Catholic social teachings dictate that migration is a fundamental human right (O’Brian and Miller 2008). Although the Catholic Church does not condone breaking
immigration laws, they have a vested interest in protecting immigrants as a vulnerable population, but also because immigrants have always been the lifeblood of Catholic institutions in the US (Matovina 2012; More 1986). Furthermore, Catholic social teachings advocate for immigrant rights as an extension of the theology of the dignity of the human person as a creation of God. From this perspective, it is the moral responsibility of Christians and all people, particularly those in power, to care for the outcast, the poor, and the stranger. This perspective places the moral responsibility of caring for the most vulnerable among us (undocumented immigrants) at the existential core of the human condition (Rabben 2011).

Archbishop Michael Sheehan wove the dramatic "rescue mission" into his sermon for the statue’s dedication celebration in 2008, "The Virgin’s most cherished children are her immigrant children, and now she knows what it is like to cross the border without papers." Father Tien-Tri Nguyen, an immigrant from Vietnam and the revered Pastor of Our Lady of Guadalupe Church, tempered the Archbishop's comment by adding, "The original families who settled New Mexico came under the protection of the Virgin of Guadalupe and this continues today, even though travel along the corridor has become more restricted." As these examples show, religious leaders employ the trope of El Camino Real and enduring devotion to the Virgin of Guadalupe as the sacred thread of continuity that binds Mexican immigrants and

4 There are many different ways to refer to individuals who are foreign nationals living in the United States. I have opted to use the terms “migrant,” “immigrant,” interchangeably in this document. I also refer to undocumented individuals using the terms “undocumented immigrant” and “informally authorized migrant” interchangeably.
local Hispanics\textsuperscript{5} together as Catholics with a shared faith and dedication to *La Guadalupana*. References to ancestors, origins, and pilgrimage are also employed to transform the profaned space of militarized borders and the exclusions of citizenship into a transcendent connective tapestry of shared sacred space that binds local Hispanics and new immigrants from Mexico together in spirit (Peña 2001).

*The Resurgence of Mexican Migration to northern New Mexico*

The 1990s brought enormous social and economic change in Mexico. After the passage of NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement) new economic opportunities arose in the northern border cities, which experienced rapid growth in the *maquiladora* industries as well as development in tourism, construction, and other commercial sectors (Téllez 2006). Cuidad Juárez, Chihuahua, and Tamaulipas, Coahuila, both cities located along the Texas-Mexico border, experienced a demographic explosion as rural farmers were pushed off their lands due to the centralization of agribusiness, the influx of cheaper agricultural products into Mexico from the United States, and also new laws that encouraged the privatization of communal farming lands or *ejidos* (Lewis 2002; Téllez 2006). In addition, urban dwellers also moved to the border cities in search of better economic opportunities. These factors coincided with the technology boom of 1990s in the United States, which created economic prosperity and increased growth in the construction and service industries. The agricultural, dairy, and meat and poultry packing industries

\textsuperscript{5} I use the term “local Hispanics” and “Nuevomexicanos” to refer to the native Hispanic/Chicano/a/Latino/a population who usually have deep historical ties to the region and often see themselves as culturally, linguistically, or ethnically distinct from Mexican nationals.
also increased the demand for immigrant labor. The resurgence of labor migration from Mexico and Latin America extended well beyond the traditional areas of settlement in the Southwest. Mexican and Latin American migrants began creating immigrant enclaves in "new destinations" such as Georgia, Alabama and North Carolina (Zúñiga and Hernández-León 2005).

Although Mexican migration is commonplace in New Mexico’s border region, the reappearance of immigrant communities in the northern part of the state and particularly in Santa Fe, is a relatively recent phenomenon. According to US Census data, there was a 27% overall increase in migration to New Mexico between 2000 and 2010, with 78% from Latin America. Most of the Latino foreign-born population, 66% entered before 2000, but about 35% entered after 2000, which is more than half of the settled population. This hints at a resurgence of Mexican migration to New Mexico since the late 1990s. However, according to recent national statistics the same number Mexican migrants who have entered the United States have returned to Mexico since 2007, a rate of net zero. Of course, not all of these migrants have returned or stayed home voluntarily. The Obama administration has deported 1.4 million immigrants since he was elected in 2008. According to ICE’s own statistics, 409,849 immigrants were deported in 2012 alone. We are living in another era of mass deportation, unmatched since the 1930s round-ups of Mexican Americans in the Southwest during the Great Depression (Kanstroom 2007).

---

6 The next highest immigrant group is Asian at 10.3%, followed by European at 7.3% and African at 1.4%.
In Santa Fe, Hispanics make up 48.7% of the population, but it is uncertain how many are native born and how many are foreign nationals. This uncertainty comes from the fluidity of ethnic nomenclatures and the unreliability of statistical categories. According to census data, within the Hispanic category 20% identified as Mexican and the remaining 27.5% chose the catch all non-Mexican category. The non-Mexican category could include both immigrants from other countries in Latin America and native Hispanics. Similarly, native Hispanics could have chosen the Mexican category, although this self-designation is rare among this population.

Given the ambiguity of census data, a view of the changing landscape of the city is a better indicator of the resurgence of Mexican migration and settlement in Santa Fe. Recently the Santa Fe New Mexican published an article about "Little Chihuahua," which highlighted the increased visibility of Mexican nationals and immigrant-owned businesses on the city's Southside (Martinez 2013). However, what the journalist identified as "Little Chihuahua" is not an exclusively immigrant enclave although in specific barrios up to 46% of the residents are foreign born according to most recent census data. Many local Hispanics moved to the Southside during the 1990s because it was the only location where they could find affordable housing. Today, the Southside is a mixed community made up of working class local Hispanic and Mexican immigrant families (and a sprinkle of Anglos). Businesses that cater to Mexican nationals can be found throughout the city, but are largely concentrated on the Southside.
According to recent data from the Immigration Policy Center, immigrants make up at least 12% of the state's workforce and Hispanic-owned businesses generate over $6.5 billion in revenue for the state each year. Some of the most prominent immigrant-owned businesses in Santa Fe include the Mendoza family’s furniture store, Mueblería Familiar, on Cerrillos Road, Pedro Solis’ Guadalajara Grill, Sofía Trejo’s Zapatos Gala, Jesus Marquez’s Tortas Chihuahua sandwich shop, and Mariola Mendoza’s La Tiendita. Many of immigrant entrepreneurs who have recently established business on Santa Fe's Southside and elsewhere are from Chihuahua. Therefore, they have imported new merchandise, foods, services, and vaquero fashions from their home state. Although the Mexican immigrant population in Santa Fe hales from different regions in Mexico and settle in New Mexico for many reasons, the city has become a place of sanctuary for migrants leaving Mexico's embattled northern states of Chihuahua, Zacatecas, and Durango, places that also happen to have deep historical ties to the region (Mora 2011).

The increased demand for Mexican migrant labor in the tourist-oriented cities of Santa Fe and Taos is likely due to the displacement of local Hispanics due to the influx of Anglo amenity migrants in the 1990s, which exacerbated gentrification and land loss, thereby pushing local middle and working class Hispanics out of heritage cities (Rodriguez 1990; Horton 2010). This structural displacement is visible in the changes Our Lady of Guadalupe Church has undergone over the last decade. In the late 1990s the parish was on the brink of closing due to the Archdiocese’s
mismanagement of the property (the Shrine was in a serious state of disrepair),
dwindling Mass attendance, and decreased participation in the life of the parish.

Deacon Anthony Trujillo recalled that, “there was talk of selling the property
but then all of sudden Mexican and [Central American] immigrants began to arrive.
I’m very grateful to them because if they had not started coming, this parish may have
not survived.” There is no doubt that Mexican and Central American migration has
completely revitalized Our Lady of Guadalupe Church, which is evident in the
numerous external beatification projects and improvements that the church has
undergone since the statue of Our Lady of Guadalupe was erected in the courtyard in
front of the ancient Shrine. The Shrine is the original adobe structure built in 1777 as
an auxiliary to the Cathedral of Saint Francis of Assisi. The Shrine is located in front
of the newer church building, which was erected in the 1950s. As the vacant pews at
Our Lady of Guadalupe Church filled with Mexicanos, Salvadoreños, and
Guatemaltecos, local Hispanic parishioners, the enduring pillars of the faith
community began leaving the parish.

The attitude at Our Lady of Guadalupe is one of polite avoidance – Hispanics
and Anglos attend the English language Mass and send their children to catechism in
English. Mexicanos attend the Spanish language Mass send their children to
catechism in Spanish. In addition, Mexicanos are increasingly taking part in Tuesday
night charismatic assembleas and are asserting their presence and reformed identity as

7 The ancient Shrine was placed in the care of a private foundation in 1982 that worked to restore and
repair the crumbling building. After a long struggle to reclaim the Shrine, it was finally returned to the
Catholic Charismatics or *Cristianos renovados*, the term that converts use to refer to their renewed commitment to their faith. To be clear, not all Mexicanos are involved in the charismatic renewal movement and this has created an internal division within the immigrant community at Our Lady Guadalupe, one that draws a loose boundary between Traditionalists and Charismatics. In general, local Hispanics are very attached to "tradition" as a key aspect of regional heritage and ethnic identity (Horton 2010).

Mexicanos and local Hispanics attend separate prayer groups and mingle uncomfortably but amiably at church fiestas and social events in which they are forced together. Separation between the two communities is also evident in residential areas and social gathering places albeit to lesser degree, as both have been pushed to the Southside on the outskirts of the city and to the rural enclaves surrounding the village of La Cienega. To be clear, the idea that local Hispanics and more recent Mexican (and Central American) settlers live in separate and conflicting worlds is inaccurate. Their children grow up together and attend the same schools. They often date and sometimes intermarry and form transnational families. Local Hispanics and new immigrants are neighbors, business partners and co-workers. They also interact informally at shopping centers, restaurants, nightclubs, parks and other public spaces. Elders or *ancianos* (as we respectfully refer to them) in their late seventies and eighties are the last vestiges of northern New Mexico’s Spanish-dominant past. This

---

8 While many of the conversion narratives I documented in my research resemble the "born again" subjectivity that is associated with Protestant evangelicalism, I have steered clear of this term. Charismatic Catholics remain Catholic even through they engage in many practices marked as "Protestant" in character.
generation relishes the return of Mexican sociality to public space and savors speaking Spanish with new friends in *la resolana.* However, the most important evidence that local Hispanics are not anti-immigrant is the fact that New Mexico is a pro-immigrant state. This would not be possible without the support of Hispanic lawmakers.

However, the notion that local Hispanics and more recent immigrants from Mexico share the same heritage of belief as *Guadalupanos* is also overly simplistic and lacking in nuance. It elides the different ways that each group of Catholics orients their faith traditions around Marion icons. There is no question that local Hispanics revere the Virgin of Guadalupe as both a sacred representation of the Virgin Mary, and a key cultural symbol, but they also uphold their devotional legacy to Santa Fe’s own patroness, *Nuestra Señora del Rosario, La Conquistadora.* This petite and ancient statue was brought to New Mexico in 1625, survived the Pueblo Revolt of 1680, and accompanied Diego De Vargas in his Reconquest campaign in 1692 (Chavez 1948). While not all Nuevomexicanos and new immigrants from Mexico and Latin America are Catholics (a growing number are Protestant, practice non-Christian religions or are unaffiliated), devotion to *La Conquistadora* and participation in the ritual traditions that revolve around her is a defining aspect of Hispano ethno-nationalism in Santa Fe (Horton 2010; Garza 2007).

Unlike Mexican nationals, local Hispanics who orient their faith traditions and

---

9 *La resolana* is a term used in northern New Mexico to describe a social gathering space where people talk and soak up the warmth of the sun after church or morning coffee. Recently, the term has been used to refer to activist and artistic spaces where *Nuevomexicanos* gather to create, exchange ideas, and engage in political organizing.
public rituals around *La Conquistadora* tend to emphasize the role of Spain in their own salvation history as decedents of the “original” settlers who founded New Mexico. It has also been argued that the unique biography of *La Conquistadora*, which revolves around her legendary role in mending relations between Spanish/Mexican colonizers and Pueblo Indians, is not only the central narrative of the modern Santa Fe Fiesta, it is productive of middle-class values, idioms racial purity, and notions of respectability among local Hispanics (Horton 2010). Religion is the lifeblood of ethno-religious solidarity and claims to place and space, particularly among middle and working-class Hispano-Catholics in Santa Fe (Garza 2007; Horton 2010).

In this way, the community of memory that has collected around the foundational Hispano ethno-nationalist narrative of *La Conquistadora* departs in significant ways from the one that congeals around the Mexican-born Virgin of Guadalupe. Although devotion to Guadalupe and *La Conquistadora* overlap in important ways, Mexicanos have no connection to this local icon. In general, Mexican immigrants know very little about her and are not members of her devotional confraternity. Only a handful of Mexicanos attends the processions and Novena dedicated to the Santa Fe's Virgin patroness in June. *La Conquistadora* devotionalism revolves around her home base at the Cathedral Basilica of Saint Frances of Assisi, which is the spiritual and cultural core of local Hispanic faith traditions in Santa Fe.

Furthermore, the Virgin of Guadalupe as a key symbol of Mexican
nationalism does not quite match up with the way that local Hispanics in Santa Fe relate to her as a Marion figure that comes from Mexico. Although devotees claim that La Conquistadora and La Guadalupana are in essence, one in the same, because they are both manifestations of the Virgin Mary (Mary of Nazareth), they are clearly not identical. Significantly, local Hispanics also say that La Conquistadora is different because she is their own Virgin patroness. She is the one that accompanied their ancestors to New Mexico and continues to guide and protect the community along with those whose hearts she has conquered (Garza 2007). Local Hispanics and Mexicanos share a religious traditions rooted in Mexican faith practices and symbols, but the system of representations and remembrances that frame local Hispano-Catholicism reference regional histories of conquest and conversion and the particular coping strategies that Pueblo Indians and Nuevomexicanos (we have mixed bloodlines and overlapping histories of struggle) have developed for negotiating these legacies. Devotion to La Guadalupana and devotion to La Conquistadora mirror each other, but they are not the same and the differences matter.

To further complicate the situation, the resurgence of Mexican migration has also ushered in the Catholic Charismatic Renewal or Renovación Carismática. The movement began in 2000 when a talented family of lay preachers and musicians from Cuauhtémoc, Chihuahua joined our Lady of Guadalupe Church and organized a charismatic choir and prayer group. They began holding Tuesday night assembleas at the parish that became widely popular among Mexican immigrants. Today, these gatherings attract Mexican immigrant families from across the city. On any given
Tuesday night over a hundred participants can be seen singing and dancing in the confining pews to praiseful cumbia songs and other popular musical genres and collectively channeling the power of the Holy Spirit, their arms raised in surrender.

*Renovación Carismática* is an outgrowth the spread of evangelical Protestantism and Pentecostalism in Mexico and throughout Latin America, which has forced the Catholic Church to accommodate charismatic religiosity and its evangelical tenor (Chesnut 2003). Recent studies of Pentecostal movements in Latin America and the subsequent genesis of Pentecostal-infused Catholicism, indicate that participation in these movements cultivates sensorial experiences of divine healing and deliverance that inculcates new religious subjectivities and orientations to the world, which also inspire dramatic and durable personal and social change (Chesnut 2003; Csordas 1994; 1997; Dow and Sandstrom 2001; Espinosa 2004; Martin and Mullin 1984; Navarro and Leatham 2004; Robbins 2004; Stoll 1989).

The Catholic Charismatic Renewal (CCR) is a global religious movement that shares features with similar movements around the world that emphasize baptism of the Holy Spirit manifested in the experience of charms or spiritual gifts such as speaking in tongues, prophetic visions, and miraculous healing (Csordas 2007; 2009). Conversion or participation in this Pentecostal-infused Catholicism promotes careful attention to scripture as a guide for daily living, encourages a deeper commitment to the Church and its doctrines of faith, and a renewed zeal for evangelism (Cordes 1999). The Vatican approved the renewal in 1970, but pastors are advised to remain vigilant and to practice discretion (Cordes 1999; Espinosa 2004). The movement
originated at Duquesne University in 1967 in the United States, but it also has autochthonous origins in Colombia and Mexico (Valdés-Villalva 1996). The arrival of the movement in New Mexico is an example of return missionization, a project fashioned in the context of Mexico's encounters with Protestantism (Chesnut 2003b; Martin 1990).

The charismatic movement is not new to New Mexico. In fact, a few Hispano-Catholics, who discovered the renewal in 1970s, continue to participate in small charismatic prayer groups. However, for the most part, Catholic traditionalists remain skeptical of the renewal movement. Nuevomexicana/o religious practices, performances, and visual arts hold on to vernacular Catholic rituals, devotional practices and performances as enduring traditions passed down from ancestors. The term, “Catholic traditionalism,” brings many different images to mind; solemn processions, painted and carved images of saints, pilgrimages to sacred places, singing ancient *alabanzas*, Doña Sabastiana in a death cart, mock crucifixions, dancing for the Virgin, mass protests of blasphemous images of the Virgin,10 and of course, colonial-style adobe churches and missions. All of these elements of Catholic cultural production have at one time or another been the focus of intense historical and anthropological research. Often these traditional practices are envisioned as remnants of New Mexico's Spanish colonial past, but contemporary scholars have also interpreted them invented traditions created in response to present circumstances.

10 Here I am referring to the controversy over Alma Lopez’s feminist rendition of the Virgin of Guadalupe, *Our Lady*, which was displayed as part of a temporary exposition of contemporary art at the Museum of International Folk Art in 2001.
of ethnic conflict and Anglo domination - as sites of resistance to colonialism both past and present.

Sarah Horton’s (2010) ethnography of the Santa Fe Fiesta, for instance, shows how participants understand the event as a multi-pronged cultural preservation project held together by historical and religious homeland claims or ethno-nationalist narratives. In Horton’s estimation, Catholicism serves as both as a vehicle for these narratives and its principal. Religion not only provides the spiritual core of Hispano identity, it is the material manifestation of the ideology of the “disappearing homeland” that makes cultural preservation mission all the more appealing (2010:15). The enmeshment of cultural difference with Catholic traditionalism is a defining feature, a placeholder of sorts, in the ethnography of Nuevomexicana/o communities.

In fact, it is arguable that Catholicism and cultural difference have come to be conceived not solely as relational concepts but as co-constituted productions. From this vantage point, Nuevomexicana/o religious solidarities and revitalization projects are only possible within the ideology of the "disappearing homeland" and its attendant preservationist schemata (Horton 2010). In other words, from this perspective, religion is cultural preservation and cultural preservation is a religion. This taken for granted tautology contributes to the rooted regionalism that has kept us in place and a notable absence of ethnographies of other religious practices and adherents. For example, there are very few studies of other Christianities in New Mexico (Protestants, Pentecostals, Mormons and Evangelicals) not to mention the
paucity of research on non-Christian faith practices or atheists for that matter. In addition, the secular and processes of secularization, both of which run in tandem with religion, have almost entirely escaped analysis.\footnote{There are some notable exceptions with regards to the paucity of studies of secularism in New Mexico studies: Tisa Joy Wenger’s excellent historical analysis of Pueblo Indian struggles for religious freedom (2009), and Martina Will de Caparro’s interesting study of changing burial practices and orientations to death among Nuevomexicanos due to their encounters with Anglo Protestants and missionaries (2007).}

With \textit{Renovación Carismática} as a touchstone, in this dissertation I turn my attention to a variety of religious solidarity and subjectivity that is not necessarily anchored in a shared sense of cultural difference, nationality or ethnic identity formation. As I will show, borderlands charisma marks a turning away from Catholic traditionalism and its ethno-religious orientations towards a new expression of faith, relationship with God, and evangelical community spirit. The solidarities being formed in this Mexican immigrant place of sanctuary are not primarily focused on preserving Mexican culture and identity or recreating traditions from home but instead, the goal of the movement is to revive “dead” Catholics by promoting and also inculcating a new identity as Charismatic Catholics or \textit{Cristianos Renovados}. This re/animated form of Catholic subjectivity and sociality is also not rooted in place – it is transnational, transposable, and global.

\textit{Who is a "native" New Mexican?}

The relationship between place, space, and religion brings us to the problem of ethnicity and nativeness that has defined New Mexico scholarship. As a tourist destination with a stylized Southwestern image, Santa Fe is branded as a uniquely

\footnotetext[11]{There are some notable exceptions with regards to the paucity of studies of secularism in New Mexico studies: Tisa Joy Wenger’s excellent historical analysis of Pueblo Indian struggles for religious freedom (2009), and Martina Will de Caparro’s interesting study of changing burial practices and orientations to death among Nuevomexicanos due to their encounters with Anglo Protestants and missionaries (2007).}
diverse and tolerant place where Native Americans, Hispanics, and Anglos coexist amicably (Dilworth 1996; Mullin 2001; Riley 1994; Weigle 2010). Contrarily, anthropologists and historians argue that the “tricultural balance” is not solely a representational economy used in tourism propaganda, it has material consequences that matter (Mitchell 2005; Montgomery 2002; Nieto-Philips 2004). The built environment as much as the people inhabiting it are differentiated in terms of race, class, gender, and nationality (Wilson 1996). In northern New Mexico, the distinction between “natives” and “outsiders” has a particular spatial and temporal configuration that is identifiable along a spectrum of characteristics (Gonzáles 2007). There are generally two categories of newcomers in Santa Fe. The "transplant" category is comprised of amenity migrants, usually wealthy Anglos, young artistic bohemians, and nuclear scientists and administrators employed at the Los Alamos National Laboratory (Rodriguez 2003; Masco 2006). The "immigrant" category includes Mexican migrants escaping economic stagnation and violence in Mexico’s northern and northwestern states and other Latino migrants. They are an emergent sub-category of newcomers whose presence is increasingly visible and also entering into Santa Fe's civic identity.

Those who claim to be “native” on the basis of their deep generational and historical ties to the region include Native Americans and Nuevomexicanos, as well as some Anglos. While relatedness and depth of rootedness demarcate the boundaries between “natives” and “outsiders” cultural creolization and accommodation in confluence with the interwoven ties of affinity and dependency that extend across
multiple lines of difference, exceed and confound the tricultural order (Rodriguez 2003). Symbolic boundaries and the characteristics that differentiate natives and outsiders are highly spatialized in terms of class – place of residence, religion and parish affiliation, work places, shopping places, restaurants, and recreational spaces; but also in terms of racialized characteristics – bodily practices such as language, accent, clothing, disposition and surnames. Pueblo communities are yet another boundary-making element that pervasively shapes social relations and interactions in that they are relatively closed and have their own tribal governments, social organization, business ventures (such as casinos), schools, and hospitals.

Another area of consideration is the importance of claims to whiteness in the construction of local Hispanic distinctiveness and its historical connection to the rights of citizenship and inclusion in the Anglo dominated political and social order that colonized the territory after the Mexican-American war (1846 - 1849) (Nieto-Phillips 2004; Gomez 2005). Legal historian, Laura E. Gomez, argues that during the mid-nineteenth century Mexican’s “off-white” racial status in conjunction with their second-class citizenship produced the conditions by which whiteness could be successfully claimed by some individuals, but only by excluding other non-white populations from the rights of full-citizenship (2005: 11 - 12).

Ironically, Mexicans' precarious position between black and white “functioned

---

12 New Mexico’s native Nuevomexicanos are identifiable by their Spanish surnames, which signify their genealogies and deep ties to the region. Esquibel (1998) traces the origins of New Mexican family names with waves of migration from along the Camino Real since the 1600s. Family names such as Archuleta, Luján, Barela, Ortega, Manzanares, Pacheco, Tafoya (to name a few) can be traced to early settlers and are readily identifiable as regional surnames. However, some Anglo family names are also recognizable as local or “native.”
simultaneously to challenge and buttress white supremacy (Gomez 2005: 12). This situation extends beyond New Mexico and has national implications. Mexican’s racial status between blackness and whiteness not only makes claims to whiteness appealing, but also solidifies the current racial order that oppresses all people of color (Bonilla-Silva 2009; De Genova 2005). Therefore, assertions of Spanish heritage, a claim to whiteness and middle-class respectability, can be considered a form of cultural citizenship that bets on white privilege at a cost; it requires an ideological distance from lo Mexicano and Pueblo roots (Horton 2001; Padilla 2007).

To be clear, Nuevomexicanos are not unified in how the define themselves as an ethnic group. There are deep fissures within the “community” based on ethnic identity, class, religion, and political orientation (Gonzales 2007a; Trujillo 2009; Rodriguez 1990). Those who define themselves as Chicanas/os actively reject the conceits of Spanish heritage and have expressed this sentiment in moments of vehement protest against the construction of monuments dedicated to Spanish conquistadores (Freise 2007) and glorifications of Spain in public commemorations and museums displays (Gonzales 2007b; Horton 2001, 2007). They also tend to be politically progressive and more apt to align themselves with Mexican immigrants and Native Americans on questions of social justice (Gonzales-Berry and Maciel 2000), but Chicanas/os have also taken conservative stances on religious issues and particularly those concerning feminism representations of the Virgin Mary in contemporary art (Nunn 2007)\textsuperscript{13}. In this dissertation, I envision both the

\textsuperscript{13} Again in reference to the controversy over Alma Lopez’s Our Lady, the principal organizers of the
intersectionality of the spatialization of difference in terms of race, class, gender, and religion along with multiple power struggles and accommodations between ethnic groups as ethnographic waters that I swim in, and the condition of post-migration urbanism.

Scholars interested in the development of ethnic nomenclature particularly claims to Spanish origins have looked to the historical, economic and political factors that made identification with Spain appealing to some Nuevomexicanos beginning in the late nineteenth century and first half of the twentieth. According to historian, John Nieto-Phillips (2004), Hispano ethnicity hinges upon a system of ethno-racial meaning that emerged after the Anglo occupation of the region (1846), which parcels New Mexico’s cultural and racial complexity into three separate categories (Native American, Hispano, and Anglo).

This system of ethno-racial meaning served an important political purpose during New Mexico’s statehood campaign (1846 – 1912). It upheld Anglo cultural and racial superiority, while at the same time, sanitizing the untidy mestizaje of the native populations (Nieto-Phillips 2004). This neocolonial project not only redefined the native inhabitants of New Mexico within a new ethno-racial taxonomy and social hierarchy, it made them legible in terms that Anglos outside of New Mexico could understand and even appreciate. Therefore, recasting Nuevomexicanos as the progeny of Spanish noblemen and the diverse Pueblo Indian communities as “noble savages” movement to censor the artwork defined themselves as Chicanos, but there was no clear way to group supporters and protesters by religious affiliation or cultural identity. Overall, the controversy revealed the complex articulation between ethnicity and religion and underscored the deep fissures within the Nuevomexicano “community.”
proved an effective strategy for convincing a hostile U.S. Congress that New Mexico’s unruly natives were actually "civilized" or at least, worthy of a chance to be included in the nation and conferred the rights of US citizenship (Nieto-Philips 2004). However, as Chicano historians have argued, the colonized populations of Mexico's former territories, now strangers in their own land, would never fully achieve social and economic parity with Anglos nor would they be guaranteed the full citizenship rights given their racialized minority status within the United States (Acuña 2004).

In fact, given the option to return to Mexico after the US occupation, a surprising number of Nuevomexicanos packed up and repatriated (Mora 2011). A group of these refugees, many of whom were defiant Mexican nationalists, established the town of Mesilla, which is located near Las Cruces on the border between New Mexico and Cuidad, Juárez, Mexico. Historian, Anthony Mora, argues that Mexican nationalism among both Nuevomexicanos and Native Americans was quite strong and often used strategically (2011). Even after the flow of the Rio Grande shifted and the town of Mesilla found itself once again inside the borders of the United States, the people of the town refused to recognize the Catholic Diocese of Las Cruces, continuing their fidelity to the Diocese of Durango in Mexico. They also continued to conduct their business in Spanish, actively resisting assimilation by asserting their Mexican identity (Mora 2011).

This brings us back full circle to the contemporary appeal of the metaphor of *El Camino Real* as a way to bridge differences between Mexican nationals and local Hispanics. While they are not unified in how they define their "nativeness," some
Nuevomexicanos see themselves as culturally and racially different from Mexican nationals (Gonzales 2006, 2007; Montgomery 2002). The assumption being that their regional distinctiveness depends upon an ideological, temporal, and geographic distancing from Mexico (González 1969; Rodriguez 2003; Horton 2001).

Additionally, what it means to be "native" or "local" are highly contested concepts in northern New Mexico as elsewhere. However, scholars have identified a localist variety of nativism that coheres around a regional system of ethno-racial meaning that emerged after the U.S. occupation (1846), which parcels New Mexico’s cultural complexity into three separate groups: Native American, Hispano, and Anglo (Nieto-Phillips 2004). The three groups are constructed as “equal” with regards to their contributions to the state's regional character.

Triculturalism is a substitute for social equality and in this regard can be considered a regional discourse of multiculturalism, which operates to contain difference by placing people into discrete ethnic groups that have balanced representation in the public sphere (Rodriguez 1990; Wilson 1997). The growing presence of Mexicanos in northern New Mexico challenges the delicate tricultural balance upon which regional distinctiveness depends, which foregrounds the difficulty of sorting out who can be counted as a “native” or "local" and also who can be included within the circle of local citizenship and belonging (Plascencia 2012). As I will show in this dissertation, Mexicanos are reconfiguring these already unstable categories of affiliation and difference through the creation of new religious and political solidarities and subjectivities. All of these factors play upon the politics of
immigration and the productions of local citizenship.

Following the lead of Catholic religious leaders, immigrant rights activists have also adopted the *El Camino Real* strategy as a framing device for their own unification projects. For example, in 2010 *Somos Un Pueblo Unido*, the leading immigrant rights organization in the state and based in Santa Fe, collaborated with the city's Office of Cultural Affairs, to produce a video aimed at re-educating local Hispanics and Mexican nationals about their shared cultural and historical orientation in order to make a statement about their shared future. The video, intended as a public service announcement to be broadcast on local television and on YouTube, was part of the “*Somos Primos Campaign,*” which focused on creating spaces for positive cross-cultural exchange and collaboration between Nuevomexicanos and more recent Mexican immigrants through cultural events, social justice campaigns, and the arts.

While the dominant narrative of Hispanic heritage in Santa Fe celebrates Spanish heritage in place of Mexican nationalism or Chicana/o pride, the *Somos Primos* project aims to displace exclusionary understandings of local citizenship and belonging by creating a more inclusionary vision of who we are as a community. After the release of the video and a few *Somos Primos* events, the campaign was put on the back burner to focus on more practical concerns such as protecting immigrants from wage theft, limiting collaborations between local police and ICE, and since 2011, combating Governor Susana Martinez's anti-immigrant agenda. Since the election of the nation's first Latina Governor, the sanctuary polity, which *Somos* resurrected and completely reinvented from the remnants of the Sanctuary Movement
of the 1980s, has come under fire as the anti-immigrant lobby has gained a foothold in the region. Republican lawmakers (and some Democrats) have attempted to undermine the state's pro-immigrant image and by working to repeal the law that allows undocumented residents to apply for drivers' licenses and by retracting policies that limit alliances between local police and ICE.

Thus far, I have focused this introduction on establishing the post-migration context in which I conducted my fieldwork in Santa Fe. In this section, I will outline the theoretical thread that binds the chapters of this dissertation. I have provided a brief review of relevant literature on local systems of ethno-racial meaning and religious difference in northern New Mexico and while the present study is in conversation with this body of work, my research is directed elsewhere. This dissertation is about sanctuary place making as both a practice - something immigrants and activists do collectively as a basis for claiming space and rights in the United States - and a conceptual category that takes on a variety of meanings and produces diverse social effects. Sanctuary is an ancient concept that is associated with sacred or protected spaces and the right of asylum. Therefore, it carries both religious and juridical meanings and functions that have diverged and evolved independently over time but remain intimately connected. Analytically, I am interested in the ways in which the concept of sanctuary and attendant practices and productions of sanctuary place making bring the religious and the secular into closer proximity, thereby making the relationship between them visible.
What I have attempted to do in this dissertation is to bring together seemingly disparate examples of sanctuary place making in order to illuminate ethnographically the diversity of ways in which religion and secularism comeingle and collide and also to understand and describe the varieties of social relations and social effects that these entanglements produce. I have selected some rather unique ethnographic examples as case studies. I begin with the controversial municipal and state sanctuary ordinances that many locales have enacted (and also retracted) across the United States to protect immigrants and refugees from discrimination and deportation and describe what happens when immigration laws confront and attempt to contain the untamed spiritual side of sanctuary. Then, I follow bureaucratic document - a driver's license - on its offbeat path from banal identity document to "vibrant matter" imbued with moral, religious, and political vitality (Bennett 2010). Finally, I trace the transnational flows of the Holy Spirit across the boundaries of the nation-state and the across the borders of Catholic traditionalism.

The Sanctuary City

Let us begin with the trans-historical idea of the sanctuary city. In contemporary usage, “sanctuary” is often associated with sacred space or “the sacred” more generally, but it also encompasses secular dimensions and uses such as political asylum and acts of clemency. On the spiritual side, sanctuaries are most often locatable in a specific place that holds extraordinary significance or strong sentimental and symbolic meaning. The ancient Greeks had two words for place – topos and chora – the former referring to an undifferentiated point on a map or “inert
container,” and the latter, an animate and inspiring place that moves people to dance to a shared “choreography” (Lane 2002: 54). Sanctuary is in concert with \emph{chora} – a meaningful place. Sanctuaries can be a physical location such as a place of worship, a sanctified aspect of nature or protected environment reserved for endangered creatures; a metaphor for refuge that connotes a retreat from the mundane activities of everyday life; or a realm of safety, comfort, and security.

As a holy place that inspires reverence, a familiar place called home, or a secure location where the persecuted seek asylum, a sanctuary is a special kind of cultural space (Bau 1985; Cunningham 1995). In the Judeo-Christian tradition (and many others) sanctuaries are differentiated from ordinary places and activities; they are set apart. In the words of Victor Turner, sanctuaries are “liminal” spaces that hang in the balance between sacred and profane orders and are ambiguous in relation to the social structure (1982: 20). Scholars have traced the Biblical roots of the concept of sanctuary to the ancient Hebrew tradition of asylum used to mitigate the retaliatory blood-feud system (Bau 1985; Rabben 2001). A person accused of murder or rape could be protected from persecution if he could reach the designed sanctuary city before being killed by avengers. Under Jewish law, family members of the victim had the right to kill the suspected perpetrator. The fugitive was himself considered marginal, a person without status, while awaiting his judgment. Within the city of refuge, the asylee becomes \emph{homo sacer}, a “sacred man” (Agamben 1998: 71 – 73). As the subject of sovereign power, or in this case, an exception to Roman law, the sacred
man is “bare life” meaning he is both included and excluded from the rule of law. Therefore, he can be killed, but not sacrificed (Agamben 1998: 72).

Besides designated cities, altar sanctuaries located in religious shrines also functioned as asylums by virtue of their holiness. Violating the sacredness of these sites was considered an incorrigible sin against God (Cunningham 1995: 69 - 70). The idea of sanctuary as consecrated ground imbued with supernatural powers and as a liminal place that was both present and absent from the realm of worldly affairs that offers protection from evil or persecution became the cultural cornerstone of church sanctuaries in medieval Europe (Bau 1985), and the conceptual foundation of many liturgical traditions and popular devotional practices (Belting 1994; Webster 1998; Morgan 1998, 2005), and aesthetics (Elkins 2004; Howes 2007).

Over time, the juridical function of sanctuaries declined in importance as states assumed responsibility for determining the rights of the accused, but the association between churches and political asylum has persisted (Crittenden 1988; Golden and McConnell 1986; Villazor 2008). For example, in the United States churches and religious groups offered sanctuaries for escaped slaves in the nineteenth century, and later to Jews fleeing the Holocaust; in the 1950s and 1960s, Vietnam War draft resisters and civil rights workers threatened by mob violence in the South (Carro 1985); and in the 1980s, political refugees from Latin America (Coutin 1993). As these examples illustrate, ideas of sacred space, persons and communities are implicit in the multiple meanings that adhere to the duality of the concept of
sanctuary and its diverse sacred and secular manifestations in different time periods and cultural contexts.

During the colonial period in New Mexico, both secular and ecclesiastical authorities respected the right of asylum in churches. Historian, Elizabeth Howard West, identified thirty-two cases involving forty-five individuals from a variety of racial and class backgrounds that sought sanctuary in churches (1928). The cases, which span over one-hundred years (1685 – 1796), involve individuals accused of crimes or having committed a crime, taking sanctuary in a church in order to suspend or evade punishment by avengers and/or civil administrators, and were able to delay persecution. What is interesting about these cases is that refugees, when asked by an official to recount their side of the story or provide official testimony, could essentially, “plead the fifth” by responding to all questions with the phrase, “My name is church.” In this fashion, both the body and the words of the person in sanctuary were under the protection of the ecclesiastical judge, who would either release the person to the civil authorities upon official request, or decide to allow the refugee to stay in the church indefinitely (West 1928).

However, in the cases cited by West (1928) the individual’s worldly possessions as well as their family members were not under church protection, since they were located outside of the sacred space. Often people’s property was ceased or their wives were arrested in order to coerce the individual to leave the protection of sanctuary and face their worldly fate. Some refugees attempting to evade the law, fled from one church to another. This was risky of course, because once more than forty
steps distance from the church, the person could be captured. There were also rules outlining which crimes were protected under the right to asylum and which were not as well as the procedure by which ecclesiastical judges and civil authorities negotiated custody with regard to their respective jurisdictions. West (1928) also suggests that civil administrators very carefully and respectfully negotiated with church officials in sanctuary cases, which illustrates the very real power that the Catholic Church exercised in the region on individuals of all classes and ranks. Banishment from the Church was a fate equivalent to social death.

Sanctuary and the right of asylum are ancient customs and are also not exclusively Western concepts or practices. In fact, some have argued that protecting sacred things and places as well as providing people with safe harbor is a human universal (Bau 1985; Godbey 1905; Rabben 2011). In many traditional cultures, spirits that reside in certain places cannot be disturbed and therefore the animals, plants, and objects located there cannot be touched. Godbey cites examples from the indigenous tribes of central Australia, New Guinea where designated tracts of land are natural treated as sanctuaries. Any animal or person who flees there will not be hunted. He also offers examples from Native America (1905). The Ojibwa of the Hudson Bay had communities of fugitives living in sanctuary and the Creeks had “white towns” were violence of any kind was prohibited (Godbey 1905: 607). Buddhist convents are have functioned as places where political refugees are protected for thousands of years, and among the Afghans the tombs of ascetics and Islamic saints are places of refugee for fugitives (Godbey 1905). The Pueblo Indians
have many sacred sites, such as mountains, rivers, lakes and other special places.

After the Pueblos revolted against Spanish colonists in 1680 forcing them to flee to El Paso de Norte, refugees of different tribes, some of which were enemies before the Revolt, fled to ancient cities atop high mesas where they created cities of refuge\textsuperscript{14} (Liebmann 2012).

**Research Questions**

In our “secular age” the religious and juridical functions of sanctuary are seemingly separate (Taylor 2007). However, as I will show in this dissertation, the boundaries the religious and political sides of sanctuary place making are more fluid than they seem at the outset. Today, the sanctuary city is under siege. The sanctuary city is a contentious subject in the context of surging anti-immigrant racism, mass deportations, and the proliferation of legislative attacks on immigrant families living in the United States today. While Arizona, Alabama, and Georgia have responded to post-migration diversity with extremist and overtly discriminatory measures that further isolate and exclude undocumented residents, other locales have acted to protect and integrate migrants. New Mexico stands out as a “state of exception” in this regard, where undocumented immigrants can obtain a driver’s license, have access to in-state college tuition and scholarships, and benefit from laws that safeguard workers against wage-theft and discrimination (Agamben 2005).

\textsuperscript{14} Liebmann (2012) identifies four major cities of refuge located near Jemez Pueblo (Walatowa): Kotyiti, Patokwa, Astialakwa, and Bolesstakwa. In Bolesstakwa in particular, refuges from different Pueblo Indian tribes as well as some individuals from non-Pueblo communities created a sanctuary city made up of diverse indigenous peoples.
New Mexico has largely been neglected as an important site for the study of Mexican migration and transnationalism. Granted, the immigrant population is small compared to other border states because the state is poor and does not have many industries that attract large a number of migrants. For the most part, migrants settle in New Mexico because it is close to home. The recent resurgence of Mexican migration over the past decade is changing the cultural landscape of northern New Mexico and with it the regionalist frameworks and research agendas that have long defined studies of religion, politics, and ethnic relations in the state. In addition, our concentration on communities in the northern part of the state also needs to be redirected. Recently, many immigrants have settled in the southeastern corridor to work in agriculture, dairies, and the oil and gas industry. These industries are driving the beleaguered economy of the state and immigrants who have settled in these historically Anglo-dominated areas have both revitalized and transformed what used to be known as “little Texas.”

With this project, I am attempting to bring New Mexico studies out of rooted regionalism and into a transfrontera vision that is in conversation with studies of transnational migration, globalization, and post-migration urbanism (Saldívar 1997: 13). Therefore, one of the questions guiding my research is how dose local environments (such as New Mexico’s pro-immigrant polices and affinities with Mexican both cultural and geographic) impact migrant settlement strategies and in turn, how has the resurgence of Mexican migration transformed the local? This overarching question captures the dynamic processes by which migrants transform
the local, while simultaneously becoming emplaced within its cultural and political terrain. The idea of “entrapment” is familiar to many native Nuevomexicanos who consider the region their homeland and often find it difficult to escape. We are all emplaced to some degree, but the process is more conspicuous to newcomers.

For me, sanctuary place making is where trans/localization becomes legible and therefore, accessible to ethnographic analysis. However, my secondary questions get to the heart of the matter. While other studies of contemporary sanctuary policies have focused exclusively on the political and legal side of sanctuary, I am interested in its untamable spiritual side. What happens when we take religion seriously when studying local immigration policy activism? How do religious and secular sites of sanctuary place making interact, collaborate, and collide in a post-migration landscape? This dissertation attempts to answer these questions based on archival research on the Sanctuary Movement of the 1980s and the New Mexico Sanctuary Trial (1988) and also two years of embedded field research inside Somos Un Pueblo Unido, the leading immigrant rights organization in the state, and within the Santa Fe branch of the transborder religious revitalization movement, Renovación Carismática, which is growing in popularity with Mexican and Latin American immigrants in the United States.

Fieldwork and Methods

In order grasp the different facets of sanctuary place making that I was interested in examining, I used a variety of research methods and took a multi-sited approach. The historical aspects of this study required a combination of archival and
The local sanctuary movement of the 1980s and the dramatic Sanctuary Trial that defined the movement in New Mexico are well documented. Activists who participated in the movement, particularly those who were members of the Sanctuary Defense Committee, created a rich archive of their activities and correspondence. It is located at the State Records and Archives Center in Santa Fe. I spent the first three months of my fieldwork examining these archives and reconstructing the history of the sanctuary movement in the tri-state area (Mexico, Texas and New Mexico). I also utilized sections of the “Toney Anaya’s Papers,” which document his tenure as Governor of New Mexico. I conducted a formal interview with the former Governor about his sanctuary state proclamation and the social and political factors surrounding its issuance.

The “Sanctuary Defense Committee Papers” includes newspaper clippings and magazine articles about the plight of Central American refugees and the national Sanctuary Movement(s). It also includes monthly newsletters, official communications, and pamphlets. One box contains all of the statements, depositions, and court deliberations from the trial. However, a full court transcript of the trial was not produced. Therefore, I conducted formal interviews with eleven former sanctuary movement activists who also had some knowledge of what occurred during the trial in order to fill in the gaps. Some of these individuals chose to remain anonymous. Therefore, I have given these individuals pseudonyms and I have opted not to cite any personal names of interviewees in the bibliography. My primary research collaborators were Demetria Martinez and Glen Thamert. Both were indicted and
stood trial for allegedly transporting two Salvadorian women across the US-Mexico border. I conducted in-depth life history interviews with both individuals. I also interviewed Demetria’s parents, Tom and Dolores Martinez. All of the formal interviews I conducted for this project were digitally recorded and later transcribed. In addition to this data, Glen Thamert gave me exclusive access to his extensive personal archive of materials that he had collected related to the local sanctuary movement and his prosecution.

In addition to the archival research, I conducted two years of embedded fieldwork with Somos Un Pueblo Unido (2010 - 2012), a statewide immigrant rights organization based in Santa Fe. At the same time, I conducted fieldwork with Renovación Carismática. Because I believe in community-based research that furthers the mission of the organization, I initially approached Somos and asked the director, Marcela Díaz, what the organization needed. I began working on a volunteer basis on a project related to bias-based policing. I was able to secure a grant to help the organization with an evaluation they were conducting on law enforcement compliance with a state law passed in 2008 banning bias-based policing. While I was working on this project, I was able to develop relationships of trust with the state members and with Somosistas or immigrants who are active members of the organization. I conducted short, videotaped interviews with five key members of the workers committees who had successfully organized for better working conditions or to recover stolen wages. I interviewed three members of the Board of Directors, one who had been a member of the organization since she was a teenager, and also with
individuals who were involved in founding the organization in 1995. Again, I have taken care to assign pseudonyms to individuals who requested to remain anonymous and I have not cited any personal names in the bibliography. In some cases, I have cited the date in which specific personal interviews where conducted in the endnotes, when relevant to the discussion.

My involvement with Somos became more concentrated when Susana Martinez was elected in 2011 and the state's pro-immigrant laws came under intense scrutiny. Therefore, I worked side-by-side with Somos staff members and with Somosistas as a participant observer in the immigrant rights movement and specifically, the campaign to save the law that allows undocumented residents to obtain a state-issued driver's license from repeal. Repealing the law was one of Susana Martinez's campaign promises and she believed that it would be easy. She was wrong. During the first 60-day struggle, I documented policy committee meetings at Somos, individual meetings with legislators, legislative hearings, and also House and Senate floor debates. As a member of the policy committee, I helped plan and orchestrate protest actions, which included marches, rallies, infiltrations, lobbying, email petitioning, call-in days, and candlelight vigils. I documented these events in my field notes as soon as possible after the events took place and also took notes on a voice recorder to remind myself of what to write down later. I took countless photographs and videotaped many events for Somos and was able to use this data as part of my analysis. Most of my research with Somos happened informally, through my daily participation in the organization and through informal
interactions with members. I documented these interactions and conversations in my field diary at least three times a week.

In addition to interviewing Somosistas, I also interviewed a number of elected officials including the former Mayor of Santa Fe, David Coss and eight other lawmakers who had worked with Somos to craft pro-immigrant legislation or contributed to their policy work through their leadership in municipal and state government in some way. I also attended the City of Santa Fe's Immigration Committee meetings and interviewed a number of key committee members. One is the pastor of Westminster Presbyterian Church and the other is the former Chief of the Santa Fe Police Department. These individuals chose to remain anonymous.

While I was working with Somos as an activist-researcher, I attended the Tuesday night charismatic revivals at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church each week. I also asked the coordinator at the time, Ruth Nava, what they needed from me. They needed me to help teach the Spanish language catechism classes. So, I volunteered. Through my dedicated participation in Renovación, attending Mass at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church, and teaching catechism I had the opportunity to get to know immigrants who were involved in the movement and also with those who were not. My ethical practice is to participate as fully as possible in the religious community, which means staying open to the possibility of conversion. Early on, I made announcements to the congregation of Mexicano Charismatics that I was researching the movement and writing about it for my thesis. After this announcement, people
were somewhat skeptical of me. However, my affiliation with Somos helped me gain rapport with immigrants since they know and trust the organization. Soon, due to my regular attendance at the Tuesday night revivals, dedicated participation in the evangelization program, attendance at conviviencias (fellowship activities), and serving as a catechist, people forgot that I was a researcher. I often reminded them of this fact, but I had become integrated into the religious community.

In order to understand how the movement came to New Mexico and what its leaders are trying to revive, I conducted formal interviews or life histories of the founders of the movement (including two local Hispanics who encountered the movement in the 1970s) and with four long-time choir members and two lay pastors. Some of these interviews were recorded on my digital voice recorder and later transcribed. Other interviewees preferred that I take hand-written notes. I also conducted formal interviews with clergy members such as the Pastor of Our Lady of Guadalupe and two of the Deacons, a seminarian, and the Director of Hispanic Ministries. I visited the Catholic Charismatic Center in Albuquerque and conducted informal interviews with the staff members. I was a keen participant observer within my evangelization cohort or bible study group. We had many informal conversations about religion and many other topics on a weekly basis and I recorded these informal conversations in my field diary. In addition, I participated and observed La Comunidad de Mujeres, which is a charismatic prayer group exclusively for women. There is also one for men, but I was not privy to their meetings.

Analysis of Data
Three sets of data were collected for this project and each grew into an extensive archive of ethnographic and archival materials. The first data set consisted of archival documents and oral history interviews related to the sanctuary movement and trial as well as Governor Toney Anaya's sanctuary proclamation. All of the interviews I conducted with movement activists were recorded on my digital recorder and later transcribed. The second set of data consisted of interviews with Somosistas, which were videotaped or recorded on a digital recorder, and over one hundred single-spaced typed pages of field notes, three small notebooks of jottings that I took while in the field, and hundreds of pictures of Somos events and protest actions. I also collected newspaper articles about Somos and archived their newsletters and press releases, as well as the notes I took at policy committee meetings and other types of meetings. The third set included interviews with leaders and participants in Renovación Carismática and with Catholic clergy and administrators and field notes based on my participation in the Tuesday night revivals, bible study, fellowship activities, retreats, catechism, and the women's prayer group.

I transcribed most of the interviews that I recorded or I took notes from them using a data processing tool called Scribner, which allows researchers to store all kinds of data and media in one place and also access it while actively writing text. Using this tool, I archived my three data sets as separate projects and also included scholarly articles that I planed to use as references in each of the project files. The data management tool allows you to write digital note cards and also to move them around and rearrange them. Using this tool, I was able to arrange the cards into
different files based on shared themes and topics. This allowed me to derive some of the major themes that were developing as I matched interview data and with related field notes using the note card tool. Finally, I wrote short summaries of the data to bring it all together.

From these summaries, I was able to begin writing ethnographic scenes and putting them into conversation with different sets of literature. This process took about a year, because it was parallel with the writing process. From that point, I began writing drafts of the chapters. After I had the chapters drafted, I gave them to key participants who were featured in the chapters for review. These individuals provided feedback and also made factual corrections where necessary. I then went back and incorporated their corrections. This editing process was easy for the first three chapters but the final chapter was more difficult because the participants featured are Spanish speakers and they do not read or write in English. In this case, I talked to them about what I had written and did some fact checking. I eventually plan to translate the chapter on Renovación Carismática for the community.

Structure of the Argument

This dissertation has two parts. The first two chapters are historical and based on archival and oral histories. The historical chapters examine the overlapping dimensions of secular and religious sanctuary place making by comparing the faith-based Sanctuary Movement of the 1980s with the rise of present-day local immigration policy activism in US cities. In 1986, then Governor Toney Anaya declared New Mexico a "State for Sanctuary" in response to the Central American
refugee crisis and as a gesture of solidarity with the local sanctuary movement. Sanctuary activists in New Mexico and Texas interpreted Governor Anaya's sanctuary proclamation as a "sacred passport" that authorized their work of assisting Central American refugees. In 1988, a Lutheran minister, Glen Thamert, and the now famous Chicana writer, Demetria Martinez, were indicted for transporting Salvadorans across the US-Mexico border. Governor Anaya's controversial sanctuary proclamation, although never codified into law, became the cornerstone of a successful legal defense and ultimately, secured the acquittal of both defendants. Recovering the New Mexico Sanctuary Movement and Trial to history is a point of origin that connects the sanctuary city (or state) of the past to present-day local immigration policy activism. The story, compelling in its own right, is also an entrée into larger conversations about the intersections between the secular and the religious that run throughout the dissertation.

Placing immigrant rights activism alongside religious revivalism, the ethnographic chapters of this project examine how the contemporary immigrant rights movement intersects with what I have termed, borderlands charisma, a transnational Catholic charismatic movement that is creating new kinds of solidarities and religious subjectivities that transcend the boundaries of the nation state. Mexican migrants’ participation in both movements blurs the boundaries between sacred and secular spaces, crossing the ideological lines that separate legislating from evangelizing and legality from theology. Bringing different sites and configurations of sanctuary place making together within a comparative field of ethnographic analysis, Places of
Sanctuary illuminates how locality shapes migrant settlement strategies and also how transnationalism impacts the formation of new political and religious subjectivities.

This dissertation is not solely about social movements or the lives of undocumented immigrants, it is about locating the secular and the sacred in unexpected spaces, particularly within the marginalized places of sanctuary that migrants create to survive the hardships of migration and settlement in the United States. Each chapter is an instance - a scene of representation - in which the interactivity between the secular and the religious is rendered visible through ethnography.

The competitive and often collaborative spirits of these two categories of human activity emerges within the “doings of documents” such as laws and policies, but also in legal settings such as courtroom deliberations and legislative committee hearings (Brenneis 2006: 41). It comes to life in stories about grassroots organizing for immigrant rights, protests and modes of political participation, but also in the charismatic prayers and songs that Mexican migrants invoke to praise God and commune with the Holy Spirit. The theoretical thread that binds the diverse chapters of this dissertation is sanctuary place making, which includes forms of government such as the pro-immigrant policies that are currently under attack in New Mexico and elsewhere, but also the sanctuary practices and charismatic networks that undocumented migrants create that transverse the cityscape and the congregation.

Given the stagnation in Congress over passing fair immigration reform with a path to citizenship and the critical situation of mass deportations that have separated
countless immigrant families living in the United States today, this project is both important and timely. However, instead of harping on the negative, my research focuses on a pro-immigrant state that has decided to implement progressive and integrative solutions to handle post-migration diversity as well as the grassroots organizing and new religious movements that form the backbone of what I call, the sanctuary polity. Sanctuary place making offers a prophetic twist on immigration politics. The book makes a significant contribution to studies of immigration and religion by connecting the faith-based sanctuary movements of the past to contemporary local immigration policy activism, but also by taking religious revitalization seriously as a political force, revealing how religion and politics comingle and collide in shared social space.

This dissertation also sheds light on a popular religious movement that is changing what it means to be Catholic on both sides of the US-Mexico border. Borderlands charisma is what I have termed the dynamic re-missionization project that a family of talented lay preachers and musicians from Cuauhtémoc has brought to Our Lady of Guadalupe Church in Santa Fe. The movement is more than an evangelization project designed to revive "dead" Catholics, it is the basis for new kinds of religious and political solidarities among Mexican immigrants; a sociality not necessarily anchored in shared ethnicity or nationality, but in the shared experience of religious conversion and an emergent collective identity as Cristianos Renovados or renewed Christians. Borderlands charisma is currently sweeping northern Mexico and growing in popularity among Mexican and Latino immigrants in
the United States. The movement brings wayward Catholics into a new relationship with God and with one another, but also creates alternative spaces for political mobilization and enactments of local citizenship.

The theoretical thread that binds the diverse chapters of this work is sanctuary place making. Sanctuary place making implies practices of community making and alternative forms of political participation that bridge secular and sacred spaces. Sanctuary place making includes local immigrant rights activism and its products such as the municipal and state-level policies that Somos Un Pueblo Unido, the leading immigrant rights organization in New Mexico, has crafted from the ground up and instituted through city councils, county commissions, and the state legislature, but also includes the religious practices and activities that support these actions.

Grassroots pro-immigrant laws and resolutions comprise what I have termed, the “sanctuary polity.” For the purposes of this study, the sanctuary polity is local immigration policy grounded in place, but it is also a conceptual space where undocumented residents stake a claim local citizenship as bonefide Nuevomexicanos who participate in the civic community through religious and political organizations regardless of their legal status. In contrast to other studies of sanctuary cities or local immigration policy activism, I understand the sanctuary polity as more than a collection of pro-immigrant laws. It is generative site of cultural production situated at the intersection of immigrant rights activism and religious revivalism. The sanctuary polity as both a practice and a concept is never stable or secure. It is
something that must be inaugurated, conjured, and created in struggle. The sanctuary polity is claimed not given.

As a political project that bridges the secular and the sacred, the sanctuary polity challenges the ideological separation between religion and secularism by illuminating how ideas, practices, and institutions that are normatively thought to stand on either side of the wall of separation between the religious and the secular actually comingle. It is through these inchoate encounters that new modes of resistance and forms of political participation are made possible. Using a variety of qualitative and applied research methods, including participant observation, surveys, formal and informal interviews, and archival research, my research documents the convergence of religion and politics in the creation of sanctuary places in the original sense of the term – a conjectural space that has both religious and juridical elements. As a secular formation, the sanctuary polity includes forms of government but it also has an untamed (and therefore often ignored) spiritual side. When analyzed alongside religious awakenings and grassroots mobilizations, the sanctuary polity is produced within historically embrocat and mutable collaborations and entanglements between religion and politics.

Outline of the Chapters

Chapter One, “A State for Sanctuary: The Career of a Controversial Proclamation,” establishes the historical context for local immigration policy activism in New Mexico and beyond through the social and political life and legacy of Governor, Toney Anaya’s 1986 Sanctuary State Proclamation, which declared New
Mexico the nation’s first “state of sanctuary” for Central American refugees. I draw on the anthropology of bureaucracy and public policy in conversation with new scholarship on secularism to theorize the idea of the sanctuary state as a political theology. This chapter takes issue with the sanctuary state in order to complicate the ideological boundary separating religious and secular ideas, practices, and forms of authority as a project aimed at protecting certain “sacred” classes of individuals, in this case, Central American refugees, as opposed to “illegal” immigrants.

Using archival sources and oral history interviews with former Governor Toney Anaya and with activists who were involved in the sanctuary movement in New Mexico during the 1980s, I place New Mexico’s sanctuary proclamation within a rich cultural and historical tapestry of the rise of the national Sanctuary Movement in response to both Cold War Politics and the rise of the Evangelical Right under the Reagan Administration, as well as the political climate surrounding immigration reform. I bring national and transnational developments with regards to the politics of immigration, foreign policy, and religious revivalism to bear on New Mexico politics and Anaya’s turbulent tenure as governor. Drawing these elements together, I examine the sanctuary state as a specific kind of political and moral project with unexpected social effects that echo in contemporary debates about undocumented migration and the rise of local and state-level immigration policy activism in the United States.

Chapter Two, "The Intimacy of Politics: Sanctuary on Trial in New Mexico," is the first extensive archival and ethnographic study of the 1988 New Mexico
Sanctuary Trial, an event that has been excluded from most histories of the national Sanctuary Movement. In 1988, Chicana author, Demetria Martinez, and a former Lutheran minister, Glen Thamert, were both indicted on charges of violating immigration law in relation to transporting two Salvadoran women across the U.S. – Mexico border to a safe house in Albuquerque. While Governor Anaya always maintained that his sanctuary proclamation was purely “symbolic” the document became the cornerstone of a successful legal. Both defendants were acquitted based on their belief in the reality of the sanctuary state. The preparations leading up to the trial and the different arguments presented by the prosecution and the defense also reveal how Governor Anaya's sanctuary state proclamation figured in the confrontation between religious freedom and the freedom of speech and how these constitutional rights competed for dominance during the Sanctuary Trial.

Chapter Three, "The Force of Documents: Driver's Licenses and Legitimacy of Presence," connects both the sanctuary proclamation of 1986 and the decline of the faith-based Sanctuary Movement to the emergence of a new movement – the radically “secular” immigrant rights movement – and the establishment of Somos Un Pueblo Unido in 1995. I briefly chronicle the history of the organization, highlighting the roles of founders and members who also participated in the local sanctuary movement during the 1980s. However, the major focus of this chapter are the local and state level immigration policies that have become the organization’s signature contribution to the local immigrant rights movement and also which have brought them national attention for innovating some of the most progressive pro-immigrant policies in the
nation. I examine the different approaches, or prongs that must be in place to build the sanctuary polity through the implementation of policies that improve the lives of undocumented immigrants and also serve to protect and integrate them through legislating and lobbing.

The thrust of this chapter engages the on-going battle to maintain the law that allows undocumented residents to obtain a New Mexico driver’s license beginning with the inauguration of the first Latina Governor, Republican Susana Martinez in January of 2011. I follow Somosistas from the silent protest of the Martinez’s inauguration through the intense legislative warfare that ensued during the January 2011 session over driver’s licenses for immigrants. Drawing from the anthropology of bureaucratic documents, I show how the driver's license, once a banal piece of plastic, was reconfigured as a "vibrant object" with a charismatic moral career (Bennett 2010). I describe how this transformation played out between the charismatic spaces of religious renewal that immigrants have created at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church and the secular spaces of legislating and lobbing, crossing the boundaries between them, and creating fissures between the ideological wall that separates the sacred from the secular.

Chapter Four, “Borderlands Charisma: The Transnational Turn from Catholic Traditionalism,” documents the rise of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church through the life histories and migration stories of the founders of the movement. My analysis focuses on the translocal connectivity between Charismatic Catholics in Cuauhtémoc, Chihuahua, and migrants from that area who
ignited the movement in New Mexico. I also focus on the lure of sentimentality in the process of conversion and in the making of charismatic networks. I argue that sentiment is the vehicle through which charismatic religious subjectivities are formed. While this charismatic religious subjectivity eschews ethnicity or national origin as its organizational principal, it also demarcates this Mexican immigrant place of sanctuary from the more dominant form of Hispano-Catholic traditionalism in Santa Fe.

My analysis of the movement as an “immigrant sanctuary” also explores the links between reforming the self and reforming society as a political project and details the overlap, but also the tensions between the work of Somos Un Pueblo Unido and the spiritual work of the leaders of the renewal. I also show the different levels of participation, explore the diversity of reasons why people become involved in the renewal and what they gain from it, and how the Catholic Church and clergy are responding to its growing popularity among the immigrant community in New Mexico. I also briefly discuss how race and ethnicity intersect with religious difference in the post-migration context as Mexican immigrants involved in the renewal challenge local Hispanic Catholics who are deeply invested in the preservation of “traditional” practices for spiritual, cultural, and political reasons.

