

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18232/20073496.1369>

Articles

## Latin American migrants under the US New Political Economy: Public raids cost vs private sanctuary revival

### Migrantes latinoamericanos ante la Nueva Economía Política de Estados Unidos de América: el costo de las redadas públicas contra la reactivación del santuario privado

Antonio Sánchez-Bayón<sup>1</sup>, \*  0000-0003-4855-8356<sup>1</sup> Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Madrid, España.\* Correspondence: [antonio.sbayon@urjc.es](mailto:antonio.sbayon@urjc.es)

**Abstract.** This is a case study on migration management in the United States of America, according to the New Political Economy approach. Attention is paid to how Latin American immigrants are treated, given the change in public policies and their economic perception. There has been a shift from open-door immigration policies to raids and massive deportations, violating the founding principles of the United States and the key to its growth and development, since immigrants are not only a greater productive factor of work, but also bring knowledge, technologies and institutions that improve the competitiveness. Faced with this change in public powers, civil society has reacted, with a revitalization of the Sanctuary Movement. This study uses an explanatory methodology on the evolution of the academic disciplines and approaches dedicated to the research on religion-economics-migration relations, to focus its attention on the case study of the Sanctuary Movement.

**Keywords:** migrants-citizens relations; Sanctuary Movement; New Political Economy; religion and economics.

HOW TO CITE: Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2023). Latin American migrants under the US New Political Economy: Public raids cost vs private sanctuary revival. *América Latina en la Historia Económica*, 30(3), 1-19. DOI: [10.18232/20073496.1369](https://doi.org/10.18232/20073496.1369)



Esta obra está protegida bajo una Licencia Creative Commons Atribución-NoComercial 4.0 Internacional

Resumen. Este es un estudio de caso sobre la gestión de la migración en Estados Unidos de América, según el enfoque de la Nueva Economía Política. Se presta atención a cómo son tratados los inmigrantes latinoamericanos, dado el cambio en las políticas públicas y su percepción económica. Se ha pasado de políticas migratorias de puertas abiertas a redadas y deportaciones masivas, violando los principios fundacionales de Estados Unidos y la clave de su crecimiento y desarrollo, ya que los inmigrantes no solo son un factor productivo de trabajo, sino que también aportan conocimiento, tecnologías e instituciones que mejoran la competitividad. Ante este cambio de poderes públicos, la sociedad civil ha reaccionado, con una revitalización del movimiento santuario. Este estudio utiliza una metodología explicativa sobre la evolución de las disciplinas y enfoques académicos dedicados a la investigación de las relaciones religión-economía-migración, para centrar su atención en el estudio de caso del Movimiento Santuario.

Palabras clave: relaciones inmigrantes-ciudadanos; Movimiento Santuario; nueva economía política; religión y economía.

JEL: A12; B5; F22; N9.

Received: march 10th, 2022.

Accepted: august 15th, 2022.

Published: june 14th, 2023.

Sponsor: This study is part of Sánchez-Bayón's PhD dissertation in Economics (Universidad Complutense de Madrid); supported by several research institutions as GESCE; GID-TICTAC CCEESS, Universidad Rey Juan Carlos & INES, Universidad Internacional de la Rioja.

#### INTRODUCTION: WHY DO THE MIGRANTS OFFSPRING OF YESTERDAY REJECT THE MIGRATION TODAY?

In the United States of America (USA), there is a commemoration of the four centuries first European migrants arrived to the USA, in New England, searching for religious liberty and freedom of movement, and also to establish new settlements (Rothbard, 1975-1979; Sánchez-Bayón, 2008-2013, 2014a). This anniversary brings highlights on the difference between the colonial period and the current social problems in relation to migration (Turégano, 2020): Why do the descendants of the migrants of yesterday reject the migration today? Particularly, why does this happen among white Anglo-Saxon protestants who received more benefits in migration terms? (Baltzell, 1962, 1964, 1979).

The public powers, who should guarantee America's foundational principles (i.e. religious liberty and freedom of movement, included into the Declaration of Independence and in the Bill of Rights), can they violate them? Federal powers and many State powers enforce raids and deportations under the premise of Criminal Law rather than Administrative Law. How can diversity be integrated if the former civic melting pot model is attacked in favor of community identity policies that aim to promote differences?

Defenders and detractors of immigration coincide in rejecting the melting pot model and its welfare (because it was Eurocentric), without offering a practicable alternative (Hirschman, 1983; Steinfield, 1973). How can the new migrants be integrated in the USA during a deep identity and sociocultural crisis since the culture wars? (Sánchez-Bayón, 2014b, 2019a; Yarnold, 1999, 2000).

Identity politics has meant that the rights of minorities in the USA are promoted more than ever, but they are done so at a moment when these same rights are completely restricted to migrants, leaving them with barely any alternatives for integration into citizenship, which is questioned, and which implies the need to belong to a minority that can shelter them, i.e. one based

on ethno-cultural, sexual or gender aspects (Fukuyama, 2018; Lilla, 2017). Confronted with this overall confusion, this paper will address one key concept: that of the *Sanctuary Movement*. Though its name evokes a medieval period in Europe (when the persecuted found asylum on sacred ground), in the USA never experienced, it fits quite well within the longstanding American tradition of socio-religious movements, social crusades and civil disobedience (Mateus & Sánchez-Bayón, 2019; Valero & Sánchez-Bayón, 2018, 2020, 2021). Depending on how these movements are managed, they could lead to a new cycle of awakenings and revivals (CAR) or to a worsening of the polarization that characterizes the current identity crisis (Sánchez-Bayón, 2019b).

To find a starting point for the current problem, one phenomenon to consider is the brain-drain during the interwar-period, intensified after War World II. The social conflict in Europe, it was realized by the hybridization of the two main communitarian ideologies (socialism and nationalism). Moreover, though it is true that these regimes were defeated, their legitimizing intellectual underpinning was not. Because the USA had a strong desire to proclaim itself the leader of the West, it considered it acceptable to risk attracting the European *intelligentsia* (close to socialism: Frankfurt School, Annales-Normale School, etc.), without previously subjecting it to a process of *Americanization*: the belief at the time was that this massive inflow into universities, media and think-tanks would help to increase America's scientific-academic capital. It was also believed that this could be used as part of the post-modern critique of Europe, without realizing that this would eventually lead to the deconstruction of the USA itself (Sánchez-Bayón, 2019a, 2019b). This has led to the American postmodern paradox, which, as part of its process of deconstruction and deepening of its citizens' identity crisis, fosters the violation of the USA's foundational principles, without offering a clear substitute –with the disappearance of the white Anglo-Saxon protestants model, what could replace it, and how would this operate?

Meanwhile, one citizens' response has emerged through the Sanctuary Movement: a movement against injustice that has a religious origin (into Catholic Church and Evangelical Churches, see later). This is typical of the USA, where socio-religious movements and the crusades associated with them have played a key role in transforming social order throughout history, i.e. the support to emancipation movement by Evangelical churches (Stokes, 1950). This movement has experienced a recent revitalization in the wake of the Great recession of 2008 (so-called the crisis of values: financial and ethical), but it has also been impacted by the cited American postmodern paradox, which has caused internal divisions and conflicts (between those very socio-religious groups who center around peaceful civil disobedience, and who would rather toe the traditional line, and the anti-system and communitarian ideologues, who seek conflict). There is also an externalization of this conflict: both in migrant communities, by forcing them to choose between citizenship or community; and among the rest of the population, making them choose between helping their equals or violating the existing order.

