

# Lippert, R. K. and S. Rehaag (2013). Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives: Migration, Citizenship and Social Movements London, Routledge. INTRODUCTION

Sanctuary across countries, institutions, and disciplines

Randy K. Lippert and Sean Rehaag

Beginning in the late 1970s, sanctuary practices underwent a revival. Immigrants living without legal status and their supporters, first in the United Kingdom, and then in the United States, Canada, and elsewhere in Europe, have resorted to sanctuary practices to avoid and resist arrest and deportation by state authorities. Sanctuary appeared amidst a dramatic rise in the number of asylum-seekers arriving in Western countries and a simultaneous escalation in national and international efforts to discourage and control their arrival and presence through myriad means, including arrest and deportation. This volume explores sanctuary in its multiple iterations and examines the conceptual and theoretical issues into which they provide insight in new national and institutional contexts. Assembled are 17 chapters written by scholars from eight countries. Each chapter either explores key issues that sanctuary practices raise or details the development and trajectory of a particular sanctuary movement. Most do both. In so doing, this volume showcases the multi-disciplinary character of sanctuary scholarship, with chapters authored by scholars writing from the disciplines of anthropology, geography, political science, sociology, law, theology, and English. Among these scholars are also several sanctuary movement participants. The chapters are geographically diverse, exploring sanctuary in the US, Canada, the UK, Germany, Finland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, France, Iraq and Afghanistan. The volume is organized as follows. This Introduction highlights key themes and overviews the chapters. The volume is then divided into four Parts: Part I on historical, theological and theoretical perspectives on sanctuary that reveal its justifications and rationales; Part II on the US context, including the 1980s US Sanctuary Movement's effects and the recent inter-faith New Sanctuary Movement (NSM); Part III, an international section, primarily focused on traditional faith-based sanctuary practices and movements in Europe and Canada; and Part IV on emergent forms of sanctuary, which also has an international flavour in covering developments in the US, Canada, and the UK, as well as Iraq and Afghanistan. There is inevitably some overlap of purpose among the four Parts, but Part I is broadly focused on ways of seeing and justifying sanctuary; Parts II and III expose details of neglected contemporary sanctuary movements and practices internationally; and, finally, Part IV encompasses chapters that explore the broadening of sanctuary beyond Christian churches and its emergence in other institutional realms such as municipal governments and in international/ military relations. In the English-speaking world, most people associate contemporary sanctuary practices with a faith-based social movement commencing in the early 1980s in the US. This movement spawned an extensive multi-disciplinary body of scholarship, ranging from ethnographies informed by social movement theory, to sociological studies of so-called 'deviant behaviour', to consideration of legal questions surrounding constitutional freedom-of-religion claims, especially in the wake of US state authorities charging and convicting several sanctuary activists. However, by the early 1990s, this self-defined social movement had all but expired in the US. The existing scholarship on sanctuary, drawing mostly on this US experience, has exposed sanctuary as a set of practices, including spatial practices, as a fertile site to unearth and examine theoretical and