Chapter Five, “Anthropolocura: Tying Up Loose Ends,” serves as the conclusion and discussion section for the dissertation. In this chapter, I reflect on my experiences of doing hometown ethnography in conversation with some of the literature on native anthropology. I introduce anthropolocura as a reversal of
anthropology’s colonial gaze as both a place to think from and a methodology. I also revisit each of the chapters of the dissertation. I use this opportunity to reevaluate some of the arguments and explain what I was trying to accomplish theoretically. Realizing that this project is a starting point for further research and analysis, I point out the strengths and the limitations of each chapter and discuss areas for improvement.
Chapter One:

A State for Sanctuary: The Career of a Controversial Proclamation

On Good Friday, the 28th of March 1986, in the final year of his term as Governor, Toney Anaya issued a controversial proclamation declaring New Mexico the nation’s first “state of sanctuary” for refugees from El Salvador and Guatemala fleeing devastating civil wars in Central America. Governor Anaya held a press conference in Santa Fe to announce the action during Holy Week intentionally underscoring the moral weight and “compassionate spirit” of the proclamation as a “symbolic gesture of solidarity” with the Sanctuary Movement. A native Nuevomexicano, practicing Catholic, and staunch democrat, Governor Anaya described his motives for issuing the sanctuary proclamation in terms of righteous conviction, consecrated by his deeply held religious beliefs and commitment to ethical leadership. Issuing an official proclamation to make New Mexico a sanctuary state was a bold political move, yet Anaya assured the public and government officials that it was intended to be a “symbolic, moral, religious statement” and therefore held no legal force or efficacy. Curiously, the final lines of Anaya’s supposed symbolic gesture indicated that a more concrete policy on the protection of refugees seeking sanctuary in New Mexico was in formation. As I will show in this chapter, the proclamation was in both spirit and in content, law-in-the-making.

The proclamation, while not a legally binding document, produced unintended legal and social effects, some of which endured beyond the life of the document itself and its original (or purported) intent. The proclamation was short-lived and
unfinished. The following Governor, republican, Garrey Caruthers, promptly rescinded the sanctuary state proclamation on January 9, 1987, shortly after taking office. That same year, a journalist, Demetria Martínez, and a former Lutheran Minister, Glen Thamert, were indicted on charges of violating immigration law in connection to transporting two Salvadoran women across the U.S.–Mexico border to safe houses located in Albuquerque. In the summer of 1988, Demetria Martínez and her “co-conspirator” Glen Thamert stood trial on multiple charges related to “transporting and harboring illegal aliens,” actions that many sanctuary activists across the nation lauded as crimes of conscience. Sanctuary workers who were helping refugees and journalists writing about the movement were deemed criminals or enemies of the state by federal immigration authorities and the U.S. government. However, from the perspective of movement members and supporters, prosecuting sanctuary workers violated their religious freedom or in Demetria Martinez’s case, her freedom of speech as a journalist writing about a sanctuary incident. During the New Mexico Sanctuary Trial, Governor Anaya’s “symbolic and religious statement” became the cornerstone of Glen Thamert’s legal defense. In the court of law the sanctuary proclamation embraced both religious and legal authority because the defendant had to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he believed in the reality of the sanctuary state—a claim to legal truth that Toney Anaya had denied repeatedly upon issuing the proclamation.

The creation of a state for sanctuary was a political statement. As a symbolic declaration of noncooperation with federal authority in the enforcement of
immigration law, the proclamation opened up space for an alternative form of citizenship based on membership in the local community and presence within the state of New Mexico. Sanctioning the Sanctuary Movement’s most viable moral claims, the declaration cast New Mexico in a familiar role – an outlier, a space of difference, out of sync and out of line with the rest of the nation. As a moral critique of the failures of immigration law and President Reagan’s Central American policy, Governor Anaya’s proclamation was used to justify the actions of sanctuary activists and to legitimize their religious interpretation of the law (Bezdek 1994). On the other hand, the sanctuary state also betrayed the core principals and aspirations of the faith-based movement from which it emerged in terms of its inexorable ties to state power and its preoccupation with asserting national boundaries as well as distinguishing “illegal” persons from those deserving of protection. Is an inclusionary local citizenship possible within the confines of nationalism and nativism? This question sits unsettled at the center of this chapter and throughout this thesis.

The idea of the “sanctuary city” as a place of refuge or oppositional space where undocumented migrants are constituted as persons with certain rights as members of the local community depended upon a notion of worthiness based on nationality and circumstance. In contrast to the “illegal” Mexican economic migrant, Salvadoran and Guatemalan asylum seekers took on an almost sacred status in the minds of sanctuary activists who felt it was their moral obligation to welcome the stranger or to save them (Marfleet 2011). Throughout the 1980s, churches, schools, municipalities and in a few cases, an entire state (New Mexico, and later Hawaii)
were declared places of sanctuary for Central American refugees as a moral and political statement. Public sanctuary spaces stood on religious grounds in resistance to the enforcement of federal immigration law.

As oppositional space, the sanctuary city was revived as part of a political movement and religious revitalization project whose positive legacy continues in many different forms (Freeland 2010). However, the contemporary politically savvy and radically secular immigrant rights movement(s) in New Mexico rarely acknowledges the connection between the sanctuary movement of the past and local immigration policy activism. One reason may be that the dark side of the sanctuary city of the past is our present reality. Since the mid-1990s there has been a significant shift in federal immigration powers to local and state governments. This rescaling or localization of immigration enforcement, along with the power to constitute personhood and define the parameters of inclusion has rendered possible newfound ways to discriminate on the basis of alienage or noncitizen status, legal categories that are increasingly racialized in post-9/11 America (Varsanyi 2008).

In a complete reversal and some might say, profanation of its original meaning and intent, the specter of the sanctuary city is a rallying point for anti-immigrant extremists, who vigorously lobby law makers on both sides of the political aisle to promote the idea that passing anti-immigrant legislation will solve our problems. Ultimately, the goal of exclusionary sub-federal immigration laws such as Arizona’s SB1070 and Alabama’s HB 56 (and copycat versions in other states) is to cleanse local communities of menacing “illegals” by forcing immigrant communities
deeper into the shadows. The shadow city is an isolated region of refuge where undocumented immigrants are made more vulnerable to crime and exploitation. Purged of brown bodies the sanctuary city is transformed into a space of exclusion, an imaginary urban green zone, where only the ideal (white) American citizen is worthy of protection and rights.

Searching for Sanctuary

In this chapter, I search places of sanctuary in the brief but significant career of Toney Anaya’s 1986 sanctuary proclamation as a faith-based political project. As a living document produced within a particular historical moment in the politics of immigration in the United States, New Mexico’s sanctuary proclamation can be examined as an artifact of political theology whose “moral career” makes visible clandestine crossings between theological motivations and political aspirations in the making and breaking of immigration law (Chu 2010: 62). Political theology has been defined most simply as a relationship between religion and politics that reveals the vulnerabilities of each of these categories by pinpointing areas of overlap between them (Schmitt 1985; Lloyd 2012).

I find political theology a useful concept for understanding sanctuary place making as a flexible and mobile political and religious project. One may look to political theology to understand how religious ideas, practices, and institutions have shaped the politics of immigration in the United States and in turn, politicized theology. For my purposes, political theology is also a way to access the secular by locating specific points of articulation between political ideas and theological
concepts by examining the rituals, practices, and institutional structures that serve to distinguish forms of government from religion. The cultural and conceptual structures that support the invisible wall of separation that keeps religion in its proper place (Asad 2003). To investigate and describe these entanglements between the politics of immigration and religion is also to uncover the intricacies of American secularism as a political system but also a moral and cultural formation indebted to the historical transformations in Christianity that gave rise to secularism in the West, but with a unique signature or brand of expression (Harding 2010). It is with this case study, my search for places of sanctuary, that I attempt to trace a strand of this unique signature of the secular.

According to Saba Mahmood, “secularism has sought not so much to banish religion from the public domain but to reshape the form it takes, the subjectivities it endorses, and the epistemological claims it can make” (2006: 326 – 328). Following this line of reasoning, I locate New Mexico’s sanctuary proclamation, along with attendant historical documents, in tension with the political and theological claims it makes on undocumented migrants. The sanctuary proclamation artfully conjoins religion and politics to make a case for sanctuary, revealing the ways in which separation between church and state must be continuously reasserted and reified in order to keep religion in its proper place (Mahmood 2006). The oppositions we make between church and state, private and public, sacred and secular, while useful, are politicized and contested.

Another useful framework I have considered in relation to the idea of the
sanctuary state is Foucault’s theory of governmentality. From his perspective, state power is pervasive and insidious; juridical institutions and laws themselves are conceived as instruments of discipline that are used to control knowledge and influence the behavior of individuals towards the means and ends of sovereignty (Foucault, Burchell, Gorden and Miller, 1991). In contrast to this invisible hand or “capillary” idea of state power and following Ronald Niezen’s (2010) work on public justice and Michael Warner’s (2002) discussion of counterpublics, I am interested in how power is exercised and circulated through ideas or discourses that gain traction, inspire action, and acquire agency in relation to the state. Warner suggests counterpublics begin on the margins of the mainstream and develop a larger following among similarly interested and invested strangers who share the same oppositional or alternative values or experiences (2002:86).

In the case of the sanctuary movement, the work (assisting refugees) formed the basis of a type of oppositional consciousness -- a public oriented around a particular religious perspective and political agenda (Coutin 1993). Sanctuary activists organized strategic public information campaigns designed to shape public opinion through legitimization and consensus (Niezen 2010), and which incorporated testimony and witnessing, genres of public speech used in both religious and secular contexts to “convert” others to a particular perspective. As an intervention into the politics of state power, the sanctuary movement did not intend to overthrow the system, but rather to change public opinion about Reagan’s Contra War and to redefine Central American migrants as refugees using the political theology of
sanctuary to inspire and mobilize as well as manufacture consent and consolidate political power (Shore and Wright 1997).

As outlined in the introduction, the ancient practice of setting apart places of sanctuary where holiness resides and where the persecuted could find protection from violence or punishment evolved alongside historical transformations in Christianity that not only resulted in the separation of church and state, but produced the secular as the dominant moral and cultural order in the West (Asad 2003; Taylor 2010). The sanctuary concept was revived during the 1980s to accomplish quite modern political goals (Bau 1985; Lippert 2005; Villazor 2010). My analysis of New Mexico’s sanctuary declaration looks beyond the document itself to the public or social movement that inspired its controversial path as a lighting rod political issue that challenged federal policies. I will discuss how the complex social history of migration, immigration policy, and borderlands politics made both the proclamation and the sanctuary movement possible in New Mexico. Through an ethnographic grounding of the issues of sanctuary and immigration policy, I am able to locate the state not in amorphous systems of domination and control, but rather in the everyday activities of subjects, particularly political actors such as activists, government officials, lawyers, judges and bureaucrats, placing them at the center of the analysis.

In a recent article calling for a more ethnographically engaged analysis of the state attuned to bureaucracy, Bernstein and Mertz (2011) suggest that scholars interested in governance might move away from a focus on elected officials, towards an emphasis on a politics where the people who maintain, manage and administer
public policy are at the center of attention. In other words, the power to decide on the exception is effective, but even rule bending needs an apparatus for its practical implementation. The authors explain that, “an asocial notion of sovereignty as something grabbed and possessed ignores the communicative process that lies at the heart of all political action” (Bernstein and Mertz 2011: 6). From this perspective, the state is in the hands of positioned and empowered individuals such as administrators and bureaucrats. However, in a democracy elected officials and policy makers must also respond to collectivities or politically vested “publics” who also participate in the exercise of exceptionality (Niezen 2010; Coutin 2005b; Gupta 2006).

The fundamental questions guiding my ethnographic reading of Governor Anaya’s sanctuary proclamation and its social, legal, and religious implications are, what constitutes a sanctuary state and under what conditions was this particular kind of moral and political project made possible in New Mexico? Given that large numbers of refugees from Central America were not present in the state at the time of the declaration was issued (and perhaps because of this fact), Governor Anaya’s motivations for creating a state for sanctuary were embedded in the broader political context of opposition to the Reagan Administration’s policies in Central America, the creation of contradictory and discriminatory immigration and refugee policies, and the increasing political power of the Latino electorate and elected officials. What did Toney Anaya expect to accomplish with this symbolic, moral and religious statement? This question touches upon another windfall of political and cultural change during the 1980s, the coming of age of ethnic politics and the emergence of
influential Chicano and African American leaders in state and national politics, their participation in foreign policy discussions and immigration reform. In light of these factors, my goal is to show how New Mexico’s sanctuary proclamation engaged a broader arena of national and international affairs, moving the action well beyond the provincial scene of local politics.

Finally, and in the spirit of political theology, I ponder how the symbolic is operating in Toney Anaya’s discourse about the sanctuary proclamation. This double movement between the symbolic and real, or in this case, the artful collaborations between statements that constitute enforceable laws and those that perform symbolic gestures, complicates anthropological and popular notions of the concept of the “symbolic” as something imaginary that stands in for something else – a meaningful set of relations between the signifier and the signified (Levi-Strauss 1979), or vehicle for meaning making – a model for and of reality (Geertz 1993: 93 – 94). Theories of the symbolic grounded in linguistic, ideational, and cognitive terms often define the concept in relation to religious ideas and practices rather than secular ones (Asad 2003). When entangled with public policy statements and unfinished legal formations “the symbolic” takes on a transcendent power that unsettles secular authority of juridical discourses and interpretations. This apparent coupling of religious convictions and legal orders produced the sanctuary state as a political statement with policy effects connected to a broader movement with implications for all undocumented migrants residing in New Mexico.

_A Brief History of the Sanctuary Movement_
The Salvadoran civil war began in 1980 as a populist uprising involving five leftist guerrilla groups banded together under the umbrella of the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FLMN) against the ruling economic elite (Wood 2003). The despotic regime in El Salvador dominated the population through military control, intimidation, and exploitation. Motivated by fears of a communist-controlled El Salvador and leftist uprisings throughout Latin America, the Reagan Administration supported the Salvadoran Government with over $6 billion in military and economic aid from 1980 to 1992 to fend off the armed insurgency (Quan 2005). The US government also trained and funded paramilitary groups called the Contras to defeat the FLMN and restore power to the Salvadoran elite. The civil war brought about an unprecedented reign of terror and state-sponsored violence upon the Salvadoran population for over a decade. Over 75,000 people died in the war and about an equal number were disappeared. Escaping economic crisis, death squads, political persecution and civil unrest, a quarter of the Salvadoran population migrated north to Mexico, the United States and Canada (García 2006).

The national Sanctuary Movement was a collection of locally operated faith-based movements that emerged in response to the humanitarian crisis brought about by civil war, political upheaval and state-sponsored violence in El Salvador, Guatemala and Nicaragua, which led to an unprecedented mass exodus of refugees from Central America in the 1980s, millions of whom settled in the United States and Canada (Bau 1985; Bon 2008; Lippert 2005). In response to this critical situation, activists, clergy and community members from a broad spectrum of faith traditions
provided assistance to Central American refugees, sometimes risking their own lives and emotional health in the process (Cunningham 1995; Coutin 1993). Scholarship on the U.S. sanctuary movement has largely focused on faith-based activism on the borderlands and the criminal trials that occurred in Arizona and Texas or the experiences of Central American refugees in cities such as Chicago, San Francisco and Los Angeles (Cunningham 1995; Coutin 1993; 2007; Crittenden 1988; Golden and McConnell 1986). However, New Mexico’s role as a point of entry and “waiting station” for refugees on their way to other places has been completely overlooked in the literature. While this chapter is not a comprehensive history of the sanctuary movement in New Mexico, it does begin to fill this gap in the historical and anthropological literature on the sanctuary movement in the United States.

According to commonplace accounts, the sanctuary movement began at the local level in the late 1970s and early 80s (primarily in Tucson, Arizona, the Bay Area of California and Chicago, Illinois) as individuals and churches organized to provide food, shelter, legal aid and other kinds of assistance to refugees to help them get settled and navigate the process of attaining political asylum in the United States or Canada (Cunningham 1995). John Fife and Jim Corbett, based in Arizona, became the charismatic spokesmen for the sanctuary movement. Initially they worked within the legal system to help Central American migrants by raising funds to get refugees out of immigration detention centers, and assisting them with legal fees and application procedures (Crittenden 1988). However, when working within the legal system failed due to systematic discrimination against Central American refugees by
the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), which continued to classify them as “economic migrants” or illegal aliens subject to removal, sanctuary activists turned to more radical approaches.

This shift involved circumventing the immigration system altogether by transporting refugees across the U.S.-Mexico border into the United States illegally and providing them safe harbor in churches, safe houses, and shelters along the Underground Railroad (Bau 1985). Sanctuary activists declared designated spaces, often churches, “public sanctuaries” where refugees were unofficially protected from deportation, but also expected to contribute to the movement by sharing their testimonies of survival with others (Cunningham 1995; Coutin 1993). These locally based and loosely organized networks facilitated the migration of hundreds of thousands of Central Americans to the United States and Canada beginning around 1982 and tapering into the early 1990s (Bau 1985; Lippert 2005).

On March 24th 1982 the sanctuary movement revealed itself in dramatic fashion after years of clandestine activity, when six Catholic and Protestant churches held a press conference announcing their commitment to provide places of refuge, transportation, and humanitarian assistance to people fleeing El Salvador and Guatemala and other Central American countries (Coutin 1993, Cunningham 1995). The Southside Presbyterian Church in Tucson, Arizona and five Northern California churches were at the forefront of the early movement with John Fife and Jim Corbett
as co-founders and spokesmen\textsuperscript{15}. While Corbett and Fife became visible spokesmen for the movement, sanctuary work, like most religious labor, was largely performed by women who took refugees into their homes, raised orphaned children from Central America, organized caravans and public information campaigns, raised funds, provided legal council and translation services, and incurred the risks of transporting refugees (Cunningham 1994; Lorentzen 1991).

Admittedly, the sanctuary movement attracted relatively affluent, white middle-class Americans who rejected the conservative and capitalist-oriented values of the Evangelical Right, and instead, identified with the plight of the poor and the oppressed (Coutin 1993; Cunningham 1995). Describing the conversion experiences of sanctuary workers in Tucson, Arizona, anthropologist, Susan Coutin, uses “border crossing” as a framework for translating the deeply emotional transformations that people experienced in identifying with Central American refugees (1993: 60 – 66). Coutin recounts how sanctuary activists, many of whom had never been involved in politics and knew very little about Latin America, awoke to consciousness. They became more reflexive about their privileged social position as Anglo-Americans, critical of their government’s involvement in Latin America and also began to reevaluate their faith. This conversion process was radically transformative for many sanctuary workers, changing the way they viewed the world and their place within it. Sometimes, this change took the form of actual religious conversion - a commitment

\textsuperscript{15} Mimi Lopez, the founder of Albuquerque Border Communities (ABC) and prominent sanctuary activist during the 1980s, claims that Chicana/o grassroots organizations began helping Central American refugees through transnational solidarity networks as early as the late 1970s (personal communication June, 2011).
to social justice using liberation theology as the basis for action and sacrifice. Coutin
argues that the culture of protest that grew out of the sanctuary movement not only
involved personal conversion, but altered the social and legal terrain that defined
Salvadoran and Guatemalans as illegal beings, thereby effecting changes in society

The Sanctuary Movement was particularly appealing to progressive Catholics
and Protestants who had participated in the Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s or
who were dedicated to faith-based social justice work (Coutin 1993; Cunningham
1995). Others identified with the state-sponsored persecution and assassination of
religious leaders in El Salvador such as the iconic, Archbishop Oscar Romero, and
were inspired to join the movement. While official histories of the sanctuary
movement emphasizes its spokesmen, Jim Corbett and John Fife, and the dramatic
sanctuary trials that occurred in Arizona and Texas, women more often took charge of
the details of grassroots organizing, praying and hospitality efforts (see Lorentzen
1991). Transnational Latino and refugee-led organizations were largely responsible
for initiating Central American solidarity efforts and successfully mobilized public
opposition to the Reagan administration’s military interventions in the region (Perla
2008, 2010). Hector Perla’s work on transnational public diplomacy, for example,
traces the history of the U.S.- Central American Peace & Solidarity Movement
illuminating how Central American intellectuals and activists living in exile worked
to re-activate the left in the United States, particularly among white liberals, by
getting them involved in the Central American cause (2010).
The white and middle-class orientation of the movement has been critiqued as self-interested paternalism. However, scholars point out that involving U.S. citizens, particularly people with the ability to influence politicians was part of a broader political strategy derived by refugees themselves to legitimize, extend and fund the sanctuary movement using “leverage politics” (Perla and Coutin 2010). Even so, the process of identification with Central American refugees was more complex, emotional, and deeply entangled with Anglo-American liberal sensibilities and the idealization of revolution and revolutionaries. Constructs of freedom and justice often get tied up with the symbolic allure of the indigenous other rising up against their oppressors (Nelson 2009).

This aspect of participation in the movement may be related to what anthropologist Diane Nelson (2009) describes as “identi-ties” or the process of reciprocal identification. In this sense refugees take on the role of survivor or victim and middle-class, white Americans become saviors as sanctuary activists. This “detour through the Other that defines the self” arguably defines the process by which activists came to think of themselves as someone different and perhaps, more “authentic” (Coutin 1993; Nelson 2009). It is through these reciprocal encounters that the “sanctuary activist” as a particular kind of moral, religious and politicized subject is produced and in turn, a movement mobilized. On the other side of the process of reciprocality, Central American migrants were produced as refuges in need of protection. This process also required them to assume new identities as survivors and bearers of sacred knowledge or “testimonies” that could only be obtained through the
experience of terror. The born-again quality of the testimonio [harrowing story of survival or triumph over adversity] is verified in confronting death to tell a tale of survival (Coutin 1993: 117).

Activists involved in the faith-based sanctuary movement worked in collaboration and sometimes in tension with other organizations focused on supporting the Central American cause. The US - Central American Peace and Solidarity Movement and the Sanctuary Movement(s) were transnational grassroots movements that were often directed by Central American refugees living in exile the United States or Canada. These leaders maintained strong ties to leftist organizations in their home countries such as the FMNLF (Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front) in El Salvador and the Sandinistas in Nicaragua, or who were affiliated with Christian Base Communities and liberation theology (Perla 2008, 2009). While regional conferences provided training, education and networking opportunities for people involved in sanctuary work and also helped enlist new recruits, more often people joined the sanctuary movement through “witnessing” in churches and other spaces where refugees imparted their testimonies of torture, death, and survival and created space for that reciprocal process of identification and conscience-raising that prompted people to act (Coutin 1993; Cunningham 1995).

While working locally and often independently, these grassroots solidarity movement(s) in support of Central American refugees were unified by a shared goal; they aimed to speak truth to power by bringing to light the role of the United States government in funding the oppressive political regimes and shadowy paramilitary
death squads that killed hundreds of thousands civilians and political dissidents in El Salvador and Guatemala, as well as U.S. funded military training and support operations such as the infamous, School of the Americas\textsuperscript{16} (Gill 2007). Popular opposition and organized resistance to Reagan’s Central American policy proved influential and largely successful (Coutin and Perla 2010). As U.S. citizens came in contact with refugees and engaged with their eye-witness testimonies of the human costs of the war, a compelling counter-narrative emerged that directly challenged Reagan’s version of Central American revolutions as part of an oppressive communist takeover (Perla 2008; 2010).

Some critics viewed Central American Caravans, which usually consisted of families in sanctuary traveling between cities, organizing rallies and telling their heart-wrenching stories of survival as inherently exploitative. However, Perla argues that these spectacles were part of a conscious political strategy (2010). “Because of their marginalized status Salvadoran immigrants used various performative and informal methods in order to shape politics through their public interactions, most importantly, though the telling of their personal testimonios” (2010: 173). In turn, U.S. citizens who were involved in Central American solidarity movements, secular or faith-based, influenced their representatives in Congress to change refugee policy to abolish support for the Contras. As a result of their fierce activism and lobbying

\textsuperscript{16} Gill (2007) points out that graduates from the School of the Americas committed some of the worst atrocities against their own people during the Cold War, including the massacre of over a thousand people in the village of El Mozote in El Salvador. Soldiers trained in counterinsurgency tactics at SOA became some of the most reviled dictators in Latin America during the 1990s.
efforts, congress vetoed Reagan’s request for additional military aid to Central America in November 1989 (Perla 2010).

People dedicated to the sanctuary movement were often motivated by religious conviction, attempting to claim the moral high ground using Biblical references and theological arguments to reinforce and justify their actions and reinterpretations of international and domestic refugee policy (Bezdek 1984; Coutin 1993; Cunningham 1995). Incidentally, the sanctuary movement emerged as an organized and formidable liberal counterpoint to the ultra-conservative and politically entitled Christian Right during the 1980s (Coutin 1993; Marley 2007). In fact, setting the record straight, sanctuary activists or the Christian Left had more success in changing votes in Congress and influencing policy (local and national) than the Christian Right (Marley 2007; Perla 2010). Historian, David Marley, argues that that during the Reagan Era the “Christian Right enjoyed a high profile but had little tangible success in politics” (2007: 851).

Nevertheless, Evangelicals played an important role in fueling the fire in Central America by circumventing Congress and the legislative process altogether. Pat Robertson, a conservative televangelist who ran for President against Reagan in the 1984 primary, was an avid supporter of the counterinsurgency or the “Contrads” in El Salvador. Driven by his irrational fear of the spread of godless communism, Robertson visited the country with his camera crew and even raised over $34 million dollars through his Evangelical networks to help fund U.S. military intervention in El Salvador after Congress vetoed continuation of aid to the region (Marley 2007).
Guatemala’s genocidal attacks on indigenous people has also been linked to the Moral Majority in the United States. The leader of the coup, Efraín Ríos Montt, became the first Protestant president of Guatemala in 1982 (O’Neill 2010). Montt, a dictator and self-proclaimed Christian Soldier, gave weekly radio “sermons,” which drew from the Bible as an authoritative instrument of government. He also murdered an estimated 100,000 indigenous Guatemalans and peasants and displaced an equal number of people during his one-year reign of terror (O’Neill 2010). Montt made a guest appearance on the 700 Club to rally support for Robertson’s Christian missions in Central America (O’Neill 2010). These collaborations were not lost on sanctuary activists who often supported the FLMN and vehemently opposed U.S. aid and military support to the Contras. In effect, Central America became the ideological battleground for competing liberal and conservative Christian publics and their organizing political theologies, each attempting to influence national and international politics. Patently, the Christian Right was the constitutive other of the Sanctuary Movement, which was largely composed of the Christian Left.

Given this historical backdrop, Governor Anaya’s sanctuary proclamation moves beyond New Mexico and his career aspirations as well as his personal religious and political convictions. The document was produced within the broader national and transnational context of Reagan’s Cold War containment policy, which aimed to wipe communism from the face of the Earth by threat of a growing nuclear arsenal and empowered by righteous American exceptionalism (Wirfs 1992). This overarching foreign policy narrative propelled U.S. military intervention in Central
America as a “Cold War battle ground” and exemplary zone for the enactment U.S. Imperialism (Gill 2007: 4 – 8). Perhaps, it is not so unlikely that resistance to Reagan’s Cold War agenda would come from New Mexico, a remote borderland state on the fringes of the nation. So remote and unimportant that the state was designated a “national sacrifice zone” by the U.S. Government in the 1940s in order to become the birthplace of the nuclear bomb and also a dumping ground for nuclear waste (Masco 2006). Although beyond the scope of this chapter, there is some overlap and correspondence between the sanctuary movement and the anti-nuclear movement in New Mexico. Many sanctuary movement members and supporters were dedicated peace activists who also participated in the anti-nuclear movement throughout the 1980s.

However, it would be misleading to cast Governor Anaya’s move to create a sanctuary state as a radical act of defiance. The sanctuary proclamation was not a legally binding document, an executive order or even a legislative proposal. It was, as Anaya repeatedly asserted, a symbolic gesture of support for Central American refugees and an astute way of calling attention to the issue. Therefore, the action was perfectly in step with the national Democratic Party’s counterattack on the Reagan Revolution. It was a political statement in opposition to Reagan’s Central American policy and the systematic denial of legal status or temporary protection for refugees fleeing the violence of civil war – a conflict whose disastrous impacts on the lives of civilians were exacerbated and unnecessarily prolonged by economic aid and military support from the United States.
Despite the energy, dedication and risk taken to provide political backing for the sanctuary state endeavor, it was a short-lived experiment in New Mexico. In fact, the controversial proclamation that conjured its existence did not last beyond Governor Anaya’s final eight months in office. As stated previously, Republican Governor, Garrey Carruthers, rescinded the proclamation by executive order only a few weeks after assuming office in January of 1987. The order retracting the proclamation cites various reasons for the action pertaining to its potential legal implications. First, the elusive administrative guidelines, which had yet to be concretized as official policy, were offered as evidence of the potential “legal and regulatory boundaries” of the sanctuary state, thereby using the language of the proclamation itself to counter Toney Anaya’s claim that the document was a moral and religious statement and thus, merely symbolic. The order retracting the sanctuary proclamation also stated that the document was inconsistent with U.S. immigration law and overstepped federal authority, thereby impeding the ability of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) to accomplish their enforcement mission.

In a letter addressed to New Mexico State legislators, Governor Anaya, confirmed that his intention for issuing the sanctuary declaration was to “express my support for the equal and impartial treatment of Central American refugees who flee this nation for refuge and to focus state and national debate on this question” (April 11, 1986). His primary concern was that refugees from El Salvador and Guatemala
were being systematically denied refugee status and political asylum in the United States in violation of federal and international law. The 1980 Refugee Act elevated quotas for refugee admissions, expanded the definition of the category of “refugee” and established an “orderly but flexible” procedure for dealing with refugee emergencies (Bon 2008). In accordance with the Geneva Conventions, which obligates nations to assist people fleeing war or political persecution, the 1980 Refugee Act established an asylum provision in immigration law which would allow refugees an extended period of voluntary departure so they could remain in the United States at least temporarily without fear of deportation.

However, the problem as Anaya had clearly stated in agreement with sanctuary movement members and supporters, was not that the laws already in place were flawed, rather the discriminatory manner in which they were being applied (Anaya 1986). For example, refugees from communist countries in Europe as well as those from Indochina and the Middle East were granted refugee status and political asylum at much higher rates than Central Americans. Because they were more often labeled, “economic refugees” (escaping poverty, not political persecution) asylum seekers from Central America were routinely denied legal protections. Anaya cites “systematic discrimination” as the primary reason for declaring New Mexico a state of sanctuary as a way to draw attention to this injustice. More often than not, from the perspective of the INS and other Republican elected officials, the declaration was an act of defiance and noncooperation with the federal immigration law. As a legally impotent document lacking policy guidelines, I tend fall on the side of Toney Anaya’s
assertion that the proclamation was not an act of defiance. In my view it was a rather accommodative political statement in opposition to the unfair treatment of Central American migrants. Where the waters get choppy is in the vernacular interpretation of the proclamation. It served the purpose of legitimizing the local sanctuary movement’s moral claims and justified the “rescue missions” that activists were engaging in to bring Central Americans across the U.S. - Mexico border.

By the time Governor Anaya made his declaration sanctuary networks in El Paso, Texas and New Mexico were already well established and there was growing awareness locally and nationally of the failures of Reagan’s Central American policy. Basically, the tide was on the brink of turning, which made Governor Anaya’s sanctuary proclamation a politically viable action. More importantly, he already had strong political backing for the action in the state legislature. For instance, two Memorials in support of the Moakley-DeConcini Bill (renamed the Central American Studies and Temporary Relief Act of 1987), which granted temporary suspension of the detention and deportation of Central American refugees, passed with large bipartisan majorities the year prior to Governor Anaya’s proclamation in January of 1985. The Memorials call attention to the systematic discrimination against Central American refugees due to the federal government’s unwillingness to comply with international law (the 1968 United Nations Convention on the status of refugees) and the Refugee Act of 1980. They also highlight statistics showing that political asylum was being granted at much higher rates to refugees from communist countries in Asia and Europe during the same period, while denying temporary stay of departure to
Central Americans who were more often than not designated “economic migrants” and therefore, categorized as “illegal aliens” subject to detention and deportation. During the period 1981-1984, for example, more than 32,241 Salvadoran refugees applied for political asylum in the United States, but less than 3% of these applicants were approved (Bon 2008). Sanctuary activists consistently cited this information to justify illegal border crossings and for providing hospitality and other kinds of assistance to Central American migrants.

Practical activists argued that the Sanctuary Movement would not be necessary if the United States government would simply comply with the domestic and international regulations already in place. This is an example of a popular interpretation of the law becoming authoritative through the repetition, circulation and consolidation of a vested “public” (Niezen 2010). However, because this reinterpretation of the law arose from a faith-based movement drawing from theological sources as the basis for a moral critique of Reagan’s Central American policy and INS practices, this particular version of public justice can be better understood as a “religious interpretation” of the law (Bezdek 1995). Sanctuary activists’ justifications for helping refugees, sometimes in violation of U.S. immigration law, were premised upon religious motivations and Biblical references, which emerged as a religious reading of secular laws as unjust and immoral.

Although it is unlikely that Governor Anaya would have issued the sanctuary proclamation without the political cover that broad bi-partisan support for Central American refugees offered, there is no question that he genuinely agreed with the
sanctuary movement’s analysis of the situation. A graduate of Georgetown University and former Attorney General for New Mexico, Anaya had a credible academic interest in Central American issues as evidenced in an article he wrote for the Hofstra Law Review (1986) supporting the sanctuary movement on legal, moral, and ethical grounds. The article outlines the ways in which the U.S. Government had violated international and domestic law pertaining to refugees by continuing to detain and deport Central Americans fleeing the war-torn region. In addition, Anaya refused to send the New Mexico National Guard to Honduras when the Pentagon requested the state’s units be deployed to participate in training exercises in the country.

Proclaiming Political Theology

The sanctuary proclamation matched statements and citations used in the legislative Memorials as well as in Santa Fe’s sanctuary city resolution however, it departs from them in its use of explicitly religious language and in this way, is rather sui generis. New Mexico was the first to become a sanctuary state, but three other states (New York, Wisconsin and Massachusetts) made similar declarations soon thereafter. Wisconsin Governor, Anthony S. Earl, a fellow Democrat and sanctuary advocate, issued a similar proclamation on September 10, 1986. In a letter to Toney Anaya, Governor Earl noted that he had modeled Wisconsin’s declaration on New Mexico’s and even drew upon the same language when drafting his document. The document is comparable in many ways but does not include any of the religious references and Biblical citations found in Anaya’s proclamation. This is also true of the New York and Massachusetts proclamations. In effect, they are purely secular in
tone and content. Governor Anaya stated that his declaration was primarily a “symbolic, moral and religious statement,” and this religious orientation distinguishes New Mexico’s sanctuary proclamation from those issued in other states. In effect, the sanctuary movement’s religious interpretation of the law became a key component of Anaya’s proclamation, which also places the document within the purview of a political theology.

What is a “proclamation” and what kind of political work can it accomplish? It does not perform the same function as a municipal resolution or legislative Memorial, which require a majority vote, nor does it count as an executive order, which sets forth immediate policy changes for state employees once issued. Turning to the written document itself for answers to this question, New Mexico’s sanctuary proclamation (like all proclamations, resolutions, and legislative proposals) contains of a variety of thoughtful references, or “Whereas” statements in support of its purpose and each of these statements is carefully constructed, cogently encapsulating the cultural, political and historical environment in which the document emerged.

In the first clause the religious leaders from an array of dominations who lobbied for the declaration are acknowledged to establish the reasons behind the action and in an effort to address the public to which it speaks directly. Then Anaya places the proclamation in a broader context - the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Statue of Liberty – to address a broader audience. He cites the inscription: “Give me your tired, your poor, you huddle masses yearning to breath free…” is quoted from the base of the icon. Reference to the icon of American exceptionalism,
along with its inscription recalling the myth of the immigrant nation, emplaces Central American refugees within the powerful narrative of American nationalism. Ali Behdad has argued that the tension between hospitality and hostility toward immigrants is productive, in that this very opposition is a collaborative force in solidifying the myth of the nation (2005: 32)

Next, the declaration references “Central American Week,” which was observed March 24 – 30, 1986, and its purpose in commemorating the sixth anniversary of the murder of Archbishop Oscar Romero of El Salvador. Romero’s passionate plea for peace is included in the next line of the proclamation: “In the name of God, then, and in the name of this suffering people whose laments reach up to the heavens every day with greater intensity, I beg you, I beseech you, I command you in the name of God: Stop the repression!” The martyred Archbishop Romero became a popular saint for Catholic sanctuary advocates, but many viewed his life and words as inspirational (Coutin 1997). Continuing with the religious language, the next few statements in the proclamation cite Biblical sources and Christian traditions. The Easter Season as a time “when spiritual considerations are paramount” serves as a preface to the inclusion of passages from the Bible that address the moral question of sanctuary; “speak up for those who cannot speak for themselves, for the rights of all who are destitute (Proverbs 31:8); “Open they mount, judge righteously, and plead the cause of the poor and needy” (Proverbs 31:9); and “Love the sojourners, for you are sojourners in the Land of Egypt” (Deuteronomy 10:19). These Biblical sources
were commonly as moral and religious justifications for the sanctuary movement in literature, newsletters, and other texts.

Comparison between the sanctuary movement and other historical periods in which persecuted individuals were provided refuge are also mentioned. Specifically, the Underground Railroad during the Civil War period, which facilitated the escape of African American slaves to the safety in the North. It also cites providing refuge to the Jews during WWII. In the proclamation, these historical references are referred to as an “honorable and moral” American tradition in the liberal sense and are used to establish a deeper historical concept of sanctuary as embedded within Christianity and the history of the nation. These statements could be taken to justify breaking unjust laws in pursuit of a higher moral cause. Throughout the proclamation appeals are made to the sanctuary movement’s core values, but in the interest of establishing a secular balance, statements that appeal to common “American values” directly follow them. This strategic paring of sanctuary’s religious justifications alongside the language of nationalism produced the sanctuary state as a moral good and as a political argument well attuned to secularists and those unsympathetic to the Central American plight as a way to universalize the declaration and to bring the idea of sanctuary into the realm of sacred American values.

The second part of the proclamation discusses the rationale behind the two Memorials passed in the New Mexico State Legislature in 1985 recommending that the United States government reconsider its current policies regarding Central American refugees, namely migrants from El Salvador, constituted as a dangerous
place where civil strife was particularly destructive. This section reiterates the arguments outlined in the Memorials, such as the United States being a full contracting party in the 1968 United Nations Conventions on the Status of Refugees which prohibits participating nations from expelling or forcibly returning refugees to territories where their lives or freedoms are threatened on account of race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership in a particular social group. Incidentally, historian Ron Tempo’s study of the evolution of refugee policy in the United States reveals how the 1968 Protocol was an “empty diplomatic and public relations gambit” and would not significantly alter existing refugee classifications or admissions policies in the United States (2008: 173). Based on this assessment, signing on to the Protocol was patently an empty gesture.

Tempo also recounts the collaborations between Reagan’s Cold War policy agenda and refugee law throughout 1980s. The Refugee Act of 1980, which assigned annual quotas for refugee admissions, made classificatory distinctions between, “immigrant,” “refugee,” and “asylum” but generally expanded the definition of refugee to be more inclusive (2008: 186). Nevertheless, as previously stated, the Reagan administration favored admissions from communist countries, particularly Indochina, the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe making the classification system a useful political tool towards the advancement of his foreign policy agenda (Tempo Bon: 187). Therefore, since its inception, refugee policy has always been a matter of politics and the assertion of U.S. national interests. Apparently, refugee policy is a
primary instrument of governmentality or the power to decide on the exception (Foucault et al. 1991).

The politics of refugee policy during the 1980s is revealed in the unfair treatment of Central American migrants – they were made the objects of sovereign power in that few exceptions were made, while at the same time, they became an exceptional category of migrant available for sanctuary’s protections (Lippert 2005). Reagan used the refugee crisis to further his Cold War rampage against communism by firing up xenophobic fears about the massive influx of Salvadoran and Guatemalan refugees. The argument was that funding the Contras was the only way to crush the spread of communism in the region, a project that would have the added benefit of curbing the flow of “feet people”\(^\text{17}\) attempting to escape the turmoil by improving economic and social conditions in their homeland (Bon 2008: 189). At the same time, this policy agenda became politically untenable because funding the Contras had the opposite of effect. It propelled and sustained the mass exodus of Salvadoran refugees north to the United States and Canada. As a result, the legibility of Salvadorans became a liability for the Reagan administration. Admitting large numbers of migrants from Central America and giving them legal status would make them legible signifying the futility of Reagan’s military ventures in El Salvador. While refugee and asylum applications rose to unprecedented levels during the 1980s, refugee

---

\(^{17}\) Tempo (2008) mentions that Reagan referred to Salvadoran and Guatemalan refugees in a derogatory manner as “feet people” because many were Indigenous people who had walked the long journey from their homelands to the United States. They had also walked across the U.S. – Mexico border illegally.
admissions were particularly restrictive across the board under Reagan who at least in theory, favored anti-immigrant groups and policies (Bon 2008).

Focusing on the national and international policy actions, the Toney Anaya’s sanctuary proclamation mentions a 1983 resolution passed by Congress requesting the suspension of deportation of refugees which underscores the “years of civil strife and disruption in Central America that resulted in thousands of deaths and hundreds of thousands of refugees fleeing persecution, torture, assassination, and turmoil.” This particular statement draws attention to the humanitarian crisis in Central America and attests to the bona fide refugee status of those fleeing the violence as recognized by Congress, the United Nations Commission on Refugees, and even in reports commissioned by the Reagan Administration itself.

The proclamation cites the “Kissinger Commission” which was a report issued in January of 1984 by the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America. Although the report confirmed the horrible conditions in El Salvador, it recommended doubling military aid from the previous year. Congress complied, increasing funding for the counter-insurgency in El Salvador under the guise of supporting economic development, humanitarian aid, human rights, and democratization. In essence, much like George W. Bush’s “War on Terror,” Reagan’s Central American policy amounted to the same contradictory, and ultimately impossible premise of building democracy while waging war and destruction (Dillon 1988).

This brings us to the paradox of the Reagan Era – the amnesty incident. President Reagan authorized the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act or IRCA
(Public Law 99-603; 100 Stat. 3359), which is notable for its amnesty provision for undocumented individuals who had entered without inspection or overstayed visas, but had been continuously present in the U.S. since January 1, 1982. However, this generosity came at the price of new restrictive immigration reforms such as employer sanctions for hiring undocumented workers and increased funding for the INS and border security. According to anthropologist, Nicholas De Geneva, immigration policy is responsible for the “legal production of illegality” due to the increasingly restrictive quotas and bureaucratic barriers on legal migration from Latin America and Mexico, in particular (2005: 234). The IRCA was no exception. While it offered a path to legalization certain migrants, it further foreclosed possibilities for legal migration or adjustment of status for the vast majority of undocumented migrants residing in the United States who did not qualify for the amnesty and also for future generations of migrants to come thereafter.

The final statements of the proclamation turn back to the local, affirming Santa Fe’s sanctuary status and the sanctuary resolutions passed in other cities across the country. The proclamation concludes with a declarative statement: “I Toney Anaya, Governor of the State of New Mexico, do hereby proclaim New Mexico to be a ‘State of Sanctuary’ for Central American refugees.” This statement is followed up with the promise of administrative guidelines for State employees, which would clearly define the legal and regulatory boundary lines of sanctuary protections. The proclamation ends with a statement of solidarity with the sanctuary movement: “The State of New Mexico commends those civic and religious organizations, an the
compassionate and dedicated individual volunteers assisting these organizations, who are working in New Mexico and throughout this country to extend the spirit of ‘sanctuary’ to all those in need.”

In the final analysis, Governor Anaya’s sanctuary proclamation is a political theology. It is an amalgam of American liberal values and national mythologies, religious language and quotations relevant to the sanctuary movement, selected information from international and national policy actions and reports on Central America, was well as local municipal and state level actions in support of sanctuary. Finally, while claiming that the proclamation was largely a symbolic gesture and therefore, not legally binding, Anaya intended to back up the sanctuary state with policy recommendations and administrative guidelines defining how state employees (including state police) should proceed. As a liminal document that hung in the balance between a symbolic religious statement and an official proclamation of law, the sanctuary proclamation was a matter of interpretation, effecting unexpected changes in both legal and religious spheres.

Statements of Exception

New Mexico’s declared status as a state for sanctuary turned the national and international media spotlights on Governor Anaya and spurred a firestorm of controversy locally. However, most of the letters the Governor received in response to the action from New Mexicans and people outside the state were overwhelmingly positive. Sylvia Rosales, the Executive Director of the Central American Refugee Center in Washington, D.C. thanked Anaya profusely on behalf of her compatriots
from El Salvador and Guatemala for the “the struggle that we are sure you confronted
in the act of proclaiming New Mexico a symbol of justice and mercy for the more
than 500,000 refugees in this country, which has for us, has come to symbolize hope,
democracy, and liberty.” She also describes in passionate detail the hardships and
tireless efforts of Salvadoran community to “achieve recognition as refugees from a
nation at war and to break the divisive hostility that has impeded us from being
received with welcome arms in a foreign land.” This was the only letter written by a
Central American refugee responding to Anaya’s sanctuary state proclamation. In
fact, apart from the celebratory telegram he received from Cesar Chávez, all the other
letters of support came from Anglo sanctuary advocates, which underscores the
white, middle-class and liberal Christian orientation of movement members and
supporters in New Mexico and beyond.

Governor Anaya also received a passionate letter of support from John Fife,
the primary spokesperson for the national Sanctuary Movement. Fife published his
letter in the form of an op-ed, which appeared in the *Albuquerque Journal* the day
after Anaya issued his proclamation. Fife, Pastor of Southside Presbyterian in Tucson,
Arizona, cast the sanctuary movement’s mission as a transcendental battle between
good and evil. He begins his dramatic letter with a hellish scene from the border
drama unfolding in Arizona - rape, death, torture, and abuse of Salvadoran refugees at
the hands of pimps, racist border patrolmen and other shady characters.
A common rhetorical device deployed in sanctuary movement publications (including scholarly literature on the topic) casts Central America as a place to die and refugees as victims in need of protection. The borderlands became a proxy for this discourse.

The testimonies from refugees and sanctuary allies about the human suffering (physical and psychological) of surviving war are real and I am not attempting to undermine these experiences with this critique of John Fife’s letter. Fife accentuates border violence to construct a religious and moral argument about what is at stake in sanctuary and as a choice between good and evil: “New Mexico, with Governor Toney Anaya’s leadership, is the exception, the first state in the Union to declare that Central American refugees within its borders are not longer below the law and without human rights. New Mexico has declared its intention to respect our country’s refugee laws in the face of the federal government’s massive violations…forcing state, county and city governments to choose between Governor Anaya’s and the Regional Immigration Commissioner, Harold Ezell’s way.”

While New Mexicans were largely supportive of the sanctuary state, those who opposed the action tended to dominate the conversation often accusing Governor Anaya of encouraging people to break the law. Republican state senator, Les Houston, for instance, declared his Albuquerque district 19, in the Northeast Heights near the Kirtland Air Force Base, a “non-sanctuary” zone in protest. Although the sanctuary proclamation had no legal authority over INS, Mario Ortiz, spokesman for the Immigration and Naturalization Service at the time, called the action a “cruel hoax
that would draw more illegal aliens into the state under the false impression that they
would be protected from deportation or be given refugee status."

David Vandersall, the Regional Commissioner for the INS, issued a press
release in which he stated, “Although Governor Anaya claims that his proclamation is
not unlawful, the governor freely admits that he seeks to discourage cooperation with
the INS.” The verbal tussle between Toney Anaya and INS was resolved after he met
with Vandersall to discuss the action. Anaya defended his proclamation as a
“symbolic, moral statement” and made a sharp distinction between Central American
refugees fleeing for their lives, and “illegal aliens” from Mexico. Anaya repeatedly
emphasized in official communications and media statements that the sanctuary
declaration was a symbolic gesture pertaining exclusively to refugees from Central
America - the proclamation did not speak to the question of unauthorized migration
from Mexico and other Latin American countries.

Despite strong public support for the action, Governor Anaya’s proclamation
became the target of criticism of Republican and conservative pundits as well as INS
administrators. Critics labeled the proclamation a lawless act and argued that
lobbying Congress to amend the Refugee Act of 1980 was an action unsuitable for
Governor to undertake. As expected, the debate over the legal consequences of the
proclamation turned on the question of illegal immigration from Mexico. In April of
1986, only a few weeks after issuing the proclamation, Anaya appeared on ABC’s
Nightline to defend his decision to declare New Mexico a state for sanctuary. “I
would hope one of these days the morality of this country will rise and recognize that
it’s the INS that’s breaking the law and not those behind this movement." This controversial statement was certainly part of the polemic that arose between the Governor and INS officials in the press as discussed previously, but the statement also empowered sanctuary workers in New Mexico and other border states where confrontations with INS were (and continue to be) a constant reminder of the power of the state to define national boundaries and determine who can cross them. In subsequent interviews about the sanctuary state proclamation Governor Anaya was more conservative and tempered in his responses.

On June 29, 1986, Anaya appeared via satellite on the ABC News program, *This Week with David Brinkley*, to comment on immigration issues and defend the sanctuary state. Guests included INS Commissioner, Alan Nelson, Senator, Alan K. Simpson (R-Wyoming) and Colorado Governor, Richard D. Lamm (who continues to be notorious for his anti-immigrant extremism). Sam Donaldson joined David Brinkley and News Analyst, George Will on the show. Interpreting Anaya’s sanctuary state as a welcome mat for all illegal immigrants, Brinkley asked, “Tell me, how many immigrants should we take?” Anaya began his response with an explanation of what he intended to accomplish with his declaration stating that, “my proclamation is a symbolic effort to try to draw attention to the fact that our country is not abiding by international law or federal law when we are dealing with people fleeing for fear of persecution.”

Brinkley turned the conversation back to the Mexican question: “So what? You’re willing to take all those in danger of being persecuted and how about
Mexicans? Anaya responded first by separating the Central American situation from the question of illegal immigration and suggested that unauthorized immigrants (Mexicans) already living in the United States should be given some kind of amnesty while at the same time curbing the flow of migration by tightening up border security. What is striking about this interview is the association between Mexican nationality and illegality and the reframing of the sanctuary issue in terms of undocumented migration. Instead of contesting this move, Anaya played into the trap of making Central Americans an exceptional category of migrant instead of emphasizing the moral critique of the Reagan’s Central American policy or discussing how the immigration system discriminates against both Central American refugees and Mexican migrants, albeit in different ways. Anaya’s suggestion that immigration reform should include a path to legalization and more border enforcement should sound familiar in light of contemporary immigration politics. It echoes the Democrats’ contradictory position on immigration policy today.

Sanctuary and Chicano Political Power

The sanctuary state declaration propelled Governor Anaya onto the national stage to comment on the immigration debate and the issue of sanctuary. Although he was depicted as the leader of a “rouge state” out of step with the rest of the nation in some instances, the fact that he had taken a controversial stand on the moral imperative of asylum for Central American refugees made him a de facto expert on sanctuary and immigration because of the conflation of the issues in the media. Toney Anaya’s national notoriety during his tenure was rather unprecedented. He admits that
in the 1980s, governors did not have a prominent role on the national stage as they do today. Furthermore, although he was positioned as having expertise on immigration as a border state governor, New Mexico’s immigrant population was small in comparison to other receiving states such as California and Texas. About thirty thousand undocumented immigrants from Mexico and Latin America were residing in New Mexico during the Anaya administration and fewer than one thousand of them were Central American refugees (Human Rights Commission of New Mexico Report 1986).

Governor Anaya entered the national foreign policy making arena partly as a result of the notoriety he gained by declaring New Mexico a sanctuary state. In 1985, with the help of Bill Richardson who was serving in the Congressional House of Representatives at the time, Anaya was appointed to the Commission for the Study of International Migration and Cooperative Economic Development, a committee established to make international policy recommendations to Congress. However, before being appointed to this national post, Governor Anaya was active in discussions leading to the passage of the IRCA, the most important comprehensive immigration reform legislation that came out of the Reagan Administration.

The IRCA, besides offering amnesty to certain classes of undocumented migrants residing in the United States, was the first immigration bill to include employer sanctions for hiring undocumented workers. In hindsight, it is clear that this provision did not curb the flow of unauthorized labor migration as intended. Instead, it created a cottage industry for false identity documents and social security numbers
while at the same time making working conditions more precarious for undocumented workers (De Genova 2005). Because the onerous of proving that a person is legally authorized to work falls on the worker and not the employer, employers could claim (and surely continue to do so) that they were unaware that their workers were not properly documented. Furthermore, with the addition of loopholes such as education periods, appeals and minimal fines, the sanctions for hiring undocumented workers are minimal. In fact, the entire system benefited employers who have an even more vulnerable and exploitable labor force, which because of their undocumented status are also retractable. This situation gives the term, "at will employee" an entirely different meaning for informally authorized workers.

At the time that the IRCA was under consideration some Democrats argued that employer sanctions would increase discrimination against workers who appeared to be undocumented. Responding to this issue, Governor Anaya commented that, “Hispanics appear to be both the principal victims of this bill and the principal beneficiaries.” The contradictory nature of the IRCA was its most notable feature: It offered amnesty to some undocumented migrants, while punishing those who could not qualify for legalization. In addition, the law provided for a guest worker program that would allow a certain number of agricultural workers to obtain a green card, but also allocated an additional $4 billion to states for increased enforcement measures. The border control provisions were intended to tighten border security and reimburse states for verification programs to ensure that welfare benefits and jobs were reserved
for citizens and individuals with proof of legal presence in the United States. Interestingly, the IRCA passed the same year that Governor Anaya issued the sanctuary proclamation and although he disagreed with aspects of the Bill, such as the discrimination issue and the guest worker program, which he termed “slave labor,” Anaya fully supported the border enforcement entitlements.¹²

As these examples illustrate, Governor Anaya was fully integrated into the immigration policymaking arena. Therefore, it may be safe to assume that the sanctuary proclamation was never intended to radically change or circumvent immigration policy as its critics claimed. Governor Anaya’s accommodative position is clearly evidenced in the article he published in the Hofstra Law Review (1986) on the sanctuary movement. In this article he outlines the biblical and moral imperatives that underpin the concept of sanctuary, but focuses his argument on three central policy issues: 1) the United States is violating international and federal law by deporting Salvadorans and Guatemalans back to their homelands; 2) the discriminatory application of refugee designation and granting of asylum against Central Americans; 3) the Geneva Conventions protection of the right of U.S. citizens to offer humanitarian aid to refugees. The article, which was also presented as a lecture on June 26, 1986 before the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., was a serious analysis of the failure of the U.S. government to address the Central American issue in a humane and ethical manner, the lack of transparency about U.S. military intervention in the region, and the obfuscation of the political motivations behind the persecution of the Sanctuary Movement. The arguments and scholarly evidence
presented in this article provide the basis and justification for his sanctuary proclamation.

While Governor Anaya’s intellectual and political investment in the Central American cause is clearly evidenced in his writings and lectures on the topic and in his controversial move to establish (symbolically or otherwise) a state for sanctuary there were other political motivations behind the proclamation. During the summer of 1982, while Anaya was a candidate for the office of Governor, he made a trip to Mexico City to meet with Mexican presidential candidate, Miguel de la Madrid (PRI). The meeting was to be focused on tourism and trade between the New Mexico and Mexico’s border states. Political consultants for both candidates had advised them to avoid any discussion issues of national concern such as immigration or foreign policy. While in Mexico, Anaya attended a press conference in which he was asked, among other topics, to comment on his impressions of President Ronald Reagan. In a moment that called for a careful diplomatic answer, Anaya instead responded off the cuff stating that, “President Reagan is the most anti-Hispanic president in my memory.”

When I interviewed former Governor Anaya at his law office in Santa Fe in January of 2011, he recalled his gaff in Mexico with some regret. The comment would come back to haunt him in unexpected ways. According to Anaya’s version of events, U.S. Attorney, William Lutz, a Reagan appointee and conservative extremist, made it his personal mission to make Toney Anaya’s tenure as Governor a living hell. Lutz brought up numerous frivolous charges, scandalous accusations, and
investigations into Governor Anaya’s dealings and those of members of his administration, none of which resulted in any evidence of wrongdoing. Anaya recalled feeling personally victimized by Lutz who went to extreme measures to delegitimize and discredit him and his administration. “They did make life very difficult for me and for my family, recalled Anaya, “Members of my family were investigated and I was the subject of thirteen grand juries and an IRS criminal investigation.” While Lutz’s vendetta against the Governor was unprofessional and certainly and a waste of the state’s resources, Anaya claims that these tactics were part of a national Republican strategy to undermine minority elected officials particularly African American and Hispanic Democrats. In essence, the sanctuary proclamation was not only a critique of immigration policy and the treatment of Central Americans, but also part of a broader political struggle against the Reagan Administration.

Sanctuary in New Mexico

Governor Anaya’s sanctuary proclamation was not solely of his own creation, nor was it entirely exceptional or rebellious (hundreds of sanctuary cites were established across the nation during the 1980s). The action followed at least a decade of sanctuary activity and activism in northern New Mexico and the southern border region of Las Cruces and El Paso, Texas. Sanctuary activism in New Mexico grew out of and also transformed already existing social networks such as Bible study groups, civil rights organizations, as well as artist collectives into sites of transnational political participation and activism.
The New Mexico Council of Churches was the institutional arm and legitimate face of the local sanctuary movement. Under the leadership of Mary Ann Fisk and Jane Bergquest, who worked together to coordinate the Hospitality Committee for the Central American Refugees Task Force, the organization built a network of individuals through churches and other venues who worked to educate the public about Central American issues and raise funds for their initiatives. They also recruited people to assist in providing housing and other kinds of support for Salvadoran and Guatemalan refugees passing through Albuquerque and Santa Fe. Beyond growing the movement and raising funds for the Hospitality Committee, which was the front line for public education initiatives and for hosting refugees, the New Mexico Conference of Churches also worked to legitimize the sanctuary movement by providing it an institutional structure or public face.

The Catholic Church Diocese of New Mexico, under the administration of the late Archbishop Robert Sánchez, vigorously supported the sanctuary movement. Sánchez wrote letters of support to legislators and made various public statements about the role of the Catholic churches in providing assistance to Central American refugees. Many local Hispano and Anglo Catholics quietly participated in the work of providing sanctuary for refugees by hosting them or raising funds as individuals, but only one Catholic parish in New Mexico declared itself a public sanctuary - Church of the Risen Savior in Albuquerque. However, this declaration was again, largely symbolic, since the parish did not house any refugees. Nevertheless, the Pastor, Father Paul Baca and his sister, Betty Baca, were committed to social justice work
and many parishioners at Risen Savior were involved in movement indirectly. The reason that more Catholic parishes supportive of the Central American cause never declared themselves public sanctuaries may be related to the fact that the Catholic Church, unlike Protestant congregations, have an established tradition of helping refugees and have a vast institutional structure of charitable organizations in place to facilitate refugee resettlement and provide assistance.

Protestant congregations in Albuquerque and Santa Fe debated the question of declaring public sanctuary often times leading to tension and conflict within the parish. St. Andrews Presbyterian in Albuquerque for instance, debated the issue but there were many parishioners who worked for the Sandia Laboratories and other institutions run by the federal government who feared negative repercussions. Basically, they feared that they would lose their jobs by mere association with the sanctuary movement. Erik Mason, currently an elder at Westminster Presbyterian in Santa Fe, remembered how discussions about declaring the church a public sanctuary created friction and discord among congregants at First Presbyterian Church, fracturing the parish along political lines.

The Pastor of First Presbyterian in Santa Fe, James Brown, was a stanch supporter of sanctuary and took an active role in the movement. He welcomed refugee families into his home and made sanctuary runs across the U.S. - Mexico border. In 1984, Pastor Brown won the Santa Fe New Mexican’s “Those Who Make a Difference” award for establishing a Central American Refugee Task Force, which helped Guatemalan and Salvadoran refugees with food, clothing, transportation, legal
fees, and moral support\textsuperscript{16}. While, Brown enthusiastically supported Governor Anaya’s sanctuary proclamation, not everyone in his flock agreed with his position creating tension and conflict within the congregation. The smaller Westminster Presbyterian never officially declared sanctuary, but they did sponsor a Salvadoran family who decided to settle in Santa Fe and whose descendants continue to be active members in the parish.

On August 19, 1984, the Santa Fe Friends Meeting became the first religious institution to declare itself a public sanctuary for Central American refugees. The Albuquerque Friends Meeting (Quakers) followed suit in November of the same year. As the Quaker tradition dictates, this decision was made through unanimous consensus, which was a difficult and painful process for everyone. The deliberations, which occurred over several months, resulted in some members having to recuse themselves from the decision altogether, a move that alienated them from the Quaker community. The Santa Fe Meeting House was largely responsible for organizing the inter-faith movement and working with secular organizations to successfully lobby members of the Santa Fe City Council to pass a resolution declaring Santa Fe a “sanctuary city” in 1985.

In fact, Santa Fe’s sanctuary resolution may actually trump San Francisco’s claim to fame as the first city in the United States to declare themselves a “City and County of Refuge for Central American refugees.” San Francisco’s original 1985 resolution simply stated that, “city departments shall not discriminate against Salvadorian and Guatemalan refugees based on immigration status” (Pham 2006: 160).
It was not until 1989 that San Francisco passed an ordinance that more generally prohibited city employees from assisting in the enforcement of immigration laws or gathering or disseminating information about immigration status, unless required by law (Pham 2006: 1388).

In contrast, Santa Fe’s 1985 sanctuary resolution mandated that “agents, agencies, offers and employees, in the performance of official duties shall not to the extent legally possible, assist or voluntarily cooperate with Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) investigations or arrest procedures relating to alleged violations of immigration law by Salvadorans and Guatemalans.” Based on this comparison, Santa Fe’s 1985 resolution was a legally binding statement of non-corporation with INS and included more comprehensive and enforceable policy directives than did San Francisco’s initial soft handed anti-discrimination resolution. If the sanctuary city were defined as a protective space where the threat of deportation is minimized through a legally binding assertion of local sovereignty or non-cooperation with federal immigration enforcement, than Santa Fe would indeed usurp San Francisco's claim to being the first sanctuary city in the nation.

Competitive spirits aside, sanctuary declarations as statements of non-cooperation have a narrow scope of influence because in reality, the drafting and enforcement of immigration law is the purview of the federal government (Pham 2006; Varsanyi 2010). Immigration agents can detain and deport people regardless of the establishment of declarations of non-corporation at the local or state level. Nevertheless, sanctuary city resolutions do present a challenge to the exclusions of
citizenship by including the undocumented in the local community, thereby incorporating them as “local citizens” offering them rights and privileges that they are denied outside the space of the sanctuary city (Villazor 2010: 582). In this way, the sanctuary city becomes a space of differential membership in a locality based on residency, rather than national citizenship. From this perspective, Governor Anaya’s declaration of the entire state of New Mexico as a zone of differential membership had potential. However, the declaration specified that protective status be exclusively reserved for Central American refugees as an exceptional category of migrants and thus, undocumented residents from elsewhere are excluded.

This partial extension of local citizenship to a particular class of undocumented persons is one of the critiques of sanctuary declarations more generally. Once a church, city, or state is declared a sanctuary space the parameters of inclusion and exclusion begin to solidify. What kind of refugee will be admissible? Innocent civilians escaping violence and persecution, or war criminals trained at the School of the Americas, who tortured, kidnapped, and killed their adversaries? The question of membership within notions of the local and citizenship carries exclusions beyond residency or physical presence in a particular place. Citizenship and locality are both culturally defined concepts that are historical and ideological and in different but often collaborative ways, mark the social boundaries of inclusion and exclusion.

