

Sanctuary City: a concept to be known and expanded

Cidade Santuário: um conceito a ser conhecido e expandido

Celso Machado Júnior¹, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3835-2979>; **Maxwel Martins da Silva**² ⁱⁱ, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8477-7356>; **Marcus Vinicius Moreira Zittei**³ ⁱⁱⁱ, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8398-6941>; **Roberto Bazanini**⁴ ^{iv}, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1575-4791>; **Cristiane Jaciara Furlaneto**⁵ ^v, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9145-4160>; **Ricardo Pereira Trefiglio**⁶ ^{vi}, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1172-2001>

1. Universidade Municipal de São Caetano do Sul - USCS. São Caetano do Sul, SP, Brasil. E-mail: celsomachado1@gmail.com
2. Faculdade de Informática e Administração Paulista – FIAP. E-mail: maxwelmsilva@gmail.com
3. Centro Universitário das Faculdades Metropolitanas Unidas - FMU, São Paulo, SP, Brasil. E-mail: marcuszittei@uol.com.br
4. Universidade Paulista UNIP, São Paulo, SP, Brasil. E-mail: robertobazanini@gmail.com
5. Universidade Paulista - UNIP, São Paulo, SP, Brasil. E-mail: crisjaciara@gmail.com
6. Universidade Municipal de São Caetano do Sul - USCS- São Caetano do Sul - SP – Brasil. E-mail: ricardo.trefiglio@gmail.com

Abstract

As a rule, when a locality defines itself as a sanctuary, it adopts policies that protect illegal immigrants who reside there. Through a qualitative approach, with the support of the use of documentary research, the present study aims to identify the services offered by the municipalities self-titled as Sanctuary City in the United States. The survey results show that only thirty out of a total of fifty American states have cities that are self-styled sanctuaries. Regarding the services provided in the form of benefits to immigrants by the sanctuary cities and the federal government, they seek to meet basic needs by offering basic food and health services, free public transport, and police protection. It is concluded, therefore, that, due to its relevance, the concept of Sanctuary City must be better understood and disseminated as it constitutes an inalienable element of the right to life and dignity of the human person.

Keywords: immigrant, social benefits, american government.

Resumo

Regra geral, uma localidade ao se definir como santuário passa a adotar políticas que protegem os imigrantes não legais que ali residem. Por meio de uma abordagem qualitativa, com o apoio do emprego da pesquisa documental, o presente estudo tem como objetivo identificar os serviços ofertados pelos municípios autointitulados como Cidade Santuário nos Estados Unidos. Os resultados da pesquisa apontam que apenas trinta de um total de cinquenta estados americanos possuem cidades autointituladas santuários. Em relação aos serviços prestados na forma de benefícios aos imigrantes, pelas cidades santuários e pelo governo federal busca-se atender as necessidades básicas, ofertando serviços de alimentação e saúde, gratuidade no transporte público e proteção policial. Conclui-se, portanto, que, em razão de sua relevância, o conceito de Cidade Santuário deve ser mais bem compreendido e disseminado, por constituir em um elemento inalienável do direito à vida e dignidade da pessoa humana.

Palavras-chave: imigrante, Benefícios sociais. Governo Americano.

Citation: Machado Jr., C., Silva, M. M. da, Zittei, M. V. M., Bazanini, R., Furlaneto, C. J., Trefiglio, R. (2024). Sanctuary City: a concept to be known and expanded. *Gestão & Regionalidade*, v. 40, e20248831. <https://doi.org/10.13037/gr.vol40.e20248831>



1 Introduction

The understanding of the relevance of public management in cities, and the contribution to society, incorporate several areas of knowledge, and in this perspective, several approaches are under construction. The proposition of concepts is observed, with the purpose of analyzing how the management models adopted by cities benefit society. The concepts that approach the management of cities most found in the literature are: eco-city, green city, sustainable city, habitable city, knowledge city, ubiquitous city, low carbon city, information city, smart city (Machado Jr., Ribeiro, & Viana, 2021). These concepts, which are sometimes positioned as competitors, sometimes as complementary, that is, in a broad perspective, in the process of construction (Ahvenniemi et al., 2017). In Brazil, there is a greater tendency for managers to adhere to the proposition of smart cities (Machado Jr. et al., 2018).

Despite the greater emphasis on aspects related to sustainability, the Earth Summit, which took place in 1992, is positioned as one of the events that inserts urban management, as an element of attention of society and academia (Machado Jr. et al., 2018). Additionally, the Aalborg Charter initiates the process of assessing the sustainability of cities, unfolding in the development of the local Agenda 21 (Benites & Simoes, 2021) and more recently in the UN 2030 agenda (Mazza, 2021).

Among the emerging concepts, intended to understand the management of cities, the perspective of Sanctuary City specifically addresses the reception of immigrants, whether legal or illegal. The term Sanctuary City is used to designate the locations that welcome the immigrant, even if on some occasions, it opposes the laws, policies, and practices, established in a national context. This definition was adapted from Cowen (2008), Tramonte (2011), Ridgley (2011) and Mancina (2013).

The migration process of people in different areas of the world has always been a constant, (Dandekar & Ghai, 2020) motivated by several factors, such as: environmental catastrophes, war conflicts, political, ethnic or religious persecution, search for development opportunities and better living conditions (Greenspan; Walk; Handy, 2018), and the main driver of immigration is mainly related to the inadequate human and economic development that certain locations provide for people (Oliinyk, 2021).