conceptual questions from across several disciplines. Scholars have theorized sanctuary in relation not only to migration and citizenship processes but also gender, race, church– state relations, social movements, civil disobedience, freedom of religion, and political identity. Activists and scholars have wrestled with several vital questions about contemporary sanctuary practices. Do these practices constitute a social movement or a string of unrelated events that merely share similar tactics? Are these practices faith-based or an assemblage of disparate elements, some secular, some sacred? How do these practices relate to law; are they ‘illegal’ as state agents often argue or are they a means to actuate higher forms of law, including international law? The collection’s aim is to surpass isolated accounts and case studies of sanctuary practices and movements in one country, from one perspective, and one historical period that characterize sanctuary scholarship to date. Rarely noted in existing scholarship is that sanctuary practices have had a presence outside the US, continue to persist, and have undergone a recent US resurgence. Thus, neglected are sanctuary activities outside the US before (as in the UK), and after the early 1980s (as in Canada, Germany, France and the Nordic countries). That said, the US remains a key site of sanctuary, especially with the rise of the NSM, which culminated in a national sanctuary meeting in New York City in 2009 and which helped inspire in continental Europe an international conference on sanctuary in Germany in 2010. Sanctuary, therefore, would seem to be garnering popular and scholarly attention in the US once again. Two chapters in this collection focus exclusively on the NSM and its significant conceptual and theoretical implications. Moreover, the US has been the source or location of several of sanctuary’s other forms that are explored in Part IV. This volume also seeks to reveal sanctuary as a more international, institutionally-flexible, and perhaps above all, theoretically-rich set of practices. The collection’s multi-disciplinary and international character raises new questions about sanctuary movements and practices. Among the principal issues that require such consideration and debate include: What is the critical potential of sanctuary practices? Are these acts of consequence beyond the relatively small spaces and the few lives positioned at their centre? Are they the symbolic tip of an iceberg of resistant acts waiting to surface if conditions present themselves? Alternatively, are they merely another appendage of the state systems of inclusion and exclusion involving refugee determination and immigrant selection, merely a temporary corrective for flaws in these systems, despite their accompanying rhetoric of resistance and sovereignty? Are these practices representative of asymmetrical power relations at their core? At the centre of contemporary sanctuary activities has been – almost exclusively – immigrants (often asylum-seekers) living without legal status in Western countries. All but two of the 17 chapters in this volume focus on sanctuary in relation to migration and to a lesser extent citizenship processes or on the role of immigrants without legal status in sanctuary practices. These two chapters, the first and last in this volume, situate sanctuary in an even broader perspective. They reveal that sanctuary’s terrain in the past was not always migration and citizenship and that it may not be so in the future. Sanctuary was once about protecting persons alleged to have committed criminal acts, rather than immigrants facing expulsion, as Karl Shoemaker’s Chapter 1 on medieval sanctuary documents. Nor is it clear this link will continue in the future, because sanctuary has quickly begun acquiring new forms and meanings during its revival in the 1980s and during the post-9/ 11 context since. As Michael Innes shows in Chapter 17, ‘sanctuary’ has been increasingly invoked in military and/ or international relations discourse to refer to ‘terrorist and militant’ havens and spaces of terrorism in Iraq and Afghanistan. Other themes that emerge in the volume are equally significant. These concern visibility, asymmetry, agency, sovereignty, legality, mutability and transformative potential. Reflected in the earliest scholarly accounts of contemporary sanctuary practices, the division between visibility and non-visibility is seen in the analytical distinction

