

Sacred and the Secular in Catholic Activism: An Analysis of the “Justice for Immigrants”
Campaign by the U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of
Arts at George Mason University

By

Mary Jo Lopez Duckwitz
Bachelor of Arts
George Mason University, 2006

Director: John B. Burns, Professor
Religious Studies

Spring Semester 2009
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

Copyright: 2009 Mary Jo Lopez Duckwitz
All Rights Reserved

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my loving and supportive family, especially my parents who taught me that love, respect, and perseverance are the foundations of any matter-religious or otherwise. And to my husband, Dan who lives these teachings with me. Our relationship inspires the totality of this work- that with love and respect two different worldly perspectives can not only coexist but accept each other.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank Dr. John Burns for his continual support and advice throughout my graduate and undergraduate studies. More significantly, I thank him for being one of the best teachers I have ever had. His class managed to uproot me from my primary undergraduate political science track by showing me the value of religious studies.

Additionally, I am grateful to my thesis committee, Dr. John Farina and Dr. Jo-Marie Burt. They not only took the time to review and comment on my thesis, but both have reached out to show me how my studies can have a concrete effect in an academic community.

Last but certainly not least, I would also like to thank the Religious Studies department, in particular Dr. Ro and Dr. Shiner, whom I have gotten to know throughout my many, many years at George Mason.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract.....	vi
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Historical Precedent for USCCB Civic Engagement.....	6
Religion in American Politics.....	9
Religious Leadership and Rhetoric in the Civil Rights Movement.....	18
American Catholics and the Vatican II Church.....	25
Summary.....	29
3. “Justice For Immigrants”: USCCB’s Campaign for Immigrant Rights.....	31
The Melting Pot: Brief History of United States Immigration.....	33
Catholic Leadership and Immigration Reform.....	41
USCCB’s Religious Justifications for Immigration.....	47
Summary.....	51
4. Conclusion.....	53
Works Cited.....	55

ABSTRACT

THE SECULAR AND SACRED IN CATHOLIC ACTIVISM: AN ANALYSIS OF THE “JUSTICE FOR IMMIGRANTS” CAMPAIGN BY THE U.S. CATHOLIC CONFE- RENCE OF BISHOPS

Mary Jo Lopez Duckwitz, M.A.

George Mason University, 2009

Thesis Director: John B. Burns, Ph.D.

This thesis discusses the United States Conference of Catholic Bishop's (or USCCB) civic engagement as a means to understand the secular and sacred in Catholic activism. In order to better comprehend the religious engagement in political and social issues, this thesis examines the Post Vatican II Catholic civic action and engagement by the USCCB in regards to immigration reform. However, before the case study analysis can be rendered, there must be a historical examination of religion's role in American politics. Therefore, the first half of the thesis is dedicated to three historical religious-civil factors. The first historical factor is the creation of the First Amendment. The second historical factor of importance is the Civil Rights movement. Lastly, there is an analysis of the Second Vatican Council's influence on American Catholicism. All three events legitimate the current civic engagement of the USCCB. Thus, this thesis argues that that the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, with its religious and secular components, is an essential and necessary element in the transformative movement of immigrant

rights. This thesis serves as a reference for those who want to understand the role of religion in affecting societal change and reform in American society. Additionally, this study adds to the academic dialogue of what the USCCB brings to the immigration debate that secular organizations cannot.

1. Introduction

American civic organizations, such as the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (hereinafter “USCCB”), have been heavily influenced by both the state and the religious. Historically, the United States provides a cultural and constitutional basis for the freedom of religion and assembly which supports the political engagement of the USCCB. Thus the democratic and constitutional principles of freedom of religion established precedent for the USCCB’s political and civic relations. Even during the nineteenth century, American bishops applauded American democracy. They believed that the United States’ independence and liberties were the “work of special Providence.”¹ Additionally, the USCCB’s foundation and its civic engagement came about after two significant events during the mid to late twentieth century. The first and most direct influence was the Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican (II Vatican). The second, indirect influence was the twentieth century phenomenon of social movements, such as the 1960s civil rights movement.

Although the Second Vatican Council took place overseas, it still had an important influence on a large portion of American society, American Catholics. For

¹ Gelm, Richard. Politics and Religious Authority: American Catholics Since the Second Vatican Council. London: Greenwood Press, 1994, p. 20.

instance, the precursor to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) and the United States Catholic Conference (USCC), was formed in 1966, only a year after the close of the Second Vatican Council.² Since then, the USCCB has taken upon itself to follow the social and religious directives of the Roman Catholic Church. This explicit religious mission of the USCCB is an important factor to its civic participation.

Additionally, the social turmoil and subsequent social movements of the 1960s most likely had a contextual effect on the USCCB. The civil rights movement called for civic engagement by U.S. citizens through the secular, political environment and ideals of the United States. For example, the civil rights movement would peacefully assemble for its protests. This political participation of peaceful assembly is an important part of the first amendment of the Bill of Rights, since it is the right of those being governed by a democratic government.³ The civil rights movement, also, provided the USCCB an historical precedent for its engagement in present social issues, such as the case study of the USCCB's "Justice For Immigrants" campaign. The USCCB specifically calls for the United States to "accommodate migration flows...[and that] Government policies that respect the basic human rights of the undocumented are necessary."⁴

² USCCB. "Brief History." About USCCB. 2008. 22 Oct. 2008 <<http://www.usccb.org/whoweare.shtml>>

³ "Bill of Rights." U.S. National Archive and Record Administration. 22 Oct. 2008 <http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/bill_of_rights_transcript.html>

⁴ USCCB. "Strangers No Longer: Together on a Journey of Hope" 22 Jan. 2003. United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Inc. and Conferencia del Episcopado Mexicano. 19 Oct. 2008 <<http://www.usccb.org/mrs/stranger.shtml>>

At its foundation, the USCCB saw civic engagement as vital to their mission. In this study, the definition of civic engagement is taken from Antonius Liedhegener's article *Civic Engagement in Religion*. Thus, civic engagement is defined as a form of voluntary activities citizens undertake in the public sphere. However it is "not confined to the non-political sphere of civil society."⁵ Therefore, civic engagement, also, can be seen as an activity that intends to affect government action. The first tenet of the USCCB's mission statement falls under this definition. Their mission statement declares that they must "[a]ct collaboratively and consistently on vital issues confronting the Church and society."⁶ Presently, the USCCB continues to adhere to its mission of civic engagement in pressing social matters. The USCCB has provided its full support behind the movement for immigrant rights. For example, they apply the papal message and the social teachings of the Catholic Church to their own writings regarding the social movement for immigrant rights. Moreover, the USCCB through the secular realm pressures the United States government to accept comprehensive immigration reform.

A study of the USCCB's civic engagement with respect to immigrant rights allows one to see an example of the role a religious group takes part in a transformative movement. Additionally, the analysis of the USCCB's incorporated religious and secular

⁵ Liedhegener, Antonius. "Civic Engagement in Religion." *Civil Society, Civic Engagement and Catholicism in the U.S.* Liedhegener, Antonius and Kremp, Werner, eds. Trier: Atlantische Akademie, 2007, p. 7.

⁶ USCCB. "Statement of Mission." *About USCCB*. 2008. 22 Oct. 2008 <<http://www.usccb.org/whoweare.shtml>>

components will add to the discourse on the benefits and hindrances of uniting the secular and the religious.

Additionally, when examining this study, three questions first come to mind. First, why can religious organizations, such as the USCCB, politically participate in the secular American state? Second, what is the role of religious groups in affecting immigration reform, specifically the role of the USCCB? Third, what does the USCCB bring to the immigration debate that secular organizations do not?

This thesis proposes that the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, with its religious and secular components, is an essential and necessary element to the transformative movement of immigrant rights. Additionally, it is theorized that the USCCB, as a religious group, fulfills an important aspect of inspiration and tradition that secular organizations cannot replicate. For example, the USCCB's use of religious doctrine and rhetoric influences and compels American Catholics to support immigrant rights. This study should further aid an understanding of the role of religious groups in effecting societal change and reform in immigration. Additionally, this study adds to the academic dialogue of what the USCCB brings to the immigration debate that secular organizations cannot. Secular organizations cannot outright claim religious inspiration which ties many people to social movements.

In order to better understand the USCCB's civic engagement, this analysis uses an historical methodology. An historical and qualitative methodology allows a better

examination of several interrelated theories, such as separation of church and state and American civic engagement, influencing church and state relationship. Hopefully, these theories and methodology should enhance an understanding on how and why religious organizations, such as the USCCB, engage in political discourse. The use of the religious and secular by the USCCB to influence U.S. policy and American Catholics can be seen as either an affront to the separation of church and state or an important relationship to foster societal change. To fully examine this problem and the context of USCCB's engagement, one must look to the constitutional legacies of religion in American politics.

2. Historical Precedent for USCCB Civic Engagement

On my arrival in the United States the religious aspect of the country was the first thing that struck my attention... [i]n France I had almost always seen the spirit of religion and the spirit of freedom marching in opposite directions. But in America I found they were intimately united and that they reigned in common over the same country.⁷- Alexis De Tocqueville, (as quoted in Miller 235)

Religious civic engagement has a long standing tradition in American politics.

Alexis De Tocqueville became quite aware of this fact while studying American Democracy during the Nineteenth Century. Since America's founding, religious institutions and its ideas would engage civil society through its charitable works or through the civic involvement of individual members. For the most part, American society and its founders wanted it to stay that way.⁸ For instance, the American Constitution formally placed religion in terms of freedom of individual conscience and prohibition of the establishment of any religion. In a pluralist society dedicated to the secular state, these laws were not only important but necessary.

⁷ De Toqueville, Alexis. as quoted in Miller, William L. The First Liberty. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2003. p. 235.

⁸ This will be discussed further when analyzing Thomas Jefferson's Letter to the Danbury Baptist association.