Recently, the occurrence of the COVID-19 pandemic outbreak, and the respective lockdown events, established a profound negative impact on the world economy (Gautam & Hens, 2020), resulting, among other consequences, in the even greater impoverishment of the poorest regions, establishing thus, an incentive factor for the people of this locality to move to regions that, in a way, offer minimal possibilities of economic support and, as a result, can meet their basic needs.

Thus, based on the premise that the occurrence of the COVID-19 pandemic outbreak, and the respective lockdown events, established profound negative impacts on the world economy (Gautam & Hens, 2020) and that sanctuary cities have a social role, as a result of its history of welcoming immigrants, the objective of this research emerges to identify the services offered by municipalities self-titled as Sanctuary City in the United States. The choice of the United States as the research locus is justified by the fact that it is the birthplace of the sanctuary city concept and because it is the location where the concept is most widespread and, also because it is the destination of interest to many immigrants over time. Additionally, the research explores the characteristics of the city of New York to exemplify the scope of action of a sanctuary city. Additionally, Quesada *et al.* (2014) point to the absence of research that portrays



the governmental practices developed by the US government within the scope of sanctuary cities.

2 Framework

This section was written with the aim of establishing the evolution of the Sanctuary City concept. Because it is an approach with low social and academic diffusion, which covers a specific portion and with low representation of society, this study proposed to elaborate a historical and conceptual evolution of Sanctuary City.

The perspective of Sanctuary City originates from an event in the city of Berkeley, located in the San Francisco Bay, in the US state of California. At a time when the United States was participating in the Vietnam War, a movement was identified, in which sailors refused to board the aircraft carrier USS Coral Sea, in case it returned to operations in the Vietnam War theater (Ridgley, 2011). The refusal to board the warship was positioned as an act of military insubordination, sanctioning the act with legal reprimands, including the arrest of those involved.

In this context, social agents, such as religious congregations, lawyers, among others, initiated an action so that all civil society could offer a safe alternative for soldiers who did not wish to go to war (Ridgley, 2011), thus, the city of Berkeley it declared itself as a sanctuary, offering legitimacy, protection, and material support to deserting soldiers.

Interestingly, contrary to prevailing orthodoxy, despite the soldiers being in an illegal condition, they were not detained by local authorities and transferred to military or federal jurisprudence. In line with this non-orthodoxy in relation to other North American cities, in that same period, the city of Berkeley became known for being the place of origin of the Hippie Movement, thus evidencing its unconventional social profile. It should be noted that the social behavior adopted by the residents of Berkeley, at the same time, represented an attitude of civil disobedience and a challenge to those who wanted to impute to the deserting sailors the obligation to go to war (Cowen, 2008). According to this author, the support, advice and especially the willingness of residents to host the soldiers in Berkeley, established a change in behavior in American society, which from the practice of holding protests, evolved into concrete actions against the participation of Americans in the Vietnam War.

The pioneering movement to protect individuals in conditions of legal fragility, which took place in the city of Berkeley, expanded to other cities in the region, with emphasis on the state of California. It is thus observed that, from 1971 onwards, cities in California formulated laws of protection and assistance to those who had some type of documentary restriction. This concept expanded and incorporated undocumented immigrants who settled in the region, thus giving rise to the perspective of the Sanctuary City.

However, even when considering the support movement of the sailors that took place in Berkeley, as the starting point of the Sanctuary City perspective, there are controversies regarding the impacts of its effective dissemination, since, on the one hand, it was not clearly observed in the sequence, the occurrences of events that make it possible to associate the establishment of a historical linearity and, on the other hand, different social groups pressured by different needs were welcomed by cities that shaped their help according to the established local culture (Cunningham, 1995).

Based on these controversies, it can be inferred that the construction of the concept of the Sanctuary City is being built through the action of a great diversity of local actors, who provided assistance to different social groups, characterized by vulnerability, which in many cases was aggravated by the lack of possession of documents. Additionally, the attention dedicated to the study of the sanctuary movement was more intense in the 1980s and 1990s in



the analysis of Central American refugees, who had their asylum application denied by the US government. Another point to be highlighted concerns the occurrences of the sanctuary city movement, which gained notoriety and encouraged other cities to incorporate the same posture of social assistance, which, in many moments, involved challenging the immigration authorities (Mancina, 2013). Among the cases that gained notoriety, the authors highlight the action of religious and civil groups who, in the 1990s, challenged the US immigration service by welcoming and supporting refugees from Guatemala and El Salvador in vulnerable situations, who were without official documents and with limitations to carry out economic activities, whether working or opening small businesses.

The city of Madison in the US state of Wisconsin was the first to be recognized sanctuary city, in promoting activities of reception of undocumented immigrants. In 1983, local authorities implemented laws that encouraged churches to offer shelter to illegal immigrants, thus protecting them from possible deportation by federal authorities (Knorr, 2018).

The phenomenon of self-declaration as a sanctuary city finds resistance and positions itself as an important political dimension in the American context. The main restriction component to the establishment of sanctuary cities comes from the claims of increased crime in these locations, because of the implementation of policies to protect undocumented immigrants (Bauder, 2017). However, this position is contradictory, as O'Brien *et al.* (2019), argue that the adoption of policies to support undocumented immigrants does not interfere with the crime rates in these locations.

