Chapter 2

From Hospitality to Mutual Accompaniment

Addressing Soul Loss in the Citizen-Neighbor[1]

Mary Watkins

As extreme poverty persists and income divides in many places widen, as the ravishes of climate change encompass more parts of the globe, and as humans fail to avert violence through diplomatic means, more mass migrations will—of necessity—occur. As more economically privileged nations build walls and security armies to avert the flow of migrants, and as leaders promote xenophobia, racist violence, cultural purity, and the exclusion of those deemed "others," what happens to the soul of citizens called upon by immigrants and refugees to be neighbors? Beyond postcolonial "hospitality" lies the necessity for an ethics of mutual accompaniment, where the hierarchical binary of host and immigrant is replaced by horizontal relationship. What is mutual accompaniment? What does it look like in an era of mass migrations? What is at stake in failing to engage in the psychosocial accompaniment of migrants and asylum seekers? As a critical community psychologist, I reflect here on the soul of the citizen in the face of migrant and asylum-seeking newcomers and neighbors. I reach for an ethics of mutual accompaniment and solidarity in this age of mass migrations.

Post–9/11, my husband, philosopher Ed Casey, and I began to learn about and witness the extension and fortification of the US wall at the US-Mexico border. In the wake of NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement), forced migration due to economic need and the violence of the so-called drug war, millions of migrants from Mexico, crossed into the United States, contributing to the total sum of 11.5 million immigrants without documents. We studied the humanitarian and ecological crises that erupted as the United States tried to divert economic migrants from crossing the border in urban areas like San Diego to the perilous deserts and mountains of Arizona and

New Mexico. In the wake of NAFTA and 9/11, bulldozers were unleashed to destroy nature preserves, fragile marshes, and other delicate ecosystems for the sake of building the border wall. By policy migrating children and their parents were allowed to die in the desert as a result of the wall, so that they might be a warning to others contemplating migration. Many migrating women endured rape and extortion to arrive in a land where they had the hope of feeding and educating their children.

As my work took me from the US wall at the southern border to the metaphorical "walls" between immigrants without documents and Anglos in my own city of Santa Barbara, California, I conceived of my own calling to find ways to relate to immigrant neighbors as a personal one, akin to other people's calls to other social issues. After watching the United States descend into yet another historical chapter of criminalizing migrants, of the creation of Juan Crow laws in many municipalities and states (akin to Jim Crow laws in the South after the Civil War),[2] I came to believe I was simply wrong about this being my *personal* call.

As I witnessed the creation of a gulag of detention prisons for migrants throughout the United States, and the largest annual deportations of migrants without documents in US history (400,000 per year)—year after year during President Obama's administration—I knew I was wrong. As I began to know through my relations with immigrant neighbors the toll of fear and insecurity the cloud of potential deportation wreaks in their daily lives, I became clear that all citizens are needed to respond empathically as neighbors in what promises to be a continuing, ongoing humanitarian crisis. I now believe that all citizens, regardless of their other commitments, need to resist the walling off at our borders and in our communities, and, in addition to whatever else we do with respect to debordering politics, that we commit to forming relationships of accompaniment and solidarity with migrants and asylum seekers.

PSYCHOSOCIAL ACCOMPANIMENT OF MIGRANTS AND ASYLUM SEEKERS BY CITIZEN-NEIGHBORS

I am a student and practitioner of what in Latin America is called "psychosocial accompaniment."[3] Accompaniment is a term used in liberation theology which has migrated into liberation psychology. The root of *acompañamiento* is *compañero* or friend.[4] It draws from the Latin *ad cum panis,* to break bread with one another. In the daily course of our lives, we enjoy the friendship of family, friends, and colleagues, and share the labors and joys of living life with one another. There is often an easy back and forth relationship with these others. We "break bread" with each other. Inevitably, however, daily

life is interrupted by crises—both acute and chronic—that call upon us for extraordinary efforts. At times, we are the subject of such crises and need to call upon others for help and assistance. At others, we are aware of the need of others who are facing challenges that lead them to call out for accompaniment, for our coming alongside them in an intentional way to be of whatever assistance they might ask for that we are capable of sharing.