They still remain as necessity in contemporary United States government and society. However, religion was not completely discounted and separated in the founding of the United States. The First Amendment protected the right to religious freedom as well as the right to freely assemble. Thus, assuring U.S. citizens, as individuals or as a collective, the right to think and act religiously (and irreligiously).

The constitutional protection of religious freedom and the right to assemble provides religious organizations, such as the USCCB, the legitimacy to participate in American civil and political society. And with the egregious acts committed by humans, there is a necessity for religious ideals to not only influence its individual membership but to engage the state as well. The American state through its bodies of government and religious institutions through its members and civic organizations both work for the welfare of mankind. Why, then, can they not work together for the common purpose of social and moral order?

By the middle of the twentieth century, religious organizations would no longer focus solely on charitable actions. New American religious organizations were established to focus on political issues that affected their members and American society on whole. A prime example of the a politically engaged religious organization was the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC). The SCLC focused its attention to the political dilemma of equal rights for all United States citizens. Thus, the civil rights movement gained organizational and inspirational support from religion and religious organizations. This melding of the political and social in the civil rights movement would

provide an important precedent for future religious political engagement in the United States.

Contemporaneously, The United States Catholic Conference of Bishops follows the historical precedent which has already been established by, first and foremost, the U.S. Constitution. During the USCCB's time period, two major events occurred that also heavily influenced its political and civic engagement- the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 60s and the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s. Thus the USCCB's religiously inspired political actions in the immigrants rights movement is part of the tradition of religious civic engagement. Moreover, it is a religious organization that illustrates this melding of the political and religious, secular and sacred, for the common concern of social order and welfare in the United States.

The Second Vatican Council heavily influenced a re-emergence of social welfare in American society. Vatican II brought issues of social progress and welfare to the front of Catholic thought and action. The Vatican II Encyclicals also aligned itself with the merits of democracy and its protections of human rights.⁹ Thus, the USCCB gained much inspiration and support from the Vatican to go forward with its political engagement in the United States.

Notwithstanding, there is still contention of how far reaching religion, such as the Catholic Church, should influence the government and society. A growing and more vocal secular camp of American society is calling for a complete isolation if not

⁹ Griffin, Leslie. "Pope John XXIII." The Teachings of Modern Roman Catholicism. Witte, J. and Alexander, F., eds. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007, p. 255.

withdrawal of religion in American politics. Richard Dawkins' 2006 bestselling book, "The God Delusion," demonstrates the large support of secularism and the call for religious withdrawal from society. For one, Dawkins argues that religion never produced morality but morality evolved over time. However, that argument completely disregards the foundational tradition and protection of religious freedom and assembly by religious citizens and their leadership, such as the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

Religion and American Politics

American society was established on the foundational principle that the United States would be a secular state. One only needs to review the Preamble to the Constitution for support. The Preamble states:

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.¹⁰

The Preamble lacks any mention of religious pursuit for the creation of the United States government. As H. Mark Roelofs argues the only interests indicated within this statement are secular.¹¹ Moreover, the First Amendment explicitly stipulates that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."¹² Through the

¹⁰ "The Constitution of the United States." The U.S. National Archives and Records Administration . 8 Mar. 2009. <http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/constitution_transcript.html>

¹¹ Roelofs, H. Mark. "Church and State in America" *The Review of Politics*. 1988. JSTOR. George Mason Uni. Lib., VA. 16 Mar 2009. p. 562 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1407354>>

¹² The Bill of Rights." The U.S. National Archives and Records Administration . 8 Mar. 2009. <http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/bill_of_rights_transcript.html>

enactment of such legislation, religion could not have a direct involvement and place within the national government. No one religion nor any religion can claim to be the religion of the United States.

Many United States scholars took this claim one step further. Some scholars asserted that secularization would dominate all facets of American society, political or not. What led to this notion? The popularity of secularism in intellectual circles came from the rise of modernity and science during the 17th-19th century. This rise of modernity and science brought some fear to religious circles who saw these changes as threatening their religious traditions and ideals. For example, Enlightenment philosophy not only questioned scriptural discrepancies, but also the existence of God.¹³

However, for the most part modernity and science integrated into intellectual and societal life. Many felt that religion was a barrier to rational thought and progress. For example, the early 20th century intellectual John Dewey exclaimed in his book *Human Nature and Conduct* that, "[religion] has been petrified into a slavery of thought and sentiment, as intolerant superiority on the part of the few and an intolerable burden on the part of the many."¹⁴ By mid to late twentieth century (1960s to 1980s), many scholars rallied behind the simplified Nietzsche declaration that "God is Dead."¹⁵ However, those scholars underestimated the significance of religion in American politics. The United

¹³ Lawrence, Bruce B. *Defenders of God: The Fundamentalist Revolt Against the Modern Age*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1989, p. 106.

¹⁴ Dewey, John. *Human Nature and Conduct; an Introduction to Social Psychology*. New York: The Modern Library, 1957.

¹⁵ Wicks, Robert. "Friedrich Nietzsche." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. 15 Jul 2008. accessed on Nov. 23, 2008. <<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/nietzsche/#NieInfUpo20tCenTho>>

States may have been founded as a secular state, but it could not strictly separate religion from American politics. Religion not only has deep roots in American society but is continuously protected by the United States Constitution.

For instance, after the establishment clause in the First Amendment follows the free exercise clause. This line exclaimed that there can be no “prohibiting the free exercise” of religion.¹⁶ Neither the government nor American society can prevent any individual or collective from practicing their religion. Thus, the First Amendment fundamentally separates yet protects religion in American society. Nevertheless, these two clauses did not fully clarify the subject of religion in American politics.

Thomas Jefferson attempted to clarify the meaning of the First Amendment through the now infamous letter to the Danbury Baptist Association in 1802. Jefferson explained the following:

Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between Man & his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legitimate powers of government reach actions only, & not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," thus building a wall of separation between Church & State.¹⁷

¹⁶ The Bill of Rights.” The U.S. National Archives and Records Administration . 8 Mar. 2009. <http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/bill_of_rights_transcript.html>

¹⁷ Jefferson, Thomas.”Letter to the Danbury Baptists: The Final Letter, As Sent.” Library of Congress. Martha Graham Collection: June 1998. Vol 57, No. 6. 8 Mar 2008. <<http://www.loc.gov/loc/lcib/9806/danpre.html>>

The first line of Jefferson's discussion frames religion as solely an individual practice- "a matter which lies solely between Man & his God."¹⁸ By framing religion as an individual matter or a matter of free conscience, then government as a large collective entity cannot infringe upon that individual relationship. Moreover, he goes on to say that religion cannot encroach on government. Thus, Jefferson claims the First Amendment built "a wall of separation between Church & State."¹⁹

This passage has become entrenched in the political and religious discourse regarding religion and U.S. politics, even though it was written in a letter and not in any legal form. Ironically, the letter has only added fuel to the debate. One may ask why American society has fervently debated the First Amendment during the twentieth century. For one thing, religious freedom is an essential tenet of American democracy. Religious Freedom is seen as a "linchpin of expanding democracy because it is a potent right, involving as it does the right of people to act on their consciences, to speak freely, assemble, organize."²⁰ Additionally, the First Amendment and the additional recognition of separation of church and state gained much traction with the Fourteenth Amendment's incorporation of the bill of rights to all American states.²¹ Therefore, the reach of the federal government extended liberties to each and every state solidifying the importance of such liberties, i.e. freedom of religion, in American society. Thus with such a plural

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Hertzke, Allen D. "Emerging Trends in Religion, Society, and Politics." The Future of Religion in American Politics. Dunn, Charles, ed. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2009. p. 238.

²¹ Miller, William L. The First Liberty. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2003. p. 192.

society there have been various interpretations and conflicts regarding religion's place in American society.

Nevertheless, the government through its judicial arm ,i.e. the Supreme Court, has tried to determine religion's neutral place in American society; but it too could not and has not ended the separation of church and state debate. Chief Justice Waite commented on the letter in his 1878 *Reynolds v. United States* opinion stating that "coming as it does from an acknowledged leader of the advocates of the measure [the Jefferson letter] may be accepted *almost* as an authoritative declaration of the scope and effect of the amendment thus secured."²² (emphasis supplied.) *Reynolds*, 98 U. S. 145 (1878)

Chief Justice Waite's comment illustrates the Court's attempt at separating the church and state; however, the Court has instead added to the the complexity and confusion surrounding the First Amendment. Perhaps, it is because there can be no absolute division of religion from the state.

One main dilemma with a strict separation of church and state is the fact that religion is an integral part of social man. It is true that religion is a matter of opinion and conscience, but it is also true that religion is expressed through social actions. Religion is seen as an arbiter of morality and a sustainer of democratic civilization.²³ One of the most influential philosophers for U.S. founding fathers, John Locke, also discussed the complexity between the church and state in his *A Letter Concerning Toleration*. David

²² Miller, William L. *The First Liberty*. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2003. p. 191.

²³ Roelofs, H. Mark. "Church and State in America"*The Review of Politics*. 1988. JSTOR. George Mason Uni. Lib., VA. 16 Mar 2009. p. 564 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1407354>>

McCabe explains that Locke's "argument is more sensitive both to the need for citizens of liberal states to embody certain moral virtues and to the role that religion may play in sustaining such a citizenry."²⁴ Religion is not solely isolated to the realm of individual conscience but it also actively participates in developing individual and collective morality. Alexis de Tocqueville remarked that religious beliefs have an indirect, if not more important, influence on political society through its influence on moral habits. Firstly, most if not all religious churches or sects preach "the same morality in the name of God."²⁵ This assertion still rings true today. American religious institutions, albeit Catholic, Jewish or Muslim, continue to preach morality as a common necessity in American society. Moreover, religion has been and continues to be highly practiced in the United States even though it is "at the same time the most enlightened and the most free."²⁶

One only needs to review the first amendment's call for religious freedom and assembly to understand that the First Amendment's main concern is the common good of American society. These constitutional laws were not established solely for an individual, but how individuals act in collectives. Religious freedom and assembly are meant to uphold the dignity and morality of American society, just as religion attempts to uphold morality in America. Tocqueville observed that "in the United States there is not a single

²⁴ McCabe, David. "John Locke and the Argument Against Strict Separation." The Review of Politics. Spring 1997. Vol 59, No. 2. JSTOR. George Mason Uni. Lib., VA. 16 Mar 2009. p. 564 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1407354>>

²⁵ Tocqueville, Alexis de. "Excerpts." Democracy in America. Abridged by Sanford Kessler. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2000, p. 132.