#### THEORETICAL & METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK REVIEWED

This is part of a bigger research program, with the support of some publication in other languages (Sánchez-Bayón, 2018, 2019a; Mateus & Sánchez-Bayón, 2019; Valero & Sánchez-Bayón, 2018, 2020, 2021). In this occasion, the current paper is a critical and comparative socio-historical review, with a cross-disciplinary approach (Church-State Studies, Migration Studies, New Political Economy). The main theoretical framework comes from the Chicago School (a pioneer in cross-disciplinary studies, where were improvements the three disciplines cited) and its

influence on new disciplines (from the 70's, i.e. Religion & Geography, Religion & Economics). The aim of this paper is to review the development of the US migrant-citizen relation, and the explanation of the hermeneutic turn and paradigmatic swift (Sánchez-Bayón, 2020, 2021), from a common open-doors policy (under the traditional Political Economy approach, to include labor force and social capital) to a divided situation, between public raids and private sanctuaries (as re-privatization of charity, according to the New Political Economy, based on the supply competition decentralized).

In terms of the current state of the art, the attention is focused on native scientific-academic research (just American literature). In particular, the bibliography from the area of Cultural Studies is used, which is intrinsically linked to the influence of religious factors on religious citizen-migrant relations (such is the case, for example, with Church-State Studies & Migration Studies, linked to the New Political Economy thanks to dual disciplines as Religion & Economics). It should also be mentioned that, though traditionally we consider the state of research to be the most recent bibliography (usually published in the last five years and determined by the limits of available knowledge), given the temporal-spatial coordinates and object of this research, and its critical-comparative and revisionist hermeneutic nature, we have concentrated our attention on the most relevant production since the consolidation of Cultural Studies up until globalization (determining impact as the number of citations of a given work and its presence in syllabi for courses taught in the aforementioned disciplines). In order to understand the recurring social phenomenon through which US civil society can be mobilized to reclaim the rights of the dispossessed (in this instance, migrants) and/or oppose domestic public policies and regulations considered unfair (putting their own freedom on the line), there is an invitation to consider several topics and research disciplines and approaches connected: Political Theology and Cultural Studies; Cross-Cultural Studies (Political-Legal-Economic Sociology and Cultural Studies), and other contributions of those approaches.

### *Political Theology and Cultural Studies*

Traditional Theology was focused on the knowledge of God, but modern or Political Theology is focused on the organization and salvation of God's people. In the USA, thanks to modern secularization and the support of Political Theology, great advances have been made towards an original *novus ordo seculorum* (this being one of the great national slogans; The Great Seal, 1782). This is shaped (much like other national slogans, i.e. *Annuuit coeptis*, In God We Trust), by social constructs such as American Civil Religion (which allows the cohabitation of traditional religions but also integrates them under a formula for citizenship which predates the 19th century European concept of nation); American Social Gospel, a social evangelism which promotes the concern and betterment of the common good, with crusades to transform American society on its path to progress and wellbeing; and American Covenant Theology (which serves as the base for its social contract and institutional development). This Political Theology, which inspires other manifestations, such as American Manifest Destiny or American Self-Righteousness, it has influenced the USA's development (both domestically and internationally), even inspiring its self-proclamation as the champion of the West (after War World II).

Cultural Studies, a net of cross-disciplines that has developed since the end of the 19th century (particularly in Divinity Schools and Arts and Humanities Colleges), they have provided a historical-comparative perspective, which changed throughout the interwar period, focusing on

the study of American singularity and the establishment of its idiosyncrasy (on which the religious factor has had a relevant influence). This concept was maintained until the culture wars (1960-1980), when New Cultural Studies (which were nurtured by the post war *brain drain*, and did not go through an *Americanization* process), they took on post-modern veils of confusion and were protected by both the 1972 federal law and funds for policies (i.e. *Ethnic Heritage Studies Act of 1972*), related with affirmative action funds right up until the appearance of identity politics. Since then, religion has gone from being a social sphere of relevance (one which facilitated vision, mission and values) to becoming one which is contingent to each community and therefore yet another element of difference and social conflict (there are even New Cultural Studies which re-focus the issue as one of racial justice). In terms of issues related to theology and religious studies, one of the first veils that appeared was that of the *new age* theology of religion and spirituality. Since then, traditional religions and American Civil Religion, they have been abandoned, giving way to political religion as a sustaining force for the moral superiority of the weak thought of one single vocation.

#### *Cross-Cultural Studies (Political-Legal-Economic Sociology and Cultural Studies)*

Ever since America's origins there has been a keen interest in social order and its legality (the legitimacy, validity and effectiveness of norms and institutions), as well as in issues relating to values and principles, the common good, and political-legal culture.

For this reason, the USA has been a pioneer in providing formulas and politico-legal sociological schools: it has been so since the pro-religious liberty and freedom of conscience reformist puritan movement of the pre-colonial period, represented by Reverends Williams, Penn, etc., as well as the pro-abolitionist Mennonite and Quaker movements; passing through the 19th century transcendentalist movement and the related acts of civil disobedience, with theologians and proto-sociologists such as Emerson, Thoreau et al. Also, the Methodist and Quaker movements with their commitment to abolition and suffrage (i.e. Anthony, Stanton, Bloomer). More recent movements (in the interwar period), such as American Legal Realism and its social test (i.e. Holmes, Pound, Frank); or civil rights movements and their non-violence resistance (i.e. Reverends T. D. Jemison and M. Luther King Jr.).

The sociological and legal-humanist tradition is even older amongst Americans: from the first generations of colonial pilgrims and puritans, with their transition from their Blue Laws to Chartism to the Bill of Rights (from tolerance to freedom and to the Bill of Rights from the thirteen original colonies), through the political theologians who started the network of American universities.<sup>1</sup> They were followed by the framers (Franklin, Adams, Jefferson, Paine, et al.) with the *Declaration of Independence* (1776) and *Bill of Rights* (1789). Next reference came from the previously mentioned transcendentalists (led by Reverends Emerson, Whitman) and their civil disobedience (Thoreau, 1849); reaching the recent civil liberties movements (during the 1960s for African Americans, in the 1980s for Latin Americans, etc.).

<sup>1</sup> I.e. Rev. Prof. S. Stoddard, grandfather of Edwards, and the Mathers in New England of the 18th century; W. Ames and S. Davies, at Princeton University, in the Middle Provinces of 18th century; G. Whitefield, W. Tennent, S. Johnson and J. Edwards, who promoted the new Ivy League universities, as a proto-Enlightenment of the thirteen colonies, and inspiration for the First Great Awakening of the 1730s, etc.