between sanctuary as 'exposure' and sanctuary as 'concealment'. The former – exposure – is a strategy to provide protection to immigrants in a church or religious building and to gain the attention of mass media, the public and state authorities. The latter – concealment – is the antithesis of this effort whereby sanctuary provision is purposely concealed from state authorities. Whether sanctuary practices are invisible or visible has much to do with the shifting rationales and purposes of sanctuary practices that are well-documented in this volume. In Hector Perla and Susan Bibler Coutin's Chapter 5, for example, the issue manifests in relation to questions of whether Central American activists needed to remain quiet and become invisible to foster North Americans' involvement in the 1980s sanctuary movement. In other words, invisibility was maintained to hide practices, not only from US authorities, but also from other movement activists or would-be participants. As Perla and Bibler Coutin's contribution suggests too, there is a certain asymmetry at work in at least some sanctuary practices. While sanctuary may appear at first glance as obviously a form of resistance to state power, a transparent counter-stroke to state processes of exclusion, or at least its arbitrary exercise, several chapters question this assumption by looking more closely at these practices. Thus chapters by Naomi Millner, Hiroshi Oda, and Jonathan Darling and Vicki Squire (chapters 4, 10 and 13) problematize the sanctuary relationship as asymmetrical, each calling it into question in a different way. This raises the spectre that these practices may reproduce some dominant discourses that sanctuary practices overtly seek to counter. The question of asymmetry of power relations swirling about sanctuary practices emerges as a consequence. The issues of visibility and asymmetry are directly related to another: agency. To what extent are those persons at the centre of sanctuary practices the agents, rather than merely the recipients, of sanctuary's protection and aligned 'hospitality'? Put simply, are these people takers or receivers of sanctuary? This question looms in the background of most chapters such that there is little doubt immigrants aid the genesis, production, and cessation of sanctuary activity. These immigrants faced with immediate deportation sometimes defy sanctuary's paternalistic currents, whether by deciding to exit sanctuary, by challenging sanctuary's restrictions and conventions, or by playing a key role in enacting sanctuary practices in the first place. Yet, it is also true that immigrants without legal status often – even if only temporarily – adopt passive, obedient roles to flow with these paternalistic currents or otherwise deem it necessary to 'stay quiet'. Furthermore, close study of efforts to mobilize the significant legal and financial resources required to gain legal status through sanctuary plainly reveal that undocumented immigrants are often not positioned to move to the visible forefront of the resistance effort. To state otherwise risks denying the grim, precarious reality in which many people receiving or taking sanctuary find themselves due to organized state efforts to control them. There is an accompanying risk of overstating opportunities for effective resistance, regardless of the extent of immigrants' involvement in initiating sanctuary practices or escaping its conceptual and physical confines. Thus, while questions of agency are crucial to understanding sanctuary practices, in our view, the extent of agency is best left as an empirical question in each site. Indeed, it would seem there is a danger of throwing the potentially resistant baby out with the bathwater where asymmetry is discerned. A related question concerns sovereignty. Sovereignty is considered in this volume by Karl Shoemaker who shows, in his account of medieval sanctuary, how kings wielded sanctuary, before the emergence of the modern state, to shore up their sovereignty. However, Agnes Czajka, Hilary Cunningham, Hiroshi Oda, and Caroline Patsias and Natassia Williams in their chapters (3, 10, 11 and 12) also each raise the possibility that sanctuary challenges the modern state's monopoly on sovereignty. Tied to the issue of sovereignty is the matter of legality. Several chapters engage the question of whether sanctuary is lawful, and if so, according to what legal order (e.g. state law, international law,