²⁶ Ibid.

religious doctrine that appears hostile to democratic and republican institutions. All the clergy there speak the same language; the opinions there are in accord with the laws, and there prevails, so to speak, only a single current in the human mind.”²⁷ Therefore, religion through its moral codes influences society and, consequently, facilitates the common good of democracy and liberty.

One of Tocqueville’s contemporaries, G.W.F. Hegel, also asserted religion’s role as moral arbiter and substance of a state and civil society. Hegel claimed that “[r]eligion is the basis and substance of politics, its foundation.”²⁸ Religion continually influences the state through religious citizens and communities. Yet, he contends that the secular state should not be overrun by religiosity and, for the most part, there needs to be a separation of the two. Contemporaneously, there is a place for both, such as in American society.

Religion and the secular state can be reconciled by their quest for an ethical society, such as in America. This particular aim of religion and the state, though could not be realized if there was no former relationship between them. Historically, religion has played a significant role in culture and politics as well as a mode for human self-understanding. It is important to note that Hegel is not calling for a religious society without secularism. In fact, it would be detrimental to each entity to be fully integrated

²⁷ Ibid, pgs. 130-131.

²⁸ Hegel, G.W.F. Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion. ed. Hodgson, Peter. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006, p. 379.

since the state and church can stifle progress. Hegel gave the example of the imprisonment of Galileo by the Church for his discovery of the earth's motion.²⁹

He simply attributes religious principles and experiences as the foundation and substance of politics through its community and their derived moral teachings. The foundation of the United States was heavily influenced by Western, Christian principles and experiences. One cannot simply erase the religious context of American political and social history.

Similarly, John Courtney Murray specifically asserts that religious people, such as Catholics, can engage in American society because American society is a religiously plural society and a society established on the principles of God and Law being supreme. America was established in the tradition of natural law; and, natural law has been influenced by Western Christian political tradition. According to Murray, "The philosophy of the Bill of Rights was also tributary to the tradition of natural law...Their proximate source is in nature, and in history insofar as history bears witness to the nature of man; their ultimate source, as the Declaration of Independence states, is in God, the Creator of nature and the Master of history."³⁰ Religion cannot be fully separated from American politics and society due to its historical involvement and influence on American law.

²⁹ Hegel, Georg W.F. Hegel's Philosophy of Right. Translated by Knox, T.M. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953, p. 172.

³⁰ Murray, John Courtney. We Hold These Truths: Catholic Reflections on the American Proposition. New York: Sheed and Ward, Inc., 1960, p. 37.

Nevertheless, religion was and still is traditionally seen as “charged with...inculcating the personal values necessary to the maintenance of the civil and political order.”³¹This conception of religious influence on individual and collective morality was something well accepted by our founding fathers, even Jefferson.³² Religion, then, found its function and tradition protecting social welfare in American society.

Religious influence in time would extend the social welfare realm. During the twentieth century, religious leaders and organizations would frame their political grievances and actions in religious terminology instead of using strictly secular methods of civil society. Thus, religion would come into a more political engagement with the state. The civil rights social turmoil of the twentieth century exemplifies religion’s increasing civic engagement. Instead of opposing such a relationship, religious organizations and the state should work together in a dialectic relationship. According to Roelofs, the leaders of church and state “should be essentially concerned to sustain a dialogue of challenge of response” to all sorts of plaguing societal issues.³³ Only through dialogue and a dialectic relationship can comprehensive solutions arise for the common purpose of social well being, as exhibited by the civil rights movement.

³¹ Roelofs, H. Mark. “Church and State in America”*The Review of Politics*. 1988. JSTOR. George Mason Uni. Lib., VA. 16 Mar 2009. p. 565 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1407354>>

³² Ibid. 565.

³³ Ibid, 579.

Moreover, the religiously inspired civic engagement of the civil rights movement could not have emerged if there was a strict separation of church and state.

Religious Leadership and Rhetoric in the Civil Rights Movement

“Let judgment run down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.”³⁴ -Amos 5:24

“All men are created equal, and are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.”³⁵ -Declaration of Independence of the United States

The twentieth century participated in great social interaction and transformative change just as the centuries before it. However, much of the change in the twentieth century can be attributed to the social phenomena of social movements, such as the civil rights movement. The Civil Rights Movement was a nonviolent reform movement which strived for equal rights between Black and White Americans and an end to racial discrimination through American governance and societal acceptance. The Civil Rights Movement took place during the mid-twentieth century (1950s and 1960s) and was led by religious leaders, specifically from the Christian denominations, such as Southern Baptists.

There are several contributing factors and events which aided the development of this movement and it is essential to note them since they demonstrate the movement's

³⁴ Houck, Davis W. & Dixon, David E. Rhetoric, Religion and the Civil Rights Movement 1954-1965. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006. p. 224.

³⁵ “Declaration of Independence.” The U.S. National Archives and Records Administration . 27 Oct. 2008. <<http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration.html>>

development and the continuing dialectic relationship between the religious and the secular. Moreover, the civil rights movement's use of religion through its leadership and rhetoric gave justification to future religious engagement in U.S. social movements.

It is also important to note the contributing factors that have led to the rise of social movements, such as the civil rights movement, in the United States? The civil rights movement as well as other movements have various contributing factors, but two stand out from the onset. The first is urbanization and the second democratization.³⁶ Both of these factors are central to how and, to a certain extent, why social movements have become a popular means of civic contestation in the United States. Notwithstanding, an even more essential question is what makes a successful social movement?

For one thing, social movements, such as the civil rights movement, are a combination of various factors, including the political opportunity to protest, a large, committed constituency, and organizational strength.³⁷ However, what keeps these people committed and how do they attempt to achieve their goal for social change? A collective consciousness is also needed to maintain a large, diverse membership. Religion, in this regard, can be an essential element in the construction of social movements. It has given leaders inspiration, protection, and continued to strengthen the resolve of many members and their collective consciousness.

³⁶ Tilly, Charles. Social Movements, 1764-2004. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2004.

³⁷ McAdam, Doug. Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982.

The civil rights movement could not have withstood opposition and the test of time, if they did not have a collective consciousness that supported their actions. Additionally, this consciousness undergoes certain cues that indicates to individual and group members that they can take collective action against the perceived illegitimate state.³⁸ Nevertheless, religious strength and inspiration alone can not achieve any movements' goal. In order to enact change religious organizations and leaders must engage the secular avenues of American society. Therefore, civil rights leaders and organizations, such as the SCLC, brought in lawyers and volunteers to engage in political activism, such as voter drives and civil rights legislation.³⁹

Thus the Civil Rights Movement best exemplifies the cohesion of the secular and sacred in U.S. civic engagement. The Amos quote at the beginning of this section as well as the Declaration of Independence quote were used by Civil Rights Leader and Alabama pastor, Martin Luther King, Jr. to inspire and motivate the movement. The use of religious doctrine and rhetoric by Martin Luther King Jr and other religious leaders developed their communities' aspiration to build a socially moral society. Thus, to a certain respect, continuing the tradition of religion's maintenance of a moral society in America. Without the support and inspiration of religion in social movements such as in Civil Rights, there could not have been such stamina and success in the movements.

³⁸ Ibid, p. 49-50.

³⁹"Southern Christian Leadership Conference." Encyclopædia Britannica. 2009. Encyclopædia Britannica Online. 30 Mar. 2009 <<http://search.eb.com/eb/article-9068919>>.

Additionally, the religious inspired leadership provided by Martin Luther King, Jr. provided a legitimate face in the movement. Martin Luther King, Jr. and his Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) took their call as religious leadership assisting the social welfare of America and transformed it into the political arena. Martin Luther King, Jr., as a minister and political activist, could encourage his membership to join the movement. Doug McAdam notes that:

“by building the movement out of established institutions, insurgent leaders were able to recruit en masse along existing lines of interaction, thereby sparing themselves the much more difficult task of developing a membership from scratch.”⁴⁰

Thus, “insurgent leaders” such as Martin Luther King Jr and the SCLC opened a vast network of individuals to the movement’s actions and aims. Moreover, the movement leadership was able to frame participation in the movement as also a religious duty. “It was their religious duty now not only to go to church, visit the sick, and to pray, but they must attend the mass meetings...and boycotts.”⁴¹ This in turn set a precedent of how religious leadership can successfully inspire and motivate collective action in social movements and political action.

Martin Luther King, Jr. also framed his leadership in terms of a religious call. He stated in his Letters from Birmingham Jail that he has been called to aid his people in their time of need. He stated:

⁴⁰ McAdam, Doug. Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982. p. 129.

⁴¹ Ibid. As quoted in Walton, 1956: 19

“I am in Birmingham because injustice is here. Just as the prophets of the eighth century B.C. left their villages and carried their ‘thus saith the Lord’ far beyond the boundaries of their home towns...so am I compelled to carry the gospel of freedom beyond my home town. Like Paul, I must constantly respond to the Macedonian call for aid.”⁴² -Martin Luther King, Jr.