In terms of Cultural Studies (much as with Political Theology), after leaving behind the comparative-historical perspective, there was a refocusing on the idiosyncratic elements of the USA, which led to the tension and polarization between Traditional Cultural Studies (based on *ethos-logos* and of a consensual nature) and New Cultural Studies (with a conflictive nature and conceptualized according to *pathos-mythos*). Amongst the latest attempts by Traditional Cultural Studies to reformulate a legal-political sociology of consensus we must highlight the revival of American exceptionalism from comparativists and geopolitical theorists such as Lipset (1963, 1996), Huntington (2004), etc., or cultural analysts such as Almond & Verba (1963), or even economists, from New Political Economy, such as Fogel (1964, 2000), Fogel & Engerman (1974), Posner (1973) or Rothbard (1975-1979, 1995).

#### *Other contributions*

Other contributions of those approaches, attended in this paper, they are the various constructs to understand and to manage the complex and fickle American social reality. From its American Awakenings & Revivals theory (or cycles of awakenings & revivals, see later) to its proposals of denominationalism (which is essential to understand solidarity and social movements in the USA), ecumenism (to understand cross-confessional initiatives, such as the Sanctuary Movement), and its American Civil Religion (with American Social Gospel, American Manifest Destiny, etc.). Amongst the innovators in this area during the mid-20th century it can highlight Blau (1946, 1952), Eliade (1961, 1971, 1978), Mannheim (1950), Stokes (1950), Dawson (1953), Wood (1961), etc.; and amongst its defenders during the culture wars it can cited Bell (1960, 1976), Bellah (1970, 1975, 1987), Berger (1967, 1969, 1974, 1979), Bloom (1992), etc. Amongst Traditional Cultural Studies, we must highlight the role of Church-State Studies as a pioneer of the American relational model, based on separation by accommodation, as ruled by the First Amendment (non-official religion: a lower limit or (non)establishment clause, and an upper or free-exercise clause); without forgetting the famous wall of separation between Church and State (based on autonomy and non-interference) which supports the idea of *sanctuary* (from the 19th century underground railroad cases that aided slaves escaping to abolitionist States). Amongst the thousands of researchers specializing in this area, it must highlight figures as Stokes (at Yale), Pfeffer (at New York University and Yeshiva University), Dawson, Wood and Davis (at Baylor and University of Mary Hardin-Baylor).

Finally, it is offered an outline of the main US scientific-academic contributions on citizen-migrant relations, with particular focus on religious and economic influence. First, the pioneer School of Chicago (with sociological theories as *marginal man* or *lonely migrant*, to support the State action –not right, because the religious communities still support the migration, i.e. congregations welcoming–, versus the economic theories from New Political Economy –as second and third generation of economists–, with proposal such the re-privatization of charity and the social action). Secondly, the current specialization and polarization into the Migration Studies in relation with the case study of Sanctuary Movement.

### *School of Chicago*

With many generations, the sociological approach offered contributions as the symbolic interactionism (from Mead to Blumer, as a new edition of the American pragmatism), which aims to interpret and manage the problems found in complex social realities, particularly those of Human Ecology in thriving Chicago. In 1910 it had a population of over 2 000 000, with two thirds of them from a migrant background, where communities integrated migrants (this happened particularly with religious communities, both because they were transversal and because national identities were not then as strong or binding).

According to symbolic interactionism, behaviors depend on the meanings given to social life objects (symbols), which then vary according to each person's social experience (people select, use and transform symbols, in their interpretative processes and according to their intentions and expectations). So, symbols condition communication and social capital, easing the solving of problems and the development of a social imagination (which allows us to understand, systematize and manage a rich social reality according to our vision, mission and values), which then, in turn, transforms social reality (Thomas' theorem: the belief that something is real makes it real in its consequences, Thomas & Thomas, 1928). Therefore, the religious communities were the best suited to study symbolic interactionism (as they have mastered the management of the social-me and the theorem already mentioned above), and as their desires for a better society lead them to spear crusades of social change, influencing both public opinion (through their concerns and narratives) and the institutional agenda (through public policies and regulation). In the School of Chicago, also, there was a line of criminological studies, which understood that the religious factor was the key for restraining social deviations and achieving greater solidarity.

From the first generation of the School of Chicago, it must cite the theory of organization-disorganization-reorganization, which describes the processes that affect generations of migrants (religious factors ease the adaptation process and lay the basis for the theory of melting pot). The second generation introduced other elements for social analysis (and therefore migrant-citizen relations), such as racial, sexual-gender or migrant relations, influencing the social status and residence place (i.e. concentric zone model), as well as possible criminality (i.e. social disorganization theory). Adding to this, it no longer conceives of migration as the flux of groups, organized by imposed communities (family and religion), but rather sees it as an individual phenomenon, with a selection of support structures (both legal and illegal): this is the marginal man theory (Goldberg, 1941; Park, 1928; Stonequist, 1937). Within the third generation, it must highlight the following contributions (with elements of migrant-citizen relations): Anderson and *The Hobo* in 1923; Thrasher and *The Gang* in 1926; Wirth and *The Ghetto* in 1928; Zorbaugh and *The Gold Coast and the Slum* in 1929; Shaw and *The Jackroller* in 1930; Cressey and *The Taxi Dance Hall* in 1932; Fraizer and *The Negro family* in 1932, et al. All those theories were reviewed by the economic approach thanks to the new-institutional economists of New Political Economy (which includes the second and third generations of the Chicago School of Economy, with authors mentioned like Fogel, Posner, Hirschman, etc.). They offer several lines: Law & Economics (i.e. Coase, 1937, 1960; Posner, 1973, 1979), Public Choice & Constitutional Economics (i.e. Buchanan & Tullock, 1962; Brennan & Buchanan, 1985; Anderson, 1986; Buchanan, 1987, 1990), Possibilism & Institutional Analysis (i.e. Hirschman, 1970, 1993; Fogel, 1964, 2003), etc. These lines pay attention to the quality of the social-economic institutions, with special focus on the efficiency,

sustainability, power-relations (i.e. lobbies, relations between public and private sector), etc. They have been supported by the Chicago School and Virginia School, and with connections with Austrian Economics (Sánchez-Bayón, González-Arnedo & Andreu-Escario, 2022).

### *Migration Studies*

It is a recent discipline (into the Cultural Studies in comparison with Church-State Studies), but it has a high scientific production. For this research, it is used the melting pot theory, at least in its latest version: American exceptionalism (Lipset, 1996), from the perspective of multiculturalism (Masur, 1999; Naylor, 1998; Rodríguez, 2003). It has also focused on its research on models applied to citizen-migrant relations, particularly the current Sanctuary Movement model. At the same time, however, it divides itself into two currents (which tend to polarization and confrontation): *a*) Traditional Sanctuary Movement (here forth TSM), and *b*) New Sanctuary Movement (here forth NSM).

