
Immigration and the Dehumanizing of the “Other” in the United States

Steven Ybarrola

Immigration has become the defining issue of our moment. People are on the move like never before, and countries are scrambling to deal with both the influx, and the loss, of people on the move. In the United States, our former and current president, Trump, has made expelling immigrants his top priority, and we are witnessing the revamping of the Department of Homeland Security, and the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), to capture and expel immigrants at an alarming rate, disrupting peaceful communities and denying those detained due process as required by the U.S. Constitution. What should be our response as followers of Jesus? How do we need to be, as Andrew Walls stated, “out of step” with our society when it comes to supporting the most vulnerable among us?

Anthropology, from its inception as a discipline in the latter part of the 19th century, dealt with the study of the non-Western, “exotic” Other. Armchair anthropologists such as Edward Tylor and Henry Morgan gathered data from missionaries and global travelers to construct a theory of cultural/societal development that fit within the construct of the biological evolutionary paradigm recently developed at the time. This placed some peoples at the evolutionary level of “Savages” (e.g., Australian Aborigines), others at the level of “Barbarians” (e.g. Tahitians and Aztecs), and still others at the level of “Civilized” (i.e., Westerners) (Langness 2005, 39). Since the latter part of the 19th and early part of the 20th centuries, and the critique of this “paradigm” or construct in anthropology brought by the German immigrant to the United States, Franz Boas, the discipline has moved more in the direction of a cultural relativistic approach that tries to understand and present non-Western, as well as the diversity within Western, cultures in their own context and understanding, rather than judging them by some arbitrary ethnocentric standard (see Stocking 1992).

However, the early evolutionary model presented

a clear way of distinguishing “us” (Western, civilized) from “them” (non-Western barbarians, savages). As an undergraduate and graduate student studying anthropology in the 1980s, the way this was sometimes conveyed was through the image of cannibalism. There was hardly any trope that more clearly demarcated the gulf between us and them than the accusation that other non-Western groups of people ate humans. Now, there evidently are cases where a group would practice what we in the West might call ritual cannibalism (though they would not see it that way), such as when the Yanomami of the Amazon would drink the remains of a cremated ancestor in a ritual ceremony (Chagnon 1968), and Americans may be familiar with the tragedy of the Donner Party which, when trapped by snow in the Sierra Nevadas, resorted to eating members of their party who had died in order to survive. But in general it was found that “The charge of cannibalism has always been leveled against people whom other societies find foreign or inferior. It was a weapon of colonialism and class” (Pickering 2018, 9).¹ In other words, a key aspect of the accusation of

¹ In Pickering’s concise overview of the anthropological study of cannibalism, he states, “Invariably, in-depth research into the evidence for cannibalism in specific societies has contributed to disproving allegations. The closer we look, the less reliable is the so-called ethnographic evidence” (2018, 4). See also Obeyesekere 2005.

cannibalism was an egregious way to dehumanize the “Other.”²

This brings us to the presidential debate between then Vice President Harris and contender Trump on September 10, 2024. During a discussion of immigration, Trump accused Haitian immigrants in Springfield, Ohio of eating peoples’ dogs, cats, and pets.³ The Washington Post noted,

The promotion of such rumors, which thrust the city [of Springfield] into the national spotlight, is rooted in a centuries-old racist trope of vilifying newcomers to the United States and highlights the country’s present-day divides, historians note . . . His remarks were the latest in a swirl of canards that Trump has spread about Haitian immigrants, despite local officials debunking the claims.⁴

Vice President Harris was incredulous, stating that this was not happening. However, the accusation was enough. This is because, like cannibalism, to accuse another group of people in the United States of eating peoples’ pets is akin to accusing them of cannibalism, as most people in the U.S. consider pets as part of their family, especially dogs and cats. The Christian anthropologist Robert Priest has a take on this that he gave in a chapel talk at Wheaton College in 2008⁵ in the context of discussing Billy Graham’s cultural faux pas of preaching in India among upper caste Hindus about the Prodigal Son’s father killing the fatted calf upon the reception of his lost son—a moving story, at least for Americans. This was, of course, perceived as an abomination among those Hindus who understood the cow as something sacred. Priest presents the Hindus saying, “The cow is our mother. You do not kill and eat your mother!” This led Priest to give, as a comparative cultural faux pas, an imaginary evangelist from outside the United States, who preached a

sermon in which, at the end of the story, without any good reason, the father of the story kills and cooks the family dog to celebrate the son’s return. One can imagine how this would be received. The point is, for the majority of us in the U.S., pets are sacred—they are part of our family—and to accuse immigrants of eating them is sacrilegious—it’s dehumanizing.