The civil rights movement, therefore, structured much of its grievances and collective conscience in religious terms. First, was the religiously inspired movement principle of nonviolent protests and marches to garner public support. Members of the movement would peacefully assemble and march throughout towns and also on the national capital, such as the March on Washington which took place in August of 1963, in order to bring public awareness to their cause.⁴³ These marches, again, were led by religious leaders and national coalitions of churches. For example the executive director of the Commission on Religion and Race, Robert Spike, expressed his happiness with the involvement of churches in the political struggle of African Americans. Spike stated,

“When the National Council of Churches delegation, over 100 strong, moved into the stream of marchers...one of the deepest longings of ministry was for a moment fulfilled-the longing that the Church of Jesus Christ be in the midst of the human struggle, not on the sidelines.”⁴⁴

There were also several student sit ins throughout the early 1960s and Rosa Parks refusal to give up her seat on an Alabama bus in 1955.

⁴² King, Jr., Martin Luther. “Letter from Birmingham Jail” Why We Can’t Wait. New York: Mentor, 1964, p. 77.

⁴³ Findlay, James F. Church People in the Struggle. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993. p. 50.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

Second, the movement's religious leadership and religious language, as seen above with leader Robert Spike, aided the movement's strong development and victorious civil rights legislation. However, the leader which best exemplified the use of his religious leadership and language was Martin Luther King, Jr. For example, even at the beginning of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s career, his strong leadership helped end the Montgomery transportation segregation in 1955. This event is most well known for Rosa Parks refusal to give up her seat.⁴⁵

He then went on to establish the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) and became an in demand speaker throughout the United States. Houck and Dixon rightfully state that "King would lead the movement's political, judicial, and spiritual revolution."⁴⁶ Moreover, the movement would inspire clergy everywhere to take up their cause and these clergymen would proclaim from their pulpits their support for civil rights and ask their flock to support civil rights with them. For example, in 1963 clergyman, David G. Colwell called for his congregation to support Racial Justice Now. He did so through his recounting of his holocaust liberation experiences as an American soldier and how the pogroms in Europe were similar to Southern pogroms against neighbors that supported the movement. He ended his sermon with a passage from Acts 5: 29 "We must obey God rather than men."⁴⁷

⁴⁵ Houck, Davis W. & Dixon, David E. Rhetoric, Religion and the Civil Rights Movement 1954-1965. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006. p. 224.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid, p. 667.

In 1964, Congress passed civil rights legislation called the Civil Rights Act of 1964 outlawing segregation in public places and schools as well as the Voting Rights Act of 1965. A few years later Johnson would sign the Civil Rights Act of 1968 which called for fair housing without exception.⁴⁸ These landmark bills began a movement towards the racial integration of society. And without the religious influence and leadership, perhaps these bills would not have gained such support. President Johnson wrote to Edwin Espy, General Secretary of the National Council of Churches, of this positive religious influence in this socio-political matter stating that “[their] support of what we have tried to do in the economic and social fields is encouraging.”⁴⁹

The organizational strength, leadership, and language of the civil rights movement fully demonstrates the cohesive nature of religious and secular realms united for a common cause. Moreover, without such integration the civil rights movement would have lacked the force to achieve their goals. Therefore, the civic engagement by the religious civil rights leaders and its members set forth an example for other religious groups engagement in American Politics, such as American Catholic engagement by their leadership.

⁴⁸ Houck, Davis W. & Dixon, David E. Rhetoric, Religion and the Civil Rights Movement 1954-1965. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.

⁴⁹ Findlay, James F. Church People in the Struggle. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993. p. 170.

American Catholics and the Vatican II Church

During the mid twentieth century, American Catholics too found themselves in a new position regarding political engagement. It has been argued that “the last great wave of democratization [in America]...was largely a Catholic wave, driven by changes in the Catholic Church after the Second Vatican Council or Vatican II that placed its powerful imprimatur and institutional structures behind human rights, religious freedom, and democracy.”⁵⁰ This statement may be overstating how influential Vatican II was on American democracy, but it does emphasize the transformative influence of Vatican II in American Catholicism. Simply, the Second Vatican Council did influence the Catholic political experience.⁵¹

The Second Vatican Council was called into session in 1962; however, the first announcement of the council’s meeting in 1959 came as a surprise to the world, even Pope John Paul XXIII admitted his surprise with the suddenness of the idea.⁵² According to Komonchak, Pope John called the council to undertake two main tasks: “a renewed exploration of the church’s biblical and traditional patrimony and a simultaneous review of the ‘new conditions and forms of life introduced into the modern world.’”⁵³ These

⁵⁰ Hertzke, Allen D. “Emerging Trends in Religion, Society, and Politics.” The Future of Religion in American Politics. Dunn, Charles, ed. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2009. p. 238-9.

⁵¹ Gelm, Richard. Politics and Religious Authority: American Catholics Since the Second Vatican Council. London: Greenwood Press, 1994, p. 2.

⁵² Ibid, p. 48.

⁵³ Komonchak, Joseph A. “Vatican II and the Encounter between Catholicism and Liberalism.” Catholicism and Liberalism. Contributions to American Public Philosophy. Ed. Douglass, R.B. and Hollenbach, D. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. 79.

tasks could be summed up as resourcement and aggiornamento or renewal.⁵⁴ Church leaders, then, came together to renew Catholic, theological principles regarding Catholicism in the modern era. For example, in *Guadium et Spes*, the Church approached its discussions by “reading the signs of the times and of interpreting them in the light of the Gospel.”⁵⁵ Thus, Vatican II entered into the secular reality leaving behind a static worldview.⁵⁶ The Church from the 1960s on would support democratic principles of liberty, human rights, and justice in the natural, secular world.

For instance, Pope John Paul XXIII’s last encyclical, *Pacem in Terris*, spoke of democracy and the necessity of a constitutional state to “protect human rights but not interfere with human liberties.”⁵⁷ The Church would also include religious freedom as a protected human liberty. Therein, the Catholic Church demonstrated their support of state action in protecting human rights. This acceptance of modernity and democracy by the council established the theological support for freedom of religion, which in turn supported Catholic life in American society. If by chance the Catholic Church were to deem democracy and civil liberties a religious evil (as it had in the past), Catholics would find themselves conflicted, living in a society such as in the United States. Thankfully, this is not the case. With the theological changes by Vatican II, American Catholics and

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ GS 4 as quoted in Komonchak, p.80.

⁵⁶ Ozodor, Paulinus I. Moral Theology in an Age of Renewal: A Study of the Catholic Tradition since Vatican II. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003. p. 18.; Gelm, Richard. Politics and Religious Authority: American Catholics Since the Second Vatican Council. London: Greenwood Press, 1994, p. 47.

⁵⁷ Griffin, Leslie. “Pope John XXIII.” The Teachings of Modern Roman Catholicism. Witte, J. and Alexander, F., eds. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007, p. 255.

their leadership, i.e. the USCCB, would now have theological justification for civic engagement and American church-state relations.

First, the Vatican II Church acknowledged that it was natural for people to seek freedoms in this secular world.⁵⁸ No longer was freedom limited to the afterlife. The aim towards fostering and obtaining liberty was seen as a natural, social development arising from social relationships and living in communities. The Church views the foundation of rights as a communal necessity rather than an individual's right as proclaimed by classical liberalism. Komonchak details the Church's stance by arguing that "[r]ights do not belong to isolated individuals, pre-political monads, from whom society is a later, man-made artifact. Rights adhere in persons living in communities. Strictly speaking, a monad has no rights, for there is no one to respect them."⁵⁹

Additionally, the Church stated that "this tendency" gave impetus to "the formation everywhere of both national and international movements... with economic, cultural, social... and political ends."⁶⁰ Catholic thought no longer would see social movements with political, economic and cultural ends as adverse, atypical, and unnatural developments, such as its prior view of the rise of communism. Political action and civic engagement for justice and liberty were acceptable. Moreover, the Second Vatican Council emphasized that "the obligations of justice and love are fulfilled only if each

⁵⁸ "Original Source Materials." The Teachings of Modern Roman Catholicism. Witte, J. and Alexander, F., eds. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007. p. 269.

⁵⁹ Komonchak, Joseph A. "Vatican II and the Encounter between Catholicism and Liberalism." Catholicism and Liberalism. Contributions to American Public Philosophy. Ed. Douglass, R.B. and Hollenbach, D. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. 90.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

person, contributing to the common good...promotes and assists the public and private institutions dedicated to bettering the conditions of human life.”⁶¹ The council then goes on to state that any development of the community “in economic and political affairs, both on the national and international level which will everywhere recognize and satisfy the right of all to a social culture in conformity with the dignity of the human person.”⁶²

Secondly, Vatican II encouraged a church as a People of God as a common priesthood. The council stated in *Lumen Gentium* that “[t]he common priesthood of the faithful and the ministerial or hierarchical priesthood are none the less interrelated; each in its own way shares in the one priesthood of Christ.”⁶³ The Church did not call for a common priesthood, but a shared experience of laity, clergy, and all humans as a people of God. Moreover, this statement illustrates two main points. The Church not only opened itself to modern principles of democracy, justice and liberty, but the church also saw the value of individual lay membership in transforming and aiding society.

The Vatican II Church wanted to strengthen its membership, because the Church was still preoccupied over the weaknesses of the modern state. Pope John XXIII still saw inadequacies of the modern state and its ability to “ensure the universal common good.”⁶⁴ The Church encouraged bishops and, to a certain extent, laity to participate in social and

⁶¹ Pope Paul VI. “GS 30.” *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World: Gaudium Et Spes*. Vatican. 7 Dec. 1965. 17 Apr 2009 <http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html>

⁶² Ibid, GS 60.

⁶³ Ozodor, Paulinus I. *Moral Theology in an Age of Renewal: A Study of the Catholic Tradition since Vatican II*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003. p. 22.

⁶⁴ “Original Source Materials.” *The Teachings of Modern Roman Catholicism*. Witte, J. and Alexander, F., eds. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007, p. 284.

political discourse.⁶⁵ Therefore, Vatican II opened the opportunity for Catholic leadership and Catholic laity, in general, to actively participate in civil society.

