INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the original text directly from the copy submitted. Thus, some dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from a computer printer.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyrighted material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is available as one exposure on a standard 35 mm slide or as a 17″ × 23″ black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. 35 mm slides or 6″ × 9″ black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I
Accessing the World's Information since 1938

300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA

Order Number 8814225

Prophetic rhetoric and the Sanctuary movement

Clark, Jeanne Ellen, Ph.D.

The University of Arizona, 1988

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark _✓_.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages _✓_
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received _✓_
16. Other _____

UMI

PROPHETIC RHETORIC AND THE SANCTUARY MOVEMENT

by

Jeanne Ellen Clark

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1988

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Final Examination Committee, we certify that we have read

the dissertation prepared by Jeanne Ellen Clark

entitled Prophetic Rhetoric and the Sanctuary Movement

and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement

for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

H. L. Ewbank Henry L. Ewbank	3/21/88 Date
Andrew A. King Andrew A. King	3/21/88 Date
Robert W. Sankey Robert W. Sankey	3/21/88 Date
David A. Williams David A. Williams	3/21/88 Date
	Date

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copy of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

H. L. Ewbank Dissertation Director	3/25/88 Date

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under the rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: Jeanne Ellen Clark

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge and thank the men who shaped my graduate career: Henry L. Ewbank, Andrew A. King, David A. Williams, William E. Bailey, William G. Dever, and Peter B. Machinist. They made graduate study stimulating and worthwhile. Thanks are also due Robert W. Sankey for friendly advice throughout my protracted graduate life.

Hank Ewbank and Andy King occupy a special place, not just for their patient encouragement and criticism during the writing of this dissertation, but for their constant caring--about people, about learning, and about teaching. During my time in Arizona, they were for me "like streams of water in a dry place, like the shade of a great rock in a weary land." Would that all students were blessed with such teacher-friends.

A special acknowledgment is due the Sanctuary workers of Tucson. The open generosity of John Fife, the Southside congregation, and the American Friends Service Committee encouraged my interest and aided my research. The faith of the whole Sanctuary community gave me something worth writing about.

Thanks are also due the faithful friends and supportive "nags" of the last few years: Risë Samra, Catherine Collins, Lane McGaughy, Roberta Bigelow, John Hooker, Lorraine Couture-Brunette, Barbara Ewbank, Suzanne Miles, and all the others, not named, but not forgotten, including my students, who must be weary of Sanctuary examples.

Final thanks are due my family, particularly my parents, who have always helped and encouraged me even when they neither understood nor wholly approved my interests. Without you, I could not have reached this point.

On many levels this is a document made possible by loving trust. I hope it is worth some fragment of that trust.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract....................7

Introduction....................9

The Sanctuary Challenge....................10

The Rhetorical Problem....................12

The Civil Religion Contract....................13

The Prophetic Reaction....................15

Approaching Sanctuary Rhetoric....................23

Prophets and Prophetic Rhetoric....................28

To Speak as a Prophet....................28

Going Beyond the Crystal Ball....................29

To Speak as a Prophet in Mari....................30

To Speak as a Prophet in the Old Testament....................32

Using Signs for Authority in the Gospels....................35

Prophets and the Modern Rhetoricians....................36

Social Location of the Prophet....................41

How a Prophet Speaks....................44

The Prophetic Message....................46

Assumed Authority....................50

Emotional Imagery....................50

The Kernel....................55

The Philosopher Gadfly....................56

Three Early Letters....................57

October 1982 Talk in Austin....................83

"A View from the Border"....................................88

In Prophetic Community...96

Fife and the Church as Community..............................97

Professing Prophetic Action....................................103

Preaching to Prophetic Community...............................105

"The Lord Is Blessing Me. . ."...................................112

You Can't Stop that Wind: Extending Prophetic Community in Worship.125

"Gathered in this Place of Holy Worship".......................126

"We Follow the Footsteps of the Prophets"......................128

"That We May Be Strengthened to Live Faithfully"...............130

Images in Conflict in Sanctuary Debate.............................135

Overview of the First Debate...................................137

Overview of the Second Debate..................................144

Conclusion...160

Guilty of the Love Conspiracy......................................163

Wendy Lewin...165

Maria del Socorro Pardo de Aguilar.............................167

Reverend John Fife...171

Father Anthony Clark...178

Father Ramon Dagoberto Quiñones...............................182

Margaret "Peggy" Hutchison.....................................185

Phil Willis-Conger...188

Darlene Nicgorski SSSF...191

Conclusion...200

Reference List...206

Abstract

Throughout history, religion and politics have approached each other with a wary appreciation of mutual power. One of the latest offspring of this uneasy relationship is the Sanctuary movement. On March 24, 1982, Southside Presbyterian Church in Tucson, Arizona and five churches in Berkeley, California publicly proclaimed their status as sanctuaries for Central American refugees. Three years later there were 214 churches involved and eleven church workers were about to be tried in Tucson. This study is an analysis of the rhetoric used by the movement as it sought to extend its mantle of authority and thus move from the social periphery to the center of society evoking a new public vision of reality.

The rhetoric of religious critique of the governmental and social order has been designated "prophetic rhetoric" after the often modeled discourse of the Old Testament prophets. Such discourse can be sectarian and polarizing in tone and impact, but to achieve social transformation the prophet needs some central acceptance. This study examines the potential of prophetic rhetoric within the Sanctuary movement in southern Arizona. It explores how Sanctuary rhetoric draws on the prophetic tradition; how that rhetoric expands or leaves the tradition; and how the rhetoric employs prophetic themes, authority claims, and emotional imagery.

The letters and statements of Jim Corbett introduce major Sanctuary themes of the God/Love-Money/Government conflict, prophetic action, civil initiative, and the WWII parallel. The predominantly in-group rhetoric of Southside Presbyterian develops religious justification arguments, while ecumenical Sanctuary services use varied texts, church authority figures, and bonding rituals to build prophetic community across denominational lines. In public debate, religious argument is deemphasized as Sanctuary speakers focus on legal justification and assertion of general social values through image manipulation. Sentencing statements of eight Sanctuary workers vary as some are harshly polarizing, others focus on secular images and legal values, and still others deftly interweave religious and secular justification.

Sanctuary speakers use prophetic discourse to critique, without falling into the trap of purely secular political campaigning. A tiny core of dissenters, viewed as extremists, grew into a movement with worldwide support. The justifying message adapted and was at times diluted, but it did not lose its prophetic essence.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

> The striking surprise is that prophets of Israel were tolerated at all by their people. To the patriots, they seemed pernicious; to the pious multitude, blasphemous; to the men in authority, seditious.[1]

> Whenever Christians set forth the wild, demanding, scandalous truth of the Gospel, in word and deed, they are ignored, ridiculed, opposed and in some cases hammered, quite literally, into the ground. It will be the Christian's aim to transform society without such bitterness and pain. . . that hope is likely to be a vain one.[2]

> So, here I am in Tucson: the city where the government is trying to give new meaning to the term "religious conviction."[3]

Throughout history, religion and politics have approached each other with a wary appreciation of mutual power. The Akkadian king, Sargon, apparently encouraged his priestess daughter to tamper with Sumerian theology to strengthen his own political standing.[4] In Isaiah 36-37, the prophet Isaiah offered King Hezekiah guidance and reassurance when the Assyrian Sennacherib invaded Judah. Jeremiah was arrested and threatened with death for prophesying the destruction of an unrepentant Judah according to Jeremiah 22. Henry II set up a puppet prelate and decried his obstinance. Henry VIII separated himself from the authority of Rome and claimed his own religious authority. "Church" and "state", in their many forms, have been uneasy mates: now married, now separated, now meddling.

---

[1] Abraham J. Heschel, The Prophets, 2 vols. (1962; New York: Harper and Row, 1969) 1: 19.

[2] Rex Ambler and David Haslam, postscript, Agenda for Prophets: Towards a Political Theology for Britain, ed. Rex Ambler and David Haslam (London: Bowerdean Press, 1980) 173-174.

[3] Mike Farrell, address, Arizona Sanctuary Legal Defense Fund Dinner, Tucson, 14 Sept. 1985.

[4] William W. Hallo and J. J. A. van Dijk, The Exaltation of Inanna (New York: Yale University Press, 1968) 6-11.

The Sanctuary Challenge

One of the latest offspring of this uneasy relationship is the Sanctuary movement, the contemporary Underground Railroad. On March 24, 1982, Southside Presbyterian Church in Tucson, Arizona and five churches in Berkeley, California publicly proclaimed their status as sanctuaries for Central American refugees. Two months earlier, Jim Corbett, the Quaker "coyote" considered a founder of the movement, had challenged the National Council of Churches consultation on immigration:

> Much more than the fate of the undocumented refugees depends on the religious community's participation and leadership in helping them avoid capture. If the right to aid fugitives from government-sponsored terror is not upheld in action by the churches--regardless of the cost in terms of imprisoned clergy, punitive fines, and exclusion from government-financed programs--the loss of many other basic rights of conscience will surely follow.[5]

Corbett's statement was clear, uncompromising, and spoken from the periphery.

---

[5] Paul Burks, "This is Sanctuary: A Reformation in Our Time," Sequoia: The Church at Work February 1985, c.

By April of 1985, 214 churches, schools and communities from La Jolla to Boston, from Baton Rouge to Minneapolis, had joined the Sanctuary movement. A January 1985 Inter-American Symposium on Sanctuary, the first national gathering of the movement, drew some 1300 people to Temple Emanu-El in Tucson. At that time the movement included representatives from many mainstream religious bodies: Catholic, Friends, Unitarian, Presbyterian, United Church of Christ, Lutheran, Methodist, Mennonite, Baptist, Episcopal, Disciples of Christ, and Reform Jew. With endorsements from organizations as diverse as the American Friends Service Committee, the Rabbinical Assembly, the Maryknoll Fathers, and the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches,[6] and with the declaration of the entire state of New Mexico as a sanctuary,[7] there is a clear attempt to gain a central authority to enhance rhetorical credibility.

Eleven church workers in Arizona and Mexico were tried in federal court for their Sanctuary activities. After five months of testimony, examination, and objection, eight of the eleven were convicted. Denied mention of religious motivation, conditions in Central America, international law, U.S. refugee treaties, or defense by necessity, the defense had rested its case without calling a single witness. A motion for dismissal based on selective prosecution by the government was rejected without allowing defense discovery of relevant government data. A central government had perceived and responded to a challenge from what it perceived as the socio-political periphery, but in a very real sense Sanctuary was never tried. The religious question was disallowed.

---

[6] Burks; "Denominational Breakdown of Sanctuaries --4/85," Sanctuary Media Office.

[7] "New Mexico is Proclaimed a Sanctuary for Refugees," New York Times, 30 March 1986, sec. 1, p. 17 (national) col. 1.

The Rhetorical Problem

The nature of the difficulties was seen before the trial started. At a Phoenix meeting two days before the June 1985 resumption of the pre-trial hearings, Fr. Robert Drinan acknowledged the rhetorical problem imposed on the movement by its disputed social location:

> We should not overstate our case. It's going to be very complicated. We should be careful, and cautious, and courteous. For the sake of the refugees we cannot allow ourselves to be portrayed as a fringe element or as extremists, because we are not. We are in the mainstream of the churches that have come forward with a phalanx of support for what you are doing. We must go by communal discernment.[8]

To be effective public theologians, to evoke a new public vision of reality, the movement must overcome what may be an inherently polarizing rhetoric. This is the rhetorical challenge for the new Freedom Train. It must extend its mantle of authority. A rhetoric of the periphery may not be adequate to reach the center. Prophetic rhetoric was once able to cross over the line. It should still have that potential. This study will examine the potential and problems of prophetic rhetoric within the rhetoric of the Sanctuary movement in southern Arizona. It will explore how Sanctuary rhetoric draws on the prophetic tradition, whether that rhetoric attempts to expand the tradition, and why the rhetoric leaves the tradition.

---

[8] Robert F. Drinan, S.J., address, Consultation on Government Infiltration of the Churches, Central United Methodist Church, Phoenix, 23 June 1985.

The Civil Religion Contract

In a nation founded by an assortment of rebels, religious and otherwise, with a Constitutional commitment to the separation of church and state, the clarification of roles has not been easy. The reasoning behind that early commitment reflects the divergent concerns: "It has been said that Thomas Jefferson favored separation of church and state so that the state might be protected from the church, whereas Roger Williams favored it so that the church might be protected from the state."[9] Some scholars suggest the tension is unavoidable.[10] The state borrows the credibility of religious language and form. The church persists in probing what belongs to Caesar and what belongs to God.

Since Robert Bellah's seminal essay,[11] discussion of civil religion in America has been a familiar topic. Formal Presidential references to God foster our image of America as "one nation, under God," even if a rather secularized nation and an ambiguous God.

---

[9] William Clancy, et al. Religion and American Society: A Statement of Principles (Santa Barbara, CA: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1961) 73.

[10] Clancy, et al. 74.

[11] Robert Bellah, "Civil Religion in America," Daedalus (Winter 1967); rpt. in Russell E. Richey and Donald G. Jones, eds., American Civil Religion (New York: Harper and Row, 1974) 21-44.

Roderick Hart explicates this phenomenon as having a rhetoric which is expedient, complex, non-existential, ritualistic, and optimistic. References to deity are used when situationally advantageous. Several "gods" of different characters may be presented. The concern is not immediate action, but nostalgia or future hope. Ritual forms like Washington prayer breakfasts and Fourth of July services provide rhetorical reinforcement for civic piety. Here is a god of hope and unwavering approval.[12] Hart delineates a clear purpose for the "accommodationistic God" of American civil piety: "The civil religious discourse emanating from America's clergy is, by and large, . . . a rhetoric tacitly supportive of the political status quo. It functions to legitimize the current political order."[13] Hart acknowledges the absence of a prophetic God in his civil-religious pantheon. He speaks of a church-state contract rooted in accommodation: suasory support is permitted; existential meddling is not.[14]

The result has sometimes been perceived as a religion celebrating Americanism. "Sidney E. Mead told of a young German who came to America several years ago to study our religion; after attending a number of varied worship services, he reported that the only symbol common to all of them was the American flag."[15] The example may seem extreme, but it does suggest the pervasiveness of the civil religion contract.

---

[12] Roderick P. Hart, The Political Pulpit (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 1977) 66-104.

[13] Hart 79-80.

[14] Hart 79.

[15] Perry C. Cotham, Politics, Americanism and Christianity

The Prophetic Reaction

Religious rhetors have periodically been dissatisfied with this contract as something apparently jarred some one or more to sense a disparity between the faith professed and the faith enacted, and so prophetic rhetoric has reemerged. In 1960, as the country emerged from the comfortable Eisenhower era, one scholar complained:

> . . . each of the religious communities continues to cast up its prophets, its rebels and radicals. But a Jeremiah, one fears, would be positively embarrassing to the present position of the Jews; a Francis of Assisi upsetting the complacency of American Catholics would be rudely dismissed as a fanatic; and Kierkegaard speaking with an American accent would be considerably less welcome than Norman Vincent Peale in most Protestant pulpits.[16]

Two years later Abraham Heschel would claim: "Prophecy ceased; the prophets endure and can only be ignored at the risk of our own despair. It is for us to decide whether freedom is self-assertion or response to a demand; whether the ultimate solution is conflict or concern."[17] We were reminded that the biblical prophets are relevant for current crises. One book title dubbed the church a "prophetic community" and rejected the recurring notion of the church as withdrawn from the world: if religion only affected "private,

---

(Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1976) 140.

[16] John Cogley, "The Problems of Pluralism," Danforth Lectures, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, 1960 qtd. in Clancy, et al. 74.

[17] Heschel 1: xv.

personal life of the withdrawn community" then it is "irrelevant to culture" and "doomed to remain on the periphery of life."[18] In the era of civil rights marches and Vietnam protests the church rejected this peripheral role. Walter Brueggemann described "a prophetic ministry" as "imperative and difficult" at "a moment when the old traditions mechanically applied seem no longer to give clear guidance or supply adequate motivation for facing history responsibly."[19] In the early 1970s as one scholar noted "a continuing lay backlash against the challenging or prophetic functions of religion,"[20] Brueggemann was again calling us to a "prophetic imagination": "The time may be ripe in the church for serious consideration of prophecy as a crucial element of ministry. To be sure, the student indignation of the sixties is all but gone, but there is at the same time a sobering and a return to the most basic issues of biblical faith."[21]

Outside the United States there was a growing concern about prophetic religious involvement in politics. One British theologian wrote of politics as "no distraction from religion but the medium by which both love of neighbor and justice are made effective."[22] He warned against equating "the prevailing order" with a vision of a just Christian society.[23] Critiquing the emerging political theologies, André Dumas echoed the imperative of the sixties: "From a sociological perspective the church may be a minority, but theologically speaking it seeks to address the whole world. . . . It cannot just be a private religion, tolerated by, or a matter of indifference to, certain citizens and with no real significance for society as a whole. It is remarkable that the middle classes and the Marxists are agreed in seeing religion as a private affair. . . ."[24] Dumas summarized the current political theologies which stress the crucified God of the suffering and the liberating hope of the exodus and the resurrection. These theologies "contrast with a God who may be called upon to guarantee and hallow the status quo, another God whose dynamism is subversive and whose work has only just begun and has yet to be accomplished."[25] Political theologies were characterized as prophetic in quality.

---

[18] E. Clinton Gardner, The Church as a Prophetic Community (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967) 185 qtd. in James E. Wood, Jr., "Christian Faith and Political Society," Religion and Politics, ed. James E. Wood, Jr. (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 1983) 9.

[19] Walter Brueggemann, Tradition for Crisis: A Study in Hosea (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1968) 129.

[20] Harold E. Quinley, The Prophetic Clergy: Social Action Among Protestant Ministers (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974) 11.

[21] Walter Brueggemann, The Prophetic Imagination (1978; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982) 9.

By 1980 a collection of essays seeking an Agenda for Prophets: Towards a Political Theology for Britain bore a dedication reflecting the source of the latest spark: "the so-called 'underdeveloped world', particularly Latin America."[26] Inherent in third world demands at the time was a renewal of the old prophetic challenge: ". . . it is, in the Hebrew prophetic tradition as well as in the Christian tradition, impossible to belong to the oppressors of human kind and worship the one true God. To pretend to do so is indeed blasphemy."[27]

---

[22] J. G. Davies, Christians, Politics and Violent Revolution (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1976) 12.

[23] Davies 75-76.

[24] André Dumas, Political Theology and the Life of the Church, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1978) 11.

[25] Dumas 91, 96, 102.

In the mid-seventies an American scholar, Stanley Hauerwas, criticized political theologians as naive utopians and asserted that the "most damaging aspect" of the Watergate "malaise" in America was:

> . . . that we no longer have the language to articulate our profoundest social issues in the political realm. . . . The social ethical task of the church demands nothing less than keeping our grammar pure by calling societal injustice by its proper name--i.e. sin. A society that has degraded the language of sin and judgment is a society that ultimately has no purpose beyond the manipulation of some for the security of others. Such a society will always prefer order and peace to justice.[28]

Hauerwas rejected the early political theologies of hope, but called for a renewed, challenging language of prophecy.

Four years later, speaking in the tradition of the political theologies of the third world, liberation theology, Walter Brueggemann reiterated the call to go beyond civil piety into a prophetic religion. The task of the prophet "is to nurture, nourish, and evoke a consciousness and perception alternative to the consciousness and perception of the dominant culture around us."[29]

---

[26] Ambler and Haslam, eds. 7.

[27] Enda McDonagh, The Demands of Simple Justice: A Study of The Church, Politics and Violence with Special Reference to Zimbabwe (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1980) 86.

[28] Stanley Hauerwas, Vision and Virtue: Essays in Christian Ethical Reflection (1974; Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981) 7.

The church of the civil religion contract must remember the temple sermon of Jeremiah 7, the sermon that resulted in the prophet's arrest: "Amend your ways and your doings, and I will let you dwell in this place. Do not trust in these deceptive words: 'This is the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord.'" Having the temple is not enough. The extended Puritan vision of America as the new promised land is not enough. As the Presbyterian lawyer of an indicted church worker commented, "Being a Christian means more than sitting in a pew on Sunday."[30] For the prophetic rhetor, civil piety or a pious patriotic vision is not enough. Non-existential rhetoric is not enough. Prophetic religion must analyze society and call it to account. The prophet must invoke a new rhetorical reality in the minds of the audience to enable the birth of a new existential reality in society. "All the horse collars in the world did not suffice to abolish slavery until the image of a free society became dominant."[31] The prophetic rhetor transforms our perception of reality. He clarifies the exigencies of his age:

> The pulpit is not the place for analyzing, spiritualizing, and leveraging political issues. It is certainly not the place for political campaigning. Yet the pulpit is where a prophetic voice is heard proclaiming the biblical vision of justice, focusing attention on issues that need to be addressed, pointing the direction for change,

---

[29] Brueggemann, Prophetic 13.

[30] A. Bates Butler III, address, Arizona Sanctuary Legal Defense Fund Dinner, Tucson, 2 June 1985.

[31] Kenneth Boulding, The Image (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966) 121.

> calling believers to demonstrate justice and mercy in the dealings of their own sphere, and inviting the members to political discipleship.
>
> Prophetic preaching is most difficult and most dangerous. . . . there is always the danger that unbalanced persons will push an ethical issue to its emotional extreme. The prophetic preacher must be visionary and practical, absolute and relative, eternal and temporal, personal and social, objective and involved. Only the mind of the Spirit can keep the balance.[32]

This task is paradoxical and controversial to say the least. The Evangelical author of the preceding statement sees both the necessity and the danger. His prophet is caught in a rhetorical vise of polar demands.

These polar constraints result in part from the social location of the prophet. Within ancient Israel the prophets seem to have functioned either as central prophets within the court or organized cult, or as peripheral prophets outside the recognized social structure. We might say the prophet either preached the "party line" or he did not, but that is an oversimplification. Some prophets, like the first Isaiah, seem to have been recognized by the court, thus holding the authority of a central position, yet they carried out a prophetic criticism of their social structure. Often prophets like Amos began as peripheral figures, but were eventually accepted as central voices.[33]

---

[32] David L. McKenna, "A Political Strategy for the Local Church," Christianity Today 19 April 1985: 20.

[33] Peter L. Berger, "Charisma and Religious Innovation: The Social Location of Israelite Prophecy," American Sociological Review 28 (1963) 940-950; J. G. Williams, "The Social Location of Israelite Prophecy," Journal of the American Academy of Religion 37 (1969) 153-165; Robert R. Wilson, Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980).

Now, as then, a prophet may begin on the periphery seeing a need not recognized by central society. If a new perception is to be evoked, a new social reality to be accepted, the prophet must gain central credibility. The mantle of prophetic authority must extend inward from the periphery. As an effective public theologian seeking social transformation the prophet needs some degree of central acceptance. The prophetic message must be acknowledged by a central audience. The double-edged dilemma remains.

Noting that the "real issues in any social moment are always obscure and responding to them requires a special freedom and courage that do not rely on certainty," one Benedictine dubs the prophetic role a function of a minority within the church: "The Church by and large is people by and large, and people by and large do not uncover reality nor locate the latent injustice in their society as long as the goods are being delivered."[34] The larger body of faith may not see the need or hear the prophetic word. To reach those outside the body may seem impossible.

That difficulty brings the second danger: weakening the message to gain broader approval. A Methodist minister warns the young would-be prophet-preacher: "People who like you have prejudices, and you are so human that you have prejudices. Before you realize, pressure gets to you and you forget what you were going to say."[35] To be heard the prophet must adapt, but that adaptation cannot be allowed to undermine the prophetic stance.

---

[34] Thomas Cullinan O. S. B., "The Church as an Agent of Social Change--From the Edge," Ambler and Haslam, eds. 136-137.

[35] Barry Bailey, "Religion and Politics in the Context of

At a recent Speech Communication Association convention a communication scholar attempted to describe a rhetoric of public theology. Working in contrast to Hart's political pulpit, Steven Goldzwig outlines a rhetoric of "expedient simplicity," with "a well-defined existential content," "action rituals," and "nuanced moral-political programs." The public theologian is speaking to need, as must any rhetor who wants an audience. The image of God may be more consistent than that employed by civil religious rhetors. Goldzwig maintains the image is consistent within if not across his two examples: Jerry Falwell and Archbishop Oscar Romero. The major distinction comes with the action orientation of public theology. This is not pious talk. This is a call for action. The reinforcing rituals advocate action. The prescribed course of action is supported by a rhetoric which Goldzwig terms "sectarian, emotionally polarizing and more pessimistic than optimistic."[36]

Goldzwig describes a rhetoric of the periphery. To be critical, sectarian, and polarizing is to alienate. To achieve Brueggemann's aim, to both criticize the existing order and energize communities to an alternative order,[37] the prophet must somehow cross sectarian lines and overcome the language of polarization. Only with

---

Biblical Faith and a Free Society," Wood, ed. 120.

[36] Steven R. Goldzwig, "Toward a Rhetoric of Public Theology: The Religious Rhetor and Public Policy," SCA Convention, Chicago, 4 Nov. 1984.

[37] Brueggemann, Prophetic 13.

that delicate balance will the prophetic vision of reality become what Bitzer terms "public knowledge." Then

> the poets, the orators, the prophets, the men and women of vision -- all those who in some way give expression to truth and submit their discovery or invention to the tribunal, which is the public, do thereby give competence and confidence to the public; and the public confirms the truths offered to it, and is thus enriched.[38]

Approaching Sanctuary Rhetoric

Sanctuary has established a prophetic vision of reality on the periphery. It is attempting to extend that vision to a broader public. In so doing the movement is caught in the perennial dilemma of "the church" taking a prophetic stance regarding "the state." Reactions reflect the dilemma. Patricia Derien, assistant secretary for human rights under the Carter administration, assured:

> Sanctuary operates from a moral imperative. The case may be complicated with church versus state questions, questions of process, interpretation of the law, influence of government . . . policies, but there is no question in my mind you who are Sanctuary people will be heroes, not criminals, when the history of this time is written.[39]

Several months later, in the heat of controversy around the trial, a career law enforcement officer from Mesa, Arizona told a Tucson audience, "You have to be anti-American to be in the Sanctuary movement."[40] At a vigil at the U. S. Border Patrol office in Tucson two weeks after the trial verdict, Sanctuary demonstrators singing "America the Beautiful" and "This Land is Your Land" were met by anti-Sanctuary demonstrators including members of the John Birch Society carrying signs claiming "Sanctuary is a tool of the KGB" and uniting "God, U.S.A. and the Border patrol." The responses reflect the polar reactions to prophecy.

---

[38] Lloyd Bitzer, "Rhetoric and Public Knowledge," Rhetoric, Philosophy and Literature: An Exploration, ed. Don Burks (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 1978) 91.

[39] Patricia Derien, address, Arizona Sanctuary Legal Defense Fund dinner, Tucson, 14 September 1985.

The Freedom Train that left Phoenix on June 30, 1985 was a visible example of the movement's attempt to meet the polar rhetorical demands confronting them. The act was peripheral: transporting "illegal" aliens, refugees in the eyes of the movement, to Massachusetts. The car signs were assertive: "Tren de libertad," "Compassion + Justice = Sanctuary," "Love Your Neighbor," "Blessed are the Peacemakers." The final touch was an attempt to identify with the central: the cars driving all the way to Flagstaff, the first stop, had American flags waving from their antennae. For the Sanctuary movement this was to be an American gesture, an American confrontation. This was not to be seen as an incipient, anti-American revolution. The symbols of central authority were claimed. Whether they were widely acknowledged as central authority identification by those outside the movement is another question.

Movement spokesmen are concerned about their rhetoric. Two workshops at a May 1986 national gathering of Sanctuary supporters in Tucson dealt with reaching the public with the Sanctuary message.

---

[40] Richard Dalton, address, Sanctuary debate, Tucson, 12 February 1986.

Questions about the Sanctuary movement and its rhetoric are wide-ranging. This dissertation reflects a more narrow interest in the movement. This study, therefore, is not intended as a comprehensive survey of a movement, nor is it an attempt to analyze the legal maneuvers of the trial or the first amendment implications of Sanctuary-government interaction. This study is an attempt to trace the rhetorical establishment of a prophetic vision of reality and the efforts to extend that reality from periphery to center. Interviews, videotapes, position papers, local debates, media reports, press releases, ecumenical worship services and Sanctuary related art will serve as the material for analysis, an examination of the problems and potentials of prophetic rhetoric within the frame of the Sanctuary movement.

Within Communication the study of prophetic rhetoric has been divergent and diffuse. A pop word of the sixties, prophetic rhetoric, has had varying applications, often with a secular bent.[41] William

---

[41] Sacvan Bercovitch, The American Jeremiad (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978); Brian Betz, "Erich Fromm and the Rhetoric of Prophecy," Central States Speech Journal 26 (1975): 310-315; Ernest G. Bormann, "Fetching Good Out of Evil: A Rhetorical Use of Calamity," Quarterly Journal of Speech 63 (1977): 130-139; Ernest G. Bormann, The Force of Fantasy: Restoring the American Dream (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985); William L. Burke, "Notes on a Rhetoric of Lamentation," Central States Speech Journal 30 (1979): 109-121; Ronald Carpenter, "The Historical Jeremiad as Rhetorical Genre," Form and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action, eds. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Jamieson (Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association, n.d.) 103-117; Robert Carroll, When Prophecy Failed (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1979); Robert Cathcart, "Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form," Southern Speech Communication Journal 43 (1978): 233-247; Charles Conrad, "The Rhetoric of the Moral Majority: An Analysis of Romantic Form," Quarterly Journal of Speech 69 (1983): 159-170; Ernesto Grassi, Rhetoric as Philosophy: The Humanist Tradition (University Park:

Carl III presented a dissertation at The University of Pittsburg in 1977 exploring prophetic preaching and the participation of William Sloan Coffin Jr. in protesting the Vietnam War. Carl offered a frame of prophetic rhetoric from the Old Testament tradition, noted the contrast with civil religion, and concluded that Coffin's success was the result of his concern for balancing the prophetic and the pastoral.[42]

Sanctuary offers a different set of problems. The movement deals in prophetic communities rather than individual prophets. The Central American refugee speakers shift the emotional weight of the argument. The issue of social location and the attempts of the movement to shift location are a concern untouched by Carl. By focusing on the Sanctuary example, this dissertation undertakes a unique examination of an important, if apparently ambiguous rhetorical form as it is used by a living, growing movement.

Pannsylvania State University Press, 1980); Phyllis M. Japp, "Esther or Isaiah?: The Abolitionist-Feminist Rhetoric of Angelina Grimke," Quarterly Journal of Speech 71 (1985): 325-348; Richard L. Johannesen, "The Jeremiad and Jenkin Lloyd Jones," Communication Monographs 52 (1985): 156-172; Martin J. Medhurst, "McGovern at Wheaton: A Quest for Redemption," Communication Quarterly 25 (1977): 32-39; John Rathbun, "The Problem of Judgment and Effect in Rhetorical Criticism: A Proposed Solution," Western Speech 33 (1969): 154-155; Ronald Reid, "Apocalypticism and Typology: Rhetorical Dimensions of Symbolic Reality," Quarterly Journal of Speech 69 (1983): 229-248; B. L Ware and Wil A. Linkugel, "The Rhetorical Persona: Marcus Garvey as Black Moses," Communication Monographs (1982): 50-62.

[42] William Carl III, "Old Testament Prophecy and the Question of Prophetic Preaching: A Perspective on Ecclesiastical Protest of the Vietnam War and the Participation of William Sloan Coffin Jr.," diss., University of Pittsburg, 1977.

Chapter two will examine the nature of prophetic rhetoric and offer a critical frame for studying such rhetoric. The following chapters will apply the frame to various aspects and examples of Sanctuary rhetoric including ecumenical worship, the position papers of Jim Corbett, the perspective of John Fife and the Southside Presbyterian congregation, the sentencing statements of the eight convicted Tucson Sanctuary workers, and the public debates held at the University of Arizona between September 1985 and April 1986.

Any rhetoric of prophecy or public theology, ancient or modern, suffers problems along with its claims of authority. Through the rhetoric of the Sanctuary movement in Southern Arizona we can explore those pitfalls and possibilities.

CHAPTER 2

PROPHETS AND PROPHETIC RHETORIC

Chapter one established a contemporary usage of prophetic rhetoric. Chapter two will explore the foundations of such rhetoric and will propose a blueprint for studying current examples of prophetic rhetoric through the examination of a series of questions. What does it mean to speak as a prophet? What characterizes prophetic rhetoric? How is this prophetic rhetoric different from other reform rhetoric?

To Speak as a Prophet

"I am no prophet, nor a prophet's son; but. . . the Lord said to me, 'Go, prophesy. . .'" Thus spoke Amos (7: 14-15, Revised Standard Version), the fiery prophet from Tekoa who challenged a king in the monarch's own sanctuary. To speak as an acknowledged prophet is to speak with established credibility, to be clad in Elijah's mantle, to have authority. As a sign of authority the prophetic designation is powerful and controversial: one does not give authority lightly. The early Israelites sought signs by which they should distinguish false from true prophets. Within the last few decades the word has been bandied about rather freely. People still claim or are given the mantle of prophecy when they speak. The prophetic designation is still subject to debate. Thomas Frentz warns against uncritical acceptance of "prophet" rhetors:

> . . .if moral action entails the unreflective acceptance of the advocacy of a rhetor who claims to have been to the mountaintop and received "the Truth," we are surely faced with a rhetoric having little to do with morality and the virtues. For every Moses, history sadly records a hundred Hitlers and the tragic consequences of following false prophets.[1]

The signs of such new prophets must be tested even as were the signs of the old. Idiosyncratic behavior or messages must be accepted as prophetic by the norms of a larger group.