Acts of Faith and Politics

In coordination with the New Mexico Conference of Churches, the Inter-faith community in northern New Mexico came together to sponsor a Central American
Caravan in October of 1984, which consisted of three refugee families who were in sanctuary in Los Angeles, California and on their way to another sanctuary church in Davenport, Iowa. Over two hundred people gathered at the Bruit Avenue Baptist Church in Albuquerque to welcome the refugees and hear their testimonies of survival. The purpose of the six-car caravan was to generate public awareness about the crisis in El Salvador. The headliner for the event was none other than former Democratic presidential candidate, Jesse Jackson. In a passionate speech on morality and justice, Jackson critiqued the double standard of the Reagan Administration. Referencing the terrorist bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Beirut, Jackson said, “Unless we’re against terror everywhere, we’ll not have the moral authority to attack it anywhere.” Jackson’s participation in the Central American Caravan illustrates the way in which sanctuary was taken up by African American and Latino politicians as a way to shame the Reagan Administration and rally their own religious base. If Reagan had won the hearts and minds of white Evangelicals, Democrats rallied the Central American cause to energize the Christian Left – liberal Protestants, Catholics, and Jews.

Political change also happened at the individual level through the power of testimony and witnessing. The Albuquerque Friends Meetings organized a number of interfaith forums on Central America and invited refugees passing through the city to present their public testimonies of survival. In October of 1986, Carlos Trujillo from Guatemala and Ricardo Chávez from El Salvador spoke before one hundred and fifty representatives of local churches and synagogues, their faces partially hidden behind
bandanas to protect their identities. This spectacle of veiling was actually used to amplify the identities and testimonies of refugees through a dramatic symbolic marker of the risk they had taken in undergoing their escape only to land in a country as undocumented migrants on the run from INS; their bodies as much as their stories were contraband that could only be shared with insiders. The political strategies of veiling, witnessing and testifying were used to humanize and also dramatize the Central American crisis in order to inspire identification with the cause and to inspire U.S. citizens with the power to influence their government to join the movement (Perla 2008).

Carlos Trujillo came from a middle class family and studied to become a teacher at a public university in Guatemala where he learned about the critical situation of poverty and lack of access to education in rural indigenous communities. Upon graduation he worked as a teacher in a rural village and helped the community organize for better health care, housing, and access to land. His activism made him a political target. The government monitored his actions and he began receiving death threats. After death squads assassinated his co-workers and some of the village leaders were kidnapped, he left his family and escaped to Mexico where he connected with the sanctuary movement. Ricardo Chávez told a horrifying testimony of being tortured and interrogated by soldiers for eight days because of his involvement in a Christian base community in El Salvador. These evocative acts of co-performative witnessing were instrumental in the process of “conversion” that not only produced the sanctuary movement one convert at a time, but served as a form of public
diplomacy that actually impacted foreign policy by diminishing public and Congressional support for Reagan’s Contra War (Perla 2010).

Besides conscious-raising efforts, the Quakers led a vigorous campaign to educate the public and government officials about Central American issues. In the spring of 1985, the Santa Fe City Council passed a resolution declaring La Villa Real de la Santa Fe a “city of refuge” in solidarity with their “Hispanic and Indian neighbors” from El Salvador and Guatemala. This municipal action passed unanimously and unlike Governor Anaya’s proclamation, the resolution was legally binding. Interestingly, Santa Fe was the only city in New Mexico to declare sanctuary status. This is partly due to its liberal political orientation and reputation for being a multicultural Mecca, but also because of its religious diversity and rooted Hispano-Catholic heritage.

On the other hand, although Christians were the most visible and vocal sanctuary activists, the sanctuary movement was an interfaith movement. Some of the most passionate supporters were Jews. Joanne Forman, whose grandparents escaped Berlin and found sanctuary in Chicago, wrote a letter to Governor Anaya chronicling her family history, “I am very mindful of the blessings of safety, and the teachings of the Bible and the Talmud, which teaches us that the ‘stranger’ is our brother and sister, as much as our next-door neighbor.” In a respectful, but forceful way, Forman implored Governor Anaya declare New Mexico a sanctuary state. In addition, Hispanic Protestants also voiced their support for the sanctuary proclamation. The Rio Grande Conference of the United Methodist Church, which represented over
sixteen hundred members in over one hundred Hispanic Protestant congregations in New Mexico and Texas, sent Governor Anaya a supportive and congratulatory letter upon learning about the sanctuary proclamation.

The Santa Fe-based Quakers took part in expanding sanctuary networks in the Southwest and beyond when they accepted a Salvadoran refugee named “José Antonio” into sanctuary. Gary, a member of Santa Fe Friends Meeting remembers picking up José Antonio from Casa Refugio, a shelter for refugees and undocumented migrants located in El Paso, Texas. Casa Refugio was the primary “hub” of sanctuary activity in the border region, although it never declared itself a public sanctuary. Gary disguised himself as if he was going on a weekend retreat to Elephant Butte Lake. He packed his jeep with camping and fishing gear, and strapped a canoe to the top of his all-terrain vehicle. His disguise was so successful that even with José Antonio in plain sight in the passenger’s seat of the jeep, they easily made it through the border patrol check point near Truth or Consequences, New Mexico. Other, more experienced sanctuary workers steered clear of check points altogether by taking alternative routs through the back roads or by traveling the long rout through the mountains of the Gila Wilderness.

Gary, a dedicated Quaker and peace activist, explained that he never knew the real names of the refugees who stayed at the Santa Fe Friends Meeting House and only knew the code names of his Quaker contacts in Arizona with whom he coordinated his activities. These measures helped ensure the anonymity and protection of both refugees and the sanctuary workers helping them escape to safety.
Sanctuary workers in Arizona had learned to be more discrete about their activities after the movement was infiltrated by the FBI in 1984, which lead to the indictment of sixteen sanctuary workers from Tucson, eight of which were convicted in federal court (including John Fife and Jim Corbett) on charges of smuggling and harboring illegal aliens.

*Between Conspiracy and Charity*

There were many people in New Mexico who helped Central American refugees, but did not necessarily identify with the sanctuary movement. The experiences of Patricia (Pat) and Frank Malcolm of Albuquerque exemplify how some Catholics became politicized as a result of their contact with Central American refugees. Pat Malcolm, artist, homemaker, mother of four and dedicated parishioner at Church of the Risen Savior in Albuquerque, was named a “co-conspirator” by the grand jury in the Tucson Sanctuary Trial for housing a Salvadoran family in 1984. She was not charged with any crime and was allowed to return home, but the experience sent shockwaves throughout her white middle-class social circle when the media picked up the story. Pat and Frank Malcolm knew virtually nothing about the sanctuary movement when they began taking Salvadoran refugees into their home. It all began in response to a church bulletin announcement asking for volunteers to sponsor a Salvadoran teenager named, Rene Vides, who had lost his parents in the war. As a member of the Peace and Justice Committee at Risen Savior Catholic Church, Pat learned about the turmoil in Central America and was particularly inspired by the story of Oscar Romero, the Archbishop of El Salvador who was
assassinated for his liberation theology and unwavering support of the poor in opposition to the government persecution of campesinos. The Malcolm family moved to Albuquerque from Brooklyn, New York during the economic crisis of 1972 when the factory they worked for closed down. Recently married with two toddlers and a pregnant dog in tow, they spent seven days driving across the country to New Mexico.

With their children in their early teens, the Malcolms decided that providing a home for Rene Vides would be good for the family in the way that hosting an international student might enrich the lives of their children. The family was instantly smitten with the charming, outgoing, and handsome young man from El Salvador. His parents had been disappeared and likely killed by death squads. Rene found his way out of El Salvador through sanctuary networks and along with a few hundred young people who were orphaned in the war, ended up at Casa Refugio in El Paso, Texas. In fact, most of the refugees who passed through or stayed in New Mexico at the height of the Central American civil wars crossed the U.S.-Mexico border into El Paso, Texas.

The founder and director of Casa Refugio, Gabriel Atencio, assisted hundreds of refugees throughout the 1980s and he continues to witness for the poor and shelter victims of the drug cartel wars in Juárez today. Casa Refugio, an independently run Catholic non-profit organization, never officially declared itself a public sanctuary for reasons that I will discuss shortly, but it is rumored that Gabriel and his cadre of dedicated volunteers arranged transportation and safe harbor for hundreds of Central
American refugees en rout to Canada through formal (officially declared) and informal sanctuary networks across the United States. While Gabriel denies having any direct involvement in organizing these activities through Casa Refugio, many sanctuary workers identify him as a key leader of the sanctuary movement in El Paso, Texas.

Rene Vides came to live with the Malcolms in the summer of 1982 and stayed with the family for five years. He attended Valley High School in Albuquerque and upon graduation he attended a technical college in Tucson where he studied engineering. At the same time they were supporting Rene and helping him get through the asylum application process, the Malcolms cared for sixteen other Salvadoran and Guatemalan orphans who came to them through Casa Refugio over a twelve-year period. Rene and his two younger siblings were able to legalize their status and bring other family members to the United States. The Vides siblings are remembered. They were the first successful asylum cases that Gabriel sponsored through Casa Refugio. Sadly, few Central American migrants who sought refuge at Casa Refugio were able to adjust their status.

In 1984, the Malcolms agreed to temporarily house a Salvadoran family destined for Canada. The family was nervous and uncomfortable throughout their stay. They seemed to know something was wrong, but they were not at liberty to express their suspicions. It turned out that the person who had taken the family to the Malcolm’s residence was an undercover FBI agent who had infiltrated the Tucson sanctuary movement as part of “Operation Sojourner.” Because of the FBI’s use of
illegal tactics such unwarranted tape recording of meetings and surveillance and infiltration of church groups that were not engaged in sanctuary activities and who were not targeted for investigation, the sanctuary activists who were convicted in the Tucson trial were eventually acquitted, given reduced charges or probation upon appeal (Coutin 1993b).

With a hint of relief in her voice, Pat explained that her “middle-class bubble” exploded when the FBI identified her as a “criminal suspect” for acts of generosity and genuine love for the children in her care. Initially, she had understood her work with Casa Refugio as part of a spiritual journey, framed under the rubric of “Christian charity,” but after being directly exposed to the government’s persecution of sanctuary activists in the borderlands, the meaning of her involvement made the leap from charity to the struggle for social justice. “I was getting harassing phone calls from the FBI, pushing me to confess out of the best interest of my family. I had nothing to tell them! We had hosted these families on our own.” When Pat arrived in Arizona for questioning she was not alone. There were over thirty other “conspirators” who were called in for questioning in relation to the Tucson indictments from all over the country. Pat was sent home the first day following a brief interview. “It blew our middle-class Catholic identity, Pat confirmed. “After that experience we became global citizens working for a higher cause.”

After their run-in with the FBI, the Malcolm family’s comfortable middle-class world began to crumble. They were ostracized from the community. Neighbors avoided contact with them and even their fellow parishioners at Risen Savior who had
also participated in the social justice committee began to look at Pat and her husband, Frank, with suspicious and judgmental eyes. “Before it was all theoretical, but now it was real. All of a sudden, my co-workers at my conservative construction company were calling me, ‘Mr. Activist,’ recalled Frank. People began to realize the risk involved in helping Central American refugees and they were scared. Any kind of assistance provided became politicized as a form of dissidence against the U.S. government with potential legal repercussions. “We felt abandoned, but that’s when the sanctuary people contacted us to offer their support. Mary Ann Fisk from the Conference of Churches, and the Inter-faith community, the Quakers and the Mennonites.”

On January 16, 1985, over eighty Albuquerque residents gathered in front of the Society of Friends Meeting House for a candlelight vigil in support of Pat Malcolm and Sister María Luisa Vasquez (also named a conspirator in the Tuscan investigation) and in solidarity with the people of Central America and sanctuary workers in Arizona. “The indictment was my introduction into politics,” recalled Pat. I began to understand my country’s involvement in the horror stories, loss and trauma that the kids who came through our house brought into our lives. I never even protested the Vietnam War! I wasn’t interested until this…something lit in me. I wrote letters, went to rallies and organized through the Conference of Churches.”

Pat’s conversion experience is a theme that runs through the literature on the sanctuary movement. Susan Coutin describes the personal transformation that came with interpreting the world through sanctuary discourses as border crossing. For the
Malcolm family, the transformation meant a complete lifestyle change. They moved from their affluent neighborhood in the Northeast Heights to a working-class Hispano/Mexicano barrio in the South Valley. There, the Central American children they were housing would fit in better and feel more accepted, they ascertained, but it was also a move that allowed the Malcolms to live out their transformed reality.

Years later, when the sanctuary movement had ended, Pat and her daughter visited El Salvador where they participated in mural project in an indigenous community. They also visited Rene Vides’ aunt in the village of San Miguel and paid their respects to his mother who was buried near by (his father was disappeared and never found).

Pat continued to volunteer with Casa Refugio and in 1992, she moved to Juárez to help Gabriel build a second shelter for homeless youth, which he named “Casa Vides” in honor of Rene’s parents. Gabriel had not only helped Rene Vides. He traveled to El Salvador and smuggled out his five siblings who also came to live at Casa Refugio and occasionally with the Malcolms. Gabriel “adopted” the Vides children (Rene’s siblings), became their legal guardian, and helped all of them obtain refugee status. After the Casa Vides project was completed, Pat stayed in Juárez for another nine months living in a cardboard house in the colonias with the poorest residents; migrants from all over Mexico. It was there that she lost her faith in the Catholic Church.

After a long day of building houses, a friend named Lola insisted that they go to the Cathedral to bless the work. They were filthy after a day of working in the mud under the hot sun, but Lola insisted that they enter the church to light a candle and say
a prayer. “That used to be me behind the altar rail,” Pat lamented. “I was in the church choir, I was a Eucharistic minister and all that. Now, I was on the other side of the rail, interrupting mass.” The residents of the colonias were shunned and forced to stand outside the church to hear mass. It was socially unacceptable for the poor to enter the opulent Cathedral. “That was a breaking point for me. I didn’t have to be in the Church. The church is the people.” When Pat returned to Albuquerque, she no longer identified with Risen Savior, her former parish. “The church became more conservative again and I couldn’t relate to the sermons anymore. I tried really hard, but I just couldn’t listen to them.” In the end, Pat’s border crossing led to a crisis of faith that led her away from the institutional Church to embark upon a different spiritual journey.

Sanctuary’s Silences

Gabriel Atencio never used a personal “I” when talking about Casa Refugio. The founders were a group of young adults who had been serving in Catholic ministries and wanted to do this kind of work on a full-time basis. According to Gabriel, one of the founders and the current director of Casa Refugio, the shelter was not established to serve immigrants or refugees; it was created to serve the poor. The building, which is owned privately and is used rent-free, is an inconspicuous and well-worn two-story redbrick building that was built in the 1930s as a hospital for people suffering with tuberculosis. Casa Refugio is located in a somewhat desolate, broken down area of El Paso, situated only a few blocks from the Chamizal Bridge, which connects Texas and Juárez, Mexico. The building has about twenty rooms, a
community dining hall and kitchen, a small reception center and a larger kitchen
where college-age volunteers sort out the eatable fruits and vegetables from the rotten
ones donated from supermarkets and dropped off at the shelter every evening.

The inspiration for Casa Refugio came about through a process of
discernment among a group of young adults, who according to Gabriel, “simply
wanted to live life with a greater depth of meaning and sense of purpose and along the
way we came to understand that the God of Creation identified first and foremost
with the poor and disenfranchised, the marginalized in Scripture, and if we want to
live life with greater meaning we need to place ourselves among the poor.” Casa
Refugio came into existence as a result of the desire of these young adults “to walk
with the poor and see where the poor would take them.” The process of discernment
began in 1976, and on February 3, 1978, Casa Refugio opened its doors to the
homeless. Since shelters in the El Paso area ask for social security numbers and do
not house undocumented immigrants the House became the place for the desperate
and destitute from either side of the border.

“The problem with looking back historically is that we organize history, we
create categories and it all sounds so smooth,” Gabriel began with a stern professorial
tone. “People started doing things and then in retrospect, labels were applied to what
people were doing.” When I interviewed Gabriel in August of 2011, I found him in
the El Paso County Hospital where lay in bed suffering from an infected ulcer on his
lower right leg that refused to heal. The problem likely developed because of stress
and Gabriel’s refusal to stop working to allow his body time to rest and recouperate.
The handsome and youthful-looking man in his early sixties with thick salt and pepper hair and a slight build sat up in his hospital bed hooked up to an IV infusing powerful antibiotics into his bloodstream. In his hands he held *Murder City*, a book about drug cartel violence in Juárez. Now, a new wave of refugees was at his doorstep.

Gazing out his hospital window, Gabriel told me half joking, half serious, that I was lucky to have found him sidelined or I would not have been able to catch up with him for an interview. Taking off his round-rimed glasses and putting his book down on the portable table of half-eaten hospital fare, he paused before responding to my question about when he first began seeing Central Americans at Casa Refugio. Like many of the people I interviewed, bearing witness to sanctuary is a painful experience. “We began seeing Central American refugees at Casa Refugio in the late seventies, that’s when it all started.” In 1979 when the Sandinistas overthrew the government of El Salvador, the INS contacted the Catholic Diocese of El Paso and said that they had detained thirty-six Nicaraguans at the airport. They did not fit the ideal concept of the “refugee” as an innocent civilian or rebellious indigenous peasant escaping oppression and violence as envisioned by the sanctuary movement. These refugees were from the upper middle classes and on the other side. They were a group of twenty-four family members of the twelve highest-ranking military officials of the totalitarian Somocista structure. “We were criticized because it was said that we took in the wrong side,” lamented Gabriel. “This was the problem with the sanctuary movement, people trying define what constitutes sanctuary. When we started Casa
Refugio we set some basic principals…to respond to poorest of the poor. People who had the fewest resources.” At that moment, the Nicaraguan families had no resources, so Casa Refugio responded.

“The shelters refuse to house the undocumented, Gabriel reiterated. They [the Nicaraguans] didn’t have money, but had people in Florida who were raising money to help them. They didn’t have any way to rent hotel rooms. I’m assuming that some of those military generals went back and joined the Contras.” The shocking realization that Gabriel had helped war criminals escape detection or even gather resources in the United States and return to command death squads and kill their own people in Nicaragua or El Salvador lingered with me for many months following our conversation. If we take Gabriel’s process of discernment seriously along with his moral and ethical commitment to do God’s work by serving the poor (or those without resources) and using the Bible as the moral and ethical force behind his actions, then the question of politics - which side of the conflict the refugee was on - disappears. Michel Foucault argued that state power is not expressed in the enforcement of the rule of law, but rather in the power to decide on the exception to those laws (1988). However, Gabriel’s refusal to accept the ideology of the ideal refugee as dictated by the Sanctuary Movement’s discourse is the assertion of another kind of exceptional power – pastoral power.

Foucault understood pastoral power as running parallel to secular rationality or “sovereign power” and defined it as care for the lives of individuals, as a Shepard tends to his sheep (Lippert 2005; Foucault 1988: 145 – 162). Pastoral power, which
Foucault linked to the establishment of the Welfare State, draws from a different form of authority, that of the pastor. The Shepard who cares first and foremost for the individual needs of his flock. The objects of pastoral power are the “sheep,” those under his care and guidance (Lippert 2005). Gabriel enacts pastoral power by following his calling to “walk with the poor” and to serve their individual needs. Casa Refugio was and continues to be a place of sanctuary but Gabriel’s refused to define his work as “sanctuary work” because of the claims it makes on refugees. By enacting a more rigorous form of discernment, based on the moral force of his calling to serve the poor, Gabriel challenged the exceptionalism that not only separated Central American refugees from other migrants, but also defined some refugees as worthy of saving and others as unworthy.

Shortly after the Nicaraguans passed through Casa Refugio, waves of Central American refugees began to arrive, which created a structure of inequality between Mexicans and Central Americas seeking assistance and protection at Casa Refugio.

As time went on and we got into the 1980s the numbers started to grow and then it was just like a floodgate. I remember one day counting and there were one hundred and fifteen Central Americans living in the House. We laugh about it now, but it got to the point that we would turn away people who were not from Central America. This set up a funny dynamic. Mexicans would come to us and try to convince us that they were Central Americans, but when Central Americans met up with Border Patrol they tried to convince them that they were Mexican.

While Gabriel did his best to reject the categories that distinguished the worthy from the unworthy, the power to decide who Border Patrol can deport or who was worthy of sanctuary infused Casa Refugio as well as the identities of Mexicans and Central Americans themselves - they became objects of both state and pastoral power at once.
This is not to say, that migrants did not play with or resist subjection, being defined from without as either a deportable criminal or protected “sheep” worthy of being saved.

Border security was radically different in the 1980s, almost everyone I interviewed reminded me of this. Sanctuary activists bragged about how easy it was to evade Border Patrol agents, circumvent checkpoints, and cross the Rio Grande without detection. Being white and dressed as a tourist or a fisherman on a boating trip provided them with a sense of entitlement. Whiteness as a cover was itself a form of exceptionality - immigration law does not apply to middle-class white people on vacation. However, Gabriel likes to tell the story about one of his Mexican guests who deftly circumvented border security by using false identities:

One of our guests went out to look for work and got picked up by the Border Patrol. He convinced them he was Mexican, signed a voluntary departure and was deported. He was back at the House before lunch. He went out after lunch and got picked up again and deported to Juárez. He was back that same day for dinner. At that time the border patrol documentation system was not digitized and fingerprints were on cards. You could give them a different name every time you were picked up.

This anecdote exemplifies what many sanctuary workers I interviewed nostalgically call, “the golden age of border crossing.” Before the passage of IRCA, which initiated the use of wartime technologies to secure the US – Mexico border, it was much easier to dupe the Border Patrol. In addition, only one checkpoint existed on I10 between El Paso and Van Horn heading west into New Mexico, the highway frequently taken to get to California. Refugees and other migrants passed through the Texas borderlands and New Mexico on their way to more prosperous places like Los
Angeles, Washington D.C., New York, Chicago, and Miami where they had already established strong networks. The vast majority of these refugees came through Casa Refugio. However, Gabriel refused to declare the shelter a public sanctuary even though it certainly functioned as one, because such declarations would compromise their mission to serve the poor no matter who they were, where they came from or what they had done. Gabriel rejected sanctuary’s conceits. For him, the idea of declaring places of sanctuary was a “northern concept” [meaning Chicago] that did not fit the El Paso/Juárez situation, or the borderlands context:

The problem with the sanctuary movement is that the north has the churches and the buildings…we have the bodies. They would take in one family and make a big deal out of it. We had hundreds of people staying at Casa Refugio. We didn’t know how we were going to feed them! The other aspect is the ‘correct refugee’ and the ‘incorrect refugee.’ The correct refugee is one who reflects a certain political perspective in El Salvador or Guatemala. Some people believed that it was an individual who was willing to go public…willing to do the interviews and public advocacy. Casa Refugio was not meant to be a place for refugees, it was meant to be in solidarity with the poor.

Randy Lippert’s (2005) study of Canadian sanctuary incidents is instructive in light of Gabriel’s critique of sanctuary. Lippert expands Foucault’s concept of “pastoral power” to theorize the actions and motivations of faith-based sanctuary workers as an instance of enacting the power of the Good Shepard, understood within the Judeo-Christian tradition (2005:10). One of the primary techniques of pastoral power mirrors the classic anthropological drive for intimate knowledge of the Other - the demand to know the subjects of investigation as objects of analysis. Gabriel’s intimate knowledge of the complexity of individual refugees’ lives was powerful. His personal connection with refugees on all sides of the conflict gave him access to
privileged information including secrets that the U.S. Government was hiding from
the American public. This intimate knowledge gave him a bold sense of vindication
and further cemented his ethical and moral stance against sanctuary’s exclusions and
exceptions:

We also had people who when enough *confianza* [trust] grew sat down with me the way that you are sitting down with me and said to me, ‘I was a member of a death squad.’ They shared with me how they got into the death squad and what they went out and did. You know, I had three young men, one from El Salvador, one from Honduras and one from Guatemala all of them members of death squads, and all of them with identical [stories]. At different times they had each told me, ‘we had been recruited from within the military, there were death squads within the military and directed by the military.’ I am sitting here in El Paso with zero resources and I’m able to determine that the death squads are being operated through the military in those countries, and the U.S. State Department is saying they don’t know? They were lying…they knew.

By 1986, Casa Refugio had organized a clandestine and highly efficient
Underground Railroad into Canada. Gabriel revealed that “we would move people
[refugees] from El Paso to Las Cruces through the mountains and there we connected
with our own people, former volunteers, and we would get them through Buffalo and
Detroit.” His most triumphant moment was when he helped people who had been
detained by the INS and held in the immigration detention facility in El Paso apply
for refugee status. The individuals were released to Casa Refugio where they awaited
an interview with a woman from the Canadian consulate in Dallas. After arranging to
do the interviews at Casa Refugio, the consulate official asked for some time to
review the applications. “As I was leaving she said, ‘one more thing…can you tell
me, is the Government from Guatemala a leftist or a rightist?’ I looked at her and
said, ‘It is extremely authoritarian. It is to the radical right.’ I walked down they hall
thinking, this just can’t be, this just cannot be. They sent us an utterly unprepared person! Everybody that she interviewed she denied and she denied them right there in front of us.”

The only satisfaction that Gabriel had that day was that the official was going to spend a couple more days in El Paso at the corralón [immigration detention center] to conduct more interviews with asylum seekers. In order to do the work more efficiently, she did not process the people she interviewed at Casa Refugio for deportation before leaving so that all the cases could be handled at once. This bought Gabriel some time to get the Underground Railroad on track. Before the official returned to Casa Refugio, several of the individuals who she had denied refugee status were already in Canada. “That was one of the greatest satisfactions in my life,” Gabriel admitted, beaming. “We protected [the sanctuary network] so much that even the volunteer staff did not know what we were doing. I had to do that way. I had no way of knowing if when a person applied to be a volunteer at Casa Refugio they were not an [undercover] FBI agent.” As Lippert points out in the Canadian sanctuary incidents he studied, sovereign power enacted by immigration authorities and sanctuary providers is similar in that they both have the power to decide on exceptions. Even Gabriel’s moral conviction against the exceptionalism inherent within declarations of sanctuary was contradictory. In exercising pastoral power he was forced to decide whose lives were in need of saving. “The network stayed up for a couple of years, and it was very discretionary,” Gabriel explained. “We were very selective about who we sent out. They had to be very high risk people.” Immigration
authorities and consulate officials also made distinctions between economic refugees and those whose lives were in danger. This overlap between state and pastoral powers rests on the practice of discernment; the ability (or the authority) to interpret the law, whether it is God’s law or federal immigration law, and decide on the exception.

*The Sacred Passport*

New Mexico’s sanctuary declaration was viewed as a major victory for people involved in the sanctuary movement locally and beyond. Although Governor Anaya had explicitly stated that the declaration was “symbolic” and held no legal authority, many sanctuary workers believed (or chose to believe) that the sanctuary state was in fact, a reality. The document was interpreted as an authoritative pronouncement of law. Those who were vehemently against the issuance of the proclamation clearly understood this. For instance, opponents of the sanctuary proclamation argued that the administrative guidelines pending approval made the document a policy statement, similar to that of an executive order, and therefore quite different from a “symbolic statement of solidarity” as Governor Anaya had claimed. In fact, this was the primary reason why Governor Garry Caruthers rescinded the sanctuary proclamation during his first month in office. Much like the sanctuary activists, he too believed in its power.

Incontrovertibly, people on both sides of the political divide understood the sanctuary proclamation as a powerful document. It was after all, a pronouncement of law (or something akin to law) from the highest government official in the state of New Mexico. The performativity of the sanctuary proclamation as law-in-the-making
arises from its status as an artifact of political theology – a document that performed as a religious statement (symbolic gesture) and a secular pronouncement of law (policy statement) simultaneously, thereby creating the conditions in which the document took on different meanings, uses, and interpretations and also produced unintended social and legal effects in New Mexico and beyond.

For example, many sanctuary activists believed that the proclamation legitimized the movement and more importantly provided sanctuary workers some measure of political cover and legal protection when engaging in “illegal” border crossings. Gary, a member of the Santa Fe Friends Meeting who transported three Salvadoran men from Casa Refugio in El Paso, Texas to Santa Fe and helped them make a connection through Arizona to their final destination in Los Angeles, California, affirmed that the sanctuary proclamation gave him a sense of comfort and confidence in doing sanctuary work. The document, in his view, was much more than a symbolic gesture. It provided him with an officially recognized moral justification for sanctuary that legitimized his actions, if not entirely legal. Furthermore, political support for the sanctuary movement at the municipal and state levels allowed the movement to expand, which also helped consolidate networks between activists in New Mexico, Arizona, and Texas.

The popular understanding of the legal force behind the sanctuary declaration made the sanctuary state a transcendent reality and transformed the meaning of a “symbolic and religious statement” as Governor Anaya had proclaimed it to be. In practice, sanctuary activists carried the document with them on sanctuary runs across
the US - Mexico border and were prepared to display it to *la migra* if necessary, believing that it gave them special status as residents of New Mexico, a declared sanctuary state. In this way, the document acted as a “sacred passport” that provided protection if not on legal grounds, on moral principal. Authorized by a higher power but also by Governor Toney Anaya whose support for the religious and legal arguments of sanctuary were codified by his proclamation. Sanctuary activists’ shared interpretation of the document as a moral shield with legal force that could, at least in theory, protect them from the INS actually conjured the sanctuary state into existence as a symbolic and legal alter-reality.

The transformation of a symbolic gesture into a forceful pronouncement of law with moral backing and legal standing was premised upon sanctuary activists’ religious reading or reinterpretation of the sanctuary declaration as a sacred passport. As residents of a declared sanctuary state, the sacred passport not only legitimized their work but also offered sanctuary workers some measure of protection when engaging in “illegal” activities related to transporting Salvadoran refugees to New Mexico. In the next chapter, we see that this belief was not entirely devotional or naive. The sacred passport remerges in the court of law as a credible legal defense.

Under the terms of the sanctuary declaration, when understood as legal doctrine, undocumented migrants from Central America became “refugees” with a protected status or legitimate presence within the boundaries of the sanctuary state, even while continuing to be undocumented from the perspective of federal immigration law and the exclusions of U.S. citizenship. The assertion of sovereignty
in relation to the sanctuary state was a symbolic act of defiance or non-cooperation with federal immigration law on moral grounds, materialized in the conceptual and practical ways in which sanctuary activists read the law in their own moral language and on their own terms. This recoding or translation of the sanctuary proclamation as a sacred passport in both concrete and intangible ways, empowered sanctuary activists to take substantial risks, but it also opened up space for the production of an alternative sub-federal or “local citizenship” not solely based on residency in the sanctuary state but on conviction. As the next chapter will illustrate, an unwavering belief in the legal and moral force of the sanctuary proclamation and in the existence of a state for sanctuary made it a concrete legal reality.
Chapter Two:

The Intimacy of Politics: Sanctuary on Trial in New Mexico

“The right to freedom of religion claims a right to transcendent fidelity to a life outside the state and outside oneself.”

---Winnifred Sullivan

“Justice is above the law. That’s the core idea of Sanctuary.”

---Rev. Glen Thamert

The 1988 Sanctuary Trial put the “sacred passport” interpretation of Governor Toney Anaya’s sanctuary proclamation to a legal test and also resurrected the dead declaration as a petition of legal truth. Belief in the reality of the sanctuary state, a declaration that Governor Anaya had only partially sanctified was not only the cornerstone of Glen Thamert’s defense, but also a secular substitute for religious freedom. In this chapter, I challenge the notion that the legal system is a rational apparatus that advances the logics and disciplinary motives of the state by looking at the subjective construction of legal arguments as well as the social ties and political passions that underlie the making of legal truths and untruths. The New Mexico Sanctuary Trial was not only a momentary event that occurred over the course of three weeks in a packed courtroom in downtown Albuquerque. It was the culmination of “contingent encounters” across international borders, secular and religious spheres, and social relationships (Tsing 2005: 4). My ethnographic endeavor here is to make visible the idiosyncratic and submerged connections between people and events both distant and intimate that produce what Ann Stoler has termed, the “affective state”
(2004: 5). The Sanctuary Trial is a site where these frayed edges are neatly packaged into storylines and presented to judge and jury as verifiable legal truths.

In contrast to the Webern notion of the hyper-rational, bureaucratically managed, and radically secular nature of state power, the story of the New Mexico Sanctuary Trial illuminates the political intimacies at the heart of law and order by revealing the intimate relations between politics and sentiment, where the art of governance confronts the passions and secular authority mingles with religious conviction (Stoler 2004: 10). In related theoretical terms, Bourdieu suggests that the act of general application – making laws to fit specific contexts – is what gives the impression that the law is objective truth. The reality is that law or in this case, an official declaration of law, is contextual and flexible. Laws must be interpreted and applied as legitimate legal truths (1987). The juridical field has its own internal organization or legal culture and the protocols and assumptions that make up this social field need to be part of the analysis.

Ann Stoler’s notion of “affective states” is helpful to this project of reframing the state and its secular legal apparatus as a network of social ties that get caught up in the “distribution of sentiment” and other supposedly irrational causes and their unexpected effects (2004: 6 – 7). In contrast to viewing the law as the place where passions are intentionally put to rest in exchange for practical neutrality and the unbiased pursuit of justice, this story uncovers the intensity of rivalries, ideological attachments and moral ambitions that produce the “dense transferpoints of power” that revision the law and its enforcement strategies and disciplinary techniques in
Terms that capture and make visible the “ordinary affects” of everyday life (Stewart 2007:3).

Traditionally, anthropologists focus their ethnographic eye on the legal discourses and cultural biases that arise out of courtroom dramas using transcripts of the trial to reconstruct the case. Unfortunately transcripts of the New Mexico Sanctuary Trial were unavailable for analysis because they were never made. This erasure of history is interesting given that the trial, although set in Federal District Court and dealing with constitutional issues, was so outlandish and “provincial” that the judgments made could not set any legal precedence. According to public defender, Tova Indritz, who worked on the case, the trial proceedings which lasted three weeks were recorded by a stenographer, but the transcripts were never made because the case was settled and there was no appeal. Therefore, my analysis of the Sanctuary Trial is reconstructed through archival sources including case files, legal briefs and analysis, newspaper articles, as well as sanctuary-related newsletters, correspondence, press releases, and other documents collected by or produced by the Sanctuary Defense Committee (1986 – 1988). I also collected in-depth interviews with the defendants, Glen Thamert and Demetria Martinez, and ten other individuals associated with them or the trial.

Sanctuary advocates' religious reading of the law was challenged in U.S. District Court when two New Mexicans stood trial for their involvement in a sanctuary incident that occurred in August of 1986, just four months before Republican Governor, Garrey Carruthers, rescinded the sanctuary proclamation by
executive order. On December 10, 1987, Lutheran Minister, Glen Thamert, and freelance journalist and acclaimed Chicana writer, Demetria Martínez, were indicted on charges of violating federal immigration law in relation to transporting two pregnant Salvadoran women across the U.S.–Mexico border into El Paso, Texas, to safe houses located in Albuquerque. The young women wanted to give up their unborn children for adoption to families in the United States. Luis Arturo Ventura-Rivas, a Salvadoran lawyer and active member of the Lutheran Church in San Salvador, turned to his good friend and fellow Lutheran for advice. Glen assisted Ventura-Rivas to arrange legal adoptions through an international agency in Belen, New Mexico, called Rainbow House International. However, Ventura-Rivas was unable to secure the women visas. Therefore, Thamert activated his sanctuary networks in New Mexico and El Paso, Texas to bring the two women to Albuquerque by other means. Incidently, Ventura-Rivas was also indicted in relation to the criminal case. He was questioned and responded with an official affidavit explaining his involvement, but he was not extradited to stand trial in the United States.

While movement members understood that sanctuary runs across the U.S.–Mexico border were risky business, these actions were framed as God’s work and this framing gave sanctuary workers the courage and spiritual fortitude they needed to engage in illegal border crossings (Coutin 1995). Authorized by a higher power beyond the state, some sanctuary activists working on the borderlands often justified violating immigration law to help refugees escape to safety as a moral imperative and more importantly, as a religious and political statement (Coutín 1995; Cunningham
1995, 2002). In fact, the criminalization of sanctuary work actually provided activists, particularly those who were indicted and stood trial for violating immigration law, a platform for bringing their alternative moral, legal and religious justifications to a broader audience (Coutin 1995). However, secular laws supersede God’s law when it comes to national sovereignty and in particular, border security and immigration control.

According to the official docket sheet from the case file, USA vs. Remer-Thamert, Martínez, and Ventura-Rivas, the defendants faced numerous charges and serious jail time\textsuperscript{20}. Glen Thamert, husband and father of two young children, was indicted on nine counts including conspiracy, illegally transporting and harboring aliens and inducing them to enter the U.S. He was also charged on one count of mail fraud related to the handling of the international adoption contracts. This charge was dropped early on in the course of the trial due to lack of evidence. If convicted, Thamert faced seventy-five years in federal prison and over two million dollars in fines. Demetria Martínez’s fate was equally daunting. Also cast as criminal, the young journalist faced six federal crimes against the state including conspiracy, transporting and inducing illegal aliens. Together these charges tallied to twenty-five years in prison plus thousands in fines. Before delving into the dramatic details of the trial, I lay out the backstories that came together in an almost metaphysical way to produce the New Mexico Sanctuary Trial.

\textit{States of Intimacy}
The New Mexico Sanctuary Trial brought Toney Anaya’s sanctuary proclamation full circle in ways that reflect what Ann Stoler has termed the “affective states” of governance as well as the intimacy of New Mexico politics (2004: 6). U.S. Attorney for New Mexico, William Lutz, a graduate of the University of Texas at Austin Law School and a partner in the largest law firm in Las Cruces, had also served as the GOP Chairman of Dona Ana County. Lutz, a Reagan appointee nominated for his leadership in the Party, dreamed of one day becoming a federal judge. Incidentally, the position went to his friend (and rival) GOP compatriot, John Conway. Actually, it was also Governor Anaya who approved Conway's appointment to the Federal Bench. Conway served as a state senator in the New Mexico legislature (1970 – 1980), and Minority Whip (1973 – 1980). As fate would have it, the friendly competitors would meet up again in the sanctuary trial of 1988, Conway as the presiding judge and Lutz as federal prosecutor. Historically, U.S. Attorneys become more zealous toward the end of their terms, usually trying to make a name for themselves and Lutz was no exception. He was determined to convict Glen Thamert and Demetria Martínez to advance his own political career.

Lutz asserted that the indictment had nothing to do with the sanctuary movement and instead, accused Thamert of being the kingpin of a black market “baby-selling scheme.” He balked at the notion that the Lutheran pastor was motivated by his religious convictions and asserted that his actions were based on calculated profit (despite clear evidence to the contrary). In addition, Lutz accused Demetria Martínez of being a willing accomplice in the smuggling ring, asserting that
she had crossed the line from journalist to participant. Martínez, an established freelance journalist, accompanied Thamert on the trip to Juárez, Mexico, to document the “sanctuary run” for a Christmas story she planed to write. The two Salvadoran women, Ínez Campos-Anzora and Cecilia Elías-Alegría were due to give birth in late December. Their stories would make a compelling Christmas story, linking a present-day sanctuary incident with the sacred history of the Nativity, the story of the miraculous birth of Jesus and the Holy Family’s flight from Bethlehem to Egypt to escape the wrath of King Herod. However, the article Demetria had prepared to write never materialized. Instead, she wrote a poem, *Nativity for Two Central American Women* (1987), which would be presented as criminal evidence in court.

**Prelude to a Sanctuary Incident**

Demetria Martínez, a native of Albuquerque, was twenty-seven years old at the time of her indictment. Her soft-spoken and seemingly delicate demeanor is in tune with her introspective, pensive personality and spiritual centeredness. However, as a self-proclaimed *mitotera*, Demetria has a knack for speaking truth to power in creative ways. She began experimenting with creative writing at a very young age. Her mother, Delores Martínez, recalled that she had found one of her daughter’s poems by accident while cleaning her room. It was so well written that she was convinced that the poem had been copied from a book. After graduating from Albuquerque High School in 1978, Demetria’s scholarly focus and affinity for writing took her to Princeton University where she majored in public and international affairs but also took creative writing workshops with prize winning poets such as Stanley
Kunitz and Maxine Cumin. A Woodrow Wilson Scholar at Princeton, Demetria wrote her first book of poetry as an undergraduate thesis project. Parts of this early work were published in *Three Times a Woman* (1989), a critically acclaimed book of poetry. However, she is most commonly recognized as a Chicana author and for her award-winning novel, *Mother Tongue* (1994), which is based on her encounters with Salvadoran refugees in Albuquerque and her engagements with the sanctuary movement in New Mexico.

In 1987, before the indictment, Demetria was steadily working towards establishing herself as a professional writer. She had published various individual works of poetry and made a modest living as a free-lance journalist covering religion and immigration topics for *The Albuquerque Journal*, and writing a weekly column for the *National Catholic Reporter*. Although she had written about the sanctuary movement, she did not identify herself as a political activist. In order to maintain her “journalistic distance” she quietly participated in the movement in small ways, behind the scenes because of her close friendship with Mimi Lopez. In addition, Demetria's husband at the time, Daniel Erdman, a Presbyterian Minister, spent time in Nicaragua as an organizer for Witnesses for Peace, a program that sent peace activists and religious workers to Central America to provide protective accompaniment to communities living in war zones and to document the tragic effects of U.S. foreign policy on the everyday lives of civilians. Significantly, Demetria Martínez was the first (and only) journalist in the United States to be indicted in a criminal trial related to a sanctuary incident. This fact somewhat shifted the focus of the trial away from
sanctuary’s religious and moral arguments to the First Amendment, freedom of speech and of the press. This aspect, in conjunction with the sanctuary proclamation, distinguished the New Mexico Sanctuary Trial from others that occurred in Tucson, Arizona and McAllen, Texas, both of which resulted in convictions of sanctuary activists including John Fife, one of the founders of the movement.

Glen Thamert was forty-four years old at the time of his indictment. He had been active in social justice work most of his adult life as seminarian and in his professional career as a Lutheran Minister, pastoral counselor and social worker. He grew up in Loveland, Colorado and was educated in the Lutheran tradition. His paternal uncle was a Lutheran minister and it seemed that everyone in his family expected he would follow in his uncle’s footsteps, so he did. This career path took him to Fort Wane Indiana where he studied for six years at the Concordia Theological Seminary in the late 1960s. As part of his training, he served the poor in the ghettos of St. Louis, Missouri. In 1968, Thamert entered the Navy Chaplin Reserves as a way to evade being drafted into combat during the Vietnam War. While in Indiana he fell in love for the first time with an African American woman from Gerry Indiana. They realized early on that their marriage was not going to hold together and the couple separated amicably. As a young man searching for spiritual enlightenment and a way to heal his broken heart, Glen took a sabbatical from his religious studies and joined the Prince of Peace Volunteers, which allowed him to travel throughout Latin America. Instead of returning to seminary, he decided to stay in Cuernavaca where he studied Spanish and worked as an English teacher for a few years.
Glen Thamert was an adventurous and fearless young man. After learning Spanish, he decided to travel around the Panama Canal and eventually landed in Caracas, Venezuela where he taught English for two years at Escuela Nautica, a private Jesuit college on the coast. He often watched the oilrigs sail by on foggy days to pass the time between classes. One day, feeling lonely and restless, he decided to catch ride back home on an oilrig. He loved the sea and worked alongside the crewmen. One night he climbed the mass of the ship and saw the lights of Cuba and pondered swimming ashore. Instead, he continued on to Houston, Texas where the ship finally docked. Soon after landing stateside, he decided to hop on a bus to Memphis, Tennessee to see the site where Dr. King was assassinated. “This was my personal reentry plan,” Glen recalled, somewhat wistfully. His method of reacquainting himself with his country involved mourning Civil Rights heroes for inspiration and returning to his ministry in service of the poor.

After completing seminary and becoming an ordained Lutheran minister, Thamert worked as a community organizer and social worker in an African American and Puerto Rican community in Chicago in the early 1970s on a project to obtain affordable housing and fight displacement due to gentrification. Glen says that his professors at Concordia Seminary in St. Louis were Christian radicals inspired by liberation theology. They exiled themselves along with 99% of the student body and formed a group called Seminex (seminary in exile). “These guys knew what the gospel was about and they helped me understand that,” recalled Thamert. During his last year of seminary he married Diane Remer, a fellow seminarian, and after
graduation they moved to Omaha, Nebraska where he took a job as the Pastor of a Lutheran parish (1976 – 1978). Glen was deeply dissatisfied and rather disillusioned with the politics of parish leadership, which made him reevaluate his spiritual path. Church leadership was just not his style of doing God’s work, so he decided to pursue a degree in social work at the University of Nebraska.

In 1981 Glen received his Master’s in social work and he and Diane moved to Albuquerque. He worked as a hospital chaplain at Saint Joseph’s Hospital for a year and then took a social work position with the Salvation Army providing for the homeless. It was during this time, around 1982, that he first came in contact with Central American refugees passing through New Mexico. “I met Central Americans who had walked half way across the Americas from El Salvador or Guatemala to Albuquerque and ended up right there in the lobby. I listened to their stories. I could walk into that lobby and look at the faces and almost with one hundred percent clarity be able to pick out the Central American refugees. Faces that looked like they had just walked out of hell from the war scene.” One of the migrants Glen met at the Salvation Army was Juan Carlos, a young man from El Salvador who had also been a seminarian. Having a common experience of faith and ministry, the two men became fast friends. “He told me how the military had forced him to join the army, Glen recalled, his voice dropping away with sadness. “Because he was educated and very intelligent they trained him at the School of the Americas, that death-squad factory funded by the Reagan Administration. Juan Carlos should have been leading a church; instead he was trained in aggressive interrogation techniques and torture. He
escaped El Salvador and somehow ended up in Albuquerque on the brink of self-destruction. Juan Carlos, like many survivors of the fog of war attempted to alleviate post-traumatic stress with alcohol. “I worked with [Juan Carlos] for several years,” Glen explained with regret, “I just felt so helpless that couldn’t do much for him. Eventually, I lost track of him…I suspect that he killed himself.” Years later he happened to pass by the house of the Mexican woman with whom Juan Carlos lived for several years. He felt an incredible urge to knock on her door and ask what became of her former partner, Juan Carlos. Instead, Glen sat outside the house crying. Immobile and guilt-ridden, he sat in the car for almost half an hour, physically unable to walk up to the house and ring the doorbell. Thinking back on his actions, Glen concluded that “maybe it was better not to know what really happened to Juan Carlos.”

After numerous distressing and deeply depressing encounters with Central American refugees while working for the Salvation Army, Glen felt called to do more than provide emergency services and counseling for people in need. He wanted to do something to change the political situation that was creating the refugee crisis. In 1984, Glen learned about the sanctuary movement after listening to a lecture at the University of New Mexico on international law and the status of Central American refugees in the United States. This initiated his “conversion” experience - a hunger to learn more about the conflict in Central America driven by furious indignation about the U.S. Government’s complacency in the human suffering he had read about and witnessed first hand. He felt called to reach out to the people of Central America or as
Glen would say, “help the stranger.” After attending a regional sanctuary conference in Tucson, Arizona, which attracted thousands of people from across the country, he officially became an activist armed with the theological basis for doing sanctuary work. The following year, Glen traveled to Nicaragua with Demetria’s former husband, Daniel Erdman, with Witnesses for Peace. It was through this experience that he claims to have seen, “how our government intervenes, interrupts, and aids terrorists called the Contras, who were killing innocent civilians.”

In 1986, Glen Thamert decided to go to El Salvador with a religious group to investigate the persecution of the Lutheran Church after the murder of David Fernández, a Lutheran Pastor who was targeted by the Salvadoran government and was disappeared, likely brutally tortured and buried in an unmarked grave. While in El Salvador, he met Bishop Medardo Gómez, who was prominent in Lutheran circles and renowned throughout the world for his peace activism and human rights work. Gómez was kidnapped and tortured by President Duarte’s henchmen in the early 1980s, but the entire Lutheran world community came to his rescue. They intervened in the situation demanding that Gómez be released immediately and threatening to hold Duarte personally responsible for his life.

The global Lutheran outcry and organized political pressure was effective and Gómez was miraculously released five days after his disappearance. His compatriot, David Fernández, was not so fortunate. However, because of the government’s persecution of Lutheran and other religious leaders in El Salvador, the international campaign to bring the army sergeant responsible for the death of David Fernández to
justice was also successful. Luis Ventura-Rivas, a special military prosecutor for the Salvadoran government and active member of the Lutheran church in San Salvador, was hired to prosecute the case. Incredibly, the defendant, who had just returned from training at Fort Benning in the United States, was convicted and sentenced to thirty years in prison for his role in the murder of Pastor Fernández. Glen became good friends with Bishop Gómez and Ventura-Rivas during his initial visit to San Salvador. This relationship would change the course of his life.

Glen and his wife Diane desperately wanted children. After suffering three miscarriages and a devastating stillbirth, they decided that the losses were God’s way of telling them that it was time to adopt a child. “My wife and I discussed the many children orphaned in El Salvador because of the war and decided we should try to give a home to such a child.” In 1986, Glen wrote to his friend Medardo Gómez, Lutheran Bishop of El Salvador, expressing his desire to adopt a Salvadoran child. Deeply moved by Thamert’s letter, Bishop Gómez put him in contact with Luis Ventura-Rivas who agreed to help the couple with the adoption process in collaboration with Rainbow House International, an agency located in Belen, New Mexico. That same year, the couple traveled to San Salvador, El Salvador to adopt a child. They encountered a very depressing situation:

We saw children who had been wounded by land mines and guns. We saw children who suffered severe malnutrition and parasites. We learned that these poor children came to the orphanages from many sources. Some were found abandoned, walking in the streets, begging for food. Neighbors brought some in after the child’s parents had been killed or abducted, often right before the child’s eyes. In many cases, parents had taken their children to the hospital for treatment for malnutrition and never returned for them, hoping their child would
be better off there than back on the streets. One of the worst cases I saw was that of a child who had been found totally abandoned in a heap of garbage.

After visiting a number of orphanages, the couple decided to adopt a 10-month-old baby girl named Norma who had been abandoned on the streets of San Salvador and rescued by a nurse who took her to a local orphanage. The adoption would take fourteen long months to complete. Norma was nearly two years old when she finally arrived in the United States, but not in the way in which Glen and his wife Diane had anticipated. A few weeks after the prospective parents returned to Albuquerque, Glen received a desperate phone call from his friend Luis Ventura-Rivas. The friends had discussed the sanctuary movement at great lengths back in San Salvador and Glen proudly told him about New Mexico being declared a sanctuary state for Central American refugees. Luis took this information as seriously as did many sanctuary advocates in New Mexico who believed that Toney Anaya’s sanctuary proclamation was more than a symbolic gesture. Luis explained that a young woman named, Ínez Campos-Anzora a friend of the family, had revealed to him that she was three months pregnant and desperate to leave San Salvador. Another woman, Cecilia Elías-Alegría, who was in a similar situation, came forward later also wanting to give her baby up for adoption in the United States. Both women had been brutally raped by married soldiers and had become pregnant as a result of the violent act. This situation put them at great risk since they could not easily hide their pregnancies and would likely be ostracized by their families and the community as unmarried mothers. Initially, Ínez come to Luis seeking sanctuary. Cecilia soon followed.
The young women in their mid-twenties wanted to give their unborn children up for adoption to families in the United States and certainly hoped remain there. “I said, well if they are afraid to be in El Salvador, we’ll help them,” explained Glen in his matter-of-fact way. “We devised a plan to pay for them to fly out of San Salvador to Mexico, to Chihuahua City, and then take the train to Juárez.” Glen helped Luis arrange the adoption contracts legally through Rainbow House International and also covered all of the expenses. After the adoptions were finalized, he began the work of planning a “sanctuary run” with help from movement members in New Mexico to bring Cecilia and Ínez across border between Ciudad Juárez, Mexico and El Paso, Texas to Albuquerque to await the birth of their children.

The Sanctuary Run

Glen Thamert and the young journalist, Demetria Martínez were acquainted through their mutual interest in social justice work and their tangential involvement in sanctuary-related activities. Mimi Lopez, who married a Salvadoran man so that he could stay in the United States and often transported and housed Central American refugees passing through Albuquerque, was a close friend and mentor to Demetria. Therefore, she had frequent contact with refugees though Mimi and other friends involved in the sanctuary movement. The stories and personalities of these people would reemerge as composite characters and images in the poems and novels Demetria Martínez would write as a way to heal after the psychological turmoil of having to stand trial for smuggling. However, as an ethical journalist she felt it necessary to maintain an objective distance from the movement (at least publically)
since she had published several articles about Central American refugees and sanctuary.

Objectivity may not have been realistic or even possible given her activist social circle and her former husband, Daniel Erdman’s, work in Central America with Witnesses for Peace. Martínez was working on a book of poetry when she befriended Glen at an outdoor soup kitchen for the homeless organized by the Salvation Army, which happened to be set up in a park near her home in downtown Albuquerque. The mobile soup kitchens became political theatre when in 1985, Glen Thamert and a Quaker accomplice, Dori Bunting, founder of the Albuquerque Peace and Justice Center, organized a soup line across the street from the hotel hosting the New Mexico State Republican Convention. The soup line was organized in protest of Reagan’s economic policies and his war on the poor.

Demetria would often bring freshly baked from her grandmother’s horno18 to Thamert’s soup line protests to add to the bounty. “Be careful if Glen ever calls you and says, ‘I have a story for you,’” she warned, with a sly smile on her face. When Glen told Demetria about Cecilia and Ínez and his plan to make a sanctuary run to bring the women to safe houses in Albuquerque, a vision of the Holy Family fleeing Egypt leaped into her mind. “I was not so naive,” she admitted. “I immediately said yes. It sounded fascinating and not only that, you can’t call yourself a religion reporter and miss one of the most important movements of the day, sanctuary. I had met many refugees, but I had never witnessed the act of crossing over.” She didn’t

---

18 A small, outdoor wood-fire oven made of adobe in the shape of a dome that is commonly used to bake bread in both Pueblo and Hispano communities in northern New Mexico.
tell her editors about her plan to accompany Glen to write a story about the
“sanctuary run” (they were unlikely to approve it), but she did tell her father, Ted
Martínez. The Martínez family is well known and respected in Albuquerque. Both her
parents, Ted and Dolores Martínez, grew up in one of the historic Chicano barrios in
the South Valley (Martínez Town) and Ted was very active in politics and public
education. In 1968, Ted Martínez became the first Chicano elected to the School
Board for the Albuquerque Public Schools. At the time of his daughter’s indictment,
Martínez was the President of the New Mexico Technology and Vocational Institute,
the only two-year technical college in Albuquerque, and was also serving on the
Commission for Higher Education for the Anaya administration. Although he was
concerned about his daughter’s decision to document a sanctuary incident first hand,
he trusted her judgment and gave her his blessing.

In July of 1986, Glen Thamert prepared to drive his Volkswagen Rabbit to El
Paso to pick up Cecilia and Ínez in Juárez, México. He recruited a friend, Davey
Ricks, who was part of the sanctuary network at New Life Presbyterian in
Albuquerque, along with Mike Webster, Pastor of the same congregation to assist in
the operation. Pastor Webster also recruited his father from Farmington to help drive
his truck. They strapped a canoe to the top of the truck to look as if they were on a
fishing trip, which was a cover that many sanctuary transporters used to evade la
migra. “In those days…” Glen recalled, “a sanctuary run meant that we would drive
the rout we were going to take down to the border and then turn around and come
back to check for safety.” Of course, it was not his first time making a sanctuary run.
The year before, he had accompanied a Quaker named Judy Cull, a member of the Albuquerque Friends Meeting, to help transport a Nicaraguan physician who had been persecuted during Daniel Ortega’s Sandinista era. “Riding around in my little Volkswagen, I was able to see how to circumvent INS check points. We knew of a road that went around the checkpoint through the hills of Truth or Consequences, New Mexico. We had safe houses everywhere and thanks to Casa Refugio in El Paso, we had an organized system…a major conduit for folks coming up through Mexico with other sanctuary folks to move people to California, the Midwest, Canada, and to the East Coast coming right through Juárez.”

Everything looked clear on the trial run, but due to his previous experience and because more people were involved in this particular sanctuary run (including a journalist), Glen decided to take the high road through the Gila Wilderness Preserve to El Paso in order to provide the caravan with additional cover. The contact point was a Juárez train station where Cecilia and Ínez would be waiting for a guide across the border into El Paso. Glen carried copies of his “sacred passport,” also known as Governor Anaya’s sanctuary declaration, in the glove compartment of his car for in case they were detained or questioned by border patrol. Concerned about her journalistic integrity, Demetria decided not to travel in the same car with the refugees. Demetria and the sanctuary workers she accompanied on the journey were well aware of the risks involved in the operation and although they all believed (or hoped) in the reality of the sanctuary state, they were sure to bring copies of the sacred passport along with them as proof of its existence. The precautions they took to evade
detection by the border patrol underscored the limits of the sanctuary state. Glen and his assistants did not go into the business of sanctuary, or in Demetria’s case, documenting this kind of work, naively. They were keenly aware that from the perspective of the average federal agent, sanctuary was deemed an “illegal activity,” and transporting undocumented migrants across the U.S.-Mexico border is indeed, a federal crime. However, for Glen and other sanctuary workers who understood their work as a spiritual calling, justice is above the law.

**********

Glen paid a fifteen-year old female coyote or smuggler to help guide the Salvadoran women across the U.S.-Mexico border into El Paso. The group met at the contact point, a dingy train station in Juárez. The two women had been waiting there for many hours and had begun to lose hope that their contacts would arrive. Demetria and Glen did not cross the border with the women. Instead, they waited for them in El Paso at Casa Refugio, which at that time was located only a few miles from the Bridge of the Americas, connecting Ciudad Juárez, Mexico and El Paso, Texas. The refugees’ first attempt at crossing with the help of the Coyote was unsuccessful, but they were eventually able to cross later that same night at a different, more clandestine location. Ínez and Cecilia spent their first night at Casa Refugio, a place where hundreds of refugees had received assistance and hospitality since the early 1980s, when the Central American conflict began pushing migrants north. Many of these individuals or families lived at the shelter temporarily, a few days or a couple of months, at most a year, before embarking on the next leg of their
journey. Demetria shared a room with the tired, nervous, and silent young women. She tried to get them to interview with her, but they were still shaken after the emotional stress of leaving El Salvador and the additional difficulties of crossing the border into El Paso. At the time, both women were in their second trimester and experiencing the physical discomforts of pregnancy – nausea, exhaustion and frequent urination.

Glen and Pastor Webster took turns driving the pick-up truck with Ínez and Cecilia in the cab, ready to duck down for cover under dark blankets in case a border patrolman passed the vehicle. Davy Ricks, who was the director of the New Mexico food stamp program at that time, traveled with Demetria in the lead car. The trip back through the Gila Wilderness at night with its dark and desolate winding roads did not make comfortable travel accommodations for the two pregnant women. “We had to stop a lot along the road so they could pee or vomit. It was quite a difficult trip for them,” Demetria recalled. “I felt that I had witnessed something sacred in the way that the women made a very dangerous choice to flee. Making this kind of leap of faith and realizing that God doesn’t see borders. It was sacred to see Glen and others make the choice to help. Christianity during the holocaust failed by looking away. For them to understand that we could not let that happen again compelled people like Glen to risk a lot.”

Glen arranged for what he imagined to be safe houses for the refugees, placing them in the homes of fellow Salvadoran immigrants. However, he did not take into account the social and personality differences between Cecilia and Ínez. They were
both twenty-five years old, from the same country and in similar circumstances, but apart from that the two women were worlds apart. Cecilia was from the urban barrios of San Salvador, while Ínez was from the rural hinterlands outside the city. According to Glen, Cecilia turned out to be “a bit problematic.” He had found a Salvadoran woman named María to house Cecilia through his sanctuary networks. María was from a middle class family in her homeland and formerly married to an American airline pilot. Unfortunately, María and Cecilia did not get along. Although both of the women had led everyone to believe that they were going to give their babies up for adoption and then return home to El Salvador, neither had any intentions of returning. Ínez changed her mind about the adoption. She decided to keep her baby girl. Cecilia, on the other hand, went through with the legal adoption as arranged and moved to Los Angeles shortly after giving birth. Ínez stayed in a different safe house with a woman named Antonia Robledo, who was also from El Salvador and married to a Mexican Evangelical preacher. At the hospital, when Ínez was in labor, Antonia and Glen had a heated argument about what it means to be a Christian. Antonia disagreed with his notion of prophetic justice or the call to live Christ’s example even if it meant breaking the law. Glen speculates that it was Antonia who tipped off the federal authorities.

Baby Norma’s Unexpected Journey

After the successful sanctuary run, everything seemed to return to normal. In July of 1987, Glen traveled to El Salvador to bring his adopted daughter, Norma home. On all accounts, the adoption process was complete. “My wife and I figured
that it had taken fourteen months because Luis Ventura didn’t want to go through all that work. He probably thought that we had two babies up here that we could adopt.”

Before he left for El Salvador, INS had approved baby Norma’s visa and assured Glen that the document would be included with the adoption papers. When he arrived he was told that Norma’s visa had been delayed. After three grueling days at the U.S. Embassy in San Salvador doing battling with the bureaucrats, Glen was informed that Norma’s visa had been retracted. They refused to provide him with any explanation.

“So, I went and called Diane and told her that we had to initiate Plan B and that’s what we did.” The alternative plan consisted of taking Norma with him to New Mexico without a visa. Glen had a contact within the Lutheran Church who had both Mexican and Salvadoran citizenship. The woman took Norma ahead with her on the plane as if she were her own daughter using her Mexican passport. Glen walked twenty feet behind them and boarded the same flight from San Salvador to Juárez as if they were strangers. Once they arrived in Juárez, a friend whose wife worked with Glen at the Salvation Army met them at the airport. “We took the woman to a hotel. She planed to fly back to El Salvador the next day. Then Norma and I went to a restaurant in Juárez, while [my friend] went back to El Paso to find a family he knew who had a bunch of kids. A few hours later they arrived. I said my prayers and put my daughter in the car with the family and all their little kids. My friend and I followed behind them and we all crossed the border into El Paso without incident. Thank God we made it!” After revealing that he had taken his adopted daughter home by other means Glen walked over to a corner in his cluttered adobe house in Jemez Springs
where we sat talking in his living room for hours. He slowly knelt down before a
locked file cabinet as if it were an altar. He unlocked it pulled out a yellow office
folder containing all of Norma’s documents; pictures of her as a toddler in El
Salvador, her adoption papers, and finally, her citizenship papers. He handed me the
folder as if it contained sacred contents. “I keep these here with me…I keep them safe
with me for Norma.”