"Accompaniment" is a term currently used in social medicine, peace activism, human rights, pastoral support, social psychology, and liberation psychology. The concept is used when speaking of accompanying the ill who are also poor, those caught in prison and detention systems, political dissidents, refugees, those suffering under occupation, victims of torture and other forms of violence, those forcibly displaced, those suffering from human rights violations, those imprisoned, and those attempting to live peacefully in the face of paramilitary and military violence. In countless other situations of duress, accompaniment is engaged in without recourse to the term.

Charitable helping that leaves intact and unchallenged the wellsprings of oppression is not the aim of psychosocial accompaniment. It is most important to keep in mind that accompaniment is not something I do for the sake of others alone, but for my own liberation as well. It was put best by an Aboriginal group in Queensland, Australia, in the 1970s:

> *If you come here to help me, you are wasting your time.*
> *If you come because your liberation is bound up with mine,*
> *then let us work together.*

Those who accompany who are not from within a community must traverse the borders that have been set up to keep them apart. Citizens need to enter into dialogue of a substantive nature with migrants and asylum seekers in order to be able to actively counter the sadly normative xenophobic narratives and practices that are promoted by right-wing leaders and media. They need to do so in order to understand more directly the histories of migrants that are causing them to flee their homes, so that as citizens they can advocate for humane approaches to resettlement and integration and to the diplomatic resolution of violent conflicts that spur migration.

We also need to do so for the sake of our own souls, as locking one's door in the face of neighbors' and strangers' needs damages our own capacity for empathy, for living an ethical and compassionate life. It also continues to undermine our mutual need to create intercultural commons in the face of neoliberal globalization. My present work concerns the role of accompaniment in the creation of intercultural commons, places for human and other-than-human-nature flourishing through the meeting of needs and the satisfying of mutual obligations.

Whether we address the issue of humanitarian bordering or propose decolonial approaches to debordering, both depend on associations of individuals who have committed themselves to accompanying immigrants, in small and large ways. William Walters describes humanitarian bordering as a "situation where the actual borders of states and gateways to the territory become themselves zones of humanitarian government."[5] Here reception centers and border patrol with support from other government agencies assist migrants and offer hospitality, even if conditional.

While the professionalization of humanitarian bordering and debordering and the proliferation of social service agencies and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) is usually thought of as positive, there is also a downside we need to address. Unfortunately, the message to civil society of this professionalization is that the situation is taken care of and the intervention of citizens is not needed (or desired). This is far from the reality on the ground. In the United States, at the turn of the twentieth century, Jane Addams and her colleagues established Hull-House, a settlement house in the poorest neighborhood of Chicago, a place where citizens and immigrants could meet, develop friendships and alliances, celebrate cultural arts, and join in solidarity to improve the lives of the immigrant poor and their citizen-neighbors.[6] Addams and her colleagues lived at Hull-House, and experienced their cross-border relations—crossing economic, ethnic, and national borders—as necessary to and desirable in their own lives. They experienced the accompaniment they practiced as a mutual and dialogical process, and framed it as a necessary ingredient to living democratically in an intercultural context. Today when I visit settlement houses in immigrant neighborhoods, I am struck by the "radical monopoly"[7] of professionals who have been hired and deployed to assist.[8] Indeed, citizens often find themselves locked out of direct relationship with migrants and asylum seekers by professional and governmental workers.

Humanitarian bordering also depends on *nongovernmental* efforts, on the participation of citizens in the psychosocial accompaniment of migrants and asylum seekers. It must acknowledge that the borders between citizens and non-citizens are multiple and that to achieve humanitarian debordering is not possible by an exclusive focus on national border areas. The borders exist in and between our neighborhoods, schools, faith communities, and workplaces.