How does a community recognize these prophets? How does a speaker assume the mantle of prophetic authority? How do we differentiate the false and the true? What are the signs of a prophet? This section will attempt to answer these questions. After some initial parameters are set, two areas will be reviewed: the signs of the prophet--ancient and modern--with a view to applying established standards to modern prophets, and the social location and legitimation of the prophet.

Going Beyond the Crystal Ball

There has been some imprecision in the use of the terms "prophet" and "prophecy."[2] Too often we fail to distinguish between the prophetic and the apocalytic. We hear "prophecy" and conjure visions of Nostradamus, Jeane Dixon, or Hal Lindsey. We remember the foretelling and forget the forthtelling. We equate prophecy with eschatology or apocalypse.

---

[1] Thomas S. Frentz, "Rhetorical Conversation, Time, and Moral Action," Quarterly Journal of Speech 71 (1985): 16.

[2] Wilson 21-22.

Certainly the two are related. In the ancient models apocalypses seem to be a continuation of prophecy with some new and varying influences,[3] though some scholars have seen the two as utterly different.[4]

Apocalytic vision looks at the world, proclaims it hopeless, and hopes for a deus ex machina happily-ever-after ending. By removing immediate responsibility from the visionary, apocalyptic rhetoric pulls us out of reality. It seeks to alleviate the intolerable. Prophetic vision is profoundly different. It requires us to acknowledge alienation, to admit the existence of the intolerable, and to wrestle with it.[5] Prophecy is personally demanding; we are responsible for acting to rectify the intolerable: "prophetic discourse is by its nature a speech of protest."[6]

To Speak as a Prophet in Mari

As early as 1750 B.C. in the city of Mari on the trade route between Syria-Palestine and Mesopotamia, there were clear sign rules for determining prophetic status. Divination via the reading of the entrails or livers of sacrificial animals was the preferred method of foretelling. This acknowledged and authoritative mode drawn from Mesopotamian influence served as a credibility check on the ecstatics, dreamers and oracles of the time. Prophetic communications of the latter type were deemed "aberrant."[7] They were reported as potentially important, but the recording official might indicate some hesitancy about the reliability of the message. Hence, nondivining prophets had a tentative credibility which continually needed to be reestablished.

---

[3] M. Knibb, "Prophecy and the emergence of the Jewish apocalypses," Israel's Prophetic Tradition: Essays in Honour of Peter R. Ackroyd, ed. Richard Coggins, Anthony Phillips, and M. Knibb (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982) 176; and Ronald E. Clements, Prophecy and Tradition (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975) 85.

[4] Clements, 85 discussing Von Rad; and W. McKane, "Prophet and Institution," Zeitschrifte für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 94 (1982) 260 citing Martin Buber, "Prophecy, Apocalyptic, and the Historical Hour," Pointing the Way (1957) 192-207.

[5] Arthur E. Zannoni, unpublished lectures, Episcopal Church Women's Institute, Petit Jean, Arkansas, 11-13 June 1983.

[6] Yehoshua Gitay, "Reflections on the Study of the Prophetic Discourse," Vetus Testamentum 33,2 (1983) 212.

Prophetic messages in the Mari letters were not limited to foretelling. They varied from general admonitions to the king to rule justly and to give generously to the prophet's god, to woe oracles pronouncing doom on enemies of the king, to warnings of impending revolt or doomed military campaigns, to assurances of the god's support if the king would only keep the god more apprised of his doings. Messages varied. The concern for prophetic legitimation did not.[8]

One rather fragmentary letter with a garbled message clearly expresses this concern for legitimation: "Now, my hair and my hem I am giving to you . . . . Let them declare (me) free (of guilt)."[9]

---

[7] Herbert B. Huffmon, "Prophecy in the Mari Letters," Biblical Archaeologist 31 (Dec. 1968): 101-24; rpt. in Edward F. Campbell Jr. and David Noel Freedman, eds., The Biblical Archaeologist Reader 3 (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1970) 220.

[8] Huffmon 204-219.

[9] Huffmon 207-208.

Hair and hem were tokens of identity. Impressions of garment fringe were used as witness marks in Mari, and some ritual texts required a fringe or fingernail of an inquiring worshipper.[10] The letters contain repeated references to hair and hem being sent as guarantees, while one text states the items were not included with a dream report because the dreamer was "trustworthy."[11] Untried or aberrant prophets needed credibility signs. Authority was not granted automatically.

To Speak as a Prophet in the Old Testament

Deuteronomy took the problem of determining prophetic credibility further. The people were warned to avoid soothsayers and diviners, and they were offered a model, Moses: "The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among you. . ." (Deut. 18: 14-15) The omen readers of Mari and Mesopotamia had lost syntactic credibility in this Near Eastern culture. That credibility now belonged to prophets of the Mosaic mold, but how were such prophets to be distinguished?

Two basic tests were provided: the veracity of the prophet's sign or prediction and the theological validity of his message. Both were essential. If the prophet offered a message which was not fulfilled, then the message was not from the Lord (Deut. 18: 21-22c). The prophet might offer a sign which was fulfilled, however, and still be a false prophet. If the prophet's message was theologically inconsistent, if it called the people to follow other gods, then his message was invalid though his prediction was true (Deut. 13: 1-3b).

---

[10] Huffmon 221.

[11] Huffmon 217.

This second test was a reminder of the underlying conservatism in the prophetic charges. The message cried a return to older religio-ethical norms, though the hearers might not realize they had left those norms. Jeremiah was arrested and threatened with death (Jer. 26: 7-24) after preaching his temple sermon. He dared to tell the worshippers that the existence of the temple was not a sure sign that God would not destroy the city. Even as Shiloh and the tabernacle had fallen, so would the desecrated temple and the unrepentant city fall (Jer. 7: 1-15). The official priests and prophets were outraged. Only a reminder of earlier prophetic reprimands, of older norms, saved Jeremiah from a bloody end.

The first test seemed simpler. If the message/prediction was true, believe the prophet. We may at this point feel a little sympathy for Jonah called to preach doom to his enemies, knowing that if they repented God would not destroy them and the reluctant prophet would lose his credibility at the least. This seemingly practical test had some complications.

Isaiah ran naked through the streets of Jerusalem for three years as a sign of what the people of Judah would suffer if they joined the Egyptian revolt against the Assyrians (Isaiah 20). It took three years of apparent madness for a sign to be revealed as true. Jeremiah had a longer wait. When Jerusalem was besieged by the Babylonians who would send her people into exile, Jeremiah the doomsayer bought a field as a sign of the promised return (Jer. 32: 1-

15). He offered the people a sign of God's hope in the midst of calamity. Decades would pass before their exile ended. Seeing the veracity of sign acts or messages was not simple.

Ecstatic behavior was sometimes a clue. During Saul's rise to power his ecstatic behavior with a band of prophets was seen as a sign that he might be one of the prophets (I Sam. 10: 10-13). However, at the anointing of Jehu, the prophetic beginning of an Israelite coup, the young prophet sent to anoint the new king was initially dubbed a madman. When his message was heard, "Thus says the Lord, I anoint you king over Israel" (II Kings 9: 12), his prophetic status was acknowledged. Ecstatic behavior was not a sufficient sign of prophetic status. Circumstances and message were important in the assessment.

Prophets also used call narratives to establish their credibility, so these narratives became yet another sign of prophetic authority.[12] The call of Amos was cited above. Isaiah's call, a vision of the throne of God and an angel who purifies the prophet's lips for his task reflected the prophetic connection with the world we ordinary mortals cannot see. Jeremiah's call told of a prophet designated before his birth "to pluck up and to break down, to destroy and to overthrow, to build and to plant" (Jer. 1: 10). The passing of Elijah's mantle to Elisha secured the younger prophet's authority (II Kings 2). Call narratives became a possible, though perhaps not a necessary nor perhaps even a sufficient, sign of prophetic authority.

---

[12] Hans Walter Wolff, "Prophecy from the Eighth through the Fifth Century," Interpretation 32,1 (1978) 20-21.

Was the message valid--in the name of the Lord and consistent with previous teachings of the Lord? Was the sign or prediction verified? Had the prophet been called? Was the behavior merely madness? These questions served as test signs in the legitimation of prophetic authority. A true prophet had to possess the first two signs. He might have a call narrative. If he gained prophetic credibility for himself or through association with a prophetic community, then aberrant behavior was labeled prophetic rather than mad. These signs helped frame who would speak authoritatively in the social world of ancient Israel.

Using Signs for Authority in the Gospels

The gospel writers used prophetic signs for authority as they built the credibility of Jesus. In Matthew the disciples told Jesus that he was being identified as Elijah, or Jeremiah, or one of the prophets (16: 14). Jesus presented himself as a fulfillment of earlier prophetic predictive signs as he preached in his hometown (Luke 4: 16-21) and as he sent word to John the Baptist of his status (Luke 7: 22). He duplicated a previous prophet's miracle in a location which made association of the two events inevitable: Elisha revived the son of a widow in Shunam (II Kings 4: 32-37); Jesus raised the son of a widow in Nain, a village on the opposite side of the same hill where the earlier village was located (Luke 7: 11-17).

Some of the community was according Jesus prophetic status. The gospelers show Jesus presenting himself as the embodiment of the predictions growing out of the old norms and offering sign acts linking him with the old prophetic tradition.

Prophets and the Modern Rhetoricians

The ancient prophets have been a type source for scholars seeking to understand rhetorical events. Genre critics have examined the jeremiad, a two pronged rhetoric of grief and hope which merges social criticism and spiritual renewal. The form has been traced from the ancient prophet of lamentation through a European focus on "mundane, social matters, . . . the city of man."[13] In American Puritan sermons the form becomes a "ritual designed to join social criticism to spiritual renewal, public to private identity, the shifting 'signs of the times' to certain traditional metaphors."[14] The pattern is extended into historiography where, despite an initial feeling of doom, readers come to believe "that adherence to older values and the adoption of a specific policy" is the assurance of salvation.[15] These genre critics have traced the borrowing of a prophetic rhetorical form; they have not been concerned with the later rhetor as prophet.

Others have examined the assumption of prophetic personae by rhetors. Ware and Linkugel explained Marcus Garvey as a black Moses because of his use of the motif of election, captivity and liberation. The prophetic persona was established through the use of prophetic themes.[16]

---

[13] Bercovitch 9.

[14] Bercovitch xii.

[15] Carpenter 115.

[16] Ware and Linkugel 50-62.

Phyllis Japp explored Angelina Grimke's adoption of a prophetic persona in her Pennsylvania hall address.

> Quoting liberally from Old and New Testament prophets, she assumed a forceful, dynamic, "male" posture. . . . She did not flatter or cajole. Via the prophetic persona, as one chosen of God to present God's message, she admonished the uncommitted, exhorted the faithful, and rebuked the opposition. . . . She exuded power and authority.[17]

With an authoritative air and exhortative discourse the prophetic persona was established.

John Rathbun examined Martin Luther King's prophetic persona as "a unifying device for his public work" and a connection with "a centuries old tradition that has remarkable vigor and dramatic appeal."[18] Rathbun saw King speaking from a prophetic perspective where history went beyond the secular moment, social justice was to be produced by love, society bore corporate guilt for failed institutions, and such guilt brought divine judgment. King thus developed the themes of the Old Testament prophets as expressions of his own concerns.

These themes are reflections of the iconoclastic role of the Old Testament prophets "struggling. . .to understand themselves and their world in light of a new age."[19] Horrified by a state we accept as normal, seemingly minor injustices had cosmic ramifications for the prophets:[20]

---

[17] Japp 342-343.

[18] Rathbun 154.

[19] Williams 165.

[20] Heschel 1: 3-4.

Hear this, you who trample upon the needy,
    and bring the poor of the land to an end,
saying, "When will the new moon be over,
    that we may sell grain?
And the sabbath,
    that we may offer wheat for sale,
that we may make the ephah small and the shekel
        great,
    and deal deceitfully with false balances,
that we may buy the poor for silver
    and the needy for a pair of sandals,
    and sell the refuse of the wheat?"

The Lord has sworn by the pride of Jacob:
    "Surely I will never forget any of their deeds.
Shall not the land tremble on this account,
    and every one mourn who dwells in it,
and all of it rise like the Nile,
    and be tossed about and sink again, like
        the Nile of Egypt?"
Amos 8: 4-8

In a day when blue laws seem archaic, and the rule of the marketplace, despite consumer protection, is still caveat emptor, the message of Amos seems outmoded. That is the point. It also seemed outmoded to the Israelites of the northern kingdom. As was noted with Brueggemann in the above chapter the prophet's concern is the evocation of an "alternative" social consciousness: an alternative founded in prophetic notions of social justice.[21]

As Rathbun observed, King presented himself in that tradition, as a prophet: "Letter from Birmingham Jail" referred to the eighth-century prophets who left their villages and carried God's message beyond their home borders. King placed himself in that tradition and spoke from that moral philosophical perspective.[22] Theme, perspective, and the claiming of tradition worked together to establish the prophetic persona.

---

[21] Brueggemann, Prophetic 13.

[22] Rathbun 154-155.

William Coleman analyzed Theodore Parker's use of a prophetic role in abolition rhetoric. Parker spoke as one who knew God's truth and therefore could not compromise in his prophetic quest to lead America away from the sin of slavery and into a realization of God's kingdom on earth. Coleman presented Parker as a prophet with two necessary audiences: supporters to act as disciples and opponents to react to his challenge. The prophetic persona, the role, is derived from speaker assurance of message truth, conviction of the necessity of manifesting that truth in the world, and the interaction of supporting and rejecting audiences.[23]

Ruth Anderson examined Dorothy Day as prophet in the Catholic Worker movement. Here prophetic status was measured by concern for religious reformation, use of the prophetic rhetorical forms of proclamation and condemnation, employment of emotional anecdotal appeals, and rhetorically reflected awareness of and reliance on a superior moral ethical wisdom, on a sense of God's purpose.[24]

Brian Betz's discussion of the rhetoric of Erich Fromm presented four basic prophetic functions: to provide new spiritual goals rooted in reality rather than illusion; to illustrate the ultimate alternatives; to protest ideas and actions which diminish man and society; and to offer a reforming hope for all of society.[25] By assuming these functions the social critic took on a prophetic role or persona.

---

[23] William Ebbert Coleman, Jr., "The Role of Prophet in the Abolition Rhetoric of the Reverend Theodore Parker, 1845-1860," DAI 35 (1975): 5556A (The Ohio State University).

[24] Ruth Diana Anderson, "The Character and Communication of a Modern-day Prophet: A Rhetorical Analysis of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement," DAI 40 (1980): 4796A (University of Oregon).

In 1970 while assessing the then current fad of terming public figures prophets, W. Sibley Towner offered a more inclusive analytic frame. Faced with a list ranging from Dick Gregory and the Beatles to Martin Luther King and Everett Dirksen, Towner was concerned that the term "prophet" was being loosely applied. He saw his analysis as "part of the larger quest for the locus of authoritative moral and religious utterance in our time."[26] Towner sought more than typical characteristics of the prophet; he sought authoritative signs, signs of legitimacy. Warning against a simple reductionistic approach to prophecy, Towner outlined four primary "identifying characteristics" of the Old Testament prophet: style, rhetoric, constituencies, and message.[27] Style incorporated "ecstatic behavior," "prescience," and "utter conviction in speaking" thus including the concern examined by Japp and Coleman. For Towner, rhetoric included the various formulaic phrases of messenger authority, cultic and secular commonplaces, and references to "older sacred tradition," hence relating to the analyses of King and Day. Message concerned the relationship to traditional prophetic concerns like justice, purified active religion, indictment and hope. Here were set the discussions of Garvey, King, Day, and Parker. Constituencies queried the social location and level of acceptance of the prophet.

---

[25] Betz 312 citing Fromm, You Shall Be as Gods (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1966) 117-118.

[26] W. Sibley Towner, "On Calling People 'Prophets' in 1970," Interpretation 24 (Oct. 1970), 492.

[27] Towner 497.

Towner unhappily observed that each of these characteristics had in some cases been seen as a sufficient sign for according prophetic status. For Towner, as for the ancients, style and rhetoric were not enough. An ecstatic might be merely mad. A prescient or one who spoke as a true believer might be wrong. The language might be appealing, but it still might be the word of a false prophet. Message and constituencies were and are crucial characteristics in the question of signs of prophetic legitimacy. The old commanded sign had been the test of the message by tradition. Not recorded as a sign, but always the final test of the prophet was community acceptance. Those who were not at some point accepted did not survive.

Social Location of the Prophet

Placement within the social order affects the reception of the prophet. In Mari, where style was more important than location, there were syntactically authorized diviners within the religious institutional setting and unauthorized ecstatics both inside and outside the cult institution. In ancient Israel the prophet might be inside the recognized religious institutional order like Jeremiah (Jer. 1: 1), outside that order but still recognized as a prophet by the government like Isaiah, or outside the religious and political institutions like Amos. Institutional placement was no guarantee of immediate or ultimate acceptance: speaking within the cult system and critiquing problems in that system, Jeremiah suffered immediate rejection though he attained ultimate acceptance.

As noted in chapter one, sociological studies have identified prophets as having either central or peripheral status.[28] A central prophet had an acknowledged role as a prophet within the social order like the Mari diviners or the court prophets of Israel. A peripheral prophet spoke outside these institutional frames. Jonah was sent as the quintessential outsider to prophesy to Nineveh in the heart of enemy territory. Amos, a Judean of no professed cultic status, spoke at a cult shrine city in Israel until the central prophets of the shrine and city ordered him out: his critique of the social and religious order was not then popular. Amos was a peripheral prophet. By the establishment of the canon of scripture his position had reversed. Amaziah of Bethel was remembered only as the priest who drove God's man out, while the teachings of Amos were accorded scriptural authority. Remembered perhaps by a school of disciples in the south, Amos the peripheral messenger gained ultimate central acceptance. Over time the message sign was acknowledged and the prophet was accorded central authority.

The prophet might be acknowledged by one or many in his own day. He could begin with a reforming message of the social periphery and only over time be accepted as a figure of central significance and authority.

---

[28] Berger; Williams; Wilson.

The prophet might speak as part of a school, a band of prophets, a prophetic community. To that degree we have an accepting audience which might itself be on the periphery of society though the message presented might have central authority within the community.

As implied in the Amos story, central status was not a sufficient sign of a true prophet. Such status sometimes implied the opposite, as the socially authorized prophet might be no more than an offical yes man. Message became the final crucial measure for ultimate acceptance.

The prophet speaks in a time of crisis--political threat, social injustice, or moral-religious failure. As the nature, cause, or very existence of the crisis may not be generally recognized, the prophet tends to speak from the periphery. If the message is to be immediately effective it must attain some degree of contemporary central acceptance. If the message is to survive other than as the chance found records of an obscure eccentric, it must attain some degree of ultimate central acceptance. That acceptance might vary with location, prophetic character, and prophetic message.

> . . . groups will immediately support a particular intermediary but just as firmly reject another. The reasons lying behind these evaluations are not usually clear, perhaps because both rational and irrational factors are involved. However, a major role is played by the would-be intermediary's social status, personal characteristics, behavior, and point of view. A person who is a well-integrated, respected member of a group is more likely to be accredited as an intermediary than someone who arouses the group's antagonism. A person who delivers a divine message that is in line with group expectations--even though the message is unpopular--is more likely to be accredited than a person who delivers outrageous and disruptive messages.[29]

Given these related factors of concern--social location, resultant audiences, and message, the next logical issue is the framing of the message.

How a Prophet Speaks

In the figures of the Israelite prophets we can observe a classic rhetoric for reform, a rhetoric of exhortation. A prophet might be defined as one who reads the signs of the times in the light of faith and calls for a response: prophets examine the state of their world, and specifically their public, in light of tradition and they speak out persuasively for a needed change of belief and action. The rhetoric for this suasion is two pronged, incorporating a rhetoric of grief to jar society into recognizing the need for action, to break the complacency of the public, and a rhetoric of hope to energize the audience to act.[30]

Emerging in times of political difficulty like the Philistine incursions and the Assyrian and neo-Babylonian invasions, the Israelite prophets worked in a crisis and responded to that crisis. They typically defined the problem in a politically unexpected way: a lapse from the covenant, a drawing back from earlier ethical and spiritual concerns. Perception of "the tragic discrepancy between the faulty creatures we are and the destiny to which we are repeatedly called"[31] provided a motive for the discourse. Crisis produced

---

[29] Wilson 52-53.

[30] Brueggemann, Prophetic 14.

[31] Philip Wheelwright, The Burning Fountain: A Study in the

critique.[32]

As a form of social criticism, prophetic discourse may seem radical. How then does this discourse differ from general reform rhetoric, or even the rhetoric espoused in Saul Alinsky's Rules for Radicals? Alinsky remarks:

> I've been asked . . . why I never talk to a Catholic priest or a Protestant minister or a rabbi in terms of the Judaeo-Christian ethics or the Ten Commandments or the Sermon on the Mount. I never talk in those terms. Instead I approach them on the basis of their own self-interest, the welfare of their Church, even its physical property.
>
> If I approached them in a moralistic way, it would be outside their experience, because Christianity and Judaeo-Christianity are outside the experience of organized religion. They would just listen to me and very sympathetically tell me how noble I was. And the moment I walked out they'd call their secretaries in and say, "If that screwball ever shows up again, tell him I'm out."[33]

Alinsky encourages the social critic rhetor to adapt to the audience, but to make that adaptation outside of a concern for the moral-religious heritage. He asserts that heritage would prove an ineffective argument base.

Ernesto Grassi offers an explanation for the tendency to reject prophetic rhetoric and a rationale for the use of such rhetoric. In "our desacralized and demythologized world we believe in no annunciations, in no purely directive statements, in no evangelist,

---

Language of Symbolism (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1954) 14-15.

[32] Robert Carroll, When Prophecy Failed (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1979) 9.

[33] Saul Alinsky, Rules for Radicals: A Practical Primer for Realistic Radicals (New York: Random House, 1971) 88.

be it God or prophet. We turn to rational thought, to proofs and reasons. . ."[34] Grassi sees such purely rational, proof-centered, metaphor free, formally valid speech as a metaphysical dead end. He enumerates two other kinds of speech: a false sophistic speech which substitutes opinion and image for insight, and a true rhetorical speech which is the product of "the wise man, of the _sophos_, . . . who with insight leads, guides, and attracts."[35] This speech illuminates higher truths, employs the common language in a formal setting to vivify, argues authoritatively, and roots itself in norms which are the basis of a "balanced law, which when pursued protects everyone's interests and welfare."[36] If those norms are part of the ethical-religious heritage, then Grassi's description could serve as a sketch of prophetic discourse.

Society may indeed be more self-interested than religiously or ethically motivated, but the reform rhetor who is also a prophet does not have the option of simply taking Alinsky's advice. The prophet reformer may argue from audience self-interest, but he or she must argue from the religious ethical norms. The legitimate prophet seeks a renewed understanding and application of those norms.

The Prophetic Message

Remembering the importance of the message and its relationship to the ethical-religious heritage in determining prophetic legitimacy, the significance of message as an aspect of prophetic rhetoric should be obvious. The prophet is a namer of the social condition, giving "impulse to other people to look at the world, or some small part of it in . . . [his or her] way."[37]. The message may be an indictment, a call for purification, a call for equity, a promise of hope, but the messenger speaks as the honest rhetorician of Weaver with "a vision of how matters should go ideally and ethically and a consideration of the special circumstances of his auditors."[38] The prophets seek a balance of vision and reality.[39] They are not boxed by current socio-political norms, but look for a possible transformation. Amos, Elijah and their fellows saw a socio-political structure marked with wealth and oppression and they presented it as it was, a covenantal failure. It was and is the prophet's role to establish a connection in the prophetic message "between crisis and tradition."[40] The message demonstrates the continuing applicability of the covenant. The rhetoric of grief clarifies the existence of the lapse from covenant. The rhetoric of hope, the vision of the possible future provided by the prophets, serves as a catalyst for energizing change, just as the American Protestant understanding of the millenial vision has at times lead reformers to work "to bring in the kingdom."

---

[34] Grassi, 104.

[35] Grassi 32.

[36] Grassi 81-82.

---

[37] Richard Weaver, "Language is Sermonic," Dimensions of Rhetorical Scholarship, ed. Roger E. Nebergall (Norman: University of Oklahoma Department of Speech, 1963); rpt. in Richard L. Johannesen, Rennard Strickland, and Ralph T. Eubanks, eds., Language is Sermonic: Richard M. Weaver on the Nature of Rhetoric (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985) 224.

[38] Weaver 211.

[39] David P. Reid SS. CC., What Are They Saying about the Prophets? (New York: Paulist Press, 1980) 30.

[40] Brueggemann, Tradition 123.

The prophet's role is distinctly polar. He must criticize society and energize the community to change.[41] To bring about this recognition of condition and renewal the prophet is "to pluck up and to break down, to destroy and to overthrow, to build and to plant" (Jer. 1: 10b). He is called to both activities, the building no less than the destroying. We understand the burning criticism and the related warnings. We are less apt to expect the renewing function, yet that too is vital for the prophet's end: energizing the people to change.

The prophetic message comes from a religious-ethical tradition, but not a tradition of empty rites and legalisms. The prophetic message seeks more. Worship without accompanying action revealing the covenantal relationship is meaningless:

> "When you come to appear before me,
>   who requires of you
>   this trampling of my courts?
> Bring no more vain offerings;
>   incense is an abomination to me.
> New moon and sabbath and the calling of assemblies--
>   I cannot endure iniquity and solemn assembly.
> Your new moons and your appointed feasts
>   my soul hates;
> they have become a burden to me,
>   I am weary of bearing them.
> When you spread forth your hands,
>   I will hide my eyes from you;
> even though you make many prayers,
>   I will not listen;
>   your hands are full of blood.

---

[41] Brueggemann, Prophetic 14.

> Wash yourselves; make yourselves clean;
> remove the evil of your doings
> from before my eyes;
> cease to do evil,
> learn to do good;
> seek justice,
> correct oppression;
> defend the fatherless,
> plead for the widow.
> (Isaiah 1: 12-17)

The prophetic call is not just for a public and private rethinking, but for resultant public acts.

The prophetic summary in Micah is built on action words: "to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God" (Micah 6: 8b). The translation "kindness" is weak. The word is chesed. It is not easily translated, but its implications are not passive. It is an active, ongoing, loyal, merciful love. "The prophetic summary refers to practice, not theory; to life as it is lived concretely, not to ideals or principles that belong in a realm of abstraction."[42] This should be the core of the prophetic message: a call to active justice, a call to embodied chesed, a call to renewal of the religious covenant relationship.

The message as legitimizing sign must be evaluated. Is the message transforming but within the traditional religious ethical norms? Is the message a call to action or a call to religious fence sitting? To assess the prophetic status of a message we must examine themes, demands and justifications.

---

[42] Bernhard Anderson, The Eighth Century Prophets: Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah (Philadelphia: Fortress press, 1978) 47.

Assumed Authority

"Thus says the Lord," "hear the word of the Lord:" the prophets of the Old Testament spoke with a mantle of assumed authority. They were God's messengers. As noted above, a call narrative was sometimes related to establish the prophet's status as messenger. However the authority is attained, assumed, or bestowed, the result is a discourse which seems at times to presume authority, a discourse which is assertive.

Edwin Black wrote of exhortative discourse observing a dearth of strongly developed lines of argument in exhortation and concluding "Prophetic utterance avoids the tortuous justifications that moral arguments usually require. Thus the didactic function of the prophetic tone is to simplify discourse."[43] Based on an assumption of authority prophetic rhetoric requires less proof for efficacy.

Based on the central or peripheral social location of the prophet that lessened proof may or may not be sufficient to reach a broader audience. The simplified discourse resulting from assumed authority may prevent the granting of a broader authority. The strength of assertion may prove to bring the curse of polarization.

In assessing prophetic discourse we must examine how authority is assumed and how that assumption is legitimized.

Emotional Imagery

Prophetic rhetoric falls within the realm of F. G. Bailey's work, The Tactical Uses of Passion, which suggests that although reason is perceived as the preferred form for debate, emotion is finally necessary in the process of suasion and management.[44] Truth may indeed be more than "logically articulated evidence."[45]

---

[43] Edwin Black, Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method (1965; New York: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978) 144.

Prophetic rhetoric is characterized by heightened pathos. As a form of exhortative discourse Black would have us anticipate emotion which "does not follow the acceptance of a belief, or even accompany it; it precedes it. Emotion can be said to produce the belief, instead of the reverse."[46] Whether or not one accepts the implication, and I do not, that emotion completely replaces logic in this discourse, emotion is certainly central, hence the earlier observation of the two prongs of prophetic rhetoric: grief and hope.

Radical grief is required to pierce the self-satisfaction of the people.

> Thus says the Lord of hosts:
> "Consider, and call for the mourning women to come;
> send for the skilful women to come;
> let them make haste and raise a wailing over us,
> that our eyes may run down with tears,
> and our eyelids gush with water.
> For a sound of wailing is heard from Zion:
> 'How we are ruined! . . .'
> The dead bodies of men shall fall
> like dung upon the open field,
> like sheaves after the reaper,
> and none shall gather them."
> (Jer. 9: 17-19, 22b)

---

[44] F. G. Bailey, The Tactical Uses of Passion: An Essay on Power, Reason, and Reality (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983) 7.

[45] Wheelwright 73.

[46] Black 138.

Rooted in the authority of the "Lord of hosts," Jeremiah's message vividly builds a grief for a people who do not realize their time of judgment. Jeremiah denies the people the peace and release the political establishment still hoped to secure,[47] but Jeremiah and other prophets do not deny hope.

Just at the point the message of grief might reduce the people to despair the community is given something to celebrate. In the face of conquest and exile, Jeremiah redeems part of his family's land, he buys a field as a sign that the people will return to their inheritance (Jer. 32).

The rhetoric of hope, the energizing force, sometimes spoke in exaggerated amazement of a time

> when the plowman shall overtake the reaper
> and the treader of grapes him who sows the seed;
> the mountains shall drip sweet wine,
>   and all the hills shall flow with it.
> I will restore the fortunes of my people Israel,
>   and they shall rebuild the ruined cities and inhabit them.
> . .
>   (Amos 9: 13-14b)

Elsewhere the hope comes more gently.

> Therefore, behold, I will allure her,
>   and bring her into the wilderness,
>   and speak tenderly to her.
> And there I will give her her vineyards,
>   and make the Valley of Achor a door of hope.
> And there she shall answer as in the days of her
>   youth,
>   as at the time when she came out of the land of
>   Egypt.
>   (Hosea 2: 14-15)

---

[47] Brueggemann, Prophetic 59-60.

The prophets are accusers and consolers.[48] They must awaken the people to an awareness of their failings, and motivate them to change. The numbness of self-satisfaction is not to be replaced with the numbness of despair, but with a consoling hope which will energize reform.

Biblical critics have observed a distinct rhetorical style in the Old Testament prophets. Chaim Rabin noted a "New Rhetoric" which began with Amos and Hosea and extended parallelism and other features once limited to poetry into the realm of oratory.[49] David Noel Freedman and Francis Anderson termed this an "intermediate style, partaking of both prose and verse" recognizing it as "a distinct third category--rhetorical oratory."[50] The description of eighth century prophetic speech as "orotund, ornate, hardly conventional narrative or exposition, but not lyric poetry either,"[51] might almost be a discussion of Cicero's grand style.

As the Old Testament prophets took the characteristics of Hebrew poetry into their discourse, their rhetoric became not only emotional, but vividly imagistic. These images would in their turn heighten the emotion further as clarifying metaphors were drawn from the common life:

---

[48] Heschel 1: 24.

[49] Chaim Rabin, "Discourse Analysis and the Dating of Deuteronomy," Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honour of E. I. J. Rosenthal, eds. John A. Emerton and Stefan C. Reid (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982) 176-177.

[50] Francis I. Anderson and David Noel Freedman, Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, Vol. 24 of The Anchor Bible, eds. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1980) 132.

[51] Anderson and Freedman 62.

> Ephraim is like a dove,
> silly and without sense,
> calling to Egypt, going to Assyria.
> As they go, I will spread over them my net;
> I will bring them down like birds of the air.
> (Hosea 7: 11-12b)
>
> . . . they sow the wind,
> and they shall reap the whirlwind.
> The standing grain has no heads,
> it shall yield no meal;
> if it were to yield,
> aliens would devour it.
> Israel is swallowed up;
> already they are among the nations
> as a useless vessel.
> (Hosea 8: 7-8)

At times the castigation is wistful: " Yet it was I who taught Ephraim to walk,/I took them up in my arms;/but they did not know that I healed them" (Hosea 11: 3). Sometimes a point begun with imagery is driven home with wit. The song of the vineyard in Isaiah 5, which describes Israel and Judah as a vineyard, lovingly tended by God, which has unexpectedly yielded wild grapes instead of those planted, ends with two rather pointed puns. The lines are commonly translated:

> and he looked for justice,
> but behold, bloodshed;
> for righteousness,
> but behold, a cry!