religious law, higher law, natural law). David Michels and David Blaikie, for example, in Chapter 2, contend that sanctuary providers in the UK, the US and Canada on occasion resort to natural law and international law arguments to justify sanctuary practices, while nonetheless typically conceding that sanctuary is unlawful according to domestic state law. Along similar lines, a number of chapters raise the question of the legitimacy of civil disobedience. When is it appropriate to violate domestic state laws on the grounds that these laws are unjust? But of course, debates over whether sanctuary is a legitimate form of civil disobedience presume sanctuary is in fact unlawful – a point, as Patsias and Williams note in Chapter 12, on which not all sanctuary supporters concur. Indeed, as Cunningham suggests in Chapter 11, an unwillingness to concede the illegality of sanctuary, even as a matter of domestic state law, leads some sanctuary supporters to argue that sanctuary is a ‘civil initiative’ (a practice whereby individuals act to uphold the law in face of unlawful state actions) rather than civil disobedience. This brings us to mutability and transformative potential. That sanctuary practices mutate over time is well documented in this volume, even across two traditional sanctuary movements in the US, as described in chapters by Marta Caminero-Santangelo and Grace Yukich (Chapters 6 and 7). Similarly, Naomi Millner’s account in Chapter 4 of sanctuary in Northern France details a shift towards sanctuary as solidarity. Investigating transformative or critical potential is more difficult. Agnes Czajka, for example, in Chapter 3, argues that a self-limitation of social movement goals to advocacy for policy reform, such as a merit-based appeal for asylum-seekers in Canada, as important as this may be for asylum-seekers’ well-being, nonetheless casts doubt on sanctuary’s transformative potential. Similarly, when sanctuary is cast as civil initiative, this implies sanctuary may be merely a new arm of the state system, rather than possessive of a transformative capacity. Jonathan Darling and Vicki Squire’s account of the City of Sanctuary in Chapter 13 also identifies tactics of resistance in the formal practices of this movement that may imply the potential for the movement’s wider political effects. Until this volume, a rarely stated or documented fact is that since the late 1970s sanctuary has not limited itself to spaces of Christian churches and their members’ beliefs and practices. To be sure, the link between Christian churches and sanctuary remains tight. However, sanctuary practices have been present beyond Christian churches in other faith-based communities (e.g., a Mosque in London in the 1970s and a Sikh temple in Vancouver in the 2000s) and also in relation to secular institutions. Sanctuary has adopted other institutional forms and affiliations and is acquiring new meanings in the process. This is evident, for example, in ‘sanctuary cities’ in the UK, US, Canada discussed in the chapters by Jonathan Darling and Vicki Squire, Peter Mancina, Jennifer Ridgley and Julie Young (chapters 13, 14, 15, and 16). While at first glance sanctuary would seem necessarily sacred, city governments in the US such as San Francisco’s and New York’s have embraced this symbolism of safety in political engagements with the US federal government, as early as the 1980s, but devoid of its religious trappings. That urban space can be a space of sanctuary is, of course, not historically new. Rather, it suggests a return to sanctuary’s early history: the Cities of Refuge in the Bible. We suggest these varied themes above are not mutually exclusive, but are instead interrelated and overlapping. For example, it would seem that acts of sanctuary must be visible to be conceived as demonstrable instances of sovereignty. Similarly, asymmetry would appear to be consonant with seeing sanctuary practices devoid of immigrants’ agency, and is a quality that is worthwhile identifying for modification if sanctuary practices are mutable, and so on. In the end, the volume, which draws together scholars from various disciplinary traditions, and looks at sanctuary practices through multiple historical, theoretical and comparative lenses, confirms the need for further multi-disciplinary and comparative inquiry and dialogue in this particularly fertile field. The themes that emerge in the volume, especially of asymmetry, agency, sovereignty, legality, and transformative potential, represent, in our

view, merely seeds from which further inquiry and dialogue can grow. Sanctuary's significance extends far beyond any one country, institution, discipline, or, indeed, epoch; the multiple questions these practices raise and which are represented in these themes are as relevant to understanding human survival and protection in our globalized, conflict-ridden twenty-first-century world as they are to the practices of medieval Europe.

#### Part I Sanctuary perspectives: historical, theological, theoretical

In Part I, four chapters investigate sanctuary from several key perspectives. Many scholars and supporters discuss sanctuary as though the nature of these early practices is well known, that there is a 'tradition' that informs closely aligned contemporary practices. Very few scholars, though, have actually researched these early practices, which is why Karl Shoemaker's Chapter 1 on medieval sanctuary is essential to commence this volume. His chapter shows continuity between early and contemporary sanctuary practices is doubtful. He notes that in the mid-sixteenth century criminals who were able to reach a church's sacred spaces could anticipate protection from prosecution. However, he argues sanctuary practices were not due primarily to weak forms of medieval authority or to flaws in existing criminal law processes. Rather, kings might have defended existing sanctuary laws as a way to demonstrate their strength. Sanctuary's later abolition across Europe resulted from a significant shift whereby deterrence began to be viewed as a quality of sovereignty, and in which long-standing legal practices linked to penitential discipline and dispute resolution became viewed as nuisances. In so doing, Shoemaker provides an understanding of medieval sanctuary as a lawful and celebrated practice – one that may be deployed to reinforce, rather than challenge, sovereignty. Examining further the justifications for sanctuary is Chapter 2 by David Michels and David Blaikie. These authors empirically and comparatively investigate three types of contemporary public justifications for acts of sanctuary directed at undocumented immigrants and asylum-seekers in the UK, the US and Canada, which, they argue, share similar legal, faith and cultural histories. They seek to discern how these distinct political and geographic contexts, however, might influence sanctuary practices, which they find vary significantly. Furthermore they discovered that while strong religious arguments were not deployed to justify these practices, there was a common motivation and, from self-avowed Christians, a broad theological commitment that encompassed sanctuary's various expressions. In Chapter 3, Agnes Czajka asks a vital and largely overlooked question about contemporary sanctuary practices: do they reproduce state discourses and technologies or do they possess critical, transformative potential? To do this, Czajka turns to intersections between the spaces and subjectivities found in the social theory of Giorgio Agamben, in particular, camp and bare life, on the one hand, and the refugee and sanctuary's spaces and subjectivities, on the other. Through this, she argues that while what she calls 'acts of sanctuary' must be challenged, they nonetheless possess a potential to disrupt the state's attempt to monopolize territorial sovereignty and ways of being political. Echoing similar themes but using different theoretical tools in an under-studied context, Naomi Millner explores sanctuary practices in Northern France in the post-war period in Chapter 4. In particular, she examines how existing notions of citizenship are reinforced through compassionate assistance and the creation of safe havens within international humanitarianism. Yet, underscoring the multiple influences on ethical subjectivity, Millner shows how sanctuary is being renegotiated due to immigrants' activities. By focusing on migration via the shelter Sangatte and sans-papiers movements, she reveals how ideas of collective belonging that move beyond and problematize citizenship are changing ethical responses to migrants. Significantly, sanctuary is replaced with a philosophy of solidarity whereby equality becomes shared by various social movements