What we are experiencing today regarding immigration, unfortunately, has a long-standing history in Western societies, and particularly the United States. There has always been a xenophobic and racist understanding of the “Other”. See, for example, Thomas Jefferson’s *Notes on the State of Virginia* in 1781 where he stated, “I advance it therefore as a suspicion only, that the blacks, whether originally a distinct race, or made distinct by time and circumstances, are inferior to the whites in the endowments both of body and mind” (1825, 198).

Following the trajectory of Jefferson’s “suspicions”, in the latter part of the 19th century arose “scientific racialism” (Lieberman and Scupin 2012). This was the idea that “race” was real and determinative, and people of other “races” were inferior in their intellectual and other capabilities to “Americans” (i.e., northern and western Europeans). My grandfather was one of these “inferior ones”, coming from southern Europe (Spain) in 1896 when he would have been viewed as non-white and a threat to American society—much as immigrants, especially those from the Global South, are being portrayed today (see Scupin 2012, and Guglielmo and Salerno 2003). Scientific racialism, promoted by leading 19th century scientists such as Samuel Morton, was based on a social imaginary of their time—the immigrant “Other” as inferior. Social imaginaries, according to the Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor,

² While what I will present in this essay could be applied to any number of societies, since one of the seeming human universals is distinguishing “Us” from “Them”, or in-group from out-group (see Brown 2012), and could be used to analyze any number of social divisions, I will limit my discussion to the United States and the issue of immigration.

³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IHycpIhnFcU>. Around the time of the debate, polls showed that for 82% of Trump supporters, immigration was a very important issue in the 2024 election, whereas only 39% of Harris supporters felt the same (<https://www.pewresearch.org/race-and-ethnicity/2024/09/27/trump-and-harris-supporters-differ-on-mass-deportations-but-favor-border-security-high-skilled-immigration>).

⁴ <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2024/09/14/trump-immigrants-eating-pets-racist-stereotype/>.

⁵ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pfTbSNtVEo>.

are something broader and deeper than the intellectual schemes people may entertain when they think about social reality in a disengaged mode. I am thinking, rather, of ways people imagine their social existence, how they fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations that are normally met, and the deeper normative notions and images that underlie these expectations (Taylor 2003, 23).

If we think today of the social imaginaries related to the immigrant “other”, we have a whole litany of denigrations—the immigrant as invader, occupier, job-stealer, social welfare cheat, stranger, enemy—and on the other side, beneficial to the economy and society, and even friend,⁶ among others. In my research among internal migrants from other parts of Spain to the Basque region (north central Spain), a region which historically has had a very strong Basque nationalist sentiment, I found that the attitudes of the local population created two contrasting social imaginaries—the immigrant as enemy or ally, stranger or friend. The first was largely a political designation—you’re either with us or against us in our struggle in opposition to the Spanish state. The second was more of a cultural designation—you’re either with us or against us in our struggle for cultural sovereignty, including things like the Basque language (which is not remotely related to Spanish or French), and other Basque cultural exhibitions (e.g., ways of socializing, festivals) (Ybarrola 2002; 2009).