Lastly, Vatican II changed its old punitive strategy to a dialectic and persuasive approach with its membership and other religions. With Vatican II the Church decidedly left its authoritarian legacy behind and adopted dialogue and persuasion as its new tactics.⁶⁶ This new approach especially affected the Church leadership's relation with its membership.

Laity could more openly disagree with American bishops, regardless if the Church wanted or accepted the laity's dissent, which before Vatican II would be deemed almost treasonous. For instance, many Catholic laymen disagree with the USCCB's stance on immigration reform. American Catholics are just as divided about immigration as the rest of the American population. However, just the fact that American Catholics can disagree on this matter demonstrates the influence of Vatican II. Dialogue and dissent could more thoroughly spread in American Catholic culture. A culture "already steeped in a tradition of independence and freedom."⁶⁷

Summary

Vatican II and its social teachings continues to inspire the political and civic work of American Catholics and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

⁶⁵ Gelm, Richard. Politics and Religious Authority: American Catholics Since the Second Vatican Council. London: Greenwood Press, 1994, p. 6.

⁶⁶ Ibid, 7.

⁶⁷ Ibid, 7.

Additionally, the long standing American tradition of religious maintenance of social welfare legitimizes the current critics and engagement by the USCCB. Therefore, the USCCB's political and civic action not only has grounding in Catholic and American past, but is also necessary to alleviate suffering by those members of society who are disenfranchised. Roefols puts it best that: "Far from separating responsibilities and defining jurisdictions in static dualistic, institutional terms, leaders of both church and state should be essentially concerned to sustain a dialogue of challenge of response on the broadest range of contemporary issues."⁶⁸

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops attempts just that. It continues to challenge and engage the American state to morally solve the most pressing matters in contemporary society, such as immigration and the rights of immigrants-legal or not.

⁶⁸ Gelm, Richard. Politics and Religious Authority: American Catholics Since the Second Vatican Council. London: Greenwood Press, 1994, p. 579.

3. “Justice For Immigrants”: USCCB’s Campaign for Immigrant Rights

“All men are created equal, and are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.”⁶⁹ -Declaration of Independence of the United States of America

“Attention must be called to the rights of migrants and their families and to respect for their human dignity, even in cases of non-legal immigration.”⁷⁰ - John Paul II, *Ecclesia in America*

American tradition, through the Declaration of Independence, stipulates that regardless of a person’s socio-economic, political, racial or gender position in life, “all” are created equal. Moreover, the first quote does not mention all citizens are created equal but again a general openness to every person. Catholic teaching holds the same point of view. Human dignity is of utmost importance to the church as established in the Catholic Social Teachings. For instance, Pope John Paul II exclaimed this similar stance in in his *Ecclesia in America*, as demonstrated above. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), deriving from both traditions, expresses the same sentiment towards protecting and upholding human dignity regardless or race, gender or citizenship.

⁶⁹ “Declaration of Independence: A Transcript” [Declaration of Independence](http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html). U.S. National Archive and Record Administration. 5 Oct 2008. <http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html>

⁷⁰John Paul II. Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation *Ecclesia in America*. 22 January 1999. [Libreria Editrice Vaticana](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_22011999_ecclesia-in-america_en.html). 5 Oct. 2008 <http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_22011999_ecclesia-in-america_en.html>

The USCCB's involvement in immigrant rights, therefore, should not sound too far removed. Moreover, the Catholic Church in America has mainly seen itself as an immigrant church. For instance, during the 19th century, Catholic immigrants were targeted by xenophobes and nativists.⁷¹ Thus the current Catholic Church in America, through its episcopal leadership, has even more reason to align itself with immigrants- both legal and illegal.

However, the USCCB's contemporary political engagement can be seen as an affront to the secular religious divide in America. Nevertheless, as argued in the previous section, the United States has a long tradition and rationality of religion playing some part in politics, whether it be in charitable works, actively engaging in a transformative social movement, or reaffirming freedom and morality in America. As G.W.F. Hegel stated, religion is the substance of politics and substance. The USCCB's existence is an exemplary recognition of this assertion as well as America's long religio-political tradition.

The USCCB, therefore, continues this tradition of uniting the religious and secular for social justice. Thus, the USCCB has taken a supportive stance towards comprehensive immigration reform and immigrant rights. More importantly, how the USCCB has civically engaged in this initiative is the truly interesting matter. The use of

⁷¹ Juarez, Jr., Jose Roberto. "Catholic Social Thought and Immigration." Faith and Law : How Religious Traditions From Calvinism to Islam View American Law. Edited by Robert F. Cochran, Jr. New York: New York University Press, 2008, p.197.

the religious and secular by the USCCB to influence U.S. policy and American Catholics fosters an environment of peace, development, and social justice.

The USCCB, as well as most scholars, understands that in order to fully engage in immigrant rights discourse and policy, there must be a working knowledge of U.S. immigration and its history. Thus, it is important to note, that the term immigration will be defined similarly to emigration. It will be defined as the physical relocation and “change of jurisdiction from one state to another and eventually also a change in membership from one political community to another.”⁷² Emigration and immigration have therefore evoked public concern and contention regarding the boundaries of a state and security of a nation. The USCCB also similarly defines immigration as migration by people from one state to another usually to escape social and economic equality.⁷³ United States immigration falls under the scope of this definition, which is illustrated by United States’ long history of immigration.

The Melting Pot: Brief History of United States Immigration

The United States’ history has always been an immigrant history, notwithstanding the indigenous population who already inhabited the territory that would become the United States. It is well known that the first people to immigrate to the Americas were of

⁷² Krieger, Joel, ed. “Immigration/International Migration.” *The Oxford Companion to Politics of the World*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001, p. 407.

⁷³ Ibid, p. 407. and USCCB. “Strangers No Longer: Together on a Journey of Hope” 22 Jan. 2003. United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Inc. and Conferencia del Episcopado Mexicano. 19 Oct. 2008 <<http://www.usccb.org/mrs/stranger.shtml>>

Dutch, British, Spanish, and Portuguese origins. The British colonists, though, would be the ones to establish the territory of the United States as independent of Great Britain.

After the War of Independence in 1783, the United States rapidly increased in growth and diversity than any other country in the world.⁷⁴ The 1790 census demonstrates that U.S.

population was approximately 3.9 million and less than half were English (49 percent).⁷⁵

The rest of the population was broken down into Africans, Germans, Scots, Scots-Irish, Irish, and Dutch.

By the nineteenth century, the United States had an open door policy and, consequently, saw a huge influx of immigrants coming from the minor populations, especially from Irish immigrants. Nevertheless, these newer immigrant populations were not always happily accepted. John Powell states:

[t]hrough out American history, there had been periodic peaks of antforeign sentiment. From the earliest colonial days , there had been a fear that immigrant lifestyles would erode the distinctive features of the majority culture. An early nativist movement developed in the 1790s, when Federalists hoped to exclude the corroding influence of radical immigrants by passing the Alien and Sedition Acts.⁷⁶

When the Irish emigrated to the United States in the nineteenth century, they were highly discriminated against due to their Catholic background. The nativist and anti-Catholic sentiment in the U.S. led to the creation of a Secret order called the Secret Order of the Star-Spangled Banner or, ironically, the Know Nothing party. In the 1850s the

⁷⁴ Powell, John. Immigration. New York: Facts On File, 2007. p. 15.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Ibid, p. 18.

Know Nothing party was able to gain control of many state governments and influence over 100 Congressmen in order to restrict immigration of Catholics.⁷⁷

Catholics were seen by such nativists as a threat to United States culture, sovereignty, and national security. Many Americans thought that immigrant Catholics were conduits for the Vatican. Wherein the Vatican would use new American Catholics to implement Vatican policy and make the United States a Catholic nation. Moreover, Catholics were called devious, delinquent, and criminal by many Americans including the Know Nothings.⁷⁸ Much of the nativist turmoil died down when the perceptions were found out to be subsequently false. The lessons from nineteenth century immigration, though, would not necessarily be learned by the United States government who would see an even greater increase of immigrants in the twentieth century.

The United States after two world wars and an ever rising conflict with the Soviet Union would turn to drastically changing their stance on immigration and who should immigrate. However, the direct effects of today's immigration policy stems mostly from late twentieth century immigration policy and the influx of latino immigration. For instance, the Bracero program of 1942 allowed a steady increase of immigrants, mainly latino, to work in the U.S since the U.S. lost millions of its agricultural domestic labor force to urban wartime production jobs and men being drafted during WWII.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Ibid, 20.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ LeMay, Michael C. Illegal Immigration. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, Inc., 2007. p. 4.

During this peak period of mostly Mexican-Latino immigration, American employers saw an increase in profit since these workers could be paid less and work more. Therefore, when the war ended and immigration was restricted, many American employers did not want to lose their new labor force. For the most part, American employers either moved their production to Mexico, closed their businesses, or continued to hire illegal migrant workers.⁸⁰ It was not illegal for American businesses to hire illegal immigrants, even though it was illegal for migrant workers to come into the United States. This fault demonstrates the inconsistency of U.S. immigration policy in the twentieth century.

To rectify this inconsistency, the United States implemented a new policy called the Immigration and Naturalization Act (INA) of 1965. The INA had five main goals to change the quota system to a preference system. They were:

- 1) to preserve the family unit and to reunite separated families;
- 2) to meet the need for highly skilled workers;
- 3) to ease population problems created by emergencies;
- 4) to better the understanding of people through cross-cultural, national exchange programs; and
- 5) to bar from the United States those aliens who were likely to represent adjustment problems because of their physical or mental health, criminal history, or dependency, or for national security reasons.⁸¹

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid, p. 8; and Powell, John. Immigration. New York: Facts On File, 2007. p. 187-189.