that embrace the existence of a universal community of migrants that precedes those categories that are closely tethered to the nation-state.

## Part II Sanctuary movements and practices in the United States: old and new

Given that the US sanctuary movement is by far the most studied and well-known example of sanctuary activity, and because of the nascent NSM, a separate section on the US is appropriate. The chapters in Part II are not the only ones in this volume about sanctuary in the US. Part IV includes three chapters that focus on sanctuary activity in a US city context, those by Peter Mancina, Jennifer Ridgley, and Julie Young. However, the chapters here in Part II focus more closely on US church sanctuary movements and practices as they traditionally have been understood. Chapter 5 recasts an understanding of the nature and significance of the original US movement many years after its cessation. Hector Perla and Susan Bibler Coutin provide a retrospective exploration of this movement, arguing that the movement's structure and effects were transnational rather than national in character. The sanctuary movement arose consonant with broader activities of Central Americans who sought to encourage North American support for social justice activists. This rethinking of the movement's origins also reveals unintended consequences of sanctuary that include legal and policy changes in the US, increased remittances to Central America, and the Central American community's growth in the US. These consequences cast doubt on the efficacy of social movement theories that centre on instrumental (i.e., intentional) action. Moreover, as exemplified recently in sanctuary incidents in Canada, which are more closely linked to refugee determination and immigration processes, these unanticipated consequences suggest the particularity of sanctuary activity. This attention to social movements and how far this particularity should be considered is pertinent to other chapters that describe sanctuary movements and practices in specific countries. A key point made by Perla and Bibler Coutin is that the first US sanctuary movement has important legacies that reach beyond participants' stated goals. One such legacy, albeit one still being negotiated, is the New Sanctuary Movement (NSM). Marta Caminero-Santangelo authors the first of two chapters centred on the NSM. She argues in Chapter 6 that, compared to the first sanctuary movement, the NSM has been less about offering physical protection to undocumented immigrants and more about offering a new way to tell the story of the effects of US deportation policies. Like the earlier chapter by Blaikie and Michels, this chapter analyzes public justifications for sanctuary used both by US-citizen movement participants and undocumented immigrants. She asks how the narratives of the NSM differ from justifications for the earlier movement and how the former sought to constitute a new form of intervention in debates over immigrant rights in the US. In the NSM, she argues, sanctuary became recon-figured as a public and performative practice that provides a counter-discourse to the dominant rhetoric on immigration and that constructs an activist faith community. Grace Yukich, in Chapter 7, considers the NSM in relation to how a social movement adapts older tactics to a new political environment and in this way complements Chapter 6 and other chapters that show how sanctuary practices can change over time. She argues that the political terrain of the 2000s required activists to attempt to create and disseminate a new version of sanctuary: a strategy of 'radical accompaniment' rather than a primary tactic of church-based physical sanctuary. She asserts that sanctuary's history, and in particular the earlier US sanctuary movement, is an obstacle to strategic adaptation, since activists already assume what sanctuary entails. Uncertainty resulted from the movement's adaptation of sanctuary, harming its ability to recruit members and create a collective identity and commitment. The NSM highlights both sanctuary's power as a symbol and practice, but also the difficulties inherent in altering its meaning.