One of the key imaginaries that is being used today is the immigrant as a “threat” to societies and “our” way of life. This has been the main social imaginary used to try and deport thousands of migrants from the United States, even those who have legal standing in the country. One of the most egregious of these recently is the case of Abrego Garcia. Here, a man from El Salvador, who had legal status to be in the U.S. and a court order barring his deportation, was nonetheless rounded up by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and deported to a now known notorious prison in El Salvador. The Supreme Court

of the United States (SCOTUS) unanimously ordered the Trump administration to facilitate his return, even as the administration acknowledged that his arrest and deportation were an error. He was eventually returned to the United States after weeks of delay, and after the Trump administration indicated that they were not planning to bring him back despite the ruling by SCOTUS.⁷ Upon his arrival, he was immediately arrested by the U.S. government for alleged “smuggling” undocumented immigrants into the country.⁸

We are not in an unprecedented time, since our country has experienced this anti-immigrant sentiment throughout its history; but we are in another dangerous and inhumane time regarding migrants. Unfortunately, open racialism has reared its ugly head again, which, one could argue, is both good and bad. The good aspect is that since Trump’s statement after coming down the escalator in Trump Tower regarding Mexican immigrants when announcing his candidacy (“They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists. And some, I assume, are good people”), and his election and first presidency in 2016, it has been very clear that American racialism and racism were just residing below the surface of American society after the presidency of Obama. In other words, there has always been a racist/racism part of who we are as a society. In the wake of Obama’s election in 2008, some pundits were arguing that we were now in a post-racial society. This “imaginary” has been dispelled; racialism/racism went underground, but in the last decade it has come back in full-force. The Unite the Right white supremacist rally, and the killing of a counter-protester, in Charlottesville in 2017, was an early cautionary tale of Trump’s first administration.

The bad aspect of open racialism is that now it seems no holds are barred when it comes to immigrants of color. ICE is conducting raids on stores, meatpacking plants, and agricultural fields throughout the country, as well as rounding up people on the streets while wearing masks and unidentifiable

⁶ <https://news.gallup.com/poll/692522/surge-concern-immigration-abated.aspx>.

⁷ <https://thehill.com/homenews/administration/5274438-donald-trump-abc-news-interview-kilmar-abrego-garcia/>.

⁸ <https://www.axios.com/2025/05/04/trump-deportations-abrego-garcia-supreme-court>.

⁹ <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2015/07/08/donald-trumps-false-comments-connecting-mexican-immigrants-and-crime/>.

clothing. Some Hispanic¹⁰ churches have stopped meeting for fear of being raided. Racial profiling increasingly has been used to detain Hispanic U.S. citizens and others who are here with documentation, as well as those who are undocumented.¹¹ In response, we are currently witnessing protests against ICE raids in various cities throughout the U.S., with the Los Angeles area receiving the national spotlight when some demonstrators became violent. This prompted the Trump administration to claim that LA was “under siege” and a “war zone” which led Trump to send in the National Guard and Marines to “control” the situation.¹² Governor Newsome and other elected officials from California, as well as local authorities, have accused the Trump administration of fanning the flames of unrest through their militarization of the situation.¹³ As *The Guardian* pointed out, “The only people facing a war zone [in LA] are immigrants.”¹⁴

So when president Trump made the claim, completely unsubstantiated, that immigrants in Springfield, Ohio were eating people’s pets, he was tapping into this social imaginary of the immigrant as the Other to be feared; they are the pet eating Other. My wife and I have been watching the television series *Resident Alien*, in which an alien from another planet arrives, and, while at first planning to destroy all humans, becomes more human as a result of his connections with other people. It is interesting watching his transformation from an earth-killing alien into a more compassionate human being. With the current administration, we are seeing no such transformation. What we are watching in the TV series is the development of empathy, something we have yet to see regarding immigrants with anyone in this administration despite the fact that Trump is married to an immigrant (though white) and J.D. Vance is

married to someone whose family immigrated from India. Ironies abound!

Samuel Huntington, a Harvard professor and key theorist during the Cold War, scrambled, as did many other political scientists after the rapid fall of the Berlin Wall, to come up with a new theory of what our world looked like in the wake of the collapse of the Soviet Union. He developed the theory that we were now in a “clash of civilizations”—the idea that the world could be divided into clearly bounded “civilizations” which would be in conflict with each other (Huntington 1996). The attack in the United States on 9/11 seemed to support his theory, as a handful of largely Saudi men (15 of 19) flew planes into the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and attempted to do the same with the Capitol. Critics of Huntington’s theory have pointed out that there is far more conflict and warring within his designated “civilizations” than between them.¹⁵