### *Traditional Sanctuary Movement*

The TSM, which born of the US-Mexican border. In 1982, the US states with the strongest hold were Texas and Arizona (where legal and judicial problems started to arise). Despite Central American travelers meeting the conditions for refugee status according to the 1980 Refugee Act, the Reagan Administration, specifically, the Immigration & Naturalization Service did not grant it in first instance (perhaps because of geopolitical interests), leading to the extremes of controversial cases such as *US v. Aguilar* (883 F. 2d 662). TSM responded to the USA's long tradition of the American social gospel, as part of its idiosyncrasy (i.e. examining how religion has worked both as social cement and as motor and raising agent). This is studied in Traditional Cultural Studies, which has considered social transformation crusades, in which the social bases seek to achieve the common good, justice and the improvement of the system through civil disobedience and non-violent resistance (Altemus, 1988; Coutin, 1993; Crittenden, 1988; Davidson, 1988; Godar, 1986; Pirie, 1990; Tomsho, 1987).

### *New Sanctuary Movement*

The NSM, which is influenced by the concepts presented by New Cultural Studies (Caminero-Santagelo, 2009; Freeland & Stud, 2010; Hagan, Rodríguez & Castro, 2011; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2007; Meirowitz, 2017; Wild, 2010), so it is no longer about spontaneous voluntary movements with a religious conscience which aim for the common good, but rather, there is a leadership made up of professional and well-organized activists, with new slogans (i.e. social and racial justice, moral indignation) that emphasize differences and conflict and carry certain contradictions (i.e. the fight for pacifism), as well as with innovative approaches and revolutionary subjects (i.e. Muslims, women, the environment, the media). A proof of this change is the manifesto for a Global Sanctuary Movement or Sanctuary Planet (based on a network of coalition networks), promoted by the interuniversity project Society and Space (led by the University of Washington).

This study combines all the points' mentioned, in a historical-comparative and critical-hermeneutic review, applied to the sanctuary case.

## CASE STUDY: SANCTUARY MOVEMENT

The New Political Economy includes Law & Economics, which respects the legal rule of the terminology observance, even more than in any other technical or professional language, because it is crucial to use the words with rigour and precision. For this reason, there is an examination of socio-religious activism, its development and its cost, in the relations between migration and citizenship in the USA (Wiltfang & McAdam, 1991), it is essential to understand the legal basis for this institution. A *sanctuary* means both the religious building where the pilgrim and/or persecuted individual can take refuge, the charitable practice of safeguarding and granting safe conduct, and the medieval legal institution that forms the basis for the law of asylum. This is the result of a merger between Roman/Canon Law (*asylum*), and Germanic Law (*shrine or sanctuary/hörgr or altar*), which survived in vestigial form in Anglo-American Common Law (*grith or refuge*), until it was revived in modern times by socio-religious movements in the USA with their practices of civil disobedience and non-violent resistance in the course of their campaigns for social justice. In this way, in United States culture at the dawn of post-globalization a pre-modern concept of seeking protection through the sacred has been combined with post-modern information technology and social networks to revitalize modern citizens committed to civil liberties (through means of organization under the auspices of social movement that do not seek power in itself, but rather aim to improve the system (hence their cycle of awakenings and revivals, see below, rectifying injustices through campaigns aimed at transforming society).

This study focuses on the revitalization of the Sanctuary Movement. This is an interconfessional initiative in US civil society that arose in the 1980s (with the growing movement pursuing civil liberties for the Hispanic population) and was reactivated after the crisis in values in 2008. It is a way of offering refuge to persecuted immigrants in the USA, through a network of over a thousand organizations throughout the country. It can be seen as a further case of heteropraxis (a heterogeneous religiosity oriented towards action that is promoted through grass roots communities as a way of exercising their social evangelism), in consonance with the long US tradition of cycle of awakenings and revivals to promote the common good and social justice through non-violent civil resistance to transform the social order. Its main objectives and campaigns are set forth here (these are now usually conducted through internet and social networks), considering the risks and responsibilities taken on by the people who form part of the movement, the administrative sanctions imposed on the organization, and the detention of around fifty members (around one third of whom are ministers of religion).

In the Western religious tradition (which has deeply influenced Political Theology in the USA), there are many passages in the *Scripture*, that not only recognise the status of sanctuary, but also promote it as one of the practical imperatives or works of charity. In the Western secular tradition, there has also been broad recognition of this institution (partly within the framework of Church-State relations), through which different jurisdictions were understood to exist in the different spheres: if someone was persecuted by civil justice and took refuge in a church or monastery (this rule was later extended to cover universities), he or she could ask for sanctuary and thus come under church jurisdiction. Various traditions have taken root in the USA, acquiring an American character, which became important in the great crusades to transform American society over the centuries (Sánchez-Bayón, 2014a, 2018).

a) Foundational period (CAR 1: 1620-1791): *Sanctuary* was used to refer to each new colony of dissidents founded on the frontier to offer protection to people who were persecuted (see Reverends R. Williams, in Rhode Island, and W. Penn, in Pennsylvania); these were the distant ancestors of the later sanctuary-towns.

b) Re-foundational period (CAR 2: 1820-1880): Sanctuary was the abolitionist network (underground railroad) that took in runaway slaves; women's role in this was such that it also served to promote the suffragist cause (the Beecher: 1841, 1852, 1869, 1870, 1873).

c) Hegemonic period (CAR 3: 1890-1950): Sanctuary was any socio-religious centre that provided healthcare and other services to the community (i.e. education, healthcare, accommodation, support in cases of addiction).

d) Period of decline (CAR 4: 1960-1990): Sanctuary could be from any of the socio-religious centre mentioned, or even sanctuary towns or campuses (e.g. against conscription for the wars in South-East Asia, particularly Vietnam); it is in CAR 4 that the Sanctuary Movement proper came about, to give asylum to immigrants from Central America who were fleeing wars and dictatorships in their own countries (particularly, those coming from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras).

At present, with the revitalization and reformulation of the Sanctuary Movement, it is not clear yet if it is part of the fifth cycle of awakenings and revivals or a major social conflict that will transform the USA (Howe & Strauss, 1991, 1993, 1997). What is clear is that the Sanctuary Movement is experiencing a boom, in reaction to the Trump administration (compared with his predecessors), since his policies against undocumented migrants (particularly Hispanic Catholic migration), are perceived to be even more unjust (because the wall in the border with Mexico). The reaction of the civil society is the opposite: against the raids, there are many examples of sanctuary protection (i.e. a Hispanic migrant with leukemia in Shadow Rock United Church of Christ in Phoenix, in February 2018, a Mexican in the Methodist Church of Philadelphia in October 2017, a migrant from El Salvador in the First Unitarian Church in Austin in September 2017, a Guatemalan woman in the Pentecostal Church of God in New Haven in August 2017, etc.). With Biden administration, there is expectation for changes in public policies, but it is not clear yet.