The ways in which neoliberal capitalism continues to enclose "commons" creates an outer periphery of what Joao Biehl calls "zones of abandonment" and Chris Hedges describes as "zones of sacrifice."[9] Immigrants without documents and refugees most often find themselves consigned to these zones. Those citizens who can, most often avoid these places, where human and ecological misery threaten or triumph over the needed

integrity of everyday life. Accompaniment seeks to interrupt this avoidance. Indeed, the practice of accompaniment is committed to what we might call "reverse osmosis" or *reverse border crossing*, entering into situations that many are seeking to flee. In doing so, accompaniment traverses the walls built to keep some people out and ourselves in, and dares to see into the situations those walls otherwise separate us from but which immigrants confront each day.

I volunteer in several programs of psychosocial accompaniment that help citizens cross these walls. One, New Sanctuary Coalition of NYC,[10] welcomes requests for accompaniment from immigrants living in the United States without documents who are going through deportation proceedings. When they go for their immigration hearing, they do not know if they will be placed in detention and slated for deportation or marked for continuing surveillance. Family members who are not citizens may be frightened to attend, fearing their own capture by the system. The immigrant requests accompaniment and the accompanier is prepared to notify family members and friends if the immigrant is taken into custody. These are tense and often tragic occasions when one can all of a sudden be separated from a partner, children, and friends, one's life shattered by a single judgment. Another program, First Friends of New Jersey and New York,[11] asks detainees within immigrant detention centers if they would like visitation. Most have no contacts in the United States. Their journeys border on the unimaginable: to take a boat from Africa to Brazil and then to walk to the United States. They need asylum to save their lives but they have no right to legal representation because they are not US citizens. Accompaniers make regular visits, and offer help from simple things like sending a book to read, to helping get legal representation, or contacting Amnesty International to assist with a given case. In both of these instances, the citizen crosses over into places he or she would not ordinarily visit or even see. In doing so, the vast US gulag of detention centers that has sprung up in the last fifteen years becomes apparent, as do opportunities for advocacy for immigration reform and for local legislation to improve the lives of migrants. Without such reverse border crossing, I would not know that we use windowless warehouses to imprison asylum seekers. I would not know that many immigrant mothers go to work with ankle monitors on as though they were criminals. I would not know, in my bones, the kinds of violence people are fleeing from, a violence that will be revisited upon them if deported.

What makes this "psychosocial" accompaniment is that the accompanier attempts to become aware of the social, political, and historical circumstances that have created the traumatic circumstance being suffered. There is commitment not only to support an individual person psychologically, but to seek ways to change societal conditions that manufacture such distress.

ENCLOSING THE COMMONS AND OUTLAWING HOSPITALITY: REMOVAL AND IMPRISONMENT

In the United States, despite a national narrative of our success in welcoming the "stranger," the vulnerable, and the immigrant, our history is laced with both networks of solidarity with immigrants *and* xenophobic and racist attacks and legislation against them. The latter has roots going back to the enclosure of the commons in England and the subsequent rise of Elizabethan poor laws in England and Ireland in the early seventeenth century which I want to briefly describe. Few US citizens are aware of how they and others carry forward this tradition of inhospitality. It needs to be known and critiqued, deconstructed, and countered with traditions of solidarity with the migrant and the asylum seeker.

"Commons" refer to those lands that are used and sustained for the common good. Early stewardship of commons involved not only appropriate use but obligations and duties, ensuring sharing and sustainability. According to Gary Snyder, the commons[12] was an "ancient mode of both protecting and managing the wilds of self-governing regions."[13] The land belonged to the local community members. "The commons is a level of organization of human society that includes the nonhuman. The level above the local is the bioregion."[14] When a piece of land or water was considered part of the commons, it did not mean that everyone could take from the common resource as much as he or she wanted. Access was regulated from the excess of individual exploitation. Being a part of the commons involved mutual obligation between people, as well as between people and the local natural system.

When wealthy lords began to seize these lands, often to provide grazing land to vast cattle holdings or to market timber,[15] those people who lived in and by the commons, who cared for and sustained the commons, were massively and violently displaced.

The enclosure of the commons movement in England and Ireland disrupted the practice of communally held land, fenced off the land, and turned it over to private interests, displacing communities, disrupting sustainable and communal agriculture, and replacing it with profit-making practices that led to deforestation and overgrazing.