The main characteristic of the sanctuary movement in the United States lies in the promotion of the phenomenon related to the non-mandatory cooperation of cities with federal immigration authorities (Bauder, 2017). Thus, the evolution of the sanctuary movement enabled the establishment of a social network of support and protection, in which different social actors act to create protection and security mechanisms for the fundamental rights of undocumented immigrants (Hintjens & Pouri, 2014).

The concept of sanctuary city is established as a challenge to the primacy of the federal government, as a guarantor of rights and prerogatives to citizens (Bauder & Darling, 2019). Issues related to citizenship, rights, and prerogatives, which are established in immigration processes, are positioned as an administrative management and legal security challenge for the federal government (Bauder; Darling, 2019), giving rise to points of friction with the sanctuary city proposal. The divergence between the actions of the federal government and the practices of the sanctuary city is manifesting itself in restrictive laws for cities that declare themselves as sanctuaries (Gulasekaram, Su, & Villazor, 2019). For the authors, laws such as those in force in the US state of Texas, informally known as anti-sanctuary laws, limit the municipal government to carry out broader actions to protect illegal immigrants. In the United States, municipalities are subordinate to the states, so their authority to legislate is limited to what the states grant them. Therefore, the diffusion of the sanctuary city in the United States has as a limiting factor not only the restrictions of the federal government (Martínez-Schuldt & Martínez, 2019), but also the potential restrictions of state governments, which justifies the greater existence of sanctuary cities in some US states than in others.

The sanctuary city establishment movement was not confined to the United States, with the identification of this phenomenon in the United Kingdom and Canada (Basok, 2009). The author points out the existence of approximately 500,000 undocumented immigrants residing in sanctuary cities in Canada, and highlights the city of Vancouver, which since 2016 has adopted the slogan 'fearless access' as an incentive to welcome immigrants. The dynamic of self-declaration of city sanctuaries has expanded to other Canadian locations, such as Montreal and London. Thus, the sanctuary city concept expands to other countries, however, predominantly in North America and Europe. Strangely, this expansion process of the sanctuary



city concept is not widespread in anthropological studies that address government practices or public policies in concert with those developed by the US government (Quesada et al., 2014).

At the end of this review of the main authors related to Sanctuary Cities, which was based on the synthesis of controversies and criticisms proposed by different theoretical references, four significant findings are identified.

First: the incorporation of the sanctuary city approach is monolithic in the different countries that adopt it. The services and benefits offered by sanctuary cities are intended for different target audiences inserted in different legal and administrative contexts. In the United States and Canada, the focus of the sanctuary city is the protection of undocumented immigrants, while in the United Kingdom, there is a broader commitment to the reception of refugees and exiles (Bauder, 2017).

Second: the process of theoretical construction of the sanctuary city approach is still in its infancy, since, in studies aimed at developing a more consistent definition, characteristics of this concept are evidenced in broad perspectives. For Walia (2014), the sanctuary city is configured as a process of building new ways of life, supported by decentralized decisions by local communities, exempting itself from state approval, in response to a diverse range of social and geopolitical conditions. On the other hand, Chishti and Hipsman (2015), point out that the sanctuary city concept refers to a set of relevant local policies and measures, which establish the prevalence of their applications to people with different nationality contexts, limiting the application of federal laws of immigration in that locality. Bauder (2017) points out that despite the services and benefits provided by urban sanctuaries, immigrants remain undocumented (illegal). At this point, there is an indication that the sanctuary city mitigates the adaptation problems of individuals in living in a community, however, they do not act at the root of the problem, which is the legalization of the immigrant, and consequently the provision of full citizenship. In addition, the concept of sanctuary city presented by Wong (2017) reinforces the perspective of protection of undocumented immigrants, by local agents, thus avoiding the extradition process.

Third: the concept of the Sanctuary City must be inclusive and not just be restricted to the reception promoted by the city, to undocumented individuals, but expanding to the assistance of populations in a state of vulnerability. The term sanctuary is used to express the set of measures of protection and reception of local governments, to care for those in need, regardless of the beneficiary's condition of illegality (Haynes, 2017).

Fourth: the establishment of the sanctuary concept incorporates the need for the city to carry out its self-proclamation as such. In this perspective, O'Brien *et al.* (2019) indicate that some sanctuary cities do not establish official policies to support undocumented immigrants, however, local authorities refuse to cooperate with federal authorities by not detaining undocumented immigrants and forwarding them to the immigration service. Corroborating this view, the American Immigration Council (2015) warns, that although the term Sanctuary City may eventually promote a sense of security among undocumented immigrants, in which local police can protect them from deportation carried out by federal authorities of immigration, clarifies that the term sanctuary city is not included in community policing policies, notably when imputing imprisonment to an immigrant who commits a crime or transgression. It follows, then, that the eventual arrest of an undocumented immigrant, for having committed a crime, will result in arrest and potential extradition proceedings.

In summary, in the approaches present in the theoretical framework on the Sanctuary City, there are controversies, conveniences and criticisms that are characterized by sometimes denouncing a monolithic and incipient approach to the concept, sometimes by proposing another more comprehensive and inclusive perspective, which contemplates not only

immigrants, but also including all people in vulnerable situations and, finally, the need for a city to declare itself as a sanctuary, to signal its willingness to protect illegal immigrants.