However, Huntington’s theory gained a widespread hearing and acceptance in governmental circles. He then followed up his book *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order* (1996) with *Who Are We: The Challenges to America’s National Identity* (2004). Here Huntington extends his “Clash” theory to immigration, arguing that if one “civilization”, in this case the U.S., accepts too many immigrants from a different civilization (i.e., Latin American), it is in danger of losing its own identity. In the context of his argument, the word “challenges” could just as easily be replaced with “threats”. This was not lost on one reviewer of his book, who prophetically noted

Nowhere does Huntington address the question of what is to be done. He doesn't have to. Merely to “problematize” Mexican immigration in this

¹⁰ Throughout this essay I will use the term Hispanic to refer to immigrants from Latin America. I recognize that this is somewhat of a controversial issue with some preferring the use of Latino/a and more recently Latinx. While I understand the arguments for using the latter, I’ve chosen to use Hispanic due to its wide usage in the United States, as well as the fact that the Latin American immigrants I worked with in Iowa self-identified as Hispanic.

¹¹ <https://www.axios.com/2025/07/09/ice-us-citizens-detention-racial-profiling>.

¹² <https://abcnews.go.com/US/trump-la-siege-mayor-governor-paint-picture/story?id=122652268>.

¹³ <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2025-06-10/newsom-says-about-immigration-l-a-raids>.

¹⁴ <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2025/jun/22/los-angeles-trump-immigrants>.

¹⁵ <https://newrepublic.com/article/176019/samuel-huntington-clash-civilizations-wrong>.

fashion is enough. The more Americans buy into his argument that Mexicans are a threat—an argument that will be increasingly attractive the more the economy turns downward—the more a host of “solutions” will present themselves more or less automatically: stepped-up border patrols, intensified efforts to bar those whose papers are not in order from public schools and hospital emergency rooms, etc. (Lazare 2004, 22).

What is often missed in this rush to deport the immigrant Other is what they contribute to American society. I grew up in the Central Valley of Northern California where I saw Hispanics, primarily those from Mexico, working in the fields to harvest the produce most of the rest of the United States depends on. One of the arguments being made today, which is not new, is that immigrants are taking jobs away from Americans, but these are jobs other Americans do not want. I recall in 2011, after Alabama passed one of the then most restrictive immigration laws in the country, a mass exodus of Hispanic workers from the state took place. There was a news story about one owner of a fruit orchard who, while the camera panned showing the abundance of fruit hanging from the trees, said that almost all of that fruit would fall to the ground and rot due to the lack of laborers willing to work in the orchard. He stated that once the Hispanic laborers left, no Americans were willing to take the job of picking the fruit. This has led Alabama orchard growers to push for more guest worker visas.^{16 17}

When I was in Middle School, a friend and I decided that for a summer job we would work in the fields in the Central Valley of northern California. We filled out the paperwork to allow us to do this, and then went to a field to pick bell peppers, working alongside Hispanic laborers. My friend was tall, so he picked the peppers on the top of the plants, and I laid in dry

irrigation ditches on my back picking those on the lower side. After a day of working in the hot San Joaquin Valley summer, and receiving very little compensation, we decided that that was enough for us; we worked one day! This has always given me a great appreciation for what these immigrants do to provide the produce that we eat every day.

In a small town in Iowa I did life history interviews among Hispanics who had moved there primarily to work in a meatpacking plant. Again, this was hard, and often dangerous, work that did not pay well, or have benefits expected by most American workers. One day I took a tour of the plant, and was struck by how many, mainly Hispanic workers (though there were other immigrants as well) were providing this labor. In doing these life history interviews, I always came away with two feelings: First, I was humbled that they would be willing to share their stories with me, since I was an outsider, though I spoke Spanish. And secondly, I was struck with how their stories were very much like my family’s stories of immigration to the U.S. In other words, I was able to empathize with them, seeing myself and my family in their stories. This empathy is what is too often missing from Americans who have forgotten their or their family’s own immigrant past.