The INA also ended the Bracero Act, but not the flow of migrants. Instead, illegal immigration replaced the regular flow of migrant workers. Additionally, illegal migrant workers did return to Mexico after a period of nine months as stipulated in the Bracero act. More migrant workers began to settle in the United States without the provisions of the United States.⁸² The 20,000 visas per country limitation, that was previously not a limitation, pressured immigrants to find another entry into the U.S. By 1970s “the number of persons crossing without authorization began...to swell to a veritable flood.”⁸³ The INA, instead of restricting immigration, set the stage for illegal immigration.

Why had immigration transformed into an unmanageable flood? The international climate had drastically changed in the 1960s,70s, and 80s pushing thousands of people to leave their home countries. The context of the cold war left many latin americans seeking refuge in a country they felt could better protect them from military dictators or a waging war. The United States became the pinnacle of stability, freedom, and democracy. Moreover, the United States was also financially stable and opportunities seemed to flow out of it. LeMay has considered these types of factors- push and pull factors. Push factors are “reasons, trends, or events that compel people to emigrate.”⁸⁴ Examples would be population explosion, poverty, political turmoil, unemployment, mass starvation, etc. Pull factors are “characteristics of a county that attract immigrants for permanent

⁸² Immigration Enforcement Policies. Isenburg, Bruno T. ed. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc., 2007. p. 5-6.; LeMay, Michael C. Illegal Immigration. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, Inc., 2007. p. 5.

⁸³ LeMay, p. 8.

⁸⁴ Ibid, p. 2.

settlement.”⁸⁵ Examples of pull factors would be a country’s strong economy, stable, nonviolent government, and a free society.

The United States responded to the increased flow of immigrants in the 1970s with a new Immigration policy in the mid 1980s. In 1986, the Immigration Reform and Control Act was passed in order to grant amnesty to illegal aliens living in the U.S. since 1980, an increase of guest workers, sanction employers who “knowingly hire” illegal aliens; a 50 percent increase of INS budget to enhance enforcement; the detention of immigrants coming on boats, such as Haitians; and an increase of legal immigration to 610,000.⁸⁶ Nevertheless, the IRCA Act had trouble controlling the flow of legal and illegal immigrants.

In response to the ineffectiveness of federal law, California passed an anti-immigration measure called Proposition 187 or “Save Our State Initiative” in 1994. The initiative required state and local agencies “to report to the INS any persons ‘*suspected of being illegal*’ and to prevent illegal aliens from receiving benefits or public services in the state of California.”⁸⁷ (emphasis supplied). Most of Proposition 187’s provisions were found unconstitutional, but it demonstrated California and a large portion of its population’s stance against illegal immigration, especially targeting Mexican immigrants.

⁸⁵ Ibid, p. 3.

⁸⁶ Immigration Enforcement Policies. Isenburg, Bruno T. ed. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc., 2007.; LeMay, Michael C. Illegal Immigration. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, Inc., 2007. p.13.; Powell, John. Immigration. New York: Facts On File, 2007. p. 199-20

⁸⁷ LeMay, Michael C. Illegal Immigration. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, Inc., 2007. p.17.

In 1996, though, Congress passed the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA). This act doubled Border Patrol and authorized a fence to be built on the border between Mexico and the United States. It also increased penalties against documentation fraud, alien smuggling, and illegal aliens could be deported without appeal to courts.⁸⁸ Additionally, Congress passed the Welfare Reform Act (WRA) the same year. This Act restricted welfare benefits to illegal or undocumented immigrants.⁸⁹ The IIRIRA and the WRA basically added in many of the provisions of California's proposition 187, but without the unconstitutionality. However, both policies eventually were seen as too strict and were amended in order to reintroduce some social programs to undocumented immigrants. Immigration policy and discourse would drastically change, though, after the turn of the twenty-first century.

When the September 11th attacks occurred, immigration policy and sentiment would also change. The implementation of the Uniting and Strengthening American by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism or the USA PATRIOT Act in 2001 and the Homeland Security Act of 2002 had a direct involvement in immigrant matters. In 2002, the INS was abolished in order to restructure immigration under the Homeland Security Act. From then on, the Department of Homeland Security through the new Immigration and Custom Enforcement Agency would be responsible for

⁸⁸ Immigration Enforcement Policies. Isenburg, Bruno T. ed. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc., 2007. p. 7.; Powell, John. Immigration. New York: Facts On File, 2007. p. 45.

⁸⁹ Powell, p. 212-213.

immigration in the United States.⁹⁰ Therefore, both Acts changed immigration to being primarily a national security matter.

The United States government had put much blame on the inefficient INS for not only not catching, but approving the visas and flight schooling of the terrorists who attacked the World Trade Centers and the Pentagon. The PATRIOT act authorized monitoring of aliens, such as student aliens, in the U.S., as well as monitoring and limiting the visa applications of men from Muslim countries.⁹¹ One of the immediate actions taken by the post 9/11 government was a sweep of illegal immigrants. “[A]fter 9/11, some 1,200 Muslim immigrants were rounded up by the police and the INS across the nation. Many were held for months without access to lawyers...most were released as totally innocent, swept up in the post-attack hysteria”⁹² Illegal immigration and immigration in general were, therefore, seen as terrorist pathways into the United States.

Although it is not within the scope of this paper to criticize United States immigration policy, it is necessary to understand one of the fundamental flaws with immigration laws. Immigration is dynamic whereas immigration policy is static. The push and pull factors for migrants changes almost every year if not every few years. As LeMay points out “[n]o sooner are some international problems or foreign policy considerations dealt with than the world system changes.”⁹³ U.S. policy makers are

⁹⁰ LeMay, Michael C. Illegal Immigration. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, Inc., 2007. p. 25.

⁹¹ LeMay, Michael C. Illegal Immigration. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, Inc., 2007.; Powell, John. Immigration. New York: Facts On File, 2007. p. 46.

⁹² Ibid, p.23.

⁹³ Ibid, p.31.

outside the scope to solve all international dilemmas in order to affect international immigration.

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, in their leadership capacity, attempts to influence national policy to consider and implement policy that upholds at the minimum the human dignity of migrants coming into the United States. The USCCB also takes into account the push and pull factors of immigration in order to better formulate its own policy positions.

Catholic Leadership and Immigration Reform

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, through its previous auspices as the the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB), has played a religio-political role in the United States, such as through the contemporary U.S. immigration debate. Since Vatican II, Catholic Bishops, in general, have taken leadership positions in advocating for social programs that uphold the morals of the United States community. For one thing, Catholicism is the largest religious denomination in the United States. The USCCB through its Episcopal leadership, organization, and the large number of American Catholics fulfills two important aspects of leading a social movement or political action. The USCCB has organizational strength, and access to a committed constituency. Vatican II and the civil rights movement also gave the USCCB the advantage and political opportunity to focus on social justice issues in political affairs.

Therefore, American Catholic leadership are no longer denied their role as part of American civil and political society.

One American Catholic Bishop, unnamed, explained that:

No longer on the edge of society but in the middle; we now have our best chance to restore the idealism of the nation's heritage. Gospel values should challenge us to give dignity and infinite value to each human-life an individualistic, consumer-ridden society to go beyond self-serving interest and be a model for all nations. Pastorals are only words unless put into action. New people-new cultures force us to realize for all the American Dream.⁹⁴

This sentiment is shared by most American Catholic Bishops, which can be seen by their increased political action the past thirty years. Catholic leadership through its collective organizations, have the ability “to create or fortify social movements in support of ...preferred policy positions,”⁹⁵ During the 1980s, The NCCB took a highly publicized and controversial stance on social issues with their pastoral letters “The Challenge of Peace” and “Economic Justice for All.”⁹⁶ Many Catholics and Catholic leadership felt that “Bishops should stay out of politics.”⁹⁷

John Farina, mentions that the USCCB political engagement and pastoral letters regarding the economy and military steered outside the comfort zone of many conservative American Catholics. Moreover, these statements “were the topic of broad

⁹⁴ “Comments of an American Catholic Bishop (1989)” as quoted in Gelm, Richard J. Politics and Religious Authority: American Catholics Since the Second Vatican Council. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1994, p. 1.

⁹⁵ Byrnes, Timothy A. Catholic Bishops in American Politics. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991. p.5.

⁹⁶ Gelm, Richard J. Politics and Religious Authority: American Catholics Since the Second Vatican Council. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1994, p. 2-3.

⁹⁷ Unnamed Bishop as quoted in Gelm, p.86-87.

discussion and debate in the church and secular media.”⁹⁸ In the 1990s, the Bishops mainly advocated on the behalf of the pro-life movement. This could be seen as a decisive change after the fallout of their more activist pastoral letters of the 1980s. Regardless, Catholic Bishops in their collective stance through the NCCB, now known as the USCCB, established their role and importance as religious leaders in the American political environment.

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops’ campaign for immigrants during the past ten years demonstrates this continued political engagement. The USCCB has used grassroots methods through its “Justice for Immigrants” campaign to engage the large Catholic community. For instance, their website links to the Justice for Immigrants Campaign, which provides activist toolkits for parishes, individual Catholics, and priests. The campaign also established an activist network in order to contact movement membership.⁹⁹ Moreover, their campaign is one that takes into account the history and complexities of United States immigration as described before. Their call for immigration reform attempts to account for both immigrants and the United States’ sovereign right to regulate immigrants, which is reflected in their policy position.¹⁰⁰ Without the inspiration of both the secular and sacred traditions of the United States and the Catholic Church, the

⁹⁸ Farina, John. “The Future of Catholic Civic Engagement.” *Civil Society, Civic Engagement and Catholicism in the U.S.* Liedhegener, Antonius and Kremp, Werner, eds. Trier: Atlantische Akademie, 2007, p. 258.

⁹⁹ “Activist Network.” Justice for Immigrants Campaign. 2009. 23 Oct. 2008. <<http://www.justiceforimmigrants.org/joinnetwork.htm>>

¹⁰⁰ USCCB. “Comprehensive Immigration Reform.” 2009. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Migration and Refugee Services. 23 Oct 2008 <<http://www.usccb.org/mrs/legal.shtml>>

USCCB's immigration stance could not withstand the political turmoil within immigration discourse.