3 Methodology

In this study, a qualitative approach was adopted, with the use of the documentary research technique, seeking to obtain the necessary data to meet the proposed objective. Creswell (2010) states that documentary research can use: Public documents such as minutes of meetings and newspapers; Private documents such as records, diaries, and letters, to the extent of their availability and permissiveness.

The documents that make up the database were selected with the aim of promoting understanding of the circumstances and constructing meanings and interpretations (FLICK, 2009), meeting the criteria of: i) Authenticity; ii) Credibility; iii) Representativeness; iv) Meaning. The research data collection was based on three different bases, namely: i) Newspapers and magazines; ii) websites in general and; iii) government websites. Based on the criteria, in the first phase of the research, 26 different sites were identified, containing information that addressed the theme of sanctuary cities. For the continuity of the research, the following premises were adopted for the identification of the sites to be used: i) contain information aligned with the objective proposed in this research and; ii) sites that use first-party data. Based on these criteria, the survey selected six sites that address the issue of hosting undocumented immigrants, namely: Pew Research Center (2022); Center for Immigration Studies - CIS (2022); International Organization for Migration – IOM (2019); New York City Comptroller - Office of Public Affairs (2018); Immigrant Legal Resource Center (2016) and; National Conference of State Legislatures (2014). The search for sites aimed at meeting the objective of this research used the following descriptors: - sanctuary city; - undocumented immigrant; - illegal immigrant and; services offered to immigrants.

From the definition of the consultation sources, the phase of identifying the content to be collected through Text Mining began. Text mining is suitable for analyzing data from databases available on the internet (Kumar, Kar, & Ilavarasan, 2021). For the authors, data mining is appropriate when it focuses on obtaining useful data from unstructured or semi-structured files. The use of the Text Mining technique was not used to identify trends, but rather to characterize relevant information that would enable the establishment of an understanding of the topic under analysis. In view of the nature of the data, and the structure they presented in their original documents, the need to pre-process the text was not identified (Hickman, 2022). In this perspective, data were collected and analyzed from the original documents obtained.

The collected data were grouped into six categories, established with the purpose of providing an overview of the sanctuary city approach in the United States. The established categories were: - Number of undocumented immigrants in the United States; - Sanctuary Cities in the United States; - Policies of sanctuary cities in the United States; - Benefits and services offered to undocumented immigrants by New York City; - Benefits and services offered by the United States federal government and; - Dimensions and role of Local Migration Governance Indicators. The next section presents and develops the analysis of the collected data. It is worth mentioning that the research sought to identify the most recent data, however, many of the websites responsible for disseminating official information did not have updated data, a context that is positioned as a limitation of this study.



4 Data presentation and analysis

This section is intended to present the collected empirical data. We sought to identify the most recent data, however, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, some information was not updated. In this perspective, some surveys position themselves as parameters prior to the pandemic and as a reference for further studies in the area. This first set of data shown in Table 1 is positioned as an estimate of the number of undocumented immigrants in the United States.

Table 1 - Number and representativeness of undocumented immigrants in the US.

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
American Population	316,1	318,9	322,1	324,3	324,7	327,2	328,2	331,5	331,9	333,4
Estimate of undocumented immigrants	11,3	11,3	11,0	10,7	11,4	11,4	11,5	-	10,2	11,5
Representativeness of undocumented immigrants	3.6%	3,5%	3,4%	3,3%	3,5%	3,5%	3,5%	-	3,1%	3,5%

Source: Pew Research Center (2022). notes: 1) data in millions; 2) no data available in 2020.

By means of Table 1, it is possible to observe that the American population presents a modest and continuous growth in the last ten years, and the number of undocumented immigrants oscillating discreetly in the same period. The representativeness rate of undocumented immigrants in relation to the US population was close, in the comparison between the years 2013 to 2022. The values shown in Table 2 are estimated by the Pew Research Center (2022), based on data available from the Department of Homeland Security and the Center for Immigration Studies.

Another relevant aspect concerns the location of these undocumented immigrants in the United States, with the vast majority residing in sanctuary cities, precisely because of the security they provide. Table 2 presents the distribution of sanctuary cities in the United States.

Table 2 - Sanctuary City in the United States by State.

State	Number of Cities	State	Number of Cities
California	20	Nebraska	2
Colorado	14	Nevada	2
Connecticut	2	New Jersey	1
District of Columbia	1	New Mexico	2
Georgia	3	New York	9
Illinois	2	North Carolina	6
Iowa	11	Ohio	2
Kansas	2	Oklahoma	1
Louisiana	1	Oregon	32
Maine	1	Pennsylvania	17
Maryland	5	Rhode Island	1
Massachusetts	8	Tennessee	1
Michigan	5	Vermont	3
Minnesota	1	Virginia	5



Mississippi	1	Washington	20
-------------	---	------------	----

Source: Center for Immigration Studies - CIS (2022).

The United States is made up of 50 member states and a Federal District, which have a total of 181 counties and cities called sanctuaries, which declare their refusal to help the federal government in the application and enforcement of immigration law, as well as offering support and services to those who are in a state of vulnerability (Center for Immigration Studies, 2022). It is observed in Table 1 that only 30 American states including the Federal District (60%) have cities that position themselves as sanctuaries for immigrants and in these states significant heterogeneity is observed. With the most expressive volume of sanctuary cities identified the following states: Oregon (32), California (20), Washington (20), Pennsylvania (17), Colorado (14) and Iowa (11), with the other states reporting having less than ten sanctuary cities.