So what happens when we lose this immigrant labor? Growers and producers in various parts of the country, be they fruit or sweet potato growers in Alabama, vegetable growers in Northern California, or meat plant owners in Nebraska and Iowa, will either see their crops rot and businesses suffer, or will have to pay higher wages to workers (not a bad thing), which will raise the price of everything we eat. At the time of this writing, there have been ICE raids on meat plants,¹⁸ farm laborers,¹⁹ and even stores like Home Depot, which is leading to growing protests in many parts of the country, and great fear among the immigrants.^{20 21}

¹⁶ <https://aldailynews.com/in-labor-shortage-more-alabama-farms-turn-to-guest-worker-visas/>.

¹⁷ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LiQj_VYLvPw.

¹⁸ <https://www.cnn.com/2025/06/17/us/omaha-ice-raid-meatpacking-plant>.

¹⁹ <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2025-06-10/ice-expands-immigration-raids-into-californias-agricultural-heartland>.

²⁰ For example, the No Kings protests throughout the country on June 14, 2025, which opposed president Trump’s policies, may well have been the largest one-day protest in U.S. history, with an estimated 4 to 6 million people participating (<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/jun/19/no-kings-how-many-protesters-attended>).

²¹ President Trump stated that the government needs to pull back on ICE raids with farmers and hotel workers. However, within a few days this change in policy was reversed and ICE raids on these industries resumed (<https://www.washingtonpost.com/immigration/2025/06/16/trump-farms-hotels-immigration-raids/>).

Other contributions immigrants make to American society are safer communities (O'Brien, Collingwood, and El-Khatib 2017); the increase of religious people, especially Christians, who practice and take their faith seriously (Levitt 2007, 2001); and, especially among undocumented workers, payments to Social Security which most will not collect, helping to keep that program solvent.²²

Biblical Reflections

On January 21, 2025, following the inauguration of president Trump, Bishop Mariann Budde, the Episcopal Bishop of Washington, DC, delivered her remarks at a prayer service at the National Cathedral directly to the newly installed president:

In the name of our God, I ask you to have mercy upon the people in our country who are scared now . . . I ask you to have mercy, Mr. President, on those in our communities whose children fear that their parents will be taken away, and that you help those who are fleeing war zones and persecution in their own lands to find compassion and welcome here. Our God teaches us that we are to be merciful to the stranger, for we were all once strangers in this land. May God grant us the strength and courage to honor the dignity of every human being, to speak the truth to one another in love and walk humbly with each other and our God for the good of all people, the good of all people in this nation and the world.²³

When shortly afterwards Bishop Budde was asked on CNN what led her to make those comments, she said,

Well, these are the people that I know. These are not abstract people for me, they're actual people that I know, so I wanted to speak on their behalf. I wanted to present a vision of what unity could look like in this country that is transcending of differences and viewpoints and acknowledging our common humanity. I wanted to speak in such a way that

reflected that dignity and respect, but I also wanted to bring into that space the real humanity of the people I was referencing.²⁴

This is the key element that I've discussed above. When we talk about people in the abstract, we view them through our social imaginaries, and when it comes to immigrants, too often this is a denigrating or dehumanizing imaginary. But as we actually get to know people who have migrated, this imagery, i.e., our understanding, has the chance to be modified and transformed. However, this is not always the case. We can see the immigrants we may know as an "exception", and it doesn't necessarily change our overall view of the immigrant Other. I recall, when my family and I were living in the Basque region of Spain doing my dissertation research, being in a pub with a couple of my friends from church. They were talking negatively about the United States, which is quite common in many parts of Europe, and one of them looked at me and said, "What about Steve?" The other friend looked at me, and knowing my Basque ancestry, said, "Oh, he's not really American. He's Basque." This made me feel good, since I was not actually culturally Basque, but it also illustrates how I became an "exception" to their general view of Americans.

So, as Bishop Budde indicated, we need to develop empathy, since we are all, nationals and immigrants alike, created in the image of God (the *imago Dei*). This does not come easily, as the uncomfortableness of Trump and his family during Budde's presentation demonstrated. We as Christians—as Jesus followers—like everyone else, are naturally ethnocentric, and often too nationalistic to be willing or able to move beyond our own national perspective regarding the immigrant Other to understand and accept them in their own, and our own, weakness. As Bishop Budde noted, which is quite biblical, we need to be merciful to the stranger because we were all once strangers in this land.