### Part III Sanctuary movements and practices in Europe and Canada: international comparative and case studies

Following Part II on US sanctuary practices is a section that deals with various case studies of sanctuary movements in Europe and Canada. In the first English language scholarly account of its kind, Jill Loga, Miikka Pyykkönen and Hanne Stenvaag illuminate church sanctuary practices in four Nordic countries: Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden. Echoing other chapters, they argue that while there are many similarities, there are also significant differences among these countries that stem from, among other things, distinct state– church relations, migration histories, and networks. Nordic church sanctuary practices are rooted in the official legal position of sanctuary during the pre-Reformation era. Two justifications for sanctuary practices in Lutheran and various other Christian churches remain: the obligation to respond to everyone within the holy territory of churches, and the priests' ethical duty to help the distressed. They argue that sanctuary providers have increasingly deployed these justifications as asylum-seeker migration to the Nordic countries has increased beginning in the 1980s. In Chapter 9, Wolf-Dieter Just provides an overview of the long-standing German sanctuary movement. In the early 1980s, this movement emerged as a reaction to restrictive German asylum policies and poor living conditions for refugees. By 1994, a nationwide network of individuals and parishes prepared to provide church sanctuary had developed. Just argues that this network offered opportunities to provide mutual support, for theological reflection and for political protest against German asylum policies. Parishes offering sanctuary attempted to serve immigrants facing social hardship and physical harm and to fight for the right to human dignity as set out in the German Constitution. As in Canada, Just suggests that sanctuary is provided only as a last resort when legal means to prevent deportation have failed – and has proven surprisingly successful in preventing deportation. Just asserts that this practice has also had a positive impact on congregations involved in giving members' Christian faith a practical expression. Still focusing on Germany, Hiroshi Oda investigates, in Chapter 10, the relationship among actors in Germany's sanctuary movement. He recounts the story of a Kurdish refugee who took sanctuary. In his first refugee determination hearing, chronological inaccuracies in his story were overemphasized in judging his credibility. In the second hearing and in taking sanctuary, his credibility was constructed instead based on face-to-face relationships and compassion. Although compassion is referred to in the German Constitution, Oda argues the rights of foreigners have been restricted by state sovereignty. As a result, a confrontation emerged in which sanctuary became necessary. In this respect, sanctuary can be understood as a manifestation of local communities' potential for hospitality. Moving from Europe back to North America, in Chapter 11, Hilary Cunningham documents the rise of the Ontario Sanctuary Coalition (OSC), which is one of the first Canadian sanctuary movements, from 1993 onward. Like other faith-based groups, such as those in Germany described above, the OSC adopted church sanctuary to respond to Canada's restrictive immigration and refugee process. However, she argues, it adopted a unique coalition culture and has continued to underscore the role of a 'civil initiative' and reform of Canada's refugee determination process. Caroline Patsias and Nastassia Williams, in Chapter 12, explore sanctuary by comparing two contexts that are discussed separately in previous chapters: Canada and France. The authors argue that how one understands sanctuary's legitimacy depends in part on whether one adopts a liberal or republican view of democracy. The authors illustrate how different visions of political obligation, liberal and republican, highlight certain aspects of sanctuary. To do this, they compare two sanctuary incidents in Catholic parishes in Montreal and Paris. Beyond cultural and political differences between Canada and France, they show that the supporters of sanctuary practices

help redefine new 'pockets' of sovereignty, where citizens assert their vision of justice and contest the state when it drifts too far from social realities.