In 1847, Bishop of Meath (Ireland), Thomas Nulty, described his personal recollection of the evictions in a pastoral letter to his clergy:

> Seven hundred human beings were driven from their homes in one day and set adrift on the world, to gratify the caprice of one who, before God and man, probably deserved less consideration than the last and least of them. . . . The horrid scenes I then witnessed, I must remember all my life long. The wailing of women—the screams, the terror, the consternation of children—the speechless agony of honest industrious men—wrung tears of grief from all who saw

> them. I saw officers and men of a large police force, who were obliged to attend on the occasion, cry like children at beholding the cruel sufferings of the very people whom they would be obliged to butcher had they offered the least resistance. The landed proprietors in a circle all around—and for many miles in every direction—warned their tenantry, with threats of their direct vengeance, against the humanity of extending to any of them the hospitality of a single night's shelter . . . and in little more than three years, nearly a fourth of them lay quietly in their graves.[16]

I want to underline the *outlawing by force* of hospitality and solidarity, as hospitality and solidarity are crucial to the building and sustaining of the commons, as we shall soon see. In parts of the United States, it has been made illegal to offer a car ride to a person without documents. Some municipalities have passed laws forbidding renting a living space to those without documents. Efforts have been made in some states to forbid non-citizen children from attending public schools. Checkpoints throughout the border region with Mexico, including at bus and train stations, are patrolled by armed border patrol agents. Misuse of violent force at the border by such agents is commonplace, including beatings, torture, murder, and rape.

Those who survived displacement in England and Ireland, the rural homeless, became the first industrial working class in the burgeoning cities. This dynamic continues to unfold in our current world, as commons are erased. For instance, in Mexico, as a result of trade agreements in NAFTA that allowed US farmers to dump subsidized corn on the Mexican market, Mexican farmers were unable to compete and had to leave their land to survive. Many tried to gain employment in the vast *maquiladores*, the industrial plants, created in the new "free" trade zones, that demand cheap labor; others risked the perilous passage to the United States through the scorching desert. During the enclosures in England and Ireland, those who could not find work in the cities fell into vagrancy and poverty. Many were imprisoned. Indeed, the enclosure of the commons required both a walling out and a walling in. The poor laws began to legislate where the responsibility for helping these people lay. It was agreed that vagrants, beggars, the disabled and the deserving poor, should be returned to and taken care of by the community or parish from which they had come, where they might still have family and may have once contributed their labor. This minimized people being called upon to pay taxes to support people from outside their community. But for many, this community to which they were supposed to return no longer existed. Categories were created to divide those considered the "deserving" poor from the undeserving poor, the latter being subject to torture and imprisonment. Indeed, the birth of the prison is directly related to the creation of the urban poor due to the enclosures.[17]

When the Puritans came from England to New England (in the Americas), they brought these sensibilities and practices with them. Families were not allowed to shelter strangers. Strangers in need would be asked to return from where they came. Indeed, there were "warners" employed, like Robert Love in Boston, who made his daily rounds to determine if any strangers had come to town and where they were staying. They were given fourteen days to leave, and were encouraged to go back where they came from. This practice protected the local treasury from caring for the poor not originally from their jurisdiction.[18]

We continue this habit with forced migrants, busing and flying shackled migrants back to where they came from, even when it is fairly certain life is unsustainable for them there and, in many cases, is mortally dangerous. The nation, counties, cities and towns establish restrictions on who aid and care can be extended to and who is considered outside its jurisdiction. When town budgets are stretched due to an influx of migrants, it is not uncommon to see xenophobia and racism rise, as well as efforts of exclusion and acts of violence toward migrants. The use of detention centers, prisons by another name, to hold indigent migrants is akin to prisons populated by the poor and unemployed. Both prisons and detention centers in the United States disproportionately imprison and detain people of color.

I raise this early history to suggest the inappropriateness of this inherited orientation in a global situation where it is untenable for many to return to where they came from. Their having left in the first place is often due to the poverty and/or violence that has afflicted their lives. The outlawing of "hospitality" that gained strength with the enclosure of the commons must be resisted and replaced with an ethics of accompaniment.