M. Daniel Carroll R., an Old Testament scholar and Professor of Biblical Studies and Pedagogy at Wheaton College, has written as someone with

²² <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/01/13/business/social-security-undocumented-immigrants.html>.

²³ https://www.democracynow.org/2025/1/22/bishop_budde.

²⁴ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2BMZakFbt9M&t=189s>.

Guatemalan ancestry, on the biblical mandate to love the stranger (Carroll 2013). Carroll's Old Testament study of how Israel was to treat the "stranger" is quite illustrative of what we are experiencing today with immigration. There is currently a Facebook discussion on immigration from a "Christian" perspective that is making the rounds. In this iteration, the "Christian" perspective is presented as one in which immigration, and the mandate in Scripture to love the stranger or foreigner, is qualified, largely on nationalistic grounds.²⁵ While all countries must develop policies regarding immigration, and both Democrats and Republicans in the U.S. agree that our immigration policy needs to be reformed, my focus in this essay is not on border policy, but rather how Christians are called to treat immigrants who are already here. Carroll argues that "The Bible is a set of lenses that brings us into focus as God would want us to perceive [immigration]" (43). He states, "Immigrants are made in the image of God. Believers must examine their hearts for possible contrary allegiances that might lead them to want to deny entry to those from elsewhere—whether this be on cultural, racial, socioeconomic, educational, or political grounds" (2013, 48). As I understand Carroll, he is not calling for open borders, but rather that whatever our immigration policy, we do not deny entry of immigrants based on the factors he states above.

Carroll's emphasis on allegiances is quite germane to our discussion of immigration, since, as the anthropologist Clifford Geertz noted decades ago after the collapse of colonialism in many parts of the world, the key question in these countries was where did their allegiance lie—with the newly developing states, or with their ethnic group. This is a question that Christians need to ask themselves today—where does my allegiance lie; with the state (country) or with the Kingdom of God. Even Geertz, a secular anthropologist, back in the 1970s realized that you could not serve two masters (Geertz 1973. See also Meneses 2006).

As is well known, the Bible is about people on the move. From Abram's calling to leave his people and move to a new place, which would have been

incredibly dangerous at the time, to the call of Jesus for his followers to go into all the world to spread the Gospel, we, as believers, have been called to move; stasis is the death throes of Christianity. After the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15, the Gospel became culturally translatable (Sanneh 1995). Since that time (and even before, since this was the reason for the Jerusalem Council) Christianity has made itself welcome in all of the world, with the potential to become contextual in every culture, though this is not always realized.

As Andrew Walls, the historian of World Christianity, wrote, there were two unchanging characteristics of the Gospel throughout church history—the Indigenizing Principle and the Pilgrim Principle. The Indigenizing Principle was the idea that every believer wanted the church to be "a place to feel at home"—to be with people who were like us. This is what I call the cultural aspect of the Gospel. The Pilgrim Principle, on the other hand, argued that to be a follower of Jesus one had to recognize that "no city is our home", and that to be a follower of Jesus meant that we had to be "out of step" with our own society and culture. This is what I call the countercultural aspect of the Gospel. As Walls states, "Not only does God in Christ take people as they are: He takes them in order to transform them into what He wants them to be" (Walls 1996, 8).

Christians in the United States, and globally, are living in a time when our allegiance is being tested when it comes to immigration. What does it mean to be "out of step" with our society with regard to loving the most marginalized, vulnerable, and dehumanized members? Will we side with our nationalistic selves and support the widespread rounding up of immigrants, including U.S. citizens or those who are here with proper documentation? Will we support our elected officials being harassed and arrested for challenging current immigration policies?²⁶ Will we support masked and unidentified ICE agents "disappearing" people on city streets?²⁷ Or will we stand up for those who are having their civil rights, according to the Constitution, such as the Fourteenth Amendment's due process clause, denied? Will we, as

²⁵ <https://www.facebook.com/HowertonJosh/posts/pfbid02hs7R7UCJPm8DmtTnDQ4Hw775r6tV3VPPeCoZMWXHHqQ9bQhomjso46UqXQ5g57Mtl>.

²⁶ <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/06/12/us/politics/senator-alex-padilla-handcuffed.html>.