A survey carried out by the Immigrant Legal Resource Center ILRC (2016) summarizes the main policies adopted by sanctuary cities in the United States. Table 3 presents the main policies adopted by Sanctuary Cities, highlighting the fact that cities offer a set of reported services and not necessarily all these policies.

Table 3 - Set of US Sanctuary City Policies.

Policies	Description	Argument
Declaration of Sanctuary	The city declares itself a sanctuary by the local authorities, or by a resolution of the council elected for this purpose.	The Cities self-declarations establish social conduct for residents. If the statements do not have specific policies attached, they are considered only political statements, however, they generate the benefit of dialogue in society and of expressing welcome to immigrants.
Prohibitions from investigating immigration status and/or place of birth	Prohibit police authorities and city officials from carrying out investigation of the immigrant's legality, when he requests access to city services, or during police actions.	Restrictions on asking about immigration status are designed to discourage discrimination, thereby ensuring access to local government services regardless of the status of the illegal immigrant. This policy is recurrent in the sanctuary city.
Prohibition of use of city resources to support federal immigration law enforcement.	Some local jurisdictions have policies that prohibit the use of local resources to support federal immigration law enforcement.	The limitations that cities place on their servers are generally focused on preserving local resources for local priorities and limiting the activities of local public agents and federal immigration authorities.
Limits on detentions to be carried out by Customs Immigration Authorities (ICE).	Cities instruct law enforcement and local officials not to contact Customs and Border Protection (CBP) or Customs Immigration Authorities (ICE).	Local police officers generally do not have the authority to stop or arrest people for civil immigration violations. However, more explicit instructions from the city government can mitigate the discrimination of a certain racial profile.
Acceptance of various forms of identification	Cities can instruct their agencies and law enforcement officials to accept non-governmental forms of identity, or even develop municipal forms of identity.	There are US states where immigrants cannot obtain driver's licenses (a common form of identification in America). Thus, cities establish policies to provide a municipal identity or instruct their agencies and law enforcement officials to accept non-governmental or foreign identifications.

Source: Immigrant Legal Resource Center (2016).

The policies raised by the Immigrant Legal Resource Center (2016) indicate that the sanctuary city limits the time and resources of its management in helping to enforce federal immigration laws. The city government has the autonomy to define the priorities for its



employees, thus eliminating the need for local agents to request documents from people, which attest that the immigration process is legalized.

The approach of the sanctuary city, to the undocumented immigrant, presents an interesting nuance, if local agents are encouraged not to request documentation from individuals, with the alleged intention of not spending time on this activity, they are not imputable as transgressors of federal laws.

To identify the positioning of Sanctuary Cities in offering reception to undocumented immigrants, this research sought the services offered by an American city. In this sense, the research chose the city of New York to identify the services it offers to undocumented immigrants. The justification for choosing the city of New York for data collection is based on the following aspects: the city declared itself a sanctuary; the city has policies aimed at welcoming undocumented immigrants; its relevance in the international scenario and; ease of access to data. The New York City Comptroller-Office of Public Affairs (2018) published the Immigrant Rights and Services Manual, in which it establishes the benefits offered by the city to undocumented immigrants. Many important services and benefits are available to everyone, regardless of their immigration status. The services listed in Table 4 are available to all people, including undocumented immigrants.

Table 4 - Set of benefits and services offered to undocumented immigrants by the city of New York.

Children under age 19 are eligible for health insurance under the State Children's Health Insurance Program;
Pregnant women, children under 5 years old and mothers of babies up to 6 months old (or 12 months old if breastfeeding) are eligible for nutrition education, nutritious food and breastfeeding support in the Women, Infants and Children (WIC);
Prenatal care for pregnant women under the Prenatal Assistance Program (PCAP);
Emergency medical care, including ambulance service;
Counseling about domestic violence;
Immunizations;
Testing and counseling for prevention and treatment of HIV disease;
emergency shelters;
Poisoning prevention control hotline;
food pantry;
Social care and child welfare services;
Public school education;
School breakfast and lunch programs;
Senior services and senior center programs provided by the Department for Aging;
Services that protect against consumer fraud provided by the Department of Consumer Affairs;
Protection against discrimination provided by the Commission on Human Rights;
Services and facilities provided by the Department of Parks and Recreation;
Services provided by the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene;
Public library services and special events;



Free public transport;
Police protection;
Fire protection in the house.

Source: New York City Comptroller - Office of Public Affairs (2018).

The data show that the city of New York offers two groups of assistance to undocumented immigrants: the first group of assistance is characterized by the care of people with greater vulnerability such as pregnant women, children, the elderly, and adults without access to adequate food. The second assistance group is not focused on a specific user profile, but on categories of services offered. The services to be highlighted in this category are: free public transport, police protection and food expenses. It is observed that the services offered by the city of New York are positioned as a set of actions that enable support to those who are seeking to be productively inserted in society.

Although the sanctuary city concept is limited to a locality, the National Conference of State Legislatures (2014) indicates that unauthorized immigrants, in general, are not eligible for federal public benefits. However, the institution identifies exceptions to this ineligibility, and Table 5 presents federal benefits that can be offered to undocumented immigrants, provided that the state management agrees.

Table 5 - Set of benefits and services offered by the US federal government to which undocumented immigrants are eligible.