The Hebrew words for "justice" and "bloodshed" have close sound links, as do the words for "righteousness" and "a cry." We might approximate the two puns in English by translating the lines as:

> and he looked for justice,
> but behold, just vice;
> for righteousness,

but behold, rottenness.[52]

Homely images, vivid metaphors, and humor are all used to drive home the message of the prophet.

Prophetic rhetoric is emotional and imagistic. The critic of such rhetoric must assess how the images and related pathetic appeals are developed and employed.

The Kernel

To assess prophetic rhetoric we will examine the message presented as it relates to prophetic themes and values. We will further explore the authority of the prophet or the prophetic community: how authority is assumed or presented to the audience. We will finally investigate the emotional and imagistic aspects of the message. In each case we should consider how the social location of the prophet is affecting the rhetoric.

---

[52] James Limburg, The Prophets and the Powerless (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1977) 80.

CHAPTER 3

THE PHILOSOPHER GADFLY

> In contrast to ideologies, which we fashion out of words in order to justify ourselves, the way of the Cross is communicated by being lived. It is met in those who point the way with their lives. . . .
>
> -And so this unregenerate Quaker looks for sanctuary in a church, huddles among fugitives as the patrols pass, and bends to the stations of the Cross.[1]

A retired rancher with family roots in the religious fundamentalism of the Missouri Ozarks, son of a former chairman of the Wyoming House of Representatives' Judiciary Committee, might seem an unusual person to begin a nationwide movement to aid Central American refugees. A self-described Quaker "unbeliever"[2] might seem a strange choice to advise the National Council of Churches of Christ on the need for mainline churches to "act decisively to awaken public awareness of the [Central American refugee] situation's moral and religious dimensions."[3] A goatherd, horse trader, Park Service ranger[4] would seem a surprising spokeman on "The Mexican Government's

---

[1] Jim Corbett, Borders and Crossings, vol. 1 of Some Sanctuary Papers, 1981-1986, June 1986 ed. (Tucson: Tucson Refugee Support Group, 1986) 10.

[2] Dodie Gust, "Quixotic sanctuary founder focuses on human rights," Arizona Daily Star 2 May 1986: A8.

[3] Corbett 29.

[4] Gary MacEoin, Sanctuary: A Resource Guide for Understanding and Participating in the Central American Refugees' Struggle (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1985) 214.

Alignment with U. S. Violations of Refugee Rights" for a Congressional briefing.[5] Yet Jim Corbett, Harvard M.A., philosophy student,[6] brings all of these things to his role as a major spokesman of the Sanctuary movement. Corbett's public statements and writings provide basic arguments and strategies for the movement. This chapter will review a selection of those writings in light of our concern with prophetic discourse.

Three Early Letters

No one reading Corbett's statements would mistake his overall style for that of Amos or Hosea. The Corbett papers are distinctly written discourse, more apt to fall into complex arguments, rather than indulging in the oral poetic style of the early prophets, yet the Corbett letters are not without characteristics of prophetic rhetoric.

The letter of May 12, 1981 addressed to "about 500 Quakers and Quaker meetings throughout the United States"[7] opens with narrative. It is in story and narrative detail that Corbett and many other Sanctuary spokespersons will establish the imagistic emotional appeal of prophetic rhetoric. He begins:

> Imagine a moonless night and a group of about 15 fugitives who are groping their way through country that's terrifyingly alien to them. Two carry infants. Three are small children who clutch at their parents' hands and try not to cry.
>
> The blinding stare of spotlights suddenly freezes them in place. An amplified voice blares orders. Uniformed men close in.

---

[5] Corbett 57.

[6] MacEoin 214.

[7] Corbett 4.

> They will be sent back, maybe to be tortured or killed, at the very least to live under the daily threat of being assaulted or killed at the whim of any soldier. It needn't happen that way, though, if the people who live where they are captured would help them, but few of the local people seem to know it's happening. Maybe they don't want to know.
>
> -Vichy France? It did happen there, as it has happened so many places before and since, but I'm writing to you because it's happening now, here in Arizona.[8]

It may not be poetry, but Cicero would be proud. The helpless refugees, the rather mechanical governmental enforcers, and the blinkered local populace are vividly portrayed. The audience is emotionally ready for Corbett's appeal.

The first letter continues as Corbett casts himself with the blinkered populace and explains how his own eyes were opened. From the "Quaker unbeliever" we should not expect a religiously oriented call narrative, and we do not get one. Instead we read a simple story: a friend picked up an undocumented Salvadoran hitchhiker who was in turn picked up by the border patrol. That evening Corbett and friends discussed the fate of deported Salvadorans, "a whole planeload who were shot as they arrived in El Salvador, right at the airport,"[9] and the next day Corbett entered the bureaucratic world of asylum requests.

The narrative language is often weighted:

> Central American refugees who desperately need help are pouring into Arizona and other border states, but they make up only a small fraction of the flood of undocumented aliens whose needs are urgent and whose human and constitutional rights are routinely violated.[10]

---

[8] Corbett 1.

[9] Corbett 1.

The victims and the villains are clearly distinguished with the language of desperate need and routine violation, as is a feeling for the extremity of the situation. In discussing the bonding of refugees Corbett states: "Because the alternative to meeting the bond requirement may be tantamount to a death sentence, refugee bonds have, in fact, degenerated into ransom."[11] Thus with vigor and vividness Corbett asserts his perspective in a heavily weighted analogy. The resulting perspective allows no compromising response from an audience which shares his values.

Does the audience share his values? Corbett writes as a Quaker to Quakers:

> This letter is addressed primarily to Friends because their history presents them with special responsibilities. If the time does come when Quakers are once again being jailed in the U.S. for helping refugees, the implications will be clear to everyone. This is one reason the U.S. government is usually reluctant to jail Quakers for conscientious resistance and may sometimes even modify oppressive policies in order to avoid creating a confrontation, but this special consideration entails an obligation not to abandon the victims of war and oppression, even when active resistance with all its risks becomes the only alternative to passive collaboration.
>
> Right now, though, resistance would divert us from more productive courses of action.[12]

He assumes a common understanding of those "special responsibilities." He recalls the tradition of Quaker aid to "victims of war and oppression." He starts with an established audience, an audience

---

[10] Corbett 2.

[11] Corbett 2.

[12] Corbett 3.

clearly peripheral to central authority, but an audience with an accepted, established role as a counterpoint to that authority. Quakers are not fringe lunatics; they have an authoritative voice though it may not be the voice of central political society. Corbett is thus speaking to a recognized group with acknowledged authority as a member of that group. While the language is assertive and the argument lays the ground for "resistance" the immediate call is less extreme as he seeks "more productive" action within the system.

Language choice is often weighted and the ground is laid for active resistance, but the call is to work within the system and the first letter sharply criticizes the system without vilifying it. Corbett speaks from the periphery, but he does not yet explicitly employ extreme polarization. He encourages his Quaker audience "to initiate fruitful conversations with people who work for the Border Patrol and the Immigration and Naturalization Service" as these people "are not SS goons delighting in sending undocumented refugees to their fate. Most of those I've met are pleasant enough. Probably they'd be good neighbors."[13] By raising the comparison, Corbett has already implicitly made the polarizing charge.

The second letter, written July 6, 1981, while addressing a larger audience of "friends" in "the church, in the fullest ecumenical sense of the term,"[14] defines the system with more overt harshness. We are told the "INS takes extreme measures to prevent the public from learning about" the Salvadoran refugees.[15] The story is related of two Salvadoran women who were deported while seeking legal assistance. They showed the appropriate forms "to the INS officers, who just laughed at them. The officer taking them to the airport told them papers like that didn't mean a thing except when a lawyer was sitting right there with them."[16]

---

[13] Corbett 3.

[14] Corbett 4.

The characterization of the government agents is sharpened in the next paragraph. In the first letter Corbett had alluded to the Central American/Nazi Germany analogy with his references to "Vichy France" and "not SS goons." In the second letter he crystallizes one of the basic argumentative analogies of the movement: an analogy which leaves no room in the interpretation of victims and villainizing systems.

> There's . . . no question that Border Patrol, INS, and jail personnel know about the reign of terror in El Salvador - specifically, that they know some of the refugees are being deported to torture and death. "Of course I know," one young jailer told me. "How could I be with these people every day and not know? But you can't be involved or relate to them personally or you'd lose your mind. I'm not responsible for what's happening to them. I just do my job." She's quite young and doesn't realize it's been said before.[17]

The World War II Holocaust/Nuremberg trial analogy will become central to Sanctuary argument. With the use of that analogy the cast of characters is polarized. Having taken the analogy Corbett now deftly depicts his villains. INS guard actions at the El Centro detention center are termed "sadism" as they pressure Central American prisoners to

---

[15] Corbett 4.

[16] Corbett 5.

[17] Corbett 5.

> "request deportation . . . by forcing them to stay outside during the day, when temperatures often reach 120 degrees in the shade and there isn't enough shade for all, and by limiting indoor cooling to one cooler for each 180 inmates, by refusing to let them read anything but the Bible, and by repeatedly telling them that everything they say on asylum requests will be sent to the Salvadoran government and that any who do gain asylum won't be let out of jail."[18]

The Border Patrol and INS are finally characterized as "internal U.S. branches of this reign of terror," a reign "calculated to force them [the Salvadoran people] to resign themselves to established patterns of rule and exploitation."[19] The villain is depicted as a war machine run by apparently unthinking brutes.

Despite this polarization of the basic cast the call is still moderate: to work within the system. There are occasional heroes in the system like the judge at El Centro who was pushed into action when an INS officer "simply tore up a bunch of . . . G-28s [detainee legal representation forms]." He ordered all Central American refugees at El Centro from that time to be represented by the Manzo Area Council, the Tucson organization which was then engaged in legal assistance to the refugees.[20] The system is not seen as hopeless.

The broader audience of the second letter encourages another new development in the argument. Corbett addresses the church explaining how his "search for the refugees led to my discovering the church."[21] A theme with clear religious underpinnings is introduced: the "choice between the Kingdom of Love and the Kingdom of Money."[22] For Corbett the awareness of the Kingdom has come in with the refugees.

---

[18] Corbett 6.

[19] Corbett 7.

[20] Corbett 6.

> They share their joys and their hopes as well as their griefs, and one soon learns that a new religious awareness has been spreading through Latin America, a revolutionary religious consciousness taking root in basic communities that are determined to live the freedom, peace, and justice of the Kingdom into actuality. There is, indeed, a force at work that threatens to sweep away the established powers of this hemisphere, and it is far more radical than the state capitalism of Cuba or Russia.[23]

The kingdom he has seen is quite unlike the world he has known. The refugees have served as prophets bringing awareness of traditional prophetic concern that religion be more than mouthings of spiritual intentions. They have offered an alternative vision, a fresh understanding of the interrelationship of religion and the world.

The alternative is radical and active. Peace must be waged. The "battle . . . raging . . . in Arizona and the other borderlands" weekly produces "refugees who desperately need help but for whom there's just not enough time or money." These victims cannot be ignored within the renewed vision, for "If a man has enough to live on, and yet when he sees his brother in need shuts up his heart against him, how can it be said that the divine love dwells in him?"[24] The awareness of need requires an active response.

---

[21] Corbett 4.

[22] Corbett 8.

[23] Corbett 7.

Corbett quickly asserts that this is not

> a pitch for donations. The issue is much more fundamental and has to do with our sharing life - it has to do with communion . . . There's no way for us to take our stand with the refugees while retaining the privileges and immunities the war machine provides us. The choice between the Kingdom of Love and the Kingdom of Money is radical; we can't serve both. Choosing to serve the poor and the powerless - not just as an intellectual posture or as a charitable gesture, but in spirit and in truth - we will be stripped of our wealth and position. And just as the refugees are outlawed, hunted down, and imprisoned, if we do choose to serve them in spirit and truth, we will also be outlawed by the Kingdom of Money.[25]

The echoes of the prophetic tradition are obvious. In the synoptic gospels (Matthew 6:24; Luke 16:13), Christ proclaims: "No one can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will be devoted to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon." God's Kingdom of Love stands in opposition to the kingdom of earthly gain. The values are quite different, as are the actions demanded by those values. Amos raised the issue (4: 4-5; 5: 21-24) when he taunted the people with their willingness to bring sacrifices and offerings when they did not practice justice. Christ was crucified. Amos was driven away from the place of his prophecy. Corbett would make the implicit analogy completely clear: to follow the Kingdom of Love will require active commitment resulting in persecution by the followers of the Kingdom of Money. The prophetic justification for prophetic action is unmistakable.

---

[24] Corbett 8.

[25] Corbett 8.

As Corbett continues the religious argument he raises the beginning of another Sanctuary theme: service within a dedicated community.

> If we do give up our position of privilege, a place to stand with the dispossessed and serve the peaceable kingdom can only be found in a special kind of community that dedicates itself to such service. During recent weeks I've been discovering this catholic church that is a people rather than creed or rite, a living Church of many cultures that must be met to be known.[26]

The prophetic action to which Corbett calls his audience is the action of a group, of people unified in their commitment. Corbett's call opens by implying a choice: we might not choose to leave the Kingdom of Money. The call continues with language of the peaceable Kingdom, service to the dispossessed, and a vision of the living Church; such language plays on the religious values of his audience and makes the choice not to act less and less likely.

Corbett proceeds with his religious justification only after stressing his openness: "Should I become so personal in an open letter? I won't apologize. It should be shared."[27] Corbett is exposing himself. Trusting his unknown readers to understand his concerns, he all but demands a fair hearing by forestalling any attempt to dismiss the following testimony as merely the irrational, emotional perspective of one man. Corbett presents himself as feeling compelled to explain.

---

[26] Corbett 8.

[27] Corbett 8.

That testimony describes Corbett's changing understanding of the crucifixion. Involvement with the refugees transformed his perspective. It is the unbelieving Quaker coyote's account of a sort of philosophical conversion as Corbett ceases to be the "dutiful tourist . . . struck by what appeared to be a morbid obsession [on the part of the cathedral artists] with the Cross." As "a peripheral witness to the crucifixion of the Salvadoran people," Corbett comes to see the Cross "as revelatory depth meaning rather than salvationist egoism." He comes to recognize the Cross as a unifying community symbol offering "a way beyond breakdown." The meaning "one discovers only in meeting those who share it, much the way a language lives among a people rather than in a dictionary's afterthoughts. It is the kind of meaning that binds the generations and diverse cultures into one people and that is accessible to children and the unsophisticated. . . ."[28] Corbett has recognized the Cross as a way to offer meaning for community suffering. It has become a mythic symbol to unify the disparate. Corbett understands a religion of community action rather than individual experience. The Cross is offered as the symbol strengthening the refugee community he has joined.

It is perhaps worth noting that Corbett's language choice at this point is not what one would expect from an emotive, imagistic prophetic style. Phrases like "revelatory depth meaning" and "salvationist egoism" sound like the philosophical theologian simultaneously explaining and obscuring symbols.

---

[28] Corbett 8-9.

The emotion and the polarizing message shine through even when cloaked in the Latinate language. Corbett announces that "the Kingdom of Money is selling us an alternative theology of violence that must come under the shadow of the Cross to be adequately exposed." The theology is identified with the treatment of the Salvadoran refugees as mere economic refugees and with the acceptance of the "growing reign of terror in Latin America as no more than a historico-cultural curse which this hemisphere's non-Anglos inherit from their ancestors (in spite of Uncle Sam's many years of concerned tutelage in democracy). The language is weighted with phrases like "reign of terror," and the tone drips acid. The divisiveness is even more apparent as Corbett contends that "Officialdom will, of course, provide the professional adherents of the Way of the Cross with some token Salvadorans to tend..." Corbett would separate the church as active prophetic community from the church as dupe of the Kingdom of Money, i.e. the government. The rebuke is stinging. The effect is distinctly polarizing. That polarized position is crystallized in the next paragraph as Corbett defines the Salvadoran government as a "client state" of the U. S. whose "calculated violence" and "sheer sadism" "inflicted" on the Salvadoran people is granted "operational acceptance" by the United States government through a "casuistry too blatant to comment." The human rights violations are identified as acts considered "'crimes against humanity' at the Nuremberg trials."[29] Corbett has extended the favored Sanctuary analogy to the Nazi holocaust. Such language establishes two clear enemies to the cause of the Kingdom of Love. Such language leaves the prophetic community no room to compromise.

---

[29] Corbett 9.

There is a touch of irony in this specific case of polarizing language for Corbett ends the paragraph by discussing "a false polarization that leads to a false choice" within the government language and reasoning: "Identifying unacceptable violence with a particular ideology, one chooses the way of violence under cover of a contrasting ideology."[30] Corbett has employed polarization in language and characterization to counteract an existing polarization.

Drawn back to image and emotion Corbett returns the reader to specificity in the tradition of Amos 1:13 and the "ripped up women" of Gilead. Corbett reminds the reader that calling violence by its right name does nothing for the victims, "the man or woman who has seen loved ones violated, mutilated, murdered." The reader is drawn from the politically polarizing tone to the depicted reality of human suffering and human need. Policy has implications.

There are implications for the followers of either Kingdom:

> One can only hope for the strength to love that each day demands, recognizing that passive acceptance of the reign of violence is collaboration, a far more fundamental betrayal than is the failure to love well enough to transcend the violence one meets.
>
> Do we ever love enough to transcend violence, even in more peaceful places? Preaching nonviolence to the oppressed often goes with a belief that a gun in unofficial hands is much more distinctively the instrument of violence than is a bank account that quietly gathers interest as children starve. As ideology, the profession of nonviolence also serves to mask the way of violence, especially from oneself.

---

[30] Corbett 9.

> In contrast to ideologies, which we fashion out of words in order to justify ourselves, the way of the Cross is communicated by being lived. It is met in those who point the way with their lives.[31]

The community is called to act, not merely to acknowledge the problem. Passive inertia is "betrayal." The prophetic community of the Kingdom of Love is called to life, not ideology. As in the older prophetic focus of living the demands of the covenant rather than mouthing the phrases of worship, Corbett calls his community to action rather than ideology. Even nonviolent ideology is exploded as a beguiling nonoption. Holding a nonviolent stance requires active involvement, not mere passive inaction. Living the way of the Cross is the only acceptable option for his polarized, emotionally charged community of readers.

Corbett does not leave his readers thinking they may be called to violence by a Quaker. He closes by recounting the violent death of one of those Latin American martyrs who pointed "the way" with his life: Archbishop Oscar Romero. For a believing community the emotional retelling of that murder further polarizes the lifestyles associated with the Kingdoms of Love and Money. The story opens with a call for unity and nonviolence from Romero as he addresses the police and soldiers:

> Brothers, each one of you is one of us. We are the same people. The campesinos you kill are your own brothers and sisters. When you hear the words of a man telling you to kill, remember instead the words of God, Thou shalt not kill.[32]

---

[31] Corbett 9-10.

[32] Corbett 10.

This appeal is designated by Corbett as what probably evoked the attack on the Archbishop, for the "Monseñor reached out in fellowship to win them from the way of violence, and that constituted a far more radical threat than a call to armed insurrection." "Boys" from "campesino families" who had been "stripped of their humanity and fashioned into instruments of violence" are called to return to their roots in Love, leaving the violence of Money. The soldiers are called to "communion," and therein lies the threat for while dead soldiers are replaceable, disaffected soldiers who have given up fighting their brothers are a knottier problem.

> -So as Monseñor celebrated the Mass, "This is my body which will be given up for you. . . This is the cup of by blood. . .shed for you. .," they fired a bullet through his heart.
> Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani. . . Was it now we did it - made the Cross a sword, the truth of love a lie?[33]

The story has been told. A series of victims has been established: the killed, the killers, and those who suffer from the killing. Corbett has given his reader the emotional images of the poor boys who are twisted into killers, and the Archbishop who dies appropriate to his type role in the act of eucharist. The death of a religious authority figure is framed by quotations of central religious authority: the ten commandments and the last words from the cross. The three events are entwined as a triptych of apparent failures which become success: the commandments were destroyed and rewritten, Christ died and was resurrected, Romero died, but his work and message live on. "In the midst of this agony, underlying defeat, is fulfillment and renewal - neither a noble fiction nor the rhetoric of consolation, but the live reality of the Kingdom of Love."[34]

---

[33] Corbett 10.

The second Corbett letter is an appeal to the Church, to friends beyond the Friends. It polarizes the audience from a government vision of reality using story to build emotion and establish need. Two lifestyles and ideologies are depicted under labels which decisively divide Corbett's world into two clearly characterized Kingdoms which are related to the New Testament masters: God and money. Corbett calls his readers using authoritative comparison and authoritative example to a life of action in the Kingdom of Love.

The letter ends in poetry as the "unregenerate Quaker. . . huddles among fugitives. . .bends to the stations of the Cross," asking for his "share of pain" and "pauper's chains" in a place where God may be gold and "pious lies" numb the senses.

> Let it be that this, our fate,
>   reveals the working of Your grace,
> That we can bear the hurt and hate,
>   to grow love's realm, in this pain's place.[35]

The letter thus ends with an ironic jab. This is the unregenerate Quaker--praying. Here is a request for poverty in a place where power and wealth are connected. Here is the age old request that suffering will be, at some level, redemptive.

The third letter comes after Corbett traveled to the Mexican deportation areas in Chiapas and Guatemala, and after Southside Presbyterian agreed to house the incoming refugees.[36] Dated January 24, 1982, the third letter begins on Christmas Eve and ends in the figurative growing season when "[s]owing time is over."[37] The letter is rich in emotional anecdote. It is distinctive for Corbett's justification of a prophetic base for an extended Sanctuary community.

---

[34] Corbett 10.

[35] Corbett 11.

Corbett uses the emotion of his Christmas Eve opening well. He is holding a Salvadoran baby while its mother plays a "grim game of cat-and-mouse" with the Border Patrol as she crosses under cover of the Christmas crowds. The story is a counterpoint of the hopes and fears of the first Christmas with the hopes and fears of this Christmas.

> The sleeping baby projected a trusting innocence that called quietly for love and protection. For a few moments I rediscovered the hope and wonder of Christmas, revealed in the child's presence.
>
> -But Herod's slaughter of the innocents casts the shadow of the Cross on the Christmas story. I couldn't help remembering, from two weeks earlier on Mexico's Guatemalan border, the grief in Mother Elvira's eyes as she told of just such a baby boy, 9-months-old, whom Guatemalan soldiers had mutilated and slowly murdered while forcing his mother to watch. Only at the risk of wounding the mind can one learn about the methodical torture of dispossessed peoples which the U.S. is sponsoring in Latin America.
>
> The victim might have been the baby in my arms. And it might yet be.[38]

Corbett proceeds from the emotional wrenching of murdered infants to the relief of reunion of mother and child, and then to the Tucson

---

[36] Corbett 11.

[37] Corbett 28.

[38] Corbett 16.

Federal Building for another interplay of church against government for "the 45th weekly prayer vigil for social justice in El Salvador and Guatemala." He remembers the service "lifted us from realistic awareness of the 'darkness of oppression, torture, and death' up through prophetic torah to celebrative recognition of the holy night's revelatory light."[39] In the opening page and a half of a single spaced thirteen page letter, Corbett uses imagistic narrative to set an emotional foundation for the conflict of Sanctuary and government, establish a sympathetic character for the refugees, and introduce the language of prophetic justification.

For the next half page Corbett leaves anecdotal emotion and gives five "conclusions" about his Central American trip. Those conclusions are structured to lead inevitably to his conception of Sanctuary action. The first seems a backward shift, but by asserting that "economic and social opportunities are better in Mexico than in the U.S." for the refugees, Corbett is refuting the standard government argument that these people are "economic refugees." The second conclusion labels "the Church" as "the only institution" able to help the refugees in Mexico without becoming a tool of the Mexican and U.S. governments. The third affirms that the problem of the refugees will not simply disappear as "the Mexican-Guatemalan border cannot be closed" against refugees. The last two suggest the character of the action: "aid" should include a review of refugee options and should be carried out in "solidarity with the oppressed people of Central

---

[39] Corbett 16.

America" rather than as patronage. This supportive action will go against "government prohibitions," but will "build the Church" in "Anglo America." Apparently secure in his demonstration of the necessity of a sort of action, Corbett acknowledges an authority problem in his proposal: he is "a Quaker of the unprogrammed persuasion" discussing building the Church. Nodding at this status, Corbett then plays with the status semantically as he chooses not to explain, but to "pontificate." The resulting pronouncement summarizes Corbett's contention that prophetic action must be corporate: "Only a people can stand at Sinai and choose to serve the peaceable kingdom; individuals enmeshed in a warmaking society may resist war, but they are powerless, as individuals, to serve peace and justice."[40] Corbett has moved quickly from the base of emotional justification through a forced decision to act in a prescribed manner back to an imagistic characterization of the actors "at Sinai."

The next five and a half pages are narrative of the trip to the Guatemalan border, a narrative focusing on "people rather than scenery." Corbett sets a tone of danger, "writing some of the names and settings would be betrayal," but cautiously proceeds with the account since, "Lies sever community; secrecy smothers it."[41] This is a narrative report about the broader community to the community of the committed that Corbett seeks to build.

---

[40] Corbett 17.

[41] Corbett 17.

Most of the narrative recounts the conditions and characters of border life: "destitute young refugee women. . . with no alternative to prostitution," Salvadoran bodies floating by in the river, "intolerance toward down-and -out foreigners, and a priest said to be hiding a "Spanish priest and associated Guatemalan parishioners" who played the part of a "Mexican redneck"

> ". . . too busy with my regular work to have noticed anything about refugees. Maybe they're around - who knows if they're refugees or just looking for work? - but I wouldn't know unless they came here to the Church, which they don't. You know, these Central Americans don't integrate culturally. They come here with different ways. -And they're dirty. -And opportunistic, unreliable taking advantage of whatever serves their purposes. . ."[42]

The priest gives Corbett a way to caricature the attitudes of fearful U.S. border residents. The beliefs of intolerance are presented here in the context of the need of the refugees, immediately after Corbett has said he will leave his "little maroon, imprimatured Bilbao Biblia behind in Mexico with my other subversive documents" when he goes to Guatemala. The "subversive" Bible and the inwardly supportive priest mouthing the phrases of intolerance characterize those who would reject the needy refugee members in the community Corbett is building. The rejecters are rednecks who see the world in stereotypes, while across the border the people of the Bible are suppressed. The "subversive" Bible reference is an aptly planted authority reference which strengthens Corbett's view and his negative characterization of the opposition.[43]

---

[42] Corbett 18.

[43] Corbett 18-19.

Corbett goes further in his efforts to explode anticipated anti-sanctuary arguments in his narrative as he offers "a variant domino theory" suggesting that repressive militarization of the borders "to deny sanctuary to insurgents" produces "popular reaction," hence it is not the insurgents which bring the revolt, but the militarization intended to keep them out, the militarization required by "superpowers" seeking "to preserve rotten establishments militarily." The language is obviously loaded. This is not to be the account or interpretation of an unbiased observer. Corbett is writing in image, character, and weighted language to confirm the community of "friends" in his view of the situation and its demands, so he attacks the arguments they have heard from the government and he offers justification for new interpretation.[44]

Corbett interweaves matter-of-fact narrative with his obviously weighted interpretation:

> Most of the people thought it would be safe enough for me to go across to Guatemala. According to Padre Z, six people were killed on the other side of the river a couple of days ago, but they were involved in the upcoming elections.[45]

He continues by explaining that the candidates of the "civilian puppet party" are being killed off by the military to prevent a Washington supported "Salvadoran-style 'reform coup.'"[46] Having used the narrative to establish an emotional awareness of refugee need at the border and to characterize the arguments against assisting the refugees, Corbett now lets the narrative reinforce the sense of U.S. responsibility for the refugees as he presents the Mexican justification for refugee assistance.

---

[44] Corbett 18.

[45] Corbett 19.

[46] Corbett 20.

He returns to the character of Padre Z who is working with the refugees: "We had a lot to talk about. It's startling how analogous the everyday problems and processes are to those we've discovered in Tucson." Padre Z is thus identified with the work back in the U.S.: he has the same problems. The identification goes further, for he has the same justification:

> Padre Z is brimming over with Christian joy and generosity, but he's not the least bit fuzzy-minded about it. He knows, for example, that an active community is necessary to respond to the refugee situation. The Bible and the Holy Spirit speak to us unambiguously about our duty to foreigners seeking refuge, so he has no doubt about the community we're talking about...[47]

Thus Corbett returns to biblical authority and the necessity of community action. Corbett minimizes his own role. Invited "to speak to a retreat," Corbett speaks "poorly," but this is unimportant for "the gathering was prepared..." The implication seems clear: for this audience his authority source did not require an eloquent advocate. Questions of breaking government law were not issues for this group: ". . . everyone at the retreat knew what the Law is and that the Mexican government is violating it, so the question of obedience wasn't even raised..." For Corbett and his community, authority comes in a higher "Law." In Mexico that higher justification is sufficient to overcome the doubts that Corbett notes are still raised in the U.S. The audience of the letter is given a model to emulate in apparently risky Christian action. They are then assured that the action may not be quite as risky as they fear, for with only 150 people working in this Mexican area "the group can minimize individual risk while magnifying the dissuading influences that can be brought to bear on government officials." Significantly, when Corbett questions whether the government "will hesitate" to act against "the Christians for acting the way everyone thinks they ought to act" the term he employs is not "prosecute," but "persecute."[48] He uses the term for government oppression of the Church. He reinforces the concept that providing sanctuary for refugees is a necessary action by and for the Church community. By this characterization if the government interferes it will be persecuting Christian actors, rather than prosecuting lawbreakers.

---

[47] Corbett 20.

The rest of the travel narrative highlights the deadly contrasts of Guatemala:

> A few moments ago I was in the plaza, sitting and watching the evening promenade, when there was a burst of pistol fire from the police station about fifty yards away from me. Everyone scurried for cover. . .
>
> . . . The daily paper has 6 stories about 11 disappearances and 3 stories about 7 recovered corpses, all written in ways that indicate the death squads got them ("tortured-strangled-was intercepted by various unknown men"). The guerillas burned 4 buses on the Interamerican Highway last night, but didn't hurt anyone. (As the bus burns, they often hand out leaflets to the passengers.)
>
> . . . It'd be quite good cow country, if people didn't have to suffer so much for it.[49]

---

[48] Corbett 20.

In a page and a half Corbett has presented a vivid account of the conditions producing the refugees. Eye witness and news accounts together offer further justification and motivation for action.

The narrative passage closes with the disquieting reminder that there is discord over the action needed even within the religious community as "Pie-in-the-sky Protestants are clearly aligned, in the most fundamental way, with the military." For Corbett it is a battle between "religious egoism" and "communion." His preference is clear. His characterization of the Pentecostalists as unconcerned with the church as supportive community, as uninterested in issues of social justice, seems to put them outside the prophetic community Corbett is trying to build.[50]

Corbett then confronts the question of division by turning to the news of the death of Win, a friend and supporter, and to a discussion of the rhetorical and theological grounds for refugee support action. Win was a "bootstrap" capitalist, not the expected sort of Sanctuary supporter, but Corbett reminds the audience, "Consider that, among the priests of his diocese, Archbishop Romero himself was initially written off in this way." The discussion will end with an affirmation of the worth of each individual: "To write off anyone is to write off the Kingdom itself." Anyone may become a member of the Kingdom community.[51]

---

[49] Corbett 20-21.

[50] Corbett 22.

[51] Corbett 23-24.

In the middle of this worth-of-the-individual, community building sandwich comes a discussion of the type of rhetoric that the community should be using. It is not to be a consciousness raising literature which "cultivates hatred in order to motivate the oppressed to take up arms." Corbett may be prone to employ a rhetoric of polarization, yet he does not want to employ the "easy organizing tool" of "hatred." Noting that this is the tool of "political ideologists" who find "dialogical cultivation of community" too slow and unwieldy, Corbett contends that "the leading proponents of liberation theology do not abandon dialogue for ideology." It is easy for some to use "the prophetic faith's preferential option for the poor" as "a slogan excusing partisan injustice," but this Corbett says "becomes the Christian slave morality denounced by Nietzche. A thorough grounding in the prophets is the antidote." Corbett goes to Buber for support, citing The Faith of Judaism:

> . . . This very world, this very contradiction, unabridged, unmitigated, unsmoothed, unsimplified, unreduced, this world shall be - not overcome - but consummated. . . .in the kingdom. . . .It is a redemption not from evil, but of evil. . .[52]

For Corbett it seems no one should be written off as the personification of evil, for all may be redeemed. As all may become a part of the community, none should be rhetorically excluded from community. The rhetoric is to awaken awareness, but not to incite hatred. The prophetic foundation he claims is to be honored in full application, not abused by self-serving oversimplification. The philosopher gadfly has set himself a high ethical standard for one who would seek to awaken the masses.

---

[52] Corbett 23.

After a brief accounting of expenses, Corbett returns to the philosophical/theological underpinnings of sanctuary action, this time focusing on ecumenism and community: ". . . my discovery is that the church is truly Catholic, a people of peoples that incorporates not only a multiplicity of nations and cultures but also divergent beliefs, rites and perspectives." The claims of a prophetic base are reestablished as

> liberation theology is no novelty, but, rather, an affirmation that torah and the prophets are integrally Christian. . . . the war against the Church now raging with such intensity in Latin America is the same war that has always been waged aginst the community that tries to go free from Pharaonic civilization.
>
> . . . (Beneath the veneer of Orphic otherworldliness and Manichaean dualism [overlaying Christianity] is the suffering servant who opens the way toward community fulfillment of torah.)[53]

The foundation of Sanctuary action is to be a fresh understanding of the prophets and the vision of faith community. Corbett would return to the Hebraic sense of corporate involvement, the sense of community bound in faith covenant seeking to establish the just society urged by the prophets. Corbett, the community builder, used emotion and image to build the sense of corporate involvement. Now Corbett the philosopher uses theological interpretation to authorize the desired action: it seems, for Corbett, this is not a new thing, nor a theological fad. This is rather a return to origins.