The USCCB has outlined six main elements to comprehensive reform. They are the following: 1) earned legalization; 2) enforcement; 3) future worker program; 4) family-based immigration reform; 5) addressing root causes; and 6) restoration of due process rights.¹⁰¹ Point by point the USCCB defends each element in their comprehensive immigration reform.

First, earned legalization translates as a program where immigrants would work for several years, learn English, and pay a sum in order to become a legal immigrant. Enforcement measures should still be intact at the border and within the United States. However, what would aid enforcement would be the replacement of illegal migration with legal migration.¹⁰² The establishment of a future worker program would reduce illegal immigration as well as uphold the dignity of migrants in the workforce. Immigration policy should also be based on upholding the dignity of the family and increasing the availability of family visas as well as decreasing the amount of time to obtain family visas. It is also important to address the causes, or push and pull factors, that lead to immigration and, more importantly, illegal immigration. Lastly, the right of due process should be re-established for immigrants, which was taken away by the IIRIRA in 1996.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Ibid.

The USCCB's policy position is influenced by several religious and political factors. Most directly, the USCCB has used its own previous pastoral letters, fact finding missions and statements to formulate its stance. In 2003 the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops with the Mexican Episcopate Bishops Conference issued a statement called "Strangers No Longer: Together on a Journey of Hope." The Bishops' statement integrated Catholic Social teaching and the papal address of *Ecclesia in America* in order to confront the "pastoral and public policy challenges impacting migrants" in the Americas.¹⁰³ Additionally, the writing focused on the human dignity and rights of migrants, even if they are undocumented. The USCCB's coalition with the Mexican Episcopate Conference saw itself as those who have truly witnessed the plight of migrants.

In their pastoral letter's introduction, they stated that:

As pastors to more than ninety million Mexican Catholics and sixty-five million U.S. Catholics, we witness the human consequences of migration in the life of society every day. We witness the vulnerability of our people involved in all sides of the migration phenomenon, including families devastated by the loss of loved ones who have undertaken the migration journey and children left alone when parents are removed from them.¹⁰⁴

It is important to note that from the beginning, their pastoral letter indicates the vast number of followers the Bishops have to lead within the Catholic Church. The number of American Catholics alone would tell political and civil society leaders that the

¹⁰³ USCCB. "Strangers No Longer: Together on a Journey of Hope" 22 Jan. 2003. United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Inc. and Conferencia del Episcopado Mexicano. 19 Oct. 2008 <<http://www.usccb.org/mrs/stranger.shtml>>

¹⁰⁴ "Introduction." USCCB. Strangers No Longer: Together on a Journey of Hope. 2003.

Catholic voice is not one to be or can be diminished. Therefore, at the hands of the USCCB, are tens of millions of U.S. citizens who could be potentially mobilized in support of immigrant rights.

Moreover in this pastoral letter, the Bishops address the United States' national security concerns. They state their understanding of increased security actions in response to "credible terrorist threats," but the Bishops call on the United States not to undermine "human rights, reduce legal immigration or deny asylum seekers" since it does not serve to make the U.S. secure.¹⁰⁵ Additionally, in their 2002 Policy Analysis named "Immigration Policy for the 21st Century: The Case for Legalization of Undocumented Immigrants," The USCCB states that immigrants were not responsible for the September 11th terrorist attacks and that legalization would bring all immigrants into the nation's light "thereby allowing the government to keep better track of who is in the United States."¹⁰⁶ Much of the other policy advice in both the policy analysis by Walter Ewing and the joint pastoral address imitates the previously discussed policy elements.

The USCCB adds that much of their inspiration for this pastoral letter comes from the Papal address, *Ecclesia in America*, wherein Pope John Paul II calls on American pastors to meet migrants "with a hospitable and welcoming attitude which can encourage them to become part of the Church's life, always with due regard for their freedom and

¹⁰⁵ "Public Policy Challenge and Responses." USCCB. Strangers No Longer: Together on a Journey of Hope. 2003.

¹⁰⁶ Ewing, Walter. "Immigration Policy for the 21st Century: The case for Legalization of Undocumented Immigrants." The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. Mar 2002. 3 Feb. 2009. <<http://www.usccb.org/mrs/legaliza.shtml>>

their specific cultural identity.”¹⁰⁷ The Bishops, thus, have a church mandate to openly accept immigrants into America. The Catholic Church and USCCB position has also been inspired by Catholic social teaching and the Vatican II.

USCCB’s Religious Justifications for Immigration

“So, you, too, must befriend the alien, for you were once aliens yourselves in the land of Egypt.” (Deut. 10:17-19)

“I was a stranger and you welcomed me.” (Mt. 25:35)¹⁰⁸

The Bible and Catholic social teachings provide one of the most fundamental foundations for the USCCB’s engagement in immigrant discourse and action. The two biblical quotes from above were used during the congressional testimony of Bishop Nicholas DiMarzio during the Immigration, Border Security, and Claims Subcommittee meeting in 2006. Bishop DiMarzio explained that in the Old Testament God called upon his people to accept outsiders since they too were outsiders at one time. Secondly, the New Testament quote derives from the words of Jesus, who, as Bishop DiMarzio states “was an itinerant preacher without a home of his own as well as a refugee fleeing the terror of Herod.”¹⁰⁹ Additionally during this testimony, he cited the *Ecclesia in America*, the pastoral letter *Strangers No Longer*, and the words of Pope Pius XII and Pope

¹⁰⁷ John Paul II. Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation *Ecclesia in America*. No. 65. 22 January 1999. *Libreria Editrice Vaticana*. 5 Oct. 2008 <http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_22011999_ecclesia-in-america_en.html>

¹⁰⁸ Deuteronomy 10: 17-19 and Matthew 25: 35 As quoted in “Most Rvd. Nicholas DiMarzio Testimony: The Implementation of Comprehensive Immigration Reform.” House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims. 27 Jul 2006. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. 12 Mar 2009. < <http://www.usccb.org/mrs/dimarziotestimony.shtml>>

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

Benedict XVI. He mentioned all of these works in order to demonstrate the Church's commitment to immigrant welfare and the need for improved immigration policy in the United States.

In *Strangers No Longer* the Bishops addressed several biblical references to the treatment of migrants. They broke down biblical passages into the categories of Old Testament and New Testament. In the Old Testament the Bishops discussed God's presence in migrant stories. For instance, In Genesis 12, Abraham and Sarah extended their hospitality to three strangers who, in actuality, were a manifestation of God. Genesis Chapter 37 tells the story of Joseph's forced migration. Joseph was sold into slavery yet he became the savior of his family.¹¹⁰ Moreover the Old Testament in Leviticus and Deuteronomy stipulates to its adherents that they must welcome and care for aliens in "their gleaning and tithing laws."¹¹¹

The New Testament also provides many other examples of protecting the welfare of migrants other than Jesus' words from Matthew 25. For example, the Bishops recall the story of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph as refugees in Egypt (Mt 2:15). Moreover, Jesus again made the call to his disciples that they must respect the lowest ranking of people. Jesus' words were:

¹¹⁰ "Reflections in the Light of the Word of God and Catholic Social Teaching." USCCB. *Strangers No Longer: Together on a Journey of Hope*. 2003.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

“Amen, I say to you, whatever you did for one of these least brothers of mine, you did for me.”¹¹²

Jesus, then, calls upon all his followers to treat well, if not very well, all humans in the worst or least acceptable positions.

Catholic social teaching, as previously indicated, has its place in USCCB’s policy formation. In the same pastoral letter, the Bishops discuss these social teachings, such as *Rerum Novarum*, and its effects on immigration welfare. For instance, Catholic teaching states that the main causes of migration are poverty, injustice, and armed conflicts. By addressing these issues of the homeland, migrants could then stay in their native countries and support their families.¹¹³ Therefore, to alleviate migration, the United States and international community must pay attention to the issues that plague migrants at home, specifically what pushes migrants to leave.

In *Rerum Novarum*, Pope Leo XIII states that “[n]o one would exchange his country for a foreign land if his own afforded him the means of living a decent and happy life.”¹¹⁴ If society respects the dignity and rights of man then the common good would be served and society in general would be protected. As demonstrated above, Catholic social thought recognizes the rights of all immigrants who seek a better life. As Jose

¹¹² Mt 25: 40 As quoted in “Strangers No Longer.” 2003.

¹¹³ “Reflections in the Light of the Word of God and Catholic Social Teaching.” USCCB. Strangers No Longer: Together on a Journey of Hope. 2003.

¹¹⁴ Pope Leo XIII, “On Capital and Labor.” *Rerum Novarum*. no. 47. 15 May 1891, Vatican <www.vatican.va>

Roberto Juarez states “secular law in the United States has yet to acknowledge this fundamental right.”¹¹⁵

The USCCB’s use of religious rhetoric and imagery, therefore, brings another layer to the support for immigrant rights and welfare. Secular organizations and secular laws alone do not have the opportunity to invoke such strong sentiments to an American population that, for the most part, is religious. The USCCB, therefore, exemplifies the cooperation of both the secular and religious realms of society. The use and necessity of religion in the USCCB’s “Justice for Immigrants” campaign demonstrates the religious call of social man to abide by a moral code for the common good of American society. Secular organizations do not have the same authority as USCCB religious leadership to evoke such a strong moral presence and invocation of its membership.

Moreover, it is not as if the USCCB, through its involvement in immigrant rights and American politics, attempts to establish a political theology in America. The USCCB attempts to establish a moral and political ethic in society. A position the Catholic Church supports. Pope Benedict stated that the Church is only positioned to mediate “the moral principles on which genuine democracy must be built.”¹¹⁶ This position similarly effects

¹¹⁵ Juarez, Jr., Jose Roberto. “Catholic Social Thought and Immigration.” Faith and Law : How Religious Traditions From Calvinism to Islam View American Law. Edited by Robert F. Cochran, Jr. New York: New York University Press, 2008.p. 202.