Emergency medical treatment under the “Medicaid” Program. In this case, the individual needs to meet federal eligibility requirements, and organ transplant procedures are excluded from this benefit.
Provide immunization for diseases where possible, as well as testing and treatment for symptoms of communicable diseases (does not include “Medicaid” Program assistance).
Provide emergency, short-term, non-financial disaster assistance.
Programs, services, or assistance aimed at communities that are unable to obtain the necessary resources to protect life and safety. It includes access to soup kitchens, counseling and crisis intervention, short-term shelter, mental health services, and child and adult protection services.
In the state option, medical coverage under the State Child Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), including prenatal and childbirth services, for those who meet other program eligibility criteria.
Financial assistance in rural areas to: farmers, landowners, developers, and the elderly, for: - loan insurance; - purchase of properties; - housing for interns and; - low-cost housing for agricultural workers (title, V of the Housing Act of 1949).
Provision of loans and grants for access to water and waste treatment to alleviate health risks (Section 306 C of the Agricultural and Rural Development Consolidated Act).
Free public education for grades K-12 (K-12 covers Elementary and Secondary Education).
Federally subsidized school lunch and breakfast programs for individuals eligible for free public education under state or local law.
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC).
Food Program for Child and Adult Care (CACFP).
Summer Food Service Program.
Special Milk Program for children.
Complementary Commodity Food Program (CSFP).
Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP).
Food Distribution Program on Indigenous Reserves (FDPIR).

Source: National Conference of State Legislatures (2014). Note: Medicaid is a US government program for low-income people of all ages who receive help paying for health insurance.



Among the benefits offered by the federal government, which can be enjoyed by undocumented immigrants, subject to the agreement of the States, there is a focus on food and health in general and education in the context of children. In this perspective, it is possible to observe that despite the conflict that is established between the sanctuary city and the federal government, in the processes of detention of undocumented immigrants, for referral to the extradition process, the federal government provides benefits that the sanctuaries can offer to the undocumented immigrants. Overcoming this conflict is based on the possibility of offering minimum citizenship conditions to all, regardless of the individual's legal status.

In the same line of reasoning, when expanding the analysis to the international context, the International Organization for Migration (IOM), established in 2015, a set of 90 indicators (called - Indicators of Migration Governance), aimed at guiding countries in the assessment of their migration governance processes. Additionally, the indicators provide guidance for public policies aimed at immigrants. The IOM (2019) established the indicators to enable Local Migration Governance, and in this perspective structured them through six dimensions of Migration Governance presented in Table 6.

Table 6 - Dimensions and role of Local Migration Governance Indicators.

Governance Dimensions	Role of Indicators
Migrants' Rights	Indicators in this dimension address whether migrants have access to social services such as: health, education and social assistance. They also examine measures to ensure integration and access to work.
Integrated Approach to Government	Indicators in this area address cities' institutional frameworks for migration. It also examines the existence of consistent and sustainable migration strategies, institutional transparency, and policy coherence and migration management.
Partnerships	Indicators in this category look at the city's cooperation on migration issues with the national government, with other cities and with relevant non-governmental actors, civil society and the private sector.
Migrants' Well-Being	Indicators in this category analyze international student mobility initiatives, access to the labor market and decent working conditions for migrant workers. Aspects related to diaspora engagement in the country are also included in this domain.
Crisis Mobility Dimension	Indicators in this category examine the type and level of preparedness of cities to deal with the mobility dimensions of crises. The questions focus on aspects related to during and after disasters, for natives and immigrants.
Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration	Indicators in this category address migrant safety in cities, return and reintegration policies, and combating human trafficking.

Source: International Organization for Migration (2019).

The support structure of the Local Migration Governance Indicators, proposed by the International Organization for Migration (IOM), points to an ordered set of planning and management, to which cities can adhere to offer welcome to undocumented immigrants. However, the proposal is not limited to the approach of undocumented immigrants, it is possible to identify that it expands to the perspective of providing cities with resilience, in overcoming moments of crisis. In summary, not only undocumented immigrants benefit from a Local Migration Management, but society, as the public apparatus appears to be robust to face crises and to promote greater collaboration of social actors. The next section promotes the discussion of the data obtained against the elaborated theoretical framework.

5 Discussion of Results



The dynamics of the data obtained indicates that the sanctuary city concept is established in the United States. The American sanctuary movement is based on establishing support and protection for undocumented immigrants, positioning the city as a core element of guarantee and support for immigrants in their process of integration and construction of a diverse society. This perspective is in line with that pointed out by Ávila (2017) in which the sanctuary city is inserted in a democratic context, which seeks long-term solutions for undocumented immigrants.

The number of 181 cities declaring themselves with sanctuaries, which in turn are distributed in 30 of the 50 American states, and with an average participation of 3.5% of the American population in the last ten years, indicates that this phenomenon is positioned discreetly and with low spread in society. Considering the movement that took place in the city of Berkeley in 1971, as the starting point for the elaboration of the sanctuary city concept, it is possible to infer that the phenomenon's diffusion is discreet, since after 50 years, the number of sanctuary cities in the United States is still modest. Thus, the highlight of the concept is related to the participation of iconic cities such as New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, among others, and not the number of cities that adhered to the concept.

The sanctuary city, in the American approach, is not configured to provide a permanent and lasting solution for the undocumented immigrant, as he is legally subject to the extradition process of the federal government. What the sanctuary city offers is leniency for the undocumented condition of the immigrant, through the removal of barriers to accessing the promoted social services and the guarantee of non-detention due to the absence of a document proving their legal condition.