There is now a development evaluation and a diagnosis and prognosis of Sanctuary Movement. The movement began on the border with Mexico, and in 1982 it was most widespread in Texas and Arizona (where legal problems and lawsuits soon arose). It turned out that the fugitives from Central America, despite fulfilling all the conditions to be declared refugees (in accordance with the federal *Refugee Act of 1980*), the Reagan administration (through its agency Immigration & Naturalization Service) did not initially accept this (perhaps because of geopolitical interests in the region), and polemical legal cases were heard such as *US v. Aguilar* (883 F. 2d 662). In 1982, Immigration & Naturalization Service agents infiltrated the Sanctuary Movement (operation sojourner), resulting in 71 criminal and administrative charges against 16 people (three nuns, two priests, one pastor and volunteers in various congregations), as well as the arrest of 53 Central Americans accused of collaborating with the network throughout the country (in Phoenix, Seattle, Tucson, Philadelphia and Rochester). The trial was held in 1985, under conditions that were unfavourable to the defence: the use of terms like "refugee", "murder", "torture" or "enforced disappearance" was forbidden, and the use of the international regulation ratified by the USA and its federal law of 1980 was also refused; in the end, only eight of the defendants were convicted, on 18 charges. As a result of the popular indignation throughout the trial, the Sanctuary Movement grew exponentially, beyond the religious movements, spreading to the whole of civil society, with

the addition of new categories such as sanctuary city or sanctuary campus, as well as other protected groups (i.e. boat people) and causes (i.e. pacifism and non-intervention in Latin America). Although it took over a decade to change the regulations and public policies, the cultural battle had been won, and the movement now had support in the form of public opinion. There was now popular sympathy for the cause and backing for the dreamers (as the Central Americans sheltered by the civil rights movement came to be known, in allusion to American Dream).

From the original Sanctuary Movement (in the early 1980s), with its calls to civil disobedience and to aid the needy, as was the case in the Catholic diocese of Tucson and the Presbyterian and Unitarian congregations of the area (which, like many others, had been infiltrated by the Immigration & Naturalization Service, and whose members were to pay a high price before proving the injustice of the system and bringing about change), by the late 1980s there was already a sound network of collaboration with over 500 organizations across the country (Tucson, Phoenix, El Paso, San Antonio, San Diego, Los Angeles, Las Cruces, Chicago, Boston, New York, Washington DC, etc.). Their activities extended to providing lodging, medical attention, teaching English, transport in private vehicles, helping people to obtain employment, and so on. In the early 1990s, with the advent of globalization, not only did the situation for regulating asylum for refugees improve, but there was also a certain openness to immigration (at least, since new means of entry became possible, such as by air), and the USA even became a place of transit for entry into Canada, where the Sanctuary Movement also gained ground. During this boom period (the happy years of 90s), the Sanctuary Movement dispersed somewhat, as it seemed that the desired social change had been achieved.

However, in the 2000s this situation was reversed: after 9/11 and the recession, the regulation of immigration again became a hot issue, with an increase in restrictions and the start of large-scale deportations (with many highlight cases, as Elvira Arellano, a Mexican mother with an American son, arrested in 2002 and took refuge in the Adalberto United Methodist Church of Chicago in 2006). At the same time, in Central America, the conditions were again ripe for a new migratory wave. This time, it was inspired by denominationalism (related to the pull effect of the dreamers' success story), and appealed to young people with dismal prospects in their countries of origin.

In the years running up to the crisis of 2008, the multinationals were cutting back in Central America (with massive redundancies for unqualified workers and the closure of many subsidiaries), at the same time as corruption and violence were coming to the fore and populist regimes were again taking control (i.e. the return of Ortega and Sandinism regimen –with the motto Catholicism, socialism and solidarity– in Nicaragua in 2006, which has lasted until today, dragging the gross domestic product down to one third of its former value and situating the country among the poorest three in Latin America, next to Honduras and El Salvador, according to data from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Economic Commission for Latin America, and the World Bank, without mentioning the massive failures in Haiti and Venezuela). Under the contradictory Obama administration (with the highest indices of deportations, over 400 000 cases per year from 2011 to 2015), and the Immigration and Customs Enforcement –formerly Immigration & Naturalization Service– carrying out large number of raids, at the same time as regulations were approved such as Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents, and the Executive Action restricting police action, or state legislation was criticised (see *Arizona's SB 1070: Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhoods Act of 2010*– described as a hate law), the movement was re-launched under the name of the NSM. From the Sanctuary Movement to the NSM there

were many changes (not just the name, but also the stance towards various issues, actions, etc.), because the social reality itself had changed, with its public policies and regulations. Then, with the Trump Administration (from late 2016, even before he took possession), there was a U-turn on migration issues: restrictions on police action were overturned (particularly concerning raids and deportations), new policies were enforced limiting immigration and refusing refugee status to people who had fled from violence or persecution in their countries of origin (for example, Syrians fleeing from persecution).

The NSM (revival) was no longer one social movement among many, but developed into a network of digitally integrated coalition networks. This network included the following organizations that descended from the original Sanctuary Movement: Austin Sanctuary Network, Boston NSM, Salt Lake City Sanctuary Network, Colorado Springs Sanctuary Coalition, Metro Denver Sanctuary Coalition, Columbia County Sanctuary Coalition, Interfaith Movement for Immigrant Justice, Interfaith Movement of Human Integrity, NSM New York, NSM Philadelphia, and others. But it also included new groupings: *a*) migration activists, **such as:** Mijente, #Not1More Deportation, Cosecha, United We Dream, National Day Labor Organizing Network, Fair Immigration, etc.; *b*) Muslim organizations, such as: MPower Change, Muslims for Social Justice, CAIR, Shoulder to Shoulder, etc.; *c*) racial justice groups: Black Lives Matter, Showing Up for Racial Justice, etc., and *d*) organizations providing legal support, i.e. Unitarian Universalist Association, Unitarian Universalist Service Committee and Unitarian Universalist College of Social Justice, American Civil Liberties Union, The National Lawyers Guild, etc. This came to constitute a collective movement taking in around one thousand organizations, hundreds of platforms and channels, and thousands of collaborators, in which people did not merely share support for a cause, but became equipped to bring about social change.

In a comparison in the development of SM: is there continuity between TSM and NSM or there are many mutations? TSM emerged from the long-standing American tradition of American social gospel (a reflection of American idiosyncrasy and studied as such by the Traditional Cultural Studies), with its campaigns for social transformation, promoted at grass roots level in favour of the common good, justice and improving the system, by means of civil disobedience and non-violent resistance (Altemus, 1988; Coutin, 1993; Crittenden, 1988; Godar, 1986; Pirie, 1990; Tomsho, 1987). By contrast, the NSM is influenced by the assumptions of the New Cultural Studies (Caminero-Santagelo, 2009; Freeland & Stud, 2010; Hagan, Rodríguez & Castro, 2011; Paik 2017; Ridgley, 2008): this is no longer a spontaneous movement undertaken by volunteers with a religious consciousness seeking the common good. Instead, there are professional, well-organised activists who provide leadership under new slogans (such as social and racial justice or moral indignation) –exalting difference and conflict, and thereby falling into certain contradictions, such as the “struggle” for pacifism, as well as innovative ideas and revolutionary subjects (i.e. Muslims, women, the environment, the media). Proof of this change is the manifesto for a *Global Sanctuary Movement* or *Sanctuary Planet* (based on a network of coalitions), driven by the inter-university project Society and Space. led by the University of Washington (Carney, Gomez, Mitchell & Vannini, 2017):