---

[53] Corbett 25.

Having claimed the tradition, Corbett then offers his own distinctive interpretation of that tradition. He is seeking "a pre-Pauline reading of the Books of Moses." The resulting reading probably would not thrill the average Presbyterian: ". . .calling Mosaic revelation 'monotheism' is misleading. The prophets are anti-theological: any conceivable God is an idol. . ." If Corbett's rejection of monotheism is hard for some of his audience to accept, his call to action is within the tradition of the social gospel as he quotes the prophetic summary of Micah 6:8 and says "Our task is to become a holy people who hallow the earth."[54] Corbett wants to get past the "cultic accretions" to Torah which "clearly and repeatedly calls us to actualize divinity's human dimension - 'to walk humbly in the ways of your God' - by actively choosing lovingkindness over slavish obedience to the scriptural word or to any other cultic preconception."[55] Corbett's closing interpretive justification is radical, but the call to prophetic action which it contains as central message still stands in the scriptural authority he professes to lessen. In the last two pages of the letter the Quaker philosopher atheist adds his own distinctive stamp to the message of the developing movement. He carefully presents those closing pages as "an opening for dialogue. . .personal perspective"[56] and so attempts to forestall outraged rejection. He invites the readers to think, and the interpretation he proffers seems to demand some thoughtful response.

---

[54] Corbett 26.

[55] Corbett 27.

[56] Corbett 26.

The letter opens in emotional image and closes in startling challenge. It is a letter designed to achieve Brueggemann's aim for the modern prophet for it would awaken readers to awareness of an alternative vision of society.

October 1982 Talk in Austin

This talk, seven months after the public declaration of Sanctuary by Southside Presbyterian in Tucson via press conference and a formal letter to the U.S. Attorney General, contains a source of difficulty by Corbett's own assessment.

> John Fife disagreed with my use of the phrase "nonviolent insurrection" to distinguish the provision of sanctuary from both collaboration and revolution. (As I explained my use of the phrase, it referred to organized insubordination to government officials, but not for the purpose of seizing state power. When a government loses legitimacy because its officials violate established human rights, nonviolent insurgency is often the only course open to a community that chooses to stay within the law and preserve it.) John was right. Few who heard or read the phrase grasped its denotative meaning, but its connotations often misled both supporters and opponents.[57]

The ground for this misunderstanding is laid in Corbett's consciously polarizing opening: "We find ourselves going to extremes to awaken Americans because the crucifixion of entire peoples is not particularly newsworthy at the time it's happening. One massacre is very much like another. . ." Corbett opens with the emotional image evoking language of "crucifixion," "massacre," and two sentences later

---

[57] Corbett 38.

"martyrs." Corbett plays with the audience need for him "to personalize a few atrocities" to counter media "abstractions" saying he "can't" without succumbing to "grief" which "disables" him and would cause the audience "embarrassment." He then invites the audience to "cool, critical thinking," but his opening has played on emotion even when claiming he cannot play on emotion.[58]

He moves quickly to use that emotional base and bring the crowd to identify with his active stance: "If you decide to become actively involved - maybe I should say 'entangled' - an understanding of our experience in Southern Arizona may also save you from repeating our errors." He assumes audience commitment, "the deliberations begun today should serve to open the way for you to take your own initiatives," and thus having identified them with a "grassroots movement" in "solidarity with Central American refugees," he warns them to expect repression: "we must expect the government to try to destroy us." The audience has been characterized as part of "we" against the "they" of government. The forced choice, a polarizing dichotomy, follows: "Because the U.S. government takes the position that aiding undocumented Salvadoran and Guatemalan refugees in this country is a felony, we have no middle ground between collaboration and insurrection." The word appears as a forced choice for an audience which given Corbett's assessment of the reaction may have been ready to identify with the movement, but were not ready to see themselves as revolutionaries. Corbett closes the section with a reiteration of his old theme of the basic Gospel conflict between the Kingdom of Love and the Kingdom of Money, thus offering religious authority for his perspective. The also repeated assertion that "law-abiding protest merely trains us to live with atrocity" leads Corbett from emotional polarization to a discussion of the legal issues.[59]

---

[58] Corbett 39.

The next few pages discuss strategies for serving the refugees. The initial focus is legal. Corbett moves from the earlier devaluation of "law-abiding protest" to a statement of Section 274(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act which he says "anyone who actively helps Salvadoran and Guatemalan refugees," other than "attorneys and employers," "will not be in compliance with." If one would help, one thus seems forced to break the law. Corbett seems to reinforce the earlier forced choice between Love and Money. Instead of merely reiterating the dilemma however, he provides a way out of part of the problem by introducing a new Sanctuary justification based in legality rather than morality: the UN Refugee protocol which "is now supposed to be the 'supreme law of the land,' but the Reagan administration simply flouts it."[60]

A need-cost-benefit evaluation of the types of services which might be provided the refugees follows. By this analysis "minimal legal services are essential," "[s]ocial services often become cancerous," and "[e]vasion services are highly cost-effective." Emphasis is placed on services requiring active involvement: "social and legal services" are "important," but "as alternatives to evasion services" they "divert attention. . .from the most urgent need. . . which is to evade capture." Given that need hierarchy, devalued services are labeled "cancerous," "a dead end," and "ransom," while the effectiveness of evasion services comes from the "highly motivated volunteers." The label to be sought seems obvious, but Corbett then complicates his plea by reintroducing the "nonviolent insurgency" theme. Arguing a legality justification for Sanctuary action in direct correlation with a guerilla insurgency analogy for desired action sets up a logical contradiction for the audience which must have been disquieting and may explain the reaction Corbett observed.[61]

---

[59] Corbett 39-40.

[60] Corbett 41-42.

Despite a "religiously mixed company" Corbett returns to prophetic/religious justification terming the Bible "one of the books you will need to study" if Sanctuary action is to be understood as it offers "[a]t the very least. . .the frame of reference and the basis for dialogue." Corbett then moves to another primary authority source in this argument, "the ecumenical Church" in which "[m]embership is established by service rather than by doctrine or ritual." He offers the now familiar Sanctuary favorite, the prophetic summary in Micah 6:8, as "a full agenda." The prophets, hence the prophetic ecumenical church, mandate "active allegiance."[62]

Corbett then offers "the Church" as the necessary "institutional foundation" for Sanctuary action. While state power

---

[61] Corbett 41-42.

[62] Corbett 44-45.

"comes from the barrel of a gun," the Church "organizes from the bottom up" and "aspires to become an inclusive human community bonded together by love." Corbett seems to be linking the church to another basic American value: a sense of popular involvement, of democracy. Corbett is investing a religious base with a secular appeal just before reminding the hearers that "the struggle for justice in the Western Hemisphere is emerging as a struggle between Church and State." With "justice" one more value, here both prophetic and secular, comes into the appeal. Contrasting "the gospel of resignation and the gospel of liberation," Corbett turns to the Quaker concern "to become a holy people who hallow the earth" and "to build the peaceable kingdom." For Corbett it seems this building goes on with churches determining "to take their stand with the oppressed and, in choosing, becoming the Church." Again the focus is on prophetic action: "The choice is not a matter of words or talk but of actually helping undocumented refugees evade capture."[63]

The church becomes the best option as it "can provide declared sanctuary as well as refuge." With a reference to "Vietnam War draft resistance," Corbett notes that this combination provides a way to meet the immediate needs of the refugees and to awaken public opinion about "the policies that force them to leave their homes." Corbett sees the church as the necessary source if the message is to be heard:

> Because the Reagan administration is cultivating fears of the Brown Peril in order to create a scapegoat for the failure of

---

[63] Corbett 46.

> Reaganomics, most Americans will see the fundamental moral and religious issues posed by the refugee influx only if those to whom they customarily look for moral and religious guidance do demonstrate, in action, the right and duty to aid anyone fleeing from torture and murder. If churches and clergy fail to respond to undocumented refugees' desperate need to avoid capture, the good news of the Peaceable Kingdom will itself, once again, seem to be a lie.[64]

The polarizing language and the forced choice are unmistakable. Corbett demands an active response as he has throughout the talk. At least, in the conclusion he does avoid the language and imagery of "insurgency." That overly loaded word is abandoned as he closes with the more uplifting vision of the Peaceable Kingdom. There lies community building motivation.

"A View from the Border"

Two years later at Sanctuary meetings in LaCrosse, Wisconsin on 8 September 1984 and Dallas, Texas on 15 September, Corbett offers a "view from the border." On 25 September 1984, the first three paragraphs of that talk would become, with some modifications and extensions in the last paragraph the position statement concerning the Sanctuary movement by the Tucson Ecumenical Council Task Force on Central America. This talk thus clarifies Corbett's vision of the movement and demonstrates Corbett's influence on the public argument justifying the movement.

The opening statement quickly lays the ground for an explication of major themes:

> There is no sanctuary movement apart from the covenant people whom the Christians among us customarily call 'the

---

[64] Corbett 47.

> Church'. Churches and synagogues must decide whether they will adhere to the prophetic faith they proclaim, not whether they will become members of still another ecumenical organization. As Bishop Lona of Tehuantepac puts it with reference to Latin America's base communities, this is not a movement within the Church; rather it is the Church on the move.[65]

The actions of the movement are thus quickly and decisively associated with the Church as people, the covenant relationship, and the prophetic faith. It is identified in that closing characterization as being a central defining force in the Church, not a fringe element, but the Church as it should be jarred out of complacent inaction. In the next paragraph Corbett reiterates the decision point vividly: "Israel stands at Sinai, deciding to be Israel: having heard the cock crow, the Church is now deciding to be the Church." The decision point separates out "a people that hallows the earth" and gives up "their allegiance to wealth, privilege and domination, taking their stand with the poor and persecuted. . ." The language of hallowing puts the action in a distinctly religious context, while the allegiance shift briefly expands the social justice themes of "the prophetic faith" of the opening.[66]

Having offered a religious, covenantal definition of Sanctuary, Corbett then rejects "the interpretation that would convert the growing network of sanctuary congregations into a mass movement that is defined by its political objectives and distinguished by its religious identity." As the talk develops he clarifies this as a rejection of the efforts of the Chicago Religious Task Force to shift the movement into "mass mobilization for direct action against the U.S. government" in order "to uproot the violence [in Central America] at its source."[67] Corbett contends that such an understanding of Sanctuary would limit those who could be helped to those useful "in promoting preconceived objectives." When this happens he contends the covenant community has "abandoned" its "prophetic role." Sanctuary is to be an act of religious community not limited by political "factional restrictions."[68]

---

[65] Corbett 110.

[66] Corbett 110.

The distinctions are further delineated, still along religious lines, as Corbett, having chosen a prophetic religious stance, carefully maintains that stance. He says the distinction is not between "apolitical . . . activities" and "political" activities; the difference goes deeper to two kinds of faith: belief, focusing on "doctrines" and "primary objectives" and trust, focusing on "communion" and "a unifying presence that enlivens each moment." One becomes coldly rational and the other invitingly mystical. The faith distinction is carried into the prophetic realm as Corbett contrasts the abstract jargon of belief with the concrete action of trust:

> For faith as belief, the prophets call us to stand with the class of oppressed people, a class that can be identified only by means of a correct analysis of society; our action for peace and justice must be designed to put us in a supportive relationship to this class. (There are, of course, many sects claiming that their creed provides the analysis needed for determining correct strategies.) For faith as trust, the prophets call us to share our goods and

---

[67] Corbett 112.

[68] Corbett 110.

> risk persecution in full community with the oppressed people as meet; the Kingdom grows out of concrete personal communion rather than being constructed according to the blueprint of a social or theological vanguard.[69]

Corbett does not damn the Chicago perspective. He leaves it a place in the prophetic faith, but he does make the action potential of his own perspective seem more useful in its direct involvement with those in need, more plausible as it avoids the conflict over creed and strategies, and more ultimately fulfilling with its vision of "the Kingdom" growing "out of concrete personal communion." Corbett does not wish to throw people out of the prophetic community. He does hope to shape the way they act as community.

The rest of the talk will outline that action. He stresses the communal nature of the action: "Alone or massed into a collectivity, individuals may resist injustice, but communities can also do justice." He goes to Genesis to authorize his claim: "man and woman are made as one to be co-creators of humanity; the human community is made in the image of the unimageable source of creation." Biblical authority is thus reasserted, and the value potential of the creativity ascribed to community is introduced.[70]

Corbett contrasts the effects of the types of action on the acting communities: "the conviction that we can do no more for the persecuted than petition their persecutor deadens congregations even more than does the fear of becoming illegals." He goes further and contends that mere petitioning "serves to confirm and legitimize a government's power to persecute."[71] Prophetic trust action is thus by implication more effective for the community in terms of its own growth and in terms of its political statement.

---

[69] Corbett 111.

[70] Corbett 112.

Corbett then contrasts civil disobedience with Sanctuary action: "we should not lose sight of the fact that sanctuary for Central American refugees defends good laws that the U.S. government violates."[72] Prophetic trust action thus does not make the community actually violate the law, they merely violate the wishes of the government: legal justification is added to biblical justification.

Corbett goes further with value appeals for the audience as he rings in individual liberties. Prophetic trust action in sanctuary becomes "the only way we can maintain established liberties that are attacked by the government."[73] With the themes of legality and liberty Corbett has acknowledged the need to go beyond simple social justice and prophetic faith appeals to win the audience. He maintains the religious stance and favors the prophetic perspective, but he adds other themes to broaden and strengthen the appeal.

His summation of movement needs again presents his characterization of the movement not bound by "definitive creeds nor an executive superstructure," but built on "base communities" who provide a place where "the persecuted can speak and be heard, " although these loose knit communities need more internal cooperation and more preparation for "an intensified government attack." This is a movement of individual communities, a rather congregationalist perspective for a movement with roots in Catholicism unless the "base community" model is remembered. In either understanding the model for Sanctuary action is a faith community. The sense of Sanctuary as primarily religious rather than primarily political is maintained.[74]

---

[71] Corbett 113.

[72] Corbett 113.

[73] Corbett 113.

The talk has none of the emotive narrative passages of the early Corbett letters. The language is still weighted, but the play of image and characterization is somewhat subtler than in the earlier works. This is not rhetoric to awaken people to the need for communal action. This is a self-conscious rhetoric apparently designed to direct the shape of community action by reinforcing the understanding of the nature of the community and by emphasizing the greater efficacy of the desired type of action. The talk is self-conscious rhetoric; Corbett warns against a "rhetoric of rage."[75] His closing statements assert that rage "inspirits the struggle to break through" and the guilt which "[r]eligion adds" attempts "to break the cycle" of "violence and counterviolence" by "turning rage inward, which just opens resentments in which hatred becomes perenially rooted." These effects are counterproductive, for they may bring the movement to "a fever pitch of activity" but such movements "pass suddenly as though they had never existed, serving only to distract us from our creative tasks." Corbett is objecting to the rhetoric of polarization which he himself has used so well on earlier occasions. This is a speech of movement reconciliation, and a speech which characterizes the movement in a nonpolarized way. The stress is on finding ways to broaden the Sanctuary community: this is community action, faith community action, creative prophetic trust action, actually legal action, action which supports individual liberties. His closing appeal encourages identification with the refugees in more vivid language than that used earlier in the talk as he urges the audience to an emotional peak and refocuses attention on the religious nature of Sanctuary action.

---

[74] Corbett 114.

[75] Corbett 112.

> At times like this, having become fellow "illegals" in the refugees' nightmare underworld, our daily lives echoing with the screams of the tortured and our nation on the brink of approving still worse atrocities, we are tempted to conclude there is no alternative to the reactive counterviolence urged by the spirit of rage. But even now the Kingdom's creative power is right here among us, whenever we gather into covenant congregations that seek to hear and do torah.
> "For every thing that lives is Holy."[76]

Corbett has closed with a fervent reminder that no one should be written out of the Kingdom.

His letters and talks have been geared to build community and to characterize that community. Tone and arguments have changed with the shifting concerns of the moment and shifting nature of the audience, but the focus on religious justification through religious authority appeals, identification with religious community, and some use of religious imagery has remained consistent. The philosopher gadfly seeks to build a community both defined and distinguished as prophetic.

---

[76] Corbett 115.

CHAPTER 4

IN PROPHETIC COMMUNITY

> Sanctuary by definition requires the decision of the congregation before you can do sanctuary. As Jim is fond of saying and I keep quoting him, "Individuals can resist injustice, but only communities can do justice."[1]

In the preceding chapter we noted Jim Corbett's concern for action in and by prophetic community, so this chapter will explore the rhetoric related to one of the prophetic communities of the Sanctuary movement. The church to be studied, Southside Presbyterian in Tucson, might be said to have initiated the Sanctuary movement within the United States. The investigation of Southside community rhetoric will begin with an analysis of several sermons and interviews given by the pastor, John Fife, and a discussion of the public statement in which the church declared its status. The culmination of the chapter examines a videotape, "The Lord is Blessing Me. . ." Sanctuary: A Decision of Conscience. The tape was produced with the approval of the congregation by Lydia Breen, a woman active in the congregation. Support funds for this Southwest Reports, Inc. production were provided by the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. The video offers a community approved depiction of what the movement would consider a prophetic community as that community explains the impact of its actions. Within the tape we see the community speaking both to itself and to a larger world.

---

[1] John Fife, personal interview, October 1985.

Fife and the Church as Community

John McMillan Fife, son of a Presbyterian pastor and a Latin teacher, once described as resembling "a Pittsburgh Theological Seminary Poster Boy,"[2] might seem an unlikely candidate for the role of convicted felon, perhaps even an unlikely leader for a movement which would be considered an anti-government conspiracy. Active involvement as the pastor of a small congregation meeting "on a scraggly corner in one of Tucson's poorest and bleakest neighborhoods" lead him to both roles. Caught up in the needs of "los oprimidos de Centro America," Southside became "el santuario"[3] and Fife became an outspoken indictee because of his Sanctuary activities. The complexities of the Tucson Sanctuary trial and the related publicity made Fife seem a rather ironic embodiment of the Native American motif on his belt buckle: the man in the maze. Fife seemed caught in mazes of bureaucracy, legality, and morality. Pressures of the trial would make the congregation almost pastorless. Fife commented, "They haven't had a pastor now for a year, a year and a half. I mean, I have been preoccupied with the trial spending all but two or three days a week [on it], sometimes more than that."[4] Pastor and congregation both survived the maze test of the trial supporting each other. When a pastor was chosen to succeed Fife should he be imprisoned, the congregation included a reaffirmation of its commitment to offering sanctuary for Central Americans. Fife recounted the communal implications of that act:

---

[2] "The Door Interview: John Fife," The Wittenburg Door 91 (June-July 1986) 13.

[3] Vicki Kemper, "Convicted of the Gospel," Sojourners (July 1986) 19.

[4] Kemper 19.

> It's been delightful to see a congregation who has understood that kind of commitment and has come together as one around that decision, who has not been afraid in the face of a threat from the civil authorities, who has understood that faith is that important to them and is common to them, and who can discover that and celebrate it--and have a sense of humor about it.
>
> The spiritual joy of that congregation at worship is something that has kept me on track and grounded through all the emotional ups and downs of the trial.[5]

Pastor and congregation served together, keeping each other "on track" in their mutual commitment.

Throughout the trial and its preliminaries, Fife served as a central Sanctuary spokesman, but he rejected the view that he was acting as one of the prophet-preachers of 1960's activism.

> . . . Sanctuary is a different kind of appropriation of that tradition. What we're trying to have people understand is that there are no prophets as individuals in Sanctuary, but prophetic community. Communities of faith understanding the prophetic ministry of the church is what Sanctuary is all about, I hope. And it's very difficult in North America which is so obsessed with individualism and that whole mythology to have North Americans understand that . . . the witness of the prophetic community is what Sanctuary is all about. It's something we're trying to learn from Latin Americans and the Latin American church. . . . That's not been easy. . . especially for me and for Jim who get ordained as cofounders of the Sanctuary movement or the leaders of the Sanctuary movement or something like that.[6]

---

[5] Kemper 19.

[6] Fife, interview.

For the highly visible pastor of a visible Sanctuary church, the words and acts related to Sanctuary were communal acts: Fife as a part of Southside as a part of "the Church on the move."[7] The act and the message were to come from the community.

Fife was careful to recount how the decision for Sanctuary was originally made by the community. "For our congregation, that encounter with Central American refugees began in 1980 when a 'coyote' (a well-paid smuggler) abandoned 25 Salvadorans in the desert west of Tucson in the middle of the summer." When the crisis arrived at the door of the church community, "[w]e first learned from those survivors about the suffering of the people of El Salvador. . . . We also learned quickly about the reality of U.S. immigration policy."[8] The story was told as the education of one community by the fleeing members of another community. The learning community responded: "the only thing we could think to do was what I assume people of faith have always thought of first, and that is, "Let's pray." We said we'd start a prayer vigil. . ."[9] From an ecumenical prayer vigil grew a legal defense effort and other strategies which were "legal and acceptable to the civil authorities."[10] Then Jim Corbett asked Fife if Southside would house undocumented Salvadorans.

---

[7] John Fife, "The Sanctuary Movement: Where Have We Been? - Where Are We Going?," distributed statement (March 1985) 5, citing Bishop Lona's description of Central American base communities.

[8] Fife, "Sanctuary" 1-2.

[9] "Conspiracy of Compassion: Four Indicted Leaders Discuss the Sanctuary Movement," Sojourners (March 1985) 16.

[10] Fife, "Sanctuary" 2.

> I said, "Gee, Jim, I don't make the decisions around here, the elders of my church do. You'll have to ask them."[11]

Corbett's statement to the church Session was characteristically direct: forthright, unambiguous, with distinct depictions of the possibilities. Corbett would leave the community no options if they were to be part of a community of the faithful.

> Because the U.S. government takes the position that aiding undocumented Salvadoran and Guatemalan refugees in this country is a felony, we have no middle ground between collaboration and resistance. A maze of strategic deadends can be averted if we face the imperative nature of this choice without attempting to delude ourselves or others. For those of us who would be faithful in our allegiance to the Kingdom of God, there is also no way to avoid recognizing that in this case collaboration with the government is a betrayal of our faith, even if it is a passive or even loudly protesting collaboration that merely shuts out the undocumented refugee who is at our door. We can take our stand with the Kingdom of God or we can serve the kingdoms of this world - but we cannot do both. Maybe, as the Gospel suggests, this choice is perrenial [sic] and basic, but the presence of undocumented refugees here among us makes the definitive nature of our choice particularly clear and concrete. When the government itself sponsors the crucifixion of entire peoples and then makes it a felony to shelter those seeking refuge, law-abiding protest merely trains us to live with atrocity.[12]

Corbett's polarizing language of no compromise characterized the actors and actions in such a way that it would be difficult, if not impossible for the Session to decide against his perspective. To stand with Corbett was to be faithful to the Kingdom of God, while to stand against him was to be a quiet, accepting bystander at the crucifixion. Southside had started their action as a people of faith;

---

[11] "Conspiracy" 17.

[12] Fife, "Sanctuary" 3, citing Corbett.

Corbett defined what was essential if they were to continue acting as a people of faith. Corbett defined what was essential for prophetic community. The response was predictable.

> After four hours of prayer and reflection and search, the Session voted (with two abstentions) to extend the hospitality of Southside Church to refugees from Central America. We concluded with the reading of Matthew 25. We had already concluded that Christ was on our doorstep in the person of a refugee, and we could not turn away Jesus Christ, even if it meant some risk.[13]

Matthew 25 sealed their understanding of the character of the action. Corbett had directed them to the gospel, and here the gospel has people confronted at judgment with a judge who had earlier appeared as a stranger in need of clothing, shelter, and welcoming care. For the Session and the church community to be true to the gospel as it appeared in their context, they had to care for the refugee. The gospel offered more than a justification. It presented a mandate. The group was constrained by the commitment of the previous faith action and the norms of their belief. When the question of declaring public sanctuary was raised with the whole congregation in January 1982 after two months of "Bible study, prayer, discussion, and agonizing," the "vote by secret ballot so nobody felt intimidated by anybody else"[14] may have been irrelevant. The congregation had been acting their commitment. Their actions had been characterized for them in a way that necessitated continued Sanctuary action. The decision was communal, but for the community to decide against action would have been to declare themselves less than a community of faith. They had determined to act as prophetic community.

---

[13] Fife, "Sanctuary" 3.

[14] "Conspiracy" 17.

The action is carefully characterized as prophetic rather than political. Fife addressed the question of Sanctuary motivation directly, carefully distinguishing the differences which could provide unified action in a diverse congregation. (The small congregation with 147 members included "blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans, and whites, along with a former Catholic nun, a retired Baptist preacher, single mothers, laborers, families, and professionals."[15]) Fife's explanation recalled the martyr of Central America:

> When Archbishop Romero made the statement which got him killed--that soldiers should obey God and refuse to kill their campesino brothers and sisters--he was not making a political statement. Oh sure, the oligarchs and military understood it as a radical political statement (Communisto, they said) and killed him for clear political reasons. Oh sure, Oscar Romero was not a stupid man and he understood the political implications of that statement. But I believe that Oscar Arnulfo Romero made that statement as a prophetic declaration of faith--as the Archbishop of the people who looked to him for some clear word of prophetic faith. Only those who had lost their faith heard those words as "political." The Sanctuary Movement has been, I believe, struggling to stand in that prophetic tradition here in North America. We must always cry out with the prophets against specific policies of death and terror. But we must do so as prophets, not politicians. The politicians will always hear our words as political, but that is their problem because they have lost their faith. As I use the words "prophetic" and "political," they are not dichotomies. But neither are they synonymous. My congregation did not vote to declare public sanctuary because they determined after careful study that it was an effective political tactic to oppose the Reagan administration's policy. They declared sanctuary because they determined after Bible study, prayer, and agonizing reflections that they could not remain faithful to the God of

---

[15] Kemper 19.

> the Exodus and prophets and do anything less. It was a question of faith.[16]

The authority for the justifying characterization seems to have been chosen carefully. Fife began with the martyred Archbishop, the hero of Central American faith, a pertinent choice for those involved in the movement, and ended with "the God of the Exodus and the prophets." By implication he had recalled the God of liberation and social justice. These themes of liberation and social justice could be disputed, misunderstood, and so Fife acknowledged. We are told the congregation acted as Romero spoke, with a prophetic religious base, but the actions and words had political implications and hence were subject to misunderstanding. Fife did not deny the political consequences; instead he offered a nonpolitical motivation: faith. The congregation acted not as a political unit, but as a prophetic community of faith.

Professing Prophetic Action

On March 23, 1982, John Fife, as the pastor of southside, sent a letter to William French Smith, then the Attorney General of the United States. The letter declared Southside to be "a sanctuary for undocumented refugees from Central America." The first paragraph announced Southside's intent to "violate" the Immigration and Nationality Act, hence assuming the appearance of illegality, by taking a "refugee into the care and protection of the church." The second paragraph presented the countercontention of Southside that it was U.S. government policy concerning those refugees which was "illegal," a "violation of the 1980 Refugee Act and international law." A further contrast was established when government action was designated immoral as refugees were "forcibly" returned to "terror, persecution, and murder."[17] Lines of distinction were drawn. The legality/morality conflict was established.

---

[16] Fife, "Sanctuary" 5.

The rest of the letter explained the deeper motive and the church's justifying authority.

> We believe that justice and mercy require that people of conscience actively assert our God-given right to aid anyone fleeing from persecution and murder. The current administration of United States law prohibits us from sheltering these refugees from Central America. Therefore, we believe that administration of the law is immoral as well as illegal.
>
> We beg of you, in the name of God, to do justice and love mercy in the administration of your office. We ask that "extended voluntary departure" be granted to refugees from Central America and that current deportation proceedings against these victims be stopped.
>
> Until such time, we will not cease to extend the sanctuary of the church to undocumented people from Central America. Obedience to God requires this of us all.[18]

The source of claimed authority is unmistakable as the right to act is "God-given," the call to action is "in the name of God," and the closing statement of necessity is based on "[o]bedience to God." Social government is addressed by God's messengers at a dual level. The policy is illegal--political perspective. The policy is immoral--religious-ethical perspective. Dual justification would seek to overcome the blindness of a political audience to a prophetic motivation, the problem which Fife discussed above. The core of the letter's charge, however, is unequivocably prophetic. The call to social justice is a paraphrase of the prophetic summary of Micah 6:8: "to do justice and love mercy." Prophetic community had taken the source and language of prophetic authority to call a secular government to act in a prophetically approved manner. The public announcement of action was designed to establish the movement as part of an active religious tradition, rather than a function of political extremism.

---

[17] Corbett 36.

[18] Corbett 36.

Preaching to Prophetic Community

When asked in October of 1985 why the movement's public rhetoric seemed to focus less and less on religious argument, Fife responded that "dealing with the religious question now is preaching to the choir. We've won that point." The religious question did not disappear from Sanctuary discourse; indeed, in preaching to "the choir" of the Southside community, prophetic themes and movement-related textual interpretations emerged repeatedly. Preaching might not be considered the way to "communicate the faith" to the larger populace "anymore;" television and newspapers served that function for the movement, but preaching was still essential for the congregational community.[19]

Fife took his function as preacher seriously, seeking to balance the roles of prophet, priest, and preacher:

---

[19] Fife, interview.

> That's one of the reasons I use the lectionary. . . . it's good discipline and it requires that you don't just get stuck in one of those roles. . . . My problem with too much of contemporary preaching is that it sounds like the self-help idiom of books and materials of the 70s -- how to become a better person. And that's not the function of preaching and has very little to do with the gospel.[20]

For Fife, the discipline of preaching began with a text which was explored through careful exegetical work and then examined in light of the "struggle with life as it's given to you in the world around you." Fife's "problem" in preaching came in his view of life. Being "so preoccupied with Sanctuary and refugees in my life and also fascinated with what I believe is a reformation going on in Latin America in the church," Fife said his "view of the world is very narrow." Even accepting the discipline of biblical texts prescribed by the church lectionary and the further discipline of exegesis, Fife's sermons reflected his view of his situation. In the situational context of Sanctuary that meant his sermons rather consistently proclaimed the social justice themes of the prophets which motivated Sanctuary action.[21]

On June 23, 1985, during the period of the pre-trial hearings, the lectionary lessons included Mark 4:35-41 concerning the disciples' fear and the calming of the storm and II Corinthians 5:18-6:2 relating the status of believers as "ambassadors for Christ" in the "reconciliation" of Christ and the world. Fife's youth sermon centered on Mark, asking the congregation not to be afraid.

---

[20] Fife, interview.

[21] Fife, interview.

Acknowledging the nervousness that government infiltrators had brought to the congregation, he called the congregation not to fear strangers in their midst even as the disciples were urged not to fear the storm. In the main sermon, Fife moved on to Job, reminding the congregation that despite all the attention they were receiving they were not special. Individually, they were insignificant pimples in creation. He closed with II Corinthians reaffirming the role and worth of the congregation: as a community they were called as ambassadors. The sermon met the demands of the lectionary and sought to answer the needs of a congregation caught in public controversy. Fife carefully structured a call to restored, secure community.[22]

The sermon clarifies one of the roles Fife felt he must adopt as he ministered to the congregation he would call the "Trojan horse" of Sanctuary. Other congregations carried on much of the Sanctuary work, while Southside drew the media attention. The media attention brought special stresses.

> I think the first danger is that the congregation begins to feel like they're important, that they're in the public eye, and therefore that they've done this very significant thing and begin to think of themselves more highly than they ought to think.. That's of course the greatest danger. And theologically I have some responsibility to them as the pastor to keep reminding them. You know it's kind of like the guy who used to ride around with the Roman general who was conducting at the victory parade whispering in his ear the whole time, "Remember you're mortal. . ." It's kind of that function that I have in relationship to that congregation to say to them over and over again whenever I feel it's necessary and from time to time I do think it's important to say to them. Yes, Sanctuary has been an appropriate theological witness on the part of this congregation, but

---

[22] John Fife, "Who Do You Think You Are?," sermon, author's personal notes, Southside Presbyterian, Tucson, 23 June 1985.

> that does not mean that you're better than any other congregation in town or that what that one thing you've done gives you some significance that ought to inflate your egos or make you think that you're more faithful than other people who are not as involved. . . .[23]

On 8 September 1985 with lessons from James and Mark the sermon dealt with the "pure religion" of James 1: "to visit orphans and widows in their affliction, and to keep oneself unstained from the world." The focus was serving action, Sanctuary style action. Two weeks later, after a fundraiser Sanctuary rock concert and appearances by Mike Farrell and Patricia Darien, the sermon was quite different. The lesson from Job 28 dealt with the source of wisdom. James 3 distinguished the earthly wisdom which might show jealousy from the heavenly wisdom which brought "good fruits" without "insincerity." The gospel lesson, Mark 9:30-37, had the disciples called to servanthood as they questioned "who was the greatest." Fife took the lessons and spoke in the role of the Roman whisperer as he warned the congregation against being swept away by the "big deal" the media were making about Sanctuary. The big deal brought a "big problem" to the congregation as they were faced with the temptation of fame, with questions of greatness. They were called as a "people of faith" to remain true to that faith.[24] Fife later remarked on the need for the sermon:

> I just thought it was an appropriate time to say look, it is very important for you to understand that. . .there is a

---

[23] Fife, interview.