**********

Soon after Glen returned to Albuquerque in July of 1987, he went to an
immigration attorney and paid a thousand dollars to find out why he was unable to
obtain Norma’s visa. The lawyer discovered that that the visa had been revoked
because Glen was under investigation in the United States and in El Salvador for his
involvement in a “baby-smuggling ring.” “The immigration attorney told me that I
needed to get a criminal defense attorney as soon as possible. He didn’t know the
details of the investigation. He only knew that it was in progress.” An informant had
called Albuquerque Crime Stoppers and told the INS that Glen Thamert was involved
in a black-market baby smuggling ring. The investigator later testified in court that
thirty or forty individuals had assisted Cecilia and Ínez. However, only Glen and
Demetria were indicted in relation to the criminal investigation. They stood trial in
the summer of 1988.

*Enemy Mine: William Lutz vs. Toney Anaya*

Toney Anaya grew up in the village of Moriarty in central New Mexico. He
identifies himself as a Mexican-American, which is interesting given that he comes
from a deeply rooted Hispano family with generations in the region. His father worked primarily as a rancher and part-time carpenter. His mother was a devout Catholic who served as the sacristana (sacristan or caretaker) for her parish and worked in the home raising their ten children, Toney being the third from the youngest. At the age of eighteen, having never traveled outside of New Mexico, Toney packed his bags and moved to Washington, D.C. where he attended Georgetown University and eventually earned a law degree from American University. Those were challenging and formative years for the young Toney Anaya. “You can’t live in Washington, D.C. and not get involved in politics,” he explained. “It was very heady times during the Civil Rights movement and I was in the thick of it.” Anaya credits his strong Catholic upbringing under the tutelage of his mother and grandmother and his experiences participating in the Civil Rights Movement and emergent ethnic political organizations for sparking his interest in the sanctuary movement as a moral critique of Reagan’s Central American policy and the unjust treatment of refugees living in the United States. For Anaya, it was both a political and moral imperative.

Anaya began his political career in New Mexico when he was elected Attorney General (1975 – 1978). He was subsequently elected governor in 1982 at the age of forty-one. He only served one term because at that time, governors only served four-years in office without the possibility of re-election. Although he led the charge to make a constitutional amendment that would allow for governors to be elected to a second term and was successful in this endeavor, he was unable to benefit from the
revision. However, his problems with the Reagan Administration and envoys of the federal government began well before Anaya was officially elected.

In August of 1982, while Anaya was a gubernatorial candidate, he met with the Mexican PRI presidential candidate, Miguel de Madrid in Mexico City. Anaya’s Republican opponent, John Irick was developing a position paper on trade relations on the borderlands and it was in Anaya’s interest to get ahead of the game in order to define the issue on his terms. Irick had been invited along with Texas governor, Bill Clements, to attend a meeting on U.S-Mexico relations with President Reagan. The President was also scheduled to attend a rally in Roswell, New Mexico in support of Irick. Anaya needed to do something to mark his territory, so to speak, on immigration and trade with Mexico to establish his legitimacy as a potential governor of a border state in opposition to Republicans. This campaign strategy was important given that the majority of New Mexicans had supported Reagan in both presidential elections.

Throughout the planning phase of Anaya’s Mexico mission, there was concern about Mexico’s deflated economy after the devastating oil crisis in 1982 and the subsequent devaluation of the peso, which had fallen to below eighty percent on the dollar. Conservative politicians and anti-immigration alarmists in the United States feared that Mexico’s economic crisis would result in the complete collapse of the Mexican government leading to mass migration across the border. It was assumed that Mexico’s economic and political instability would lead to “serious civil unrest in all of the border states with large Hispanic populations.” There were also
speculations in the U.S. media that a coup was preparing to overthrow the Miguel de la Madrid presidency in the transition period between his election and inauguration.

While Roberto Camp, Anaya’s Mexico advisor, assured him that these conjectures about a potential political crisis in Mexico were completely overblown, Anaya delayed his trip to Mexico several times largely due to a packed schedule of campaigning rather than fear for his personal safety. Nevertheless, Camp’s sense of urgency about changing public opinion about Mexico and opening direct lines of communication about tourism, trade opportunities, and energy with the Miguel de la Madrid’s administration (which had been closed off due to the apparent ineptitude of previous New Mexican Governors) was undeniable. However, this sense of urgency was more about beating the Republican candidate, John Irick to the punch. This sentiment was duly expressed in Camp’s letter to Anaya’s campaign manager explaining why the trip to Mexico was so important: “In strictly political terms, I again point out that an unstable Mexico is not in our best interests, and any massive migration that took place could kill Toney’s campaign, and thus points to the need to issue seasoned remarks….and projecting balanced, positive relationships.”

It is uncertain why Camp believed that an increase in migration from Mexico would undermine Anaya’s electability factor. One theory is that his opponent would bash Anaya’s liberal stance on migration using the argument about instability in Mexico to ramp up the politics of fear about uncontrolled borders, collecting more votes in his favor. Race was certainly a factor in play in the campaign. Any opportunity for Irick to bring Anaya’s Hispanic heritage into closer association with the “illegal”
Mexican migrant was thought to have a negative impact on his chances for winning the election. This backdrop certainly influenced Anaya’s decision to meet with Miguel de la Madrid. Nevertheless, the encounter was again, largely symbolic.

The agenda for the meeting was “safe” and decidedly apolitical focusing on issues that were “media worthy,” instead of substantive. Roberto Camp advised Anaya not to discuss controversial topics that would overstep his authority as a potential governor de la Madrid. Topics such as immigration control and border development were off limits as well as any “negative” issue that might set Anaya up for Republican attacks or any comment that might upset organized labor or the national Chicano/Hispanic organizations that supported Anaya candidacy. While there are no transcripts detailing what was actually discussed in the meeting in Mexico in September of 1982, Anaya did not heed Camp’s warning about avoiding controversial topics and staying within the agreed upon apolitical parameters.

In hindsight Anaya regrets stating his honest opinion of President Reagan before the Mexican press. “Reagan is the most anti-Hispanic president in my memory,” was his glib response. When conservatives in New Mexico and elsewhere got wind of Anaya’s gaff in Mexico, they retaliated with vigor. They marked Anaya for termination. The self-appointed terminator was none other than U.S. Attorney and Reagan appointee, William Lutz. Upon his return to New Mexico, Anaya was confronted with the aftermath of an “international incident,” which surprisingly did not derail his campaign for Governor. Toney Anaya won handsomely becoming the highest-ranking Hispanic official in the nation during his tenure (1983 – 1986).
Lutz capitalized on Anaya’s misstep in Mexico accusing him of disloyalty to the nation and even treason. Reaching back to an antiquated law that once prohibited U.S. citizens and government officials from speaking against their government while in a foreign country, Lutz called for an investigation into Anaya’s actions in Mexico. The ridiculous charge marked the beginning of U.S. Attorney, William Lutz’s quest to defame and delegitimize Governor Anaya and members of his administration. Over the course of his four-year term, Lutz accused his political enemy of numerous frivolous infringements and fabricated financial wrongdoings. He brought Governor Anaya before a Grand Jury for questioning thirteen times none of which resulted in an indictment. Due to Lutz’s machinations, Toney Anaya was the subject of a federal investigation for tax evasion and mishandling of political contributions. The investigations turned up empty, which prompted Anaya to file a lawsuit charging the Reagan Administration with political persecution and harassment.\textsuperscript{21} Basically, Lutz used his office to carry out a personal vendetta against Toney Anaya backed by Republican Party leaders at both the local and national levels.\textsuperscript{22} The damage to Governor Anaya’s image and legacy along with deliberate diversion of resources was perhaps precisely their intention.

William Lutz was ambitious and power hungry. Like Toney Anaya, he had a taste for the limelight and had national political aspirations. Candidly, Lutz was determined to make a name for himself within the national Republican Party by bringing down the Democrats in Governor Anaya’s camp by any means necessary, one fabricated scandal and trumped up charge at a time. When the baseless attacks
and costly Grand Jury investigations did not result in any indictments or convictions, public officials, the ACLU, and even some Republican officials and members of his own staff began to question Lutz’s professional integrity and effectiveness. His political career was on a downward spiral, so in a desperate attempt to pull off a high profile conviction he took aim at Sanctuary Movement, which by the late 1980s had made a significant dent in support for Reagan’s Contra War in Central America (Perla 2008). However, I speculate that Lutz’s motivations were more intimately “provincial.” Prosecuting sanctuary was yet another way to provoke Toney Anaya, a movement supporter and architect of the sanctuary state.

In September of 1987, a few months before the soon to be co-defendants, Glen Thamert and Demetria Martínez, were officially notified of the criminal investigations into their involvement in the sanctuary incident, Lutz traveled to El Salvador to personally interview Luis Ventura-Rivas regarding his role in “black market baby smuggling.” Although not uncommon for a U.S. Attorney to travel within the United States in pursuit of evidence related to a criminal case, it was certainly a rare undertaking to go outside the country, much less to war-torn El Salvador, to personally interview a suspect. In a witty, yet blatantly biased and very unkind article published in Albuquerque Monthly (August, 1988), Lutz is characterized as a blubering idiot, a “country lawyer” from Las Cruces who was simply unfit for the position of US Attorney of New Mexico. Honing in on his unsuccessful attempts at bringing down the Anaya Administration, the article made a mockery of William Lutz.23
Apparently, while in El Salvador, the blundering U.S. Attorney embellished his position by claiming to be an official directly from Washington, D.C. in order to intimate Ventura-Rivas into self-incrimination. These tactics proved unsuccessful. Instead, Lutz became the subject of ridicule among members of his staff who likened their boss to “Inspector Clouseau” and laughed about how their inept, English monolingual boss was attempting to play "Secret Agent Man in Central America." Posing as a U.S. official did not get him very far in El Salvador. Luis Ventura-Rivas simply refused to interview with him, as was his right as a Salvadoran citizen. Instead, he issued a written statement countering all of the accusations against him backed with documentation attesting to the legality of the international adoptions he had arranged for his clients, Cecilia Elías-Alegría and Ínez Anzora. Besides, it was not Ventura-Rivas’ fault that the women had breached their contract by deciding not to return after giving birth. In fact, he had sent a letter to Ínez, demanding that she pay a fine for not giving her child over to Rainbow House as agreed. Needless to say, Lutz’s investigation in El Salvador was a pointless. The charges against Ventura-Rivas were dropped during the pre-trial phase for lack of credible evidence.

*The Public Conversion Project*

Almost a year and a half passed between the time Demetria Martínez and Glen Thamert were indicted in December of 1987 and the commencement of the actual jury trial, which began on June 13, 1988. They spent most of this time preparing for the trial and participating in fund raising and conscience raising activities. Thamert went straight to work on organizing the Sanctuary Defense Committee, a team of
volunteers dedicated to the cause and helping raise money for his defense. Demetria qualified for a public defender and on the suggestion of close friend, Jewish Rabbi and famed civil rights worker, Lynn Gotlieb, she employed one of Albuquerque’s best and brightest attorneys, Tova Indritz. The San Francisco-based National Sanctuary Defense Fund19, which was established to help sanctuary workers and refugees pay for legal services, recognized that Glen’s case was in fact a sanctuary-related indictment. They also ascertained that the duo were victims of selective government intimidation aimed at weakening the Sanctuary Movement. The organization, headed by Gus Schultz, a prominent Bay-area sanctuary advocate, provided almost half of the funds necessary for Glen’s defense, which at the end totaled $99,000. The Sanctuary Defense Committee raised $27,000. Both organizations offered legal council and assisted him in selecting the experienced attorneys, Karen Snell and her assistant, Nancy Grey Postrero, who had both worked on the Tucson case.

The agonizing waiting period between the indictment and the pre-trial hearings gave Demetria and Glen time to garner support for sanctuary by educating New Mexicans across the state about the plight of Central American refugees. In the rush to counter the government’s criminalization of the sanctuary movement and redefine the legal discourse, Demetria became the voice of the local sanctuary movement.

“I told Tova that because my case was about freedom of speech I needed to go out

---

19 The National Sanctuary Defense Fund (NSDF) was established in 1985 by the Franciscan Friars of California to provide legal defense of sanctuary workers and refugees and to educate the public about the moral and legal issues involved in the sanctuary movement. NSDF assisted the eleven sanctuary works tried in the Tucson case.
and talk about sanctuary as a newsworthy topic.” Therefore, Demetria took the helm of the statewide public information campaign brilliantly performing her role as a serious journalist and conservative Catholic girl from an upstanding and politically connected Nuevomexicano family. Rev. Thamert, wearing his Lutheran minister’s collar and gentile smile, joined Demetria at every press conference, educational forum and media interview. However, he was not allowed to discuss his case with the media. Glen’s case was more complicated. He had been accused of conspiracy and baby smuggling. In addition, he was known to be somewhat of a loose cannon with his political opinions and was not trusted to stay on message. Demetria on the other hand, was a trained media professional.

Ultimately, the purpose of the yearlong public information campaign was to influence the jury pool and shape public opinion in favor of the sanctuary movement. Members of the Sanctuary Defense Committee concluded that the probability of an acquittal improved with public education. It was also important to claim the moral high ground by promoting the cultural values and legal truths that established sanctuary work as both a legal and moral imperative. Sanctuary movement members argued that they were enforcing laws that the government refused to uphold. Assisting Salvadoran and Guatemalan refugees was not only legal in their estimation, but a moral obligation dictated in Scripture. Essentially, they were engaged in a public conversion project, a battle for the hearts and minds of New Mexicans. The more people learned about the conflicts in Central America, heard the heart-wrenching testimonies of refugees and understood about INS discrimination against
asylum applicants, the more likely they would come to sympathize with the movement and support the defendants.

“We had to get to them before the Government,” explained Sanctuary Defense Committee member, Mimi Lopez. “Lutz didn’t count on the broad public support in New Mexico for sanctuary and he didn’t take into account the Martínez’s position in the community. He also didn’t anticipate what he was up against when he indicted a journalist.” Not only did freedom of speech enter the fray for the first time in a sanctuary-related criminal case, but also every detail of the trial went to press in local and national media outlets. Demetria, at the age of twenty-seven, unwittingly become the public face of the sanctuary movement in New Mexico, a role that lunched her career as a Chicana author and playwright, but also radically altered her life. For example, her play *Turning* (1988) was performed at the KiMo Theatre in Albuquerque by La Compañía, an all female theatre group as part of the fundraising efforts. The exposure also put in the company of acclaimed political activists and writers across the nation. Demetria found support from Mark Rudd, who helped her understand that indictment was part of the misuse of state power under the Reagan Administration's Cold War agenda. She connected with politically engaged artists like Bonnie Raitt, who gave a concert to support the cause and also opened a poetry reading featuring Allen Ginsberg with *Nativity for Two Salvadoran Women*. The poem turned the sanctuary incident she had witnessed into to literature. It was also used against her at trial. Apart from the few readings Demetria had performed, her
poem had not been made public until it mysteriously ended up in the unscrupulous hands of U.S. Attorney, William Lutz.

*Constructing Legal Truths and Untruths*

While the defendants were busy organizing the public information campaign - making presentations in churches and talking to community groups across the state, and working the local media outlets - Lutz and his assistant, Rhonda Backinoff, studied the Tucson Sanctuary Trial (*US vs. Aguilar*) and even copied entire legal arguments from the briefs verbatim. The Tucson Sanctuary Trial was result of a government sting operation focused on persecuting sanctuary advocates on the borderlands and discrediting the movement. Sixteen sanctuary workers were indicted in relation to the case and many more were brought in for questioning, including Pat Malcolm of Albuquerque who was named an “unindicted conspirator” for assisting a Salvadoran family. While not all of the people indicted or named in the Tucson case were charged with any crime, Rev. John Fife, Sister Darlene Nicgorski, Father Ramon Quinones, and María del Socorro Prado de Águilar were all convicted of conspiracy to violate immigration law. Two other individuals, Father Toney Clark and Wendy LeWin, were found guilty of harboring and transporting illegal aliens. Although the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the verdict, none of the sanctuary workers convicted of felony violations served the full two-year sentence. Some of those convicted were released on probation after serving a few months in prison while others were released after six months of detention (Coutin 1993).
As mentioned in Chapter I, sanctuary activists in the borderlands were singled out for persecution by the FBI and were the victims of illegal undercover activities, even as sanctuary incidents were occurring in communities across the United States and the most active transport networks were at the Canadian border (Golden and McConnell 1986; Lippert 2005). The Mexican border with the United States has always been a site of exceptionalism, marking boundaries of national sovereignty and the limits of state power while retaining the traces of a history of violent conquest and occupation (Mendoza 2011; Mora 2001; De Genova 2005). The assertion of state power and the demarcation of boundaries are enacted most forcefully at its margins and depend more critically on deciding upon exclusions and exceptions than on the enforcement of the law (Agamben 2005; Foucault 1988; Schmitt 1985). At the U.S.-Mexico border these exclusions and exceptions are also set out to define the parameters of membership within the nation, most forcefully through the production of illegality not only an effect of immigration law itself but also a racialized social category (De Genova 2005). Exceptionality with regard to the U.S.-Mexico border is premised upon the enforcement of immigration law but in ways that are exceptional when compared to other kinds of law enforcement practices.

For example, legal scholars have observed that federal agents who police national borders have exceptionally broad authority in terms of racial profiling practices due to their mission of securing the nation from outside threats (Chacón 2007). In her analysis of the constitutionality of border patrol search and seizure practices in light of the Fourth Amendment, Chacón observes what she terms “border
exceptionalism.” Border agents routinely engage in racial profiling and conduct coercive searches without reasonable suspicion or probable cause and with impunity (2007: 147). Border exceptionalism is a primary example of making exceptions at the limits of enforcement (in term of civil and constitutional rights) which also produces certain subjects as the objects of sovereign power by singling them out as exceptional, or in this case beyond the purview of the Forth Amendment due to the higher order goal of protecting national borders (Chacón 2007; Lippert 2005; Schmitt 1985). The government subjected only a handful of people for surveillance and prosecution even though thousands were involved in the sanctuary movement. Selective prosecution on the borderlands was used as a deterrent in order to make an example of those indicted and convicted - a spectacle of discipline and punishment - with the goal of weakening the movement. On the contrary, the sanctuary trials in McAllen, Texas and Tucson, Arizona had the opposite effect. The media attention emboldened the movement and extended its reach while also enabling activists to sharpen their legal and moral arguments and promote them as legitimate truths (Cunningham 1995; Coutin 1995; Colbert 1986).

Government attorneys working on the Tucson case developed their trial strategy preemptively as part of Operation Sojourner20 based on information relayed to them from undercover INS agents who had infiltrated the movement (Colbert 1986). Undercover operatives had taken part in meetings in which activists discussed

---

20 Susan Coutin (1995) explains that the use of the term Sojourner was an appropriation and reversal of the Biblical passage from Leviticus 19:33 that directs Christians to protect the sojourner from other lands. Beginning in 1981, the Government began collecting surveillance on over 150 churches and organizations assisting Central Americans.
arguments that would be useful on the occasion that movement members were prosecuted. Some activists believed that it was only a matter of time before the government would begin to crack down on the movement. Sanctuary activists assumed that a jury trial would be good for the movement by enabling them to bring their moral arguments and legal truths to a broader public. They also assumed that a jury would be unlikely to side with the government and rule to convict upstanding sanctuary workers and members of the clergy. Additionally, activists ascertained that a sensationalized trial would be good political theatre, bringing more attention to the plight of Central Americans, the failures of the Reagan Administration, and the moral principals driving the faith-based movement.

Unbeknownst to the activists who had been discussing how they could use an indictment and the courts to further the sanctuary movement’s goals, undercover agents working for the FBI used insider information (gathered illegally in most cases) to plan their own legal strategy against the sanctuary movement preemptively (Colbert 1986; Crittenden 1988) The Government’s strategy, which had been honed in conjunction with Operation Sojourner in anticipation of the Tucson indictments, made use of the motion in limine in a highly controversial and unethical fashion to preempt the defense by baring testimony related to the sanctuary movement’s most viable legal and moral claims: international law, the Refugee Act of 1980, freedom of religion, the doctrine of necessity, and specific intent to violate federal immigration law (Colbert 1986).
The motion in limine is defined as a “pretrial evidentiary ruling made upon application of either party to the trial court for the purpose of precluding the opposing party from ever using a particular item of evidence at any stage of the trial proceeding” (Colbert 1986). The purpose of the motion in limine is to render certain information inadmissible at trial so as not to influence the jury. It is most commonly used in criminal cases and usually works in favor of defense counsel (as intended) to protect the accused’s right to a fair trial by excluding prejudicial evidence from the jury’s consideration. For example, Glen Thamert’s attorney, Karen Snell submitted a motion in limine requesting the court to prohibit the prosecution from using the phrase, “black market baby seller” in reference to her client during the trial.

As touched upon previously, in U.S. vs. Aguilar the motion in limine was used to exclude entire arguments, defenses and claims including: 1) the first amendment right to the free exercise of religion; 2) the rights of refugees under international and domestic policy; 3) the necessity argument or the claim that breaking the law was necessary to prevent a greater evil; and 4) the lack of specific criminal intent to violate federal immigration laws. Government prosecutors refused to acknowledge the legitimacy of sanctuary’s foreign and domestic policy arguments, much less the religious freedom angle. Their rational for the exclusion of these arguments was that they were irrelevant and beyond the scope of the case. They argued pragmatically that any reference to refugees, sanctuary or religion would distract and confuse the jury by politicizing the trial in ways that were unproductive to the pursuit of justice.
In this calculated manner, the prosecution blocked any defense or legal theory that could establish that the defendants’ conduct (transporting and harboring unauthorized migrants or in this case, refugees) was not a criminal offense. In this way, the motion in limine thwarted any argument in support of sanctuary from entering the deliberations. Furthermore, by forcing the defense to respond to the motion in limine during the pre-trial phase in pursuit of asserting the relevancy of sanctuary-related arguments to the trial court, the prosecution had actually coerced the defense into revealing its trial strategies on their own accord. “This undermined the presumption of innocence until proven guilty and also shifted the power to decide the facts from the jury to judge” (Colbert 1986: 35). The judge in the Tucson trial accepted the government’s motion in limine practically in its entirety. As a result, the defendants were incapacitated. They were unable to build a credible defense based on sanctuary’s legal and moral claims. In fact, they were barred from even using the word “refugee” in their testimonies.

**Pre-Trial Posturing**

In her analysis of the Tucson Sanctuary Trial Susan Coutin identifies the pre-trial phase as a political process that is “power-laden and oppositional” in which each side attempts to define the dispute and gain an advantage (1995: 555). The Government criminalized sanctuary work by defining it as subversive acts of “alien smuggling” and “conspiracy.” U.S. Attorney, William Lutz also attempted to cast Demetria Martínez and Glen Thamert as criminals, this time with a renewed emphasis on conspiracy and human trafficking. Glen was accused of being the kingpin of an
underground baby-smuggling operation and therefore, driven by profit rather than religious conviction. This argument was a stretch given Glen’s long resume of humanitarian work the fact that the international adoptions were legal. Demetria was cast as a conspirator who actively participated in the smuggling operation. However, there were two new elements that threw a wrench in the Government’s criminalization strategy. First, Demetria was a journalist whose legal defense did not depend upon sanctuary’s legal and moral claims. Her case did not involve the freedom of religion defense; it rested on the First Amendment right to freedom of speech, an equally “sacred” constitutional guarantee. The shift from freedom of religion to freedom of speech was certainly a game changer. Glen’s freedom of religion defense became less credible because of the greater importance allotted to the freedom of speech. In fact, after Judge Conway denied his freedom of religion defense from consideration at trial, Glen’s attorneys refocused their energies on a more viable conviction – his unwavering belief in the reality of the sanctuary state.

Lutz and his prosecution team attempted to apply similar tactics used in the Tucson trial by using the motion in limine to compromise the defense in the pre-trial phase. Their motion asked the court to “establish appropriate guidelines for the defendants, their attorney’s and any witnesses called by the defense or the government from testifying about, alluding to, or presenting any evidence, either directly or indirectly” on sanctuary-related subjects. The motion also proposed to deny any reference to the “aliens” as refugees or asylees and to exclude any information that could support such a claim such as stories of war, civil strife and
state terrorism in Central America or discussions of U.S. foreign policy or military aid and assistance to El Salvador. In addition, the motion attempted to block statistical information about the numbers of Central Americans who had been granted or denied asylum status based on the Refugee Act of 1980 or any other treaties or policies as well as comparisons with applicants from communist countries. The final clause of the motion anticipated the linchpin of Glen’s defense, Toney Anaya’s sanctuary proclamation. Lutz urged the court to suppress “the declaration of any state official regarding the creation of a ‘sanctuary’ state.” However, Judge Conway was not so easily persuaded to accept the prosecution’s exclusions wholesale.

According to the prosecution’s interpretation of the facts, Glen and Demetria conspired to willfully violate federal immigration law among other crimes when they decided to assist Ínez and Cecilia by bringing them to the US without visas. Lutz rejected the notion that the case had anything to do with sanctuary and refused Demetria’s claim that she was newsgathering. In fact, he questioned whether the topic of sanctuary was even newsworthy. He construed sanctuary as a fringe movement led by peace-loving Quakers and radical communists – a subject far removed from the interests of Christians and average citizens. During the trial, Catholic, Protestant and Jewish religious leaders testified about the Sanctuary Movement as an interfaith movement attesting to the “newsworthiness” of the subject among their particular communities of faith.

In Lutz’s estimation, Demetria had crossed the line from journalist to participant in the course of a criminal act. The conspirators met the two Salvadoran
women in Juárez, Mexico and transported them illegally into El Paso, Texas and on to Albuquerque in exchange for their precious cargo: “In return for transportation and other favors offered to them, the women were to give their babies up to be adopted in the United States,” Lutz contended. In the end, Cecilia went through with the adoption as planned, but Ínez had a change of heart and decided to keep her baby girl. Neither of the women returned to El Salvador after giving birth as stipulated in the contract that Luis Ventura-Rivas drafted. In addition, Demetria had not been contracted by either of her employers to write a story about the sanctuary incident.

Lutz also stated in his motion in limine that the defenses he anticipated to be used at trial were derived from the defendants’ own public pronouncements to the media in which they plainly revealed their motivations and actions. The motion requested an order from the court to preclude and restrict evidence related to the following defenses: 1) the defendants had no premeditated or willful intent (also “specific intent”) to violate immigration laws; 2) the defendants were compelled by “necessity” and were forced to choose the lesser evil based the government’s political actions in Central America, which are immoral and contravene domestic and international law; 3) the religious beliefs of the defendants required them to act. All of these possible defenses reference the sanctuary movement’s religious and legal justifications for assisting Central American refugees. They culminate in to a particular vision of the world grounded in both liberal Christian notions of social justice and the legal truths that sanctuary movement activists derived based on their religious reading of the law. These claims to legal truth were blocked or seriously
restricted from consideration in the Tucson trial thereby impeding the defendants’ ability to build a credible defense (Coutin 1995; Colbert 1986).

Judging Sanctuary’s Convictions

The pinnacle moment in Conway’s life occurred in May of 1986 when President Reagan called him to personally acknowledge his nomination as Federal Judge for the United States District Court of New Mexico. He was so excited to be speaking with President Reagan, his personal hero, that his voice cracked and he barely squeaked out a verbal confirmation. At the time of his appointment Conway was working as a private lawyer in Alamogordo, New Mexico, while also serving in the state legislature as the Republican Senate Minority Leader in (1972 - 1980). As a civil attorney, Republican statesman, graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, and former Air Force Lieutenant, Conway was the ideal candidate.

Steeped in nostalgia for a bygone era, Conway has fond memories of his decade-long career as a state senator and paints a rather idealistic picture of New Mexico politics during the 1970s and early 80s. "Politics was different then. There were good people on both sides." In his view, the relationship between Republicans and Democrats was more amiable and certainly not as polarized as it is today. The fact that that two Memorials had passed in support of Central American refugees in 1985 with broad bipartisan support (with more Republicans voting with Democrats than not) gives some to credence to Conway's recollections, particularly in contrast with the contemporary stalemate on immigration reform. The ideological divide between Republicans and Democrats on immigration-related issues has certainly
widened among elected officials and the voting public since the 1990s. Today, Republicans are deeply entrenched in anti-immigrant ideologies and promoting exclusionary legislative proposals (Plascencia 2013).

After passing through various levels of security at the New Mexico District Court in Albuquerque to arrive at Judge John Conway chambers, I was disappointed to find the man equally as guarded as his workplace. It may seem jarring at this point for me to insert myself into the narrative to describe my personal encounter with John Conway. A few minutes into the interview it was obvious that he was unwilling to answer my questions about the Sanctuary Trial or maybe at the ripe age of seventy-nine he really could not remember. He was more forthcoming however about his views on undocumented migration. “I was down in Cruces a week or two ago and I sentenced sixty-two illegal immigrants in two hours,” proclaimed Conway, with a hint of caviler bravado in his voice. “They’re all going back south and it’s a pathetic situation, some of them on are on their fourth or fifth trip back.” Whether this comment was a lament for the plight of the undocumented stranded without a pathway to citizenship or legal presence in the United States, or for his part in enforcing a broken immigration system remained uncertain. What is certain, and somewhat surprising given the precedence set in previous sanctuary trials favoring the obstruction of justice, is that in 1988 Judge John Conway, a Reagan appointee and close personal friend William Lutz, turned out to be a fair and balanced judge. He refused to accept the arguments presented in the government’s motion in limine wholesale, thereby breaking with the precedence established in previous sanctuary
trials. Why would a man who boasts about deporting hundreds of undocumented immigrants at once allow two people accused of “smuggling illegal aliens” across the US – Mexico border to evade conviction?

Throughout Judge Conway’s response to the government’s motion in limine, he cites aspects of the arguments presented in previous sanctuary trials. However, he also cites Colbert’s (1986) article, which addresses the dangers of using pre-trial motions such as the motion in limine to block or weaken the defense in politically sensitive cases, as a justification for treading carefully in pursuit of fairness. “Although this Court recognizes its authority to make a pre-trial ruling on the admissibility of some evidence at trial, a motion in limine by the Government in a criminal trial has been subject to much criticism. I have approached with caution this motion in limine and now make my determinations only after a great deal of reflection on the issues it raises.” What we find in Conway’s response, is a comprehensive and independent consideration of the arguments on both sides, which to his credit, illustrates a strong dedication to fairness regardless of his conservative leanings and personal relationship with Lutz.

However, Judge Conway did accept the Government’s motion to preclude any evidence related to the necessity defense to jury. In his necessity plea Glen Thamert argued that given the impossibility of acquiring visas for Cecilia and Ínez to come to the United States legally, he had no choice other than to act in violation of immigration law in order to save the two Salvadoran women and their unborn children from a precarious situation in which their lives were in serious and
immediate danger. When his attempts to secure visas for the women failed, Thamert was compelled (out of necessity) to get the women out of El Salvador by other means. In Conway’s view, Thamert had failed to produce sufficient evidence as to the immediacy of the harm to Cecilia and Ínez. The evidence he presented was based on his personal experience as a witness to the dangerous conditions for women and children in El Salvador. However, because the evidence he presented was subjective pointing to an ambiguous environment of violence and poverty in El Salvador, but not directly addressing how the women he was helping as individuals were in eminent danger, Glen Thamert’s testimony was deemed too weak to warrant the necessity defense. In the eyes of the law, proof of imminent danger to the individual subject is what counts, not the potential for harm or the conditions that place the subject at risk of violence, persecution or death.

Incidently, the majority of Central American asylum seekers were denied because they could not provide the kind of particularized and individualized evidence required by the court to prove that their lives were threatened (Yngvesson and Coutin 2006). They could only speak to past atrocities and future potentialities, the general context of danger and risk in their home countries. Based on INS systematic refusal to grant Central American migrants asylum within the realm of immigration proceedings, Conway’s denial of the necessity defense was not surprising. The same burden of proof was placed on Glen to provide evidence that Cecilia and Ínez were worthy of an exception. Because he could not prove that the women actually faced “immediate and imminent danger” or any greater likelihood of harm than the
Salvadoran population in general, he could not claim that he was forced out of necessity to break the law in order to avoid a greater evil.

The necessity defense notwithstanding, the most important decision that Judge Conway made, and one that made all the difference for Glen in particular, was his refusal to grant the Government’s request to preclude consideration of Governor Anaya’s sanctuary proclamation. “You have to let people make their case and build a defense…all I do is sentence people and try people, the jury makes the critical decisions,” was Conway’s nonchalant retort to my probing into the reasons why he allowed the defense to present arguments at trial that were favorable. While Judge Conway denied outright the use of arguments related to religious freedom as a defense or justification for unlawful acts, he did allow Thamert to discuss his religious beliefs during the pre-trial phase to support the claim that he was not engaged in baby smuggling or motivated by profit when he acted to help Cecilia and Ínez. As indicated previously, Glen’s motivations as stated in official pleadings presented to the court as well as our personal conversations were guided by his deeply held sense of prophetic justice. Justice in the prophetic sense, according to historian and public intellectual, Cornel West, stands upon a higher principal, an abiding conviction that moves beyond secular authority and its legal limitations. Prophetic justice is a spiritual calling to live by Christ’s example of genuine love for humanity and his willingness to suffer alongside the wretched of the earth (West 2011: 96).

Based on the precedent established in previous sanctuary trials and the defendants’ own public statements, Lutz expected Glen and Martínez to draw upon
domestic and international policies to support their understanding of Salvadoran migrants as “refugees” fleeing for their lives and therefore, requiring immediate assistance. Lutz attempted to block testimony related to international law or foreign policy, the Refugee Act of 1980 and Toney Anaya’s sanctuary proclamation because he anticipated that the defendants would testify that they believed the Salvadoran women they assisted (or traveled with) were entitled to enter the U.S. legally as “refugees” based on these policies. From the perspective of sanctuary activists, the government was at fault for not respecting the laws already in place to assist refugees, thereby making sanctuary work a moral imperative. This shifting of responsibility for “illegal” actions onto the U.S. government and reframing of domestic and international law can be understood a “religious interpretation of the law” (Bezdek 1994: 9). These claims to legal truth while simultaneously claiming the moral high ground is an instance of prophetic justice. A position that both empowered sanctuary movement advocates to engage in activities proscribed by law and justified them on religious grounds (Coutin 1993).

Judge Conway clearly states in his response that neither international law nor the 1980 Refugee Act can confer refugee status on any migrant automatically prior to the actual filing for an adjustment of status. Likewise, Governor Anaya’s sanctuary proclamation had no legal backing to create or change an individual’s immigration status. Drawing on the precedent set forth in the Texas Sanctuary Trial (U.S. v. Merkt, 1985), Conway explains how the court instructed the jury on the issue of misapprehension of immigration law. The court determined that defendants’ belief
that the “aliens” they were assisting were already entitled by law to enter the U.S. as refugees was based upon “a mistake of law and could not constitute a defense.” He continued to show that the court had cited to the maxim “ignorance of the law will not excuse” and stated that the error made by the defendant, Glen Thamert, “is purely a mistake of law, and cannot be stretched into a mistake of fact in order to take advantage of that defense.” In criminal trials, the general rule is, “ignorance of the law is no excuse” and therefore, a mistaken belief or misunderstanding of the operation of the law does not make for a viable defense.

While Judge Conway did not restrict the defendants from offering evidence related to specific domestic and international laws, he denied arguments related to their misapprehension and mistaken belief in the applicability and effect of these policies as the basis for an acquittal. In this way Conway made an interesting distinction, an exception, with regards to the sanctuary proclamation. Because the question was not about the technicalities of immigration-related policies themselves but rather the content of the defendants’ belief in them, the sanctuary proclamation was singled out as special case. An exception to the dictum, “ignorance of the law is no excuse” is recognized when an individual relies upon an authoritative pronouncement of law by one who is charged to enforce its mandates. Despite Governor Anaya’s pronouncements to the contrary, because the sanctuary proclamation never included any words indicating that it was a “symbolic and religious statement,” it was indeed law-in-the-making.
In addition, and perhaps more importantly, the sanctuary proclamation clearly states that administrative guidelines for state employees outlining the legal and regulatory boundaries of the sanctuary state were in the works. An authoritative pronouncement of law, the sanctuary proclamation acted as a performative statement within the “total speech act” or social circumstance in which the statement was made, thus effecting changes in the world (Austin 1962: 52). Judge Conway interpreted the sanctuary proclamation as an executive order based on what was written in the document, but also on what remained unwritten. “The justification for this exception lies in the overriding societal interest in encouraging responsible actions by our authorities and reliance by the public on the pronouncements of officials whose decisions society wishes to see respected.” In his comment, Judge Conway underscored the symbolic power of the sanctuary declaration as law-in-the-making. It is a document representing the authority of the rule of law even while having no real legal standing.

In the final analysis, Judge Conway decided that the defendants should not be prohibited from offering evidence showing that they had reasonably relied upon the sanctuary proclamation since it would be relevant to the determination of intent, whether or not the defendants willfully and knowingly intended to violate the law. The defendants’ reliance or belief in the veracity of the sanctuary proclamation would be relevant to the issue of their “knowledge” of the Salvadoran women’s entitlement to reside within the territory of New Mexico, a sanctuary state. In Conway’s estimation, the government’s request to exclude the sanctuary proclamation was
unjustified. It would force the court to make a premature ruling on the relevance of
evidence to the case instead of allowing the jury full consideration of the arguments
and evidence.

Judge Conway’s decision to allow the defendants to present evidence related to
their understanding of the application of domestic and international law and the
sanctuary declaration broke with the legal precedent established in previous sanctuary
trials where the Government’s motion *in limine* was accepted as legal truth almost in
its entirety by the presiding judges. This pre-judgment precluded important evidence
relevant to the jury’s consideration from ever entering the courtroom, thus
undermining the ability of the defendants to build a viable defense using the
sanctuary movements’ most compelling arguments and claims. This unusual, and
certainly unethical use of the motion *in limine* was later revealed as an obstruction of
justice, a violation of the defendants’ constitutional rights and a blatant instance of
government intimidation and selective prosecution of sanctuary activists on the
borderlands (Coutin 1995; Colbert 1986; Cunningham 1995).

At the outset Conway’s political leanings and his personal friendship with
William Lutz made his break away decision rather perplexing, particularly given the
circumstances. An easy explanation would be that John Conway is basically a good
and fair judge and as such he did not allow politics and personal relationships to enter
his courtroom. “I’ve just done what I think is right. I’ve been criticized by people and
praised by people. That’s just the way it goes.” Another possible explanation for
Conway’s actions lies in the difference between the institutional cultures of
legislatures and courtrooms and how decisions are made in each of these realms.

Recall that before becoming a U.S. District Judge, Conway had served over a decade in the New Mexico State legislature in an influential leadership position as Minority Whip. He had only been a judge for two years when he presided over the Sanctuary Trial. Courts and legislatures have distinct institutional cultures and use different evaluative rubrics in engaging with the law. For example, Gershon (2011) observes that legislatures make laws based on representation and are always constrained by accountability to a constituency. Courts, on the other hand, apply laws to fit specific contexts. In other words, the difference is that legislatures move from a specific issue to finding a general rule that can be applied over a broad spectrum of situations while courts start from the general rule and narrow it to fit a specific case. In addition, courts are judged on how objectively they apply a law to a context, while legislators are judged unbiased based on how well the laws the make represents the interests of the public (Gershon 2011). Legislators view the laws they create as compromises among culturally plural perspectives, whereas laws in the courtroom are thought to be objective, acultural truths that are applicable to different cultural situations. Based on these observations and the previous discussion of Judge Conway’s decision-making process, it is possible that his experience as a legislator primed him to be more open to compromise. Conway was well aware of the media spectacle around this politically sensitive case. He was also aware of the widespread support for sanctuary within the legislature and among average New Mexicans. Thinking politically, more like a legislator than a judge, Conway was concerned about equal representation and
inclusiveness. Because of the political nature of the case and the fact that a journalist was involved, Conway had to allow the defendants to make their case in order to be viewed as an unbiased and objective arbiter of the facts.

_Hearing Sanctuary’s Convictions_

By agreeing to hear arguments related to the Sanctuary Movement’s philosophical foundations and political standpoint, Conway had inadvertently handed the movement a major victory. While Conway eventually declined the motion to bring Glen’s necessity defense to trial, he allowed evidence backing the necessity argument to be presented in the pre-trial hearings. This decision allowed sanctuary to make its case publically in a court of law for the first time. Expert testimony was presented in the pre-trial hearings about the civilian crisis in El Salvador, international law related to the protection of refugees fleeing life threatening violence, U.S. foreign policy in Central America and finally, the religious and moral basis for sanctuary. The hearings began on June 7, 1988, and extended over three days. On the first day the defense introduced testimony experts in US foreign policy in Central America, who discussed the failures of US intervention in El Salvador and the prevalence of human rights abuses. Jesus Campos, a Salvadoran refugee and former Justice of the Peace, provided the native viewpoint on the daily situation of violence in his homeland and the reasons behind the mass migration north. Campos ended his testimony with a moral declaration in defense of sanctuary, “When there is a conflict between law and justice, you must make justice prevail.”
The second day of testimony focused on the religious and humanitarian imperative behind the faith-based Sanctuary Movement and the political persecution of movement members. Rev. Gustav Schultz, the pastor of University Lutheran Chapel in Berkeley, California and influential leader in the movement, spoke movingly about the historical and Biblical origins of sanctuary and defined the work as a “ministry” and those who offer it as people of conscience engaged in humanitarian work not civil disobedience. He also framed the surveillance of sanctuary churches as a church-state conflict stating that, “the government was trying to tell the churches how to do their ministry when told they should not help Salvadoran refugees. Our response should be based on our faith and their needs, not the dictates of the government.”

Another witness, theologian Larry Rasmussen of the Union Theological Seminary in New York, spoke with authority on the Judeo-Christian basis for sanctuary in Holy Scripture emphasizing the concept of offering hospitality to sojourners as the continuance of God’s bringing the slaves out of Egypt in the exodus. He also gave a forceful example of the oppression of religious conscious during World War II, in which “overdue obedience to the state led to Auschwitz.”

The pre-trial hearings were generously covered in the media largely due to Demetria Martínez’s established relationship with local newspapers as an independent contributor to the Albuquerque Journal’s religion section. For this reason, media coverage tended to be slanted toward the defense reinforcing the Sanctuary Defense Committee’s political and legal strategy. The committee aimed to
shore up Glen’s defense, while also educating the community at large about the moral force behind providing sanctuary to Central American refugees as a reprieve from the tragic consequences of US immigration policy on victims of war\textsuperscript{30}. The uniqueness of the New Mexico Sanctuary Trial also peaked the interest of the national media. An article in the \textit{New York Times} outlined the government’s failure to impede the Sanctuary Movement even while gaining convictions in Arizona and Texas. Jail sentences were reduced to probation time for those convicted and the media spectacle around the trials strengthened the movement by extending its reach and providing a platform for its political message.

William Lutz’s stubborn decision to prosecute Glen and Demetria enraged his Republican colleagues. He repeatedly advised Lutz against taking the case to trial and urged him to back down and for good reason. The Government had already failed in its attempt to contain the Sanctuary Movement by prosecuting movement leaders, obstructing justice (not allowing sanctuary’s principals to be heard in court), and investigating churches. Lutz argued that the criminal case had nothing to do with sanctuary; it was a clear-cut alien smuggling case in his mind. However, by allowing sanctuary’s principals to be heard in court Conway limited the prosecution’s ability to gain the upper hand as had occurred in the Tucson trial (Coutin 1995). The defense had set the parameters of the debate. Taking on sanctuary in New Mexico, a formerly declared sanctuary state, and prosecuting a journalist was a recipe for failure. Perhaps, Lutz’s personal vendetta against Toney Anaya had clouded his judgment.
The pre-trial hearings also allowed the defendants to confront the issue of government persecution of sanctuary movement members and those who speak out against US military intervention in Central America. Various witnesses took the stand in support of Glen, attesting to his simple lifestyle and dedicated ministry in service of the poor to counter Lutz’s claim that he was intent on selling babies. In his motion claiming selective prosecution, Glen argued that it was his political activities and outspoken support for the Central American cause that had made him a target of harassment. Many others assisted Glen in the sanctuary run and provided hospitality to Cecilia and Ínez, but Glen and Demetria were the only individuals prosecuted21. The defense questioned why they were singled out. Dr. Davida Coady, a pediatrician who had worked in El Salvador testified about her work bringing war-injured children to the U.S. for medical treatment. In 1987, while obtaining visas for her patients, an administrator from the U.S. Consulate told her that the sanctuary movement had been caught selling babies. “We’re going to get the sanctuary movement this time,” were his exact words31.

Outside the courtroom some sanctuary advocates criticized Glen’s decision to act without consulting local leaders and for not screening the women beforehand. Although he had not acted alone, the rogue characterization of his actions made the Lutheran minister more susceptible to criminalization, which made his motives suspect among sanctuary movement supporters. They too questioned weather or not

---

21 The defense called Mike Murphy, the federal agent in charge of the investigation during the pre-trial hearing. He testified that over thirty individuals had aided the Salvadoran women in their journey or during their stay in Albuquerque, but authorities did not seek prosecution of these individuals. He also could not corroborate the profit motive.
Glen’s actions were really sanctuary. These concerns were aired in the *The Albuquerque Sanctuary Newsletter*, a publication issued by the New Mexico Conference of Churches. The authors, Jan Burgquist and Jenny Beatty wrote in Glen’s defense:

By the very nature of the movement, we are fluid. A movement has life and truth because of those who are involved and who dare to question, to risk, and to act. We are not an organization with structure or rules or leadership. Thamert may not have been associated with a Sanctuary church. Perhaps he did not act in traditional ways or consult anyone, but he did act, and he acted from his heart. Above all, we stand by Thamert’s actions, and stand by him and Martínez while they are under fire.32

Both Demetria and Glen presented motions pertaining to selective prosecution. Although they were tried together, largely because it was more efficient for the courts to do so, their cases and legal arguments were quite different. Martínez’s public defender, Tova Indritz, made it clear in her legal arguments that her client was not involved in the sanctuary movement, she was acting as a journalist covering a newsworthy story. Therefore, information about the sanctuary movement, apart from it being a newsworthy topic of general public interest, was irrelevant to Martínez’s case. Her defense was squarely focused on the First Amendment grantee of freedom of speech. As a journalist on the beat, she had gathered information about the sanctuary incident that she had witnessed in the course of newsgathering. Therefore, besides religious freedom another sacred right was on trial – freedom of speech and of the press. Famed Chicano intellectual, Rodolfo Acuña, author of *Occupied America* (1972) wrote about the chilling effect that Demetria’s indictment could have on journalists who critique U.S. policy in Latin America:
Demetria Martínez’s case should concern us all. It represents yet another, though more radical, attempt by the Justice Department to end the sanctuary movement where it began – in the Southwest. By going after a reporter, the department also has signaled its willingness, despite the First Amendment, to undercut the press’ role as a check against government abuses.33

Because Demetria had not written an article about the sanctuary incident and was not on an assignment for a specific publication, her role as a journalist was questioned both by federal prosecutors and some members of the press. At first, when questioned about the incident, Kent Walz, assistant editor of the *Albuquerque Journal*, denied that Demetria was affiliated with the newspaper and that she had acted independently without any oversight or prior notification about the story from her editor. However, when journalism organizations such as the National Association of Hispanic Journalists declared their support for Martínez and her constitutional right to gather news about the sanctuary movement, Walz changed his tone. He wrote an editorial in the *Albuquerque Journal* recounting the defendants’ prior appearances in the newspaper, Glen for his humanitarian work and letters commenting on US foreign policy Central America, and Demetria for her articles on religion and immigration34. He also reminded readers that Glen was suspended from his job as a social worker with the Salvation Army for his outspoken criticism of the Reagan Administration at the World Peace Vigil in Albuquerque. Walz testified to this effect for the defense in the pre-trial hearings. Tom Fox, then Editor of the National Catholic Reporter, applauded Demetria’s professionalism as a columnist with the publication and called her a “first rate journalist.”35 Fox testified about the newsworthiness of sanctuary and stated that because of the sensitive nature of the story, Demetria was correct in her
decision not to write about the sanctuary run in order to protect the Salvadoran
women she had interviewed and photographed during their journey to New Mexico.
Both editors confirmed that journalist frequently kill their own stories and that
Demetria was clearly within the bounds of journalistic ethics as a freelance writer
who chooses her own stories.

*Freedom of Speech or Freedom of Religion?*

In the *Impossibility of Religious Freedom* (2005), Winnifred Sullivan examines
a Supreme Court case, *Warner v. Boca Raton*, in which a religiously diverse group of
plaintiffs argued that their religious freedom was violated by the City of Boca Raton
when cemetery officials refused to allow them to adorn their loved ones’ graves in
accordance with their individual religious believes and practices. In their effort to
standardize and secularize the memorials used to decorate burial plots, the cemetery
demanded that unique ritual objects be removed. Sullivan illustrates the clash
between secular law and religious freedom in this case revealing how courts define
what counts as religion. These judgments usually favor Protestant conceptions of
religion and what it means to be a religious person and often deny legitimacy of
individual expression of religion in the form of “folk practices” that are not dictated
in doctrine, sacred texts or required by the faith in the opinion of clerics (2005: 146 –
147).

In the final decision, because the plaintiffs could not prove that their particular
style of mortuary ornamentation was appropriately “religious” according to the
court’s constricted definition of what counts as religion, they lost the case. The
plaintiffs’ religious practices were construed as “personal preferences” and although motivated by religious belief, did not meet the threshold for legal protection under the banner of religious freedom. Sullivan points out the inherent contradiction in the free exercise clause of the First Amendment. Religious people must prove how their faith restricts their freedom in order to claim that what they are doing is legitimately religious and in turn, a free exercise of religion (2005: 156). Paradoxically, the right to religious freedom is only possible within a transcendent reality of a life lived outside the state and outside oneself (Sullivan 2005: 158). The secular state restricts religious freedom by keeping religion in its place and by defining it as an individual right but only as far as it confirms the states’ definition of what counts as legitimate religion. These are the problematic terms upon which religious freedom is adjudicated and enforced. “To define is to exclude and to exclude is to discriminate” (Sullivan 2005: 101). As follows, the impossibility of religious freedom is a secular project of containing religious difference (and conflict) under the ruse of neutrality.

In the Tucson trial, the judge denied the religious freedom defense and prohibited any mention of religion throughout the trial. The defendants argued that helping Salvadoran and Guatemalan refugees was not only mandated by scripture, but also essential to the practice of their Christian faith. The prosecution countered that the defendants were using religion as a cover for engaging in illegal activities. In addition, they argued that the Pope had not commented on sanctuary and that the majority of Christians were not involved in the movement. Because sanctuary was not confirmed by any institutional dictum nor did the Church (Catholic or Protestant)
define sanctuary work as essential to the practice of Christianity or to being a faithful Christian it was determined to be a matter of individual conscience. Religious freedom became entangled with secular power. Citizen control of immigration law and the power to arbitrate refugee status, overstepped the state’s abiding interest in controlling migration, securing national borders and regulating migrants. In this case, secular authority easily trumped any claim to the constitutional guarantee of freedom of religion.

The New Mexico Sanctuary Trial followed a similar course in terms of its management of the question of religious freedom with few deviations. In Glen Thamert’s plea to dismiss the charges brought against him, he argues that the prosecution was an unwarranted infringement on the exercise of his constitutional right to freedom of religion. He identifies himself as a sanctuary worker engaged in offering humanitarian assistance to refugees fleeing violence and terror in El Salvador and that this work is a “ministry” dictated by his religious beliefs, not solely as a matter of personal conscience, but as an indelible aspect of his Christian faith. The prosecution, he charged, was an attack on his First Amendment rights to carryout his religious ministry in accordance with God’s mandate to help those who are suffering and to “welcome the stranger.” In another context Glen described what it meant to him to be a Christian. “As a Christian, the question is am I personally being faithful to what I believe? There is a cost for discipleship. If I need to pay it, I pay it. What happens in court happens. I live with the consequences.” The Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment protects both the freedom to believe and the freedom to act in
accordance with those beliefs (Sullivan 2005). However, the government’s prohibition of religious practice is permissible when there is a compelling state interest to do so.

In all of the sanctuary trials the prosecution had no problem proving that securing national borders and enforcing immigration law superseded the defendants’ constitutional right to practice their religion by engaging in sanctuary work. Judge Conway, for example, wrote in response to Glen’s motion, “The magnitude of the Government’s interest in enforcement of its immigration laws cannot be seriously challenged.” He also asserted that Glen was not restricted from practicing his religion without breaking the law and that there were other lawful means available for assisting those whom he was called to serve. While denying Glen’s freedom of religion defense, Judge Conway accepted as true that he was “motivated by sincere religious beliefs.” Accordingly, Glen was allowed to present a statement on his religious beliefs during the pre-trial hearings to establish his motive for transporting and harboring “illegal aliens.” In this way, Judge Conway narrowed consideration of religious freedom to the issue of motivation. Religion reduced to a “motivation” restricts the complexity and diversity of religious practice and belief to a private matter of the heart or internal subjective state that can paradoxically be evaluated externally in the form of religious “sincerity” rather than an individual’s fidelity to a transcendent authority beyond the state and beyond oneself. (Sullivan 2005).

This simplification not only denied sanctuary workers of any claim to religious freedom, but also defined religion in terms of social identity, one that is only as
sincere as its performance can be judged as authentic. In his groundbreaking book, *Real Black, Adventures in Racial Sincerity* (2005), anthropologist, John L. Jackson, theorizes racial performances through the contingent relationship between sincerity and authenticity. Jackson explains that tests of authenticity rob subjects of their agency since they depend on the objectification of the person. Authenticity is about making judgments about how well objects conform to predetermined categories. Sincerity, on the other hand, is about the lived quality or performativity of social identities. Sincerity, Jackson contends, “demands its performance.” (2005:14). While Jackson applies the concept of racial sincerity to get around the trap of authenticity testing in his analysis of black public space and social performance in Harlem, religious difference also enters the fray as part of this “unfalsifiable interiority” that cannot be proved or disproved. “Authenticity attempts to domesticate sincerity, rein it in, control its excesses.” (Jackson 2005: 17).

I bring Jackson’s astute discussion of the relationship between authenticity and sincerity into this conversation about religious freedom to underscore the impossibility of judging Glen’s religious sincerity by any verifiable measure. Judge Conway ascertained that Glen’s religious motivations for helping the Salvadoran women were “sincere.” How is religious sincerity authenticated? As discussed previously, in a court of law, the excesses of religion must be controlled and forced into narrow categories. In this context, Glen’s religious sincerity was not handled as an interior state or “motivation” it was managed as testable materiality that could be authenticated through written testimony and visible markers of religiosity such as
comportment and appearance. Glen was not actively serving as minister of a parish at the time of the trial, and his status as an ordained minister was under scrutiny by judge and jury. His lawyers advised him to wear his clergyman’s collar, look clean-cut and to do his best to act like a Lutheran minister in public and in court (certainly, being a handsome white man made for a convincing performance). These external valuations of authenticity fall short of knowing anything about Glen’s religious sincerity. Nevertheless, in the secular space of the courtroom, religion is managed and controlled through various levels of “authenticity testing.” (Jackson 2005: 14). In this way, the array of expressive diversity in what it means to be a religious person who acts in accordance with an ethical principal beyond the state and beyond oneself are rendered impossible (Sullivan 2004).

Demetria, a practicing Catholic who wrote eloquently about religion from a “native point of view” and whose faith was (and continues to be) a creative force in her poetry and novels, never commented on her religious motivations for witnessing the sanctuary incident. In contrast to Glen’s situation, being a religious person was a liability in Demetria’s case. She was thrust into the spotlight as the spokesperson for the defense and the sanctuary movement but she never portrayed herself as a movement “insider.” Instead, she presented herself as an objective and professional journalist who was knowledgeable about the situation in Central America and the refugee crisis and could articulate these issues in defense of the Sanctuary Movement’s principals and of her co-defendant. Because her legal defense hinged on the freedom of speech and of the press, her identity as a religious person dropped out
of the picture. Therefore, Demetria had to walk a fine line. In order to be seen as a
credible journalist she had to carefully manage her ethnic and religious identity – the
same qualities that produced her as a “native” Nuevomexicana and in turn,
established her “innocence” in the eyes of the community.

On the other hand, as a young woman and a Chicana Demetria was not
supposed to speak. Her freedom of speech was already compromised by her subject
position. This was one of the conditions of possibility (and vulnerability) that allowed
Demetria to become a Government target for researching and giving voice to the
Sanctuary Movement. Recall that she was the first and only reporter engaged in
newsgathering to be indicted in connection to a sanctuary incident. Demetria affirmed
her selective persecution and silencing in an interview published in the Daily Lobo, a
student publication out of the University of New Mexico. “I am a model minority. I
have made it in this system and I have paid my dues. My situation illuminates,
however, that people of color have had to disproportionately confront what I call the
dark side of our justice system. I hope that if I am a role model it was not because I
made it in the system, but because I questioned the system and now I have to question
it even more because of what’s happing to me. I have refused from the beginning to
sit down.” In a public lecture he gave in Albuquerque in support of Glen and
Demetria, the Reverend, John Fife, co-founder of the Sanctuary Movement confirmed
that government censorship of the human suffering in Central America was a primary
factor in their prosecution and that Demetria was in a sense, low hanging fruit. “They
can’t come right out and indict Dan Rather, but they think that maybe a little
intimidation like this might work,” commented Fife. Demetria’s recognition that she was indicted not only for attempting to write about sanctuary but also because of her racialized status as a Chicana who was not supposed to have a voice. Her freedom of speech was circumscribed well before her indictment.

Demetria and sanctuary activists were not the only ones questioning the system. Representatives of the ACLU and leaders of journalism organizations were outraged by her indictment particularly because the U.S. Attorney had not followed protocol by consulting the Attorney General before indicting a journalist. Tova Indritz had submitted a motion requesting the court to dismiss the charges against her client based on this technicality, but it was denied. In response, four state senators (all Democrats) introduced a memorial during the legislative session in February 1988, before the initiation of trial proceedings, requesting that federal officials reconsider the smuggling charges filed against Demetria. The memorial asks the INS to “take action to ensure that the report’s freedom to write and publish on any and all subjects is in no way prohibited, intimidated, endangered or threatened.” Certainly, the New Mexico Legislature had supported Central American refugees in the past, however this action was done in support of Demetria as an individual, a rare occurrence, which also underscores her political connections. Demetria’s father, Ted Martínez, had worked in Toney Anaya’s administration as head of the Board of Educational Finance and had many friends in the legislature. In addition, he and John Conway had served on the New Mexico Crime Prevention Board together, a conflict of interest that barred Martínez from testifying in his daughter’s defense. Years later, after the trial
was long over, Martínez encountered Conway at a social engagement and they briefly discussed the sensational trial. “Conway told me that he had allowed Demetria’s case to go to trial because he knew that she had a strong case and that the jury would acquit her,” recalled Martínez. 42

As the above examples reveal, the defendants discovered that being the objects the state’s disciplinary power also allowed them to shape the images and discourses that this gaze produced and to effectively create a spectacle (Coutin 1993b). As Susan Coutin observed in her analysis of the Tucson trial, “the publicity that displayed the state's powers of observation also gave defendants a forum for promoting their version of events” (1993b: 20). By creating spectacle and strategically fueling the media frenzy over the “baby smuggling case,” the defendants gave the trial a life of its own outside the courtroom. The story was quite compelling. It spilled out into the streets, inspired sermons and prayer vigils, and animated the kitchen conversations of average New Mexicans. Even Hollywood swooped in to get in on the drama. Actor, Edward James Olmos, considered making a film based on the story and even sent members of his production company to observe the trial. 43 The movie was never made. But, it was the local interest that counted. “There were so many people praying for me or sending me white light,” recalled Demetria. “Charlie Carrillo [a famous local artist] sent me a retablo of the Santo Niño de Atocha, the patron saint of prisoners. My Catholic grandmother was praying to her super star saints, the Santo Niño and San Antonio and my Pentecostal grandmother, rallied her prayer warriors at the Assemblies of God. Everywhere I went people came up to me to offer their
support and prayers.” In the court of public opinion, Demetria and Glen had won their case.

In the nine months leading up to the trial, the local and national media had built up a arsenal of stories about the “baby smuggling case,” which heightened the dramatic tension around the trial. In addition, recognized columnists, scholars, activists and average citizens chimed in with editorials in support of the defense many of them commenting on Demetria’s indictment and its impact on the journalists and freedom of speech. The League of Latin American Citizens announced that the it would be monitoring the trial to see if Demetria was treated differently from other journalist based on her race. “There have been other journalist who reported on border crossings before – why weren’t they indicted?” inquired an observer.44

The trial opened on June 14, 1988, with spectacular fanfare. Media representatives from over thirty different affiliates across the nation descended upon the Dennis Chavez Federal Courthouse in Downtown Albuquerque to cover the trial. A makeshift pressroom was opened in a vacant building across the street to accommodate the flock of reporters and Judge Conway reserved the first twelve rows of his courtroom for members of the press45. The Sanctuary Defense Committee came prepared with the political theatrics. They effectively organized sanctuary supporters to attend the trial wearing their signature yellow t-shirts displaying their logo – a variation on the iconic scales of justice. The interfaith community channeled their prayer and protest actions for the defendants by holding prayer vigils every Wednesday evening during the three-week trial in front of the Federal Building.
Local television and newspapers covered each day of the trial as if it was a serial
docudrama building up the jury’s verdict.

Sanctuary’s Deceptions

In his opening statements before the jury of twelve New Mexico residents,
Lutz accused Demetria Martínez of crossing the line from neutral observer to active
participant when she allegedly provided Ínez and Cecilia with disguises (caps and
dark sunglasses) and gave them instructions on how to evade the border patrol. INS
investigator, Mike Murphy, whose interrogations of the two Salvadoran women
uncovered contradictory stories about how and why they came to the United States,
provided this evidence against Demetria. Given their undocumented status and past
experiences of state terror in El Salvador where people were routinely tortured or
brutally murdered by government authorities or counterinsurgents, it is not surprising
that Ínez and Cecilia testified for the Government. Under threat of deportation, it is
possible that the women brokered a deal with the INS to serve as witnesses for the
prosecution in exchange for a stay of deportation or a more permanent adjustment of
their immigration status.