¹¹⁶ Komonchak, Joseph A. “Vatican II and the Encounter between Catholicism and Liberalism.” Catholicism and Liberalism. Contributions to American Public Philosophy. Ed. Douglass, R.B. and Hollenbach, D. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. 93.

how the USCCB engages American politics and society in contesting anti-immigration sentiment and policies.

Nevertheless, there are many secularists who claim that religious institutions are no longer needed to protect and proclaim morality. Some secularists, such as Richard Dawkins, claims that religion never produced morality. According to Dawkins, morality has evolved over time, wherein human nature has selectively picked morality genes in order to aid human survival. For instance, He asks his readers in “The God Delusion” the following, "would you commit murder, rape or robbery if you knew that no God existed?"¹¹⁷ Although this question is evocative, it, unfortunately, disregards the long historical tradition of religious institutions promoting an ethical society. As previously stated, philosophers and intellectuals, such as John Courtney Murray, Alexis De Tocqueville, and G.W.F. Hegel, observed and asserted the necessity of religion in establishing an ethical, democratic society as well as ethical individuals. The USCCB encapsulates this melding of the secular and religious realms in order to foster an ethical stance towards immigrants.

Summary

The USCCB has access to tens of thousands of American citizens who are Catholic and could understand or at least be engaged in the religious justification for

¹¹⁷ Dawkins, Richard. The God Delusion. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2006, p. 238.

immigrant rights. The USCCB's understanding and discourse within the immigration debate also demonstrates their ability to be civically engaged. Additionally, the USCCB, in its organizational capacity, is staffed by professional lobbyists and policy analysts, therefore, preparing the USCCB in a variety of ways to engage civil society and the United States government.¹¹⁸ Bishop DiMarzio's testimony to a Congressional subcommittee is only one example of how engaged the USCCB is in United States politics. Thus, the use of religion and secular by these Catholic leaders aids to the overall development of American society and the protection of immigrants, particularly undocumented immigrants.

¹¹⁸ Froehle, Brian. "National Catholic Organizations." Civil Society, Civic Engagement, and Catholicism in the U.S. Liedhegener, Antonius and Kremp, Werner, eds. Trier: Atlantische Akademie, 2007.p.189.

4. Conclusion

The current immigration debate does have two very compelling sides, which is reflected in this research literature. Firstly, the interest, sovereignty, and security of a state must be respected. Additionally, U.S. legislation also aligns itself with the protection of its borders and the prosecution of illegal immigrants. On the other hand, the human dignity and rights of immigrants must also be respected.

The USCCB directly supports this latter position calling for legalization of immigrants in order to enhance America's national security. The USCCB has found support of its engagement through the constitutional protections of religion and assembly, as well as religion's role in social movements in the United States. Thus, the USCCB can effectively influence immigration policy and law. In John Farina's writing, "The Future of Catholic Civic Engagement" he explicitly states that "religion's role in civil society is crucial."¹¹⁹ The following research comes to a very similar stance. Without the inclusion of religion and the synthesis of the secular and the sacred through the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, the immigrant rights movement would lose a strong

¹¹⁹ Farina, John. "The Future of Catholic Civic Engagement." Civil Society, Civic Engagement and Catholicism in the U.S. Liedhegener, Antonius and Kremp, Werner, eds. Trier: Atlantische Akademie, 2007, p. 273.

base of its support, influence, and voice.

WORKS CITED

WORKS CITED

- “Activist Network.” Justice for Immigrants Campaign. 2009. 23 Oct. 2008. <<http://www.justiceforimmigrants.org/joinnetwork.htm>>
- “Bill of Rights.” U.S. National Archive and Record Administration. 22 Oct. 2008 <http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/bill_of_rights_transcript.html>
- Byrnes, Timothy A. Catholic Bishops in American Politics. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991. p.5.
- Dawkins, Richard. The God Delusion. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2006.
- “Declaration of Independence.” The U.S. National Archives and Records Administration . 27 Oct. 2008. <<http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration.html>>
- De Toqueville, Alexis. as quoted in Miller, William L. The First Liberty. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2003. p. 235.
- Ewing, Walter. “Immigration Policy for the 21st Century: The case for Legalization of Undocumented Immigrants.” The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. Mar 2002. 3 Feb. 2009. <<http://www.usccb.org/mrs/legaliza.shtml>>
- Findlay, James F. Church People in the Struggle. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Farina, John. “The Future of Catholic Civic Engagement.” Civil Society, Civic Engagement and Catholicism in the U.S. Liedhegener, Antonius and Kremp, Werner, eds. Trier: Atlantische Akademie, 2007.

- Froehle, Brian. "National Catholic Organizations." Civil Society, Civic Engagement, and Catholicism in the U.S. Liedhegener, Antonius and Kremp, Werner, eds. Trier: Atlantische Akademie, 2007.
- Gelm, Richard. Politics and Religious Authority: American Catholics Since the Second Vatican Council. London: Greenwood Press, 1994.
- Griffin, Leslie. "Pope John XXIII." The Teachings of Modern Roman Catholicism. Witte, J. and Alexander, F., eds. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.
- Hertzke, Allen D. "Emerging Trends in Religion, Society, and Politics." The Future of Religion in American Politics. Dunn, Charles, ed. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2009.
- Houck, Davis W. & Dixon, David E. Rhetoric, Religion and the Civil Rights Movement 1954-1965. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006. p. 224.
- Immigration Enforcement Policies. Isenburg, Bruno T. ed. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc., 2007.
- Jefferson, Thomas."Letter to the Danbury Baptists: The Final Letter, As Sent." Library of Congress. Martha Graham Collection: June 1998. Vol 57, No. 6. 8 Mar 2008. <<http://www.loc.gov/loc/lcib/9806/danpre.html>>
- Juarez, Jr., Jose Roberto. "Catholic Social Thought and Immigration." Faith and Law : How Religious Traditions From Calvinism to Islam View American Law. Edited by Robert F. Cochran, Jr. New York: New York University Press, 2008.
- King, Jr., Martin Luther. "Letter from Birmingham Jail" Why We Can't Wait. New York: Mentor, 1964.
- Komonchak, Joseph A. "Vatican II and the Encounter between Catholicism and Liberalism." Catholicism and Liberalism. Contributions to American Public

Philosophy. Ed. Douglass, R.B. and Hollenbach, D. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Krieger, Joel, ed. "Immigration/International Migration." The Oxford Companion to Politics of the World. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

LeMay, Michael C. Illegal Immigration. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, Inc., 2007.

McAdam, Doug. Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982.

McCabe, David. "John Locke and the Argument Against Strict Separation." The Review of Politics. Spring 1997. Vol 59, No. 2. JSTOR. George Mason Uni. Lib., VA. 16 Mar 2009. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1407354>>

Miller, William L. The First Liberty. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2003.

"Most Rvd. Nicholas DiMarzio Testimony: The Implementation of Comprehensive Immigration Reform." House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims. 27 Jul 2006. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. 12 Mar 2009. <<http://www.usccb.org/mrs/dimarziotestimony.shtml>>

Murray, John Courtney. We Hold These Truths: Catholic Reflections on the American Proposition. New York: Sheed and Ward, Inc., 1960.

Ozodor, Paulinus I. Moral Theology in an Age of Renewal: A Study of the Catholic Tradition since Vatican II. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003.

"Original Source Materials." The Teachings of Modern Roman Catholicism. Witte, J. and Alexander, F., eds. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

Pope John Paul II. Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation *Ecclesia in America*. No. 65. 22 January 1999. Libreria Editrice Vaticana. 5 Oct. 2008 <<http://www.vatican.va/>>

[holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_22011999_ecclesia-in-america_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_22011999_ecclesia-in-america_en.html)>

Pope Paul VI. "GS 30." Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World: Gaudium Et Spes. Vatican. 7 Dec. 1965. 17 Apr 2009 <http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html>

Pope Leo XIII, "On Capital and Labor." Rerum Novarum. no. 47. 15 May 1891. 16 Oct. 2008. Vatican <www.vatican.va>

Powell, John. Immigration. New York: Facts On File, 2007.

Roelofs, H. Mark. "Church and State in America" The Review of Politics. 1988. JSTOR. George Mason Uni. Lib., VA. 16 Mar 2009. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1407354>>

"Southern Christian Leadership Conference." Encyclopædia Britannica. 2009 Encyclopædia Britannica Online. 30 Mar. 2009 <<http://search.eb.com/eb/article-9068919>>.

"The Constitution of the United States." The U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. 8 Mar. 2009 <http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/constitution_transcript.html>

Tilly, Charles. Social Movements, 1764-2004. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2004.

USCCB. "Brief History." About USCCB. 2008. 22 Oct. 2008 <<http://www.usccb.org/whoweare.shtml>>

_____. "Comprehensive Immigration Reform." 2009. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Migration and Refugee Services. 23 Oct 2008 <<http://www.usccb.org/mrs/legal.shtml>>

_____. "Statement of Mission." About USCCB. 2008. 22 Oct. 2008
<<http://www.usccb.org/whoweare.shtml>>

_____. "Strangers No Longer: Together on a Journey of Hope" 22 Jan. 2003. United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Inc. and Conferencia del Episcopado Mexicano. 19 Oct. 2008 <<http://www.usccb.org/mrs/stranger.shtml>>

CURRICULUM VITAE

Mary Jo Lopez Duckwitz graduated from Fairfax High School, Fairfax, Virginia in 2002. She received her Bachelor of Arts in Religious Studies with a double minor in Latin American Studies and International and Comparative Studies from George Mason University. She worked as a graduate lecturer during her final year while completing her Masters of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies in 2009.