[24] Fife, sermons, 8 September 1985 and 22 September 1985, Southside Presbyterian, Tucson, author's personal notes; Fife, interview.

> danger in all this. It's not only a danger to ourselves as a congregation and in terms of thinking more highly of ourselves than we ought to, but there's also the danger that we become enamored with this attention and therefore do what we're doing in order to get attention.[25]

The roles of prophet and pastor varied as he met the demands of the lectionary and the needs of the congregation. To keep the church community as a healthy prophetic community, the preacher felt he could not proclaim prophetic words of social justice all the time, and he did not.

Months later, 2 March 1986, the trial was nearing an end and the sermon bore an unlikely title, "Barefoot and Pregnant." The pastor admonished the congregation as they prepared for the sacraments of baptism and communion. They were to stand barefoot with Moses in the presence of God (Exodus 3:1-15) and unlike the fig tree of the parable which required a second chance (Luke 13:1-9) they were to bear the fruit of their faith. Worship and act. Stand in humility before the source of their authority and act on that authority.[26]

In the weeks surrounding the trial sentencing the sermons included prophetic critique. On 29 June 1986, two days before the sentencing the youth sermon was entitled "Sentences" and went outside the lectionary to the sentencing of Peter and John in Acts 4. Not surprisingly, the analogy was drawn between the sentencing of Peter and John for healing on the temple square and the conviction of the

---

[25] Fife, interview.

[26] Fife, "Barefoot and Pregnant," sermon, 2 March 1986, Southside Presbyterian, Tucson, author's personal notes.

Sanctuary workers: both involved conviction for "a good work." Fife affirmed that going to jail would not be a problem. It would be a place to serve. Like the apostles, however, he saw being silent about his activities and the motivation for those activities as an impossibility posing a problem for the government: "Y'all have the problem because all the people know we haven't done anything wrong. . . . Sometimes we're not permitted by God to be quiet." The main sermon, "Putting Your Hand to the Plow," acknowledged the difficulty of the situation. The lessons dealt with the call of Elisha the prophet (I Kings 19:15-21), the freedom of Christ and the fruits of the Spirit (Galatians 5:1, 13-25), and the response of Christ to difficulty and rejection as he proceeded to Jerusalem (Luke 9: 51-62). The sermon began by recalling the congregational decision four years earlier as they "agonized" over what they were "called to do as a matter of faith and freedom." They were reminded of their authority: they were called like Elisha. Then Fife introduced the theme of responsibility, the demands of acting in freedom. He recalled Michael Novak's rejection of lies which "poison the due process of human rights" as Fife characterized the trial. With Jim Wallis he called the congregation to "resist lawless authority." They were to uphold the best of our traditions, uphold the liberty to which they were called. So close to July 4, the freedom of the faith and the liberty of the country would merge in the tradition as the demands of the former were applied to the possiblities of the later. Fife used Wallis to make the link: "Hope is the conscious decision to see the world in a different way. . . .The present reality will not have the last word. . . .God will have the last word." The image of evoking a new perception of the world based in a faith perception recalls Brueggemann's concept of the role of the prophet discussed above. The community is charged to respond to trial with hope, with a continuance of the prophetic vision. Fife then went to the central story of the sermon: learning to plow. Elisha had been called from plowing. The gospel pericope ended with Jesus warning against putting your hand to the plow and then looking back. When Fife was a child his father tried to teach him to "plow a straight furrow. . . it wasn't easy hanging on to a bucking plow." In the time of trial the disciples looked for the easy way out. Fife warned the congregation that in their time of trial they must hang on to the bucking plow. It would not be easy, but it was essential: the freedom of the faith brought responsibilities which must not be avoided. In two sermons Fife had variously prepared the community for the traumas of the week. They were reminded of their tradition of service, their models of service, and the responsibilities of faith. The prophetic stance was reaffirmed and pastoral strengthening was provided.[27]

One week later, sentencing past and the July 4 weekend in full swing, the sermon focused on the lesson from I Kings 21: Ahab and Naboth's vineyard. The preacher as prophet called American values to accounting as Ahab represented the neverending quest for accumulation and Naboth acknowledged that somethings, values, rights, and ideals cannot be sold or traded away if the people are to survive. Naboth acknowledged God-given rights, while Ahab considered nothing sacred in it interfered with self interest. Fife reminded the congregation that this clash was the discussion they had been having as a congregation for five years. As the U.S. remembered her tradition of rights with pageant and spectacle, Sanctuary continued the struggle to clarify what those rights were. Human rights could not be a cheap or expendable commodity. The rights the community witnessed to and struggled to protect were God-given, and the community must remain faithful to the struggle. The social justice themes of prophetic community were reaffirmed. The role of this particular community in securing those prophetic values was reconfirmed. The demands of the lesson and the context of national celebration came together as the prophetic community was reminded that the contestation of values had not ended with the trial. The period of prophetic action was not over.[28]

---

[27] Fife, "Sentences" and "Putting Your Hand to the Plow," sermons, author's personal notes, Southside Presbyterian, Tucson, 29 June 1986.

In a few brief sermons over the period of the year of the trial the roles of prophet and pastor are varied as Fife met the demands of the lectionary and the needs of the congregation. Community was maintained as Fife spoke as pastor to the immediate condition of the congregation. Prophetic status of the community survived as prophetic social evaluation continued.

"The Lord is Blessing Me. . ."

---

[28] John Fife, sermon, author's personal notes, Southside Presbyterian, Tucson, 6 July 1986.

The video production, "The Lord is Blessing Me. . .", is a carefully crafted image of prophetic community engaging in prophetic action for prophetic reasons. It is not a presentation of the legal arguments for or against Sanctuary. It is in no way an unbiased, or even two-sided presentation. The video presents a Sanctuary church as it engages in a life which centers on Sanctuary. The source of authority is religious. The advertising flyer describes it as "a look at a moral and spiritual response to a pressing human need. It is a story of one community's faith, love and decision of conscience."

The video indeed is a story, or series of stories within stories. The overall story, to paraphrase the tape script, is that of "a small church, formerly a Papago Indian mission in Tucson, Arizona" which "became the first to publicly declare itself a Sanctuary for Central American refugees." That story is held together with three progressing and recurring scenes: the sermon, the eucharist, and the singing of "The Lord is Blessing Me." These images of the congregation in worship: listening together, singing together, and literally communing create the picture of community for the viewer. The opening narration affirms this as we watch a communion service and hear of "a community bound by faith, love, and a decision of conscience."[29] Within the larger story we hear the smaller stories of refugees and people assisting refugees. These stories are always woven together with images of communion: the core of the larger story. The video would seem to depict the creation of a prophetic community.

---

[29] "The Lord Is Blessing Me. . ."Sanctuary: A Decision of Conscience, videotape, prod. Southwest Reports, Inc., 1985 (23:38 min.).

The telling of this story is significant, for it comes in the months after the congregation learned the church had been the subject of an undercover investigation. Fife explained:

> Meetings and worship services here at the church have been infiltrated by government agents--which the government has acknowledged; church members have had their (car) licenses recorded; the church phone is tapped, the office is bugged, which is a factor when you're doing (personal) counseling.[30]

The videotape shows the community as community in spite of the difficulties. The title affirms their response: they are being blessed.

This blessing is supported in an early scene in the tape by the testimony of Susan Parrott, one of the church elders. As Parrott is shown playing with refugee children, we hear her in voice over explaining that she had seen this as "an opportunity to help people, " but she found, "I've gotten back more than I've given." In working with the refugees, "I've grown in faith. . .in knowledge of different cultures. Their courage, faith. . .has rubbed off on me a little bit."[31] The "opportunity" had become for her a personal blessing, increasing her own faith. For the Southside faith community, the work with the refugees, now labelled "pilgrims," thus clarifying their status as members of the the larger faith community, brought rewards which should be desired by community members, particularly an increased amount of the "faith" essential to their community.

---

[30] Dodie Gust, "Fife's work in sanctuary movement was a matter of faith," Arizona Daily Star 5 May 1986: B1.

[31] "The Lord is Blessing Me. . .".

For those outside the prophetic faith community there can be an element of ambiguity about the nature of the overall message. One of the opening scenes, under the singing of the title song, shows a Sanctuary demonstration in progress. The posters read "What is a church if it is not a sanctuary?," "Sanctuary for refugees," "Truth will set you free again. Reagan lies," "Compassion for war refugees," "Jesús nos libra," "Stop the bombing in El Salvador," and "From fences to friendship." The elements of social justice, prophetic loving-kindness, and religious authority are there, but so are elements which may seem merely political. Only the larger context offers clarification of a motive not rooted in secular politics.

That larger context is unambiguous. The central message is crystalline, though it may not be compelling argument for those outside the community. (Some of my undergraduate students at Willamette, otherwise unacquainted with the movement, objected to the videotape as too biased and too overtly religious in tone. They sought political argument and saw religious images.) Political argument is minimized. Political statements come within the assumed authority contexts of the sermon and the demonstration posters. Politics comes with a religious and communal coloring. For this group the political message is secondary. It is simply and necessarily an outgrowth of the primary message of the production: this is a community bound in and by a faith action.

The community is seen literally and symbolically in the recurring images of the eucharist. Five times within this brief program we are returned to scenes of the church in communion: at the opening, prior to the scene of the Sanctuary demonstration; later after scenes of the congregation working with refugee children and a thrift shop for refugees; again after scenes of refugees in a safe house; yet again in the midst of recounting the wait for one refugee family's arrival; and finally in the closing shots of the church community. The sacramental celebration of community is carefully and thoroughly intertwined with scenes of the community in action, scenes of the community acting out the faith they celebrate in the eucharist. The visible depiction of the prophetic message of the need for a faith which has action as well as ritual is carefully established. The ritual provides a persistent reminder that this a religious action carried out by a religious community for religious reasons. The related audio reinforces the sense of community. As the camera depicts the diversity of the congregation, Fife reminds them that this sacrament is not only "personal." Fife proclaims that "we cannot be faithful alone" for we are "compelled into a community of faith."[32]

We have been seeing a young man participating in the communion service. Now the story shifts as we leave the eucharist and we learn the name and story of that young man. He is a student, Fernando, and his family, fragmented by persecution, is fleeing Central America. Fernando is seen alone, waiting, but we are told he is not alone.

---

[32] "The Lord is Blessing Me. . .".

Sanctuary workers are transporting his remaining family to Tucson. The tension increases as a Border Patrol station is pictured and we are told of fears that the patrol may have had prior warning of this crossing. Sanctuary workers had very recently been indicted and the extent of government agency knowledge of Sanctuary actions is unknown. The community just established for the viewer in the eucharist, carefully established to include the refugee student, is being threatened. The communion scene is reintroduced to the story and we hear the words of the Agnus Dei: "Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us; Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world, grant us thy peace."[33] The emotion of the refugee flight and reunion is heightened, and the need of the refugees for mercy and peace are underscored, while the characterization of those outside the community who would deny them these things is implied. The image of the greater community of faith is clear.

The church is seen acting as community. Such actions come in three types. The group acts together in worship: sharing communion (as discussed above), singing, and listening to the sermon. Scenes of each of these communal acts recur throughout the program. The group also acts together to support the immediate group and to support the larger group of the refugees. The former is shown with scenes of church potluck dinners, building repair sessions, Sunday School craft activities, and the festivities of Christmas decorating. The latter includes office work, thrift shop work, visitation of refugees in their safe houses, and, on two occasions, transportion of refugees to safety in the U.S. The safe houses are shown crowded with people, and simply furnished. The activities within--children playing on the floor while adults talk on the sofa, a mother bottle-feeding a baby--are familiar. On a shelf there is a crucifix standing with a palm branch, flowers, a radio, a ceramic box, and medicine bottles. All of the actions and images are woven together with a tone of normalcy. Normal churches have potlucks, repair buildings, sing, make things with their children, and visit people in their homes. The middle-of-the-road normality of most of the activities serves to strengthen the image of the community, including the refugees, as a mainstream faith group acting on their faith, rather than a radical fringe element trying to subvert the government. The implied argument of the images establishes a character which may make the more radical tone of the sermon easier for the non-community member to accept.

---

[33] "The Lord is Blessing Me. . .".

Elements of Fife's sermon are presented in three parts. The first emerges from the demonstration scene. As a counter to political mix which might be perceived in the posters, this first sermon segment is a careful statement of the epistle lesson of the day, thus focusing on generally recognized scriptural authority:

> John wrote to the early church, "In love there can be no fear, but fear is driven out by perfect love, because to fear is to expect punishment and anyone who is afraid is still imperfect in love. We are to love then because God loved us first. So this is the commandment that he has given us, that anyone who loves God must also love the brothers and sisters."[34]

---

[34] "The Lord is Blessing Me. . .".

The scripture lesson has reasserted the image of the Southside community as standing within the general faith tradition by demonstrating that this is a group centered in scriptural authority; this is not a radical fringe. The lesson has simultaneously offered a justification for Sanctuary action from a recognized authority in the closing commandment to "love the brothers and sisters."

When the sermon returns the message will be an interpretation of the gospel with clear political implications. The ground is carefully prepared for a more radical tone as members of the community have described the way their community expanded. A woman working the the House of Neighborly Service Thrift Shop said that "John, our minister, made us aware of something besides our own little group." The message is reaffirmed by a community member that "Christ would have us. . .looking after the brothers and sisters in need." The second communion scene, the breaking of the bread, is interjected to reestablish this comunity and then we go with Rene Franco, the outreach assistance coordinator, to visit a refugee safe house. Tension has been raised as the refugees are threatened with eviction, but the refugees are proclaiming their role as an essential part of the prophetic community, not merely the recipients of a merciful prophetic action:

> Before we the refugees came it was as if the church in North America was sleeping, and now the refugees have come to awaken the church. . . . The Bible says love your brother, take care of your brother. We the refugees are now showing the American church that there are oppressed people in Guatemala and El Salvador and if the churches really follow the biblical commandments they must take care of the refugees. They have to protect the refugees since the United States administration avoids recognizing us as coming from oppressed countries. We are not economic, but political,

> refugees because we are fleeing from countries that are in the throes of civil war.[35]

The refugees have depicted themselves as prophets who have spoken to, indeed "awakened", the prophetic community. They have reiterated the biblical justification for prophetic action and they have carefully characterized the action as prophetic, rather than political.

After the third communion scene and the story of the flight of Fernando's family the sermon returns between accounts of refugee flight. We have been told of persecution at both ends of the trip: deaths in Central America causing the flight, and immigration helicopters at the crossing trying to prevent safe refuge. Now in the midst of this emotional testimony, after a refugee charge, and with a grounding of biblical authority, we are brought to a more radical point in the sermon as Fife explicates Matthew 7:7-12:

> Ask and it will be given you. Search and you will find. . . . Is there anyone among you who would hand his child a stone when he asked for bread, or who would hand him a snake when he asked for fish? Yes, there is. There are those among us who heard the cry of the people of Central America for bread so that their children would not die--half of them before the age of five--so that they could grow up strong and intelligent in the service of their God. The cry of the poor and the oppressed, those who had known nothing but military dictatorship and servitude and bondage and hunger and, and who watch death in their midst and among their children for generations and cried out for bread and freedom and they got a stone and a snake--the stone of continued oppression and military rule and the snake of Cobra gunships. And now that war has come home to North America. The thing that satisfies me most after this week is that government agents complete with wiretaps and tapes and bugs and wires and all that other kind of silly stuff were with us for eight months and what they found out is we had been telling the truth for three years--no more, no less. That's all. It is now clear that we from the very beginning spoke nothing more or less than

---

[35] "The Lord is Blessing Me. . .".

> the truth about who we were and what we were doing and why we were doing it and who the people were we were trying to extend the sanctuary of the church to.[36]

The government critique has clear political implications. The characterization of government actors as those who give evil gifts to the needy and employ "silly" technology to investigate truthtellers is a distinctly new image of U.S. government reality for those outside the prophetic community. The original context of the sermon directs the message with its radical image to the community and affirms their commitment to their task as they are characterized by implied contrast as the givers of good gifts who suffer the persecution of infiltration for telling the truth. The sermon supports the community. In presenting this radical image to the larger world outside the Southside prophetic community, the community enters the prophetic function of jarring society into a new perception of reality. Testimony, scriptural authority, and now emotional imagery have been offered to support this new vision. Acceptance of the imagery is dependent on acceptance of the testimony and the authority. The imagery crystallizes the characterization. The contextually offered testimony and authority seem necessary for hope of a broader acceptance of the vision, so even that broader acceptance would probably be limited to other faith communities. The primary authority source is religious. The refugee testimony might be ignored by those who had already rejected the religious basis of the central arguments. The sermon thus "preaches to the choir." That choir might include the

---

[36] "The Lord is Blessing Me. . .".

Southside prophetic community and potentially others of a similar, though not yet prophetically radicalized faith community.

To further commitment and encourage acceptance by those outside the community, this sermon extract is followed by two more refugee testimonies. First is the story, told with explanatory narration and black and white still shots, of Juana Alvarez who fled her home after her husband was kidnapped and presumed murdered "for union activities." After she was chased she fled to Mexico where she was raped for three days by the authorities and deported. She fled again, this time contacting Jim Corbett and entering the U.S. with Sanctuary assistance. She encountered further government persecution here as the Southside congregant who had housed her tells of the arrival of government agents to take Juana from her safe house and require her to testify against the indicted Sanctuary workers. The congregant is baking a cake while she talks: normal activity to offset the abnormal oppression, calm, homey action to counter the tendency to see Sanctuary as a radical fringe action which should expect a U.S. government response. The U.S. government action in the narrative clearly cannot be classed with the earlier persecutions, but the link is made. The testimony has served an emotional and authoritative function.

The next testimony, a brief statement by Tere, recalls the religious focus of the action:

> From my point of view my family and I are safe and sound, and I think, "Thank God.". . .Thank God that we are able to arrive here with God's help. . . .makes one see more clearly what God does for one, what God can do for all of us."[37]

The central religious authority for Sanctuary action is reasserted. For the prophetic community this is God's action. This is for them a governmentally forced choice between God's community and governmental will.

The closing sermon excerpt, followed only by scenes of the congregation and the church building under the credits, hammers home the choice.

> Where do we go from here? Now the book of Acts is very clear. We simply make clear what we have tried to say from the very beginning, what the beginning of the gospel reading in the book of Matthew said, what John and Peter said before the ruling families of their time when they were hauled into court. There is a fundamental choice to be made in each of our lives. We can either obey God with all our heart and our mind and our soul or we can bow down to some other idol. And those choices are always there. At critical times in our lives we have to decide and speak the truth--that we have chosen to obey God over all other gods. For you cannot love both God and money. Sometimes you cannot love both God and the civil authority. Sometimes you have to make a choice. I guess that's the last word. We need to give glory to God always in our lives. And if the people do that, and if they stay faithful, and they stay together, and they forgive as they have been forgiven, then I think the future will take care of itself. And the ruling families and the civil authorities will not know what to do with the people of God if they remain faithful and simply give glory to God. Amen.[38]

The lines are drawn clearly and unmistakably between the prophetic community and government. Sanctuary was an action of the "we" of prophetic community. In that action and in their continuation, the sermon justification tells them they stand with Christ and the apostles. They could ask for no higher authority, and that authority

---

[37] "The Lord is Blessing Me. . .".

[38] "The Lord is Blessing Me. . .".

offers a clear model. The apostles acted on faith ignoring their rulers. The sermon affirms that the modern prophetic community should do no less. By ending with this charge the videotape drives home the call to faith action to the viewing communities, the call to a prophetic faith which builds community in worship and service, acting on what they profess. The action of Sanctuary has been characterized as a path of blessing and trial, but the sermon has made the Sanctuary view clear: to refuse that path is to refuse God and "bow down to some other idol." The Southside prophetic community is strengthened to remain faithful. The viewers are charged by the prophets to join the prophetic faith community.

For a viewer within the Christian tradition, the videotape poses the "decision of conscience" with an uncomfortable clarity. For the viewer outside the tradition, the authority appeals are probably meaningless, though the refugee testimony may have some impact. For those within the tradition who yet affirm a stronger linking of Americanism and Christianity, the few but obvious attacks on U.S. government policy would muddy the issue with conflicting values.

The vision of prophetic community acting together, justifying action, and maintaining a sense of community is clear in the videotape. The minister may be the primary spokesman, but he is not the only spokesperson. He speaks as a member of community to community. That group focus, with its prophetic foundation, is clear throughout the observed rhetoric of the Southside community.

CHAPTER 5

YOU CAN'T STOP THAT WIND: EXTENDING PROPHETIC COMMUNITY IN WORSHIP

> Leader: We have gathered as children of God's promise, to keep alive the vision of justice and hope.
> People: We have gathered in this place of holy worship that we may be strengthened to live faithfully in the deserts of the world's life.
> Leader: We are on a pilgrimage of justice and love.
> People: We follow the footsteps of the prophets who were faithful because of God's promise.
> All: We are in the midst of our journey;
> Let us remember the Holy God who guides us![1]

The Sanctuary community in the Tucson area often "gathered as children of God's promise." The diversity of the movement was noted as early as chapter one. Within Tucson some of the efforts of the congregations, e.g. legal aid programs and education, were coordinated by the Task Force for Central America of the Tucson Ecumenical Council. Such coordination was neither an adequate source of support for the congregations engaged in Sanctuary, nor an adequate outreach to Tucson residents who might be interested in supporting Sanctuary but were not themselves members of a Sanctuary church. Corporate ecumenical worship offered a way to affirm the faith action of Sanctuary, strengthen the commitment of the broader Sanctuary community, and renew public interest in the movement. These ecumenical worship services thus tended to be both worship services and media events designed to strengthen community and spread the word. The diversity of faith traditions represented in the movement produced a patchwork of religious practices in the service; but the patchwork was coordinated to produce a patterned quilt, for the needs of the refugees which motivated the movement necessitated a unity across the diversity of the Sanctuary congregational communities. This chapter will examine eight ecumenical worship services in which the Tucson Sanctuary community was involved. Ecumenical authority and testimony, textual authority and appeals, and bonding rituals will be explored in this analysis of the attempts to strengthen the bonds of the broader prophetic community.

---

[1] The material for analysis in this chapter is drawn from the author's personal observations, personal tape recordings, and service programs from the following eight ecumenical Sanctuary worship services: St. Catherine Church, Phoenix, Arizona, 30 June 1985; Temple Emanu-El, Tucson, Arizona, 13 October 1985; St. Augustine Cathedral, Tucson, Arizona, 4 March 1986; St. Augustine Cathedral, Tucson, Arizona, 8 April 1986; St. Augustine Cathedral, Tucson, Arizona, 15 April 1986; Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Nogales, Arizona, 10 May 1986; St. Augustine Cathedral, Tucson, Arizona, 11 May 1986; St. Augustine Cathedral, Tucson, Arizona, 1 July 1986. Hereafter references to the services will employ dates only. The material here noted is from 13 October 1985.

"Gathered in This Place of Holy Worship"

While the observed services were held either in a Jewish reform temple or a Roman Catholic Sanctuary, the worship leaders were not limited to those two faith groups. Working to build unity in a diverse, congregationally committed movement, worship leaders spanned the breadth of Sanctuary diversity. The 13 October 1985 service at Temple Emanu-El included a call to worship by an Episcopal bishop, readings by a rabbi, a refugee, and the president of the Maryknoll sisters, reflections by a rabbi, the moderator of the 196th General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, U.S.A., and the Catholic Vicar General of the Diocese of New Orleans, an exiled bishop from Latin America, music by a cantor, a Christian base commmunity of Salvadoran refugees, a Lutheran choir, and others, and prayers by a United Methodist bishop, a Catholic sister, a Catholic monsignor, and a Disciples of Christ minister representing the president of the denomination. Representatives of the Society of Friends, the Unitarian-Universalists, the United Church of Christ, and the American Baptist Church were also listed as participating. The service was thus lead and supported by hierarchical authorities across the diversity of Sanctuary. Many of the representatives came from outside Tucson, reminding the local community that the national community was supporting them.

A Lutheran read greetings from other "faith communities" in Germany, Denmark, Sweden and Austria as the local inclusiveness was strengthened by a reminder of global support. The prophetic community of Sanctuary in the U.S.A. was not alone.

The "solidarity" of the Tucson Sanctuary community with the Latin American community was stressed through dual presentation of the readings in English and Spanish, a common feature of Sanctuary services, the testimony of the former bishop in Latin America, music by the refugee group, and a "congregational response of 'presente.'" The last, a statement affirming presence with each individual or group as they were named in the litany, was introduced as providing "a remembrance of those who fought in the struggle for just love," thus the local community was bonded, was present, with absent members of the struggle.

This one October service used representatives from the breadth of community to further the corporate sense of involvement in community. An ecumenical effort had ecumenically lead worship.

The weekly morning prayer services held throughout the trial were rotated through leadership by varied Sanctuary supporters. On 8 April 1986, for example, the service was lead by two Disciples of Christ pastors in Tucson and two grantees of Dutch Interchurch Aid in the Netherlands who were in Tucson "as a gesture of international solidarity with the sanctuary defendents [sic] and the refugees."

Other services consistently involved leaders from across the Sanctuary community. Refugee and defendant participation were common. Prophetic community coalesced around the people representing the need of the Central American brothers and sisters of the Church.

"We Follow the Footsteps of the Prophets"

The observed services used scripture texts from Exodus 3:1-12, 23:1-9, Leviticus 19:33-34, Joshua 1:9, Psalm 23, 46, 87, Isaiah 40, 42:5-8, 61, 65:19-25, Amos 5:14-24, 7:7-9, Matthew 5, 25:34-40, Luke 4:16-21, Romans 8, I Corinthians 12:12-27, Philippians 1, Hebrews 12:28-13:3, and Revelation 21:1-6. Themes included God and/or Christ as a source of refuge and strength, caring for the alien and the needy, establishing justice, cooperating as the body of Christ, and the vision of life in God's kingdom. Scripture thus offered a picture of what the world should be, a model for understanding prophetic community, motivation for continued community action, and a source of strength to support that action.

Other texts provided worship readings as well. Books directly concerning Sanctuary, like No One But Us by Ted Loder and Sanctuary: The New Underground Railroad by Renny Golden and Michael McConnell, were used. Excerpts from the liberation theologian, Leonardo Boff, and from the writings of Thomas Jefferson, Reinhold Neibuhr, Pope John XXIII and Rubem Alves found their way into services, as did a reading from a contemporary Haggadah. Textual authorities were almost as eclectic as the worship leaders.

One of these extrabiblical texts was a reflection of Sanctuary use of World War II holocaust material. The words of Martin Neimoeller, a German pastor sent to a concentration camp, became the core of a song and prayer of confession used in the services:

> First they came for the communists, then they came for the Jews. But I wasn't a communist and I wasn't a Jew, so I didn't stand up and I didn't ask why. They they came for the unionists and they came for the priests. But I wasn't a unionist and I wasn't a priest, so I didn't stand up and I didn't ask why. By the the time they came for me, no one was left to ask why. Still they come for the outcasts, for the poor, the refugees. . .[2]

Songs like this one offered corporate involvement in the confession of need for action and a consciousness of the tradition within which Sanctuary stood. The community existed as part of historic prophetic community.

---

[2] 11 May 1986

An excerpt from Leonard Bernstein's Mass used in the post trial rally furthered that theme of historic community while being particularly suitable to the concerns of the moment as it spoke of the locking up of "the bold ones," and of the "big ones of merit who ferret out flaws, you rely on our compliance with your science and your laws," with the reiterated assertion that "you cannot imprison the Word of the Lord."[3] There was prophetic community conflicting with the corrupt power structure. There was affirmation that persecution would not destroy the community and its message even though the community would suffer.

A litany written by Peter Ediger further strengthened the sense of the historical tradition of prophetic community.[4] The "Caesars of Century Twenty AD" are told that "all your lying and all your lawyers cannot stop" the wind of truth and the fire of love. The persecuted prophetic community joins the tradition of the persecuted church of the first century as text is used to unify and strengthen a diverse community.

"That We May Be Strengthened to Live Faithfully"

Ecumenical services brought the larger Sanctuary community together to renew and solidify their commitment to the movement. We have already seen how texts and ecumenical authority representation were used to stress the unity in diversity. It is not surprising to find several community worship actions drawn from varied traditions and used in the ecumenical services apparently to strengthen the bonds of commitment. The first observed service, the prayer service send-off for the freedom train, the Sanctuary caravan taking refugees north in public action, included a commissioning service. The worshippers were called forward as Sanctuary leaders from several religious communities, including the women who had been indicted, anointed each worshipper. The ritual anointing of hands provided individuals within the group a public opportunity to affirm commitment to the community and renew dedication to community action.[5]

---

[3] 11 May 1986.

[4] 11 May 1986; 1 July 1986.

Other services involved the sharing of salt or bread. The salt was accompanied by the scriptural reminder: "You are to be like salt. . .flavor the world and offer it God's tangy challenge."[6] Coming near the end of the trial at a morning prayer vigil the ritual served as a tangible reminder of commitment. At the major ecumenical service before the trial, 13 October 1985, bread was shared. John Fife introduced the ritual of breaking bread together as "the most fundamental act of human gratitude and solidarity and grace." He connected the bread as grace to the manna in the wilderness, an acknowledgment of Jewish roots and Jewish participants in Sanctuary. Recalling the gospel text from the Sunday after the indictment, Fife related the bread to the good gifts which we would give our children rather than the evil gifts of stones and serpents. He affirmed that "we" of Sanctuary have chosen to break bread with Central America, thus the sharing of the bread bonds the community present in Temple Emanu-El for the service, encourages their sense of unity for the testing of the trial, and recalls the broader bonding with the refugees and the church in Central America, i.e. with the broader prophetic community.

---

[5] 30 June 1985.

[6] 4 March 1986.

That same October service included a unison prayer of thanksgiving based on Psalm 9 praising God who "remembers those who suffer; God does not forget their cry, and God punishes those who wrong them." There was a unison prayer of confession asking forgiveness for "our wealth among the poor; our fear among the unjust; our cowardice among the oppressed. . . .our worship of death in our longing for our own security." It closes with a plea for God to "challenge us with your truth, empower us with your strength to live for life in the midst of death, to translate our vision and hope into action." In corporate statement the prophetic values of the community are reaffirmed and the community together states the need for renewed commitment, the nature of the commitment, and the source of power for the commitment.

The final corporate act of that October service was a group ring dance. Representatives of twelve denominations and religious orders linked arms and danced to a hymn from Micah 4: "And everyone 'neath their vine and fig tree shall live in peace and unafraid; And into plowshares turn their swords; nations shall learn war no more." The service thus reached a corporate climax as the community literally moved together singing of the prophetic vision of what the world should and would become according to the community. The service was designed to unify the Sanctuary community for the trial and infuse a fresh energy to corporate action. The liberal use of corporate ritual helped achieve those aims.

One of the most striking corporate bonding actions came 11 May 1986 at the ecumenical service during the post-trial rally. Worshippers signed "Declarations of Shared Responsibility" which were taken to the INS office in Tucson. In the face of legal action which central authority expected to weaken Sanctuary support, members of the movement rededicated themselves as prophetic community and strengthened their commitment.

> The defendants found guilty in federal court, Tucson AZ, 1 May 1986, had heard the cry of the people of Central America. Responding to the persecution of the church and the people of El Salvador and Guatemala, they recognized their obligations under the 1948 Geneva Conventions, the UN Convention and Protocol on Refugees, and the 1980 U.S. Refugee Act, to grant safe haven to sisters and brothers fleeing torture and death.
>
> These defendants have now recommitted themselves to continue the ministry of Sanctuary for as long as persecution and death threaten refugees returned involuntarily from our shores to their homeland. This they have done in fidelity to the one God who long ago called an oppressed people out of bondage, and who today calls on all of us to love the sojourner among us because our ancestors were once refugees.
>
> I, undersigned, share their faith and commitment, with a full knowledge that I also place myself in jeopardy. I have no choice.
>
> If they are guilty, so am I.

Beginning with a statement of refugee need and continuing through the legal basis for justification, the declaration stresses the faith tradition and justification for Sanctuary action in the second paragraph. The member of prophetic community is offered models in the committed, now convicted defendants who have been acting "in fidelity to the one God." The member of community is ascribed a belief, "I share their faith and commitment," a belief that carries the weight of central importance in their actions, "with full knowledge that I also place myself in jeopardy." The decision is forced: "I have no choice." To be a member of the community, to share the values of the community is to act with the community, hence "If they are guilty, so am I." The commitment of the individuals to the community is strengthened in the seemingly minor decision to sign a sheet of paper. The sheet sets the normative beliefs of the group.

The Sanctuary movement in Tucson used the possibilities of worship effectively to strengthen community across denominational boundaries. Broad authority appeals, texts developing familiar and appropriate themes, and corporate rituals were used to build a secure sense of the unity of prophetic community within a context of congregational diversity.

CHAPTER 6

IMAGES IN CONFLICT IN SANCTUARY DEBATE

This chapter will examine one aspect of the efforts of the Sanctuary movement to reach a central, generally secular audience. Two public debates held on the University of Arizona campus in October 1985 and February 1986 offer the point of focus. While the nature of the actions of the Sanctuary movement is certainly disputed, the debates seem to hinge on the older issue: the dominant role and consequent image of the United States as fortress or as refuge.