While the “real” reasons behind their decision to testify against Glen and
Demetria remain elusive, it is likely that Cecilia and Ínez did what they had to do to

---

22 Judge Conway removed and replaced one of the jurors, Martha King, half way through the trial after
she received a pamphlet from the New Mexico Sanctuary Defense Committee by mail. The flyer was
suspicious because the committee had sent out that bulk mailing months previous. It is likely that a
mystery sanctuary proponent put the flyer in Ms. King’s mailbox in attempt to influence her decision
or prompt her removal from the jury.
avoid being deported back to El Salvador. However, the women refused to be positioned either as hapless victim in need of saving nor as Sanctuary’s model refugees worthy of being saved. One of the critiques that local sanctuary movement members launched against Glen was that he had not properly screened the Salvadorans he was helping by traditional methods. This decision had placed everyone involved at risk. As discussed in Chapter I, sanctuary activists, including clergy, exercised their own form of exceptionalism or what Foucault termed, “pastoral power” (1982) in that they selectively offered sanctuary to individuals who met certain criteria. The ideal refuge, deemed worthy of sanctuary, was not affiliated with the Salvadoran or Guatemalan military or suspected of perpetrating war crimes, she was an innocent peasant, or better yet, an indigenous revolutionary brutally persecuted by the state for attempting to change her conditions of existence (Nelson 2001). The ideal refugee was also willing take their testimony of survival on tour to promote the Sanctuary Movement’s political goals. Needless to say, Ínez and Cecilia did not fit the mold.

By testifying for the Government, the Salvadoran women had performed a reversal of expectations or the return of the gift, an act of betrayal reminiscent of Diane Nelson’s (2001) discussion of the “Indian giver” in reference to Rigoberta Menchu Tum’s Nobel Prize-winning autobiography. The story is a classic case of anthropological hubris. Anthropologist, David Stoll, claimed to have uncovered numerous historical discrepancies and contested information in Menchu Tum’s book, thereby undermining the veracity of her testimony (Arias and Stoll 2001). Anglo-
American readers who identified with Menchu Tum’s story felt deeply betrayed upon learning, by dint of Stoll’s suggestion, that they had been duped. According to Nelson, duplicity plays on mutual exchanges of assumptions of identity (2001, 2009). The stereotype of the Indian giver, the Native woman who gives gifts and then demands their return, exemplifies identity detouring, a process that is simultaneously pleasurable and threatening on both ends of the exchange. Anglo-Americans projected their post-colonial fantasies of revolution on Menchu Tum as an “authentic” rebellious indigenous subject. In turn, Menchu Tum manipulated these stereotypical assumptions of her identity and put them to work towards her political goals. Nelson (2001) argues that the integrity of Menchu Tum’s enthralling testimony is less remarkable than what it reveals about power, gender and difference and how transactions of identification structured the controversy around the authenticity of her story.

I find Nelson’s discussion of duplicity useful for analyzing the convoluted court testimonies of the Salvadoran sanctuary recipients for the prosecution. Cecilia and Ínez were positioned between the sanctuary movement’s paternalistic tendencies and idealizations of the Salvadoran refugee and the Government’s categorization of them as “illegal aliens.” Either way, they were expected to reciprocate for the gifts bestowed upon them. Positioned between a rock and a hard place, the women’s testimonies reflect multiple detours through the other shot through the disciplinary power of the state. For example, after two grueling days on the witness stand, the visibly shaken twenty-six years old Ínez Campos-Anzora gave seven different
versions of what happened the night of the sanctuary run. She contradicted not only her own testimony, but also evidence the prosecution had gathered from INS investigator, Mike Murphy. Ínez testified before the jury that Luis Ventura-Rivas, the Salvadoran attorney who had arranged the adoptions, had told her that a woman named Demetria would meet them in Juárez and help them cross the border into the United States. Ínez also alleged that Demetria had not identified herself as a journalist and took photographs of her and Cecilia without their consent. This information countered Demetria’s assertion that she had acted solely as a witness, but it also contradicted testimony Ínez had given to the INS investigator. In her statement to officer Murphy, Ínez affirmed that she had encountered Demetria for the first time at the Juárez train station.

Further negating her role as the ideal refugee, Ínez claimed to be the daughter of a general in the Salvadoran military. She told the court that she had a good job and felt secure in San Salvador. She decided to go to the United States not because she felt threatened, but to secure better employment opportunities to support her unborn child. According to Ínez, Ventura-Rivas and Glen Thamert had duped her. They had coerced her into signing the adoption contract under false pretenses and then threatened her when she opted to keep her child. Similarly, Cecilia testified to being confused about the adoption contract. Although she admitted that she had left San Salvador due to a combination of violence and lack of economic opportunity, Cecilia told the court that she was under the impression that Glen and his wife were going to adopt her child and that she would have to return to El Salvador after the adoption.
was complete. If she refused to fulfill the contract, she would have to pay a fine or go to jail. Cecilia’s testimony was particularly callous. She blamed Glen for all that she had suffered en rout to Albuquerque. Glen had given her money, taken her on outings and brought her groceries. Nevertheless, Cecilia said that she secretly detested him and that no one had shown her any kindness during her stay in Albuquerque. Surely, the sanctuary members who had raised funds to help the women and who had taken them into their homes providing them with food, clothing, and medical care, were shocked and dismayed by their statements on the witness stand. The gift was returned. Both Cecilia and Ínez disavowed sanctuary and turned the image of the ideal refuge on its head.

The Salvadoran women’s vague and rather bizarre testimony about being tricked and manipulated into signing adoption contracts as well as their rather spiteful remarks about their mistrust and dislike of the defendants and other individuals who had helped them could be framed as *engaño*, a survival strategy used to dupe, confound and evade their oppressors (Nelson 2006). Ínez and Cecilia inhabited a contradictory position, doubly subjected as “illegal aliens” and as refugees in need of sanctuary. The trickster, the Indian giver, the two-faced native who hides revolution behind a mask of docility was certainly at play in their testimony. As Diane Nelson suggests, “stories about duping assume a double – two faces, two lives, this double move is the entry point of identification.” Both women claimed to have been duped by everyone involved in the sanctuary run. “One of them is a liar, Cecilia confessed on the witness stand, but I’m not sure which one.”**48**
Within the paternalistic mechanisms of both state and pastoral assertions of power, the Salvadoran women were expected to be grateful for the gifts they had received. However, gifting is premised on reciprocality (Mauss 1969). Cecilia and Ínez had become the objects of state power in ways that were both threatening and pleasurable. They promised the ideal refugee, but turned against their protectors. They also played with the powerless figure of the captured “illegal alien” mimicking lines fed to them by federal prosecutors. By virtue of engaño, the Salvadoran women had betrayed the defense and the prosecution. The judge and jury virtually discounted the Salvadoran women’s testimonies. Their stories just did not add up. They were duplicitous, two-faced, and indiscernible beyond a reasonable doubt as truth or lie, fact or fiction. Veena Das proposes that the state is “neither a purely rational-bureaucratic organization nor simply a fetish, but a form of regulation that oscillates between a rational mode and a magical mode of being” (2004: 225). This oscillation not only mirrors the mystifications of the state but also the duplicitous, two-faced character of immigration law itself. The illegibility of documents, the callousness of bureaucratic operations, the casino game of exceptionalism – the invisible hand that choses who will be granted legal presence and who will be deported back to the killing fields of El Salvador or to an unknown country far removed from memory.

The Acquittal

If the Salvadoran women’s testimonies cast any doubt on the defendants’ actions, the defense successfully guided the jury back into their corner. With tearful eyes, her voice cracking under the weight of emotion, Demetria told the jury about
her own informal conversations with Cecilia and Ínez at her kitchen table. According to the Demetria, they told her about the horrors of war in El Salvador – daily bomb explosions, armed patrols, bodies laying on the streets and the disappearances of family members and friends. “It’s impossible to raise a child in that country,” Cecilia admitted as Demetria took notes for her story. The poignant comment became a line in a poem and never appeared in an article. This fact was a sticking point for the prosecution along with Ínez’s allegation that Demetria had carried her purse across the border for safekeeping. For this reason, her legal defense became an argument not only about freedom of speech, but also about journalistic ethics.

To this end, famous author of mystery novels and professor of journalism, Tony Hillerman, entered the fray in Demetria’s defense as an expert witness on journalistic ethics. His star power struck Judge Conway, who asked him for his autograph as Hillerman took his place at the witness stand. When Lutz questioned Hillerman about carrying belongings across the border, he agreed that such actions could be interpreted as a breach of journalistic ethics. However, traveling in a car with the subjects of a potential story was not. In fact, Hillerman thought that Demetria had been overly cautious in this regard. Lutz retorted, "Transporting illegal aliens is a crime!" “I wasn’t aware that driving them is a crime,” Hillerman responded. “It didn’t occur to me when I took my roofer home the other day.”49 Demetria recalls, that after Hillerman’s testimony, she knew that she had won her case. But the win was sealed in an even more dramatic way when a surprise witness took the stand with key information about what happened the night of the sanctuary run. Davey Ricks, the
driver of the car that took Cecilia and Ínez from El Paso to Albuquerque, bravely renouncing his Fifth Amendment rights and risking prosecution, testified that he had driven the car and that Demetria had not traveled with the him and the Salvadoran women. When asked why he had risked his own freedom by coming forward, Ricks said that his faith in God confirmed that it was the right thing to do.

Testimony in support of Glen Thamert revolved around the legitimacy of the “sacred passport” or Toney Anaya’s sanctuary proclamation. Glen argued that he believed his actions were legal based on international law and the proclamation, which in his estimation, stated that Central American refugees were welcome in New Mexico. Albuquerque residents who had housed Ínez and Cecilia, Debbie Garcia and Teresa Lopez, both testified that Glen had shown them the document as proof that they would not suffer any legal consequences for helping the Salvadoran women. While Lutz argued that Governor Anaya’s decree never had any legal effect and he objected to its introduction in the trial as evidence for the defense, Judge Conway had a different opinion on the matter. Lutz reminded the court that in other sanctuary-related cases, evidence pertaining to international law or humanitarian virtues was rejected as viable defenses for helping “illegal aliens.” However, Judge Conway insisted that no other court was faced with the problem of a governor’s proclamation. In this case, Glen had proven he was not the only one who believed in the reality of the sanctuary state. Simply by displaying the decree as proof that New Mexico was indeed a sanctuary for Central American refugees made the symbolic manifest as a legal reality.
Taking the all the evidence into consideration and after five hours of listening to closing arguments, the jury unanimously acquitted Demetria Martínez, deciding that her actions were protected under the First Amendment right to freedom of speech and of the press. “This is a victory for freedom of the press and the public’s right to know, Martínez said after the verdict had been read. “Other reporters will derive energy from this victory. I wish to thank US Attorney Bill Lutz for aiding and abetting the rights of journalists everywhere.” After four hours of deliberation, the jury also acquitted Glen Thamert. “The sanctuary proclamation made all the difference,” reported juror, Antoinette Tellez. In making this determination, the jurors would both shape law and materially construct social reality (Ewick and Silbey 1998, Bourdieu 1987, Geertz 1983). However, because of the uniqueness of the sanctuary declaration, the decision held no legal precedence for subsequent cases. In this sense, the entire trial was purely symbolic. Emotionally drained and wiping away their tears of joy and relief, Glen and Demetria hugged each other in celebration. They would be forever connected by the experience of the sanctuary run, their politically motivated indictment, and the dramatic sanctuary trial. On August 2, 2013, the friends celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of their acquittal at the Albuquerque Peace and Justice Center surrounded by family, friends, former sanctuary activist, and supporters.

The Legacy of the Sanctuary State

The New Mexico Sanctuary Trial brought Governor Anaya’s proclamation full circle. In contrast to the Arizona and Texas trials, U.S. District Court Judge, John
Conway, allowed the defendants to make their case and build a defense based on diverse kinds of evidence. Essentially, the concept of sanctuary as a moral and political imperative had its day in court and emerged victorious in New Mexico. During the course of the trial, Judge Conway observed that nowhere in the document had it been stated that the declaration was indeed “symbolic.” The fact that policy guidelines had been proposed although the sanctuary state project was terminated before they could be implemented was evidence of potential legal force behind Governor Anaya’s proclamation. The policy guidelines, as drafted, directed that no person should be denied benefits, opportunities, or services offered by the state on the basis of immigration status unless required by law. It also mandated that state employees be prohibited from requesting information about or otherwise investigating the citizenship or immigration status of any person unless authorized by law. It also prohibited state workers from identifying undocumented aliens and reporting them to immigration officials unless the individual was engaged in criminal activities. Finally, each state department secretary or agency director was instructed to take all steps necessary to ensure that the guidelines were implemented and enforced.

What is striking about the policy guidelines is that they make no mention of Central American refugees as a specific category of migrant deserving of special consideration or protection. As written, all undocumented migrants residing in New Mexico would have been covered under the sanctuary state policy. This rather surprising evidence brings us back to Governor Toney Anaya’s intentions. Did he
capitalize on the sanctuary narrative as well as the moral appeal and public endorsement of protections for Central American refugees as a cover for a more comprehensive local immigration policy that would benefit all immigrants? In my interview with the former Governor, he initially denied that his symbolic gesture of solidarity with the Sanctuary Movement had a hidden agenda. However, upon further prodding Anaya admitted that the policy guidelines he had drafted did not single out Central Americans for protection and were intended to be all-inclusive. I remained skeptical. I had basically cornered him during the interview by showing him a copy of the policy guidelines after his initial denial. Therefore, my somewhat aggressive “got ya” interviewing technique may have coaxed him into giving me the answer I desired. Nevertheless, the question really cannot be pinned down to a definitive answer since the all-inclusive administrative guidelines were in draft form were never implemented or codified into policy.

In conclusion, as this biography of New Mexico’s 1986 sanctuary state proclamation illuminates, documents have the generative capacity to escape bureaucratic controls and make things come into being (Chu 2010; Gupta 2012; Riles 2006). I began by looking at Governor Toney Anaya’s sanctuary proclamation was a political theology entangled with the idea of sanctuary as envisioned by members of the faith-based sanctuary movement. The document was produced within a particular historical context that involved international relations and failed foreign policy, but also adhered to the marginal spaces of intimate politics and personal vendettas. What began as a bold political statement or as a “symbolic, moral, religious statement,” as
Toney Anaya defined it, accrued many different interpretations, forces and uses. Opponents of the sanctuary proclamation interpreted it as an act of defiance and non-compliance with federal immigration law, which positioned New Mexico as rogue state, out of line with the rest of the nation. This of course, this was an overstatement. The proclamation only referred to the protection of Central America refugees and at least initially, had no legal standing. However, local sanctuary activists took the legal force behind the document seriously. For some, the sanctuary proclamation legitimized their vision of prophetic justice and also justified “illegal” actions - transporting undocumented Salvadorans across the US-Mexico border. Glen Thamert, for example, treated the proclamation as a sacred passport that would protect him from the legal repercussions of assisting two Salvadoran women in need of sanctuary. The symbolic power of the sanctuary proclamation produced it as law-in-the making. Governor Anaya, the highest authority in the state, had declared New Mexico a “state for sanctuary” and in a court of law, this was enough to make it a legal reality.

Vindicating the Sanctuary Movement

The dramatic criminal case, USA vs. Remer-Thamert and Martinez, locally known as the “New Mexico Sanctuary Trial” both marked the pinnacle moment of the sanctuary movement in New Mexico and also the movement’s ultimate demise as the social and political context of migration and settlement in the United States shifted. Heading into the 1990s the turmoil in El Salvador and Guatemala calmed, slowing the flow of refugees seeking asylum in the United States and Canada and ultimately bringing a close the era of the Underground Railroad and its sanctuary
hubs in El Paso, Texas as well as in Albuquerque and Santa Fe, New Mexico. In addition, some landmark policy decisions and court cases, most notably, *American Baptist Churches v. Thornburgh*, a nationwide class action lawsuit was filed by the Center for Constitutional Rights (CCR) on behalf of eight religious organizations, including the American Baptist Churches in the U.S.A., the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., the Unitarian Universalist Association and the General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church against INS, the Department of State, and the Executive Office for Immigration Review. The litigation, originally filed in 1985, challenged systemic discrimination against Salvadoran and Guatemalan asylum-seekers throughout the 1980s based ideological reasons (Blum 1991).

The case was settled out of court in a fifteen-minute hearing on January 31, 1991 and confirmed what sanctuary activists had known all along and worked so diligently to prove. The U.S. government had systematically denied legal status to Salvadoran and Guatemalan migrants fleeing war zones and death squads in violation of the 1980 Refugee Act (Blum 1991). While the plaintiffs also charged that churches and individual sanctuary workers had suffered undue persecution from government officials in violation of their First Amendment right of religious freedom for assisting Salvadoran and Guatemalan refugees, the court rejected this claim, thereby affirming that sanctuary related border crossing was not a legally protected activity under the Constitution. Nevertheless, victory was attained as a result of the lawsuit.

The settlement agreement recognized that discrimination had occurred in the asylum adjudication process and ordered the reevaluation of asylum applications that
were previously denied and also allowed those who had not applied an opportunity to have their claims reviewed. The benefit also provided a stay of deportation and the issuance of legal residency and work permits. The litigation, which forced INS into a corner, unable to disprove the challenge, was a clear vindication of the national Sanctuary Movement. Predictably, the need for the faith-based movement diminished towards the end of Reagan’s Cold War enterprise. Military aid to Central America was terminated and a conciliatory amnesty program was passed under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, which provided a path to legalization for many undocumented migrants in the United States, but it was also padded with new restrictions and regulations for unqualified and future migrants (Wasem 1997).

With the passage of the Illegal Immigrant Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) in 1996, a cap was placed on the number of Salvadoran and Guatemalan asylum cases that could be adjusted to 4,000 per year, which left many applications pending review and countless Central American migrants in immigration limbo up the present day (Wasem 1997). Interestingly, in direct response to the Sanctuary Movement’s invention of municipal and state-level sanctuary declarations and ordinances and other statements of non-cooperation with federal authorities in the enforcement of immigration law, under the provisions of the IIRIRA, individual citizens maintain the right to assist immigration authorities in identifying undocumented migrants. Therefore, this mandated that states did not have the right to pass local immigration policies or ordinances that prohibit individuals from reporting suspected “illegal aliens” to ICE.
The end of the Sanctuary Movement marked a new age of globalization, labor migration and restrictive immigration policymaking heading into the technology boom of the 1990s. While economic prosperity in the United States intensified the demand for migrant labor, particularly in the service and construction industries, Mexico’s economy suffocated under the weight of failed capital investments, neoliberal policies and the passage of NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement), which together further impoverished rural farmers and small business owners, initiating a decade of steady labor migration north (Hing 2010; Fernández-Kelly and Massey 2007). With few possibilities for legal migration, the majority of these new migrants, many of them female or from the rural indigenous regions in southern Mexico, came without documentation.

In addition, the technology boom of the 1990s increased the flow of information and commodities across international borders. While the movement of commodities across the US-Mexico border became less restricted under NAFA, the movement of people became more perilous and constrained. Border enforcement ventures such as Operation Gatekeeper (1994) and Operation Blockade (1993), further militarized highly trafficked U.S. – Mexico border crossings in California and Texas, respectively. This situation forced migrants to transverse dangerous deserts and hire unscrupulous coyotes (smugglers) in attempt to cross at more isolated places along the Arizona border (Nevins 2010; Fernández-Kelly and Massey 2007).

In 1996 President Bill Clinton passed a trio of federal measures (Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity
Act, and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act), which further criminalized migration and authorized local and state governments and law enforcement entities in aiding and sometimes subsidizing federal immigration enforcement (Drake and Plascencia 2013: 221). This action occurred in the wake of California’s Proposition 187 (passed in 1994) was an exemplar of the translation of anti-immigrant and nativist sentiments into repressive public policy that would deny undocumented residents social services and education. Prop. 187 was unique in that it took aim at settled immigrants living and working in the United States who had been unable return to Mexico or Central America largely due to constraints on transborder labor mobility. The legislation was declared unconstitutional, but the idea that repressive local immigration policy could be enacted to force unauthorized migrants to “self-deport” made a lasting impression.

The tragic attacks on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001, and subsequent “war on terror” in Afghanistan and Iraq gave rise to what has been termed, the “national security state.” War propaganda in combination with economic decline heightened already existing xenophobic tendencies and irrational states of emergency, which shifted thinking on immigration from a labor issue to a pressing matter of national security (Coleman 2007; Fernández-Kelly and Massey 2007). The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) was dissolved and incorporated into the newly minted Office of Homeland Security, which resulted in a significant restructuring of immigration enforcement. It expanded the practice of border
exceptionalism into the interior of the nation, an exceptionalism marked by surveillance, racial profiling, and mass deportations (Akerman and Furman 2013; Chacón 2007; Rosas 2012).

This interiorized immigration enforcement apparatus, or what I have termed the “deportation machine,” is premised upon the attrition through enforcement model, which encourages and often depends upon collaboration between local law enforcement entities and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). As a result, local communities are increasingly subsidizing the federal government’s immigration enforcement efforts and also creating their own immigration laws. This participatory culture of “attrition through enforcement” is propelled by the discourse of illegality, which equates Mexicanness with criminality and casts undocumented residents as unworthy of rights or benefits. It is also the driving force behind the proliferation of anti-immigrant policies passed through municipal and state governments today. Arizona’s notorious SB1070 is a prime example, but less conspicuous laws aimed at making life more difficult for undocumented residents by restricting access, mobility and integration have been proposed in other states as well.

The creation of exclusionary anti-immigrant legislation enacted by local governments involving municipal, county, and state law makers and institutions seems new, partly because these proposals were introduced in so called, “new destinations,” such as Georgia and Alabama, where the presence of migrants from
Latin America is perceived as a recent development. However, anti-immigrant policymaking aimed at restricting migrant’s access to public resources deemed to be the sole propriety of tax-paying citizens is not simply a knee-jerk reaction to accelerated migration and rapid demographic change in these new destinations. Such a quick jump to conclusions ignores the fact that the idea originated in the Southwest borderlands. California (Prop 187) and Arizona (SB 1070) are “old destinations” with timeworn border crossings and rooted Mexican-descent populations (Drake and Plascencia 2013). Interestingly, California and Arizona were also hotspots for the Sanctuary Movement throughout the 1980s.

In the next chapter, I explore another instance of the force of documents. Specifically, I elucidate their uncanny ability to make and unmake ethical subjects and moral arguments, to bolster social movements, and to inspire religious energies. Focusing on the contemporary immigrant rights movement in New Mexico and the resurgence of the sanctuary polity (including both municipal and state-level policy actions) in an altogether different era of migration and settlement, I pursue the drivers' license as a “vibrant object” with unexpected moral ambitions situated at the intersection of religious revivalism and immigrant rights activism in Santa Fe.

23 Julie Weise’s forthcoming contribution to Chicana/o history, Corazón de Dixie: Migration and the Struggle for the Rights in the US South and Mexico, 1910-2010, traces the long history of Mexican migration to the US South, which discredits the assumption that Latino migration to the region is new.
Chapter Three

Claiming Moral Ground: Drivers’ Licenses and Legitimacy of Presence

The silent protest of Governor Susana Martinez’s 2011 inauguration did not take the form of a prayer. The members of Somos Un Pueblo Unido, the leading immigrant rights organization in New Mexico, stood defiantly shoulder-to-shoulder in front of the historic Palace of the Governor’s Museum in Santa Fe. Somosistas endured security checks, police harassment, and sub-zero temperatures clad in bright yellow t-shirts above layers of protective clothing. Demanding recognition of their legitimacy of presence as local citizens or bonefide New Mexicans who are contributing members of the civic community, the protesters’ wearable pancartas blasted slogans printed in large black letters: “Immigrants Chose New Mexico Too” (referring to Martinez’s Texas origins), “My Mother is an Immigrant,” and “Immigrant. New Mexican. Tax-payer.”

Somos Un Pueblo Unido, a statewide immigrant rights organization based in Santa Fe, is at the vanguard of innovative grassroots pro-immigrant policy making in New Mexico. As result of its leadership and close to twenty years of community organizing, coalition building and working through the political system, qualifying undocumented residents can attend college at in-state rates and apply for drivers' licenses. Somosistas across the state organized to pass a law banning bias-based policing in 2009, which benefits all New Mexicans. Immigrant workers form labor committees and organize for better working conditions through the new United Workers Center that Somos opened in 2012. In addition, Somos
helped institute state labor laws that protect all workers from reprisals when reporting wage theft and labor exploitation and also expedites their claims through state labor agencies. In 1999, the organization sponsored the so called "sanctuary city" resolution though the Santa Fe City Council which prohibits the use of municipal resources towards the enforcement of immigration law. The resolution also created a committee dedicated to immigration issues, which gave Somos an official presence within City government, which allows them to monitor the policies they helped implement and ensure they are enforced. In addition, Somos drafted and oversaw the implementation of new policies in the Santa Fe County and Taos County jails that omit inmates' place of birth on the booking sheets and also limit collaborations with ICE. These jail policies now serve as models for other counties across the nation.

Founded in 1995, Somos has mobilized a broad coalition of partners including immigrant families, faith communities, labor organizations, lawmakers and social justice workers across New Mexico who organize to counter anti-immigrant policies and protect human rights. Somos is not a service organization. It is an immigrant-led political organization comprised of 3,000 dues-paying members, the majority Mexican (and some Central American) immigrants living in all corners of the state who plan and orchestrate local and statewide campaigns to improve their conditions of existence, their lives. Somos’ campaigns and policy work aim to protect families

24 Before Somos changed Santa Fe County jail policies ICE agents would have full access to the inmates and would often pull them out for questioning based on surnames and place of birth. It was confirmed that this practice was racial profiling and ICE was barred from the jail. According to the policy, ICE is only called when an inmate meets the criteria of "criminal alien" and only with the approval of an administrator.
from deportation and discrimination, expand access to education, decrease the incidence of racial profiling, and fight against wage theft and labor exploitation. The Board of Directors is composed mostly of immigrants who participate in all of the internal decision-making and fundraising. Somos’ grassroots policy work has made New Mexico a forerunner with regards to crafting pro-immigrant laws that promote integration and equal rights for all residents.

This chapter emerged out of a two years of fieldwork in Santa Fe (2011 – 2013), which coincided with the onset of the emotional and all too often acrimonious polemic over "illegal immigration" and drivers' licenses. During this time, I worked as a research intern and policy analyst with Somos and actively participated in their campaigns. I enthusiastically (and rather self-consciously) documented activities and meetings, as well as protest actions and lobbying efforts orchestrated during the 60-day legislative session, which began in January 2011 and ended in mid-March. I began working with Somos in August 2010 on a different project related to racial profiling, so I was able to observe countless planning meetings, community organizing activities, and other preparations leading up to the legislative fray. I conducted informal and formal interviews with key Somos members and documented many informal conversations in my field notes. I continue to work with Somos as a member of their Policy Committee, which for the past four years, has concentrated on saving the all-inclusive drivers' license law from repeal and implementing jail policies limiting collaborations between local law enforcement and ICE.

While actively engaged in the immigrant rights movement, I also participated
in and documented the political and religious work of Renovación Carismática (the Catholic Charismatic Renewal). This popular Mexican immigrant-led religious revitalization movement draws hundreds of immigrants from all over Santa Fe to Tuesday-night assembleas held at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church in which participants sing alabanzas and dance joyously to praiseful cumbias followed by meditative prayer and collective channeling of the Holy Spirit. Renovación is an immigrant place of sanctuary and a purely Mexicano world. Local Hispano-Catholics are largely unaware of its existence. The Mexican-imported charismatic movement is a hotbed for religious innovation on both sides of the border. During the 2011 legislative battle over drivers' licenses, the Tuesday night assembleas also served as a site for political mobilization.

As I mentioned in the introduction, the Mexican version of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal came to Our Lady of Guadalupe Church in 2000 with a family of talented lay preachers and musicians from Cuauhtémoc, Chihuahua and has grown exponentially in popularity, particularly among Mexican (and some Guatemalan and Salvadoran) immigrants. The movement currently has about 250 active participants in Santa Fe. There are also satellite groups or "seed" communities in Bernalillo, Albuquerque, and other cities across the state. Situated between the sacred and secular hubs of sanctuary place making in Santa Fe, I was able to witness how these different yet interconnected spaces of sanctuary collaborated in the struggle to protect the drivers' license law from repeal during the 2011 legislative session.
In contrast to the faith-based Sanctuary Movement of the 1980s, the contemporary immigrant rights movement is radically secular in its orientation even as religious institutions, primarily the Catholic Church, but also mainline Protestant churches and increasingly Evangelical churches, support the movement as auxiliaries. In addition, many Catholics people (the vast majority Mexican immigrants) comprise its political base. Somos receives a good portion (about 25%) of their funding from the Catholic Campaign for Human Development, a grant-making branch of the Archdiocese of New Mexico. Because they depend on the Catholic Church for funding, political backing and community organizing support, Somos makes uncomfortable compromises. For example, the organization cannot speak publically about abortion or gay rights, nor can they make literature about these subjects available at their office.

Marcela often quips that, “organizing is women’s work.” Somos core staff reflects this sentiment. All are courageous, dedicated, and intelligent Latinas. The women of Somos included four full-time staff members and one intern when I began working with them in 2010. Marcela Díaz (Executive Director), Adda Sallard (Administrative Director), Elsa López (Community Organizer), Marina Piña (Community Organizer) and Alma Castro (Labor Organizer). On various occasions, usually during lunch or at social gatherings, Marcela, Elsa and Adda discussed their religious experiences and views about religion with me informally. They also had many questions about my participation in Renovación Carismática, which cast me in an aura of suspicion at first. For example, during one of our long lunches, I asked
Marcela if *Somos* had ever had an infiltrator in their midst. "Well, not until you!"

Marcela said, with a nervous laugh. I was embarrassed and dumbfounded at the same time. A burning redness spread across my face as if I had been caught in a lie. "We started to wonder when you told us that you were teaching Catechism," she explained. My own uncomfortable compromise was that I had agreed to help teach the Spanish-language Catechism classes at Our Lady of Guadalupe because that's what the religious community needed at the time. I had not, until that moment, seriously considered how my commitments to the religious community would impact my credibility as a Chicana activist.

As a follow-up to Marcela's accusation, Elsa questioned my faith. "Do you believe in God?" "Do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God?" Strikingly, the answers to these questions had gone without saying among my friends at *Renovación*. When I volunteered to serve as a catechist, the Director of Religious Education had not vetted me in this way. My consistent participation at the Tuesday night prayer meetings and my willingness to help teach Catechism classes was proof enough, I suppose. Elsa took a sip of her iced tea from a straw, looking up at me with her hazel cat-eyes that flickered with a mischievous "gotcha" gaze. I laughed nervously, but then remembered that I had nothing to hide. I was not a double agent, an infiltrator, whose true identity was about to be exposed. I simply, told my inquisitive colleagues the truth. I explained that I am still searching for the answers to those very questions and that I'm open to religious conversion, hence my participation in *Renovación*. I understand my involvement in the movement as both a spiritual journey and an
academic study, a way to understand the content of my faith and the diversity of religious options that the world has to offer. My colleagues seemed satisfied with this explanation. Elsa's line of questioning spurred a productive conversation about the anthropological method and research ethics, as well as our individual religious experiences and beliefs. We candidly discussed our difficulties reconciling Christianity with our individual brands of feminism. To be clear, my colleagues at Somos are not atheists, nor are they anti-religion or anti-Catholicism. They deeply respect religious people and faith leaders, but as feminists and activists they are also conscience of the violent histories of oppression, colonialism, and patriarchy embedded in Christian institutions and ideologies.

Over the past three legislative sessions (2011 – 2013) Somos, in partnership with a broad statewide coalition of allies including immigrant-serving organizations and social justice groups, law enforcement administrators, legal organizations such as the ACLU, victim's rights agencies, as well as the Catholic Church, the Presbyterian Church, and interfaith organizations, have worked tirelessly to block efforts to repeal or replace the all-inclusive licensing system. Through a combination of savvy political strategizing, grassroots organizing, lobbying and petitioning, protest actions and a dash of legislative magic, the law requiring New Mexico residents regardless of immigration status to drive legally remains the status quo. A complete ethnographic account of the campaign to save drivers' licenses is beyond the scope of this chapter. Therefore, this story - like all ethnographies - is partial and selective made up primarily of highlights from the 2011 legislative session. I have also taken some
artistic liberties by incorporating excerpts from other years in the struggle to support specific arguments when necessary.

*The Doings of Documents*

The all-inclusive licensing system was implemented in 2003 as a bi-partisan solution to a public safety crisis – the preponderance of uninsured, unlicensed and unregistered drivers on New Mexico’s roadways. After the election of Governor Susana Martinez, which coincided with the passage of Arizona’s draconian SB1070, the anti-immigrant lobby gained a foothold in the state and drivers' licenses came under intense scrutiny. All of a sudden licensing immigrants became an affliction - a magnate for criminals (i.e. Mexican immigrants), a threat to national security, a “dangerous practice” replete with fraud. “New Mexico is attracting people from all over the world,” warned a female voice on the radio in negative political ad register, “But they’re not coming to ski or for the Balloon Fiesta. They’re illegal immigrants coming for drivers' licenses.” The attack ad, which circulated in tandem with anti-immigrant robocalls, hyped up an incident in which a man of Indian descent (a resident of the United States) brought a group of East Asian immigrants who resided in other states to New Mexico to procure drivers' licenses.

Another ad used a shooting incident involving two Salvadoran gang members (one had been issued a New Mexico driver's license) as a justification for repealing licenses from all immigrants. The message rippling through the airwaves equated immigrant license holders with criminality and violence. *Somos* declared

---

25 Seven other cases of drivers’ license fraud were investigated and the ringleaders were prosecuted. However, the claim that widespread fraud exists in the system remains unproven to this day.
the radio ads racist and illegal and demanded that the Attorney General and the Secretary of State investigate the Governor’s misuse of leftover campaign funds to pay for the vicious radio ads and robocalls to influence (and misinform) the public and the legislature. Governor Martinez's call to end the state's all-inclusive licensing system played on the politics of fear and unleashed an unprecedented wave of anti-immigrant hatred, condoned and even authorized by the highest authority in the state and tragically, the first Latina Governor in the nation. The negative spin on drivers' licenses set in motion a peculiar transformation. The identity document, once a silent and banal piece of plastic, came to life as a two-faced talisman with the power to bring down unimaginable calamities…or…protect the most vulnerable individuals from persecution and banishment.

A driver's license is an artifact of everyday practices of bureaucratic control over our lives, one so quotidian as to be rendered invisible (Das 2004). Thinking about drivers' licenses generally provokes annoyance. Associations with long lines, lost paperwork, bloated fees and bad customer service may come to mind. But, the drivers' license rarely comes to mind until it is requested, expired, misplaced or revoked. Except of course for the teenage permit holder for whom learning to drive and earning a license is a rite of passage. The little plastic card is only the tip of the iceberg. A drivers' license is the material manifestation of the file person that shadows. This “file self” is a collection of paperwork that generates a verifiable, state-approved stamp of individual identity (Chu 2010: 132; Caplan and

---

26 Here I am referencing Annelise Riles use of Marilyn Strathern's notion of the artifact as an object of ethnographic apprehension in articulation with local knowledges; the artifact as a reflective subject (Riles 2006: 16 - 17).
Identity documents facilitate everyday activities and practicalities like cashing a check, accessing places, applying for a credit card or filling a prescription at the pharmacy. In a world obsessed with identity management (of all kinds) the drivers' license emerges as a mode of mobility, indispensable for travel and most transactions (Lyon 2009; Torpey 2000). Documents bring individuals within the state's embrace, certifying that you really are who you claim to be.

Undeniably, the driver's license is the most versatile and widely accepted verification of individual identity and locality (or residency) in the United States today. It is also quickly becoming the primary means by which the state manages the social sorting and surveillance of its citizens (Lyons 2010; Torpey 2000). All state systems of identification are exclusionary by design. ID card systems are diverse and pervasive. They sort members from non-members and assign privileges or deny them based on arbitrary requirements or characteristics. Increasingly, large-scale databases used to manage and track individuals are transforming citizenship by reducing the social and participatory components of citizenship and merging them into consumer-based technologies and state-enforced data management systems (Lyons 2010).

An excellent example is the Real ID Act, which was signed into law by President George W. Bush in 2005, which if enforced, would create a national identification card system complete with interlinked databases designed for information sharing between a variety of government entities. Real ID is an interiorization of the passport theory of citizenship and membership in that proves
belonging not to the outside world but within the nation. As a derivative of the war on terror and its instrument, the stated (and understated) objective of Real ID hedges on a familiar colonial fantasy - total knowledge of the Other. In the post-911 world, state knowledge practices are not only about knowing its citizens and denizens, but rooting out potential "enemies of the state" preemptively. However, these enigmatic enemies of the state are not known suspects but rather, an "ideological assemblage of features, characteristics, and data that produce subjects as potential criminals or terrorists" (Lyons 2010: 130). In this way, identity documents, such as drivers' licenses and passports, are like a two-faced talisman. They produce citizenship within the paradox of presence and absence, as simultaneously a perceived lack and a precious link to the state (Lyons 2010: 132; Torpey 2000).

A driver's license can signify and sanction many things, but is rarely understood as an object of moral concern or religious contemplation. In New Mexico, the trouble with drivers' licenses points in this unlikely direction. This chapter takes up the 2011 battle over local citizenship and drivers' licenses at the intersection of the banal and the fantastic by holding on to the materiality of documents in the context of national identification regimes, digital imprinting of individual identity, and database-managed “social sorting” systems that are increasingly remaking the terms of citizenship in the United States and elsewhere (Lyons 2010). Unlike immigration papers and passports, which are only used for specific purposes, the driver's license is a quotidian document and derives its authority at the local level based on established residency in a particular state. I
argue that the driver's license, while certifying driving ability, residency, and identity also secures immigrants' claims to local citizenship.

In this chapter, I will show how undocumented residents have asserted their local citizenship based on legitimacy of presence in the state of New Mexico. "Immigrants are New Mexicans too!" Somosistas chanted in protest marches and rallies, refusing to be defined as criminals. They painted the slogan on pancartas and printed it in large black letters on bright yellow t-shirts matching the golden hue of the New Mexico state flag. Immigrants articulated their local citizenship in the testimonies they gave in legislative committee hearings in defense of their families. Parents attested to needing the document to transport their children to school and for getting to work safely. Students talked about driving to the University of New Mexico to pursue their dreams of a college education. Home healthcare workers spoke about driving their elderly or disabled clients to doctor's appointments and outings. Faith leaders spoke of welcoming the stranger who is also our neighbor. The actual presence of immigrant families, students, and workers served to invalidate the figure of the "illegal alien" and deflect the anti-immigrant racism directed against them.

As I will illustrate in this chapter, assertions of local citizenship grounded in legitimacy of presence have the power to countervail the exclusionary practices of immigration law and the dehumanizing rhetoric of illegality. While enactments of local citizenship can be witnessed in immigrants' political participation, self-determination, and struggles for recognition and rights, legitimacy of presence
moves a step beyond these secular forms of protest. It has an undeniable spiritual quality, a prophetic twist on politics. As I will illustrate ethnographically in the course of this chapter, legitimacy of presence is best understood as an alternative secular formation one that departs, or at least veers off course, from the standard story of the Protestant origins of American secularism. Instead, I reveal how Catholic theological concepts and popular devotional practices regarding the simultaneous presence and absence of the divine within material sources and referents, not only mirrors the absent presence of the state, it is also fertile ground for an alternative politics of personhood and practice of insurgent citizenship. I argue that legitimacy of presence, a concept that merges the dignity of the person with the sanctity of place, has the power to counteract the state's impersonal representational frames of bureaucracy and its perfunctory modes of indifference (Gupta 2006; Hetherington 2011; Herzfeld 1993).

This chapter has two parts. The first part provides a brief history of Somos Un Pueblo Unido, the organization's connections to the sanctuary movement of the past, and the state and municipal-level pro-immigrant policies that have made New Mexico a state of exception. Part one also provides important background information about the evolution of New Mexico's all-inclusive licensing system through changes in statute and the creation of legislation and how the program ran against the grain of national trends amidst post-911 anti-immigrant hysteria and the rise of the Homeland Security State. The second part of this chapter takes a more theoretical turn focusing on the 2011 legislative battle over drivers' licenses. I contemplate how the document
became an object of moral concern and religious contemplation, but also the impetus for the productions of a variety of local citizenship grounded in legitimacy of presence.

_A Brief History of Somos Un Pueblo Unido_

The connections between the sanctuary movement of the 1980s and the founding of _Somos_ are evident in the overlapping networks of activists who continued to work on immigration issues through the late 1990s and up to the present. As you may recall from Chapter 2, Mimi Lopez was an important sanctuary movement activist. She initiated the first hotline for reporting border patrol abuses, which became Albuquerque Border Communities (ABC), one of the first immigrant rights organization in New Mexico. She also provided transportation and housing for refugees and directed the Sanctuary Defense Committee to help raise funds for Glen Thamert's legal defense. Heading into the 1990s, Mimi who is also a close friend and mentor of Demetria Martinez continued their social justice work with _Enlace Comunitario_, an organization that helps immigrant women who are victims of domestic violence. In the late 1980s, Mimi Lopez started a socialist reading group for women interested in learning about political philosophy and working for social change. It was through this reading group that Mimi befriended Maria Cristina López, who at that time was working in community health and teaching ESL in Santa Fe.

“That’s when I read all the communist texts,” recalled María Cristina, who moved the Santa Fe in 1974 and quickly embraced the local Nuevomexicano culture and became
active in community organizing. With help and guidance from Mimi Lopez, Socorro Ríos, Sarah Reinhardt and other established community organizers based in Santa Fe and Albuquerque, María Cristina founded Somos Un Pueblo Unido in 1995 in response to the resurgence of Mexican migration and settlement in New Mexico's northern cities.

María Cristina was born in the Mexican state of Chihuahua in the small mining town of San Francisco de Loro near the city of Parral, which just happens to be one of Santa Fe’s sister cities. She and her younger sister, Julía Rosa, lost their father in a tragic mining accident when they were children. Her mother took it upon herself to support the family. She decided to apprentice under some family members to become a pharmacist. “She really wanted to be a nurse when she was young, but her family thought it wasn’t a proper career for a good girl. Being a pharmacist was the closest thing to it,” explained María Cristina. With the small pension her mother received from the mining company as compensation for her husband’s death, they moved to Cuidad Juárez, and opened a botecaria popular called Parmacia del Sagrado Corazón. Thus, María Cristina’s mother became “la doctora del barrio” offering basic health care and advice to people in the neighborhood. The pharmacy did well enough for María Cristina and her sister to go to a private Catholic high school in El Paso, the Loretto Academy, which led to scholarships to attend Saint Joseph’s College. The plan was to get their degrees and move to Mexico City to work and help support their mother, but life took the sisters in a different direction.
Although not among her favorite subjects, María Cristina majored in math and chemistry. She wanted to model herself after her father who was an engineer. While in college she fell in love with a fellow chemistry student and upon graduation the couple moved to Milwaukee, where her husband attended medical school. Wanting a career, María Cristina began working in a chemistry lab using her science degree, but it was not very inspiring work. So she went looking for work within the Latino community and landed a job teaching English to migrant workers from the Texas borderlands and immigrants from Cuba and Puerto Rico. It was the late 1960s and María Cristina got swept up in the Civil Rights Movement. “At first I felt like an outsider because of my middle-class background in Mexico, but I began organizing with Latino students who were pushing the University of Milwaukee to institute a Latino Studies program. Due to our protests and sit-ins, the University answered our demands and started a Latino studies program. Being part of the [Civil Rights] movement gave us hope that we could change the world.”

In 1972, the family moved to Santa Fe to work in a community health clinic in the Agua Fría district called La Clínica de La Gente and immediately clicked with the Chicana/o activists and community heath workers who had founded the clinic. While raising two boys, María Cristina started a health education project and organized women in the community to give workshops on women’s health issues. She also began working on a Master's degree in bilingual education and discovered her true calling. “In 1974, I came to Santa Fe with intensions of teaching ESL, but there was no one that I could teach! There were no immigrants in Santa Fe back then. They
didn’t start coming here until the mid-1980s after the devaluation of the peso in Mexico. Before, people just didn’t come here because there’s no industry. But after the crisis in Mexico, getting a job in a restaurant washing dishes was a steady paycheck and more reliable than anything in the rural towns of Chihuahua and other places,” she explained.

María Cristina witnessed the Mexican immigrant population in Santa Fe grow steadily throughout the 1990s. After the passage of California’s Proposition 187 in 1994, a terrible wave of anti-immigrant racism hit New Mexico. “A group of us met, Socorro Ríos, Mimi Lopez, and leaders of the Peace and Justice Committee at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church, such as Alicia Burrola, and people from Amnesty International. Of course long-time Chicana/o activists such as Carla López, Erwin Rivera and many others were involved. We decided to get the immigrant community together.” The first immigrant community meeting was held in the rectory at Our Lady Guadalupe Church. The church was, and continues to be, a beacon for Mexican immigrants who have recently settled in Santa Fe. Immigrants consider the church a safe place, a place of sanctuary. There were few protections for undocumented immigrants at that time, recalled María Cristina. “There were raids happening and we heard that in other states la migra was going into schools and taking out students. The border was increasing becoming a militarized zone. Here in New Mexico there were raids at workplaces. Immigrants were very afraid to go out or to speak out. The church and the schools were considered sanctuaries.”
About ninety people attended the first immigrant community meeting at Our Lady of Guadalupe. The attendees, most of them immigrants from Mexico and a few from Guatemala, discussed the problems they were having finding housing and difficulties communicating with their children’s teachers and with health care providers. The main problem however, was navigating the immigration system and understanding their rights in the United States. “People were afraid to send their kids to school because they were being asked for social security numbers,” María Cristina explained. Carla López, who later became a member of the City’s Immigration Committee, was on the school board at that time, so she made sure to reiterate the directive not to ask for social security numbers in the public schools. In 1996, Somos drafted and helped the Santa Fe School Board pass a resolution prohibiting discrimination against students and parents based on language preference or immigration status.

The community meeting at Our Lady of Guadalupe was focused on strategies to counter the spread of legislation like California's Prop. 187 and it was this legislative assault on immigrant families that actually gave birth to Somos. In 1995, the developing organization led its first legislative campaign against Prop. 187. "It was necessary because we couldn't count on elected officials to do the work for us," explained María Cristina. She recalled that when Governor Gary Johnson was asked if he thought a similar law could be passed in New Mexico and his response was, "Why not?" In order to rally state lawmakers against such an action, Somos drafted and lobbied for a legislative Memorial against Prop. 187 in 1995, which initiated their
local immigration policy work and in some ways, revived the spirit of the sanctuary state.

With an $8,000 grant from the Abelard Foundation, María Cristina planed to hire part-time community organizer to get Somos established in Santa Fe. With these funds and small grants from the Catholic Campaign for Human Development and the First Presbyterian Church, the foundation for Somos Un Pueblo Unido was set, but much needed to be done in terms of making in-roads within the immigrant community. At the beginning Somos was more connected to the Albuquerque immigrant rights organizations and was part of a coalition called Promotores de Derechos. Mimi had initiated a branch of ABC called Latinos Unidos that was intended to focused exclusively on community organizing, not service providing. “Her idea when she started ABC was to do more political work, something like Somos is now,” explained María Cristina. We wanted to engage communities from the grassroots, from the ground up, with a board made up entirely of immigrants that would take the lead. We wanted to build political power. We didn't want to be an organization focused on providing services and information, but on working for social justice.” By 2000 ABC had closed shop and the coalition had dissolved, which left Somos with the task of coordinating local immigration policy activism in New Mexico.

Marcela Diaz moved to New Mexico in January of 1998 with plans of becoming an elementary school teacher. After working as a substituted in the Santa
Fe Public Schools, she was quite disenchanted with her career choice and decided to apply for the community organizer position with Somos. That summer she had lined up a well-paying job as a tour guide in New York City, a gig she had picked up while she was a student at Columbia University during the tourist season. Marcela says that she had a feeling that if she took the organizer position it would redirect the course of her life. As expected, she never did become a teacher nor did she return to New York. Instead, Marcela became the Executive Director of Somos Un Pueblo Unido.

Before coming to New Mexico, Marcela had worked with immigrant youth in after school programs in California and New York while in college and had done some community organizing, but admits that she was completely starting from scratch with Somos. Originally, from Stockton, California, Marcela grew up in a multicultural neighborhood and in a mixed-status family. Her mother also grew up in Stockton but her parents were from a small town near Las Cruces in southern New Mexico. Marcela's father is originally from Michoacán, Mexico. He migrated to California in his early twenties. After the getting to know Marcela, María Cristina was certain that she was best woman for the job. She just didn't know it yet. “I did everything I could to deter them from hiring me,” Marcela admits through her broad smile and easy laugh.

Narratives of political awakening, or coming to consciousness, are almost as ubiquitous as the classic arrival story in ethnographic tales or the religious conversion stories, or testimonios that participants in renovación carismática often tell. Luis
Urrieta, an anthropologist by training, has written about Chicana/o educators working to transform and decolonize educational practice in public schools (2009). The teachers he interviewed and observed likened their political awakenings to a religious conversion experience. They described having a revelatory experience that disrupted everything they knew previously. The world looked different through open eyes. They began to notice relations of power that were once invisible. These revelations transformed their understanding of the social world and their place within it as activist educators (Urrieta 2009). Marcela describes her political awakening in terms of joining and making a commitment.

As an undergraduate at Columbia majoring in history and Latin American studies she learned how to think critically, deconstruct arguments, and to always question the truth. However, when she went to Chile on a study abroad program during her junior year she found herself engaged in intense political discussions with students and seasoned intellectuals who had actually lived through real political and civil upheavals. The activists she had come to know in Chile stirred in her a new kind of political awakening. At that moment in her life, Marcela felt confident in her knowledge of history and her talent for intellectual debate. She relished giving the unsuspecting interlocutor a forceful intellectual slap down. This youthful arrogance came to an abrupt end while arguing with a Chilean friend about history and politics. At one point in the conversation, the Chilean friend mentioned that he had been arrested and tortured for his political activities. The phrase, “when I was tortured…” left her speechless and deeply embarrassed. It was a moment burned into to her
memory. Although she was politically conscious, she did not know what it meant to commit to a cause. “I wasn’t a joiner yet,” admits Marcela. “I learned that there is a clear line between the right side and wrong side and you have to make a choice.” She gets frustrated with “non-committals” like undecided voters and people who comment from the sidelines, but refuse to enter the ring. “Chile changed my life. I don’t know who I would be without that experience. Meeting young people who were politically conscience, who had seen and endured so much. These people were reinventing democracy from scratch! I also learned that no political ideology or social movement is perfect, but you have to make a commitment.”

**Building the Sanctuary Polity**

When asked about Santa Fe’s sanctuary city status, Miguel Angel Acosta, a community organizer and former member of Somos’ board of directors, said bluntly, “The only people who find sanctuary in Santa Fe are rich Anglo retirees from California, The rest of us are struggling to make a living here. Brown kids get harassed by the police and ICE raids are more common that you think.” The idea that Santa Fe is sanctuary for the independently wealthy is based in reality. The widening income gap and deepening lines of residential segregation has made the downtown historical district and the newly developing Southside opposites sides of tracks. The new Mexican-owned businesses and *barrios* that have revitalized the Southside of the city are sometimes referred to as "Little Chihuahua" given that most of the Mexican immigrants who have settled there are from Chihuahua and business cater to their
compatriots. However, the Southside is composed for both new immigrants from Mexico and local Hispanics because real estate is more affordable in this newer suburban area, which is located about fifteen miles from the historical heart of the city and Our Lady of Guadalupe Church. With the influx of both wealthy amenity migrants and labor migrants from Mexico coupled with the out-migration of native Hispanics, Santa Fe is undeniably a culturally and spatially bifurcated city.

Marcela would agree with this analysis, however she thinks of the sanctuary city as something that must be claimed through grassroots policy activism. She understands the concept of sanctuary as a pro-immigrant polity, a broader social and legal formation that touches upon a variety of institutions and processes that impact the lives of immigrants such as laws and practices, policing and jailing procedures, access to housing and education, as well as civic inclusion. Building the sanctuary polity, one pro-immigrant policy at a time, is part of the productions of local citizenship, which also hinge on assertions of legitimacy of presence. These actions are mobilized around the collective goal of building power in relatively powerless communities by taking a grassroots, multi-pronged approach. Much of the political work that Somos does revolves around legislative campaigns and pro-immigrant policymaking. No policy, resolution or law is perfectly crafted, but they do give people something to stand on, something upon which to base one's claims and contest injustices.
In 1999, the City of Santa Fe passed a resolution declaring a policy of non-discrimination on the basis of national origin and prohibiting the use of municipal to identify or apprehend any non-citizen resident on the sole basis of immigration status [City of Santa Fe, New Mexico Resolution No. 1999 – 6]. The resolution makes no reference to the term sanctuary, but the policy forms the basis for Santa Fe's sanctuary city status. In addition, Somos drafted the resolution using sanctuary city ordinances from other states as examples, such as those passed in New York, San Francisco, Oakland, and the State of Hawaii, all of which dated to the 1980s. The exclusion of the term “sanctuary” from Santa Fe's resolution was strategic. The 1999 resolution, in contrast to the one passed in 1986, promotes equal treatment and protection for all immigrants, not special protections for a designated group of migrants defined as refugees. Interestingly, Somos staff members admit that they were unaware of Santa Fe’s inaugural sanctuary city ordinance from 1985. They also did not know about first resolution’s historical connections to the faith-based Sanctuary Movement and Toney Anaya’s short-lived sanctuary state project.

Nevertheless, the resolution that Somos initiated through City Council in 1999 is indirectly part of the legacy of the Sanctuary Movement and mirrors the 1985 resolution's intentions which were to include undocumented immigrants in the civic community and provide them with some measure of protection from discrimination and deportation. Although Marcela agrees that the resolution is significant, it was the establishment of the Immigration Committee, an official decision-making arm of city government that has made all the difference. Both Marcela and María Cristina serve
on the committee, which gives Somos another forum from which to leverage the political influence of the immigrant community.

In summary, since 1995 when Somos organized their first legislative campaign to denounce Proposition 187 and anti-immigrant racism, they have worked diligently and to establish a sanctuary polity through grassroots policymaking and statewide immigrant rights organizing. The following list outlines the municipal, county, and state-level policies benefitting immigrants that Somos helped pass, some of which have brought them national recognition.
New Mexico's Pro-immigrant Laws and Resolutions

1995 *Somos Un Pueblo Unido* Founded
The organization conducts its first successful legislative campaign, and helps pass a Memorial denouncing Proposition 187 and similar proposals.

1996 Santa Fe School Board passes a resolution reiterating their policy of non-discrimination. Public school employees cannot discriminate against students or their parents on the basis of immigration status.

1999 Santa Fe City Council passes a resolution denying the use of municipal resources in the enforcement of immigration law.

2000 *Somos* emerges as a political force when members organized to protest and block a Santa Fe County proposal to build a privately operated immigration detention center in the county.

*2002* *Somos* forms the Alliance for a Safer New Mexico and runs a successful legislative campaign to change licensing regulations allowing undocumented immigrants to obtain a drivers' license.

2003 In collaboration with the Living Wage Network, *Somos* lobbies the City Council to increase the minimum wage in Santa Fe to $8.50 (now $10.50 per/hour). Making Santa Fe the municipality with the highest minimum wage in the state.

2005 *Somos* organizes immigrant youth to lead the legislative campaign to pass Senate Bill 582, granting qualified undocumented access to in-state college tuition at state-funded institutions and scholarships.

2006 Over 2,500 people march in the streets of Santa Fe for immigration reform as part of a nation-wide campaign that brought thousands of undocumented immigrants into the streets and out of the shadows.

2007 *Somos* organizes the first statewide forum about immigration, initiating New Mexico’s local campaign for fair immigration reform.

2009 *Somos* begins a public information campaign called “Somos Primos” to bring native Hispanics and immigrants together and dispel myths and lean about their shared history and future.

2009 *Somos* Workers Committee leads the legislative campaign to pass House Bill 489, which protects workers from wage theft and retaliation, also bringing
attention to unscrupulous employers who steal wages and engage in other kinds of labor exploitation.

2009 In collaboration with the New Mexico State Conference of the NAACP and the Drug Policy Alliance, Somos participates in a successful legislative campaign to pass House Bill 428, banning bias-based policing and racial profiling.

2010 Somos collaborates with Rep. Miguel Garcia to pass a Memorial in support of Immigration Reform. Over 1,200 march in Santa Fe to protest Arizona’s SB 1070.

2010 Somos Worker Committee wins a number of key NLRB cases involving wage-theft, discrimination in the workplace, sexual harassment, and retaliation for labor organizing bringing them national recognition among unions and labor organizations.

2010 Somos helps draft and implement jail policies limiting ICE access to inmates in Santa Fe County and Taos County jails. These policies, limiting collaboration with ICE in local jails, gained national recognition as a model for curbing the detention and deportation of immigrants without criminal records.

2011 Leading a statewide coalition made up of immigrants and advocates Somos defeats the Governor’s legislative campaign to repeal the law allowing undocumented immigrants to obtain a state-issued driver's license.

2012 Somos and the New Mexico State Conference NAACP release New Mexico’s first “Racial Profiling Report Card,” bringing national attention to the problem of bias-based policing and also the widespread non-compliance among law enforcement agencies with the 2009 law banning profiling practices.

2013 Somos helps pass another anti-wage theft law that expedites cases through the courts.

Licensing Local Citizens

The campaign for immigrants' access to drivers' licenses emerged from one of Somos' first organizing committees, Mujeres Inmigrantes en Acción. The group formed around 1998 with the goal of empowering immigrant women and organizing
to improve the conditions of life in their communities. In considering the issues and the jumble of needs within immigrant community, drivers' licenses came to the fore. The women could not come up with a reason why undocumented residents were barred from obtaining a New Mexico driver's license. In fact, according to the written regulations, all drivers are required to obtain a New Mexico driver's license after thirty days of establishing residency in the state. Immigrants were full-fledged residents (some having lived in the state for over a decade), taxpayers, and community members. They were also driving on the roadways illegally. Driving without a license can result in a costly infraction and in the worst-case scenario, get an undocumented and unlicensed driver deported.

The path to an all-inclusive licensing system was incremental. First-time applicants and those who hold an expired out-of-state driver's license are required to take a written examination. In 1998, *Mujeres Inmigrantes en Acción* began investigating why the Motor Vehicle Department (MVD) had ceased to offer drivers' license examinations in Spanish. Officials could not explain why they had ceased issuing the Spanish language version of the test, but a few theories were thrown out when the committee pushed then attorney general, Patricia Madrid, to investigate the matter as a possible constitutional violation. Some MVD workers and administrators claimed that the Spanish version was halted in 1994 in response to California's passage of Prop. 187. Others said that so few people requested the Spanish test that most offices simply stopped printing them. The oversight came under scrutiny from legislators as discriminatory, the MVD quickly reinstituted the Spanish version.
After the Spanish language examinations were ordered and well stocked in MVD offices across the state, the next step involved expanding access to drivers' licenses. In 2001, the Santa Fe City Council passed a resolution urging the state legislators to allow alternative documents to be used to prove individual identity other than the social security number so that all drivers who had established residency in the state could be licensed and insured. Gloria Nieto, a member of the City's Immigration Committee, pointed out that not only is having unlicensed drivers on the road a public safety hazard, but Capital High School had a segregated parking lot since undocumented students were unable to park on campus.

Gladys Cobos, currently a member of Somos' Board of Directors was a student at Capital High School at that time. Gladys explained that because the school required that students present a driver's license to procure a parking permit, undocumented students were forced to park off campus in a vacant lot. The principal warned the students that parking in the off-campus lot was illegal, but offered them no alternative. On day he had the students' cars towed. Gladys still gets emotional when she talks about the incident, which was very upsetting. "My mom and I lived out in La Cienega and my mother had to leave for work at 4:00am. There were no school buses to my house, so I had to drive myself to school. We were all being singled out for punishment because of something beyond our control. The whole situation disrupted our education." Gladys and her friends organized and contacted Somos for help. The students were able to find a workable solution to their parking woes, but the problem of drivers' licenses for undocumented residents remained.
The next year, Representative Anna M. Crook, a Republican from Curry County, one of the most conservative regions of the state, stepped forward to sponsor a bill permitting alternative documentation in lieu of a social security number in applications for drivers' licenses. Glen Ellington, the Secretary of Tax and Revenue, the office that oversees the MVD, had received numerous requests from foreign-born scientists who were working at the Los Alamos Laboratories on H-1B visas for drivers' licenses for their spouses and children who were in the process of applying for legal residency and did not have a social security number. The policy was changed through a regulatory hearing to allow legal immigrants (with permanent resident cards and other visas) to apply and these were the only "alternative documents" accepted.

_Somos_ was not involved in this particular regulatory change, but saw the action as an opportunity to expand the program. In 2002, _Somos_ formed the Alliance for a Safer New Mexico to begin organizing a legislative campaign for access to drivers' licenses for immigrants who were in the process of legalization. _Somosistas_ supported the effort, but other immigrant advocates vehemently rejected the plan since the proposal under consideration excluded undocumented residents from the program. However, _Somos_ understood that this was a crucial step in the process. "There were always people that thought that it would be impossible to get drivers' licenses for undocumented immigrants, but we were determined to prove them wrong and to gain credibility in the community by making it happen," explained Marcela. The strategy was to include people in the process of legalization and all
undocumented residents would follow. "We really didn't know at the time what would happen, Marcela admits. "I didn't even know what the difference was between a policy, a resolution, and a law! But going through the process sparked our legislative efforts for the future. Access to drivers' licenses was a concrete change in the lives of our members, but it also allowed us to build relationships with unlikely partners and broaden our scope of influence in the community and also make connections with legislators and other power brokers." In light of Marcela's analysis, changing the drivers' license law was the training ground for future grassroots immigration policy activism in New Mexico and the foundation of the sanctuary polity to come.

In 2002, community and faith organizations, victims' rights agencies, and law enforcement officials banned together as the Alliance for a Safer New Mexico to advocate for another change in the law, pushing further than the previous year. This time, they lobbied to allow all residents of New Mexico, regardless of immigration status, to be able to apply for a driver's license. The public safety benefits of having all drivers licensed, insured and entered into the state’s MVD database are undeniable. Advocates pointed out that by forcing undocumented residents to drive illegally the state had allowed an entire sector of the population to remain unaccountable to the law. They also cited the high rate of uninsured motorists on the roads, increased incidents of hit-and-run accidents, and problems tracking criminals and enforcing DWI laws. In addition, there had been problems with license plate theft and in 1998 two MVD employees had been convicted of selling fraudulent licenses to individuals prohibited from obtaining a driver's license by legal means. Allowing
undocumented residents to obtain the document would cut down on fraud. Taking all these public safety benefits into consideration, the law (HB 173) passed with bi-partisan support. Today, with a combination of documents proving identity (such as a translated foreign birth certificate, passport, or matrícula consular) and continuous residency in the state, non-citizens can use an Individual Tax Identification Number (ITIN) as a substitute for a social security number when applying for a state-issued driver's license or identification card.