DECOLONIAL DEBORDERING

How might understandings of colonialism and of coloniality and decoloniality assist us in thinking about decolonial approaches to debordering, including a re-thinking of "hospitality"? The tactics developed in England and Ireland to displace people from their land, their commons, and then to criminalize their presence outside the context of performing cheap or slave labor were exported into colonializing efforts throughout the world. The Indigenous became the excluded and the invaders became those with rights in an amazing sleight of hand, enforced by violence and racism. For instance, where I currently live, on the central coast of California, was originally the land of the Chumash people. The Spanish moved the Chumash into the missions and used them as slave laborers. With disease and punishment, their population rapidly moved toward extinction. Mexicans re-settled the area

and became established here until 1848 when the United States took the land from Mexico. Many Mexicans lost their land and homes, were barred from professional jobs and forced to work menially for others, as well as subjected to the terror of lynchings, and forced removals and deportations. Now, when Mexicans cross over the border to live in the United States—into the very areas once owned by Mexico—they are treated as criminals and interlopers. National borders fail to make human sense in such instances. From a decolonial viewpoint, those who are clearly Indigenous to particular places have legitimate claims to lands and reparations.[19] How these claims can be honored in the face of cities and towns that have been built on land previously inhabited by them is a thorny issue indeed.

Let us clearly differentiate those situations when newcomers arrive to seize land and power and to forcibly displace others from those situations where newcomers arrive because they are under duress, because their lives are no longer tenable in their original homes. In the first case, the newcomers forcibly expel others. In the latter, it is the expelled who seek refuge. Paradoxically, it is those who have forcibly displaced others—undermining their languages and cultures—who argue that forced migrants and asylum seekers are seeking to de-legitimate *their* culture and language, to take societal benefits that should be only accorded to those currently deemed citizens. This is made more complex if the society of those denying refuge has contributed to the destruction of the society from which the migrants and asylum seekers are fleeing. Clearly to lock the gates and to turn back the boats are not ethical options.

A decolonial approach to debordering needs to face into this complexity of claims and counterclaims and the history of seizures and dispossessions, as it is a complexity that will only increase in a world where displacement and population mobility continue to defy fixed national borders. This must be grappled with in the present and over the long term.

At the level of the citizen and the forced migrant (and asylum seeker), the situation that demands our attention and action is immediate; it is now. If our goal is to create democratic and nonviolent commons where the interdependent well-being of humans and other-than-human animals and ecosystems is promoted, then the commons must be seen as an intercultural and dynamic body, a body that creates elasticity and porousness at its borders. In Ed Casey's formulation,[20] such debordering entails the transmutation of borders into boundaries, where mobility and fluidity is provided for by the porosity of the boundary membrane. Such a porous boundary allows flow in both directions, neither walling out (the "other," the "stranger," the "migrant") or walling in (the citizen). In this equilibrating condition, the migrant and the asylum seeker's movement across the boundary in one direction fuels the movement of the citizen in the other direction, creating the possibilities of relationship

and solidarity. I refer here not only to the literal national border but to all the borders that are laid down between citizen and non-citizen.

Decolonial debordering relies on the creation of multiple sites of dialogue and joint action between citizens and migrant neighbors, blending the border crossing of the migrant with the *reverse border crossing* of the citizen; that is, the citizen needs to make efforts to gain access to places such as detention facilities, deportation proceedings, and immigrant advocacy groups. I have called these multiple sites of confluence between the citizen and the migrant *sites of reconciliation*,[21] suggesting a re-weaving of the fabric of relationship that is needed for the commons-to-come.

Fortunately, the United States has a rich history of this that can be drawn on and built upon. The Underground Railroad, providing protection to some Africans as they fled slavery in the southern United States, was an early precursor to the Sanctuary Movement of the 1980s, formed in the face of Central American government repression and violence, aided by the United States. The latter has morphed into the New Sanctuary Movement that is tracking conditions in the burgeoning detention gulag in the United States, while helping citizens to support asylum seekers in detention centers and accompanying those facing detention and deportation. Coalitions of faith-based communities are offering sanctuary in churches for those facing egregious deportations that would separate them from their spouses and their citizen children. These grass-root efforts touch more than the direct participants, as citizens are in a position to help share more widely immigrant struggles and advocate for legislative changes that would positively impact immigrant communities.