As this is written, in July of 1987, the United States is again caught in the debate of that image issue. Col. Oliver North told the Congressional investigating committee that if the United States did not support the Contras, "You will see democracy perish in the rest of Central America, a flood of refugees crossing the American borders, and potentially, the construction of a Berlin-type wall across along the Rio Grande to keep people out."[1] The consequences would seem to be that if the United States is not a fortress it will be used as an unwilling refuge. Earlier in July on the anniversary of the sentencing in the Tucson Sanctuary movement trial, Peggy Hutchison, a convicted Sanctuary worker expressed the opposing perspective: "As long as the United States continues to fund the war . . . in Central America, as long as Guatemalans and Salvadorans continue to be bombed and continue to flee, that's what causes the sanctuary movement to continue."[2] The implications are reversed: if the United States continues to be a fortress, as it should not wish to be from this perspective, then at least some of its citizens will make it a willing refuge.

---

[1] Taking the Stand: The Testimony of Lieutenant Colonel Oliver L. North (New York: Pocket Books, 1987) 564.

One year earlier in May 1986 a nationally syndicated editorial cartoon depicted the same ironic image battle: the guns of the fortress are legal aid to Central Americans, but the refugee shelter of the church is illegal. The cartoon is divided under the descriptive heading into two equal panels as the legal and the illegal are balanced against each other. The irony comes in the labelling, for the weapons we would typically associate with illegal activity are legal, while the church, complete with priest and nun in habit, the pious foundation of social morals and laws, has become illegal.[3]

Within the context of the Sanctuary debates the image claims are not always so crisply distinguished and the argumentative efficacy of those claims may be questioned. The images are not necessary polarities which can be translated into national security "them or us" terms. The fortress and refuge images may be interpreted and used in various ways.

---

[2] Arthur H. Rotstein, "Sanctuary: Principals in case still deeply involved," Tucson Citizen 1 July 1987: 4F.

[3] Peters, "US.Aid to Central Americans," Arizona Republic 17 May 1986: A27.

Overview of the First Debate

The debate of 21 October 1985, held in Harvill Auditorium on the University of Arizona campus the evening before the Tucson Sanctuary trial opened, pitted Alejandro Hernandez, the first Salvadoran granted political asylum in the Tucson area, and John Fife, the pastor of Southside Presbyterian, one of the first Sanctuary churches, against Charles Proctor, who was presented to the audience as a retired cattleman and Tucson activist. The uneven matching resulted from what Fife described as great difficulty in finding anyone willing to debate the issues. The debate was sponsored by the Associated Students of the University of Arizona Speakers Board and scheduled to occur a short time after a Sanctuary benefit rock concert was held on campus. Posters proclaimed "You've seen the concert/now hear the issues." The topic was to be "Moral Rights vs. Legal Obedience." The auditorium was over half full. The audience was a mix of interested students and community partisans representing both sides. The resulting debate was anything but a textbook example of crisp logical issue clash. Emotion and images, sometimes rather muddy images, dominated. [4]

Alejandro Hernandez opened with a recital of his persecution in and flight from El Salvador. From the malnutrition, poor housing and poor health care of his hometown, through student activism in San Salvador, through the death squad torture of his oldest brother, the shooting deaths of a cousin and uncle, to the warning that the death squads were coming for him: Hernandez depicted a country in the bloody turmoil that forces people to seek refuge. He briefly described his arrest upon arrival in the United States and his progress through the appeal process. Hernandez vividly defined the need for the United States to serve as a refuge, but he did not criticize nor directly discuss the competing image.

---

[4] Accounts of both debates are derived from the author's personal observations. Quoted texts are transcribed from the author's personal tape recordings of the debates.

Proctor opened with a line that set the tone for his entire argument: "I do not accuse anyone of being a Communist or a traitor. . . ." After assuring the audience that Proctor himself had been well received in "that part of the world" for those people "have beautiful manners," Proctor went on to explain that the atrocities such as Hernandez had described had no political purpose, but were merely "sadism by misanthropes." Continuing as if Hernandez had advanced the image of the United States as a burgeoning fortress of evil, Proctor rejected U.S. responsibility for the atrocities as we are "against misanthropes. . . . we take refugees." Proctor did not deny that refugees were being produced by conditions in Central America, but he sidestepped the Sanctuary argument that these refugees should be protected by rejecting an issue that had not been raised, i.e. that U.S. policy was producing the refugees. Proctor reasserted the traditional U.S. character, a country which does not do evil, but accepts the victims of evil. His characterization continued through a discussion of the massacre in Cambodia where "we did nothing" (we failed in our role of protector) to an assertion that it is the "same misanthropes" in Central America "liberating" the people. In short, the Communists were creating all the refugees. For Proctor the "tread" of Communism had brought death and destruction and it was the "paranoid defiance" of the Sanctuary movement which lead it to accuse the United States of "brutalities committed by Communist surrogates." Proctor reacted to earlier Sanctuary rhetoric which sometimes rejected U.S. policy in Central America. Unable to reject Hernandez's vivid testimony and unable to accept that a "U.S.-as-fortress" policy might cause the need for that testimony, Proctor simply shifted the blame: Communism caused the death squad atrocities.

Having attempted to ameliorate the image of the United States fortress by shifting the locus of evil, Proctor then attacked the goodness of the Sanctuary refuge image. He could not completely reject the refuge image for a haven was needed from Communism, but he focused the image from his desired perspective: if compassion was the motive for Sanctuary workers, why weren't they bringing in the Miskito Indians of Nicaragua or the Cambodians, in short the victims of Communism? Instead Proctor claimed the United States was facing an "invasion from over the border," an invasion he compared with the conquest of ancient Rome by barbarian immigrants. He suggested that immigration had helped the United States in the past, but now we were being victimized by hatemongering misanthropes. Given the Proctor ideology it is clear that we are to see Sanctuary style refuge as a Communist plot to destroy the U.S., though he stopped without calling Sanctuary workers "Communists." They were merely "naive" people who were being "used."

Proctor either ignored or rejected the apparent inconsistency of suggesting that Central American death squad atrocities were the work of Communist "misanthropes," but the United States should not serve as a refuge for these victims of Communist "liberators" because these would-be victim invaders were part of a larger Communist plot against the United States. For Proctor the role images of fortress and refuge could be understood only as a part of the Communist/anti-Communist struggle.

Fife shifted the tone again and began rebuilding both images. Rather than directly assaulting the inconsistencies in Proctor's argument and thus perhaps gaining Proctor some underdog sympathy (a sort of "silvertongued ministers should not verbally abuse well meaning old men" reaction), Fife thanked Proctor for agreeing to the debate and then began steadily laying the foundations for new images.

Fife's initial efforts at restructuring the fortress image were quiet and rather indirect: it "grieves me that we have withdrawn from the world court again." His emphasis would be establishing the necessity and legality of the Sanctuary image of refuge. References to the fortress/ war image were subordinated to this primary goal. Fife did not accuse the United States "fortress" of creating or directly causing the Central American atrocities. Instead he discussed the politicization of U.S. refugee policy claiming that "we hold up the sins of our enemies and we obscure the sins of our allies." With less obviously weighted language than that used by Proctor, Fife had attacked the notion of the U.S. as refuge only for victims of communism. Midway through his statement Fife made his most direct attack on the fortress, still within the context of the refuge image, asserting that the United States government had "politicized refugee policy to make it a tool of the Cold Warriors of the Pentagon."

Fife worked to reinforce the Hernandez testimony that these were political rather than economic refugees, thus ignoring Proctor's conspiracy implications while attacking the normal anti-Sanctuary argument: these people are not refugees; they are merely illegal aliens. Fife's argument centered on legal and statistical support. Citing as many as 55,000 noncombatants murdered by the military in the last five year period in El Salvador alone, Fife then dissected a U.S. State Department study which suggested that of 480 people captured, deported, and returned to El Salvador, none had been killed. Fife noted that the study admits that 270 of the study subjects were not located because those people had been deported to areas too unsafe for U.S. personnel to enter. The one person who had been found dead was presumed killed in crossfire. Fife quipped that there was a lot of crossfire these days.

Having used government data to attack the U.S. policy understanding of the refuge image, Fife then went after the underpinnings of the government position as he discussed the criteria used to determine refugee status. He began with a jab at U.S. policy: how many bodies of deportees can be counted is not an acceptable criterion. Instead we are to examine the conditions in the country of origin objectively, erring on the side of protection for the fleeing individuals because refugees have too often been politicized. Fife continued by citing what must be the favorite historical analogy of Sanctuary rhetoric: the Jewish refugees of World War II who were deported back to death in Germany because they had no documents.

With the Nuremburg trials and the U.N. protocols on refugees Fife offers the legal foundation for Sanctuary, thus justifying his image of the United States as refuge. Civilians have the right to flee death squads and conditions of war, the right to cross borders without papers in their flight, and the right not to be declared illegal aliens when they arrive. When governments fail to protect refugees then civilians have not only the right, but the duty to protect them. Given the Hernandez testimony, Fife hence established the necessity and legality of the Sanctuary image: "There is no question but we in the Sanctuary movement believe government has failed to protect the lives of tens of thousands of innocent men, women, and children whose only crime was to flee for their lives from El Salvador and Guatemala." Quickly gaining the pathetic power of the image, Fife continued with a moral imperative as he sought to overturn the fear appeal of Proctor's counter image:

> . . . civilians, you and I, the churches, all of us have a particular responsibility to protect human life. We call it Sanctuary in the church. The law says just call it whatever you want to, but save as many lives as you can--until the government begins to fulfill its responsibility under the law.
>
> And so we're going to prison--to court--tomorrow, because the government has charged us with crimes against the state. And the government's case is so shaky when they indicted us to the judge [they asked], "Please don't allow the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth to be told in this courtroom."

Having offered a legal, moral, and emotional foundation for the

Sanctuary image of refuge, Fife moved into the current situation: the Sanctuary trial beginning the next day. The minister turned to narrative pulling out the stops as he crisply detailed the conditions of the trial and the investigation, seeking to establish the government as law and tradition breaker rather than Sanctuary. The Sanctuary defendants were not to be allowed to discuss conditions in Central America, their own religious faith, refugee law, or the possible refugee status of the people who had been assisted.

> And you furthermore find a government that for the first time in the history of this country sent undercover agents and spies into church worship services, Bible study groups, into church meetings pretending to be religious people interested in helping save the lives of refugees, taped those worship services and Bible study groups. And then the government went to court last week and said, "We don't plan on using any of those tapes because we can't in their prosecution." That's because they had our case on tape. They had us talking about refugees, and torture, and murder, and disappearances, and rape, and gross violations of human rights and that that was why we were doing what we were doing and acting in the defense of refugees' lives. . . .after spending hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money, violating the Constitution for the first time in the history of this nation by sending spies into churches, now the government is going to rely on testimony of a paid undercover informant and two agents of the INS.

With the list of conditions Fife reiterated the need for the Sanctuary image of refuge. With the Constitutional attack on government spies in the churches he sought to justify the traditional legality of the Sanctuary actions and image at a time when those actions were under legal attack. In the situation, the evening before the trial began, it was essential that Fife offer a firm legal justification. With the tone of Proctor's argument it was equally essential that Fife establish Sanctuary actions as within traditional American values. His closing comments cemented what he began above:

> Finally we believe deeply in what the Declaration of Independence says--that there are certain fundamental human rights that no one can take away from any of us and among these are life and liberty and that those extend to refugees especially. That when governments fail in their responsibility to uphold those fundamental rights all of us--all of us--have the responsibility to secure those rights and that if we do it responsibly the people will support us.

The preacher made the call. Here was responsibility. Here in his image, given an understanding of his argument, was not a vision of subversion, but a vision of original American values. The moral appeal is present in Fife's argument, but the focus has been legal justification.

Proctor offered two main points in rebuttal. The first was an attack on the World War II analogy and precedent. Proctor could have claimed the analogy was unfair; he did not. Instead he attempted to destroy the legal justification offered by Nuremburg by defining those trials as a "lynching." This language was colorful and emotional, but the general audience reaction was hostile, for Proctor was thus attacking an accepted image--the trials as a good means to seek some justice for war crimes. An attack on Fife's right to use the image might have worked. The attack on the image itself did not. Instead Proctor seemed to reinforce further the sanity of the Sanctuary refuge image.

Proctor finally attacked Fife's core argument asserting that Sanctuary workers "have proclaimed themselves above the law." For Proctor the Sanctuary refuge image is invalid for it is illegal.

Overview of the Second Debate

The second Sanctuary debate on the University of Arizona campus during the 1985-86 school year took place four months later on the evening of February 12 in the Social Science Auditorium. Again the room was about half filled with a mix of students and community partisans from both sides. The Sanctuary trial was now well under way. This time there were six speakers, three for each side. The underlying theme of much of the debate seemed to be an implied border war: should the United States be an open bordered refuge or should we be a sealed fortress?

The first speaker was Tracy Thomas, president of the Arizona Wholesale Co. and honorary consul to El Salvador. He spoke as a native Arizonan, with Salvadoran in-laws, and recent travel in Central America. Using this background and the reminder that in Tucson "San Salvador is closer to us that Washington, D.C.," Tracy claimed that "in 1986 the Sanctuary movement has no validity" because "these people are here for economic reasons." Tracy ignored the possible image question of United States military involvement, direct or indirect, in Central America. The question for Tracy was "why are we being inundated" with illegal immigrants. He would seek to destroy the validity of the Sanctuary refuge image and would imply a corresponding closed border fortress image. The language of an immigrant flood and the reminder of proximity seem calculated to inspire fear: few people want a flood in their own backyard. Stating no human rights organization had ever mentioned any deportee being killed as he or she left the home airport, Tracy asserted "El Salvador is not the violent country depicted in the press." Conditions had been violent in the past, but now the only reason for people to leave was economic hardship: forty per cent unemployment. In later questioning he would state that the Sanctuary movement was living in the past, operating on an old understanding of Central American conditions: maybe a refuge was needed once, but not now.

As the second speaker, John Fife began with the assertion that the debate was really over: it had already been decided in favor of Sanctuary.

> The verdict is being rendered over and over and over again as responsible groups, communities, organizations, city councils look at and listen to the facts and then decide that the . . . responsible legal, moral, and ethical forced choice that they have before them is to provide places of refuge for Salvadoran refugees who are being systematically hunted down, captured, abused, and then deported back to the places where their lives are in danger or where they have a legitimate fear of persecution.

Fife moved from the assertion of the validity of the refuge image to the key phrases which justify that refuge: danger to life and legitimate fear of persecution. These are criteria for determining refugee status. Fife proceeded through the litany of organizations and social institutions which had acknowledged the refugee status of El Salvadorans and Guatemalans including "the United States Congress." He asserted by contrast that only "the United States federal bureaucracy and a few authorities and politicians and bureaucrats and a declining number of radicalized political supporters are opposed to the proposition that these people are refugees." Fife thus turned the tables: by this argument Sanctuary was not the radical fringe. Sanctuary opponents became the fringe. Thus, Fife claimed the Sanctuary refuge image should be validated by this audience even as it had been adopted by so many other thoughtful, responsible groups.

Fife specifically attacked what he presented as a policy of border war:

> For five years now the Sanctuary movement has spoken truth to power. That truth is that. . .federal immigration authorities are systematically capturing, imprisoning, abusing, and forcibly deporting terrified refugees back to El Salvador and Guatemala. This policy and practice is immoral, illegal, and unAmerican. It has resulted in the death of at least hundreds of refugee men and women. And until the illegal deportation is stopped, responsible, faithful and lawabiding citizens must actively and peacefully resist this policy and practice.

Using a preacher-prophet opening, "truth to power," Fife sharply characterized the actions related to the two images, the open refuge versus the sealed fortress. Given his distinctions, it would be difficult for the listener willingly to adopt a fortress perspective, for that would by Fife's implication be to become at best an irresponsible, lawbreaking machine of the bureaucracy and at worst an immoral, unAmerican sadist abusing its prey.

Fife proceeded through an assertion that "the verdict" had already come in from the country. Labelling the actions of the immigration authorities as "illegal and immoral," Fife took the audience through a reversal. The Sanctuary movement began with a "few people scattered across the border," but now the opposition was "a few authorities and politicians and bureaucrats and a declining number of radicalized political supporters. . ." Sanctuary opposition was depicted as the radical minority, as Fife claimed to hold the perspective of "the international community, the United Nations, and every responsible human rights and church organization that has looked at and studied this question. . ."

Having assumed possession of the majority perspective, Fife then detailed his assault on United States government policy rejection of the refuge image. The "people fleeing El Salvador and Guatemala" are named as refugees of an "increasing, not decreasing" war. Citing the creation of "over 1.5 million refugees in Central America in the last five years," Fife renewed his claim of the illegality of U.S. policy: "As early as 1981 the United States High Commission on Refugees reported that there appears to be in the United States a systematic practice designed to secure the return of Salvadorans irrespective of the merits of their asylum." Starting from the context of a Federal district judge's preliminary report on the INS policy, specific INS abuses were detailed: "the giving of false information," "prolonged. . .interrogation," "physical and verbal abuse." The pattern of actions was revealed as a policy. The policy was carefully characterized as illegal and immoral from national, international, and personal perspectives.

Fife began with a justification for reversing the status of the conflicting images, making the refuge image that of the majority. He continued by reiterating and expanding that justification through the detailed characterization of apparent American policy, into a listing of supporters of the Sanctuary perspective: "three hundred congregations: Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish," "eighteen cities," and "[t]he United States Congress." Since all of these acknowledged the status and rights of the refugees, Fife abruptly concluded: "The debate is over. The question has been decided already."

With Tracy and Fife the debate centered on the legitimacy of the image employed by the Sanctuary movement. Tracy used personal observation, negative evidence (the absence of death reports by human rights organizations), and fear appeals to negate the refuge image. Fife applied the authority of the judiciary system, diverse church bodies, assorted human rights organizations, and the Congress to characterize the two sides of the debate and thus establish the validity of the image.

The next two speakers offered legal perspectives. Robert Parks, of the U.S. Border Patrol, and Isabel Garcia-Gallegos, an assistant federal public defender working with the Tucson Ecumenical Council Legal Assistance program, presented divergent views of the legal status of refuge in the United States.

Parks gave a dispassionate account of the legal process of attaining asylum in the United States. Parks did not directly attempt to refute Fife's characterization of the procedures of the INS. Instead he began with a simple claim about that process: "When we talk about asylum in the United States it is important to consider that such claims or applications are received and considered on a case by case basis. And administrative procedure has been established for this purpose." Parks offered the stability of careful bureaucratic procedure as an antidote to the authority based guilt appeals of Fife.

Step by abstract step Parks explicated the due process of asylum for "asylees" who present an application for asylum to an immigration officer and "aliens" who are "arrested within the United States and found to be prima facie deportable." The latter begins with a deportation hearing, while the former may involve such a hearing if "the alien" requests it after an "adverse" decision from the district director of immigration. In carefully neutral language Parks explained

> the alien may review his or her application for asylum in a hearing before one of approximately forty-seven immigration judges who operate within the Department of Justice, but who are autonomous. The judge renders the decision on the evidence which may be the original evidence or newly presented evidence. In the case of new evidence the judge may ask the State Department to review it and make a recommendation.

Parks continued through the available courts of appeal up to the Supreme Court and concluded his explication of due process with a simple denial of refugee status to anyone outside the system:

> I want to emphasize again--if the alien does not present himself or herself to the immigration officer and file an application for asylum, no determination can be made and for practical purposes they have no claim. The same is true for anyone outside of the United States who believes he has got a claim to refugee status. There are established procedures. Again, each claim is handled on a case by case basis.

Parks' language was that of a bureaucrat: simple, straightforward, unemotional, but assertive. He had no story to involve the audience. He had the explication of procedure. For Parks, the United States might serve as a refuge if procedure was followed. Fife had contended the procedure was warped by policy. Parks denied the existence of that policy with his "case by case" procedure.

Having established the general procedure, Parks then detailed INS treatment of an El Salvadoran. Again with the unemotional, apparent neutrality of bureaucracy, Parks attempted to counter Fife's account of INS mistreatment of El Salvadorans.

> When an alien, particularly an El Salvadoran, is encountered by an immigration officer he is handed a notice read to him written in both English and Spanish. The notice says, "You are being detained by the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service. I am handing you a written notice describing your rights. Please read this notice carefully before deciding whether you wish to agree to return voluntarily to El Salvador, demand a deportation hearing, or request political asylum. You must sign a copy of this notice to show that you have received it. If you cannot read, please tell me and I will read the notice to you."

The rights of the "alien" were listed and Parks closed by noting that the aliens were also given a list of agencies willing to help them.

Parks would reclaim the refuge image. Fife had made the refuge image a peripheral, counter-government image. Parks tried to reassert the government right to control that image by affirming the legal roads to refuge.

Isabel Garcia-Gallegos introduced herself as an attorney, a federal public defender who was very involved with the question of immigrant rights. Already she had shifted the terminology from "alien" to "immigrant" while maintaining the legal focus. Garcia-Gallegos focused her address on a reiteration of the flaws and inadequacies in the the United States government's approach to El Salvadorans and Guatemalans. Hence her remarks would reaffirm the corrupt nature of the governmental claim to the refuge image.

Garcia-Gallegos began with a refugee story, a quick example to stir emotion and establish need: she became aware of the situation because a woman came in with a bullet in her chest cavity. That woman was followed by many "refugees" who were "fleeing persecution." The label had shifted again: from "immigrant" to "refugee."

By changing labels Garcia-Gallegos implicitly shifted the burden of proof in the refuge image debate. For Parks the people were aliens who must legally demonstrate their right to refuge. For Garcia-Gallegos they were refugees whose rights to refuge were being denied. The burden had shifted from the Central Americans' need to prove their refugee status, to the government's need to show cause to deny refuge.

Directly responding to Parks' account of the available due process, Garcia-Gallegos claimed the refugees were being deported without due process. With no guaranteed attorney for the administrative proceedings, the Central Americans lacked anyone to explain their rights to them. She further asserted that immigration authorities and judges were not following the law. Drawing from her experience in immigration hearings, Garcia-Gallegos attempted to destroy Parks' image of a government refuge available to those who follow the rules of the bureaucratic system: if due process was not working, then the refuge did not exist.

Garcia-Gallegos went further, suggesting that the refuge was unavailable even if due process was working as ninety-seven per cent of Central American applicants were denied admission to the United States even though Canada granted fifty to seventy-five per cent. With the claim that "an entire country cannot be lieing that they are indeed political refugees," Garcia-Gallegos closed her argument. The implication was clear. The United States should be a refuge, but current policy had manipulated the refuge role into an illusion of due process. For Garcia-Gallegos, the image that Parks claimed as the guiding image of the bureaucracy was merely a mirage, a dangerous illusion.

The next speaker was a career law enforcement officer from Mesa, Arizona and the Arizona director of the National Center for Constitutional Study. Rick Dalton took the debate in a new direction as he attacked the Sanctuary movement by raising the spectre of communism. Responding to an argument not previously raised in this debate, the validity of the fortress image for the United States, Dalton recounted his introduction to the Sanctuary movement. He went to a Sanctuary seminar in Mesa "prepared to hear a religious service and oratory preached by Reverend Fife. . ."

> I was very disappointed. What I actually heard was a political tirade--a anti-American propaganda program--that night. And I heard basically the fact that the United States is responsible for all the problems in Central America. If there are any killings, it's our fault. We're providing the bombs, the ammunition, etc. to those who are doing the killing.

Dalton raised the issue of the varied nature of Sanctuary argument. The violation of expectation became part of his critique of the movement. Dalton expected religious discourse. He heard what he considered political discourse, and that political discourse did not share his conservative right vision of American justice. Perhaps seeking a cross-and-flag government supporting religion, and certainly expecting Biblical justification which would not impinge on his political perspective, Dalton heard something else in Mesa, and what he heard galvanized the reaction verbalized here:

> We find that the movement basically is. . .not religious. It's political. It's a carryover of the anti-war, the Vietnam war movement. We find some of the very same activists involved in the movement. And we also find that

> the movement itself has something to say to these people who do have religious motive. And there are enough saved, many people who are sincere, and acting out of religious motive to help other people. This is what the Chicago Religious Task Force on Central America which is the main coordinating group for the Sanctuary movement, this is what they say, "Some churches have declared themselves sanctuary and have done almost nothing to oppose U.S. military aid to Central America. We question whether this is adequate." In other words that doesn't go far enough. You have to be an anti-American to be in the Sanctuary movement.

Sanctuary style critique of government policy could not be tolerated by Dalton. Supportive "Americanism" was too important a value to acknowledge nonsupportive critics. Sanctuary image manipulation would be suspect.

While approving the religious motivation to help the needy person at the door, Dalton rejected the notion that Sanctuary was engaged in such purely religious and humanitarian refugee aid:

> "the movement handpicks a few, a very few people in Central America, brings then here and parades them before the President of the United States. We find that these people who talk, who are brought into the United States illegally, are in fact leftist in their political orientation. . ."

Sanctuary for Dalton thus could not be a movement concerned with religious refuge, entitled to assert an appropriate refuge image for the United States. Sanctuary was a leftist political movement hiding behind religious language, perhaps duping some supporters with that religious language. Sanctuary was not even truly seeking to provide a refuge for those in need; instead Sanctuary was importing dissidents to unfairly criticize the United States government. The refuge image might be an appropriate one for the United States, since "any Christian or Jew or other God-fearing person who finds a person in need at their door asking for help would certainly, as I would, help that person." The question of appropriate role became irrelevant for Dalton with his contention that Sanctuary was asserting an image role which the movement was not truly following.

Having acknowledged that religious motivation might lead someone to offer refuge, Dalton offered an alternative way "to help other people over this need. . . .we can get involved in missions programs that help the people. . .that are still there in Central America where they are." The answer then was to maintain the United States as a sealed fortress and help the needy in their place of need. For Dalton the refuge image was not only invalid in its Sanctuary usage, but unnecessary.

Dalton then renewed his attack on the Sanctuary movement itself:

> one of the main motivations for the Sanctuary movement is liberation theology. Liberation theology started in the mid-1960s. And in Central America it is riddled with Marxist ideology. We find liberation theology having this to say, . . . Christianity is communism. . . . We find that Gustavo Gutierrez who is the preeminent liberation theologian says that the church must get involved in revolution and class struggle which of course comes directly from Marx.

With one charge Dalton seemed to go far toward undercutting the religious or political validity of the Sanctuary movement for the more conservative members of the audience. The assumption was that all would share the assumption that anything relating to Marx could not be meshed with traditional religion. For Dalton, "Marx" and "communism" were devil words[5] which would by their use alone make his implicit point: Sanctuary was misguided at best, while at worst it might be a communist front. His conclusion reinforced this as he linked Sanctuary to "a group called the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador, which is a communist terrorist organization providing direct military aid to the communist guerillas in Central America."

---

[5] Richard Weaver, The Ethics of Rhetoric (South Bend, IN: Regnery/Gateway, Inc.) 222-223.

Dalton never directly stated that the United States should provide active military support in Central America, but by opening and closing with the theme of Sanctuary meddling in American policy and aiding communist guerillas in Central America he implied the necessity of the active fortress role. The assumptions were clear: the church should not interfere with the government; if anti-American forces are receiving support then pro-American forces must also be supported. By casting Sanctuary as a military presence in Central America, Dalton nullified the Sanctuary attack on U.S. military involvement in the area. Dalton had raised an issue which had been ignored in the debate while the argument focused on the nature and necessity of refuge. He used that issue in an attempt to destroy the credibility of the movement and implicitly justify the image of America as an embattled fortress.

The final speaker, Rabbi Joseph Weizenbaum, responded to the attack on the credibility of the movement before proceeding to the other issues of the debate. To counter the hostile overtones created by Dalton's Sanctuary/communist guerilla links, Weizenbaum opened with a quip: "Thank you, Mr. Dalton, for warning me about the Christians. My people have been watching them for two thousand years." The humor quickly introduced a new tone, and Weizenbaum proceeded with repairs to ethos:

> I am a strong advocate of Sanctuary. I am an American, a former Air Force chaplain. . . .I am also the son of an undocumented alien who came into this country and fortunately was not sent back. I am the nephew of a man and a woman who sought sanctuary in Europe and did not find it.

By presenting himself as an American who did not reject the military, Weizenbaum offered self-evidence of the unfairness of the "Sanctuary is unAmerican" charge. By continuing with his family background he introduced the favored historical analogy of Sanctuary argument: World War II and the treatment of the Jews. Weizenbaum went further in those few brisk sentences demonstrating that in WW II America was a sanctuary.

With credibility repaired, Weizenbaum began an attack on the philosophical foundations of Dalton's argument: "the proposition that good and evil can be encapsulated." Here he would base his refutation of the use of communism as a devil term. Noting that communism is seen as the essence of secular evil and "everything else therefore is good," Weizenbaum denied that Sanctuary was attempting to reverse the perception of good and evil, for that "is just as wrong." He declared "that life is a mixed bag." Proceeding with the example of Adolf Hitler as "the greatest anti-communist of the twentieth century," he demonstrated the danger of labeling any anti-communist as good. He claimed the reverse of the argument: "You see whether it's from the right or left, life doesn't work that way. Good is meant to be the embodiment and betterment of humankind."

Now Weizenbaum extended his definition of good to incorporate an attack on the argument raised at the very beginning of the debate, i.e. Tracy's charge that these people the Sanctuary movement was terming refugees were economic rather than political and thus not entitled to refuge. The good, the betterment of humankind, was to allow every human being

> "the basics--a place to sleep, clothing, food. That is the proposition that motivates the movement. . . . if you're trying to make a living and somebody's shooting at you is your problem political or economic? Does it make a difference?

If the audience accepted his definition of good then it became necessary to accept the Central Americans as refugees. Weizenbaum's pointed question clearly depicted the potential difficulties of making economic/political refugee distinctions in war torn countries.

From this established claim the argument chained to the next: Sanctuary is not engaging in civil disobedience. Weizenbaum contrasted the Sanctuary movement with the civil rights movement as he observed that the latter broke "bad law. . .in order to address ourselves to it," while the former has good law which was not being followed by the "political machination of the United States government." Sanctuary is again presented as the good, while the U.S. government is the evil.

Now the scholastic argument would be reintroduced as Weizenbaum explained how the government could fall into this mechanical repudiation of the good: "according to this philosophy of good versus evil, an individual leaving a nation labeled as good must himself be evil because there can be no other reason." Since the refugees came from U.S. supported countries they themselves must be evil as their governments must be good. To react as a machine is to ignore the complexities of human society. To react as a machine is to be less than an aware, human intellectual sitting in a university auditorium. Weizenbaum would have the audience recognize how the mistake could be made, and why they themselves should not make it.

After repudiating the "Sanctuary is only political" charge, with a rejection of the power of the Chicago branch of the Sanctuary movement to speak for the Tucson branch, and after noting that "politics are such that they are used to cloud over the humanitarian concern. The Sanctuary movement is aiding people of different political persuasions," Weizenbaum returned to his pro-America theme weaving it into Sanctuary activity as he sought one last time to expunge the anti-American charge.

> Sanctuary must say to you as a very strong American, very pro-American, one who is willing to wave the flag, that what America needs is still written on the Statue of Liberty, also still a part of the United States, with the words written by, I'm proud to say, one of mine, Emma Lazarus, "give me your tired, your poor." I wonder if our government today would wish to amend the text. . . . I therefore feel most strongly, that what we do is humanitarian. For a Christian it is religious. For a Jew it is religious. Most important, for a human being it is the only decent position to take on this subject.

Orally waving the symbols of American patriotism, the flag and the Statue of Liberty, Weizenbaum moved to restore the credibility of the movement. It was not to be judged automatically as anti-American. Sanctuary was not to be judged as a political movement hiding in religious clothing. It was a religious movement engaged in humanitarian action. Given the task of restoring the ethical status of the movement, Weizenbaum's use of argument and image seemed to accomplish his rhetorical aims.

He chose not to counter the active fortress image suggested by Dalton. Instead he redeemed the refuge image by identifying it with the old patriotic refuge image every school child knows: the Statue of Liberty.

By Weizenbaum's conclusion the refuge image was identified with legality, religion, humanitarianism, and patriotism. It was explicitly separated from politics.

The debate had centered on how to interpret the refuge image/role. Coming last, with comprehensive arguments, Weizenbaum worked to repair the damaged credibility of the movement's vision, and reestablish the necessity and validity of that image.

Conclusion

Through the course of two debates Sanctuary had struggled to reach a central, secular audience. Other than fleeting references to religious motivation, the debate had centered on humanitarian and legal justification for Sanctuary action. The shaping of the secular role images provided a focus for the varied attacks and defences.

The fortress image was more often implicit than explicit. It came into play directly when the spectre of communism was raised, for the role of the fortress with active combatants was as a defender against communism. The knee jerk necessity evoked by that devil term had been defused from the Sanctuary perspective, as Weizenbaum's argument demonstrated. The image would be ineffective in swaying

Sanctuary supporters. For Sanctuary explicitly to raise the image would be to encourage those who would cast them as a radical fringe, for such arguments would take them out of their religious/humanitarian focus into political attacks. In retrospect the use of the image by either side seemed to encourage the viewing of that side as radical fringe. Proctor made the most explicit use of the image and his muddling misanthropes made that anti-Sanctuary spokesman seem befuddled and simplistic. Dalton used the image more cannily, raising it only to attack his opponents. The explicit focus of the argument was elsewhere.