María Cristina says that it all started in a very practical way, but that it became much larger than everyone had expected. "Driver's licenses became symbolic of how New Mexico is different, how it has decided to integrate immigrants instead of exclude and persecute them, but more importantly, it signified the power of the immigrant community to change the conditions of our own existence. It became a blueprint for action, for how to change policy to benefit our community," she explained in her calm and authoritative manner. Community organizer, Elsa López (no relation) echoed María Cristina's analysis. "[The drivers' license campaign] started when I was first hired on staff with Somos. We didn't even know any of the legislators or even how laws were made!" "We would walk around in circles at the Roundhouse, completely lost," Adda chimed in with a giggle. "But we figured it out by doing it," concluded Elsa with pride.

**Local Immigration Policy Activism**

Since 2005, local immigration policy activism has proliferated in cities and states across the nation. The most recent data gathered by the National Conference of
State Legislators in 2009, revealed that approximately 1,500 laws and resolutions were considered in all fifty state legislatures and 353 of these proposals became law (Varsanyi 2010). Local immigration policy activism in municipalities has also increased exponentially since 2005. These laws address a variety of immigrant-related issues such as employer sanctions, access to healthcare and housing, educational benefits, language policy, and labor regulations, among other targets of intervention. Some of these measures aim to restrict and exclude, while others offer benefits, protections and opportunities (Varsanyi 2010, Plascencia 2013). In contrast to what gets reported in the media, more states with pro-immigrant localities exist than anti-immigrant ones. In fact, forty-five cities and several states have policies in place that discourage municipal employees and police from participating in the enforcement of immigration law (Ridgley 2008).

While the enactment of sub-federal immigration laws presents a challenge to the federal government’s plenary power with regards to immigration control and foreign policy, states and cities have found ways to pass laws that impact the lives and livelihoods of immigrants, without overstepping the boundaries of federal jurisdiction (Mitnick and Halpern-Finnerty 2010). Arizona’s SB1070 and Alabama’s HB56 have crossed the line and ended up in federal court. Interestingly, pro-immigrant ordinances rarely make waves. In general, inclusionary laws attract less media attention and public scrutiny than do anti-immigrant laws. However, conservatives began attacking the sanctuary city as immigration enforcement became a homeland security function and the war on terror became a war on immigrants.
What makes the difference? Why do some localities choose to discriminate, isolate and exclude immigrants while others move in the pro-immigrant direction? One study points to partisanship and demographics as key indicators of the kind of local immigrant policies enacted in municipalities in the United States today (Ramakrishnan and Wong 2010). The authors found a direct correlation between the number of registered Republicans in a region and the propensity for anti-immigrant policy making. In contrast, areas with more liberal Democrats within the populace tend to introduce inclusionary measures. Ethnic politics is also a factor. Regions where Latinos account for a large share of the citizenry are also more likely to pass pro-immigrant ordinances (Ramakrishnan et al 2010). This trend should hold true for northern New Mexico. It is a Democratic stronghold with large, politically engaged and influential Pueblo Indian and Hispano communities. Santa Fe, the “city different,” is the seat of government and prides itself as a bastion of diversity and progressive politics. Therefore, the state has become a laboratory for pro-immigrant policymaking. Elsa says that she has often been told that Somos has it easy in Santa Fe. They say, “You're organizing in Disneyland.”

In my view, local immigration policy activism is sanctuary place making in the public sphere. Somos is the primary hub for insurgent citizenship practices. As a statewide immigrant rights organization, Somos employees community organizers who travel across New Mexico training immigrants to become leaders, organizers and active participants in the political process. However, Somos does not create leaders, they capitalize on the skills and knowledge that already exists in immigrant
communities. It is not uncommon to find migrants from Mexico, Guatemala, and El Salvador who are highly skilled in the art of politics through their previous involvement in political campaigns, social justice work, religious movements, and labor organizing in their home countries. Basically, Somos provides them a platform for sharpening their political skills.

In addition, Mexican immigrants involved in Renovación Carismática who serve as lay preachers, pastors, and choir leaders have easily transferred their oratory talents and organizing experience to the political sphere. As I will illustrate, enactments of local citizenship is a practice of legitimacy of presence in a particular place. While one side of the sanctuary polity can be envisioned as a collection of policies that benefit immigrants (and all New Mexicans) and also serve to build power within a vulnerable and relatively powerless community, the sanctuary polity is something that must be claimed. As Marcela puts it, “once you think you have power or start believing the message you’ve lost.” The sanctuary polity is never secure or complete. It is always subject to the whims of immigration politics and is therefore, constantly under threat. For this reason, the sanctuary polity should also be recognized as a conceptual space and a sacred place, one that draws its strength and very possibilities of existence from a higher authority.

Reversals of Fortune

During her 2011 gubernatorial campaign, Susana Martinez used immigration, or attacking the state’s all-inclusive drivers' license policy as a political device to
energize Tea Party activists and the Republican base. But the drivers' license issue was also a way to sway Independents and moderate Democrats to her side. Bolstered by the passing of Arizona’s SB1070, the call to repeal the “dangerous practice” of granting drivers' licenses to "illegals" also welcomed national anti-immigrant organizations to New Mexico. For example, the *Albuquerque Journal* published a letter addressed to state lawmakers from Americans for Legal Immigration (ALIPAC) urging them to stop issuing drivers' licenses to “illegal immigrants” (January 2011). According to an investigation conducted by the Anti-Defamation League, ALIPAC routinely solicits and receives both financial and lobbying support from white supremacist groups such as The Vinlanders Social Club, also known as the “skinheads.” In addition, the Southern Poverty Law Center named ALIPAC as one of the “nativist extremist groups” actively working to undermine tolerance and racial harmony in the United States.

Ironically, while Tea Party activists and New Mexicans who supported the repeal sent many hate-filled emails to lawmakers and wrote letters to newspapers, they refused to stage a public protest or appear in person to testify at legislative hearings. Therefore, Republicans were forced to recruit extremist groups from outside the state to supply the anti-immigrant theatrics for their repeal campaign. As mentioned earlier, Governor Martinez used surplus campaign funds to purchase racist radio ads and robocalls to intimidate and threaten legislators and also to frighten and misinform the public by connecting the driver's license program with illegal immigration, terrorism, and fraud. State legislators, particularly Democrats, were
under attack having received a barrage of anti-immigrant emails, phone messages, and letters from frantic constituents and anti-immigrant groups from outside the state. Rep. Miguel Garcia (D-Bernalillo), a staunch supporter of immigrant rights and access to drivers' licenses, received a death threats.

Of course, this was not the first time that New Mexico’s progressive local immigration policies have come under attack from outsiders. Recall that Governor Tony Anaya sat in the hot seat on national television in defense of his 1986 sanctuary proclamation. He also received hate mail and threats from government officials. In recent years Mayor David Coss has vacillated between championing Santa Fe’s sanctuary city status and disavowing the title altogether. His tentativeness stems from the fact that the term, “sanctuary” has become a flashpoint for anti-immigrant politicians bent on propagating the politics of fear. Nationally, the backlash against sanctuary cities is a concerted Republican strategy to discredit and reverse inclusionary local immigration polices (Plascencia 2013). In fact, House Republicans presented over fifteen proposals taking direct aim at sanctuary cities between 2004 and 2011, which threatened to retract federal funding from any state or subdivision of a state that interferes with or limits cooperation with the enforcement of federal immigration law (Congressional report service).

Actually, 2005 proved to be a landmark year for reversals of fortune with regards to progressive local immigration policy across the nation. The impetus came in the wake of 9/11 when the war on terrorism became a war on immigrants. In
response to the homeland security frenzy and because some of the individuals responsible for 9/11 had obtained (by legal means) drivers' licenses (and pilot licenses), states began to restrict access to documents required for identification and travel. Before the rise of the Homeland Security State or the merging of national security functions with immigration enforcement post-911, eleven states issued driver's licenses or permits to non-citizens. By 2005, only two states continued to license undocumented residents, New Mexico and Washington. Another impetus behind the trend toward restricting access to drivers' licenses to citizens was the Real ID Act, which was signed into law by President George W. Bush in 2005. The Real ID Act is a controversial measure that if implemented will create a national identification regime (or internal passport) through state-issued licensing systems and networked national databases used for tracking and sorting purposes. One by one, individual states begin to change their licensing procedures to become Real ID compliant increasing security features and anti-fraud mechanisms. Along with many other requirements, people without a social security number or who cannot otherwise prove legal presence in the country are excluded from the national “ID card cartel” (Lyon 2009: 65).

While Washington was able to hold the line and resist the national trend, New Mexico was the only state that was instituting pro-immigrant laws after 9-11.

---

27 In 2007, Representative, Ken Martinez (D-Bernalillo, Cibola, McKinley) introduced a joint memorial opposing the creation of a national identification card and the Real ID Act of 2005. It passed the House but the session ended before it could be voted on in the Senate.

28 Recently, as this trend is reversing, states are finding ways to comply with Real ID and continue licensing non-citizen residents. However, this strategy often requires a two-tiered licensing system.
Running against the grain, New Mexico was creating an all-inclusive licensing system and passing pro-immigrant laws (largely due to the work of Somos) while other states were passing exclusionary legislation and restricting access to identity documents. In some cases, individual states were pressured to change their drivers' licenses policies from outside groups. In fact, New Mexico's all-inclusive licensing program was availed by a hostile New York based organization, Coalition for a Secure Driver's License. In 2006, the group erected a billboard along I-40 between Santa Rosa and Albuquerque displaying a photograph of terrorism suspect, Mohammed Atta’s driver's license picture and a caption that read, “Some States Make it Easy to License Terrorists.”53 The group backed down after New Mexicans furiously protested the outsiders’ interventions.

Governor Martinez’s first action in office was reversing a so-called, “sanctuary policy” by executive order. The action reversed an order issued by Governor Bill Richardson in 2005, which prohibited state law enforcement from inquiring about a person’s immigration status for the sole purpose of determining legal presence.29 The order was rather weak and focused on protecting crime victims and witnesses from inquiries into their immigration status when seeking police assistance. Richardson's order was actually a concession to Somos after he refused to sign SB109, which would have instituted the policy statewide, reviving the sanctuary state that Toney Anaya attempted decades earlier. Marcela admits that getting SB109 passed through the legislature was the proudest moment of her life, only to be crushed

by disappointment when Governor Richardson rejected the proposal. Susana Martinez denounced Richardson's executive order spinning it as a "sanctuary policy on illegal immigration" that tied law enforcement's hands when pursuing dangerous criminals. Clearly, the order was far from a sanctuary policy and explicitly states that, “nothing in this Executive Order shall be construed to prohibit the ability of State Law Enforcement officers from cooperating with federal authorities in the investigation and apprehension of undocumented immigrants suspected of criminal activity.”

Martinez used the order as a political device to incite anti-immigrant racism and pressure legislators.

As mentioned previously, by 2005 the sanctuary city concept had been thoroughly bashed, co-opted, and stigmatized. In the minds of conservative politicos the sanctuary city harbored law-breakers and criminal elements, a hideout for the twin evils - illegal aliens and terrorists. It had become a dangerous idea and potential threat to the nation. In line with this movement, Governor Martinez certified the shadow city by executive order directing state police to inquire into immigration status of “any criminal suspect,” and effectively negating the effete protections offered previously\(^{30}\). Although the order specifically excludes victims and witnesses of crimes from inquiries into their immigration status, it creates a broad category, “any criminal suspect,” of individuals subject to such inquires. How does a police officer decide who should be questioned if not by racial profiling or bias-based policing?

\(^{30}\) Executive Order 2011-009, “Rescinding and Superseding Prior Executive Order Providing Sanctuary for Individuals Arrested for Crimes other than Violation of Immigration Laws. The title is misleading. The order directs law enforcement to investigate the immigration status of any criminal suspect.
Somos immediately issued a response: “New Mexico has a long tradition of managing immigration issues in common sense ways that support public safety and has avoided simplistic or extremist policies that compromise public safety for all New Mexicans. This Executive Order reverses the gains our state has made in securing communities,” said Marcela in a statement to the press on January 31, 2011. She also outlined good reasons for why the order is untenable. It drives a wedge between the immigrant community and law enforcement making immigrant families fearful of calling the police, reporting crimes, and serving as witnesses. It mandates that police investigate the immigration status of anyone suspected of a crime, thereby authorizing racial profiling and prolonged questioning or detention of individuals who cannot prove legal status. Bias-based policing exposes the state to liability for civil rights violations. Finally, when state police act as immigration agents it detracts them from investigating more serious crimes.

As these brief examples show, after the election of Susana Martinez pro-immigrant policies that were working for New Mexico, policies that are also symbolic of the state's inclusionary attitude towards immigrants came under intense scrutiny. To be clear, Republican legislators have attempted to reverse the drivers’ license policy every year since it was passed. However, during the Richardson administration the legislature had a Democratic majority and proposals to overturn the all-inclusive licensing policy easily died in committee. Republicans opponents of the law simply did not have the political backing or the votes to move these proposals forward. The law passed with bi-partisan support and so goes the repeal. Democrats
have also waivered on their support of drivers' licenses for undocumented residents. Richardson himself sought to alter requirements for non-citizen applicants making it more difficult for them to obtain the document. He supported a bill, sponsored by John Arthur Smith (D-Deming), adding a fingerprinting requirement in 2006. Somos opposed the bill and it was tabled.

The Martinez Administration has significantly changed the political landscape in New Mexico. Pro-immigrant laws have become liabilities, threats to public safety and national security or rewards for lawbreakers. As such, allowing undocumented residents to drive legally became a “dangerous practice,” a “magnet for fraud and organized crime,” and a policy that “encourages illegal immigration.” This time Republicans had the political capital to advance their anti-immigrant agenda and use the drivers' license law to distract voters and weaken the Democrats. Instead of a being a practical public safety measure that would increase the number of licensed and insured drivers' on the road, the law was redefined as an immigration problem and therefore, a political wedge issue. Despite what the opponents say, the reality is that New Mexico’s licensing policy has little bearing on immigration enforcement or securing the border.

To be clear, the campaign to repeal the state's all-inclusive drivers' license law is not strictly a partisan affair. Some moderate Democrats have voted with Republicans in support of repeal. In fact, Diane Denish, former Lieutenant Governor under Bill Richardson faltered on her support of the drivers' license law

---

31 John Arthur Smith of Deming, who introduced the fingerprinting requirement in 2006, was one of the Democrats that voted with Republicans for the repeal in 2011.
during her 2010 run for governor in order to distance herself from her former boss. In a desperate attempt to win the swing vote, Denish began to imitate Susana Martinez’s tough-on-crime, anti-immigrant rhetoric by criticizing the current licensing system. She did not endorse repeal, but said that the law needed revision. Denish lost the election likely because of her connection to Bill Richardson, whose administration had been sacked with accusations of corruption (among other missteps including his failed presidential bid), which had seriously damaged his popularity and credibility with average New Mexicans.

Although the Democratic candidate, Diane Denish, did not lose the election because of her wavering position on drivers' licenses (a number of factors led to her demise most notably not having a solid campaign strategy that appealed to Hispanic voters) the impression that the issue ruined her campaign lingered in the minds of many elected officials, particularly among Democrats who had also polled voter attitudes about issuing drivers' licenses to undocumented residents. In fact, internal polling indicated that the majority of New Mexican voters favored the repeal. Susana Martinez ran on a tough on crime, anti-immigrant platform and won handedly. Her win not only made drivers' licenses a political football, it shifted regional power in the state from the northern cities to the more conservative southern borderlands. This shift also leveraged the political influence of agribusiness, oil and gas, and the mining industries located in eastern region of the state that borders with Texas. In addition, Martinez’s anti-immigrant propaganda incited a new negative ideology of immigration in New Mexico and succeeded in convincing lawmakers, Democrats and
Republicans alike, that their stance on the drivers' licenses for immigrants could make or break their political careers. As a result, the driver's license became an ideological weapon and a political liability for Democrats under pressure from moderates in the newly empowered districts. As Rep. Miguel Garcia explained, “drivers' licenses are a wedge issue. It doesn’t matter how we represent the facts, it’s the emotions that count.” As I stated previously, the once inert document was reborn as a two-faced talisman with the power to destroy or protect depending upon which side of the fetish the holder decided to conjure.

Four exasperating years later, the licensing battle has extended well beyond the legislative arena, multiplying its effects into a variety of reciprocal actions and reactions, constituting a tangle of “perpetual provocations” and diverse strategies of struggle (Foucault 1982). The opposition has forced Somos to develop new skills such as using opinion polling to shape messaging, social media networking, on-line petitioning and much more. Ultimately, having a tenacious adversary has made Somos a more formidable political organization. Their policy work, lobbying experience, and impressive community organizing skills - their ability to mobilize immigrant communities and allies across the state within a few hours has earned them the respect (and consternation) of the opposition. On the flip side, the Governor’s attack on immigrant families has also forced Somos to spend an inordinate amount of time and energy on blocking the repeal. The battle has become so polemical and so important to the immigrant rights movement in New Mexico that at this point, giving them up is simply not an option. If the repeal were successful it would likely create a
domino effect placing other pro-immigrant laws on the chopping block or worse, opening the doorway to new anti-immigrant legislation.

The Moraline Object

Archbishop Michael Sheehan, a slight grey-haired man in his late sixties, stood calmly at the podium in the rectory of Our Lady of Guadalupe Church in Santa Fe on a chilly January morning in 2013. His peaceful demeanor and gentle smile concealed his mission. As an annual prelude to the 60-day legislative session, the Catholic Bishops invite the Governor along with freshmen and seasoned lawmakers of both parties, as well as lobbyists and community leaders to a breakfast banquet that doubles as a political forum. The New Mexico Conference of Catholic Bishop’s Legislative Breakfast is an occasion for the Bishops to announce their legislative priorities connecting the bills they are backing to Gospel teachings and Catholic social values. However, on this occasion, Archbishop Sheehan was primed to deliver a harsh moral condemnation of Governor Susana Martinez’s relentless anti-immigrant crusade.

The usually drab gymnasium-like basement of Our Lady of Guadalupe Church was completely transformed into a neat banquet room lined with long tables outfitted with white linen and modest place settings for the Breakfast. The event has become an annual tradition in New Mexico where the Catholic Church continues to hold significant political sway over the large Hispano-Catholic majority. As the Bishops see it, their involvement in the legislative process is not about mixing church

---

32 [The NMCCB is made up of four individuals, Michael J. Sheehan, Archbishop of Santa Fe; Ricardo Ramirez, Bishop of Las Cruces; and James Wall, Bishop of Gallup]
and state, but about their mission to take “Gospel values to the public square by teaching the policy makers.” However, they rarely get their hands dirty at the legislature. For this, they employ a lobbyist, Allen Sanchez, a charming and sharp-witted former seminarian with a pulse on New Mexico politics and groomed in Catholic social teachings.

Apart from representing the Bishops’ social values and political interests, Sanchez is the President and CEO of St. Joseph Community Health in Albuquerque, an organization funded by Catholic Health Initiatives, a national non-profit organization. Sanchez is well renowned for his powers of persuasion and ability to raise a room with one snide remark or well-placed Biblical reference. For example, during a Legislative Finance Committee hearing on drivers' licenses in 2013, Sanchez stood up to testify against a bill that would repeal the current law and institute driving certificates; a turn in the wrong direction. “The worst driver in the state is the Governor, she’s trying to drive us all backwards!” The comment was met with an uproar of applause from a room packed to capacity with immigrant families and immigrant rights advocates. A banging gavel squelched the outburst of enthusiasm, calling all to order.

When former District Attorney of Doña Ana County, Susana Martinez, was elected the 31st Governor of New Mexico in 2011, becoming the first Hispanic woman in the nation to serve in the position, the Catholic Bishops were hopeful that at the very least, they would have an ally in advancing pro-life legislation and
defending traditional marriage, issues often endorsed by Republicans. Much to their
disappointment, in her debut State of the State address Martinez was silent on all
social issues important to practicing Catholics. Instead, she announced her plan to
reinstate the Death Penalty (abolished in 2009 by Bill Richardson). Then, to hammer
it home, Martinez made a “rookie mistake” when she stood up the Catholic Bishops
who had convened for a special dinner in her honor before her inauguration. She sent
a representative in her place.

Archbishop Sheehan returned the rebuff during the Governor’s inaugural
Mass held at the Cathedral Basilica of St. Frances of Assisi in Santa Fe when he
audaciously refused her communion on grounds that she is divorced and unreconciled
with the Church. According to an eyewitness, the insult was subtle but significant.
Governor Martinez approached the altar with hands cupped to receive the Eucharist,
but the Archbishop left her empty handed. Instead, he gave her a blessing by making
the sign of the cross near her forehead. Interestingly, Susana Martinez’s religious
affiliation remains ambiguous. During the gubernatorial campaign when the
newspapers were publishing feature stories on each of the candidates, Susana
Martinez included a picture of herself as a young girl dressed up for her First Holy
Communion as a way to connect with Catholic voters. However, she does not belong
to any church. According to Alan Sanchez, who investigated the matter, there are no
records indicating that Martinez has ever been a parishioner of any Catholic parish in

33 In the Archbishop’s pastoral letter on the mystery of the Eucharist, he states the following, “It is
important to be in the state of grace and to receive the Sacrament of Reconciliation or Confession
before Mass if we are aware of mortal sin on our conscience. We must be sorry for our failings so as to
prepare to receive the Lord of Lords.”
New Mexico. Refusing her the Eucharist, the Archbishop had called the Governor's bluff, by exposing her Catholic charade.

The Eucharist is a certainly an ideological tool, but in our “secular age” it is rarely used as a political weapon. However, I want to underscore that in New Mexico’s not so distant past, being denied the sacrament was akin to social death. In the pre-Vatican II era, which many still remember, Catholicism was an essential element of social cohesion and clergy were very powerful individuals, acting as both moral authorities and social regulators particularly in the smaller villages where salvation and daily survival were so intimately connected. Certainly, the influence of Catholic clergy as social regulators has diminished and religion is not the primary social institution, it is one among many. Few wayward Catholics have suffered the public humiliation of being denied the Eucharist at the receiving line, which made the Archbishop’s ritual reproach of the Governor all the more outlandish and for some, outright scandalous. The media completely missed the incident. In fact, only those who seated in the front pews during the inauguration mass (and who were paying attention) noticed the insult. Nevertheless, talk of Archbishop’s reproach spread charismatically through religious and political circles alike.

Of course, petty politics and mutual contempt loomed large in this clash of secular and pastoral powers, but it was Governor Martinez’s anti-immigrant stance on drivers’ licenses and her refusal to support programs that benefit the poor and early childhood education that drove a hard wedge between her administration and the
Catholic Bishops. Despite their mutual contempt, Martinez has begrudgingly attended the Breakfast since her initial tangle with Archbishop Sheehan. However, each time she has invited the media to bear witness. Because I was not the only attendee at the 2013 function who knows about the bad blood between the Governor and the Archbishop, I was also not the only one voyeuristically observing Susana Martinez squirm her way through the event. Seated on display at the head table next to Allen Sanchez and alongside a row of grey-haired Bishops, the Governor was visibly uncomfortable and annoyed. Previously, she had spoken of finding common ground with the Bishops on the drivers' license issue, but that moment of compromise never arrived.

After reciting morning prayers, welcoming the dignitaries, and thanking the cadre of volunteers (Our Lady of Guadalupe parishioners and members of other Catholic parishes) who had done the cooking, serving and greeting, Sheehan carefully reached into his jacket pocket and removed a neatly folded piece of paper. He carefully opened it and began reading in his usual upbeat sermonic tone. It was a letter written to the Archbishop by a young man named Cesar Quesada, a sagacious seventeen-year-old who had been living with cancer for most of his young life. Quesada thanked the Archbishop for his leadership on the drivers' license debacle and urged him to remind others of the “human reality” at the heart of the issue:

“Throughout my battle [with cancer], I have had 8 different kinds of chemotherapies and 19 surgeries, and thanks to the drivers' licenses granted to immigrants in this state, I have also been very fortunate to be able to travel to places like St. Jude’s Children’s Hospital, Mayo Clinic and MD Anderson.”
Without the privilege of the drivers' licenses for immigrants, none of these necessary trips would have been possible; not to mention the immense weight they have lifted from our shoulders throughout our daily commutes and very frequent trips to UNM Hospital.

I am very aware that there are a few individuals who misuse and abuse this absolutely amazing privilege, but it is families like mine - which from experience are many - who really give those little plastic cards meaning and value by signifying a difference between life and death. Some state politicians continue to insist with the removal of this law, completely overlooking and disregarding the human reality behind these drivers' licenses while placing yet another weight upon our shoulders…”(People of God, October 2012).

As Archbishop Sheehan read Cesar’s heartfelt letter, Governor Martinez fidgeted in her chair, rolled her eyes, and with an exasperated expression on her face ungracefully murmured to Allen Sanchez, “Is he really going to make me listen to a bleeding-heart letter…what the fuck am I doing here?” Although the audience was not in earshot of the impudent comment, her body language spoke louder than words. At the conclusion of the reading many in the audience were wiping away tears or trying to hold them back from spilling over their mournful faces. Sheehan explained that he was compelled to read Cesar’s letter because it communicated the “human story behind the drivers' license debate.” Then came the tragic ending. Cesar, wise beyond his years, had lost his battle with cancer a few weeks prior to the Breakfast.

The public reading of Cesar’s poignant letter, a voice of reason from beyond the grave, touched upon the sacred. By stating his position through the words and example of another, an intelligent young man whose short life was directly impacted by New Mexico’s licensing policy, Archbishop Sheehan had employed the pedagogical errand of a sermon without actually sermonizing to deliver a powerful
moral message to the Governor and state lawmakers who support the repeal. Clearly, Cesar's absent presence from the world sealed its moral force.

_Navigating Moraline Drift_

I chose this scene of moral production not to give the Catholic Church any privileged position as a moral authority (they are certainly not an impeccable institution) but as a way to illustrate how the politics of licensing undocumented residents is caught up in “moraline drift” (Bennett 2002:12). Moraline drift, as theorized by political philosopher, Jane Bennett, is the desire to purify through righteous indignation or dogmatism. “It is the drive to link the good too tightly to the pure” (2002: 13). Bennett explains that most politically charged arguments, including academic ones, are susceptible to moraline drift not in the throws of grappling with moral questions per say, but in the urge to moralize in the quest for certainty (2002).

Archbishop Sheehan effectively navigated the moraline drift in this example by couching his authority as a Pastor in the personal testimony of a young immigrant whose life was directly impacted by the drivers' license policy. The call to remember Cesar is a call to attend to the moral matter at the heart of the political battle over drivers' licenses. Like a saintly being both present and absent from the life world, Cesar’s words took on a transcendent quality as did his somewhat supernatural interpretation of the drivers' license itself as a vibrant object - “little plastic cards signifying a difference between life and death.”
While the Archbishop played his hand well by drawing the audience into the moral matter propelling the drivers' license debate, his message was left hanging in the ether. When Governor Martinez took the podium, she did the unthinkable. She made no appeals for compromise or for finding common ground with the Bishops as she had done in previous years. She completely ignored Cesar’s story and refused to address the drivers' license issue altogether. Much to our surprise, the Governor made no mention of her relentless campaign to end the “dangerous practice” of issuing drivers' licenses to “illegal immigrants,” then rounding its third year of uncompromising stalemate in the legislature. Instead, she gave a highly scripted and abridged version of her State of the State address, presented a few days prior, in which she outlined her legislative priorities for the 2013 session - excluding her bid to repeal the driver's license law.

Marcela declared the Archbishop’s statement an overwhelming success and admitted that she too had been moved to tears by his performance. In her opinion, he had backed the Governor into a corner that she could not easily escape. How do you counter the moral and emotional force of a “bleeding heart letter” from a dead boy? Certainly, Martinez’s standard stump speech of criminalizing immigrants and bashing the drivers' license law as a threat to public safety and national security could not redirect the morale drift in her favor. House Representative, Miguel Garcia, a Democrat and staunch supporter of the drivers' license law since its inception, was less optimistic. He interpreted the Governor’s refusal to address drivers' licenses as a classic pivoting move often used in political debates when a controversial subject or
policy position is raised by one candidate and the respondent simply circumvents the subject altogether. By sidestepping the issue, Governor Martinez simply refused to engage in an argument she was unlikely to win.

The moraline is the tipping point between “a galvanizing moral vision and a reproachful moralizing sensibility” (Brown 2001 as cited by Bennett 2002: 11). In other words, the moraline is the fine line between moralism (or moralizing) and staying attuned to moral concerns. The trouble is locating the tipping point. Bennett explains that moralism’s purifications, punitive punch lines, and uncritical self-certainty blocks out contrary positions, alternative analysis or explanation and thus, forecloses debate altogether (Bennett 2002). For these reasons, moralizing can be a highly affective and convincing form of political discourse because it simplifies, distills, dampens complexity, while inspiring strong emotional attachment to a particular vision of the world. Raising moral questions, on the other hand, is directed towards an examination of conscience in light of what can be shared while confronting the reality that we cannot always agree, be correct, or impeccably good. Appeals to the moral can potentially inspire empathy and mutual understanding by exposing our insecurities and uncertainties.

The Governor’s callus response to Cesar’s plight along with the many hardworking and law-abiding migrant families Cesar refers to in his letter reveals the fragility of the moraline. By excluding immigrants from membership in the local community and by casting them as “illegal” and therefore, illegitimate, the Governor
and her allies can remain at a bureaucratic distance from “human realities” and can remain coldly indifferent to their concerns (Herzfeld 1992). In the Social Production of Indifference (1992), Michael Herzfeld explains how the bureaucratic attitude sanctions indifference by casting certain individuals or populations as illegitimate. This attitude of indifference can propagate unchecked persecution of those considered outside the fold of the community. Insiders are often defined in terms of innate characteristics, most notably metaphors of relationally such as family, blood and nation. “Indifference is a rejection of those who are different, made tolerable to insiders because it is presented in terms that are at once familiar and familial. (Herzfeld 1992: 31). According to Herzfeld, bureaucratic indifference is not only “arbitrarily selective,” but also serves as a “moral alibi for inaction” (1992: 33).

Therefore, moraline drift can work in the opposite direction. A population marked as different, delinquent or unethical can easily be cast adrift so to speak, located outside the fold of the moral community. Nicolas De Genova discusses migrant illegality as a form of subjugation in which undocumented workers are included in the capitalist designs of the nation as deportable labor but not as creative subjects with attachments, desires, and rights (2009). He also outlines the ways in which both liberals and conservatives position undocumented migrants as morally corrupt for having entered the nation without authorization, thereby taking away benefits and resources from the deserving citizens who pay taxes and contribute to the country. These economic citizens see undocumented immigrants as a drain on the nation and as interlopers who are taking jobs away from the working poor,
particularly African Americans (De Genova 2005). Herein we discover the dialectic that brought the driver's license to life as a two-faced talisman. The Governor cast aspersions on immigrants as outsiders and criminals. These accusations were blatantly racist and politically motivated. In response, advocates organized in the defense of immigrants and immigrant families themselves showed up to prove the opposition wrong. Faith leaders claimed the moral high ground using biblical passages and the language of human dignity and human rights. The Archbishop used symbolic weapons against the Governor and held the moraline firmly in place. As this ethnographic scene illustrates, the debate over drivers' licenses has become entangled in the moraline, which pits pastoral power against secular authority and its practices of bureaucratic indifference. However, Governor Martinez clearly put religion in its place when she refused to engage with the Archbishop's appeal to consider the human face behind the bureaucratic document. But, as an illegitimate subject, Cesar's life (and his death) could be rendered invisible, an absented and hounding presence.

The moral arguments that the Archbishop held over the Governor and her allies in the legislature were intended to chastise and shame those who support the repeal casting them as heartless and shallow bureaucrats and people of weak moral character. But, could he move the opposition to his position? Certainly, the Republicans were not going to budge, but could they be swayed to temper their anti-immigrant binge and come to a reasonable compromise? Could moderate Democrats be compelled to risk reelection and vote their conscience? These questions continue to hang in the balance of pending immigration reform at the national level and the
shifting terrain of local immigration politics in New Mexico. As secular and religious forms and figures of authority get caught in the moral line and compete for dominance in the debate, we are still faced with the possibility of losing the sanctuary polity one anti-immigrant law at a time. In the next section, I dig into the legislative fray to fully excavate the two-faced talisman. How does a banal bureaucratic instrument become vibrant matter with a charismatic moral career? In order to engage this question, I must track back to January of 2011, when our troubles with drivers' licenses began.

Into the Legislative Fray

Our successful protest of Susana Martinez’s inauguration on the Plaza in downtown Santa Fe had generated a flurry of excitement and anticipation at Somos’ headquarters that week. Mariana, Alma, and I huddled around Elsa’s computer replaying Juan López’s interview from the protest line on Univision’s website over and over again relishing the glee of victory. We exchanged stories about the icy weather, how we had endured frozen faces and the stiffening of hands and feet. Elsa and Adda bantered with one another about how they had used Spanish code talking to evade and also provoke suspicion from the police. Everyone was high on the success of the silent protest. We had delivered a strong message about Susana Martinez’s anti-immigrant agenda and put a dent in her inauguration glory. “We couldn’t just let the media ignore the fact that the first Latina Governor in the nation is also an anti-immigrant, Tea Party Republican,” Marcela declared, joining the victory circle that had formed around Elsa’s desk. “It’s such a disappointment,” Alma chimed in. She
introduced herself to the Governor at the inauguration and gave her a yellow protest t-shirt. "She's was really nice," Alma said, somewhat surprised.

Alma Castro and Marina Piña were hired fresh out of college in 2010. Alma came to Somos through Public Allies, which is an Americorps program that matches up college graduates with non-profit organizations and pays them a stipend. Alma and I joined the Somos around the same time. I began working as a research intern in August on a racial profiling study and Alma was in training as a labor organizer at the time. Marina was hired on as a community organizer a few months later. However, I was the only real rookie on the block. Alma and Marina had participated Somos campaigns since they were in high school. Alma, a native of Santa Fe, actually grew up attending Somos meetings and protest marches with her mother, Julia Castro. Marina, originally from Chihuahua, migrated to New Mexico with her parents in the 1990s. They settled in Portales, a historically Anglo-dominated town located in the eastern part of the state. Marina became a Somosista in high school when she worked on the campaign to pass HB 582, the law that currently allows undocumented students to attend college at resident rates and to apply for state-sponsored scholarships. This successful student movement preceded the Dreamer's Movement and was focused on equality and access to education, not the attainment of citizenship. Marina's experience lobbying and protesting to get the law passed in 2005 motivated her to begin organizing immigrant students in Portales at Eastern New Mexico University.
The wave of elation after the silent protest moved us on to the next stealthy action. The plan was to infiltrate the Governor’s State of the State speech wearing our bright yellow t-shirts under our jackets or sweaters revealing them at just the right moment. About twenty Somosistas disguised as Martinez supporters arrived at the Round House early and spread themselves out among the crowd of people filling into the chamber of the House of Representatives to witness the Governor’s first major public address. I arrived late to the event after circling the halls of the Round House for twenty minutes until I finally arrived at the correct chamber. The House chambers were brimming with people. All the seats were filled and the balcony was so tightly packed with politicos that you had to squeeze through the spaces between buzzing swarms of lobbyists, news reporters, legislative staffers, as well as state workers on their lunch break. I found Marcela casually leaning against the balcony, her tall slender body pressed against the rail as she looked down at the infiltrators sprinkled throughout the unsuspecting seated masses. Dressed to impress in tailored black slacks with a sleek black and white leopard print blouse, Marcela donned an attitude of calm solicitude over giddy delight as she texted them instructions.

I stood next her and we leaned against the balcony rail together trying to look aloof. The Governor took her place at the podium smiling broadly to the tune of standing applause. After the crowd settled down and she launched into her first public address, Marcela and I bantered like sports commentators picking at every conservative phrase of the Governor’s speech. Susana Martinez was dressed in a black power suit adorned with a pink corsage on her right shoulder. The new
Governor exuded the confidence of a woman in charge as she declared her intention to require identification for voting, reinstate the death penalty and outlined her plans to make New Mexico business-friendly by cutting taxes and lifting environmental regulations.

As much as the speech provided her with an opportunity to define her legislative agenda, it served as a reminder of the shift in power in Santa Fe. Applause broke the Governor’s speech intermittently with occasional hoots and whistles from GOP lawmakers and their supporters, while Democrats stared in silence. Marcela and I laughed out loud and booed at various points for balance. The security guard on duty warned us that if we continued, he would escort us out. Basically, we were not trying be disrespectful, but to make light of the horror of having a Latina Republican, anti-immigrant Governor assuming the seat of power. What else could we do? At that point, we really didn’t understand or grasp the real significance of the changing of the guard. We believed that we could easily crush the anti-immigrant lobby with the sheer power of organized people. Unfortunately, the battle would rage on as long as Governor Martinez was in office and perhaps beyond her administration. As a wedge issue, immigrants and drivers' licenses is a useful pairing that is politically expedient. It distracts voters and lawmakers from attending to the real problem at hand - New Mexico is the poorest state in the nation.

Mid-way through the Governor's speech, Marcela exited the chambers and I took my place in the aisle next to a few of the infiltrators. We gave each other
knowing looks and then turned back to the task of listening for our cue. The heater was pumping full blast. We were sweating beneath layers of clothing, aching to take off our jackets to reveal our protest t-shirts at the moment when the Governor began to talk about drivers' licenses. We waited for what seemed an eternity, passing the minutes making faces at each other and rolling our eyes, wondering if the Governor was ever going to talk about immigration. Finally, at the very end of the speech, it happened. Susana Martinez announced her plan to repeal drivers' licenses for immigrants. At that point, the infiltrators strategically placed in the audience stood up and ripped off their jackets and sweaters revealing their bright yellow, slogan scrawled t-shirts.

The stupefied crowd watched in horror as the protestors booed and hissed at the Governor. At that point, the speech seemed to end abruptly, the applause cut short. People began making their way out of their seats and up the steps towards the balcony, which was now spacious, as the spectators and politicos hurried back to their offices and government jobs. Our stealth attack was somewhat anticlimactic and unsatisfying. We had waited with anxious anticipation the entire speech to launch our protest, but it had ended so quickly. The action lasted less than a minute and it was difficult to tell if we had made an impact or not. Later that night, when we appeared on all the news stations and the next day our protest was highlighted in all of the local newspapers. The aftereffect confirmed the effectiveness of our protest action. Without the disruption we created, the Governor would have been lauded and glorified in the media, her anti-immigrant proposal buried under the celebratory tones.
commemorating the first Latina Governor's inaugural public address. Again, *Somosistas* put a dent in these discourses.

After the action, we gathered inside the lobby of the Roundhouse to recap the action and relish our stealthy retribution. Our excitement was uncontainable. We felt exuberant and electrified as if we had just accomplished something thrilling and insurrectionary. I noticed then that my friends Luz Hilda, Roberto, and Wilmer had been among the infiltrators. We embraced each other and vivaciously reveled in post-protest brilliance. I had come to know the twenty-something activists from the Tuesday night charismatic *assembleas* at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church. In fact, Wilmer, a witty and cheerful young man from El Salvador, was a member of my bible study group. We had become friends through *La Comunidad* (the term that participants use when referring to *Renovación Carismática*). Now, we knew one another as both prayer partners and as *Somosistas*, partners in the immigrant rights movement.

Roberto’s big green eyes sparkled with mischievous jubilation. He kept repeating over and over, “You should’ve seen her face!” Roberto had been sitting in the front row of the auditorium directly across from the podium at eye-level with the Governor. He was convinced that the action had stopped Susana Martinez in her tracks and derailed her speech. I was too high up in the stands to see her facial expression, but Roberto could not get over the look of shock on the Governor’s face. He was beside himself with enthusiasm. As we walked out of the Capitol still high on
post-protest adrenaline, Elsa reminded us that this was only the beginning. It was going to be a long three months of legislating and lobbying. We had a lot of work ahead of us.

*The Shadow Side of Sanctuary*

The protest of Governor Martinez's State of the State address conjured the two-faced talisman that inhabits the driver's license - Republican's fears of hidden enemies lurking in plain sight and those forced into the shadows standing up to assert their legitimacy of presence. We announced ourselves with *gritos* and bright yellow t-shirts, refusing the margin we had been given. The "work" that Elsa was referring to is precisely the political labor of asserting agency and becoming present in the civic sphere through enactments of local citizenship. Through public protest, petitions, testimony and lobbying, Somosistas not only practice insurgent citizenship they redefine it as a matter of presence and personhood in a particular place. Governor Martinez and her allies had made it their political will and intended goal to make immigrants invisible, to deny them legitimacy of presence as residents of the state of New Mexico. She promised to cancel the all-inclusive licensing program and to retract the licenses that had already been issued to undocumented residents. By redefining access to the document as a "privilege" reserved exclusively for citizens instead of a legal obligation required of all residents who intend to drive, the debate turned on the politics of immigration and spun the issue of public safety. The figure of the "illegal alien" is both implicated and excluded from ideas of the public good.
Nicholas De Genova has identified illegality not only as a process of racialization in which migrant labor is devalued and migrants are produced as illegal subjects, but also an effect of immigration law itself (2005). De Genova determines that "the legal production of migrant 'illegality' has never served simply to achieve that apparent goal of deportation, so much as to regulate the flow of Mexican migration in particular and to sustain its legally vulnerable condition of deportability (2005: 8). It is deportability, he argues, that renders migrant labor and migrant bodies expendable (De Genova 2005). In my view, the social and legal production of migrant illegality is the shadow-side of sanctuary. Through secular processes of legislating and law making, the shadow side of sanctuary reaches beyond the symbolic terror of anti-immigrant racism because it moves from the social fact into legal frameworks. The shadow city, like the sanctuary polity, is built on public policy and the rule of law. However, the shadow city is premised upon the exception. It makes use of local governments and the process of legislating and lawmaking to codify racism and xenophobic impulses into declarations of law. For De Genova, this law is already given. He does not engage with the processes by which laws are made possible. Ultimately, he ignores the process by which legal regimes are created and justified and how laws themselves have social lives and are sites of perpetual struggle.

The shadow city arises from social interaction and discursive productions, public negotiation and consensus, but also intangible things and tiny rituals and resentments, nativist impulses and personal animosities, in-groups and out-groups,
loyalties and disloyalties, discomforts with cultural, linguistic or religious difference, and of course, the institution of racism. Then also, somehow sentiments and animosities, these rituals of racism, become politically expedient. They began to work their way into city ordinances, legal documents, bureaucratic operations, legislative proposals, and ultimately, unworkable laws and policy. The same laws that De Genova claims have given rise to the social condition of migrant illegality.

Clearly, the campaign to repeal immigrant drivers' licenses is and continues to be a defilement of democracy and the democratic process. It makes use of lawmaking and lawmakers to exclude and discriminate - to engage in the rituals of racism - and punish and oppress based on immigration status. Then they can callously justify these actions through appeals to the rule of law and hid behind the bureaucratic attitude of indifference. However, the shadow city is not inevitable. The elation that Somosistas felt after their protest actions disrupted the rituals of racism by making ourselves boldly present and by refuting the over-determinations of abject citizenship and refusing to be defined as illegal, illegitimate subjects. In the next section, I show how Somosistas countered the dehumanizing drive toward legalized racism during the 2011 legislative session by enacting local citizenship and asserting legitimacy of presence.

Legitimacy of Presence

In this final section, I show how sanctuary place making produces an alternative local citizenship grounded in legitimacy of presence as a way to step
beyond the normative standpoint theory of the place of religion in politics. I carefully trace the interplay between religious and secular ways of knowing and accessing power, particularly in the actions of petitioning representatives of authority – both human and divine – who make claims on us and have control over our lives. In this way, I situate political matters of presence (how the state renders the presence of the undocumented among us absent), and ghostly ones (such as the Holy Spirit and other supernatural beings) as collaborative agents in the legislative process.

Legal scholars have noted that the role of legislatures, while being a legitimate and authoritative source of law and policy-making in constitutional democracies, remain the least examined branch of government (Bauman and Kahana 2006). The legislative task is to deliberate and interpret the grandly abstract constitutional values of equality, dignity, liberty, and security and translate them into concrete, workable policies designed to promote the common good (Nedelsky 2006: 95). In essence, legislating is assumed to be a radically secular affair, even though religious arguments and interpretations of the public good often show up in legislative debates on the traditional subjects of moral and ethical concern such as abortion, gay marriage, or the death penalty. Scholars who study the place of religion in legislating have often viewed it in terms of “enlarged mentality” or the way in which representatives weigh the different “mental standpoints” of constituents on an issue, some of whom may privilege a religious perspective (Nedelsky 2006: 98 – 99). In my estimation, this is a radically secular view of the place of religion in politics. Religion is reduced to a perspective, a private affair of the heart that enters into the public
arena as a standpoint – one interpretation of the public good among many.

Suspending this secular conviction about the place of religion in the legislative process, I evoke the concept of legitimacy of presence. Legitimacy of presence is a useful metaphor for the absent presence of the state and the invisible workings of bureaucratic documents such as the driver's license, but it is also a way to fully appreciate how religion enters into the secular affairs of government. In constructing this theory, I draw on my observations of how immigrants themselves interpreted and responded to the Governor's strike against them. Somosistas clearly understood that the Governor and her allies in the legislature were playing politics with their lives by attempting to strip them of personhood and of presence. In response, they asserted their local citizenship as bonefide Nuevomexicanos. They also prayed for the Governor's change of heart, petitioned local saints, and harnessed the power of the Holy Spirit.

Petitioning Saints: Towards a Catholic Formation of the Secular

During the 2012 legislative battle over drivers' licenses, Somosistas created paper plate masks with Susana Martinez's face plastered on them as an element of political theatre. The masks were used for the Immigrant Day of Action, which is an occasion for immigrants to practice insurgent citizenship. Somos organized a dramatic demonstration and rallied in front of the Capitol building and hundreds of immigrants occupied the Roundhouse to lobby their representatives and deliver petitions in support of the current all-inclusive licensing program. Usually, this large-scale action creates so much chaos that business is obstructed for the entire
afternoon, which is part of our strategy. That particular year we were playing on
identity and identification. Our message was that without drivers' licenses
immigrants are completely invisible to the state and therefore, can remain
unaccountable to the law. Playing on the opposition's racist arguments about
licensing criminals, we toyed with the idea that without verification of individual
identity, the undocumented could assume any identity even that of the Governor
herself. Hence, we masked our faces behind Susana Martinez's face. In this way,
*Somosistas* co-opted the politics of fear through a dramatic reversal of the
opposition's flawed arguments, turning them on their heads and using them against
our opponents.

Many months after Immigrant Lobby Day and the rally of masks, I took a
friend to visit the ancient shrine at Chimayo, a pilgrimage site and one of northern
New Mexico's most sacred places. Entering the chapel of the Santo Niño de Atocha,
I was surprised to see Susana Martinez's face glaring right at me. It was one of the
paper plate masks we had created for the protest rally leaning against the small
statue of the Santo Niño, which was also surrounded by the more traditional votive
offerings such as baby shoes, pictures, and other personal objects.

The Santo Niño de Atocha is the patron saint of prisoners and travelers and
also considered to be a special protector of migrants. Shrines dedicated to the saint
can be found along the *Camino Real* serving as spiritual signposts on the journey to
*El Norte* (Pescador 2009). Possibly, someone who had attended the Immigrant Day
of Action had gone to Chimayo to pray for the Governor, imploring the Santo Niño
to change her heart and her mind about drivers' licenses. Perhaps, the person had made a petition or promesa to the saint in exchange for the vital document under threat of repeal, leaving the mask behind to seal the deal.

The pairing of the Santo Niño de Atocha with the Governor not only brought to mind how immigrants involved in the driver's license battle petitioned both sacred and secular forms of authority, but also how these crossings trouble the ideological divide between them. Within Catholic devotional practice representations of Jesus and the saints are simultaneously present and absent from the world. For example, an iconic image of the Virgin Mary not only reminds the faithful of the Heavenly Mother, it serves as a vessel through which a connection can be made between heaven and earth. The representation is tethered to its celestial counterpart and serves as an intermediary between ontological planes - the spiritual and material worlds.

The theological concept of presence and absence is not sui generis or unique to Catholic devotional practices. In fact, the simultaneous presence and absence of God is a core paradox of Christian thought in general (Engelke 2007). Arguments about the significance or meaning of a sacred image, sacrament, or element of scripture are also struggles over how the divine can be known to humans or recognized as present on earth (Engelke 2007: 28). Divine presence is inscribed by absence and this relationship (or paradox) is often materialized within a culturally informed representational economy or "semiotic ideology" made up of words, sentiments, objects, icons and offerings (Keane 2003: 409). One of the drives behind
the Protestant Reformation was iconoclasm or the purification of Christianity from the empire of vision that so dominated Catholic forms of piety, ritual, and social control (Belting 1994). From most Protestant perspectives, the faith had to be purified of artifice - the "slippery, corrupting or deceiving effects of language (and signs in general)" which were thought to distract the believer from the Truth and knowledge of God (Keane 2002: 66). Therefore, the fleshy sensuality of ritual, material objects, and even language itself were understood as corrupting elements that needed to be carefully contained in order to inculcate a more interiorized and therefore, more modern and rational practice of Christianity (Keane 2002).

A full discussion of the historical development of visual piety (and its opponents) is beyond the scope of this chapter. However, I have taken on the problem of presence here for two reasons. First, the simultaneous presence and absence of God in material forms mirrors the absent presence of the state, but also the representational drive behind bureaucracy. Looking into the materiality of documents, how they are used, what they do, and what kinds of relations of power they produce, or what categories of persons and desires they create is one way to unmask the inner-workings of the state (Chu 2010; Das 2004; Gupta 2012; Hetherington 2011). Second, immigrants are also absented presences within the nation-state. While their physical presence is undeniable and their labor integral to the economy, as a deportable labor force that is over-determined by their unauthorized presence, migrants are positioned as abject citizens that are continuously under erasure or literally disappeared (removed) at the will of the state.
Similar to the Christian paradox of simultaneous presence and absence, immigrants become visible through documents (or lack thereof) and their exclusion from membership within in the circle of citizens is often organized around costs and benefits. As Luis Plascencia has noted, "the accrual of privilege can be thought of as advancing the inclusivity of citizenship while simultaneously advancing the exclusion of persons defined as aliens" (2012: 19) Stripped of individual personhood and denied any credit for the contributions they make to the economy through their labor as well as their contributions and participation in the local communities where they live and work, the "illegal immigrant" becomes purely a representation or figuration of the anti-citizen (Inda 2006; De Genova 2009). In order to counter the dehumanizing social condition of illegality and the process of abject citizenship, immigrants use a number of strategies to underscore the fleshy materiality of their laboring bodies and sharp minds to become present as speaking subjects worthy of recognition and rights (De Genova 2009).

Max Weber was one of the first scholars to theorize bureaucracy as productive of modern social organization. He argued that bureaucracy is a secularizing force, an instrument (and exemplar) of the disenchantment of the world, but also of the consolidation of power in the form of highly rationalized and hierarchical systems (1991). Bureaucratic governance is built upon technologies of inscription - forms of writing, documenting, and increasingly digitizing, which transform persons and relationships into representational forms or categories. Since its very inception, the lifeblood of bureaucracy had been representation.
Backtracking through the archives of Western history, we find precedence for the idea of legitimacy of presence as a coalescence of theological concepts of personhood and identity. Historian, Brigitte Miriam Bedos-Rezak, shows how the theology of the Eucharist influenced ideas of personhood, authority, and representation in medieval Europe during the eleventh century (2000). She focuses her study on the rise of the sealed charter as a certification of personal identity and how this documentary practice converged with the theology of transubstantiation.

Chancery scholars, located in abbeys and cathedrals, were responsible for writing up contracts between elites and certifying documents, but they also trained the scholars and theologians who at the time, were engaged in intense debates over the status of the Eucharist and iconic images (2000). Bedos-Rezak explains that before the seal charter was used to stand-in for persons, the elite had to be physically present before a chancellor (often a bishop or abbot) in order to authorize a document or contract. Although this was the preferred method, the seal began to replace the actual presence of persons as an imprint of the sealer, not as a stamp of identity or emblem, but as personal essence. Seals allowed simultaneous presence and representation. Like the Eucharistic doctrine, in which consecrated bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ, their mode of signification was incarnation (Bedos-Rezak 2000: 1527).

Of course, this particular mode of representation in which the essence of the person is embedded within material objects went through a multitude of transformations or better yet, secularizing processes, over time so that the spiritual
or immanent quality of signification and became more abstract and removed from documentary practices so that the person became a sign or representational device, a point of reference for replication. Bedos-Rezak concludes that "the individual consequently appears to have been a casualty of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, reduced to rule-referential roles, and retreating behind representation and representational signs whose operational principles lay not in individualization but classification, not in differentiation but replication, not in identification but verification."

I find this analysis of presence and absence useful for understanding what happens when persons become bureaucratic objects. As Bedos-Rezak points out, the theology of the Eucharist, or the idea that the Host is both a symbolic representation and the actual body of Christ once corresponded with other kinds of signification and authority such as the medieval seal which contained the essence or presence of the person within its waxy materiality. Bringing these short examples together, I argue that the driver's license became the object of moral and religious contemplation because it had become infused with presence or in this case, the essence of personhood. In this way, the bureaucratic discourses of representation collided with Catholic concepts of sacred signification - the simultaneous presence and absence of God within material objects. By moving between different kinds of dealings and exchanges with power holders and brokers, I will illuminate how popular Catholicism interfaced and (also interfered) with secular notions of citizenship and rights in the legislative battle over immigrant drivers' licenses.
In the dimly candlelit altar inside the chapel of perpetual adoration at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church Emma Rodriquez, a devout Catholic and participant in the Mexican immigrant-led revivist movement, Renovación Carismática, prayed every morning at 4:00am for drivers' licenses during the legislative session. On one of these occasions, Emma petitioned the Virgin Mary for the vital document under threat of cancellation. She promised to make a beautiful white vestment adorned with floral brocades for the ancient image of Our Lady of the Rosary, La Conquistadora, Santa Fe’s Patroness, if efforts to block the repeal proved successful. On Tuesday nights, Mexican immigrant families pack the pews of Our Lady of Guadalupe Church for charismatic revivals, swaying to cumbia beats, their hands raised in surrender to the power of the Holy Spirit. While the drivers' license battle raged on at the Roundhouse, these charismatic gatherings became political hotspots where immigrants exchanged information about what was going on at legislature and excitedly recounted their participation in committee hearings, protest actions, and spontaneous prayer sessions.

On the House Floor debate about undocumented immigrants’ legitimacy of presence turned on their residency in the state of New Mexico. Unlike immigration papers and passports, the drivers' license functions as both a certification of one’s driving abilities and as a verification of identity in terms of one’s locality or residency in a particular state. A drivers' license does not prove citizenship, but it does imply locality or membership within in particular jurisdiction. The question of
residency, whether or not immigrants really live in New Mexico, was a primary point of contention. Secretary of Tax and Revenue, Demesia Padilla, taking her orders from the Governor, has repeatedly launched the largely fictitious charge that residency fraud is prevalent among undocumented applicants and the all-inclusive licensing program is essentially a breeding ground for criminal activity. The charge was that immigrants are criminals and swindlers who are committing fraud and compromising the integrity of the states' driver's license. Soon, the document would be suspect and worthless as a verification of personal identity. Therefore, opponents of the “dangerous practice” of issuing drivers' licenses to “illegals” attempted to define and dehumanize immigrants by denying them an identity as New Mexicans with a legitimate presence (physical address or residency) in the state.

Weeks into the 2011 legislative session public debate on the issue took on a decisively moral tenor after the public safety arguments had run their course and racist anti-immigrant vitriol took over rational deliberations in committee hearings. Somosistas entered the ring swinging using a variety of protest actions including mass-scale emailing and call-in campaigns, marches, and an Immigrant Day of Action in which immigrants and allies occupied the Roundhouse and disrupted business with a barrage of petitions in support of drivers' licenses, personally delivered to the Governor’s office and individual legislators. However, it was the inspiring testimonies of immigrants in committee hearings that shifted the conversation from public safety to a matter of human rights. A young man stood before the committee and testified in Spanish: “I have lived here since I was two
years old. I don’t know any other place to call home. I was a straight-A student in High School and an athlete. I need my driver's license to get school and to work. I have done everything right. Why do you want to punish me?”

Through their protest actions and personal testimonies Somosistas became knowable, not as criminals as they had been cast, but as students, parents, workers, and members of the community. By asserting their legitimacy of presence, immigrants effectively countered the racialized figure of the "illegal alien" that was being used against them to justify taking away their driver's licenses, which for many is the only verification of individual identity and locality that they have. Somosistas were able to convince the majority of Democratic legislators to put their own political careers on the line (in some cases) to uphold the public good and the basic human rights of immigrants in New Mexico. But these efforts were not enough to capture all of the votes necessary to block the repeal in the House, where the proposal passed by a small margin. After this setback and the realization that the public safety argument was losing traction, Somos organized a candle light vigil decrying anti-immigrant racism with simultaneous vigils held in communities across the state. That night immigrants and allies prayed together for driver's licenses and for God to intervene in the legislative process.

Granted, Somos is a radically secular organization, but organizers understand the power of strategic use of public displays of piety. Marcela relishes talking about her conversion to evangelical Christianity at the age of nine, but only as a way to punctuate the drama of losing her faith in the process of becoming a feminist and an
activist. Nevertheless, she claims that she channels that same energy, the unwavering conviction that she had as an Evangelical, into the immigrant rights movement. Elsa relates a similar conversion story. Once a devout Catholic, she says that she found a new religion working with Somos – immigrant rights activism.

The final decisive vote in the Senate on drivers' licenses happened to fall on Ash Wednesday. Many of the legislators, practicing Catholics or otherwise, were walking around the Roundhouse hallways with ash-marked crosses on their foreheads. Alan Sanchez, the lobbyist for the Catholic Bishops stood on the third-floor balcony with Marcela, discussing her loss of faith. “Sometimes you have to lose your religion to God’s work,” he explained. As an envoy of pastoral power, Sanchez considers his lobbying work a ministry. His testimony during committee hearings took the form of a sermon: “Holy scripture tells us to take care of the strangers among us. When you get to the gates of heaven and God asks you, what did you do with all of those poor people I sent you? What will you say?”

When the drivers' license repeal bill hit the Senate floor, Sanchez’s words, uttered weeks earlier in committee were quoted by a Democratic Senator, “What will we say when God asks us what we did with all the poor people he sent us?” In contrast, conservative Republicans, usually comfortable with faith-based posturing skirted the moral issue altogether, honing in on the technicalities and legalities of current licensing regulations. Supporters of the repeal made melodramatic statements about national security and New Mexico being out of step with the rest of the nation. The fraud argument went on with unrelenting vigor. “Issuing drivers' licenses to
immigrants licenses criminals,” shouted an over-caffeinated Republican Senator. “They are coming here to kill us! This law is hurting the real New Mexicans living in our proud state.”

The Senate vote came down to the wire, but the proposal to end the practice of issuing drivers' licenses to undocumented residents was defeated by a small margin. By defining the issue as a moral question, immigrant rights activists, religious leaders, and the faithful not only claimed the moral high ground and saved the law from repeal, but also animated the religious matter lingering (or meddling) within the ostensibly secular process and spaces of organizing, legislating, and lobbying for immigrant rights. We celebrated our victory, but with sinking realization that this was only the first round of a prolonged and exhausting struggle against the Governor and her anti-immigrant factions in the legislature over drivers' licenses.

Weeks later, the Somos policy committee, the group responsible for political strategizing met to debrief about what had occurred during the legislative session and recount how exactly we won the campaign to save drivers' licenses for immigrants. After listing all of our activities – lobbying, protest actions, meetings with individual legislators, media coverage, relationships with allies – we ascertained that the drivers' license had became an object of moral contemplation because of the powerful testimonies immigrants gave in committee hearings. They gave the debate a human face and the driver's license had become infused with presence. When real people and their stories confront anti-immigrant racism and
extremism, these forces and attitudes loose power to dehumanize and define us.

This was a good-enough explanation, but there was still an element of surprise, an inexplicable “something else” that could not be pinned down. Alan Sanchez made countless calls to clergy asking them to talk some sense into wavering Democrats and also to shame and condemn those who voted for the repeal. Catholic clergy, Protestant pastors as well as the Quakers, organized in support of drivers’ licenses, as did Albuquerque Interfaith organizations. All of these dedicated people and their activities taken together helped us claim the moral high ground. However, this alone could not explain, at least in the minds of Somos staff and others who had diligently worked on the campaign, just exactly how that vital shift towards the moral had occurred. There was an aspect of our victory that remained outside the purview of rational strategizing, organized people, and politically motivated tactics…something beyond our control. “It was a perfect storm.”

Everything just came together in our favor – fate was on our side. The way we talked about our victory touched upon the sacred – it was a secular miracle.

While the secular radicals at Somos were rather mystified by the outcome, for the participants in Renovación Carismática at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church the explanation was clear. God had intervened on behalf of the immigrant faithful to save drivers’ licenses. He had heard our prayers and brought down his judgment. During the Novena Masses dedicated to La Conquistadora in June 2011, Emma Rodriguez dressed the ancient statue of the Virgin Mary in the vestment she had promised in exchange for drivers' licenses. The driver's license itself had become a vibrant object,
infused with God’s grace. The vestment, as a gift in exchange for miracle is like an exvoto. It weaves together our stories of struggle into a miraculous victory. Marcela herself had at one point termed the legislative battle, a "David and Goliath showdown, between Somos and the Governor." The opposition, in all their arrogance and wasteful spending of political capital had failed in something they believed would be easy.

The petition and the Vestment that Emma made for the Virgin materialized the legitimate presence of the divine in the prayerful appeals to supernatural persons to save drivers' licenses. Petitions of authority figures also took the form of paper petitions, thousands of petition cards that Somosistas from across the state collected as a martial proof of the widespread support for the current law - a counterpoint to the Governor's own polling that alleged that 70% of New Mexicans want the law repealed. The petitions were signed and delivered to the Governor and state legislators to protect the all-inclusive licensing program from cancellation. Emma’s prayers, and those of countless others, transformed a secular document into a sacred petition to the Virgin for her intersession in the legislative process. Everyone who attended the Novena in June knew about the Virgin’s intervention on the behalf of immigrants, “her most cherished children.”