In conclusion, I acknowledge the necessarily elliptical nature of these comments but want to underscore the potential contribution of the directions and efforts I am pointing to. The elaboration of humanitarian bordering, while focused on governmental and nongovernmental humanitarian zones hosted by professionals, needs to include nonprofessional citizens who must be engaged in on-the-ground relationships with migrants in intercultural encounter zones. Without citizens' participation in cross-border relations, the gates of their hearts will be closed, contributing to a civil society that is hostile, undemocratic, xenophobic, and exclusionary toward migrants and asylum seekers. An essential element of creating the commons-to-come—an active antidote to vulture capitalism—will be to retrieve multiple possibilities of interface between migrants and citizens from the professionalization of caring that is endemic to capitalism. For the citizen, the retrieval of these possibilities will require reverse border crossing, working to gain entrance to reception centers and detention centers, laboring to find where recent immigrants are in their community and what their needs are, and carefully laying the groundwork of trust and respect that open invitations for joint projects from migrant neighbors to citizens judged to be in solidarity. The commons-to-come must

be intercultural, founded on interdependent sensitivity. This would mean that the accompaniment of migrants and asylum seekers would not be conceived of as a humanitarian gesture for the migrant, as hospitality—that is, out of the "largesse" of or the generosity of the so-called host—but as a generative activity of mutual dialogue and mutual benefit.

Together we can build civil societies of acknowledged mutual dignity and respect, and can form alliances for interdependent well-being. From the deepening of citizen and migrant relations, the citizen can grow in his or her understanding of how their own country's actions and inactions may be contributing to the very migration they are witnessing, underscoring the interdependence of the citizen and the immigrant. Elsewhere I have elaborated on the restorative and generative nature of feelings of shame that arise from such realizations, if citizens then have pathways to intercultural relations with immigrant neighbors.[22] The citizen needs relations with migrants for the sake of his or her own soul and the integrity of her society.

In discussing the necessity to create cities of sanctuary for political dissidents fleeing death in their own country, Jacques Derrida offered us a compelling image.[23] He describes how when we fail to invite the stranger in to our home, we lose access to the heart of our home. The heart of our home is fenced off to us, as we fence out others. This is the soul predicament we are caught in as capitalism continues to displace and imprison in order to try to satisfy the appetites it ignites.

MUTUAL ACCOMPANIMENT AS A PATHWAY TO SOLIDARITY

Solidarity does not depend on homogeneity of identity or of origins. It depends on shared purpose, desire, and vision. Dmitri Christopoulos describes the present refugee crisis as "a solidarity crisis." Building walls and fences against outsiders destroys, he says, the "idea that we can live together constructing a project of political unity."[24] Solidarity emerges from a felt sense that our fates are interdependent, and that our own well-being cannot be separated from that of others. As Martin Luther King Jr. put it:

> As long as there is poverty in the world I can never be rich, even if I have a billion dollars. As long as diseases are rampant and millions of people in this world cannot expect to live more than twenty-eight or thirty years, I can never be totally healthy even if I just got a good checkup at Mayo clinic. I can never be what I ought to be until you are what you ought to be. This is the way our world is made. No individual or nation can stand out boasting of being independent. We are interdependent.[25]

In this spirit, we can say that as long as there are refugees and forced migrants who have not reached a safe destination and been helped to create a new home amongst us that is safe, that we cannot feel truly at home either. It is in this sense that Derrida reminds us that we are locked out of the heart of our own home if we cannot allow the stranger through our door.