#### Part IV Emergent realms: Cities of Sanctuary and military sanctuaries

The final Part in this volume is about sanctuary's emergent realms, including cities of sanctuary and military sanctuaries. Jonathan Darling and Vicki Squire commence Part IV by interrogating the politics of the City of Sanctuary network in Sheffield, in the UK. This network forms part of a national association that attempts to create a 'culture of hospitality' for immigrants. Resonating with Czajka's argument, but again using different theoretical tools, the authors assert that many activities of this network create possibilities for disruptive acts of sanctuary which are discussed via attention to everyday activities such as volunteering. The authors identify a series of tensions between the formal articulation of the movement and everyday enactments. They suggest the latter problematize the uneven relations of privilege that surround practices of hospitality. They show too how the City of Sanctuary actively propagates exclusions by permitting the supporting groups and city councilors to become part of the network without politicizing its status. The chapter draws upon Henri Lefebvre's well-known idea of the 'right to the city' as a means by which to understand the disruptive potential of everyday enactments of sanctuary. Next, in Chapter 14, Peter Mancina describes the history of a grassroots sanctuary movement in San Francisco, and how municipal officials enforced governmental sanctuary practice. Activists' efforts led to the incorporation of the sanctuary movement ethics, such as providing 'support, protection, and advocacy' for undocumented refugees, into the municipal government's culture. The municipal government then deployed sanctuary as a means to govern the city's mixed-status population. What emerged was a sanctuary city governance apparatus, a network of departments, commissions, agencies, officials, and front-line employees, to manage and improve the precarious situation of undocumented immigrants. By forbidding city employees from conducting intrusive surveillance and information gathering and sharing details of immigrants' legal status, the municipal government provided life-sustaining municipal services as sanctuary city services to undocumented immigrants and advocated on their behalf. Such sanctuary practices encouraged undocumented residents to remain healthy, law-abiding, and cooperative with municipal agents, and were therefore used as techniques of governance and welfare promotion. Broadening and complementing Mancina's chapter, Jennifer Ridgley in Chapter 15 describes the history and politics of city sanctuary in the US. She begins with events leading to Berkeley declaring itself a sanctuary for soldiers refusing to fight in the Vietnam War. Tracing the changing practices and meaning of sanctuary as it was enveloped in the legal and institutional spaces of city governments, she describes how sanctuary shifted from faith-based origins toward policies of limiting local enforcement of federal immigration law. She also discusses city sanctuary in San Francisco and New York City during the major immigration reforms of the 1980s and 1990s, and how city sanctuary re-emerged after 2001 during new security initiatives. While much is written about sanctuary movements and activities within US cities, little is known about the Canada– US borderlands. Julie Young rectifies this via a case study of responses to the Central American refugee 'crisis' of the late 1980s in Detroit (USA)– Windsor (Canada), with particular attention on the Detroit– Windsor Refugee Coalition. Young argues in Chapter 16 that coalition members re-conceptualized the international boundary line that divides and joins this border city. Advocates focused on 'overground' methods, strategically mobilizing Canada's less restrictive refugee policies to enable undocumented immigrants to leave the US to secure legal status as refugees in Canada. Local sanctuary activities created a space of refuge that spanned the boundary line, relying on cooperation between organizations and individuals on the two

sides of the Detroit River, thereby highlighting the value of working as though these two cities were one. The final chapter also explores sanctuary practices beyond those located in churches, but in a very dissimilar emergent realm. Michael A. Innes focuses on militant sanctuaries in the context of international relations. He asserts that sanctuary is many things: the most important form of support a state can provide to armed surrogates, a humanitarian shelter to civilians, and a protected base area from which guerrilla movements can operate. He argues that if states are the immutable facts of international politics, then sanctuaries are their illegitimate offspring. He explores the limitations of recent research, policy, and framing efforts, arguing for greater epistemological self-questioning among analysts and for a dynamic, constructivist view in which sanctuaries are defined by ideas, beliefs and actions rather than material features. Innes concludes by discussing the importance of practices in understanding places, the complexities of units and levels of analysis, and challenges of social distance in war.