²⁷ <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/03/26/us/ice-tufts-student-detained-rumeyssa-ozturk.html>.

Bishop Budde stated, be merciful to, and stand with, those who are scared at what is currently happening—scared for themselves, their families, and communities? Will our allegiance to Christ lead us to be out of step with our society even when this might cost us personally, challenging the social imaginary of the immigrant as a threat? Being a follower of Jesus in troubling times may not be easy, but then Jesus did tell his followers that to be his disciple meant we would have to deny ourselves and pick up our cross daily (Luke 9:23).

References

- Brown, Donald E. 2012. "Ethnicity and Ethnocentrism: Are They Natural"? In *Race and Ethnicity: The United States and the World*. Edited by Raymond Scupin. Pp. 81-94. Boston: Pearson.
- Carroll, M. Daniel R. 2013. *Christians at the Border: Immigration, the Church, and the Bible*. Ada, MI: Brazos Press.
- Jefferson, Thomas. 1825. *Notes on the State of Virginia*. Philadelphia, PA: H.C. Carey and I. Lea.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. "The Integrative Revolution: Primordial Sentiments and Civil Politics in the New States". In *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Pp. 255-310. New York: Basic Books.
- Guglielmo, Jennifer and Salvatore Salerno. 2003. *Are Italians White?* Milton Park, the United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Huntington, Samuel. 1998. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- . 2004. *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Langness, L.L. 2005. *The Study of Culture*. Novato, CA: Chandler and Sharp Publishers.
- Lazare, Daniel. 2004. "Diversity and Its Discontents" *Nation* 278(23): 18-24.
- Levitt, Peggy. 2001. *Transnational Villagers*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- . 2007. *God Needs No Passport*. New York: The New Press.
- Lieberman, Leonard and Raymond Scupin. 2012. "A History of 'Scientific' Racialism." In *Race and Ethnicity: The United States and the World*. Edited by Raymond Scupin. Pp. 11-33. Boston: Pearson.
- Meneses, Eloise. 2006. "Bearing Witness in Rome with Theology from the Whole Church: Globalization, Theology and Nationalism." In *Globalizing Theology: Belief and Practice in an Era of World Christianity*. Edited by Craig Ott and Harold A. Netland. Pp. 231-249. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Obeyesekere, Gananath. 2005. *Cannibal Talk: The Man-Eating Myth and Human Sacrifices in the South Seas*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- O'Brien, Benjamin Gonzales, Loren Collingwood, and Stephen Omar Khatib. 2017. "The Politics of Refuge: Sanctuary Cities, Crime, and Undocumented Immigration." *Urban Affairs Review* (55)1: 1-38.
- Pickering, Michael. 2018. "Cannibalism in the Ethnographic Record." In *The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*. Edited by Hilary Callen. Pp. 1-10. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Sanneh, Lamin. 1995. *Translating the Message*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Scupin, Raymond. 2012. "U.S. Ethnic Relations: Anglos and the 'White Ethnics'". In *Race and Ethnicity: The United States and the World*. Edited by Raymond Scupin. Pp. 129-152. Boston: Pearson.
- Stocking, George. 1992. "Paradigmatic Traditions in the History of Anthropology." In *The Ethnographer's Magic: And Other Essays in the History of Anthropology*. Pp. 342-361. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Taylor, Charles. 2003. *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Walls, Andrew. 1996. "The Gospel as Prisoner and Liberator of Culture". In *The Missionary Movement in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of Faith*. Pp. 3-15. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Press.
- Ybarrola, Steven. 2002. "The Basque Struggle for Cultural Sovereignty." *International Relater*, Vol. 1(3). Providence, RI: Brown University.
- . 2009. "Identity Matters: Christianity and Ethnic Identity in the Peninsular Basque Country." In *Power and Identity in the Global Church: Six Contemporary*

Cases. Edited by Brian Howell and Edwin Zehner. Pp. 107-130. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.



Steven Ybarrola is Professor Emeritus of Cultural Anthropology at Asbury Theological Seminary. He has researched and taught on issues of immigration, ethnicity, and race for over 30 years. Currently he is doing research and writing in the area of diaspora missiology.

Author email: steve.ybarrola@asburyseminary.edu