POSTSCRIPT: POST–2016 ELECTION CONTEXT REGARDING IMMIGRATION IN THE UNITED STATES

I am returning a year later to edit this chapter (initially written the summer before Trump's 2016 election as president of the United States), with a discomfiting admixture of despair, hope, and deepened commitment. The visibility of xenophobic and racist white supremacists and neo-Nazis in the United States has increased, as Trump has used his office to welcome and encourage their ideologies and violent actions. Since the 2016 election, the imprisonment and deportation of immigrants without documents has increased by 40 percent. Trump's budget calls for 4.5 billion in new spending to fight illegal immigration, adding more than 1,700 new border officers, prosecutors, and judges.[26] Trump's threats to fortify the existing wall at the US-Mexico border—estimated by the Department of Homeland Security to cost $21 billion—meets with roars of applause in rallies reminiscent of 1930s Nazi Germany. Eight hundred thousand young non-US citizen adults—brought to the United States as infants and children by their immigrant parents—are now threatened with removal. Verbal and physical violence against immigrants and those who look like immigrants happens in the open, in the daylight: on the street, in the subway, in stores. Trump's travel ban—against those from several predominantly Muslim countries—has destroyed the hopes of thousands who are seeking refuge from the violence of war for themselves and their children. Even those parents who helped their children escape the gang violence of Honduras, El Salvador, and Nicaragua by migrating to the United States are now threatened with prosecution for child trafficking because they lent their meager funds to help their children escape near certain death or kidnapping into the violence of drug cartel gangs. The reasons for despair are apparent; they are mercilessly supplemented daily.

At the same time, millions of US citizens are protesting these actions, standing in solidarity with their immigrant neighbors, forging sanctuary legislation to protect their neighbors, meeting with their police chiefs to demand they not be complicit with ICE (Immigration Control Enforcement). Before this showdown, the extent of this support for immigrant neighbors was not as apparent. On the day of the announcement of Trump's Muslim travel ban, thousands showed up at US airports to protest and to welcome those who

made it through at the last moment. Throughout the United States, church members, universities, and colleges are forming coalitions to provide sanctuary. The public display of xenophobic racism has provoked a counter-display of empathy, human decency, and inclusion. This is fuel for a radical hope that keeps alive a vision of a welcoming society.

NOTES

1. Some of the material in this chapter is drawn from a forthcoming book by the author, *Accompaniment and the Creation of the Commons*, Yale University Press.

2. See chapter 6, "Juan Crow: The American Ethnoracial Caste System and the Criminalization of Mexican Migrants," in Edward S. Casey and Mary Watkins, *Up Against the Wall: Re-imagining the U.S.-Mexico Border* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2014), 146–83.

3. Mary Watkins, "Psychosocial Accompaniment," *Journal of Social and Political Psychology* 3, no. 1 (2015).

4. Roberto S. Goizueta, *Caminemos con Jesus: Toward a Hispanic/Latino Theology of Accompaniment* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1995).

5. William Walters, "Foucault and Frontiers: Notes on the Birth of the Humanitarian Border," in *Governmentality: Current Issues and Future Challenges*, ed. Ulrich Bröckling, Susanne Krasmann, and Thomas Lemke (New York: Routledge, 2012), 139.

6. Jane Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull-House: With Autobiographical Notes* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990).

7. Ivan Illich, *Tools for Conviviality* (New York: Harper and Row, 1973).

8. This is part of an historical trend that David Schwartz traces in *Who Cares? Rediscovering Community* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1997).

9. Chris Hedges and Joe Sacco, *Days of Destruction, Days of Revolt* (New York: Nation Books, 2012).

10. See website: http://www.newsanctuarynyc.org/.

11. See website: https://firstfriendsnjny.org/.

12. Gary Snyder suggests that "common" from the Greek "*ko*" meaning together, and the Latin "*munus*" meaning service indicates "service performed for the community." See *The Practice of the Wild* (Berkeley, CA: Counterpoint, 2010), 34.

13. Synder, *The Practice of the Wild*, 32.

14. Ibid., 40.

15. Due to the enclosures, England has the least forest and wildlife of all nations of Europe, according to Snyder, *The Practice of the Wild*.

16. Erick Falc'her-Poyroux, "The Great Irish Famine in Songs," *Revue Française de Civilisation Britannique* XIX, no. 2 (2014): par. 25.

17. Peter Linebaugh, *Stop Thief! The Commons, Enclosures, and Resistance* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2014).

18. Cornelia H. Dayton and Sharon V. Salinger, *Robert Love's Warnings: Searching for Strangers in Colonial Boston* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014).