We offer here a Manifesto for radical action: the formation of a Global Sanctuary Collective. Sanctuary was a powerful movement of resistance against Reagan’s policies towards migrants fleeing repressive regimes in Central America who were supported by the US. Originally a faith-based movement inspired by the peace and justice

ethos of churches and synagogues in the US, sanctuary became a powerful grassroots movement against egregious government policies toward Central America. Today with Trump we may be witnessing a resurgence of the moral outrage and political activism that fueled the Central America peace movement in the 1980s—actions by those willing to openly confront the equally damaging policies against refugees and undocumented migrants, as well as his harmful remarks and destructive actions against Muslims, women, the environment, and the media, among others. Moral outrage, in this context, is the feelings and expressions of disparate people who witness injustices compounded over time and committed in the name of the nation, and who collectively rise up against them. It is a spontaneous but also resilient emotional awareness, one that we believe is once again being galvanized in the current moment. [...] We conclude with a discussion of future directions for sanctuaries and a manifesto for a Global Sanctuary Collective to defend the rights of refugees, undocumented immigrants, and immigrants from any nationality, race, or religion. The new Global Sanctuary Collective builds on and expands the work of faith-based organizations, where sanctuary began, and calls on the creative forces of all people to turn moral outrage into protection of the vulnerable, protest against injustice, creative expression of human values and dignity, and collective action for social justice and human rights of all people, including immigrants (Carney et al., 2017).

#### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The comparison between TSM and NSM is very complex, for this reason, in this paper is just paid attention in the relation of two points: *a*) the changes resulting from the use of information and communication technologies in the NSM's actions, from its platforms and channels to the campaigns and some instances where these were successful, and *b*) the Political Economy discrepancy, because TSM is positive and NSM is normative.

The NSM activists are highly competent in the use of information and communication technologies, with no longer reactive volunteers but rather proactive leaders: they receive training via internet (i.e. webinars, instructional clips, downloadable toolkits & reports), to run social networks and channels (i.e. Facebook, Twitter, Whatsapp), taking advantages of tools and communities (i.e. Groundswell, Actionnetwork, BitLy), and free-use programs and apps (i.e. Gmail, Dropbox, Telegram), so that they are constantly connected, and can organise actions and events at any moment (i.e. concentrations, vigils, press releases), receiving ample publicity and spreading the word through blogs and newsletters, as well as receiving legal advice in real time (from American Civil Liberties Union, Unitarian Universalist Association, or The National Lawyers Guild). Among the many resources of the NSM, to coordinate their communication and events, specific webpages and networks are important, such as *National Sanctuary Movement*, *Sanctuary Coalition* and *Sanctuarynot-deportation*. These websites bring together the main documents and resources needed, as well as advice on organizing events, communicating with the public, or giving press conferences, among others.

At the same time, the audio-visual resources provided by the NSM are very rich and varied, especially those that tell the stories of migrants who have been given sanctuary. These are examples of limbic and emotional communication, since they not only provide statistics, but also tell the stories of people and their families that people can identify with, as well as stories that can be shared

in order to call for action. Many cases of the NSM campaigns are to be found in various platforms (i.e. New Sanctuary Coalition, Sanctuary not Deportation, National Sanctuary Movement), which shed light on the way the NSM manages its resources and social networks to achieve support with a view to putting an end to raids and deportations.

The Political Economy discrepancy between TSM and NSM is based on the positive-normative relation: a positive view is about facts and it tries to deal with the reality, working into the system. In opposition, a normative view depends of values and it pretends to change the reality. This is happened because part of the NSM is close to the Post-Keynesians economists (with a revolutionary view and campaigns of confrontation), and the other half of the NSM and most of TSM are close to New Political Economy (with a reformist view and campaigns of non-violence and civil resistance). These different economic views affect the recognition of needs and purposes to be satisfied, thus transferring a new problem to the migrants and it means a non-efficient use of resources.

To make a diagnosis with the basis of this paper, it is necessary to remember the changes with the globalization and the paradigm shift: there is a transition from an old World dominated under the direction of the nation-State to one new that is intensely linked but decentralized (thanks to internet, block-chain, etc.). This need for balance and reformulation holds for all countries, particularly those that are most exposed, such as the hegemonic powers like the USA, which proclaimed itself the leader of the West after World War II (Fukuyama, 1989, 1992). This explains its identity crisis, which not only affects its own citizens, but also influences the relations between citizens and migration. If to all this we add the attacks on the foundations of its principles of integration during the culture wars (from the baby boomers onwards), the current confusion is hardly surprising –this can no longer be approached in terms of *logos* or rational-technical notions, but rather in terms of *pathos* or shared feelings. The result is the American postmodern paradox, which has not only deepened the American identity crisis, but has also given rise to new violations of the country's foundational principles, as we have seen above (free movement, pursuit the happiness, Church-State separation, etc.).

One possible solution to the sociocultural problem that this pose emerges from the Sanctuary Movement. This movement emerged from the US tradition of helping one's neighbour and fighting for social justice, and has been led through the social and religious movements that have given rise to four major cycles of awakenings and revivals. In its origins, the Sanctuary Movement could have been regarded as bearing the seeds of a potential fifth cycle of awakenings and revivals, but after its revitalization (in the wake of the 2008 crisis of values) it became affected by the American postmodern paradox, giving rise to division and conflict: on the one hand, the TSM (the original way, following the US tradition of social crusades to improve the system), led by volunteers offering socio-religious support and responding to unjust migration by peaceful civil disobedience and, on the other, the NSM (following the turn that things took elsewhere in the 20th century, with neo- or post-Marxist undertones), with professional activists leading the social protest, characterised by aspects of weak thought (political correctness and inclusive language, a gender perspective), which is no longer necessarily related to religious movements, at least not Judeo-Christian ones.

For these reasons, depending on which side emerges as victorious from this struggle (for identity and collective mentality, the social imaginary and symbolic capital, etc., in short for the American Social Gospel or spirit of the USA), we might be witnessing the start of a new cycle of awakenings and revivals, or of a new social conflict (resulting from the end of the generational cycle: War of Independence, Civil War, etc.). What does appear clear (in the case of the Sanctuary Movement), is that it is going through a new period of reformulation alongside other social movements,

with its call for civil liberties (social action, civil disobedience, conscientious objection, judicial activism, etc.). Nonetheless, it is somewhat doubtful (because of the division mentioned above), if this is only a *revival* of the call for more rights for Hispanics (as in the 1980s, in the case of the Central American *dreamers* whose descendants still influence migration policies today), or if this is another manifestation (not a movement seeking the extension of rights, but one of social confrontation: from the New Cultural Studies and its deconstruction, it is driven under slogans reflecting the gender perspective, with talk of *latinex* to impose an inclusive language, which paradoxically divides those affected). Moreover, even if we accept that this is a further renewal of a civil liberties movement in the post-Judeo-Christian mode, with recognition of rights for migrant Muslim communities (like those stemming from the Arab Spring in 2010 and particularly the Syrian humanitarian crisis), this social action places a greater emphasis on the exaltation of difference (demanding privileges, not common rights) and the deconstruction of the foundations of civic integration (by denying the sacred US tradition and its civil religion or cycle of awakenings and revivals). The issue continues to develop, without a clear objective, towards an improvement in citizen-migrant relations, since the migratory communities are in tension (within themselves and with each other), and so are the social bases and elites of the USA. This is where the situation currently stands, but it is important to attend to the American postmodern paradox (intensified with the identity politics) and its risk of trans-Westerness with the utmost interest (according to Huntington, Lilla, Fukuyama, etc.).