The position of the city as a sanctuary for undocumented immigrants, in turn, is also very tenuous, as some cities declare themselves as such, and establish specific legislation to support the undocumented immigrant. While other cities do not declare themselves as such, nor do they establish a specific jurisdiction, designed to offer security and the full possibility of integration into the social group that makes up the city. The profile of sanctuary cities converges with Cottle's (2018) proposal, which points to the non-existence of a precise and standardized definition of what a sanctuary city is, since the relevance that cities, which declare themselves as sanctuary, establish in the writing of their policies and regulations, to continue acting within the law, even if they do not comply with the request for cooperation from the federal immigration authorities.

Thus, the data corroborate the conception proposed by O'Brien *et al.* (2019), in which an American sanctuary city is distinguished by the prohibition to investigate the situation of undocumented immigrants, as well as the limitation of cooperation with the authority's federal immigration authorities, with respect to law enforcement, while protecting immigrants and city officials from legal sanctions.

6 Conclusion

At the end of this study, which had as its objective to identify the services offered by municipalities self-titled as Sanctuary City in the United States, two groups of benefits were identified in the analysis of the services provided by the City of New York, as well as those offered by the American federal government. Granted to undocumented immigrants, the first consists of basic health and food and education services for people with greater vulnerability, such as pregnant women, children, the elderly. The second group of benefits is characterized by the offer of services that make it possible to carry out everyday activities, such as free public transport, police protection and food expenses.



The number of cities that position themselves as sanctuaries, as well as the evolution of undocumented immigrants in the United States, is discreet and stable, indicating a potential stagnation of adherence of cities to this proposal. This stagnation in the evolution of the number of cities that adhere to the condition of sanctuary is perceptible when not verifying the establishment of parameters and contexts that structure the concept of sanctuary city. This stagnation of adherence by North American cities to the concept of the Sanctuary City represents a serious problem, especially in the post Covid-19 scenario, since the pandemic was not only a health problem, but a profound shock for societies and economies, which strongly affected the lives of immigrants.

It follows, then, that it is increasingly necessary to offer minimal possibilities of economic support to an ever-increasing range of people in vulnerable situations and, thus, from the perspective of Sanctuary Cities, to meet the basic needs of immigrants. Due to its relevance and as verified in this study, in the authors' discussion on the subject and in the results of the empirical research, the concept of the Sanctuary City must be better understood and disseminated, as it incorporates important elements to society, such as the inalienable of the right to life and human dignity. Additionally, it is established as an opportunity for future studies, to analyze over time the political, social and economic implications of the option of becoming a city of sanctuaries in the United States, to identify the evolution of the phenomenon.

References

- Ahvenniemi, H., Huovila, A., Pinto-Seppä, I., & Airaksinen, M. (2017). What are the differences between sustainable and smart cities? *Cities*, 60, 234-245.
- American Immigration Council. (2015). "Sanctuary Cities," Trust Acts, and Community Policing Explained. Disponível em: <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/sanctuary-cities-trust-acts-and-community-policing-explained>.
- Ávila, P. V. S. (2017). Ciudades santuario de California: la acción política de los gobiernos locales en la política pública migratoria contemporánea de Estados Unidos. *Migración y Desarrollo*, 15(29), 51-70.
- Basok, T. (2009). Counter-hegemonic human rights discourses and migrant rights activism in the U.S. and Canada. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 50(2), 183-205.
- Bauder, H. (2017). Sanctuary cities: Policies and practices in international perspective. *International Migration*, 55(2), 174-182.
- Bauder, H., & Darling, J. (2019). *Sanctuary cities and urban struggles: Rescaling migration, citizenship, and rights* (pp. 1-288). Manchester University Press.
- Benites, A. J., & Simoes, A. F. (2021). Assessing the urban sustainable development strategy: An application of a smart city services sustainability taxonomy. *Ecological Indicators*, 127, 107734.
- Center for Immigration Studies (CIS). (2022). Disponível em: <https://cis.org/Immigration-Topic/Immigrant-Profile-Series>.



- Chishti, M., & Hipsman, F. (2015). Sanctuary cities come under scrutiny, as does federal-local immigration relationship. *Migration Policy Institute*. Disponível em: <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/sanctuary-cities-come-under-scrutiny-does-federal-local-immigration-relationship>.
- Cottle, J. (2018). Policy shift. Disponível em: <https://www.policy-shift.com/single-post/2018/07/26/Sanctuary-Cities-How-local-policies-stand-up-to-immigration-enforcement>
- Cowen, D. (2008). *Military workfare: The soldier and social citizenship in Canada*. University of Toronto Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2010). *Projeto de pesquisa: Métodos qualitativo, quantitativo e misto* (3a ed.). Artmed.
- Cunningham, H. (1995). *God and Caesar at the Rio Grande: Sanctuary and the politics of religion*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Dandekar, A., & Ghai, R. (2020). Migration and reverse migration in the age of COVID-19. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 55(19), 28-31.
- Darling, J., & Bauder, H. (2019). Introduction – Sanctuary cities and urban struggles: Rescaling migration, citizenship, and rights. In J. Darling & H. Bauder (Eds.), *Sanctuary cities and urban struggles* (pp. 1-22). Manchester University Press.
- Flick, U. (2009). *Introdução à pesquisa qualitativa* (3a ed.). Artmed.
- Gautam, S., & Hens, L. (2020). COVID-19: Impact by and on the environment, health and economy. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 22(6), 4953-4954.
- Greenspan, I., Walk, M., & Handy, F. (2018). Immigrant integration through volunteering: The importance of contextual factors. *Journal of Social Policy*, 47(4), 803-825.
- Guimarães, J. L. C. (2010). Abordagens teóricas sobre migrações. Disponível em: <http://www.webartigos.com/artigos/abordagens-teoricas-sobre-migracoes/47805/>. Acesso em: 28 de abril de 2022.
- Gulasekaram, P., Su, R., & Villazor, R. C. (2019). Anti-sanctuary and immigration localism. *Columbia Law Review*, 119(3), 837-894.
- Hassani, H., Beneki, C., Unger, S., Mazinani, M. T., & Yeganegi, M. R. (2020). Text mining in big data analytics. *Big Data and Cognitive Computing*, 4(1), 1.
- Haynes, D. F. (2017). Sanctuary city initiative: Summary of arguments in favor. Disponível em: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315113054_Sanctuary_Cities_Arguments_in_Favor. Acesso em: 5 de junho de 2022.