In addition, La Conquistadora is a local Hispano-Catholic representation of the Virgin Mary. Her community of faith is different from the one that coheres around Our Lady of Guadalupe, although the two certainly overlap to some degree. For the most part, Mexican immigrants are unfamiliar with La Conquistadora. In fact,
her biography and devotional repertoire establish the spiritual core of local Hispano-Catholic identity (Garza 2007; Horton 2010). Therefore, Emma's vestment in exchange for drivers' licenses created a rare moment of unity between local Hispano-Catholics and the immigrant community through a shared system of meaning in which La Conquistadora protects those who trust in her miraculous ability to change the course of history (she is believed to have resolved animosities between the Pueblos and Spanish settlers following the Reconquista of 1692). This spiritual enactment of membership and belonging as bonefide Nuevomexicanos further consolidated immigrants' claims to local citizenship by stamping it with both a political and religious signature of authority.

This linkage between spiritual and political enactments of local citizenship is the essence of legitimacy of presence. Through these assertions of legitimacy of presence immigrants and advocates revived the essence of presence - the vibrant matter - that had been lying dormant within the identity document. Perhaps, an older form of representation had reemerged that signified the essence of personhood and presence. Similar to the way in which the icon of La Conquistadora is understood to be both a representation of the Holy Mother and her divine essence, the driver's license materialized abstract notions of local citizenship and belonging.

In conclusion, the critique of secular bureaucracy that I am working through in this chapter is related to the essence of persons and of personhood (both human and supernatural) that is not necessarily obliterated from bureaucratic modes of representation that aim to depersonalize, dehumanize, and depoliticize subjects.
Objects are always entwined with human subjectivity and relations of power (Bennett 2010; Appadurai 1986). This perspective underscores the potentiality of bureaucratic documents to take on a life form (or a form of life) that is productive of the overlapping attitudes and dispositions of religious and secular points of view colliding in spaces commonly thought to reside one side or the other of the wall of separation between the private affairs of religion and the public affairs of government.

Herein it becomes apparent that in order to illuminate the permeability of the ideological divide between activities that are normally recognized as secular or religious one must not only attend to the discursive uses of religious arguments in legislative deliberations or public performances of piety, but also take seriously the ways in which immigrants and activists rely on prayer or religious-like energies, practices, and motivations, as well as their religious networks not only to build collective power, but to influence different kinds of authority figures, both earthly and celestial, to claim legitimacy of presence in the public sphere.

Admittedly, conflicting interpretations of locality or what it means to be “local” or “native” circulate and compete for dominance in New Mexico as I outlined in the introduction. The local is a contested concept that infers productions of place and space, but also maps onto social categories and group identities such as race, ethnicity, religion, birthplace, genealogy, kinship and even blood quantum. Locality is difficult thing to pin down. However, as I attempted to show in this chapter, the religious and political potentialities that cohered around the driver's license
materialized abstract ideas of citizenship and belonging in ways that both reified and amplified locality for all New Mexicans (natives and immigrants alike) albeit in different ways. This form of emplacement is entangled with legislating, lobbying, and bureaucratic paper trails but also with prayer cards, bible passages, charismatic verses, and the patterns used to create vestments for sacred icons. Documents make claims upon us forcing us to register and sometimes define ourselves in terms of paperwork (Chu 2010). But in New Mexico the drivers' license is more than a document. It is a two-faced talisman with unpredictable powers. For the immigrant community in particular, it is something to believe in, something worth praying for.

In the next chapter, I focus on Renovación Carismática and the ways in which the secular enters into this religious place of sanctuary where Mexican immigrants, the majority from cities and small rural towns in Chihuahua, are transforming what it means to be Catholic on both sides of the border. I trace the arrivals of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal in New Mexico from its advent in the 1970s, to its dramatic return twenty years later with a family of spiritual seekers, lay preachers, and religious reformers from Cuauhtémoc, Chihuahua. Following the trace of the secular, I reveal how participants in the movement interpret deeply sentimental and gendered forms of charismatic worship and prayer as the transformative register of the Holy Spirit. I reflect on how participants in the charismatic movement work around Catholic traditionalism to create spaces of freedom that blend aspects of Pentecostalism and Evangelicalism to bring wayward Catholics into a new relationship with God and with one another. Though my own entanglements (and
resistance) to charismatic conversion, I discuss how participation in the movement encourages the inculcation of a new collective identity as *Cristianos Renovados*, one that hints at productions of the secular through religious diversification and sentimentality.
Chapter Four

Borderlands Charisma: The Transnational Turn from Catholic Traditionalism

My chance encounter with the Mexican-imported Catholic Charismatic Renewal or Renovación Carismática at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church happened in June of 2010 when I was working on a feature article for the Santa Fe New Mexican's religion section about women's ministries. My research for the article led me to Tessie López, a friendly and energetic woman in her mid-seventies who is revered in local Catholic circles for her dedication to lay ministries. A long-time parishioner at Our Lady of Guadalupe, Tessie is also one of the few local Hispanics that remains in the Guadalupe District, a neighborhood almost as old as the Shrine of Our Lady of Guadalupe, the original adobe church structure built in 1777 as an axillary to the Cathedral of Saint Francis of Assisi. While the colonial-era shrine is used for special occasions, the modern building and rectory, which were constructed in the 1950s, function as the main church today.

A few days following our interview, Tessie called me to ask about how the story was coming along. I updated her on my progress. She listened with interest and was particularly pleased that I had mentioned her prayer hotline in the article. Then she asked me for a favor. Tessie and I had chatted in Spanish and she was under the impression I was fluent enough to serve as a translator for a Pentecostal missionary couple from Alabama that she had invited to preach at the Mexicano-led charismatic gathering at Our Lady of Guadalupe. I politely refused, explaining that my Spanish is far from perfect and that my translating abilities are rudimentary. After about twenty
minutes of trying to politely back my way out of the request, Tessie continued to pester me. Finally, she wore me down and I reluctantly agreed to meet her at the church on Tuesday evening, hoping that a more capable person would come forth in the interim.

I had assumed that the charismatic assemblea on Tuesday nights was a small and intimate prayer meeting something like the one Tessie leads in a classroom within the rectory. Based on her description of her own charismatic prayer group meetings, I imagined a small group of people singing alabanzas together and meditating on the Holy Spirit. Therefore, I was taken aback when I entered the church with Tessie to find the pews packed with Mexican immigrant families. My heart raced and my stomach tightened when I realized that I would be up on the altar stage, microphone in hand, addressing a large audience of native Spanish speakers. We took a seat in a row of pews close to the front, next to the choir. I rung my hands as I watched more people file into the church as the musicians tuned-up guitars, adjusted speaker volumes, taped chirpy melodies on the keyboard, and shuffled sheets of music. Noticing my apprehension, Tessie took my fidgeting hands in hers and told me to trust in God. I tried to convince myself that her words of encouragement were reassuring, but I had a sinking feeling that praying was not going to give me the gift of being able to speak in balanced bilingual tongues.

Our Lady of Guadalupe Church retains its 1950s-era modernist style that arose after the liturgical reforms of the Second Vatican Council. The mood of that
time was to diminish excess and opulence as well as elements of adornment that symbolically distance the laity from the clergy and instead focus attention on some simple but basic liturgical requirements in the building and decoration of Catholic churches (DeSanctis 2002). Therefore, unlike the ancient Shrine that adjoins it, the modern church is not adorned with colorfully painted retablos depicting the Stations of the Cross or a Spanish baroque reredo (altar screen). In contrast, the church is bright with high placed multicolored stained-glass windows where the sunlight enters and bounces off the plain white walls and glossy tan-colored pews. The altar is set up more like a theatre, with a few steps leading up to the sacred space where the priests perform the mass. Behind the altar on a wooden panel façade embedded with vertical lines of shimmering polished metal and glass, hangs a large painting of the Virgin of Guadalupe often decorated with colored drapes or banners that mark liturgical time. The unembellished interior of the church is austere when compared the exterior. In the courtyard in front of the ancient Shrine stands a 12-foot bronze statue of Our Lady of Guadalupe, an import from Mexico City. In 2011, the parish added the Cerro de Tepeyac de Santa Fe, which is a pathway that leads from the statue to the parking lot below. The pathway is lined with beautifully painted retablos depicting narrative scenes of the Virgin’s appearance to Saint Juan Diego upon the hill of Tepeyac in Mexico City. These external beautification projects, as mentioned in the introduction, reflect the resurgence of Mexican migration to Santa Fe and announce the church’s identity as the “immigrant church.”
Local Hispanics and Mexican immigrants have carved out separate places of sanctuary within the same congregation. Mexican immigrant spaces include the Tuesday night *assembleas*, Spanish language Mass and catechism classes, and Mexican-derived ritual events such as the celebration of the Virgin of Guadalupe on December 12th, and the *Viacrucis* or live Stations of the Cross, which is performed during Holy Week. Although some local Hispanics participate in these events, members of *La Comunidad* direct and orchestrate these activities and they draw a large Mexicano audience. The *Viacrucis* is a transnational spectacle as many people from Chihuahua are in Santa Fe during Holy Week visiting their family members.\(^{34}\)

Over the years, the Archdiocese has changed their "Americanization" attitude toward both local Hispanics and new immigrants from Mexico and Latin America. According to Deacon Juan Barajas, the Director of Hispanic Ministry for the Archdiocese of Santa Fe,\(^ {35}\) "Hispanics from here are losing the Spanish language even though they retain their local culture and identity. They are well served in English. So, basically my office focuses more on the immigrant population.” Barajas admits that the culturally responsive focus on Latino immigrants creates feelings of relative depravation and resentment among Nuevomexicanos. "You have to understand their history," Barajas continued. "They [local Hispanics] were forced to

\(^{34}\) Holy Week is like spring break in Mexico. Therefore, many people from Chihuahua visit family members in Santa Fe during their break. The city is full of cars with Mexican license plates. During Holy Week, Santa Fe’s transnational ties become more visible and parishioners joke about Guadalupe Church being “Little Chihuahua.”

\(^{35}\) The Archdiocese of Santa Fe is the main administrative office for all catholic institutions in New Mexico. It covers northern New Mexico and Albuquerque and oversees the Diocese of Las Cruces, which covers the southern border region and southeast corner of the state, and the Diocese of Gallup, which covers the north and central western parts of the state. The Archdiocese was established in 1850 under the leadership of Bishop Jean Baptiste Lamy. However, the Catholic Church has been in New Mexico since the sixteenth century.
learn English and they have told me many sad stories of humiliation, having their mouths washed with soap, or being hit for speaking Spanish in school. There is not doubt that the Church was complicit in this abuse." Catholic institutions have played an important role in Americanization programs throughout history. Consider the boarding schools, missions, and parochial schools that were established under Bishop Jean Baptist Lamy in the 1850s to modernize and civilize the region, remolding the faith in the accordance with the brand of Catholicism that emerged in France in the wake of the Counter-Reformation (Lamy and Steele 2000).

Deacon Barajas is referring to Catholic institutions in the 1940s and 50s. Many local Hispanics and Native Americans of the "Baby Boomer" generation had contact with Catholic institutions during that time period and remember the abuse vividly. The Americanization programs, in which the Catholic Church zealously took part, were focused on assimilation and suppression of native cultures and languages. Clergy also held negative attitudes toward the popular religious traditions and dance dramas that both Native Americans and Hispanics have practiced in New Mexico for centuries. "The priests and the nuns in Catholic schools wanted to eradicate Spanish and reform local religion. In a way the Church failed them," admits Barajas. "This is where the resentment comes from both Hispanics and Native Americans toward the immigrant population. They ask, 'where were you when I needed you?' This is a legitimate question." Barajas observes that parishioners have a tendency to see new immigrants from Mexico and Latin America as an invasion. “But this is not the right attitude. The perspective should be, together we are creating the Church of the
future." Nevertheless, Deacon Barajas recognizes that local Hispanics and Mexican/Latino immigrants have carved out their own territories within the same parish. "This is a fact that is difficult to deny," he concedes.

*Failures of Translation*

Tessie called over Ruth Nava, who at that time was the coordinator of *Renovación Carismática* and is one of the founders of the movement in Santa Fe. Ruth is an attractive woman in her late thirties with long curly black hair, dark inquisitive eyes, and a spirited personality. Tessie introduced us and informed her that I had come to help translate for the guests. Ruth seemed surprised and a bit confused, but welcomed me and thanked me for coming. Later, I discovered that she had already lined up the perfect person for the job, one of the lay pastors or *pastores* who is well known in the community for his preaching talents and leadership in the charismatic movement. Ruth, not wanting to embarrass or offend Tessie, the person who had invited the Alabamans to the meeting in the first place, agreed to give me a chance. "¿Eres Cristiana?" Ruth asked, as she shook my hand. "I was raised Catholic so yes, I suppose I am a Christian," I responded in Spanish. She stared at me intently as if waiting for a different answer. "She studied Spanish in Mexico," Tessie chimed in, breaking the awkward pause. Ruth and I were chatting about my studies and my experiences in Mexico when the Pentecostals arrived.

I introduced myself to a middle-aged white couple from Alabama. They reminded me of the televangelists you see on programs like the *700-Club*, the kind
with southern accents and gleaming born-again eyes. The man, tall and slender, casually dressed for the occasion spoke to me briefly about his agenda. First, he and his wife would talk about their missionary experiences in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Then, he would give a charismatic sermon focused on healing and deliverance from sickness and sin. Ruth introduced us to the surprised crowd of about seventy people who were expecting the regular Tuesday night programing. We assumed our places in on the altar stage and I shakily began to translate the Alabamans accented English into imperfect Spanish. I was doing a decent job of relaying their dramatic testimonies of faith and miraculous events - a deaf child recovers her hearing in Kenya, a Guatemalan woman dying of cancer receives a clean bill of health after being prayed upon, the unsaved of the non-Christian world find Jesus. Their testimonies of faith were interlaid with the couple's stories of financial hardship. Miraculously, each time they found themselves broke and unable to unleash the fire of the Pentecost on the world, a mysterious donor would come forth to sponsor their missionary work. These acts of God proved that He takes care of those who “believe first and doubt later.”

The audience seemed bored and uninspired. Young children squirmed in their parent's laps or slept on blankets spread on the wooden pews, babies whimpered or babbled. Perhaps, they were straining to comprehend my muddled translations? A few people shouted alleluias in the pauses between parables, others gasped in awe or whispered comments to the person next to them. My mind was preoccupied with forming grammatical sentences in Spanish, but I could feel that my rendering of the
Alabaman’s preaching words had not produced the desired emotional or spiritual stirring in the spectators that they had intended. Instead, the room was tense and the audience restless, as if waiting for the gringos to shut up so start their alabanzas.

I was feeling weary and in need of a break when the preacher’s wife stepped off the altar stage and sat in the front row of pews. I was relieved, thinking the program was over. It was just getting started. The preacher's sharp facial features hardened as he ran his boney fingers through his sparse grey hair agitated as if he were confused or had forgotten his lines. Then he jerked his head up if someone had yelled, "action!" He assumed a different posture and a distinct mode of speaking, one akin to the artful diatribes that Susan Harding described in her classic article on the rhetoric of fundamental Baptist conversion (1986). As Harding portrays it, “witnessing” eloquently and forcefully blends the gospel with narratives of personal crisis and divine transformation though Christ designed to “bring the listener under conviction” (Harding 1986). Harding dramatically reveals the way in which witnessing primes the listener for a religious conversion experiences, how it invades the consciousness of the listener, strategically targeting the susceptibilities of the unbeliever to win her eternal soul for Jesus Christ (1986).

Confronted with the linguistic curves and contortions of Pentecostal evangelism, I completely lost my bearings. I stood silent and speechless with the microphone at my mouth unable to produce a single Spanish syllable. The Mexican audience members stared at me with wide anticipating eyes hoping for something
intelligible to come forth, but I could do nothing but stare back into the abyss of blanking stares. The preacher, now frustrated with my ineptness, let the microphone hang and swing at his hip, exasperated. My face burned with embarrassment. “I’m lost,” I uttered, holding the microphone out before me as if attempting to pass a baton to whomever dared to run with it. Then, just as Tessie had promised, God intervened on my behalf. A young man rose from the audience to save me. He was wearing a dusty shirt and jeans with heavy work boots, dressed as if he had just walked off a construction site and into the church.

Roberto, the man who Ruth had originally hand-picked for the job (unbeknownst to Tessie and me) did a fantastic job of capturing the emotional force and spirited twists and turns in Alabama preacher’s charismatic jargon. As skilled as Roberto was at translating the language of conviction, the audience remained flaccid and stiffly uninspired. The Holy Spirit was not conjuring any miracles that night. The preacher jumped up and down and shouted fiery professions of faith and rants about the devil and worldly sins in attempt to kindle the inert crowed, to no avail. Finally, he gave up and changed his strategy. He invited those in need of healing to come forth to the altar to be prayed upon. A few people started forming a line in front of the preacher as if cueing up to receive Communion. Others languished in the pews resting their heads on their hands, slumping and yawning. Some stood up to leave draping their sleepy toddlers over their shoulders like heavy sacks of grain. Seeing this, Ruth swiftly took the microphone and thanked the Alabamans for coming and sharing their amazing testimonies of faith. Everyone applauded dutifully. Then, moved by the
sound of *cumbia* beats everyone started to their feet. Bodies began swaying, hands clapping to the rhythm, bidding the strangers farewell.

I realized much later that the double breakdown in communication that had occurred between me and the Pentecostal preacher and the Mexicano audience was not entirely my fault. Roberto, with his balanced bilingualism and expertise as a lay preacher, was able to translate the words and communicate the forceful sentiment of this brand of Pentecostal witnessing, a dialect seemingly born and bred in the American South. Nevertheless, the group of Mexicano Catholic Charismatics in attendance that night had not felt the grip of the Holy Spirit on their hearts and souls. There seemed to be a cultural divide that the “language of conviction” had failed to bridge. I am not suggesting that the fundamental Baptist rhetorical moves Harding describes are exactly the same as Pentecostal conversion techniques. In fact, scholars distinguish between the doctrinal or Biblical literalism of the former and the experientialist and mystical tenor of the latter (Robbins 2004).

Noting these important differences, I find Harding’s description of coming under conviction useful for illustrating a similarity in the way in which the preacher from Alabama used a specialized language - the language of charisma - to produce a conversion effect or collective emotional response in the congregation (Harding 1986, 2000). I chose this story to underscore a particular kind of cross-cultural disconnect. As Csordas (1997) has observed, the creativity and spontaneity of charismatic ritual performances is what announces divine presence and authority. As I will show in this
Chapter, creativity within context the Mexicano charismatic *assemblea* is the ability of the prayer leader or lay preacher to evoke sincerity in his or her performance by revealing her inmost feelings and frailties and offering them up as prayerful praise before God and the community. In this setting, sentimentality is the driving force behind the language of conviction and also what creates the conditions of possibility for conversion.

Sentimentality has been interpreted as false or esthetic emotions (Pugmire 2005; Solomon 2004). Sentimentality is valued differently for Catholics who are becoming Charismatics and learning how "work" with the Holy Spirit. It is what makes charismatic prayer effective as a conduit of divine power and also the avenue through which we come into a new relationship with God and with one another. For Mexican immigrants who have been torn away from family and familiarity, this kind of intimacy is highly desirable and alluring. Within this charismatic place of sanctuary sentimentality is productive of new kinds of solidarities and religious subjectivities.

In this chapter, I will illustrate how charismatic conversion is attuned to a culturally situated and gendered genre of ritual performance that revalues sentiment as transcendence. I argue that the lure of charismatic conversion is mobilized through the emotional force of sentimentality (as opposed to the language of conviction). Sentimentality is the spiritual cocktail that the lay *pastoras* and *pastoras* who led the movement cultivate to revive "dead" Catholics and to bring them into a new, more
intimate and direct relationship with God. The sentimental solidarities that are cultivated and mobilized within this charismatic place of sanctuary emerge within the context of departure and disjuncture - the migrant experience - but also within the transnational circulations of what I have termed, borderlands charisma. Borderlands charisma is a transnational and more specifically, translocal movement that connects participants in Santa Fe with their sister community in Cuauhtémoc, Chihuahua. It is within these translocal circulations and interactions that borderlands charisma coheres as a both a place of sanctuary where immigrants create communities of protection against the hardships of migration as well as a religious community of practice with its own ritual language and style of worship and praise, methodologies of conversion, and ways of working with Holy Spirit.

My first encounter with *Renovación Carismática* was a double blow, first to my expectations, and then to my ego. I had embarrassed myself in the most impressive way by attempting to translate a ritual language - Pentecostal witnessing - that was unfamiliar and strange to me as a Chicana who grew up Catholic (and also to the unsuspecting Mexicanos who attended the *assemblea* that night). This episode adds to the pages of blundering “arrival stories” that fill the annuals of ethnographic representation (Clifford 1986). Henceforth, participants in the Mexicano-led charismatic movement would associate me with the incident. The following summer when dared to show my face again at the Tuesday night *assemblea*, this time as a researcher and participant-observer, those who recognized me had good laugh about my shoddy attempts to translate for the *gringos* from Alabama (at my expense of
course). In the end, the fracaso proved productive. My failure had an equalizing effect by positioning me as a novice in dire need of help and guidance. Ruth and the other pastoras took a chance on me and welcomed me into their prayer circle. As a Chicana anthropologist writing about Renovación Carismática and as a wayward Catholic who is somewhat “susceptible” to the lure of charismatic conversion there was a special place for me within La Comunidad (Harding 1986: 178).

This chapter is more reflexive or intersubjective than the previous chapters. I reflect on my personal encounters with charismatic conversion, my blunders and successes as well as my concious resistance (and that of other participants) to the lures of sentimental solidarities. As an experienced anthropologist of religion, I have learned to navigate the muddy waters of ethnography in religious communities. There is always edgework involved in remaining open to the possibility of religious conversion, while also maintaining a thin padding of ethnographic distance from the prospect. My ethnographic practice requires me to become fully immersed in the religious worlds of my research partners who themselves were engaged in a type of edgework, or experimentation with charismatic religiosity. They too, were on the edges, deciding if this spiritual path was the right one. People join La Comunidad for many reasons, practice charismatic religiosity at different levels, and vacillate in their commitment to the movement. As Ruth Nava once told me, "It's easy to start a movement. The hard part is keeping it going."
Many scholars of religion have pondered the global spread of Pentecostal and charismatic forms of Christianity describing the viral effects of these movements, their impressive popular appeal and social impacts (Brodwin 2003; Csordas 2007; Martin 1990; Robbins 2004). José Casanova has argued that the growth of Pentecostalism worldwide will soon surpass Catholicism as the “predominant global form of Christianity of the 21st century” (2001: 435). Some scholars see the spread of charismatic Christianities as a global missionizing force that embeds a “cultural logics of revivalism” that emerged out of distinctly European and North American Protestant projects of spiritual regeneration (Robins 2004). Notable among them are the eighteenth-century Great Awakening, and the African-American Holiness movement that spurred the Azusa Street Revival from 1906 to 1909 and its "spill over effect" in the US-Mexico borderlands (Ramírez 1999: 574). For the purposes of this chapter, the most relevant themes in the extensive literature on Pentecostal mobilities are the following: democratization of religious expertise and direct access to divine power (Martin 1990; Meyer 2004); changes in gender relations and social hierarchies as the result of conversion (Lorentzen and Mira 2005; Navarro and Leatham 2004), diversification of the religious marketplace (Chesnut 2003), and the ability for charisma to rupture and remake people’s religious worlds and social realities (Csordas 2009; Robins 2003)
Scholars have also observed a correspondence between Pentecostals and Catholic Charismatics, particularly the ecstatic spirituality they share that calls forth the gifts of the Holy Spirit such as glossolalia, faith healing, and prophetic visions. In addition, both movements seek to revitalize the faith and refocus it on the Trinity (God, Jesus and the Holy Spirit). However, what separates them makes all the difference. Catholic Charismatics maintain fidelity to the Virgin Mary and the doctrines of the Church, while Pentecostals are Protestants (Chesnut 2003; Csordas 1997; 2007, 2009; Martin and Mullin 1984, Martin 1990; Navarro and Leatham 2004). Tessie López explained the distinction as a lack; “The people at the Assemblies of God [a Pentecostal church with branches in Española and Santa Fe] say they have the Truth. My response is, as Charismatic Catholics, we have the whole Truth. We have Tradition and the Bible and they only have the Bible. Besides what would I do without Mass and communion? The Eucharist is so important!"

Scholars of religion suggest that the strongest evidence for the Pentecostalization of Latin America and U.S. Latino Christianity is not the growth of Protestant Pentecostalism, but rather the impressive rise of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal (CCR). According to recent estimates, there are 75 million adherents in Latin America and 54 million in the United States (Espinosa 2004: 271). As liberation theology waned in the aftermath of the Central American civil wars, the CCR has risen in its place becoming the new force in popular religious mobilization in Latin America (Chesnut 2003; Gill 1998). However, in contrast to liberation theology’s engagement in leftist politics and investment in the poor, the CCR is oriented around
middle-class values and dedicated to transforming individual lives through surrender to Jesus (Chesnut 2003).

The Catholic Charismatic Renewal encompasses different dimensions, but its primary objective is to regenerate the overall spiritual core of the institutional Church by returning to the reality of the resurrected Christ (Bord and Faulkner 1983). However, it has also been described as a new devotional tradition within the Catholic Church rather than force of conversion (Neitz 1987). The CCR emphasizes baptism of the Holy Spirit, which is manifested in the experience of charms or spiritual gifts such as speaking in tongues, prophetic visions, and miraculous healing. Conversion or participation in this Pentecostal-infused Catholicism also encourages careful attention to Scripture as a guide for daily living, encourages a deeper commitment to the Church and its doctrines of faith, and a renewed zeal for evangelism (Bord and Faulkner; Maurer 2010).

The official origin story of the CCR claims that the fire of Pentecost, which is the driving force behind the movement, came from within the Catholic Church as opposed to being influenced by Protestant Pentecostalism and other Holy Spirit-based movements. This version begins with a weekend retreat at Duquesne University in 1967, a Catholic institution established by the members of the Congregation of the Holy Spirit and located in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania. Duquesne University is unique in that it was established by the Congregation of the Holy Spirit, a relatively obscure order of priests and brothers also known as Spiritians, which was founded in France in 1703 (Maurer 2010; Nabhan-Warren 2013). There is also a parallel lineage of
influence from the *Movimiento de Cursillos de Cristiandad*, which originally emerged in Mallorca, Spain in the 1940s and spread throughout Latin America. Many of the principals of the *Cursillo* Movement also appear in the CCR such as emphasis on transcendence through the Holy Spirit, a deeper commitment to the faith and the church, engagement in public testimony and evangelism, and community solidarity built around the conversion experience and the *cursillista* subjectivity cultivated within prayer groups and retreats (Nabhan-Warren 2013; Maurer 2010).

The Vatican approved the Catholic Charismatic Renewal in 1970, but pastors are advised to "proceed with caution," which means being vigilant and maintaining priestly authority over charismatic prayer groups (Csordas 1999; Espinosa 2004). Csordas argues that the Church's compromise with the charismatic menace was mutually beneficial. "Pope John Paul II tolerated the movement's radical theology for the sake of encouraging its markedly conservative politics, its militant activism for "traditional" values and against women's right to contraception and abortion, and its encouragement of individual spirituality and contribution to parish activities and finances" (Csordas 2009: 74). Andrew Chesnut (2003b) attributes the expansion of the CCR in Latin America as part of the opening of the religious marketplace due to the penetration of Evangelical Protestantism and Pentecostalism in the region. Chesnut explains that "invasion of the sects" came at a time of both economic crisis and a sharp decline of in religious participation in Latin America and increased competition with the Catholic monopoly (2003b: 78). Using an rather convincing economic model of diversification of the religious market, privatization of faith, and
supply and demand, Chesnut illustrates how the CCR became the Catholic Church's solution to remain competitive in an environment where Protestantism was gaining a foothold and also offering a "religious product" highly in demand (2003b: 79).

Clearly, the response to the CCR was different in Latin America than in the United States. In the US the Catholic Church has historically been an "immigrant church" and persecuted outsider religion opposed to Protestantism, whereas Catholicism is the dominant religion in Latin America (Moore 1986: 67). Therefore, it makes sense that the origin story of the CCR in the United States would be one of internal revelation or spiritual awakening as opposed to in Latin America, where the movement grew out of a power struggle with religious outsiders and accommodation to unprecedented religious pluralism. In both cases, these "outsider" ecstatic spiritualties (pneumacentrism) have reinvigorated the Catholic Church and increased religious seeking and participation overall (More 1986; Chesnut 2003).

A counterpoint to Chesnut's model of freedom of religious choice, Luís León critiques the rational choice humanism that underpins this position. In his study of Victory Outreach, a network of Pentecostal churches that have set up missions in working-class East Los Angeles, León argues that Chicano and Latino immigrant communities live in environments where choices are extremely limited by racism, isolation, gender oppression, and harsh social and economic conditions. It is within conditions of restricted possibilities that Pentecostal churches operate and attract converts. León urges us to consider both "the modes of domination and modes of
empowerment" at work in religious institutions, practices of evangelization, and the formation of religious subjectivities (2006: 527).

Notably, there have always been revivalist movements within the Roman Catholic Church, but instead of oppressing them; the Church more often absorbed them in order to keep them within its institutional boundary and to prevent fracturing in to different sects (Finke and Wittberg 2000). Historically, there have been few schisms with the Catholic Church because religious orders (such as the Franciscans and Jesuits) provided an outlet for radical reformers and revivalist movements to be managed and selectively incorporated into the larger Church (Finke and Wittberg 2000). In this sense, the Catholic Church has a long history of appropriating threats rather than expelling them in order to quell dissent and decrease competition with new sects.

*Live and Direct from the Holy Spirit*

Tessie's living room is a home altar. It is decorated wall-to-wall with pictures of family members, collections of nick-knacks and mementos situated among an amazing array of holy objects and images; calendars, votive candles, prayer cards and posters of Jesus, the Virgin Mary and the saints, as well as plastic and porcelain statues of holy persons of all sizes, a liturgical calendar, a framed picture of Pope John Paul II, and many plaques with inspirational messages and biblical quotes printed in gilded script. Tessie and I sat at the table in her sunny kitchen chatting about her grandchildren while sharing a plate of apricots and drinking iced tea. After
making small talk and comparing our Nuevomexicano genealogies\textsuperscript{36}, the conversation turned to her faith and daily spiritual practice. She told me about her prayer hotline and the visits that she and her sister Ruby make to area nursing homes and hospitals where they pray for the ailing and the forgotten. Her narrative was part history, part \textit{testimonio} focusing on the rise of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal in Santa Fe during the 1970s and her dramatic conversion experience.

Although she was raised Catholic, Tessie admits that she did not truly know God or understand her faith until she was “baptized by the Holy Spirit” and reborn as a “new creation in Christ” due to her participation in the renewal movement. Tessie was in her mid-thirties at the time of her conversion. She was raising four young children and surviving daily abuse from an unloving and controlling husband. “I was on the verge of a nervous breakdown, yelling at the kids all the time, unable to find any joy in my life,” Tessie explained. “When I started going to prayer meetings, I felt so much happier. Of course, my husband tried to keep me from going, but nothing could keep me away. After awhile he would tell me, ‘you’re getting worse.’ That’s because I was standing up for myself. I told him, don’t yell at me, I’m not one of the kids!”

Tessie was swept up in the first wave of Holy Spirit-inspired enthusiasm that rolled through New Mexico in the early 1970s. The charismatic movement started in Albuquerque at Our Lady of Assumption Church, introduced by a charismatic priest.

\textsuperscript{36} Nuevomexicanos often vet one another by discussing their family histories and relations as well as their deep genealogies the region usually until a mutual relative, namesake, or geographical location is discovered between them. Sharing this kind of information establishes a relationship of trust.
named Father Hammer who had discovered the CCR while at a spiritual retreat at Notre Dame University in 1969. At that time, the renewal movement in the United States was still in its nascent stages, made possible by the liberalization of the Church after Second Vatican Council and the social and spiritual revolutions of the 1960s (Bord and Faulkner 1983; Chesnut 2003; Csordas 1999). The United States Council of Catholic Bishops, recognizing the growing popularity of the CCR, cautiously endorsed the movement in 1969. Apparently, the news had not reached the clergy in northern New Mexico who strongly disapproved of what many perceived as a dangerous infiltration of Protestantism into their Catholic congregations.

In December of 1972, twelve people gathered at Josephine Luna’s house located in the traditional village of Agua Fria, one of the oldest barrios on the east side of Santa Fe, for their first official charismatic prayer meeting. The group met weekly and invited their friends and family members to participate. In less than three months the group grew to over thirty regular participants, so they decided to move their prayer meetings and charismatic retreats to the rectory at St. Anne’s Church. Tessie recalled that the CCR was received a cold reception by the clergy. "The Catholic Church had a hard time with us. They just didn't understand what we were trying to do. They saw us a undercover Protestants who were going to lead people away from the Catholic Church." In part, the problem was that the charismatic movement emphasizes direct access to divine power, the development of an unmediated relationship with Jesus, and personal transformation through the Holy Spirit. These aspects of the Renewal threatened the doctrinal authority of the clergy.
and their role as intermediaries between heavenly and earthy matters. "You know you learn to pray from the heart with the Charismatics. That’s one thing that’s so beautiful. That’s the main thing about becoming a Charismatic, you develop a deeply personal and loving relationship with Jesus." Tessie explained.

While smaller charismatic prayer groups in homes and parish rectories continued, the larger movement in Santa Fe was centered at Saint John the Baptist Catholic Church and was expanding at an amazing rate. Four couples led the charismatic prayer meetings in the church's gymnasium until the space could no longer accommodate the over two hundred regular participants. While popular with both Anglos and Nuevomexicanos, there was a growing divide between "traditionalists" and burgeoning Charismatics at Saint John's. Tessie and other participants in the early movement recall that the priests barely tolerated them and never came to their meetings. Basically, participants were left alone to experiment with charismatic religiosity.

In the end, the leaders of the movement defected from the Catholic Church altogether taking most of the participants with them to area Pentecostal and Evangelical churches. Tessie recalls that two of the most dedicated participants founded their own church. Today, Hispano-Catholics, particularly those who remember the painful schism that occurred at St. John's the Baptist Church, which resulted in almost a third of the congregation abandoning Catholicism, continue to view charismatic practices with skepticism, if not disdain. Tessie remembers that
after the break-up she attempted to rekindle the charismatic movement at St. John's but the group was basically pushed out of the church. "The priest didn't tell us to leave, he just made things difficult for us. We would arrive for our meetings and the room we had reserved would be taken or it would be locked, things like that."

Nevertheless, Tessie and her friend Estrellita continued leading a small cohort of women of their generation in singing charismatic *alabanzas* and channeling the Holy Spirit in a catechism classroom at Our Lady of Guadalupe on Wednesday nights. If it were not for this small group's determination to keep the CCR alive, it would have long disappeared from Santa Fe, at least among local Hispano-Catholics.

The Archdiocese of Santa Fe established a Catholic Charismatic Center in 1976 in Albuquerque to oversee the movement. But, by the late 1980s participation in the CCR had dramatically declined. The center organized only one Catholic Charismatic event a year at a retreat center in Glorieta, New Mexico. Each year fewer people registered for the event. Then something unexpected happened. Mexican immigrants began organizing charismatic *assembleas* in Santa Fe, Bernalillo, and Albuquerque and orchestrating their own *congresos* in gymnasiums and parish halls. Seeing the rapid rise of the movement and its growing popularity with Mexican immigrants, this time the Archdiocese decided to grasp the opportunity. They have decided to accommodate and promote *Renovación Carismática* in order to keep it under their control. The Catholic Charismatic Center was reorganized in 2010 under the leadership of Sister Magdalena Casas-Nava, a Charismatic nun and native of Mexico. The resurgence of Mexican migration to New Mexico beginning in the late
1990's has not only revitalized Catholic parishes across the state, it ushered in the second coming of charismatic revivalism - borderlands charisma.

Borderlands Charisma

Ruth Nava and her sisters Angélica and Verónica initiated the charismatic movement at Our Lady of Guadalupe from scratch using their own money, religious expertise, and networking resources. Ruth is the younger sister and is thirty-seven years old. Angelica is in her early forties and the eldest of nine Nava siblings. Verónica, who arrived in New Mexico a few years before Ruth, spent about ten years in Santa Fe before deciding to return to Cuauhtémoc. Ruth and Angélica both work as housekeepers for wealthy families in Santa Fe. Wealthy retirees provide a steady clientele for immigrant women who want to work independently as maids and caregivers in Santa Fe. The sisters were born in a historically indigenous village called Bachurichic, located about seventy miles south of Cuauhtémoc, Chihuahua. When Angelica was eight and Ruth five, the family moved to Javier Rojo-Gomez, a small town north of their native Bachurichic.

Their father owned a share in a productive ejido de madera [communal forest land], which provided a relatively good standard of living for their large family. Their mother worked a few odd jobs in town, but mostly stayed home caring for her nine children. Although their father earned a respectable living selling wood from the ejido, he squandered most of it on liquor and gambling leaving his wife and children to scrape by on what was left over. He was also very abusive and often beat his wife
in angry fits of drunken violence. Although he did not inflict any physical abuse on his children, Angélica laments that he was never very affectionate toward his children nor was he involved in the daily responsibilities of raising them.

Angélica gets nostalgic when she recalls her youth living on the rural ejido nestled in the mountains. Ruth also remembers her pastoral childhood fondly. Things were good then. The family had enough to eat and the community shared in the work of chopping and gathering wood and small-scale farming. One day her mother gave her with a notebook fat with plastic inserts neatly framing pages of pesos. She and her younger sister Verónica took the money with them into town and bought themselves new clothes and matching pairs of boots made of jean material or botas de mezclilla. Angélica laughed incredulously when she recalled how reckless and spoiled she was in that instant, a moment that she would remember with longing and regret a few years later when she and her siblings were barely surviving on the meager salary she earned at the maquiladora and living in a one-room shack in the urban slums of Cuauhtémoc.

The good times, as Angelica remembers them, when the ejido was productive and the money was steady came to an abrupt end as she entered her early teens. Although she cannot remember the exact details of the ejido’s demise, she recalls the frenzy of industrialization in Chihuahua City that quickly consumed the village. Outsiders who did not own a share in the communal forestlands began invading the community and cutting down the trees illegally. Lumber and firewood was sold for
higher prices in the cities and everyone was rushing to get a piece of the economic boom in the border cities, at any cost. The increased demand for timber and other raw wood and pulp products can be attributed to the post-NAFTA explosion of borderlands manufacturing and construction as maquiladora industries proliferated in Chihuahua, particularly in Cuidad Juárez throughout the 1990s (Lewis 2002).

In addition, there was an increased demand for cheap paper products in the United States. Under NAFTA wood production increased significantly in Chihuahua but the tariffs for these products were significantly reduced to due to the agreement (Guerrero, De Villa, Kelly, Reed and Vegter 2001). As a result timber producers in Chihuahua began to consolidate into large sawmills in order to keep prices down in order to remain competitive. This situation put small producers, particularly the impoverished indigenous and mestizo inhabitants of common forestlands or ejidos de madera in the Sierra Tarahumara and elsewhere at an extreme disadvantage and also made ejideros more vulnerable to exploitation and illegal cutting (Guerrero et al 2001). Neoliberal economic restructuring (consolidation, privatization, and increased production pressures on wood producers) pushed impoverished ejideros off their lands and into the larger cities and eventually, across the border in search of work (Lewis 2002).

Over a short period of time, less than ten years, the forestland that sustained the Nava family and their neighbors was completely decimated. The families that lived off the products of the ejido went bankrupt had to look for subsistence
elsewhere. When she turned fifteen, Angélica found a job in a *maquiladora* in Cuauhtémoc that processed coupons for U.S. food companies such as Nabisco and Kraft. There are no schools beyond middle school in their community and because her parents did not have enough money to send her to Cuauhtémoc for high school, Angélica took on the responsibility of helping her parents raise and educate her younger siblings. Ruth, who was eight years old when she went to live with her older sister in the city to work and attend school, remembers living in a cramped one room apartment and having only a small cup of beans and rice to eat when she came home from school each day. Angélica admits that she initially joined the charismatic movement to help quell the pain of hunger and poverty.

*Las Tinieblas – The Awakening*

*Las Tinieblas* is ritual that was performed in New Mexico and northern Mexico during the late colonial period up until the nineteenth century usually during the final days of Holy Week. In northern New Mexico, the dramatic ceremony was performed inside a *morada*, which is a windowless structure resembling a long house where the members of *La Hermandad de Nuestro Padre Jesús Nazareno*³⁷ met to pray and perform their ritual acts of penitence, which often included various forms of self-mortification. *Las Tinieblas* was one of the few occasions in which the entire community was welcomed inside the *morada*, which was normally restricted to *hermanos*. Once inside the small, dimly lit space, and in very close proximity to one

³⁷ This religious confraternity dedicated to the suffering and persecution of Christ at his trial and journey to the crucifixion is also known as the *Penitentes*.
another, people sang psalms for the dead and prayed fervently for souls trapped in purgatory.

A candelabrum or *tenebrae* resembling a pitchfork holding four candles was placed upon the altar at the front of the room. Upon the completion of each of the four rounds of prayers, a candle was extinguished. As the candles were snuffed out, the darkness increasingly consumed the space of the *morada* until the final flame disappeared into smoke and the room sat silent in complete darkness. Beginning with the soft whimpering sounds of sobbing and culminating into sharp screams of sorrow and wails of despair, the stillness broke into a crescendo of petrified chaos. People beat their breasts and sometimes one another. They kicked the pews and pounded their fists on the *abobe* walls as if desperate to escape. The cacophony of horrible sounds rattled the walls of the *morada* growing louder and more intense until finally, the candles of the *tenebre* were relit one-by-one, ushering in the light of God, the good news of the Gospel, and the restoration of the cosmic order. *Las Tinieblas* dramatically symbolizes the death and resurrection of Christ and the eternal salvation of the community of believers. I learned about the ritual from Ramón Lucero, a member of the *Penitentes* of Mora, New Mexico. As I listened to Ruth and Angelica's stories about their individual conversion experiences, visions of the ritual of *Las Tinieblas* rushed to mind, although the ritual has no direct connection to their stories.

The dramatic contours and narrative structure of stories of spiritual awakening, and religious conversion are surprisingly similar across cultures. Like the
genre of speech that preachers and evangelists use to captivate potential converts, conversion stories are a genre of ritual performance infused with magical realism and narrative suspensions from reality. I am not suggesting that conversion stories are fictitious, only that they are a genre of storytelling. Testimonios work on the emotions and draw the listener into the divinely inspired personal transformation that the narrator relates. They are alluring because they speak to an absence to be filled and the desire to experience that otherworldly place of sanctuary that the convert inhabits.

It was the music, las alabanzas that beckoned Ruth to Jesus. Even though she had no formal religious experiences as a child, she remembers standing outside the Evangelical church near her home, the small town of Javier Rojo-Gómez, listening to people joyously singing, dancing, and clapping in praise of the Lord. The inspirational music filled her heart with an indescribable feeling of elation that brought her to tears. She lamented that the Catholicism did not offer this enlivening form of prayer, but believed that it was her calling to change this state of affairs. Later, as a teenager, she organized a charismatic youth group at San Martín de Porres Catholic Church in Cuauhtémoc that had a lasting impact on the parish. It seems that the rise of Evangelical Christianity in México had a significant impact on Ruth’s conversion experience, even though she always remained Catholic. Her motivation to start a charismatic youth movement at her church can also be tied to her fascination with Evangelical forms of worship.
In her testimonio Ruth described her conversion moment as a radically transformative event that changed her life forever. When she was about thirteen years old, Ruth attended a charismatic prayer group at her neighbor’s house. During the prayer session, a woman who had received the gift of healing “laid hands” on Ruth and she felt the power of the Holy Spirit course through her entire body like a bolt of electricity. She passed out on the floor. When she awoke she saw everything with new eyes. The world was more beautiful – the textures, sounds and colors of nature were more vibrant. It was as if someone had replaced the darkened lens through which she had previously viewed the world, and now she was able to see God in everyone and in everything. However, there was a dark side to her encounter with the divine - Ruth had to face her own demons. In finding God, she had to confront her father’s abuse and the emotional pain and psychological torment that domestic violence had inflicted upon her. It was a very difficult moment in her life and she went through moments of deep depression. Ruth says that only way to heal from the trauma of violence and deprivation, to defeat the demons that live within us, is through total surrender to God’s love.

Angélica also spoke of a dramatic conversion experience. Before being drawn into Manny Macias’s charismatic prayer groups, Ruth and Angélica had few experiences with formal religion. In the rural communities where they grew up there were no priests to serve the local parish and Mass was held infrequently. When she was thirteen, Angélica attended a class on apologetics (defending the faith) that Manny had organized for the youth. Manny and his partners concentrated their
charismatic evangelism on youth living in the most impoverished *colonias* in Cuauhtémoc. During the retreat, a horrible hailstorm blew in and the children were trapped inside the church overnight. The wind blew so hard that the wooden panels on the walls seemed to heave and swell as if they were about to burst and splinter into a thousand pieces. The hail struck the zinc-coated roof of the church like a torrent of bullets, leaving visible dents in the ceiling. The children were absolutely terrified, but Manny instructed them to stay inside the church. It was too dangerous to open the doors in the torrent and rising floodwaters outside.

They prayed fervently, crying and pleading for God’s mercy all through the night, terrified that the church roof would cave in on them under the weight of the waterfall pouring from the sky. As dawn broke, the storm began to subside. The angry pounding on the zinc roof turned to a slow, sparse tapping. The floodwaters tricked to a muffled hush. Angélica and the other teenagers and children at the retreat were starving and exhausted anxious to get home to assure their parents that they were still alive. When they opened the church doors they noticed that the floodwaters, which were still running down the dirt roads, had parted on either side of the church leaving it completely untouched.

Most of the houses in the neighborhoods in the vicinity of the church were flooded, some completely destroyed their ruins scattered and splintered half submerged in the mud. The children stood in the doorway bewildered. They burst out of the church crying and laughing with joy and wiping away tears of relief. They
marched through the muddy ruins of the village singing songs of praise, clapping and dancing in the watery streets. Everyone thought they were crazy, but they didn’t care. They had witnessed a miracle.

*Borderlands Religion and Migrant Sanctuaries*

Owing its theoretical and methodological innovations to Chicana/o studies, the borderlands concept “has been defined as a transposable idea used to describe phenomena that is part poesies and part subject position (Anzalúda 1987). Borderlands frameworks are built around a paradoxical location, one that adheres to a region, a territory, a geographic location - the space between the United States and Mexico - but also a "conjectural space" that can be recreated just about anywhere migrants settle (Alvarez 1995; Gutiérrez and Young 2010; De Genova 2005; Vélez-Ibañez 1996). The principal behind "border thinking" is an epistemic perspective created from within and designed to unearth subaltern knowledges from the ruins of colonialism (Mignolo 2000: 15). However, beyond the metaphorical, the US-Mexico border is a militarized contact zone, where assertions of sovereignty take place between unequal nations intertwined both economically and culturally in a violent embrace (Rosas 2012; Segura and Zavella 2007).

In this section I will show how migrant sanctuaries such as the charismatic prayer networks between Santa Fe and Cuauhtémoc are interrelated defensive urban spaces (Smith 2005) that share features with the “native hubs” that Renya Ramirez describes with regards to urban Native Americans living between their reservations.
and San Jose, California (2007). Instead of being displaced and alienated from life on the reservation, Ramirez shows how urban Indians take the reservation with them as they travel and recreate it in the places where they settle. The hub is a gathering place comprised of social relationships that extend across space and provide a sense of community and belonging for Native Americans living away from their reservations and who are living in a transnational relationship to the national space of the United States (Ramirez 2007: 11). Similar to the urban-dwelling Native Americans that Ramirez came to know through her research, migrants from Mexico often retain multithreaded ties with their home countries and also have varying degrees of commitment to settling in the places where they live and work in the United States (Arreola 2001; Chavez 1988, 1991, 1994; Inda and Rosaldo 2002). However transitory or permanent their stay in a locality may be, migrants reinvent urban spaces, they create homescapes that simulate the comforts of home (Davis 2000; Rouse 1991).

One of the primary ways in which new immigrants form affective attachments to places is by creating sanctuary spaces or what Ramirez terms, “native hubs,” within established religious institutions or by creating their own ethnic congregations (Badillo 2009; Levitt 2004; Guest 2003; Wilson 2008). The role of the Catholic Church in integrating new immigrants into American society has long been a subject of scholarly interest (Orsi 1985; Matovina 2005; Treviño 2006; García 2008). These studies emphasize the role of Catholic institutions and also reinventions and performances of popular religious practices from home in supporting the classic
model of immigrant settlement and acculturation with attention to forms of resistance and the transnational relationships that migrants often maintain (Ramírez 2005; Levitt 2003, 2009).

Along with Levitt (2009) and in contrast to the traditional assimilation-oriented studies, Elaine Peña (2011) employs the concept of transnational sacred space in terms of performativity, produced as migrants travel and circulate religious knowledge across borders. Instead of viewing migrants as on their way to becoming “Americans” through assimilative religious institutions, Peña reveals how elements of religion and identity travel beyond the congregational model and land in unlikely places. The mapping and remapping of sacred landscapes involves construction of altars, monuments, and shrines dedicated to the Virgin of Guadalupe and other Catholic saints, as well as the performances of transnational pilgrimages (Pescador 2009). These cross-border religious networks circumvent the secular limitations of the nation-state and serve as beacons for new immigrants from Mexico and Latin America (Levitt 2009; Peña 2011; Schiller 2005).

The sanctuary spaces that migrants create for themselves consist of networks of hubs, some within churches, but many others outside officially sanctioned sacred spaces (Guest 2008; Vásquez and Marquardt 2003; Rouse 2006). These places of sanctuary temper the hardships of displacement and resettlement in the United States, but also serve as political sanctuaries where immigrants learn about citizenship, immigration legislation, and also mobilize to attain recognition and rights (Espinosa, Elizondo and Miranda 2005; Espinosa and García 2008; Gálvez 2010; García 2008;
Menjívar 2006). *Renovación Carismática* is changing previous notions of the role of popular religion in the lives of Mexican migrants because the movement is mobile, flexible, extends beyond congregations and borders, and is not isolated or contained within the congregation.

While borders (between the religious and secular and between nations) are both real and imagined, they are also sites for transculturation, reinvention, and perpetual returns. Religion is one of the portable concepts that exceed the boundaries of the nation-state generating new transborder Latina/o religious movements and identities. *Renovación Carismática* is one such creation. In this section, I map out the transnational mobilizations of borderlands charisma as both a revivalist movement and a way of working with the Holy Spirit forged in the barrios of Cuauhtémoc, Chihuahua and remade through migration and re-missionization in Santa Fe, New Mexico. The community of *Cristianos renovados* in Santa Fe is a "seed" community that traces their lineage to one man, Manuel "Manny" Macías Miramontes, a spiritual seeker and dedicated evangelist who sparked the charismatic renewal movement in Cuauhtémoc almost by accident.

*Borderlands Charisma*

By the time Manny was seventeen he was already a devout Catholic and leader of the youth group at his church, *La Parroquia San Martín de Porres* in Cuauhtémoc. While most of the members of the youth group would attend to socialize with other young people or to engage in teenage flirtations, Manny and a few other participants yearned for more. He described this desire: "I began
experimenting with a small group of peers who were just not satisfied with the religious practices and teachings that were acceptable at the time. We wanted to experience something deeper. So we started praying together and experiencing powerful manifestations of the Holy Spirit such as speaking in tongues, burning sensations in the body, overwhelming feelings of love in the presence of God's grace." Within three months Manny's prayer group grew from five regular participants to over fifty young people, mostly teens. Its popularity was partly due to the autonomy of the group and novelty of it all, Manny admits. "This is how renewal happens independently all over the world and in many faith traditions," he then clarified.

"I discovered Renovación before I even knew what it was just though my desire to know God," Manny explained. He did not realize what he was doing until he attend his first charismatic conference in Chihuahua City. Over fifteen thousand people attended the event, which was held inside a soccer stadium. "This was when I realized that I was part of a larger movement," he said with a broad smile. Manny and his friends grew up as traditional Catholics. When they began experimenting with charismatic prayer their parents, some of their peers, and certainly members of the clergy considered their activities subversive. "The group suffered at that time because we were unintelligible to the other Catholics. They thought we were becoming Protestants and trying to influence the youth. But after we went to the charismatic conference, we discovered a way make our movement official, to give it legitimacy." After seeing a stadium packed with Catholics singing and dancing in praise of God
with so much joy and exuberance, Manny realized that the movement was his calling and the reason why he had started the prayer group in the first place - to bring the spirit of renewal to the barrios of Cuauhtémoc.

Manny and his friends returned to Cuauhtémoc high on the spirit of renewal. They were determined to find a way to become official. First, they convinced the priest at La Parroquia San Martín de Porres to allow them to begin holding weekly charismatic asambleas. After gaining a dedicated following, they got to work organizing a charismatic congresses and each year the participants in the movement grew. The third charismatic conference attracted ten thousand people. The renewal became so popular that different parishes started their own movements and internal conflicts bubbled to the surface. This undermined the sense of unity that was originally at the forefront of the movement - the idea of a global fellowship of Cristianos renovados.

However, Manny insists that he did not initiate the renewal movement himself nor in collaboration with the youth group. It was a process of revelation - the work of the Holy Spirit. "Renovación doesn’t start as a movement, it becomes one when we get together to pray and eventually undergo a conversion by surrendering ourselves to God. It doesn’t grow from a founder it grows from the movement of the Holy Spirit." God had mercy for the Church [the community of believers] that had become stagnant and routinized and breathed life into them creating waves of renewal across the world. This movement did not come from the clergy or intellectuals it started from the grassroots, from el pueblo, the people," he reiterated.
At the beginning, the movement grew so rapidly that each parish wanted to organize its own *assembleas* and *congresos* and this created division as every parish began establishing their own reviveral movements. Another other issue to contend with was the rise of false profits and people taking advantage of the momentum.

"Many people came to Renovación for healing or to deepen their relationship with God, but it also attracted alcoholics, drug addicts and people who were carrying around deep psychological pain. Sometimes the emotional force of the *assembleas* was too overwhelming. People started faking the gifts from the Holy Spirit. They would take advantage of the situation, particularly those who were in need of that kind of attention. All their lives they had been marginalized, ignored, and unloved. Then all of sudden they were getting attention for being able to speak in tongues, receive prophesies, or preach the Gospel. We had to learn how to control the movement and the wild enthusiasm of some of the participants. We had to learn how to work with the Holy Spirit, but in the right way."

Working with the Holy Spirit in the "right way" as Manny put it, means making sure that charisma does not draw people away from their core identity and faith as Catholics. Interestingly, Manny's account of how the reviveral movement began in Cuauhtémoc corresponds with how the Catholic Church narrates the rise of the CCR as a movement that emerged within the Church as a process of revelation and through the interventions of the Holy Spirit. Manny says that God had compassion for a Church that was "stagnate and routinized" and in need of an infusion of reviveral spirit in the form of the fire of the Pentecost. Of course, scholars
who study the movement tell a different version of the story. Andrew Chesnut (2003, 2003b) for example, discusses how the CCR was the Catholic Church's compromise with the growing popularity of Protestantism and the diversification of the religious market in Mexico and elsewhere. Although Chesnut does not describe this diversification in terms of secularization, it can be implied. For example, Charles Taylor has described the secular as a broad social context in which unbelief is accepted and religious diversity is the norm (2007). Taylor argues that this wide diversity of religious options is the defining character of the secular as a cultural and moral order. It is the overarching paradigm in which our search for spiritual fulfillment takes place (Taylor 2007).

Taking these grounds of possibility into account, Manny's experimentation with charismatic religiosity occurred in the late 1980s and early 1990s when Pentecostal and Evangelical churches were expanding in Mexico and gaining an impressive number of converts. It was within this fertile arena of sectarian competition and diversification of religious options (including falling away from religion altogether) that Renovación Carismática found its footing, attracting large numbers of adherents and also finding a place within Catholic institutions in dire need of a new marketing strategy (Chesnut 2003). However, it was also important for burgeoning Charismatics to retain their identity as Catholics. Manny implies this balancing act when he says that participants in the renewal had to learn how to "work" with the Holy Spirit. Catholic Charismatics selectively procure Pentecostal and Evangelical religious practices ideas. They mold them to appeal to Catholics and
assure that charisma retains a distinctly Catholic signature. I will say more about what
exactly this Catholic signature entails later in this chapter.

Manny had an important decision to make. He had received his calling to
bring the renewal to the masses but this would mean dedicating himself to the
religious life. "I was working at Telmex at the time, which was a really good job, and
I was up for a promotion and the company was going to triple my commission. I had
to choose between my personal life and my spiritual life. After much reflection and
prayer, I decided to quit my job. It was really difficult because everyone in my family
thought I was insane. But, I had a calling from God that I had to follow." Manny
decided to dedicate himself completely to evangelizing for an entire year. He invited
his charismatic prayer partners to join him in making a one-year commitment to
discipleship. "We found an old house in one of the poorest barrios and we lived there
together. We didn’t really know what we were doing. We split up the chores had a
strict schedule as if we were in seminary. In the morning we would wake and pray. In
the afternoon we had bible study and reflection and a night we would missionize. We
would go knocking on doors and evangelize in the poorest colonias, hold prayer
meetings in people's houses, and pray for the sick."

Manny and his friends lived on the charity of others. In exchange for their
community service, people would offer them groceries usually soup, rice and beans.
"Looking back at it all, it was quite a risk, but we did it. We focused our missionary
work on one of the poorest neighborhoods in the city. Into the second year, we started
a house for women. Ruth joined that house and dedicated herself to the project. We
would all get together to pray in the mornings and then to evangelize in the evenings, but all the rest was separate. Later, Ruth moved to the United States and started a branch of the movement in Santa Fe, others who lived with us migrated to Denver and started one there. There’s also a group in Nashville, Tennessee with ties to the original group in Cuauhtémoc. I visit my seeds at least once a year to see how they are growing."

Translocating La Comunidad

Eventually, after working in California and Arizona, the Nava sisters settled in Santa Fe where they felt a certain affinity with the landscape and the people. “Santa Fe es un ranchito, a small town like the place I grew up on the outskirts of Cuauhtémoc, recounted Angélica. It looks almost the same here with the mountains and the climate and the way the churches look and the adobe houses. It feels like home.” The sisters also had a long lost uncle who was well established in Santa Fe and helped them get settled. Angélica and her husband lived with the uncle for five years. Having established her own household after marrying and having children, she felt that although her life was full there was something was missing. Back in Cuauhtémoc her entire family was deeply involved in Renovación Carismática. Angélica felt the void. The Holy Spirit was calling to her, tugging at her heart. So she began organizing charismatic prayer groups in her home, which is how the movement starts and spreads.

As expected, the prayer group got larger and so they moved the meetings to a rented garage on the Southside of town. By this time, José Luis, the youngest member
of the Nava clan had joined his sisters in Santa Fe. In 2001, after building a small but dedicated following, the Nava family along with about ten dedicated members of the original charismatic prayer group, organized the first transnational Charismatic Congress or congreso in Santa Fe using their own resources, organizing abilities, and transnational connections. They brought a popular musical group from Cuauhtémoc called Banda Jóven and invited renowned charismatic preachers including Manny Macías and Panchito Araujo. The group raised money for the event by selling menudo at the church, holding breakfasts after mass, and selling raffle tickets. They paid for radio advertisements on Spanish-language stations and promoted the event within their migrant networks. The first Mexicano-led transnational charismatic congreso packed the gymnasium at Santa Fe High School for three days and brought many new people into the movement.

Panchito Araujo is one the most popular predicadores Católicos or Catholic preachers in Cuauhtémoc. He is also a talented singer and has a website where fans can by both his music and recordings of his dynamic predicaciones or sermons. Araujo is a sharp dresser who wears flashy suits and pointy snakeskin cowboy boots. Araujo has a reputation for being honest and humble even though as a Charismatic Catholic icon, he has certainly capitalized on the movement on both sides of the border. His style and persona much like his ministry departs from Catholic tradition in an impressive way. Even his title, Predicador Católico, seems is an oxymoron given that the Catholic Church does not rely on lay preachers, it has ordained priests. Nevertheless, some charismatic individuals have made a name for themselves as
preachers and entertainers becoming transnational superstars of Renovación Carismática. The choir at Our Lady of Guadalupe sings many of Araujo's songs (I know many of them by heart at this point).

The original organizers of the first charismatic congreso now form the core leadership of the La Comunidad. María and her sister Lucy who are also from small ranching villages on the outskirts of Cuauhtémoc have each served as Coordinator of the movement. They also sing in the choir and often preach or lead prayers. Carolina and her husband Matías, who help orchestrate the Viacrucis each year during Holy Week, both serve as pastores and each lead their own bible study group. Elizabeth, who married José Luis Nava and became the only local Hispanic in the leadership group, is the choir coordinator. In fact, Elizabeth and her sister Mini are the only locals who participate in the movement. For the most part La Comunidad is a purely Mexican immigrant place of sanctuary. Elizabeth and Mini grew up participating in Hispano-Catholic traditions such as the novena dedicated to La Conquistadora and the annual Fiesta de Santa Fe. Mini continues to participate in these local traditions, but Elizabeth has left them behind. After marrying José Luis and becoming a member of the Nava family, Elizabeth never returned to her former Hispano-Catholic social circles and activities. “I went to mass every Sunday at the Cathedral and it was as if I was asleep. I didn’t feel anything. I would just go through the motions. Renovación is more spiritual. You really feel that God is with you and that he is real. Now I look forward to going to Mass.” The theme of walking through life as a "Católico muerto" and then being revived through Renovación is quite common among Charismatics.
Deacon Juan Burrola also found his religious calling through Renovación Carismática. In fact, his participation in the movement inspired him to study to become a Deacon at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church. Juan, like many of the immigrants who have settled in New Mexico, grew up on a small ranch on the rural edges of Cuauhtémoc. He came to New Mexico in 1984 to work on a ranch in the village of Magdalena, which is located about two hours south of Albuquerque near Socorro. When the weather got colder and there was no more work to be done on the ranch, Juan moved to Santa Fe where he worked construction jobs by day and waited tables at Carrows Restaurant by night. Juan had also lived and worked in Chicago where he encountered many other Mexican nationals primarily from Mexico City and from Michoacán. But the city did not feel like home. "When I to Santa Fe it was not as modern as it is now. You could smell the wood burning stoves in the adobe houses. There’s so much Mexican influence here. I have visited many cities and the Anglo culture is dominant in those places, but it’s different here. Here you feel the Hispanic culture more strongly and it's much older and deeper. When I came to Santa Fe, I knew I would never have to leave because it felt like Mexico, it felt like home." Juan also found comfort and familiarity in the people. "The local Hispanics were very good to me, they accepted me. I would go to a barbershop on Baca Street where the owner only spoke Spanish, as did all his friends. I liked that the local Hispanics didn’t feel any shame speaking in Spanish."