As a corollary, this kind of persecution policies for migrant-citizen relations in the USA, they have a high social opportunity cost, because this country was founded by migrants and it needs migrants (they are workers and entrepreneurs who bring new human capital, according to the economist of the Chicago School, such Friedman or Becker). The State-persecution, raids and deportation policies, they have a higher social cost: *a*) in the federal budgets (i.e. Trump administration had to declare the federal lockout in 2017 and to stop the project of the border wall construction). At the same time, there is a social cost, because there is a great fracture between the elites (with this kind of policies); *b*) for the civil society, which supports the sanctuaries across the country (a re-privatization of charity). It is necessary to apply solutions to this topic from the New Political Economy (as Public Choice & Constitutional Economics, related with the social cost of collective decisions and the relevance of rules and its observance). In this way, it is possible to review the role of the public sector and the public finance for more efficiency and sustainability in the management of the citizens-migrants' relations, with more support from the civil society.

#### REFERENCES

- Almond, G. A. & Verba, S. (1963). *The civic culture: Political attitudes and democracy in five nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Altemus, M. (1988). The sanctuary movement. *Whittier Law Review*, 9, 683-721.
- Anderson, M. (1986). *The Unfinished Agenda: Essays on the Political Economy of Government Policy in Honour of Arthur Seldon*. London: Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Baltzell, E. D. (1962). *An American business aristocracy*. New York: Collier Books.
- Baltzell, E.D. (1964). *The Protestant establishment. Aristocracy & caste in America*, New York: Random House.
- Baltzell, E. D. (1979). *Puritan Boston and Quaker Philadelphia: Two Protestant ethics and the spirit of class authority and leadership*. New York: Free Press.

- Bell, D. (1960). *The end of ideology*. New York: Free Press.
- Bell, D. (1976). *The cultural contradictions of capitalism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bellah, R. N. (1970) *Beyond beliefs: Essays on Religion in a Post-Traditional World*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bellah, R. N. (1975). *The broken covenant: American civil religion in time of trial*. New York: The Seabury Press.
- Bellah, R. N. (1987). *Uncivil religion: Interreligious hostility in America*. New York: Crossroad.
- Berger, P. L. (1967). *The sacred canopy: Elements of a sociological theory of religion*. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Berger, P. L. (1969). *A rumor of angels: Modern society and the rediscovery of the supernatural*. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Berger, P. L. (1974). *Pyramids of sacrifice: Political ethics and social change*. New York: Basic Books.
- Berger, P. L. (1979). *Facing up to modernity: Excursions in society, Politics and Religion*. New York: Basic Books.
- Blau, J. L. (1946). *American philosophic addresses, 1700-1900*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Blau, J. L. (1952). *Men and movements in American philosophy*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Bloom, H. (1992). *The American religion. The emergence of the post-Christian nation*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Brennan, G., Buchanan, J. (1985). *The reason of rules. Constitutional Political Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buchanan, J. (1990). The domain of constitutional economics. *Constitutional Political Economy*, 1(1), 1-18.
- Buchanan, J. (1987). *Constitutional economics*, London: MacMillan.
- Buchanan, J. & Tullock, G. (1962). *The calculus of consent: Logical foundations of constitutional democracy*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Caminero-Santangelo, M. (2009). Responding to the human costs of US immigration policy: No more deaths and the new sanctuary movement. *Latino Studies*, 7, 112-122.
- Carney, M. A., Gomez, R., Mitchell, K. & Vannini, S. (2017). Sanctuary planet: A global sanctuary movement for the time of Trump. *Society & Space*.
- Coase, R. (1937). The nature of the firm. *Economica*, 4(16), 386-405.
- Coase, R. (1960). The problem of social cost. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 3(1), 1-44.
- Coutin, S. B. (1993). *The culture of protest: Religious activism and the U.S. sanctuary movement*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Crittenden, A. (1988). *Sanctuary: A story of American conscience and the law in collision*. New York: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Davidson, M. (1988). *Convictions of the heart: Jim Corbett and the sanctuary movement*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Dawson, J. M. (1953). *America's Way of Church, State, and Society*. New York: MacMillan.
- Eliade, M. (1961). *The sacred and the profane: The nature of religion*. New York: Harper.
- Eliade, M. (1971). *The myth of the eternal return*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Eliade, M. (1978). *A history of religious ideas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fogel, R. W. (1964). *Railroads and American economic growth: Essays in econometric history*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

- Fogel, R. W. (2000). *The Fourth Great Awakening and the Future of Egalitarianism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fogel, R. W. (2003). *The Slavery Debates, 1952-1990: A Retrospective*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Fogel, R. W. & Engerman, S. L. (1974). *Time on the cross: The economics of American slavery*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Freeland, G. & Stud, L. (2010). Negotiating place, space and borders: The new sanctuary movement. *Latino Studies*, 8(4), 485-508. DOI: [10.1057/ist.2010.53](https://doi.org/10.1057/ist.2010.53)
- Fukuyama, F. (1989). The end of history? *The National Interest*, 16, 3-18.
- Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man*. New York: Macmillan.
- Fukuyama, F. (2018). *Identity: Contemporary identity politics and the struggle for recognition*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Godar, J. F. (1986). The sanctuary movement: An analysis of the legal and moral questions involved. *St. Louis University Law Journal*, 30, 1221-1239.
- Goldberg, M. M. (1941). A Qualification of the marginal man theory. *American Sociological Review*, 6(1), 52-58. DOI: [10.2307/2086343](https://doi.org/10.2307/2086343)
- Hagan, J. M., Rodriguez, N. & Castro, B. (2011). Social effects of mass deportations by the United States government, 2000-2010. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34(8), 1374-1391. DOI: [10.1080/01419870.2011.575233](https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2011.575233)
- Hirschman, A. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and States*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hirschman, A. (1993). Exit, Voice, and the Fate of the German Democratic Republic: An Essay in Conceptual History. *World Politics*, 45(2), 173-202.
- Hirschman, C. (1983). America's melting pot reconsidered. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9(1), 397-423. DOI: [10.1146/annurev.so.09.080183.002145](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.09.080183.002145)
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (Ed.). (2007). *Religion and social justice for immigrants*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Howe, N. & Strauss, W. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069*. New York: William Morrow & Co.
- Howe, N. & Strauss, W. (1993). *13th Gen: Abort, retry, ignore, fail?* New York: Vintage Books.
- Howe, N. & Strauss, W. (1997). *The fourth turning: An American prophecy-What the cycles of history tell us about America's next rendezvous with destiny*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Huntington, S. P. (2004). *Who are we? The challenges to America's national identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Lilla, M. (2017). *The once and future liberal: After identity politics*. New York: Harper Co.
- Lipset, S. M. (1963). *The first new nation: The United States in historical and comparative perspective*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lipset, S. M. (1996). *American exceptionalism: A double-edged sword*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Mannheim, K. (1950). *Freedom, power, and democratic planning*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Masur, L. P. (1999). *The challenge of American history*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press. DOI: [10.56021/9780801862229](https://doi.org/10.56021/9780801862229)