Choosing to be viewed as "pro-Americans," acting legally, though criticizing government policy, Sanctuary spokespersons centered their arguments on the validity and necessity of the refuge image as understood by Sanctuary. From the testimony of Hernandez to the World War II ethos building references of Weizenbaum, the secular audience was molded to an understanding of the necessity of refuge.

The opposition response did not typically try to reject the refuge image altogether. Even Proctor acknowledged the necessity of a United States refuge, but that was to be purely a refuge from communism, not a potential "invasion from over the border." Most of the spokesmen would reinterpret the nature of the refuge: the image would be seen as valid if it was understood as the bureaucracy understood it. The Sanctuary contention that the bureaucratic understanding of refuge was inconsistent and contrary to the intention of the law was ignored.

The images took on a variety of shaded definitions as the bureaucrats and the social prophets squared off, but throughout the debates those images provided emotional centerpieces for argument. The images provided Sanctuary with nonreligious, but emotional assumptions to support their legal interpretations as they reached to a central audience.

The interpretation of image according to varying social values (security and bureaucratic policy legality vs. humanitarianism and legislative legality) served as a mutually comprehensible frame for the issues. It enabled both sides to seek identification with the values of the opposition by claiming the image of the opposition. Images served both to muddle and to meld.

CHAPTER 7

GUILTY OF THE LOVE CONSPIRACY

> **WANTED: Special Agent. Must be clean cut,** a "choir boy," bilingual, and pure as the driven snow with an extensive religious background. Also be willing to lie to priests in Nogales, and to be put on the witness stand and brutalized during cross examination. The pay is good. Contact Don Reno or Mr. Jim Rayburn at the INS, 629-6228. There is no higher law than that passed by Congress.[1]

In January 1985, eight Sanctuary workers were arraigned for trial in Tucson. At the time they stated "the inter-congregational provision of sanctuary for Central American refugees is simply the practice of our faith as a covenant people. . . . We have signed our release agreements under the conviction that our faith _is_ consistent with the laws of our country."[2] Eleven workers were eventually involved in the Tucson trial that ran from October 1985 to May 1986. The trial was "uncommonly contentious,"[3] and the credibility of Jesus Cruz, the government witness paid to infiltrate the movement, was so tarnished that one juror said the jury deliberations used his testimony only when there was corroborating evidence[4] (hence the earlier satirical ad at the head of the chapter), but the verdict went against the defendants. When eight of the eleven were convicted they were still contending, "If I am guilty of anything, I am guilty of living the gospel. . . .The government has called this a criminal conspiracy. We call it a conspiracy of love."[5] While government officials said, "To us it's been an alien smuggling case,"[6] Sanctuary workers objected to the judge's decision to exclude any defense based on religious or humanitarian motive. Darlene Nicgorski said it "was not a trial about truth . . . .Judge Earl Carroll was not concerned about justice. The jury was denied the facts."[7] John Fife expressed no regret about the decision to have none of the defendants testify, "The Bible says when there is no opportunity to speak for the truth. . .then stand silent."[8] This chapter will examine the July 1986 sentencing statements of the eight convicted Sanctuary workers, the first formal opportunity of the eight within the courtroom context to express their motives and personal justification for

---

[1] "Ad of the Week," _The Tucson Weekly_, 30 April-6 May 1986, p. 29.

[2] Corbett 140.

[3] Browning A2.

[4] Jackie Rothenberg and Jim Erickson, "Emotions of trial dogged

---

diligent jury," The Arizona Daily Star 2 May 1986, final ed.: A6.

[5] Daniel R. Browning, "8 sanctuary defendants found guilty; 3 acquitted," The Arizona Daily Star 2 May 1986, final ed.: A2, quoting Darlene Nicgorski.

[6] Richard Charnock, "U.S. officials laud sanctuary verdicts as 'good result,'" The Arizona Republic 2 May 1986: A4.

[7] Gene Varn, "8 convicted in sancutary trial," The Arizona Republic 2 May 1986: A1,4.

[8] Carmen Duarte and Jane Erikson, "Defendants vow to resume work with movement," The Arizona Daily Star 2 May 1986, final ed.: A7.

their actions.[9]

Wendy Lewin

Wendy Lewin, the 26 year old Tucson resident who had worked with the Central American Refugee Project in Phoenix and was convicted of one felony,[10] gave a brief statement. Her four paragraph statement begins with religious motivation: "I grew up with stories of the good Samaritan, Joseph and Mary finding no room at the inn, and the golden rule." The references are to the basic stories which might appeal to the possibly minimal religious knowledge of a general audience thus reminding them of the gospel/story concern for caring for strangers. The statement ends on a further note of religious authority as she moves from the needs of the refugees with the relevant emotion evoking images, "mothers who have been raped and tortured in front of their children," to the motivation for helping those refugees: "Women and men who have nightmares awake and asleep of seeing their families die, but continue to have hope and faith, inspire me and will keep me trying to be faithful to this call." Lewin is inspired by the suffering of faithful members of community to continue serving prophetic community.

---

[9] The analyzed texts were obtained from the office of the Tucson Ecumenical Council Task Force on Central America. The statements are presented in photocopied typescripts. The statements of Lewin, Fife and Hutchison were originally distibuted on letterhead of the Arizona Sanctuary Defense Fund. The Hutchison statement is described as "excerpts" from her July 1 statement. The statements of Nicgorski and Willis-Conger appear in a similar formal written format, but lacking the letterhead. The statements of Aguilar, Quiñones and Clark are copies of the court records, with the first two apparently appearing as translations. As each statement will be dealt with in turn there will be no further footnoting of this material.

[10] Browning A1.

Lewin's argument does not rely totally on religious appeals and authority. She employs another standard theme of Sanctuary rhetoric: the failure of people to respond to the holocaust in Germany. From that reference she moves to antithesis: she had been paid by the government for doing refugee resettlement work, "and now, for doing the same work, I am here awaiting sentencing." She would seem to create an ironic tension for the broader audience as that audience is asked to progress from the idea that people outside the bureaucracy are responsible for acting in holocaust situations to the claim that she is now being penalized for such actions, even though similar actions were previously sanctioned. She extends the responsibility theme, playing on the god term appeals of liberty and justice, principles she claims the country is violating so she must "work towards making my country live up to its own standards." By using these dual-edged terms she stays within the realm of prophetic argument while reaching for the broader secular audience as well. A few days before July 4 in a federal courtroom "liberty" and "justice" are terms which have an edge of patriotic timeliness. Lewin is using another edge as well: from her the prophetic rhetoric overtones of calls for social justice and for the captives to be set free are implicit in her charge that the country is not meeting its standards. By her interpretation of liberty and justice, the god terms of Independence Day are used to critique the government, rather than to praise it.

Lewin's brief statement is carefully crafted to appeal to a general audience while establishing her ties to prophetic community. The Bible references are chosen to be comprehensible and even appealing to the one, while entirely supportive of the other. The authority focus is clearly with the religious tradition as even the god terms of government are reinterpreted to a prophetic perspective. Story references and refugee images are emotionally appealing, while the government references are accusatory, but she does not reach the harsher levels of polarization seen particularly in some of Corbett's discourse.

Maria del Socorro Pardo de Aguilar

Señora Aguilar, the Catholic lay worker and resident of Nogales, Sonora, Mexico convicted of conspiracy and alien-smuggling,[11] returns repeatedly to themes of religious motivation, Biblical justification, and judgment by God. She opens avowing her "Christian" obligation to help the needy with the prophetic focus on action, "not only by word, but in deed." She reiterates her duty as a member of Christian community to "love one another" hence the opening of her home to "the needy." She raises the issue of the church helping those who "notwithstanding their creed or nationality" are "in search of social justice."

---

[11] Browning A1.

She establishes the need of those she helped as she speaks, apparently having been temporarily overcome by emotion, of the "chilling stories, . . .horrible in every sense" of the refugee prisoners. She mentions the "trauma of insults and above all torture," contrasting the refugee situation with her own "situation of peace, tranquility and security." The account is not extended: she would not "tire" the judge. Her account would have him see that these are people whom her faith concern for the needy required her to help.

She builds her credibility as a member of Christian community presenting herself as a "catechist" who delights in watching as "the heart of a prisoner, a hard heart, opens before the love of Christ." This is an image geared to present her specifically as a Christian social activist, not merely a social activist. She goes further with this self-characterization as she recounts how her prison work brought her honor from her own government when she was proclaimed "woman of the Year of '85" in the state of Sonora. With some irony she expresses gratitude to the court for bringing her the affection "motivated by this accusation," but notes that she does "not deserve" this gratitude as, "It is nothing extraordinary nor outstanding to help the needy. It is a Christian obligation. I hope you, Your Honor, have a lot of accused like us." Very quickly she sets herself as someone motivated by her faith, who appreciates the honor of her government, and who is caught by the irony of being dishonored by one government for actions which have brought her honor from her own.

Her credibility as a good citizen is a dominant theme, not limited to the one instance. Very early in the statement she expresses embarrassment at her position in the trial because she does "not like to bother my fellow man and much less attempt to destabilize a system of Government." She presents herself as one who "never had the intention of breaking the law. Because what I do has repercussions on my children and relatives. And I want my family to be honest, respectful of the decent and respectful of the laws."

In meeting the formal demands of the situation she asks "forgiveness" but notes "it is also necessary that we know that we have a beam in our eye which will not allow us to see the splinter in somebody else's. But that does not lessen my faith for the system of justice in this country." She extends the good citizen image, the source of her authority, and the irony of the situation simultaneously. She has faith in the justice system and so she meets its formal demands. She goes to her religious faith for the Biblical allusion of the beam and the splinter which vivifies the irony of the situation for her.

The ironic tone permeates the statement. Having described herself as "a widow 60 years of age, that represents no danger for anyone, much less an institution," she draws on a common biblical allusion as she immediately refers to the "hungry wolf in sheep's clothing" who came into her home as a U.S. government informer, putting her and her guests "in danger." The institution threatens her in her own country. She does not threaten it.

She continues, asserting that she discouraged the refugees from crossing the border (while the informant said "he could help them only if they could just cross the American border") for she did not believe the U.S. was "the Promised Land" they appeared to be seeking. Despite her explanations "they come seeking justice and political asylum and they say they fulfill all requirements to obtain political asylum from this country." She describes herself as a "victim" convicted of conspiracy when she feels INS agent Rayburn and Jesus Cruz had "the greatest conspiracy in the matter."

Señora Aguilar has asked forgiveness, according to the requirements of form, but she has not begged, and she has clearly tried to shift the focus of guilt back to the government she sees as erring: she has followed her faith; she is honored by her own government for her actions; she did not intend to break the law; she was conspired against by the government which now condemns her; she speaks with authority as a member of her faith community and as an honored, therefore good, Mexican citizen; she is polite, but she presents the ironic reprimand of the prophetic community. Her conclusion aptly summarizes her position:

> And I am happy, because the people judge me and they also say that the people's voice is the voice of God.
>
> As they judge me, I am also being judged by the all powerful. And I only ask God and say to him, let that be, Lord. Let it be as the people say, that there be many Socorro Aquilar's [sic] in and outside this country.

Reverend John Fife

Fife's carefully crafted statement runs the gamut of Sanctuary justification. He uses narrative, imagery, driving rhetorical questions, religious justification, the World War II holocaust parallel, John Calvin, John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and Bill of Rights, Thomas Jefferson, the United Nations General Assembly 1948 Declaration of Human Rights, President Johnson's statement about the U.N. Refugee Protocol, the 1949 Geneva conventions on War and War Victims, judgments of the Military Tribunals at Nuremberg, Justice Louis Brandeis, Michael Novak, the 1945 Stuttgart Declaration of the Confessing Church, and that final, faithful strategy: the letter of support. Religious justification and the narrative of refugee need dominate the opening and closing. Between comes the litany of legal, philosophical, even patriotic justification. The statement is built to demonstrate a prophetic core of justification and to assert the authority of that core over a broader secular audience. Fife interweaves prophetic discourse and secular discourse to reach a secular audience.

The opening is a vivid retelling of "where most of us began -- with one shattered human life." Fife tells the story of the anonymous Everyman refugee who is taken at his most vulnerable time, "the middle of a dark night," by men who tortured him for 15 days. The description is explicit for this is Fife's chance to verbalize what could not be said in the trial: "countless beatings. . . endless interrogations. . . . gang rape of your wife. . . . electric prods. .

. . eardrums shattered. . . .his baby's head [held] under water--" This is a sequence calculated to shock, to force awareness of need. The sequence is followed by another sequence: a list of the countries where it might have occurred, a list structured to include governments on both sides of U.S. political acceptability, "Afghanistan, South Africa, the Soviet Union, South Korea, Guatemala.... In this case he was in El Salvador and, as he told me, he was one of the lucky ones." That luck is juxtaposed with further imagery of horror as "families" search for "weeks" for the "mangled bodies -- or parts of their bodies" of "fifty thousand" victims.

From that opening Fife moved to the arrival of the refugees, the "tortured," "traumatized," "terrified" "victims" who brought "agonizing questions:"

> What is happening to people in Central America?
> Why are they being hunted down here as criminals?
> Why the deportations?
> Would we help them?
> How could we help them?
> What does our faith tell us to do?
> What is our civic duty?

Having caught the audience with emotional imagery, Fife's questions move the hearer from distance to immediacy, from the question he has just answered, through the "why" questions he will skirt, lest he alienate the audience by sounding like a purely political secular critic, through the "would" and "how" questions which stand answered in his own known actions, to the "what" questions which offer the justification for those actions and hence the center of his argument. He summarizes the questions as "one fundamental question -- Human Rights," claiming the refugees present violations of those rights on both sides of the U.S. border.

That fundamental question is first answered religiously based on his role in community "as a pastor of a Christian congregation" aiding the refugees was his "religious duty." He could not repeat the "failure of faith" the church had suffered in the 1930's over the "Jewish refugees." He was responsible to a higher authority than government: "I knew that no matter what the authorities said, I had a sacred duty to God. . ." This is the Fife of sermons in community reiterating the faith responsibility of the community.

This argument is quickly followed by an examination of his actions based on "civic, legal responsibility." Looking at "human rights as a legal concept as well as a spiritual duty," Fife notes the impact of the Judaeo-Christian faith tradition on law and the contribution of John Calvin to "the ideas of freedom of conscience and individual rights." He cites Locke and Rousseau putting human rights above the power of "civil magistrates." Then he uses the documents of the American political tradition to define the import of those rights. The approaching "anniversary" of the Declaration of Independence is noted and the first section of his legal, civic justification ends quoting Jefferson's claim that "a bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth." Fife is pulling out the patriotic stops as he plays on legal justification for a secular audience. He critiques the actions of central authority by using the secular sources of import to that central authority. Having used religious sources, now he lays claim to secular authority as well.

After another holocaust reference, Fife moves through the various international statements conerning the rights of refugees, describing them as "our obligations as I understand them under International Law." With secular authority now justifying his actions Fife seeks to undercut the position of the INS, citing the handbook of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees: "Recognition of his refugee status does not (make a person) a refugee but declares him to be one. He does not become a refugee because of the recognition, but is recognized because he is a refugee." The trial has been about alien smuggling. By implication Fife declares that label invalid. These people were refugees, though the INS did not acknowledge them as such.

Fife goes further asserting that his actions have shown him to be a good citizen, precisely the reverse of the court's interpretation of those actions:

> From the Declaration of Independence to the trials at Nuremberg, our country has recognized that good citizenship requires that we disobey laws or officials whenever they mandate the violation of human rights. A government agency that commits crimes against humanity forfeits its claim to legitimacy.

Thus he asserts the approval of central secular authority for his actions and disapproval of that same authority for one of its own branches. Obedience to international law regarding refugee rights is labeled a requirement of good citizenship. Such obedience is further made the responsibility of every "individual. . .institution. . . agency. . .court. . .and nation." The exercise of this responsibility is depicted as the only alternative to war as a means "to enforce compliance," thus Sanctuary action becomes not only good citizenship, but the responsible avoidance of war. Sanctuary action is labeled as secular good.

Fife then contrasts authority and responsibility, noting that the government agencies have all of the "authority" to counter the international law Fife has carefully established as a source of authority for those agencies. Fife then announces that he does not "quarrel with those questions of authority" but he "appeal[s] to all of us to recognize. . .our responsibility." Failure to recognize that authority and responsibility are linked is described as the road to a "blood-stained world." Starting with the U.S. Congress, echoing the "certain inalienable rights" of the Declaration, and progressing through his list of international agencies, Fife links authority and responsibility as mutual demands on the INS. After observing that Amnesty International was a Nobel Peace Prize recipient, hence a credible secular authority, he notes that organization's objections to treatment of refugees from El Salvador and Guatemala. The INS is thus made the source which exercises authority without responsibility, following that bloody path. Fife contends that the INS has a further responsibility "to be truthful, honest, fair, and to test its policies and practices before the people."

This is his opening to justify further Sanctuary action by the public nature of that action: "We agonized over our duty to God and human life, duty to refugees and refuge, duty to international law and human right, and our responsibility to the people to be truthful, honest, fair, and to test these matters in public." Reasserting the Sanctuary authority bases, God and international law, Fife adds the responsible nature of Sanctuary action, thus Sanctuary is what the INS is not: acting with authority and responsibility. Fife acknowledges that government authority has not agreed: "Mr. Reno is his closing argument said--Rev. Fife cannot set up his own immigration service." Accepting that "[t]his nation cannot have vigilantes," Fife lays the ground to shift the focus of blame before his final apology. Sanctuary was public, but the INS did not "accept the same responsibility before this court." Fife recalls the motions in limine, and Reno's objections which characterized the testimony concerning torture and death squads as "irrelevant and prejudicial." Returning to his secular authority sources Fife recharacterizes the suppressed testimony: "Human rights are inalienable, never irrelevant. And evidence of human torture cannot be prejudicial. We must all of us -- even the INS, be willing to be judged by the people on all the evidence--on all the law--and on our best ideals and traditions as a nation." The testimony becomes crucial and by implication Sanctuary is seen as supporting the "best" of American tradition while the INS is flouting it. Sanctuary is on the side of the people, the law, and American ideals. This is value laden rhetoric shaped for the broader secular audience outside the community. This is rhetoric which characterizes the prophetic community as sharing the values of that broader community. This is rhetoric to build identity.

Fife offers one final legal authority source as he shifts the focus of blame to the INS, a comment of Justice Brandeis: "If a government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for the law; it invites every man to become a lawbreaker unto himself."

With that barb Fife moves to meeting the demands of form: he must apologize. He limits that apology by setting it as a contrast. Noting Judge Carroll's designation of Sanctuary "statements and actions" as "defiant of the law and the INS," Fife states: "I apologize and beg forgiveness. I only intended to be public and responsible." With that short second sentence he calls up the echoes of the whole authority/responsiblity discussion which reversed the roles of Sanctuary and the INS.

Fife then returns to a religious focus as he justifies his action yet again asserting "that the law and human rights are ultimately a spiritual matter as well." Thus he contends that his entire statement has been religious justification for action.

Fife then notes the public approval for Sanctuary, this "movement of the spirit among people, churches, synagogues, towns, cities, universities, counties, and now a state." With that list Sanctuary would by implication have the public approval which the court would deny it and which Fife contends the INS was unwilling to seek honestly.

He closes with an acknowledgement of the "expectations of the court" regarding the "form" of his statement and reintroducing the holocaust reference. He quotes the 1945 Stuttgart Declaration of the Confessing Church which offers a closing religious justification for action:

> We accuse ourselves that we did not pray more faithfully, that we did not believe more joyously, that we did not confess more boldly, that we did not pray more faithfully, that we did not believe more joyously, that we did not love more fervently.

By implication at one level, the need for such self accusation is what Sanctuary would avoid, while at another level Fife and Sanctuary stand as part of the Confessing Church accusing themselves for not doing even more. Fife stands ironically in a court which expects him to accuse himself and beg for mercy. When he "accuses" himself, it is for not doing more of what resulted in the actions to which the court objected. When he begs for mercy, it is again a reversal: "mercy, not for myself, but for the refugees. They have no support. . ." By contrast, Fife stands "sustained by prayers and support from tens of thousands." His actions have public approval. Given his argument on public responsibility and authority, this implies he should not be standing in the court awaiting sentence.

Having opened with the emotion-wrenching images of a holocaust in Central America, Fife closes with a more subdued, but no less emotional linking to the older holocaust expressed in a letter of support, the support the refugees lack: "This letter is in memory of people who died in the holocaust because they could not find sanctuary in any Christian Church. I hope Central American people can find sanctuary now." That one letter encapsulates need, precedent, and religious responsibility. Asserting the necessity of the broader prophetic community, it also appeals to those outside that community with the emotion and guilt of the holocaust reference. Fife has met the demands of the form by apologizing, but the apology was prophetic apologia, focusing on justification of action rather than assumption of guilt.

Father Anthony Clark

Father Clark, priest at Sacred Heart Church in Nogales, Arizona uses a more direct and even more accusatory tone. He develops a thesis common in the prophetic rhetoric of Sanctuary, but with little overt religious justification, focusing instead on a theme common to secular argument and prophetic social justice concerns: the abuse of truth in the legal system.

Clark begins with acknowledgment of the formal expectations of the situation, but immediately reverses that acknowledgment:

> I stand before this Court as a convicted felon, ready to be sentenced. And yet I know full well that if I ever failed to act in any way other than to respond to my fellow brothers and sisters in a less than genuine and authentic Christian manner, I would be guilty of a far greater crime, a crime against truth as taught according to my Lord Jesus Christ.

The thesis is implicit. The conflict of government authority and religious authority has been raised again. Clark is guilty before what he deems the lesser authority, but innocent before the greater. By designating that greater authority as truth, he gives it a value weight which should exert some influence on even a secular audience.

The issue of truth and its suppression continues as Clark presents the narrative justification for his Sanctuary actions. He knows "the stories of the executions. . .recited time and time again over the years. . .by victims, friends, brothers, sisters. . . .the stories that this Court, for whatever motive, refused to allow the jury to hear in full." The justifying stories have been told, but could not be told in the place of truth. Clark sets the irony bitingly.

The one story he tells increases the bite, for it is the story of

"Ruben Torres, you recall him. It is for he [sic] that I have been accused of harboring and convicted of that. He is the one whose tape that my attorney accidentally discovered and then the Government admitting it to the Court after that accidental discovery and then claimed that they couldn't find it." Clark will tell the suppressed truth of the refugee for whom he was convicted, and in the telling he brings up another suppression of the truth. The phrasing lacks the polish of carefully written or trained discourse, but the acid bite of the message is no less harsh for that.

He retells the specific, graphic story of the conditions of Torres' flight, then states that serving the refugees is his religious duty: "As a catholic [sic] priest, besides sacramental service to the people of God, my job is to provide food, shelter, and human services to anyone who is in need regardless of political or national origin." Clark did what his faith and his profession required him to do, but he affirms, "never did I seek to illegally harbor Ruben Torres as it was so deceptivly [sic] portrayed in the presence of Your Honor and more importantly in the presence of the jury. And only out of the presence of the jury was the truth allowed to be somewhat told for the record." Again the theme of suppressed truth in the legal system is brought to the front: Clark did what he did without intent of illegality, but in the courts he faces deception and partial truth. The tone is accusatory. To say the least it is not designed to appease the court. This is a clear and sharp indictment of the system.

It is a specific indictment of the judge about to pass sentence on him and the INS. In six quick sentences, Clark passes from the judge's concern over "whether or not we, the defendants, here broke the law," to the failure of the judge within his "impartial position" to express concern over "whether or not the law towards these people from El Salvador and Guatemala was fairly or impartially being administered by the United States Government, of the people by the people and for the peoiple [sic]. In this case, the INS." The steady drip of acid cannot be ignored when one faces the echoing "impartial" and the rather ironic designation of the government. In the next paragraph Clark characterizes himself as exhibiting the impartiality in application of the law which he has just implicitly denied observing in Judge Carroll or the INS: he, outside the legal system and found guilty by that system, was impartial before the law, while the representatives of the legal system were "systematic" in their "attempt. . .at breaking the law and ignoring the rights of the refugees. . ."

Clark expands the contrast of attitudes and behavior toward the law pointing to "our law of the land of 1980 Refugee Act of Congress" which he tried "time and time again to exercise for the refugees" only to find them deported. Again the truth contrast is raised: under the law if what the refugees had "told" and "showed" him "were true, they had nothing to worry about. . . . Unfortunately, this, at least I know personally, was and is not true in Nogales, Arizona." Again Clark sees the system suppressing the truth. The suppression/deception continues in his own trial when he hears

> . . .the Government's prosecutor say to the jury that these refugees just needed to present themselves to the Port of Entry and there they would find all the help and care they were looking for. I knew that that was not true. And what

> was worse, I began to realize that the prosecutor knew that it was not true.

Clark indicts the system for a reason that coincides with an expected concern of prophetic rhetoric and with a claimed authority whose base is made clear in his opening thesis: truth as understood through his faith. As the statement progresses the focus is truth, whether religious or legal, and it is the suppression of that truth by the agents of the government for which he indicts the system. His closing comments are an assertion of his lack of guilt: "because I followed my religious dictates and firm convictions that are not and were not in conflict with any law, I am not guilty before God or before the good people of this land." The language is direct and the implications are polarizing, given the context. He offers religious justification; he affirms a contextually ignored legal justification; he closes with a claim of innocence before his authority bases and in so doing he reverses the verdict, for even as the system proclaims him guilty, he proclaims it not good.

Father Ramon Dagoberto Quiñones

Father Quiñones, parish priest of El Santuario de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe in Nogales, Sonora, begins with a prophetic theme asserting religious justification: caring for the "weak" and "persecuted" according to "the will of God." This sets up a conflict between civil and religious authority: "...ones [sic] own soul rebels if one day the public authorities enter on the scene to say that what one has been doing for 26 years constitutes a criminal act, because of ones [sic] faith in the true God." That conflict is then carried into what becomes the central theme of Quiñones statement: the abuse of the authority of one country by another.

Quiñones explains the nature of his service to the refugees in the Nogales, Sonora jail and at the Sanctuary of Guadalupe. The conditions of the jail are offered to clarify the need for the first while the latter is firmly classed as a necessary faith action: "It was and still is an open mission of Christian charity that we carried forward and charity does not require any documentation." Having underscored the religious justification he then asserts a governmental justification for his actions: "At no time, Your Honor, did the Mexican authorities prevent us in any way from carrying out this ministry on behalf of the refugees. On the contrary the Chief of Immigration there in Nogales often expressed his gratitude for the support we gave the refugees there in jail." As a Mexican citizen acting on Mexican soil in actions "which under Mexican law are not in any way illegal," Quiñones takes the justice system-gone-awry argument of Clark and carries it one step further. Now the legal system of one country is presented violating the approved behavior of another country. The argument shifts to a focus which seems more concerned with national sovereignty than religious justification, though the "Christian obligation" necessitating the acts is reiterated.

Quiñones shifts the focus of blame as he recalls the investigation

> methods that were apparently very little orthodox here in the United States and which under Mexican law were a very obvious and clear violation of our national sovereignty, especially by the introduction of spies into our nation, completely without any regard to any official program or plan of our own authorities.

INS agent Rayburn becomes the center of blame as the instigator of those methods. He is further blamed as the person who went around Mexican law to deliver U.S. indictments to Quiñones and Aquilar. He is revealed as the person the judge himself had to reprimand. He is depicted as not "a true officer of the law" as he "made deals" with "professional alien smugglers, true criminals in our country" rather than "reporting them to the Mexican authorities."

Quiñones blames the judge for not instructing the jury that there had been no violation of Mexican law or accusation in Mexico, adding that the judge should "know at least something about Mexican law" if Mexican citizens are to be tried in "American courts, although it would seem incredible. . . for actions done on Mexican soil, actions which are not illegal in our own beloved country." The nationalist focus continues as Quiñones sidesteps to point out U. S. criticism of Mexican institutions, concluding "we think, Your Honor, that it is better for each one to do his own dirty laundry at home."

Quiñones makes the U.S. actions sound not only imperialistic, but heartless and ludicrous: "Do I need authorization to ask whether I should help a woman who has been raped?"

He does not close with an apology or an appeal for mercy. After an argument rooted in nationalism that might seem farcical. He closes with an attack on Jesus Cruz, the informant, telling of a woman who was about to be deported because she refused to perjure herself when Cruz bribed her to testify against Quiñones. The final appeal is for the judge as "the representative of the law" to stop "this injustice."

Religious justification is present in the statement. Social critique permeates the statement, but the focus of the social critique is not religious justification, but the violation of Mexican sovereignty and the hypocrisy of the legal system. Quiñones speaks more as a Mexican citizen, than as a member of prophetic community, though he clearly founds his own actions in that membership. Quiñones speaks to the situation of the court. He is not merely a member of a group outside of central authority; he is a member under a competing central authority.

Margaret "Peggy" Hutchison

In her statement, Peggy Hutchison, Methodist lay worker and University of Arizona Oriental Studies graduate student, employs a symbol of patriotism and a government definition of good citizenship to work a reversal of blame. In the distributed excerpts only her closing sentences reflect her religious concerns. The rest of the statement reflects an adaptation to a secular, legal setting.

Hutchison opens with a reflection on the upcoming centennial of the Statue of Liberty. Depicting the "Mother of Exiles" holding "the book of law," "broken shackles" at her feet, with the poem of invitation on the tablet at her base, Hutchison applies the image to the people of her actions and finds that each aspect of the image has been turned upside down.

> Many of the refugees -- material witnesses -- in this case believed that the torch of liberty still burned when they fled to the U.S. Many of the refugees believed they would be free from the shackles of imprisonment, torture, and indiscriminate bombings in their homelands. At the time of the indictment I was optimistic that the Mother of Exile's laws -- International Human Rights Law, International Refugee Law

> and the 1980 Refugee Act -- would be presented to a North American jury of my peers so that the law could be clarified. But I soon learned that would not be the case and we know the jury did not hear about the United Nations Protocol on Refugees, the Geneva Conventions, or the 1980 Refugee Act.

Hutchison depicts the patriotic image emptied of meaning virtually on the eve of its national celebration. She performs a social critique, but without the religious justificatory focus one would expect in prophetic discourse. She is reaching to a broader audience.

Hutchison asserts the legal refugee status of the "illegal aliens" she has been convicted of conspiring to smuggle. She further clarifies that they are not the economic refugees the government contends who merely "want to live in the United States," but political refugees who "fear persecution or have actually been persecuted." Thus she has affirmed her claim to innocence: the people she assisted legally deserved her assistance.

Given the preceding affirmation, Hutchison's response to the formal demands for an expression of remorse are not surprising: "I am remorseful, but only for the plight of the refugees and the fact that our immigration laws are not administered fairly." The remorse is not for the deeds which lead the government to view her as a bad citizen, but for the governmental failure which necessitated those deeds. The focus of blame is reversed.

The next paragraph cements that reversal as Hutchison takes an INS document "given to newly naturalized citizens. . . . entitled The Five Qualities of Good Citizenship," and uses those qualities to define her Sanctuary action as "not only patriotic but an expression of the qualities of good citizenship. . ." The sense of irony grows as each quality is read and gives a litany-like response in a first person version of each. The list progresses from "cherish[ing] democratic values" as a basis for action, to "practic[ing] democratic human relationship," to "recogniz[ing] the social problems of the times" and "work[ing] toward their solution," to "tak[ing] responsibility for meeting basic human needs," and finally "possess[ing] the knowledge, skills, and abilites necessary in a democratic society." Hutchison uses the document of the investigating agency to establish her credibility.

The attempt is clear. In a patriotic season Hutchison uses the symbols of patriotism to affirm that she is not a bad citizen, a radical fringe element conspiring against the government. She presents herself as sharing the values of democracy, but fearing those values have been emptied of meaning by the very authorities who are condemning her.

Only in the last paragraph does she employ a direct religious reference and even there it is coupled with a secular argument:

> It is common for Jewish people to proclaim "Never Again" in terms of never forgetting the Holocaust and never allowing it to occur again. Today I stand before this court to proclaim as a Christian, Never Again should our nation stand by silently in the midst of a different Holocaust, in this case, the people of Central America.

Hutchison speaks as a member of prophetic community, but focusing on argument for a nonprophetic audience. Her justification is primarily legal. Her appeals are primarily patriotic. The tone is challenging. She would jar the audience to a new perspective and to do that she seeks to gain the credibility of "good citizenship" for her vision.

Phil Willis-Conger

Phil Willis-Conger, the Methodist lay worker who served as project director of the Tucson Ecumenical Council Task Force on Central America, offers an opening religious justification for Sanctuary action, and then progresses through a careful analysis of the types of action possible for Sanctuary workers. The result is a defense based on necessity resulting from refugee conditions, U.S. governmental abuses, citizenship responsibilities, and faith demands.

Willis-Conger opens with a listing of the types of religious organizations involved in Sanctuary, thus characterizing the action. Then he affirms that his own action was "motivated by my faith." Like Lewin he refers to the parable of the Good Samaritan to make the point. He bases his concern for public action as an outgrowth of faith in the upbringing as the child of missionaries. Thus he connects himself with the stories of a central faith and the hero types of a central faith, while affirming the faith action required by prophetic community.

The third paragraph is an indictment of the judge, "[w]hether you believe it or not. . . .understand it or not. . . .accept it or not," and an assertion of the refugee status of the Central Americans in question: "I have seen their tears and have felt the scars from their torture sessions." Willis-Conger stands as witness to those who will not believe.