When Juan settled in Santa Fe there were very few Mexican immigrants in the city. He recalls that there were no Mexican women to date and he had to compete
with local Chicanos for the affections of the young women. However, by the early
1990s more Mexicans began settling in New Mexico and most of this new wave of
migrants were young women who came to work in the tourism industry as maids in
hotels and as servers in restaurants. Juan was witnessing a shift in the global economy
towards flexible labor particularly in the service industries, which led to the
feminization of transnational migration (Segura and Zavella 2007). In 1991, Juan met
his future wife, Myra. They got married a year later and had twin girls. Juan and
Myra attended church at Our Lady of Guadalupe and enrolled the twins in the
Spanish language catechism program. "At that time I was looking for something to
inspire me. I didn’t know anything about charismatic movement. I didn’t even know
it existed. When the movement started getting really strong in Cuauhtémoc I was
already in New Mexico, so I completely missed it!"

Myra heard about the congreso that Angélica, her sister Verónica, and their
charismatic prayer partners were organizing decided to attend. She had to drag Juan
to go with her. "At first it seemed very strange to me. How is it possible that these
people are dancing and singing like this? I didn’t like it, but my wife did. She
encouraged me to just let go - to dance, sing, and move! I started to break out slowly,
first just tapping a foot to the music and then clapping my hands. By the third and final
day of the retreat I had gotten the hang of it. I was dancing and singing along with the
Charismatics! I even started to enjoy it. I didn't want it to end." Juan says that he
began to feel the pull of the Holy Spirit, calling him to get closer his faith and to the
Church. At the end of the event Juan had a conversation with the renowned Catholic
preacher, Panchito Araujo. He expressed his enthusiasm for the charismatic revival. Panchito put his hand on his head and began praying over him fervently. Then Panchito told Juan and Myra with deep conviction that it was up to them to keep the spark of Renovación alive in Santa Fe.

The first step was organizing a charismatic choir and getting permission from Father Tri to hold weekly asembleas at Our Lady of Guadalupe. Juan knew how to play the guitar and José Luis Nava could play a few melodies on keyboard. The rest of the choir members had no musical experience. "Jesus, María’s husband, even bought an electric drum set without even knowing how to play!" Juan recalled, shaking his head and laughing. Lucy Padilla corroborated Juan's account. "The choir was so terrible at the beginning. We joked about naming our group 'Milagro' because it would be a miracle if we could actually learn to sing and play music!" All of the members of the choir related stories about the difficulties of starting up the Tuesday night asembleas. "We started with only forty regular participants and it was a constant struggle to get the movement going." Angélica recalled. "There were many disappointments and disagreements between us along the way, but we kept trying. We trusted that God wanted us to succeed."

Lucy Padilla, María's younger sister also found her spiritual calling at the first charismatic congreso in 2001. Lucy came to New Mexico in 1996 when she was fourteen to join her family who had left their small rancho near Cuauhtémoc and had settled in Española. Lucy said that life was a constant struggle in Mexico. "We came here for a better life. Growing up I had never eaten a hamburger. That was a luxury."
Life there is very different and I think that is why people are leaving Chihuahua in search of a better life. Lucy had some experience with Renovación in Mexico because her mother was in charge of the village church, La Iglesia San José. "She was in charge of everything such as cleaning and preparing for when the priests came to visit. Because the village was hard to get to and there was a shortage of priests, we only had Mass about once a month. We would always have the nuns and priests who came to visit over to our house to eat or sometimes they would stay with us for a few weeks. That’s how I learned about the movement. The nuns took me with them to a charismatic congreso in Chihuahua City.

Lucy attended Pojoaque High School and did her best to learn English and adapt to life in northern New Mexico. She attended church at La Iglesia de Santa Cruz in Española and even participated in all the Hispano-Catholic traditions such as the pilgrimage to Chimayo and the feast days dedicated to the saints of the Pueblos. She too felt like something was missing. "Our family was doing their best to accommodate to the local culture. That is what is so special about Renovación it is ours, it is something that we know, something that we created with our own hands. Lucy explained that local Hispano-Catholic traditions are both familiar and strange to her. "I participated in the local traditions and after awhile it seemed like I could make them my own, but I always felt like an outsider. These [local] traditions are so beautiful but they're not really mine, they belong to the local Hispanics and the Pueblo people." Renovación, in contrast, is a purely Mexican immigrant world, a place of sanctuary that they have created for themselves.
Lucy attended the *congreso* in Santa Fe 2001 and the experience relit a flame that she believed had burned out a long time ago. "I always felt that there was something missing from my life. I enjoy writing down my thoughts each day and in one of my entries I wrote a prayer to God about the emptiness and loneliness I was feeling at the time. He answered my prayers by bringing *Renovación* to New Mexico." Lucy says that she was lacking an intimacy with God that her participation in traditional Catholicism could not provide. "When I was in Mexico and went to the charismatic retreats I can’t say that I had a transformative encounter with God. I enjoyed myself in these moments and was fulfilled but it was not the moment in which I truly received my calling. It wasn’t until I attended *Renovación* here that I found the path that I was intended to follow." Unlike Ruth and Angélica, Lucy does not have a dramatic conversion story in which her life changed in an instant. Her relationship with God grew deeper over time.

Three months following the *congreso* in Santa Fe another group from Albuquerque organized a charismatic retreat in Cuba, New Mexico. That was where Lucy received the gift of tongues (glossolalia). "It was interesting because the night before it happened I was talking to my sister María about what the gift of tongues is, how it happens, and what it means. I prayed that it would happen to me. And sure enough, blessed is the Lord, it happened! I can’t really explain what it is like to speak in tongues or why it happens. It comes on when I am praying very intensely and all of a sudden I don’t have the words to talk to God. That’s when I enter the space of being able to pray in tongues." Lucy asserts that the gift of tongues was a call to service.
She and her sister María joined the charismatic choir Our Lady of Guadalupe and became *pastoras*.

When I interviewed Lucy in the fall of 2012, she had just replaced Ruth as the new coordinator of *Renovación*. As coordinator she directs the asembleas by assigning people their different roles and she trains new lay pastors. The coordinator is also in contact with the advisors in Cuauhtémoc who provide guidance on the materials that are used for the evangelization program and on general leadership and organizational concerns. Manny comes to Santa Fe at least once a year to see how his seeds are growing and to direct retreats for participants and special trainings for *pastores*. According to Manny, the vehicle for keeping a transnational movement together is friendship. "The style and structure is brought from Cuauhtémoc, *la forma de trabajar* [the way of working] but the seed communities learn new ways of doing things in the US because they are in a different context," he explained. "There will be a different process and other themes will come up like issues related to immigration, such as being undocumented, or being separated from family members. Obviously the movement here is very similar to the one in Mexico, but we also learn things from the groups on the other side of the border. For example, Ruth started a leadership program that we are now implementing back in Cuauhtémoc."

In addition to the transnational connections and alliances between leaders and organizers of the movement, *La Comunidad* is understood to be a translocality - one community that transcends the US-Mexico border. During the Tuesday night *assembleas* we are often asked to pray for individuals in Cuauhtémoc who are
suffering from an illness or are in need of a solution to a pressing problem. Ruth receives these prayer requests and also information about how the individual or family is doing via text message, Facebook, or telephone and provides us with updates. We celebrate the good news when a miraculous healing occurs and it is attributed to our transnational prayer power. One night, we even prayed for the Mexican nation and its leaders so that God would help the country find its way out of corruption and drug-cartel violence.

Alyshia Gálvez, an anthropologist who studied Mexican immigrants in New York who have established confraternities dedicated to the Virgin of Guadalupe and support both religious and political ends, argues that religion is a crucial variable in immigrant forms of social organization and political mobilization (2010: 38). She also notes that for the Mexican immigrants she came to know, religion did not serve as a primary site for political organizing or community making in Mexico. It is the migrant experience of marginality in the United States that makes religion and the church viable as a vehicle for both political activism and community networking (Gálvez 2010). In agreement with Gálvez's findings, many of the immigrants from Chihuahua that I interviewed about their involvement in the renewal said that they had very limited experiences with religion in Mexico because they lived in rural communities where priests rarely visited. Another common theme was unconscious participation in Catholic traditions. The majority of the Mexicanos I interviewed converted after migrating to the US.
For example, Yolanda, who grew up in a middle class family in Chihuahua City and worked for fifteen years as a public accountant before moving to Santa Fe, said that she was a "Católica de pirata" or copycat Catholic back home. It was not until she came to Santa Fe and began participating in Renovación that she began to understand her faith and place God at the center of her life. Yolanda also sees La Comunidad as a place where she can get away from home, escape her troubles, and socialize with others. As a member of Somos, Yolanda often encourages people to attend protest marches and other events at the Tuesday night assembleas. She also recruited a group of fellow Cristianos Renovados to initiate an Al-Anon support group for family members of problem drinkers. In fact, many immigrants have joined other kinds of social organizations with people they have befriended in Renovación. Some of these groups include, Poder de La Palabra (Toast Masters), Transformando Vidas (a set of courses focused on the development of self-esteem and attaining personal success), and Amway marketing.

While La Comunidad also serves as a site for political organizing, Lucy believes that religion should be set apart from politics. "We had never experienced an attack like the one that Governor Martinez started against immigrants before. We felt protected when Richardson was in office. Now, people feel more uncertain. We wonder what is coming next. First driver’s licenses and then what?" Although Lucy felt the impact of the rising tide of anti-immigrant racism that accompanied the battle over drivers' licenses in 2011, she maintains that religion and politics do not go hand-in-hand. "We should be supportive and also participate in the struggle for immigrant
rights. I get worried sometimes about getting deported but if that were to happen, so what? I just go back home to Mexico, what’s so bad about that? But of course, we need to defend ourselves both as individuals and as a community. But it all comes down to God’s plan. If I were to get deported, that’s what God wanted. Governor Martinez does not decide my fate, God does."

In Lucy's view, God is the primary authority over her life. In fact, she is not alone in this way of thinking. When I would talk to immigrants about the drivers' license battle at church, some people would respond, "Dios es primero," meaning God comes first. These individuals were telling me not only to trust in God, but also reminding me that His authority was higher than that of the Governor or the state. For Lucy, religion is about the survival of the group and politics is about the survival of the individual. "People can decide for themselves if they want to be involved in politics and the participants in Renovación are supportive of immigrant rights, but La Comunidad should be focused on spirituality, on salvation, and on the afterlife.

As these examples show, Renovación Carismática is a translocal movement that has created charismatic prayer networks between the cities of Santa Fe and Cuauhtémoc and their respective parishes or movement hubs. The connection between the two communities goes beyond the religious expertise, missionary drive, and the organizing skills that members of the Nava family brought with them from Mexico that allowed them to bring the movement to Our Lady of Guadalupe Church. Actually, La Comunidad is one charismatic community in two locations. Although the community is separated by distance they are united in spirit. All the materials that
are used for the evangelization program and to train *pastores* come from the community in Cuauhtémoc based at *La Parroquia San Martin de Porres*. The pastors in Mexico function as *asesores* or consultants who help the "seed" groups in Santa Fe and elsewhere to grow the movement and also reproduce its mission and organizational structure. They also have a particular way of working with the Holy Spirit while retaining a Catholic signature.

The realities of national borders and immigration law also enter this picture. Lucy discussed her fear of deportation and the impact that the Governor's anti-immigrant agenda has had on the immigrant community. Although deportation is an ever-present reality for all the undocumented members of *La Comunidad*, God's authority comes first. However, other participants disagree with Lucy's understanding of the relationship between religion and politics within the movement. In fact, on night the members of my bible study group protested when our *pastora*, Nancy, suggested that we meet during the candlelight vigil for drivers' licenses that was scheduled the next day at Capitol building. "We can't just be in here all day praying, we need to fight for our civil rights!" Yolanda exclaimed. In addition, during the drivers' licenses battle, *La Comunidad* (on both sides of the border) prayed for the Governor's change of heart and for God to protect the immigrant community in New Mexico from persecution.

Ruth has assured me that, “when you are part of *La Comunidad* you are supported in all your activities.” We get to know one another as sisters and brothers in Christ and we care for each other in material and spiritual matters alike. Even though
the community here and the one in Mexico are separated physically we are united spiritually. We say prayers and make petitions together as one community and for the same purpose. God is overseeing both communities and sees us as one.” Lucy and Ruth describe Renovación in terms of transnational transcendence.

Given these examples, borderlands charisma is produced through the transnational circulation of people, religious knowledge, and institutional strategies and structures. As a translocal religious community of practice, borderlands charisma is a spiritual program and a social project with a shared language of creativity, method of subject formation, and process of evangelization. Essentially, working with the Holy Spirit is geared toward reviving "dead" Catholics and inculcating a new religious subjectivity as Catholic Charismatics or Cristianos Renovados. Along with this new religious subjectivity comes the formation of solidarities, a strong sense of affinity or fellowship with other participants in La Comunidad. Participants are encouraged to get to know one another, form strong attachments and friendships, trust and rely on one another as if they were family members, and also to learn to accept one another's personal flaws. Within La Comunidad, participants are expected to help one another overcome life's difficulties and cope with the hardships of migration, but also to help one another stay on God's path to salvation. In this way, individual material and spiritual flourishing are one in the same.

Reviving "Dead" Catholics

As I have already suggested, the goal of Renovación Carismática is to revive “dead” Catholics, those who are spiritually stagnant, rutted in tradition or completely
estranged from the faith, and bring them back to Jesus and the Church. To be clear, the leaders of Renovación are reformers. They find something amiss in a Catholicism that is too focused on ritual exchanges with divine intermediaries and their saintly representations on earth. As María, a talented lay preacher, prayer leader, and singer with the charismatic choir at Our Lady of Guadalupe once told me, “I venerate the Virgin, but I don’t adore her. My faith lives in the trinity – God, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit.” Touched by the spread of Evangelical Christianity and Pentecostalism in Mexico and throughout Latin America as I have already explained, many Cristianos renovados believe that popular devotions to saints, “copy cat” participation in Mass and performances of Catholic traditions are insufficient and must be redirected towards different and ultimately more spiritually prosperous end - salvation. Their mission is to evangelize the baptized.

Manny Macías says, "If you think Catholics are cold and mechanical it is your job warm them up and liberate them from routine." Barrowing from Pierre Bourdieu's theory of practice, reviving "dead" Catholics through the power of the Holy Spirit involves the cultivation or generate a new religious, or Catholic habitus (1977). As Bourdieu points out, the habitus is the incorporation of the social into the corporeal in the form of durable, transposable dispositions that mediate an individual's actions with the demands of a given institutional arena or structure of power (1977). The habitus enables charismatic Christianity, to become fully realized as an institution and as a movement that generates new religious subjectivities, identities, and solidarities that empower individuals and the structures of power and domination that underpin it
in a reciprocal fashion (Bourdieu 1977). According to Manny, participation in the charismatic revival instills the following in converts: Love of prayer and a profound desire or hunger to know God; love of scripture as a guide to daily living; immersion in the practice of alabanza (worship and praise); a special love for and dedication to the Church; and last but not least, love for the Virgin Mary. This final tenant of charismatic subject formation, love for the Virgin, is one of the elements of faith that allows participants to retain their identity as Catholics.

However, Manny realizes that revivalist movements are temporary because once the renewal is complete it is no longer needed. "The reality is that Renovación can’t last forever. There will come a day when it will disappear. The goal is for everyone to live an internal renovación and to be awakened. Once that happens, we won’t need the movement anymore." From this perspective Renovación is not a movement, but rather a catalyst for both personal and social change. The movement grounds itself in the interior of a person and is expressed externally in the mode of charity and works that not only transform the individual but society. Manny says that spiritual renewal is only the beginning, the top of the iceberg so to speak. "We need to transform the society in which we live. We can't just stay in our spiritual bubble. We need to make changes in the world." For Manny, the material outcome of his conversion is Fe, Esperanza y Caridad, a faith-based non-profit organization he founded in 2001 that provides educational activities and support services for street children and at risk youth.


*Renovación* works on the body and the soul. It creates a space of freedom and creativity outside the confines of the traditional Catholic liturgy to lure wayward Catholics back to the Truth of the resurrected Christ through embodiment - the felt presence of the transformative power of the Holy Spirit. Through the embodiment of charisma primed by sentimentality, participants cultivate a renewed relationship with God and strive toward an ethical life in the paragon of Jesus Christ. Charismatic *alabanzas* are joyful songs of worship and praise, choreographed to danceable *cumbias* and other popular Mexican musical genres. Children are encouraged to lead in the singing and dancing at the front of the altar and are allowed to run freely between the pews. After about an hour of exuberant singing, clapping and bumping knees against confining pews, the music begins to slow down and flow into soothing ballads, which serves as a cue to take the children to the rectory for bible study so that the adults can concentrate on praying and channeling the Holy Spirit for healing and deliverance.

*La Comunidad* is an exclusively Mexican immigrant place of sanctuary that recreates a sense of home, family and familiarity. Migrants often feel adrift having been torn away from their emotional and economic support systems in Mexico, not to mention the moral and social structures that dictated the rules of comportment and respectability. In addition, the social condition of illegality positions migrants as devalued labor, which relegates them to the margins of society and puts them in a constant state of insecurity and vulnerability. This situation disrupts attachments to place and dampens emotional intimacy as well as the experience of comfort and trust.
La Comunidad is a defensive urban space where migrants can feel free to speak Spanish and express themselves through cultural idioms derived from home. It is also a place where they can form friendships and new networks and also become intimately connected to relative strangers as hermanos en Cristo. In essence La Comunidad provides a space for regenerating emotional attachments and for recuperating a sense of self within a supportive community.

Emotions and sentiment have always been intrinsic to the production of anthropological knowledge even though the scientific end of the discipline has attempted to erase or suppress the important role that emotions play in ethnographic research in favor of the detached or objective observer (Rosaldo 1989). While emotions shape research concerns, influence field encounters, ethnographic representations, and even pervade theoretical debates (Svašek 2005). This reality disrupts and also challenges the notion of dispassionate scientific inquiry. Emotions have also long been associated with the primitive side of human nature and also with the weakness of women, hysteria, and the irrationality of female hysterics (Svašek 2005). Within the Christian theology, the sinful nature of human beings is contrasted with the purity of the soul. This idea also has gender ideologies embedded within them. Women are considered morally weak because of their supposed inability to control their passions. Sentiment is feminized and therefore, considered distasteful, indulgent, and aberrant within modernity (Kaplan 1987; Lutz 1998).

Many philosophers have given credence to the Cartesian principal of the separation between mind and body, positing the thinking, rational mind as the path to
liberation from emotionality (Svašek 2005). However, the alongside Enlightenment rationality and the scientific perspective the Victorian Era produced a counterculture of sentimentality exemplified by the moral philosophers, David Hume and Adam Smith. The moral philosophers privileged the idea that moral sentiments are an innate quality of mankind, a moral compass or common sense that operates on feelings rather than thought (Kaplan 1987). As an expression of the doctrine of the moral sentiments, sentimentality was considered a virtue above the faculty of reason (Kaplan 1987). This perspective stands in sharp contrast with modern interpretations of sentimentality as a distasteful and manipulative fabrication of emotion (Solomon 2004).

Anthropologists have also pondered emotions in relationship to the social and the moral. The American school of personality and culture studies, best exemplified by the work of Ruth Benedict, treated emotions as a human universals patterned or shaped by culture. In her classic ethnography, Patterns of Culture, Benedict argues that culture is a compilation of interacting traits or "arc of personality" that defines both the ethos of the culture as a whole and the individual character of its members (1959: 237). In this sense, entire cultures and even nations have a unique emotional signature or cohesive personality type.

This theory has been critiqued for many reasons, but largely because it reifies emotions and also takes them for granted as natural states of expressive being that are than shaped or acted upon by culture. In contrast to this view, beginning in the 1980s, Catherine Lutz and others argued that emotions are themselves cultural productions.
Lutz argued that, "emotional meaning is fundamentally structured by particular cultural systems and particular social and material environments…emotional experience is not pre-cultural but preeminently cultural." (Lutz 1990: 5). Lutz does not take emotion a given container to be filled out by cultural factors, but rather emotions themselves are cultural inventions or constructions.

In Veiled Sentiments: Honor and Poetry in a Bedouin Society (1986), Lila Abu-Lughod reveals how the strict moral code of modesty is a form of deference to the elders and also way of showing virtue or that one is a good and respectful person. As Abu-Lughod explains, "the moral sentiments of modesty are part of a discourse that sustains and perpetuates the particular social system and the power of certain groups within it." Therefore, immodest sentiments are understood as subversive of the strict moral code and social hierarchies that it perpetuates. She argues that emotions should not be analyzed through interpretive or mentalist mode, they need to be studied as discourses that produce or perpetuate larger relations of power.

From this perspective, emotions should be understood as part of the fabric of social and political life. Following this line of thought, emotions participate in social projects and are embedded within regimes of power. Ana Y. Ramos-Zayas, provides a nuanced race and class analysis of the emotion work involved in the production of neoliberal personhood among Latinos in Newark, New Jersey (2012). Drawing on Bourdieu's concept of habitus and practice theory, Ramos-Zayas suggests that, "emotions, affect, and sentiment are indispensible tools to understanding the process by which individuals become racial subjects and racial experts" (2012: 18). She goes
on to explain how "appropriate" and "inappropriate" affect is not only dictated by marketing and commodity capitalism, but are indicative of racial and class difference in urban space. Therefore, "street therapists" are keenly attuned to the emotional codes and style of bodily comportment that dictate the social hierarchies and racial meanings that pervade daily interactions, inter-racial relations, and economic futures in neoliberal urban spaces and publics in Newark (2012: 7).

This analysis of the gendered and even racialized aspect of emotion and affect is highly relevant to the present study of sentimentality. Stereotypes about the fiery Latina who cannot control her emotions is quite common as is the idea of the macho Mexican man who is always ready for a fight, or crying in his beer. These are stereotypes that play out in popular culture both in the US and Latin America. Therefore, the highly sentimental form of prayer that is performed and also preferred in the context of Renovación, although not unique to charismatic religiosity, also marks this sacred space as ethnically "Mexican." Therefore, sentimentality, is a racialized and gendered component of enactments of borderlands charisma.

_Sentimental Solidarities_

Catholic clergy in Santa Fe remain rather ambivalent about the movement, but the pastor at Our Lady of Guadalupe, Tien-Tri Nguyen (Father Tri), who is an immigrant from Vietnam and speaks limited Spanish, has been very supportive. "People need to find a way to express their faith. Everyone comes to God in a different way and the charismatic movement is just another way in which people began to discover their faith." Father Tri also does a good job of overseeing the
movement and keeping it under control. He often arranges for the Sister Magdalena, who directs the Catholic Charismatic Center located in Albuquerque for the Archdiocese, to give catechism lessons or lecturas on Catholic traditions to the group. Sister Magdalena's lecturas are scheduled sporadically and although the leaders of La Comunidad know about them, they never inform the participants beforehand to assure that people actually show up that night. Participants want and expect their usual charismatic Tuesday night programing and are usually disappointed and annoyed when representatives from the Charismatic Center take over their meetings.

The Archdiocese has also co-opted the movement in recent years by organizing large-scale Hispanic Conferences under the auspices of the Charismatic Center. The Archbishop usually makes an appearance or celebrates a misa de sanction, which is a special Mass in which the gifts of the Holy Spirit are emphasized and conReagants are invited to come up to the altar to adore the Santisimo, which is a symbolic representation of the Eucharist or the incarnation of Christ. The Hispanic Congress has taken the place of the grassroots congresos that participants organized for themselves in the past and are wildly popular drawing thousands of immigrants from across the state. However, the leaders of the smaller parish-based charismatic groups continue to organize their own retreats and maintain their transnational connections.

The danger of Renovación Carismática is precisely its allure, unbridled sentimentality. Clergy who are skeptical of the movement argue that charismatic religiosity, if not kept in check with regular mass attendance and bible study, can
inculcate “bad religion,” or the idea that God is simply a felt presence. In fact, the core leadership of the charismatic movement, the lay pastors or pastores who direct the evangelization program also warn against alabanza as a replacement for Mass. “La alabanza es el postre,” explained Nancy my pastora. "The center of our faith is Jesus Christ and we all must go to Mass to receive the body and blood of Christ. The Eucharist is the most important sacrament we have as Catholics," Nancy explained. In her estimation, the joyful music, singing and dancing in praise of the Lord is like a side dish, a reward of sorts, for strict adherence to the tenants of Catholicism and service to the parish through lay ministries.

Individual members of the choir take turns leading the group of about one hundred participants in charismatic prayer chants spoken in Spanish. These prayerful meditations are often accompanied by a rolling undertone of muted sobbing and murmuring tongues as participants become affected by the power of the Holy Spirit. The most talented prayer leaders, such as Ruth and María, perform deeply sentimental public conversations with God, translating their interior emotional and spiritual words into vivid spoken images. These prayerful performances artfully improvised at the microphone and accompanied by ethereal music and whispering incantations are said to be direct inspirations from the Holy Spirit. These passionately sentimental performances not only teach Catholics how to pray charismatically, they are designed to inspire a collective emotional response in the audience that brings people to tears and back to Jesus but perhaps more forcefully, brings them back for more every Tuesday night.
Now that we have a sense of what movement members, particularly its leaders, are attempting to revive through borderlands charisma, for the remainder of this chapter I explore the work of sentimentality in creating immigrant solidarities. I also reflect upon my subject position both as an anthropologist studying the movement and a potential convert within the affective productions of sentimentality. I argue that sentimentality, rather than being an inauthentic or manipulative display of emotions, is the therapeutic register through which the experience of emotional pain and trauma as well as happiness and enjoyment is translated into a meaningful and singular religious experience in charismatic contexts. I ponder how the force of emotions also plays out in the gender dynamics within La Comunidad. Situated at the edges of participant observation and religious conversion, I also question the secular sincerity of the ethnographic act. Can anthropological methods, ostensibly designed or enacted to effectuate an attuned “distance” form the religious subject overcome the lure of sentimental solidarities?

Worship is Warfare

My official induction into La Comunidad followed an intensive six-month evangelization program that involved regular attendance at Tuesday night asembleas and participation in bible study and social activities or conviviencias. I was also assigned to a group of fifteen adults, both male and female, between the ages of thirty and fifty, most of them immigrants from Chihuahua. Together, guided by our pastora, Nancy, we underwent an intensive review of basic Christian concepts and beliefs and had many deep conversations about the nature of God and our struggles to transform
ourselves in accordance with Christ’s example. After going through all the exercises in the training manual, *Evangelizing the Baptized*, which is also used in our sister community in Cuauhtémoc, we came to the point in our indoctrination in which we had to decide as individuals and as a group whether or not we were ready to commit to becoming *Cristianos renovados*.

That night, during the Tuesday night charismatic revival, Ruth, the coordinator of *Renovación*, was on a rampage. Her prayers at the microphone were not as softly emotional and meditative as usual in fact, they were fierce and fervent and somewhat condemning. She wove biblical examples of how people defy God’s commands into her prayer visualizations as a way to indirectly chastise us for failing to surrender and conform. When the music settled ending her preaching moment, she said bluntly, “*la alabanza es una guerra*” [worship is warfare]. “When we are consumed by sin and the enemy is set to destroy us. How will we defend ourselves?” Ruth asked the gathering of about eighty participants that night. Everyone remained silent awaiting an answer. Then she yelled triumphantly into the microphone, "*Vamos a defendernos cantando!*" [We will fight him by singing songs of praise!] The choir then launched into a celebratory cumbia, *Dios Me Liberó*, to conclude the night.

After the prayer session, I went to my small group meeting. Instead of gathering in our usual place, Nancy took us to a small back room where the choir practices and stores their instruments. We all sat down on the floor in a circle and Ruth stood in the center, looking down at us with a stern look on her face. She dramatically announced that tonight was our moment of truth. We had reached the
point in our charismatic experimentation in which we had to make a serious commitment to each other and to God as renewed Christians. She took out a back notebook from her handbag, overflowing with songbooks and bible study materials, and began reading the, *Liturgia Penitencial* [Penitential Liturgy] which is a communal prayer of confession and absolution. However, her version included a list of renouncements that we were directed to repeat. At the top of the list were the devil and sinful thoughts and actions, but also folk religious practices such as *curanderismo* as well as the adoration of saints and icons above God and Jesus.

Then Ruth challenged us with an ultimatum. She told us that it was time for us to confirm our pact with God and with one another to become radical Christians and be truly cognizant of what we are doing here as participants in the charismatic movement. With this pact, God will expect much more from us, she explained. This covenant must be made publically, in front of the community of believers, in order that it be confirmed and realized. Then Ruth directed us to renounce our vices in front of the group and declare our religious commitment.

Standing on the edges of “ethnographic sincerity,” I was presented with a classic anthropological dilemma (Jackson 2010: S280 – S281). Although everyone in the community knows that I am researcher and observer who is writing about the Charismatic Renewal movement (I constantly remind them of this fact), I was expected to make the commitment along with the group even though Ruth told us that we were welcome to leave if we did not feel ready. I could not ethically confirm commitment to convert and become a radical Christian because it would compromise
my secular distance as an anthropologist and personally, I was not ready to go there. However, if I opted out of the public confirmation, I would risk losing credibility in the religious community and potentially undermine the relationships of trust that I had built over the past year of regular participation in La Comunidad. I was faced with the prospect of having to renounce anthropology as a vice, a sinful act that was impeding my relationship with God.

I was terrified. My heart raced and I broke out in a cold sweat. The walls of the overcrowded room seemed to close in around me suffocating my ability to think of a way out. As I looked around the room, I realized that I was not the only one who was anxious and uncomfortable. It seemed that we were all tittering at the edge of conversion, peering over the ledge of possibilities and doubts, unable to jump. Could we make this leap of faith together? Yolanda and Bernadette, who revel the social aspects of Renovación and often chat and giggle while the rest of us try to concentrate on channeling the Holy Spirit, gave each other a sideways glance, a facial expression that said, “Ay Díos mio!” Some tried to lighten the situation with jokes and side comments but the majority remained stoic, pensive, worried.

Ruth captivated us with her severe, almost threatening gaze. God is not all about love and the good, she said frankly. “Cuando Dios nos habla duro, decimos que no,” [when God speaks to us harshly we tell him no, gesturing with her hand and body as if she was pushing something unwanted away]. Then she asked, “Do you want to be radical Christians? This means that we do not compromise or play with our commitment to God. We have to be renewed in our minds and in all of our
actions.” Peering into our petrified faces, Ruth softened her tone and changed the plan. She was visibly disappointed by our apprehension and asked us to get out a piece of paper and pen and write down our renunciations instead of confessing them publically. She instructed us to write down sinful acts, painful memories, resentments and jealousies – all the evil that separates us from our goal of knowing God. The room seemed to heave a sigh of relief. We placed our written lists of renunciations in a small urn at the center of the room and prayed as Nancy lit a match and set our sins on fire.

As the flames burned down to ashes, some of the women began to weep softly. We comforted one another with lingering hugs and whispered blessings. It was an intense and somewhat traumatic moment for all of us. I aimlessly roamed around the church afterwards trying to recuperate from what I have identified as anthropolocura, the madness of the ethnographic act. I sat down in the last row of pews and Nancy sat with me. I told her that I felt sad and lost. I could not let go of my anchor to that secular conviction that keeps me from drifting off into the sentimental lures of charismatic Christianity. Perhaps, I was quite comfortable being a “dead” Catholic. She agreed that it is difficult to let go but that this was necessary in order to advance our relationship with God, to come to know him and to change. When we feel sadness, pain, and desperation Nancy reminded me, it is God working on us.

This confessional narrative about my resistance (and those of my companions) to the sentimental lure of charismatic conversion makes visible the edgework involved not only in the ethnographic act, but also in the productions of the secular.
As Charles Taylor (2007) has observed, the wide variety of religious options and the normative acceptance of unbelief that forms the overarching background within which our search for fulfillment takes place not only makes committing to the demands of being a renewed Christian more difficult, but altogether precarious and fragile. The lure of sentimental solidarities in this charismatic space actually might foster a resistance to conversion by allowing participants to split the difference.

While sentimentality is ubiquitous in Mexican popular culture from the sorrowful gritos of the ranchera song to the melodramatic scenes of telenovelas, in the context of Renovación sentimentality is the vehicle through which we come into a renewed relationship with God and a new collective identity as charismatic Catholics (Nájera-Ramírez 2007). Sentiment, particularly painful emotions, but joyful ones too are valued differently and therefore experienced as divine intervention. It is only through the externalization of sentiment that we capture a glimpse of what an intimate relationship with God might entail. This knowledge is made possible collectively, as a shared conversion experience that is performed before an audience. However, this process is often met with resistance and wavering doubt. It is within this spiritual tug of war that we might find the secular, not only in our fumbled attempts to anthropologize religious subjects, but also the intersubjective and deeply affective spaces that we inhabit together. La alabanza es una guerra, worship is warfare.
El Corrido de Mi Licencia/ My Driver’s License
By Arturo Delgado and David García (2011)

Aquí estoy establecido
Nuevo México querido
Quince años pasaron ya
Que salí bien decidido
A cruzarme la frontera
De los Estados Unidos
Yo no vine hacerte mal,
Yo me vine a trabajar.

I am well established here
In beloved New Mexico
Fifteen years have past
Since I left with determination
To cross the border
Into the United States
I didn’t come to do harm
I just came to work

Yo soy puro mexicano
Y aquí están mis hermanos
Todo lo que hemos buscado
Es una oportunidad
Yo trabajo donde sea
Pues no me puede rajar
Porque tengo a mi familia
Y no les puedo fallar.

Proudly, I am Mexican
And my compatriots are here
All that we are looking for
Is an opportunity
I work wherever I can
I can’t give up my search

Because I have a family
And I can’t fail them

Señora Gobernadora, yo le quiero demostrar,
Cuando yo vine a este estado, nomás vine a trabajar,
Si me quitas mi licencia, ¿Cómo voy a manejar?
Todo lo que he buscado es una oportunidad
Por sacar mi familia adelante no soy ningún criminal.

Madam Governor, I want to be frank with you,
When I came to this state, I only came to work,
If you take away my license, how will I drive?
All I have done is look for an opportunity
I am no criminal for supporting my family.

No me llames delincuente nomás,
Nomás por querer trabajar
Aquí están mis hermanos mi sangre tan querida
Y cada día se esfuerzan más
Para cumplir las leyes no nos querrás aplastar
Yo tengo algo muy presente y me quiero asegurar
Que a mis hijos tan queridos no se les vaya olvidar
Que sus raíces mexicanas dondequiera van estar
Aquí la esperanza que tenemos es un día poder arreglar
Nuestro estatus migratorio para ya vivir en paz.

Don’t call me a delinquent
Just because I want to work
All my beloved compatriots are here
And everyday they endeavor
To comply with and respect your laws
I want to assure you one important thing
That my beloved children will remember
Their Mexican roots will forever be here
Our hope is that someday we will be able
To fix our immigration status and live in peace.

Interlude
El Corrido de Mi Licencia
Chapter Five

*Anthropolucura: Tying up Loose Ends*

During the 2011 legislative battle over driver’s licenses, traditional musician and anthropologist, David García, a native of Española, collaborated with Arturo Delgado, a native of Chihuahua, to write a popular protest song, *El Corrido de Mi Licencia*. The song was performed during a rally at the Capitol that *Somos* organized in September during the interim legislative session, which was supposed to be focused on resolving the state’s budget woes, but the Governor made sure to continue attacking immigrant families with her dreaded driver's license repeal proposal. The lyrics to the song were passed out among the three hundred or so participants at the rally and when the performers began the familiar accordion riff that marks the beginning of all *corridos*, everyone did their best to sing along. A few bars into the second verse, people began swaying to the music, clapping along, and scanning the crowd for dance partners. Spontaneously, Roberto, a longtime member of *Somos*, grabbed me by the waist and spun me around to dance a *ranchera*. The rally outside at the Capitol, strategically orchestrated below the Governor’s 4th floor executive office window so that she and her staff would be sure to hear the revelry if not watch the protest scene below, turned into an all-out *ranchera* spree.

The protesters danced and sang joyously in the afternoon sun in the brilliant display of community and solidarity. Governor Martinez and her political bullies could brand us as criminals and retract our drivers’ licenses but they would never break our spirit, our ability to dance *rancheras* in the face of adversity. *El Corrido de*
Mi Licensia circulated on Spanish language radio and Somos used it as the theme song for a video they made of the highlights (and lowlights) of the 2011 legislative battle over drivers’ licenses. The corrido has become an anthem of sorts for the immigrant struggle to protect the diverse and sometimes enchanted places of sanctuary that we have created together in New Mexico and beyond. From the sanctuary polity built upon pro-immigrant policies and their often unexpected symbolic and social effects; to the identity document, vivified though social struggle and invocations of the sacred that materialized immigrants’ claims to local citizenship and legitimacy of presence; and finally, the translocal charismatic prayer networks that reanimate and repair ruptured intimacies, while transcending national borders and the confines of Catholic traditionalism.

The immigrant places of sanctuary that I have described (and also inhabited) in this dissertation are not isolated ethnic enclaves or bulwarks against cultural difference, foreign threats, or the violent forces of immigration law. They are fluid and adaptable communities of protection that are fully engaged and integrated into the changing cultural, religious, and political terrain of northern New Mexico. They are urban spaces of mobilization or “native hubs” where knowledge and cultural resources brought from home are remade and redeployed in light of new circumstances (Ramirez 2007). Places of sanctuary are where Mexican immigrants gather up their resources, share knowledge, and create new kinds of solidarities geared toward improving the conditions of life (and also securing the afterlife) for their families and communities. In addition, the immigrant places of sanctuary that I
document in these pages challenge the ideological boundaries between secular and religious spaces, practices, and energies while also providing fertile ground for the production of new political and religious subjectivities.

As a Chicana who grew up in multicultural barrio on Santa Fe’s Southside and in a family who actively participated in popular Catholic practices such as devotions to saints, pilgrimages, fiestas and feast days, and blended them with indigenous spiritualities and faith healing (I have an aunt who is a curandera and claims to channel the saints and other powerful deities), the places of sanctuary in which I conducted my fieldwork were at once familiar and strange to me. Santa Fe is my hometown and I have deep ancestral ties to northern New Mexico on my mother’s side. But my father is a Tejano from the borderlands of south Texas. He grew up in a migrant family that traveled most of the year working on different farms and living in migrant camps. Every summer my sister and I would visit our grandparents who lived in the colonias near La Joya, Texas, where we were thrust into a bilingual and bicultural Tejano and Mexican immigrant world. Therefore, I feel a sense of affinity with working-class Mexican immigrants and with Nuevomexicanos, but also recognize my difference and privilege as an educated Chicana who has traveled and lived in different cities in the United States and Mexico.

I have conducted research in both communities and have a familiarity with the cultural terrain as a “native” anthropologist. However, I understand that this is a highly problematic concept not only because nativeness is a contested category in New Mexico (and elsewhere), but also because we are all entangled within webs of
power relations and one’s subject position is permeated by multiple and intersecting social categories (such as gender, sexual orientation, class, race, age, education, etc.) all of which influence the kinds of friendships, collaborations, and relationships that we create in the field (Jones 1970; Nayar 1993; Nájera-Ramírez 1999). Although this dissertation is a product of what I call “hometown ethnography,” I cannot claim to have had any insider privileges within the immigrant rights movement or La Comunidad when I arrived on the scene. I became more integrated as a participant in both movements over the course of my research and I had to work to build relationships of trust and reciprocity with my collaborators who certainly viewed me as a stranger (and perhaps, an infiltrator) at first.

However, I do not consider myself to be completely separate or radically different from the communities that I collaborated with to produce this ethnography. As a Chicana from Santa Fe, I feel that there is more at stake in conducting politically and socially engaged research and that my ethical responsibility is deeper and the ties of reciprocity expected from my collaborators are often more demanding and enduring. In essence, I do not have the privilege of exiting the field, since my research site it is also my homeland. Southwestern vicinity or borderlands where I situate my research, is also a vecindario. The people who I worked with on this project see me as a whole person with rooted kinship ties and family obligations and also as an individual with a personal stake in what happens to our community. As minorities living in the poorest state in the country and as Mexicanas/os and Nuevomexicanas/os who share aspects of culture and a similar social location in the
US, we have a common present and a shared future – a loose solidarity in difference. These intimate connections and relationships offered me both benefits and burdens as an anthropologist since it is often difficult to separate research from everyday life.

Ethnography is always messy business. In order to negotiate these kinds of enmeshments, when the “field” is also “home” and therefore, too familiar to be distant, or the gap between “the researched” and “the researcher” is too close to maintain a comfortable cushion of “objectivity,” some anthropologists have taken to split-personalities and alternative identities. John L. Jackson for example, created “Anthroman,” as his avatar while conducting fieldwork in Harlem (2005). Dominican author, Junot Díaz, has used science fiction metaphors, native curses, and comic book characters to write about diaspora, assuming the identity of the humble “Watcher,” in his award winning novel, The Brief and Wondrous Life of Oscar Wao (2007).

Some anthropologists have described a psychological process in which they consciously switch on to a different channel when they are in researcher mode as opposed to everyday person mode. I suppose have used a combination of all of these techniques. For me, fieldwork/homework required a mentally and often emotionally draining process of identity management in which I emphasized parts of myself and drew upon certain knowledge and experiences as the situation dictated. I believe that my process as more akin to a theatrical technique than a psychological mode. I played different roles in different contexts. This does not mean that I was “acting” or being dishonest, but rather I was accessing different facets of myself, situational identities that are already a part of me, while also engaging in intersubjective exchanges with
others who were also performing specific social roles (activists, community organizers, politicians, Cristianos Renovados, evangelists, prayer partners, etc…). I was more attuned or observant at certain moments within the flow of my participatory observations and experiences while embedded with Somosistas or while praying with Carismáticos. Often these moments of heightened awareness came when my anthropologist antenna detected something significant. Later I would write about these experiences, observations, or conversations in my field notes, the raw material of ethnographic representation. David García and I began using the term “anthropolocura,” which is a combination of discovery (both scientific and personal) and madness, to describe the challenging emotional work, process of identity management, and the intersubjective collisions involved in doing hometown ethnography.

When I returned to Santa Fe to conduct preliminary research for this project, I had not lived in the city on a continuous basis since I graduated from college at New Mexico State in 1997. Therefore, while I was off working and studying in other regions of Atzlán, Santa Fe was evolving and changing without me. In fact, I had completely missed out on witnessing the resurgence of Mexican migration that had occurred while I was away. When I was a teenager in the early 1990s there were very few Mexican immigrant families that I knew of in town and or students at my high school. The immigrant community was present, but not as large or as visible as it is now. By the time I returned to Santa Fe to conduct preliminary research for this project in 2008, I encountered a vibrant Mexican immigrant community and a
completely revitalized “immigrant church” at Our Lady of Guadalupe. Santa Fe had moved on without me. I was the one who had been away from the homeland and need to be emplaced anew.

I had initially planned to focus my research exclusively on the religious realm. I was interested in how the faith community at Our Lady of Guadalupe was changing in response to Mexican migration and also how local Hispanics, who were long-time parishioners of the parish, and more recent Mexican immigrants were negotiating and also differentiating the sacred space of the church. A few months before heading into my qualifying exams, I had a project crisis. I was unsatisfied with the research proposal that I was going to submit for consideration. I called my sister Renee for a pep talk and in the course of our conversation she told me about a resolution that Santa Fe County had passed in support of comprehensive immigration reform.

Renee worked for the Santa Fe County as a community planner for seven years and serves on the Planning Commission. She knows practically everyone in Santa Fe, and has a keen eye on local politics. Renee was the person who told me that Somos Un Pueblo Unido was involved in drafting the resolution and that the organization had also helped pass the “sanctuary city” resolution in 1999. It was at that moment that my project came together. I wanted to focus my research on the religious and secular aspects of the sanctuary city. Somos’ political work of organizing immigrant communities and passing pro-immigrant laws provided the foundation for political side of the sanctuary concept and Renovación Carismática, the religious side. However, after doing some initial reading on the Sanctuary
Movement of the 1980s, I realized that the religious and secular aspects of sanctuary are inseparable – they are two sides of the same coin. This understanding prompted me to consider how places of sanctuary could be important sites for rethinking the ideological separation between religious and secular spaces by teasing out and also attempting to make visible their entanglements ethnographically.

Now that I have provided some background information about where the idea for this project originated and how I negotiated some of the insider/outsider dilemmas that I encountered while in the throws of anthropolocura, I will dedicate the rest of this discussion to a review and analysis of the individual chapters. In this section, I will provide a brief synopsis of each of the four major chapters and reassess some of the arguments I was attempting to make, as well as the theoretical ladders or frameworks I used to support them. In addition, I will discuss some areas for improvement, expansion, or further research.

Chapter One, "A State for Sanctuary: The Career of a Controversial Proclamation," initiates my concern with how excitable documents and legal formations like Governor Toney Anaya's 1986 sanctuary proclamation are productive of broader social and historical phenomena. In this chapter, I locate places of sanctuary in conceptual terms, as a political theology that emerges in the doings of documents, and in practical terms, what sanctuary movement activists did to consecrate the sanctuary proclamation and transform into a pronouncement of law. I imagined the proclamation as the locus from which a world unfolds, one in which the sanctuary movement in New Mexico is recovered to history and the concept of the
sanctuary state emerges from within local and national debates about “illegal” immigration and foreign policy.

I situate the document within Toney Anaya's turbulent tenure as governor and his involvement in ethnic politics and policy making at the local and national levels. I also show how local politics in New Mexico intersected with international events and a humanitarian crisis - the mass exodus of Central American refugees from their homelands. Defining the sanctuary proclamation as a political theology, I place it within a highly politicized ideological and moral confrontation between sanctuary movement activists and representatives of the federal government, as well as between liberal and conservative Christians.

One of the underlying goals of the chapter is to bring New Mexico out of rooted regionalism, showing how the local touches upon the global and vice versa. I analyzed the different ways in which religion and politics mingled in the actual text of the document as well as in the discourses that made the declaration possible at the height of the Sanctuary Movement. In this way, I attempted to pinpoint some of the entanglements between the secular and the religious that played out in the politics surrounding the sanctuary proclamation as well as in the experiences, conflicts, and convictions of people who actually participated in the movement during the 1980s. I used the document as a point of departure for examining and reconstructing untold histories of the sanctuary movement in New Mexico. In this regard, I am making a significant contribution to New Mexico history and histories of the Sanctuary Movement, which have largely ignored the Underground Railroad that existed in the
tri-state area, the borderlands where the cultures of northern Mexico, Texas, and New Mexico comingle.

New Mexico’s sanctuary proclamation was produced within complex webs of social relations that emerged out of a particular social movement and political environment during the Reagan Era. As an artifact of political theology that contained both secular and religious references, the proclamation carried multiple meanings and symbolic interpretations. By tracing the career of the sanctuary proclamation, the idea of the sanctuary state, as a particular kind of political and moral project, also came to light. What was Toney Anaya attempting to do by issuing this controversial proclamation? What kinds of social and political effects did the action produce? In answering these questions, we see that most New Mexicans supported some kind of relief from deportation for Central American refugees and that sanctuary activists had not only pushed for the action, but used it for their own political purposes.

While conservative Republicans and political pundits as well as federal immigration officials decried the sanctuary proclamation as a subversive act of non-cooperation, Anaya claimed that the action was a symbolic gesture of solidarity and therefore, not legally binding. His stated intention was to bring attention to the plight of Central American refugees and the discriminatory practices of the INS. Nevertheless, sanctuary activists took the proclamation one step further by taking the reality of the sanctuary state to heart. For some of movement adherents, Governor Anaya's designation of New Mexico as a "state for sanctuary," legitimized the movement and authorized their work of assisting Central American refugees,
particularly the aiding and abetting part of their mission. In practice, some sanctuary activists interpreted the proclamation in terms of their own coming to consciousness as well as the movements’ religious and moral critique of President Reagan's failed Central American policy and the violence of immigration law. In this way, the document became a "sacred passport" that carried the signature of a higher authority and moral mission.

Sanctuary activists, including Glen Thamert, actually carried the document with him on "sanctuary runs" believing that the proclamation would offer him, and the people he was helping, some measure of protection from INS persecution. This religious remaking (or reading) of immigration law based on the credence of the sanctuary proclamation actually conjured up the state the sanctuary in practice. This conviction or belief in the reality of the sanctuary state stands up in a court of law in Chapter Two, when two individuals stake their freedom on the authority of the sanctuary proclamation and its principals. More importantly, the convergence of religion and politics that occurred at the height of the Sanctuary Movement(s) of the 1980s paved the way for contemporary local immigration policy activism. Today, immigrant advocates use local government entities to institute pro-immigrant policies that promote integration and inclusion. On the other side of the ledger, state legislators have also attempted to circumvent federal plenary power with regards to enforcing and enacting immigration law by passing exclusionary and discriminatory laws regulating migrants and migration.
Chapter Two, "The Intimacy of Politics: Sanctuary on Trial in New Mexico," continues to follow the signature of the sanctuary state, delving deeper into the construction of legal truths and untruths and the intimacy of politics. In this chapter, the sacred passport makes a dramatic return, this time as a legal defense presented in federal court. In 1988, Rev. Glen Thamert and journalist, Demetria Martinez, were indicted on numerous charges related to their involvement in a “sanctuary run” that brought two pregnant Salvadoran women across the US-Mexico border who wanted to give their unborn babies up for adoption to families in Albuquerque. Glen was directly involved in helping the women arrange legal adoptions and transportation from El Salvador to Mexico and across the border into El Paso, while Demetria documented the incident for a story she was writing. Attorneys for the government however, cast them both as criminals who were engaged in a conspiracy to violate federal immigration laws.

Because the transcripts from the New Mexico Sanctuary Trial are missing in action (I actually went to the National Library in Denver, Colorado and looked through the original case file), I decided to reconstruct the events leading up to the trial, which enabled me to write a richer ethnographic story about the people involved in the politically charged trial. I show how the trial was actually a culmination of “contingent encounters” across international borders, secular and religious spheres, social relations, and politically motivated vendettas (Tsing 2005: 4). Using a combination of archival sources and interviews with people who were directly or tangentially involved in the sanctuary incident or the trial, I attempted to challenge
the rationality of law and order by uncovering the “affective state” or the intimate relations between politics and sentiment, governance and passion, secular authority and theological claims (Stoler 2005).

A close reading and analysis of pre-trail statements and the arguments presented during the trial, I expose how the US Government attempted to persecute and silence sanctuary activists by blocking them from making their case in court. In addition, I illustrate how arguments pertaining to the constitutional right to religious freedom and freedom of speech competed for dominance as credible defenses at trial. Once religious freedom was put in its proper place as a matter of identity and sincerity in Glen Thamert’s case, his only option was to underscore his faith in the sanctuary state. Similarly, Demetria Martinez had to negate or minimize her religious beliefs and motivations in order to establish her credibility as an objective journalist exercising her freedom of speech by writing about the Sanctuary Movement. Finally, I show how the two Salvadoran women, Cecilia and Ínez, evaded the legal categories available to them by creating diversions and convolutions that rendered their testimonies untruthful and ultimately, inadmissible as credible evidence to be used either for or against the defendants.

Chapter Three: “The Force of Documents: Drivers’ Licenses and Legitimacy of Presence,” takes off where the previous chapters left us with an contemporary analysis of the doings of documents and the remaking of the sanctuary polity in the form of local immigration policy activism. In this chapter, I continue to employ a methodology of thickly describing the social life of documents within a social
movement and the shifting political and moral terrain of immigration politics. I shift my theoretical perspective to a deeper analysis of bureaucratic systems of identification and representation and how these processes can be countered and ultimately, re-signified.

My goal here was not only to illuminate secular and religious crossings in the legislative process, but also to offer a fresh perspective on enactments of citizenship and alternative practices of authority. In this chapter, the driver’s license gets caught up in moraline drift and becomes “vivified” or entangled with human subjectivity, political ideology, and charismatic spirituality. I attempted to disentangle these different strands or modes of vivification by showing how different groups of actors - Republican conservatives, immigrant rights activists, Catholic clergy, and charismatic Catholics - engaged the driver’s license debate. In each case, the driver’s license signified different things - a threat to national security; a claim to local citizenship and belonging; a matter of human rights and human dignity; and an object of popular devotion. Bringing these frayed ends together, a more nuanced picture of the struggle over drivers’ licenses emerges, one that is inclusive of religion, not solely as a perspective or standpoint but as a political force and perhaps, an alternative form of political participation.

Another thread that I attempt to unravel is a Catholic formation of the secular. At this point, my argument is not completely flushed out, but I consider the analogy between the presence and absence of the state and the simultaneous presence and absence of God and other supernatural persons a productive place to begin. I ponder
how Catholic visual piety (the idea of presence and likeness that tethers representations of saintly beings to their supernatural counterparts in heaven) might overlap with histories of bureaucratic representation. Immigrants prayed for driver’s licenses and made appeals to supernatural authorities to intervene in the legislative process and these activities not only changed the conversation (and perhaps, the outcome) but also transformed the symbolic meaning of the document. I suggest that when immigrants enact legitimacy of presence both in the political and spiritual realms these forces come together to produce unexpected social effects. I also consider the possibility that their actions in the political and spiritual realms infused the driver’s licenses with an “essence” of personhood that possibly mirrors an earlier form of representation that was imprecated with the theology of the Eucharist. Therefore, a Catholic formation of the secular may be also possible, one rooted in the blended popular religious practices that emerged in the Americas. This theory might offer an interesting challenge to theories of the Protestant origins of secularism.

Chapter Four, “Borderlands Charisma: The Transnational Turn from Catholic Traditionalism,” focuses on the rise of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal (CCR) to New Mexico as a result of the resurgence of Mexican migration. I trace the histories of the renewal movement through its various strands of influences and transformations in the United States and in Mexico and how infusions of charismatic religiosity have impacted Catholicism on both sides of the border. I begin this story with my own embarrassing attempts to translate Pentecostal rhetoric before a Mexico Catholic audience, emphasizing the failures of religious translation. My embarrassing
ethnographic “arrival story” is also a critique of the literature on the global spread of Pentecostalism and charismatic Christianity, which does not account for the nuances of different cultures of charisma how different movements or groups “work” with the Holy Spirit.

I argue that the disconnect between the language of conviction enacted by the Alabama Pentecostal missionaries and the Mexicano participants of in Renovación Carismática at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church had less to do with my rough translations, than with a clash of different spiritual communities of practice. My encounter with the Mexican immigrant-led charismatic revival is the point of departure for narrating the turbulent history of the charismatic movement in New Mexico from the perspective of Tessie Lopez, a native Santa Fean, who discovered the CCR in the 1970s, had an impressive conversion experience, and continues to lead a small group of local Hispanics in charismatic worship and praise. Tessie’s story reveals the conflicts that ensued between Charismatics and traditionalists in individual Catholic parishes in Santa Fe, which left a deep rift within the Hispano-Catholic faith community. This local history reflects some of the conflicts that also ensued in Mexico with the spread of Evangelical Protestantism and Pentecostalism. In addition, the divisions that the CCR created in Santa Fe parishes, particularly at Saint John the Baptist Catholic Church, is one of the reasons why local Hispano-Catholics remain skeptical of the Mexicano-led charismatic movement. In addition, according to the Director of Hispanic Ministries, Juan Barajas, some local Hispano-Catholics hold resentments towards newcomers from Mexico and Latin America that have
filled the vacant pews of local Catholic parishes. Some Native American and Hispanic parishioners see their growing presence as an invasion, while others begrudge the Catholic Church’s newfound acceptance and accommodation of the cultural and linguistic differences, an attitude that natives were not afforded in the past.

My goal for this chapter was primarily to trace the transnational movements and social effects of borderlands charisma on Catholics on both sides of the border through the stories of movement leaders, lay missionaries or pastores, as well as newer participants or converts. I was interested in what Cristianos Renovados are trying to revive. They refer to their target audience as “dead Catholics” in need of a spiritual awakening. The leaders of the movement are reformers and their goal is to jump start a “stagnant” Church through an infusion of the power of the Holy Spirit. Their method is to teach Catholics how to have a live and direct relationship with God that is more intimate, transformative, and ultimately, more fulfilling. I discovered that the movement starts in small ways, through prayer circles that grow and blossom into charismatic revivals.

Focusing on the religious testimonies and migration experiences of the Nava sisters, Ruth and Angélica, I show how economic factors, particularly the devastating effects that NAFTA had on rural economies and communities, brought people into urban colonias in the larger cities such as Cuauhtémoc where they encountered Charismatic Catholic missionaries such as Manny Macias. In fact, charismatic evangelists targeted the poorest neighborhoods in Cuauhtémoc as their primary
missionary zones. The Nava sisters had few religious experiences before getting swept up in *Renovación Carismática*. When the Nava family migrated to New Mexico, they brought the spirit of renewal with them to Our Lady of Guadalupe Church. Using their own resources and organizing power, the Nava families in collaboration with a dedicated team of *pastores* have built a translocal movement based on the productions of borderlands charisma. Borderlands charisma is a particular way of working with the Holy Spirit that has been shaped by migratory circulations including the movement of people from rural *ranchos* to urban centers in Mexico, and transnational migration from Cuauhtémoc, Chihuahua to Santa Fe, New Mexico. Borderlands charisma is a translocal movement. *La Communidad* is one community of faith that bridges the US-Mexico border in spirit and in missionary zeal.

The growing popularity of borderlands charisma among Mexican immigrants in New Mexico has not gone unnoticed by the Archdiocese of Santa Fe, which is attempting to reign in the movement by promoting it and incorporating it into the institutional structure of Hispanic Ministries. The Charismatic Center organizes large-scale charismatic *assembleas* and retreats that are designed to appeal specifically to Mexican immigrants who are also paying participants in these events. Whereas the first charismatic *assembleas* were grassroots mobilizations across borders, organized and funded by participants in the movement in Santa Fe and in Cuauhtémoc, today these large-scale retreats have been co-opted by the Archdiocese who not only choses the headliners, but also charges for admission. Where does the money that is being
generated from these events go and whom does it benefit? These are questions that remain unexplored in the chapter and require further investigation.

Finally, in consideration of the cultural aspects of borderlands charisma, I touch upon sentimentality as both a pedagogical tool and a method of conversion in this chapter. I realize that this section is rather incomplete and demands a deeper analysis of race, class, and gender in the productions of sentimentality. Using highly sentimental forms of prayer performed before the congregation, lay pastors model a new way of praying for Catholics. Charismatic prayer performances are deeply sentimental conversations with God that not only devotional - focusing on worship and praise - but confessional in that the prayer leader reveals his or her personal struggles, implores God for help, and calls upon the Holy Spirit for healing and deliverance from sin. While in other contexts, sentimentality might be interpreted as embarrassing or is condemned for being in bad taste, among Mexicano participants in Renovación Carismática, sentimentality is understood as an authentic expression of Gods love.

Rather than promoting individualism or inculcating the “sacred self” as Csordas (2009) has observed in other contexts, sentimentality makes private emotions, thoughts, and experiences public. This is an exteriorization of the faith. Through public displays of sentimentality, faith is put on display and vulnerability is laid bare for all to experience together, as a community of built around the expression of intimacy. I argue that the experience of intimacy and conviviality is alluring to many Mexican immigrants who are separated from family members. La Comunidad
fosters new kinds of solidarities based on a shared conversion experience and identity as Cristanos Renovados. For Mexicanos who are racialized minorities in the United States and also in the process of creating attachments to their new homeland as Nuevomexicanos, this Mexican immigrant place of sanctuary offers emotional support that is often denied outside La Comunidad such as the experience of intimacy and affinity with relative strangers as well as a sense of community, familiarity, and belonging within a surrogate family of Charismatics.

This chapter has many limitations, primary among them, the lack of ethnographic data from the sister community of Charismatics in Cuauhtémoc, Chihuahua. While I was able to interview some participants and lay preachers who are members who currently live in Mexico and often come to New Mexico to help conduct charismatic retreats or to train new leaders, I was not able to study the community in Cuauhtémoc largely because it was unsafe to travel through the rural towns in northern Mexico at the time I was collecting data for this protect as they were under the control of drug cartels. I was invited and even set up interviews with members of the Nava family and other individuals who are leaders or members of the movement in Cuauhtémoc, but I decided not to put my personal safety at risk. Now that the situation has improved, I plan to conduct additional research in Cuauhtémoc, which will provide a richer transnational analysis of borderlands charisma and its trajectories. In addition, research in México will also allow me to compare how sentimentality operates differently within the sister community.
In conclusion, this dissertation focused on the concept and practice of sanctuary place making in historical, contemporary and transnational contexts. Taking sanctuary place making as a site for the analysis of American secularities (or the co-constituted arrangements of secular and religious spaces, ideas, and practices), each chapter offers a different scene of representation in which some aspects of the cultural and moral formations of the secular and the religious become visible as objects of knowledge. This project is important because while religion has become a standard category of analysis in anthropological research, secularism has just begun to develop an ethnographic following and a body of literature. Scholars interested in the secular and secularism continue to struggle with how to approach the subject and in this regard, this dissertation is highly experimental. Therefore, I hope the reader considers this study good to think with, at the very least, and perhaps it and will inspire further research in this area.
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2 Governor Toney Anaya also launched a successful campaign to end the Death Penalty in New Mexico by bringing together a coalition of unlikely bedfellows: conservative religious people, Anglo liberals and Democrats. He discusses his motives as rooted in his Catholic faith.


4 In northern New Mexico local modes of belonging are organized around “degrees of nativeness,” which is a continuum of belonging based on genealogy and claims to the land which simultaneously hail Chicano, Mexicano, Hispano, Native American, and Anglo ethnic categories, thereby complicating facile identitarian distinctions based on ethnic groupings or national origins.
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15 The ancient shrine of Our Lady of Guadalupe in Santa Fe was briefly declared a sanctuary for refugees. During the 1980s the shrine was under the care of a private foundation. One of the Anglo board members who strongly supported the Sanctuary Movement put a plaque on the outer wall declaring the shrine a public sanctuary, "for all who are fleeing violence and persecution." The board did not approve this action and the plaque was removed.


Quoted from the Affidavit of Glen Remer-Thamert sworn upon his oath sometime in May of 1988 to support his necessity defense.
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Apart from the numerous scandals that were launched against Anaya and members of his administration, his unpopularity with state workers was largely due to bad policy decisions such as his refusal to give them their regular yearly increase. His nickname in Santa Fe state worker circles was “Tiny Annoyance.”


In Limine translates from Latin as “on or at the threshold” which recalls the anthropological concept of liminality as the middle phase in Arnold Ven Gennup’s classic formulation of the rites of passage (1909).
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NMSA §66-5-9, the statute that stipulates drivers' license application requirements provides for the following:
For foreign nationals applying for drivers' licenses the secretary shall accept the individual taxpayer identification number as a substitute for a social security number regardless of immigration status. The secretary is authorized to establish by regulation other documents that may be accepted as a substitute for a social security number or an individual tax identification number.
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