- Mateus, M. D. N. & Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2019). Novas abordagens e fenómenos em estudos de imigração: Movimentos religiosos no coração dos Estados Unidos da América. *Journal of the Sociology and Theory of Religion*, 8, 45-82. DOI: [10.24197/jstr.0.2019.45-82](https://doi.org/10.24197/jstr.0.2019.45-82)
- Meirowitz, L. (2017). *A Jewish guide to the new sanctuary movement*. New York: T'ruah.
- Naylor, L. L. (1998). *American culture: Myth and reality of a culture of diversity*. Westport: Bergin & Garvey.
- Paik, A. N. (2017). Abolitionist futures and the US sanctuary movement. *Race & Class*, 59(2), 3-25. DOI: [10.1177/0306396817717858](https://doi.org/10.1177/0306396817717858)
- Park, R. E. (1928). Human migration and the marginal man. *American Journal of Sociology*, 33(6), 881-893.
- Pirie, S. (1990). The origins of a political trial: The sanctuary movement and political justice. *Yale Journal of Law & the Humanities*, 2, 381-416.
- Posner, R. A. (1973). *Economic analysis of law*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
- Posner, R. A. (1979). Utilitarianism, Economics and Legal Theory, *Journal of Legal Studies*, 8, 103-140.
- Ridgley, J. (2008). Cities of refuge: Immigration enforcement, police, and the insurgent genealogies of citizenship in U.S. sanctuary cities. *Urban Geography*, 29(1), 53-77. DOI: [10.2747/0272-3638.29.1.53](https://doi.org/10.2747/0272-3638.29.1.53)
- Rodríguez, R. (2003). *Brown: The last discovery of America*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Rothbard, M. (1975-1979). *Conceived in liberty* (vols. 1-4). New Rochelle: Arlington House Publishers.
- Rothbard, M. (1995). *Classical economics: An Austrian perspective on the history of economic thought* (vols. 1-2). Aldershot: Mises Institute.
- Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2008-2013). *La Modernidad sin prejuicios. La religión en la vida pública estadounidense* (vols. 1-3). Madrid: Delta Publicaciones.
- Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2014a). Freedom of religion at large in American common law: A critical review and new topics. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 13(37), 35-72.
- Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2014b). Historia, Historiología e Historiografía de los Estudios Interculturales en EE.UU. *Revista Banda de Moebius*, 48, 147-57. DOI: [10.4067/s0717-554x2013000300003](https://doi.org/10.4067/s0717-554x2013000300003)
- Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2018). Estudio de la idiosincrasia estadounidense desde su teología política y ciencias eclesíásticas. *Estudios Eclesiásticos. Revista de investigación e información teológica y canónica*, 93(364), 165-204. Recuperado de <https://revistas.comillas.edu/index.php/estudios-eclesiasticos/article/view/8359>
- Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2019a). American identity crisis: Attack to American civil religion & trans-Westernness risk. *Cogito - Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(1), 23-51.
- Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2019b). Renovación de la teología política y sociología de la religión en la globalización: Revitalización del movimiento santuario para inmigrantes en EE.UU. *Carthaginiensis*, 35(68), 485-510.
- Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2020). Renovación del pensamiento económico-empresarial tras la globalización: Talentism & Happiness Economics. *Bajo Palabra*, 24, 293-318. DOI: [10.15366/bp.2020.24.015](https://doi.org/10.15366/bp.2020.24.015)
- Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2021). Una historia de las ciencias económicas desde sus raíces y disciplinas duales: De la hacendística y camerología a la economía aplicada y su giro hermenéutico. *Revista Facultad de Ciencias Económicas*, 29(2), 87-103. DOI: [10.18359/rfce.5439](https://doi.org/10.18359/rfce.5439)

- Sánchez-Bayón, A., González-Arnedo, E. & Andreu-Escario, Á. (2022). Spanish healthcare sector management in the Covid-19 crisis under the perspective of Austrian economics and new-institutional economics. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10, 801525. DOI: [10.3389/fpubh.2022.801525](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.801525)
- Steinfeld, M. (1973). *Cracks in the melting pot: Racism and discrimination in American history*. Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press.
- Stokes, P. (1950). *Church and State in the United States* (vols. 1-3). New York: Harper.
- Stonequist, E. V. (1937). *The marginal man: A study in personality and culture conflict* (pp. xviii, 228). New York: Scribner/Simon & Schuster.
- Thomas, W. I. & Thomas, D. S. (1928). *The child in America: behavior problems and programs*. New York: Knopf.
- Thoreau, H. D. (1849). *Resistance to civil government or civil disobedience*. Boston: Putnam.
- Tomsho, R. (1987). *The American sanctuary movement*. Austin: Texas Monthly Press.
- Turégano, I. (2020). Fronteras, movilidad y ciudadanía. *Bajo Palabra*, 23, 131-162. DOI: [10.15366/bp.2020.23.005](https://doi.org/10.15366/bp.2020.23.005)
- Valero, J. A. & Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2018). Relaciones de la inmigración hispana con la Iglesia en el área de Washington D. C., Virginia y Maryland. *Migraciones*, 45, 89-117. DOI: [10.14422/mig.i45.y2018.004](https://doi.org/10.14422/mig.i45.y2018.004)
- Valero, J. A. & Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2020). Persecución religiosa y migratoria en la posglobalización: Estudio de caso estadounidense y la deconstrucción de sus pilares fundacionales. *Lurralde: Investigación y espacio*, 43, 61-88.
- Valero, J. A. & Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2021). The Hispanic immigration in United States: An analysis of the relationship with the churches, employment and crime. *Papeles de Población*, 27(109), 225-253. DOI: [10.22185/24487147.2021.109.27](https://doi.org/10.22185/24487147.2021.109.27)
- Wild, K. (2010). The new sanctuary movement: When moral mission means breaking the law, and the consequences for churches and illegal immigrants. *Santa Clara Law Review*, 50(3), 981-1015.
- Wiltfang, G. L. & McAdam, D. (1991). The costs and risks of social activism: A study of sanctuary movement activism. *Social Forces*, 69(4), 987-1010. DOI: [10.2307/2579299](https://doi.org/10.2307/2579299)
- Wood, J. (1961). *Church and State*. Waco: Baylor University Press.
- Yarnold, B. M. (1999). *Religious wars in the Courts I: The Lower Federal Courts and the U.S. Supreme Court in religious freedoms cases, 1970-1990*. Huntington: Nova Science Publishers.
- Yarnold, B. M. (2000). *Religious wars in the Courts II. Who were the litigants in the US Courts, religious freedom cases 1970-1990?* Huntington: Nova Science Publishers.