The tone and argument focus then shifts as Willis-Conger addresses a question raised in the past by the judge: given the Sanctuary resources expended in the trial, why were those resources not being used to help refugees with asylum applications. What follows is a comparatively calm, detailed discussion of Sanctuary options: "Yes, Your Honor, we can and do work for [refugees] through the normal channels. We do provide legal defense, lobbying, education, and we help refugees to stay in Mexico. We appeal the denials of asylum, and we support class action lawsuits." Willis-Conger cites cases, bills, and monetary amounts.

The discussion includes an indictment of INS abuses, supported by narrative example and judicial evaluation, necessitating the Sanctuary action which the court has deemed illegal: ". . . the government is still deporting thousands of refugees. Lives are being destroyed while change slowly winds its way through our bureaucracy. Innocent lives are being lost because our government is playing politics with the 1980 Refugee Act and international law." This is followed by a discussion of the growth of legal opinion on the legal foundation for Sanctuary action and Willis-Conger's belief that "the government was breaking the law, and by helping the refugees I was upholding the law." The locus of blame is shifted.

Willis-Conger goes further explaining his assumption that the burden of proof would also have differed: "I understood that it was the government's burden to prove that these people were not refugees. And if they qualified under the 1980 Refugee Act or international treaties, then I or any other defendant was not guilty of any crime." Government abuse is thus characterized as that which necessitates his action and that which apparently denies him a defense.

Willis-Conger nears conclusion with a citation of Federal Judge Kenyon's understanding of conditions in El Salvador cited in the Orantes-Hernandez case, thus returning the audience to an understanding of the conditions of need they did not hear detailed during the trial, and further hearing those conditions couched in the credibility of judicial authority, thus playing one judicial authority against another.

The conclusion turns to a respected contemporary social critic, himself noted for prophetic discourse, Martin Luther King. Echoing King's concern that waiting might mean "never" and "justice too long delayed is justice denied," Willis-Conger closes with a challenge, never having offered anything in the way of formal remorse: "To all those who care about justice and peace in the world, I say that NOW is not the time to wait. NOW is the time to confront the plight of Central American refugees."

Willis-Conger's statement is direct and plain. It does not revel in metaphor, symbol dissolution, or extended narrative. It is accusing, but with more cushioning justification than seen in Clark's statement. It makes significant use of legal opinion and legal authority. He opens with religious justification, and closes with an authority source who had himself gone from fringe status to central acknowledgement. The statement is careful, built to establish central credibility and underscore the central intentions of legality while at the same time indicting central authority for its actions. The notable twist is that Willis-Conger uses central authority to indict itself, thus enhancing the credibility of the accusation. The statement ends without apology and with a call to action. Authority has been claimed and justification has been offered. The implied question is clear: why should he apologize?

Darlene Nicgorski SSSF

Sister Darlene's single-spaced, fourteen page statement is a return to extensive religious justification. Her own experience in Central America and her direct, detailed narratives of refugee conditions add broadly credible emotional impact to her argument, while her choice of supporting sources should further strengthen her credibility outside the prophetic community. The stance of Nicgorski's statement, however, is unmistakable: she speaks as a prophet, critiquing in light of her faith, challenging in light of her faith.

She opens "eager to address" the "WHY" behind her actions. That "why" takes her to personal narrative which seems to begin with a climax of immediacy and emotional impact:

> . . . Five years ago today, July 1, 1981, in Campos Nuevo, Izabel, Guatemala, our pastor Father Tulio Marruzzo was shot twice in the head while returning to his home. . . . At his funeral, Bishop Luis Maria Estrada of Izabal said: "Why was he killed, if he was not involved in anything? Many people have asked me. I would say, yes, he was involved, and he was involved very deeply . . . the gospel of Jesus is bothersome to those who do not wish to see the light."

Between the murder and the funeral has come the account of his service to the poor, his pacifist stance, and the increasing threats against his life. After follows the "planned attack against the church" and Nicgorski's experience "in my own flesh [of] a little bit of what it means to be a refugee. . . . the challenge of LIFE which is the daily experience of Central Americans." In a quick, gripping narrative Nicgorski establishes her eyewitness credibility and her active religious authority base. Her faith and the observed conditions required her to act: "Our faith would not allow us to abandon the Guatemalan people. . ."

She relates her work in the refugee camps in Mexico, mentioning "the tragic tales" she heard which were "central to the Why of my response to Guatemalan refugees here. I had every reason to believe the Marias and Joses I later met here in Arizona. They told the same tragic stories." The local stories gain credibility from the earlier stories, and further credibility is sought from the recording of those stories in "the Diocesan office of Refugees" and "various human rights organizations." Entwined with religious motivation is a seemingly conscious adaptation to the authority needs of a broader audience.

There are almost constant reminders of her religious orientation: "Sometimes praying was the most concrete way of holding on to hope." "We, as SSSF, have a commitment to ministry with the displaced and homeless."

She furthers the sense of need, discussing the attacks on the refugee camps in Mexico citing specific cases of attacks on religious workers. Nicgorski is carefully building a sense of the inevitability of her work, the critical necessity, as she depicts the horror of the conditions and the pervasive demands of her faith, but while her accounts are emotionally gripping, she carefully casts the narrative as eyewitness testimony and interweaves it expertly with statistics regarding the need. She is building an argument on a prophetic thesis, rooted in religious motivation, with an eye to the logical and emotional needs of a broader audience.

From time to time she directly addresses the judge, maintaining his involvement as her immediate audience: "What could I have done Judge -- knowing what I knew? What would you have done Judge if you had experienced what I experienced, if you knew what I knew?"

She counters the claims that the severity of the conditions had lessened with eyewitness reports from Franciscan friends and, carefully seeking the credibility of government, a citation of Rep. Moakley of Massachusetts quoting Americas Watch. She addresses the problem of directly conflicting U.S. government claims and in so doing begins her explicit indictment of the government:

> I ask you, Judge, what do the missionaries, the campesinos, the religious have to gain by lying or distorting the truth? Regrettably, I've seen too many examples of Watergates and coverups by government officials to take their word. On some level it comes down to a question of credibility. You and I have both heard a government informant distort the truth and lie in this courtroom; you and I both know that the main government agent in this case gave approval by his silent acquiescence.

The content is clearly accusatory, but the one word "regrettably" tends to lessen the potential polarization, as does the inclusiveness of the "you and I" observations.

Nicgorski moves from the accusation through a quick recounting of the Franciscan tradition of aiding refugees, a review of the numbers of refugees in Central America and the conditions they face, to the "understanding of the community of faith" that such Central Americans "under the 1980 U. S. law" could apply for asylum. Crisply and efficiently she has reestablished religious motive, necessitating conditions, and the expectation of legality. The necessity for what the court has designated as illegality comes quickly.

Nicgorski spends two pages in a detailed analysis of INS abuses. She uses U.S. District Court, Central District of California, the Director of the Los Angeles Center of Law and Justice, examples of camp conditions in El Centro, California and Bayview, Texas, and her own observation of abuses in the immigration courts to support her indictment of the system. She comes to questions designed to force a supportive response after her account:

> What more could I have done? What should I have done, knowing about the persecution and random violence in Central America? What else could I have done in the face of INS treatment of Central Americans? How else could I have tried to stop the deportations? What should I have done with all I knew to follow my call as a SSSF to "defend life"?

Her account has demanded action. She has demonstrated the futility of legal action and the necessity of action given her knowledge and her faith. A favorable conclusion is required.

With a transition quote from Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, another carefully chosen broad authority source, Nicgorski introduces her thesis: the necessity of justice and its distinction from legality. She looks to the pursuit of Kurt Waldheim for war crimes and returns to what she has depicted as a current holocaust: "Who will be hunted down in 40 years for these crimes against life? Will those who have followed the letter of the law now be tried for engaging in a conspiracy to hide the truth?"

The archbishop of Milwaukee is cited for moral justification for Sanctuary action. Statistics from the ACLU and the human rights organization of the diocese of San Salvador are used to reinforce the danger to deportees. A letter from the Bishop of San Salvador to the U. S. Congress hammers home both the conditions, "this time of war," and the biblical interpretation of deportation based on the concern for clothing, feeding, and providing refuge for the needy, "an act of injustice in the eyes of Christian love."

Nicgorski comes to a forced choice couched in uncompromising language: "The blood is now on the hands of the American people who have a chance to make a difference. It seems clear that when the question is one of life or death there is no room for equivocation or reasonable doubt. We must always side with protection of life." The choice is then explicitly directed to Judge Carroll who is told he can "make a difference." "'Justice' is in your hands and yours alone. . . . The American people are taught to be obedient to the 'law.' To get beyond the narrow concept of law and to respond to the issues of justice is very difficult."

As she develops the situationally rather ironic distinction between justice and legality, Nicgorski raises the value laden subissue of the suppression of dissent, but focuses on the inadequacy of law and the importance of religion in matters of justice: ". . . laws are not the totality of the life of a religious or morally upright person. . . . Often times the legal system lags behind 'the sense of right and justice' as expressed by the community." She presents God as "justice" expecting "us to act justly," and refers to the prophets' admonitions to the idolators. "[M]oney, power, and the law," possible goods which can be corrupted "to replace justice," become idols as she offers a prophetic indictment of the system. "I realize I am treading on delicate ground as I address this court of law, with many officers of the court who hold much power and make their money by debating the law." She nods at the need to be careful, but does not relent in her indictment, stating "law and governments can lose their God-given authority when they become idols unto themselves." Civil authority has thus been placed under religious authority in terms of the requirements of justice. She uses the motto, "one nation under God," to make her analysis a bit more comfortable for the broader audience. Then she implicitly labels the Sanctuary speakers as prophets: "History shows that when idolatrous behavior and corruption continue, God usually sends new prophets to call us back to right relations." She observes that dissent is "an authentic act of loyalty protected by the Constitution," again using secular support for the broader audience, but prophets "as voices of dissent, are often labeled as unpatriotic" and persecuted. Her correlation, though implicit, is unmistakable. She is the persecuted prophet indicting the corrupt system.

She continues, going to an analysis of the situational implications of "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's." While "[l]oyalty to God and Caesar can work together," it cannot here for "Caesar has demanded that we give up the God of Justice for allegiance to country." In the midst of such religious argumentation Nicgorski returns to Rep. Moakley's stated support for Sanctuary. To appeal to the broader audience of central authority, she uses secular central authority to support her religious perspective.

She returns to the choice of God over government forced on the U.S. church, graphically relates what happened to the "Church in Central America" which "said NO to the idolatry of its governments. . . . it has become a Church of martyrs," and defines the choice as "the most fundamental option of faith. . . life or death." Archbishop Romero, "one of the clearest prophets and martyrs of Central America," is offered as exemplar for the faith choice. Nicgorski returns from indictment to her own involvement. Her religious community's rule of life mandates her choice: "My faith is not something I leave in the church pew to proclaim on Sunday. Either I believe and serve a God of LIFE AND JUSTICE or I serve the idols of death, power, money, and law."

Based on that forced choice she comes to a request concerning her sentence: "allow me to continue in my ministry to Central American refugees. . . . They are living witnesses to the God of life." Noting that the suffering of the church has raised an awareness of the need of Central Americans, but "nothing has changed;" not believing she has "done anything to warrant a sentence," Nicgorski looks to her "creed" and asks "for the same treatment that this government continues to give to Central Americans along the border." She seeks alternative sentencing to the refugee camps of Mexico or Central America, or to the detention facilities in the U.S. noting that life there "is more difficult than a federal prison." The plea is couched in careful, almost dispassionate logic, but phrases like the last appeal about conditions of life, while explicitly employed to justify it as punishment, seem implicitly to increase the sense of shame she has tried to build with her indictment. The indictment is reiterated as she concludes her plea: "I am not acknowledging wrongdoing but rather the travesty of justice that this court has allowed and fostered."

The prophet ends with an invitation to her sentencer. She has been called by her "faith. . .to take all steps, not to count the cost." Now he is called.

> You and only you, Judge Carroll, can still make a difference. You have the authority and power. Many have prayed for your conversion, hoping you would see the light of truth and life. You by your sentence can add your YES to the God of Justice and Life and therefore your NO to the Caesar who wants to use his money, power, and law to silence the witnesses of its policies in Central America. I do not ask for myself but ask because it will be a symbol of the change of your heart and herald of hope to Central America.

Having clarified her own forced-by-faith choice, having indicted the government for its lapse from justice into corruption, the prophet invites an expression of repentance from a representative of that lapsed central authority.

Nicgorski's statement is the longest of those given by the convicted Sanctuary workers in Tucson. While full of emotional intensity, it is one of the most dispassionate statements in its language use. In contrast to others which focused on offering a legal justification for Sanctuary action, Nicgorski stresses a distinction between that which is legal and that which is just. She speaks as a prophet. She employs secular authority to extend her credible base of appeal, but her primary authority is religious. Most of her examples come from religious worker witnesses. She offers the biblical prophets as the model for her behavior. Her central thesis is a choice forced by religious belief. More explicitly than any of her fellow workers, Nicgorski depicts the persecuted, prophetic community, inviting others to join.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

How were people perceived as "pernicious," "blasphemous," even "seditious" to "transform society" with their "scandalous truth?" Given an opposition by which they were "ignored, ridiculed, opposed," and physically punished were prophets able to attract a central social following without diluting their message beyond recognition? Could the pulpit be used for social critique, for proclamation of "the biblical vision of justice," without falling into "political campaigning" or "pushing an ethical issue to its emotional extreme?" Would government objection to social critique persist in giving a dual meaning to "religious conviction?"[1] We began this document with tracings of an ongoing conflict--the uneasy relationship of "church" and "state" and perspectives on the difficulties facing the representatives of "church" who would critique the "state." These social critics speaking from a religious authority perspective were accorded their historic label, "prophets," and one specific outbreak of the conflict was designated for analysis, the Sanctuary movement within southern Arizona.

The challenge facing the movement was recognized: the need to extend its mantle of authority, to overcome a perception that it is a mere polarizing fringe. Having established a prophetic concern for themes reflecting faith in action and the establishment of social justice, with prophetic authority derived from its religious base, and with an acknowledged tendency to employ emotional and imagistic language in order to jar society into a new perception of the social order, we set out to explore how Sanctuary rhetoric draws on the prophetic tradition, whether that rhetoric attempts to expand the tradition, and why the rhetoric leaves the tradition.

---

[1] Heschel 1: 19; Ambler and Haslam, postscript; Farrell; McKenna 20.

We have seen the initial strongly imagistic, polarizing rhetoric of Corbett change as a core group of believers was established and he sought to expand beyond the base. Corbett himself came to speak of the dangers of a "rhetoric of rage," and while he consistently stressed a religious justification for Sanctuary action, with religious authority appeals, the basic justifying appeals expand to include legal argument and the defense of individual liberties. Corbett did not lose his central argument; he added additional arguments while somewhat lessening the harshness of his tone.

Having noted Corbett's concern that Sanctuary action be community action, for "only communities can do justice," we examined one congregational community as it spoke to and of itself. The community characterized itself as "prophetic" rather than "political," while recognizing that these terms "are not dichotomies." Religious heroes, like Oscar Romero, and biblical justification were used. The public declaration of Sanctuary, addressed directly to central authority, employed the language and themes of prophetic discourse, but expanded the argument to include a legal justification for Sanctuary action. That second justification served the dual purpose of indicting government action, thus standing firmly within the prophetic tradition of social criticism in light of faith demands, and appealing to people who are closer to central authority, less willing to break with the professed values of that authority. The sermons, primarily ingroup rhetoric of the community, showed the preacher varying roles of prophet and pastor as he worked to maintain the health of the community as community and as prophetic unit. The videotape offering the community's understanding of itself and its role, was heavily religious in argument, image, and source of authority. The act of eucharist depicted the community as community, and the sermon woven through the tape presented a polarizing, prophetic choice rooted in scripture: "Sometimes you cannot love both God and money." The tape presented a problem for the community: it depicted them and their actions in the language and image they approved, quite suitable for members of the community, or possibly other similar communities, but the arguments and value appeals of the tape seemed less appropriate for those who were not already within, or on the verge of joining the prophetic community of Sanctuary.

Given a movement with a broad ecumenical base we observed the use of diverse ecumenical authority figures, varied texts with shared prophetic themes, and distinctive bonding rituals, to unify the independent Sanctuary communities into one prophetic body. By employing acknowedged authorities, presenting global support, and demonstrating consistency with the historic church tradition the

Sanctuary community further established its right to claim central, rather than peripheral religious status.

In public debate, over the course of the trial, as Sanctuary struggled to reach a central, secular audience, we heard the argument shift from religious motivation to humanitarian and legal justification for Sanctuary action. Outside prophetic community religious justification seemed to offer less promise for motivation, so the speakers shifted to adoption and adaptation of traditional national images and values. The critique was maintained, but the basis for justifying the resulting action was shifted to suit the broader audience.

The sentencing statements following the Tucson trial provided a variety of responses: nationalistic, legalistic, patriotic, and prophetic. Typically the stances were merged in some way to broaden the potential appeal. Perhaps the most deft statement, most consistent to a prophetic base while carefully interweaving secular authority and shared value appeals came from Nicgorski. She unblinkingly indicted the system from a prophetic perspective, but used eyewitness evidence, acknowledged authority, and shared values to establish her right to a broader hearing. Part of the strength of her statement seems to lie in her capacity to secure heightened emotion without going to the polarizing language extremes of Corbett in her images. In her statement we see some of the potential for the prophetic rhetor, yet her statement alone could not reach the desired breadth of audience. The legal argument which she turns upside-down by focusing instead on justice, is an important argument for a central audience. Justice may be the shared value, but legality of behavior sees the value in action.

In Sanctuary rhetoric we have seen speakers using prophetic discourse to critique, without falling into the trap of pure political campaigning. We have seen a tiny core of dissenters, viewed as extremists, grow into a movement with worldwide support. The justifying message has been diluted, but it did not lose its prophetic core.

Further study should be done on the interaction of varied speaker roles within prophetic discourse. A more extended comparison of the language of Corbett's early and later statements and the language of Nicgorski's statement might focus attention on more ways to overcome stylistically the often polarizing tone of the prophet.

As long as people contend, with Darlene Nicgorski, that dissent is necessary, if personally costly, "when idolatrous gods try to hold on to an authority given only to the one true God," there will be a place for prophets and prophetic discourse. The extent to which those prophets succeed in relaying their message may depend in part on their capacity to use the prophetic tradition while also appealing to the non-religious values of the audience. The prophet, like other rhetors, reaches the audience through identification with the audience. For the prophet to achieve social transformation that may mean spending some time with arguments which may not be crucial to the faith, but are crucial to the audience. The result can be "the sharing of a vision of reality and possibility, . . . a contribution to the creation of a common vision."[2]

---

[2] Christopher Johnstone, "An Aristotelian Trilogy: Ethics, Rhetoric, Politics, and the Search for Moral Truth," Philosophy and Rhetoric 13 (1980): 16.

Reference List

"Ad of the Week." Tucson Weekly 30 Apr.-6 May 1986: 29.

Aguilar, Maria del Socorro Pardo de. Statement before sentencing. TS, distributed copy, court record, translation. Tucson Ecumenical Council Task Force on Central America.

Alinsky, Saul. Rules for Radicals: A Practical Primer for Realistic Radicals. New York: Random House, 1971.

Ambler, Rex and David Haslam, eds. Postscript. Agenda for Prophets: Towards a Political Theology for Britain. By Ambler and Haslam. London: Bowerdean Press, 1980. 170-174.

Anderson, Bernhard. The Eighth Century Prophets: Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.

Anderson, Francis I. and David Noel Freedman. Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. Vol 24 of The Anchor Bible. Eds. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1980.

Anderson, Ruth Diana. "The Character and Communication of a Modern Day Prophet: A Rhetorical Analysis of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement." 40 (1980): 4796A. University of Oregon.

Bailey, Barry. "Religion and Politics in the Context of Biblical Faith and a Free Society." Religion and Politics. Ed. James E. Wood, Jr. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 1983. 113-125.

Bailey, F. G. The Tactical Uses of Passion: An Essay on Power, Reason, and Reality. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Bellah, Robert. "Civil Religion in America." Daedalus (Winter 1967). Rpt. in American Civil Religion. Eds. Russell E. Richey and Donald G. Jones. New York: Harper and Row, 1974. 21-44.

Bercovitch, Sacvan. The American Jeremiad. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978.

Berger, Peter L. "Charisma and Religious Innovation: The Social Location of Israelite Prophecy." American Sociological Review 28 (1963): 940-950.

Betz, Brian. "Erich Fromm and the Rhetoric of Prophecy." Central States Speech Journal 26 (1975): 310-315.

Bitzer, Lloyd. "Rhetoric and Public Knowledge." Rhetoric, Philosophy and Literature: An Exploration. Ed. Don Burks. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 1978. 67-94.

Black, Edwin. Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method. 1965. New York: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978.

Bormann, Ernest G. "Fetching Good Out of Evil: A Rhetorical Use of Calamity." Quarterly Journal of Speech 63 (1977): 130-139.

Bormann, Ernest G. The Force of Fantasy: Restoring the American Dream. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985.

Boulding, Kenneth. The Image. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966.

Browning, Daniel. "8 Sanctuary Defendants Found Guilty; 3 Acquitted." Arizona Daily Star 2 May 1986, final ed.: A1+.

Brueggemann, Walter. The Prophetic Imagination. 1978. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.

Brueggemann, Walter. Tradition for Crisis: A Study in Hosea. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1968.

Burke, William L. "Notes on a Rhetoric of Lamentation." Central States Speech Journal 30 (1979): 109-121.

Burks, Paul. "This is Sanctuary: A Reformation in Our Time." Sequoia: The Church at Work Feb. 1985: c.

Butler, A. Bates, III. Address. Arizona Sanctuary Legal Defense Fund Dinner. Tucson, 2 June 1985.

Carl III, William. "Old Testament Prophecy and the Question of Prophetic Preaching: A Perspective on Ecclesiastical Protests of the Vietnam War and the Participation of William Sloane Coffin Jr." Diss. University of Pittsburg, 1977.

Carpenter, Ronald. "The Historical Jeremiad as Rhetorical Genre." Form and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action. Eds. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Jamieson. Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association, n.d. 103-117.

Carroll, Robert. When Prophecy Failed: Reactions and Responses to Failure in the Old Testament Tradition. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1979.

Carroll, Robert. When Prophecy Failed. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1979.

Cathcart, Robert. "Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form." Southern Speech Communication Journal 43 (1978): 233-247.

Charnock, Richard. "U.S. Officials Laud Sanctuary Verdicts as 'Good Result.'" Arizona Republic 2 May 1986: A4.

Clancy, William et al. Religion and American Society: A Statement of Principles. Santa Barbara, CA: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1961.

Clark, Anthony. Statement before sentencing. TS, distributed copy, court record. Tucson Ecumenical Council Task Force on Central America.

Clements, Ronald E. Prophecy and Tradition. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975.

Coleman, William Ebbert, Jr. "The Role of Prophet in the Abolition Rhetoric of the Reverend Theodore Parker, 1845-1860." 35 (1975): 5556A. Ohio State University.

Conrad, Charles. "The Rhetoric of the Moral Majority: An Analysis of Romantic Form." Quarterly Journal of Speech 69 (1983): 159-170.

"Conspiracy of Compassion: Four Indicted Leaders Discuss the Sanctuary Movement." Sojourners 14 (March 1985): 14-18.

Cotham, Perry C. Politics, Americanism and Christianity. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1976.

Cullinan, Thomas, O.S.B. "The Church as an Agent of Social Change--From the Edge." Ambler and Haslam 135-143.

Dalton, Richard. Address. Sanctuary debate. Tucson, 12 February 1986.

Davies, J. G. Christians, Politics and Violent Revolution. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1976.

"Denominational Breakdown of Sanctuaries--4/85." Sanctuary Media Office distribution.

Derien, Patricia. Address. Arizona Sanctuary Legal Defense Fund dinner. Tucson, 14 September 1985.

"The Door Interview: John Fife." The Wittenburg Door 91 (June-July 1986): 12-15, 18-20.

Drinan, Robert F., S. J. Address. Consultation on Government Infiltration of the Churches. Phoenix, 23 June 1985.

Duarte, Carmen and Jane Erickson. "Defendants Vow to Resume Work with Movement." Arizona Daily Star 2 May 1986: A7.

Dumas, André. Political Theology and the Life of the Church. Trans. John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1978.

Farrell, Mike. Address. Arizona Sanctuary Legal Defense Fund Dinner. Tucson, 14 Sept. 1985.

Fife, John. "Barefoot and Pregnant." Southside Presbyterian Church, Tucson, 2 March 1986.

Fife, John. "Putting Your Hand to the Plow." Southside Presbyterian Church, Tucson, 29 June 1986.

Fife, John. "Sentences." Southside Presbyterian Church, Tucson, 29 June 1986.

Fife, John. "The Sanctuary Movement: Where Have We Been? - Where Are We Going?" TS, distributed copy. March 1985.

Fife, John. "Who Do You Think You Are?" Southside Presbyterian Church, Tucson, 23 June 1985.

Fife, John. Personal interview. October 1985.

Fife, John. Sermon. Southside Presbyterian Church, Tucson, 22 Sept. 1985.

Fife, John. Sermon. Southside Presbyterian Church, Tucson, 6 July 1986.

Fife, John. Sermon. Southside Presbyterian Church, Tucson, 8 September 1985.

Fife, John. Statement before sentencing. TS, distributed copy. Tucson Ecumenical Council Task Force on Central America.

Frentz, Thomas. "Rhetorical Conversation, Time, and Moral Action." Quarterly Journal of Speech 71 (1985): 1-18.

Gitay, Yehoshua. "Reflections on the Study of the Prophetic Discourse." Vetus Testamentum 33.2 (1983): 207-221.

Goldzwig, Steven R. "Toward a Rhetoric of Public Theology: The Religious Rhetor and Public Policy." SCA Convention. Chicago, 4 Nov. 1984.

Grassi, Ernesto. Rhetoric as Philosophy: The Humanist Tradition. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1980.

Gust, Dodie. "Fife's Work in Sanctuary Movement Was a Matter of Faith." Arizona Daily Star 5 May 1986: B1.

Gust, Dodie. "Quixotic Sanctuary Founder Focuses on Human Rights." Arizona Daily Star 2 May 1986: A8.

Hallo, William W. and J. J. A. van Dijk. The Exaltation of Inanna. New York: Yale University Press, 1968.

Hart, Roderick P. The Political Pulpit. West Lafayetee, IN: Purdue University Press, 1977.

Hauerwas, Stanley. Vision and Virtue: Essays in Christian Ethical Reflection. 1974. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981.

Hernandez, Alejandro, Charles Proctor, and John Fife. Associated Students of the University of Arizona Speakers Board Sanctuary Debate. Harvill Auditorium, University of Arizona, Tucson. 21 Oct. 1985.

Heschel, Abraham J. _The Prophets_. 1962. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Huffmon, Herbert B. "Prophecy in the Mari Letters." _Biblical Archaeologist_ 31 (1968): 101-124. Rpt. in Vol 3 of _The Biblical Archaeologist Reader_. Eds. Edward F. Campbell Jr. and David Noel Freedman. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1970. 199-224.

Hutchison, Margaret. Statement before sentencing. TS, distributed copy, excerpts. Tucson Ecumenical Council Task Force on Central America.

Japp, Phyllis M. "Esther or Isaiah?: The Abolitionist-Feminist Rhetoric of Angelina Grimke." _Quarterly Journal of Speech_ 71 (1985): 325-348.

Johannesen, Richard L. "The Jeremiad and Jenkin Lloyd Jones." _Communication Monographs_ 52 (1985): 156-172.

Johnstone, Christopher. "An Aristotelian Trilogy: Ethics, Rhetoric, Politics, and the Search for Moral Truth." _Philosophy and Rhetoric_ 13 (1980): 1-24.

Kemper, Vicki. "Convicted of the Gospel." _Sojourners_ 15 (July 1986): 14-18.

Knibb, Michael. "Prophecy and the Emergence of the Jewish Apocalypses." _Israel's Prophetic Tradition: Essays in Honour of_

Peter R. Ackroyd. Eds. Richard Coggins. Anthony Phillips, and Michael Knibb. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982. 155-180.

Lewin, Wendy. Statement before sentencing. TS, distributed copy. Tucson Ecumenical Council Task Force on Central America.

Limburg, James. The Prophets and the Powerless. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1977.

"The Lord Is Blessing Me. . ." Sanctuary: A Decision of Conscience. Videocassette. Dir. Lydia Breen. Southwest Reports, Inc., 1985. 23:38 min.

MacEoin, Gary. Sanctuary: A Resource Guide for Understanding and Participating in the Central American Refugees' Struggle. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1985.

McDonagh, Enda. The Demands of Simple Justice: A Study of the Church, Politics and Violence with Special Reference to Zimbabwe. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1980.

McKenna, David L. "A Political Strategy for the Local Church." Christianity Today 19 Apr. 1985: 19-23.

Medhurst, Martin J. "McGovern at Wheaton: A Quest for Redemption." Communication Quarterly 25 (1977): 32-39.

"New Mexico is Proclaimed a Sanctuary for Refugees." New York Times 30 March 1986, natl. ed.: 17.

Nicgorski, Darlene. Statement before sentencing. TS, distributed copy. Tucson Ecumenical Council Task Force on Central America.

Peters. "US.Aid to Central Americans." Editorial Cartoon. Arizona Republic 17 May 1986: A27.

Quinley, Harold E. The Prophetic Clergy: Social Action Among Protestant Ministers. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974.

Quiñones, Ramon Dagoberto. Statement before sentencing. TS, distributed copy, court record, translation. Tucson Ecumenical Council Task Force on Central America.

Rabin, Chaim. "Discourse Analysis and the Dating of Deuteronomy." In Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honour of E.I.J. Rosenthal. Eds. John A. Emerton and Stefan C. Reid. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982. 171-178.

Rathbun, John. "The Problem of Judgment and Effect in Rhetorical Criticism: A Proposed Solution." Western Speech 33 (1969): 146-159.

Reid, David P. SS. CC. What Are They Saying about the Prophets? New York: Paulist Press, 1980.

Reid, Ronald. "Apocalypticism and Typology: Rhetorical Dimensions of Symbolic Reality." Quarterly Journal of Speech 69 (1983) 229-248.

Rothenberg, Jackie and Jim Erickson. "Emotions of Trial Dogged Diligent Jury." Arizona Daily Star 2 May 1986, final ed.: A6.

Rotstein, Arthur H. "Sanctuary: Principals in Case Still Deeply Involved." Tucson Citizen 1 July 1987: F4+.

Sanctuary prayer service. St. Augustine's Cathedral, Tucson. 15 April 1986.

Sanctuary prayer service. St. Augustine's Cathedral, Tucson. 1 July 1986.

Sanctuary prayer service. St. Augustine's Cathedral, Tucson. 4 March 1986.

Sanctuary prayer service. St. Augustine's Cathedral, Tucson. 8 April 1986.

Sanctuary prayer service. St. Catherine Church, Phoenix, AZ. 30 June 1985.

Sanctuary worship service. Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Nogales, AZ. 10 May 1986.

Sanctuary worship service. St. Augustine's Cathedral, Tucson. 11 May 1986.

Sanctuary worship service. Temple Emanu-El, Tucson, AZ. 13 October 1985.

Taking the Stand: The Testimony of Lieutenant Colonel Oliver North. New York: Pocket Books, 1987.

Thomas, Tracy, John Fife, Robert Parks, Isabel Garcia-Gallegos, Richard Dalton, and Joseph Weizenbaum. Sanctuary Debate sponsored by Americans for Truth in Our Nation, University of Arizona College Republicans, and Federation for American Immigration Reform. Social Science Auditorium, University of Arizona, Tucson. 12 Feb. 1986.

Towner, W. Sibley. "On Calling People 'Prophets' in 1970." Interpretation 24 (1970): 492-509.

Varn, Gene. "8 Convicted in Sanctuary Trial." Arizona Republic 2 May 1986: A1.

Ware, B. L. and Wil A. Linkugel. "The Rhetorical Persona: Marcus Garvey as Black Moses." Communication Monographs 49 (1982) 50-62.

Weaver, Richard. "Language is Sermonic." Dimensions of Rhetorical Scholarship. Ed. Roger E. Nebergall. Norman: University of Oklahoma Department of Speech, 1963. Rpt. in Language is Sermonic: Richard M. Weaver on the Nature of Rhetoric. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985. 201-225.

Wheelwright, Philip. The Burning Fountain: A Study in the Language of Symbolism. Bloomington, IN: Indiana State University Press, 1954.

Williams, J.G. "The Social Location of Israelite Prophecy." Journal of the American Academy of Religion 37 (1969): 153-165.

Willis-Conger, Phil. Statement before sentencing. TS, distributed copy. Tucson Ecumenical Council Task Force on Central America.

Wilson, Robert R. Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.

Wolff, Hans Walter. "Prophecy from the Eighth through the Fifth Century." Interpretation 32,1 (1978): 20-21.

Wood, James E. Jr. "Christian Faith and Political Society." Religion and Politics. Ed. James E. Wood, Jr. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 1983. 1-17.

Zannoni, Arthur E. Unpublished lectures. Episcopal Church Women's Institute. Petit Jean, AR, 11-13 June 1983.