- Hickman, L., Thapa, S., Tay, L., Cao, M., & Srinivasan, P. (2022). Text preprocessing for text mining in organizational research: Review and recommendations. *Organizational Research Methods*, 25(1), 114-146.
- Hintjens, H., & Pouri, A. (2014). Toward cities of safety and sanctuary. *Peace Review*, 26(2), 218-224.
- Immigrant Legal Resource Center (ILRC). (2016). Searching for sanctuary: An analysis of America's counties and their voluntary assistance with deportations. Disponível em: <https://www.ilrc.org/searching-sanctuary>.
- Knorr, A. (2018). National immigration policies and subnational resistance: 'Sanctuary cities' in the USA vs 'Non-sanctuary cities' in Germany. 9(1), 82-96.
- Kumar, S., Kar, A. K., & Ilavarasan, P. V. (2021). Applications of text mining in services management: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, 1(1), 100008.
- Machado Junior, C., Ribeiro, D. M. N. M., & Pereira, R. S. (2018). Do Brazilian cities want to become smart or sustainable? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 199, 214-221.
- Machado Junior, C., Ribeiro, D. M. N. M., & Viana, A. B. N. (2021). Public health in times of crisis: An overlooked variable in city management theories? *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 66, 102671.
- Mancina, P. (2013). The birth of a sanctuary city: A history of governmental sanctuary in San Francisco. In R. K. Lippert & S. Rehaag (Eds.), *Sanctuary practices in international perspectives: Migration, citizenship and social movements* (pp. 205-218). Routledge.
- Martínez-Schuldt, R. D., & Martínez, D. E. (2019). Sanctuary policies and city-level incidents of violence, 1990 to 2010. *Justice Quarterly*, 36(4), 567-593.
- Mazza, P. (2021). Education & smart cities: The role of the goals of agenda 2030 for sustainable development of smart cities. *International Journal of Innovative Studies in Sociology and Humanities*, 6(2), 24-31.
- National Conference of State Legislatures. (2014). Federal benefit eligibility for unauthorized immigrants. Disponível em: <http://www.ncsl.org/research/immigration/federal-benefits-to-unauthorized-immigrants.aspx>.
- New York City Comptroller - Office of Public Affairs, Scott M. Stringer. (2018). *Immigrant rights and services manual*. Disponível em: https://comptroller.nyc.gov/wp-content/uploads/documents/Immigrant-Manual-2018-English_fv.pdf.
- O'Brien, B. G., Collingwood, L., & El-Khatib, S. O. (2019). The politics of refuge: Sanctuary cities, crime, and undocumented immigration. *Urban Affairs Review*, 55(1), 3-40.



- Oliinyk, O., Bilan, Y., Mishchuk, H., Akimov, O., & Vasa, L. (2021). The impact of migration of highly skilled workers on the country's competitiveness and economic growth. *Montenegrin Journal of Economics*, 17(3), 7-19.
- Organização Internacional para as Migrações (OIM). (2022). Migrants and refugees. Disponível em: <https://news.un.org/pt/news/topic/migrants-and-refugees>.
- Pew Research Center. (2022). Unauthorized immigrant population trends for states, birth countries and regions. Disponível em: <https://www.pewresearch.org/topic/immigration-migration/>.
- Quesada, J., Arreola, S., Kral, A., Khoury, S., Organista, K. C., & Worby, P. (2014). As good as it gets: Undocumented Latino Day laborers negotiating discrimination in San Francisco and Berkeley, California, USA. *City and Society*, 26(1), 29-50.
- Ridgley, J. (2011). Refuge, refusal, and acts of holy contagion: The city as a sanctuary for soldiers resisting the Vietnam War. *ACME*, 10(2), 189-214.
- Tramonte, L. (2011). Debunking the myth of "Sanctuary Cities": Community policing policies protect American communities. *Immigration Policy Center*. Disponível em: https://www.immigrationresearch.org/system/files/Community_Policing_Policies_Protect_American_042611_update.pdf.
- Walia, H. (2014). Sanctuary city from below: Dismantling the colonial city of Vancouver. *The Mainlander*. Disponível em: <http://themainlander.com/2014/06/02/sanctuary-city-from-below-dismantling-the-city-of-vancouver/>
- Wong, T. K. (2017). The effects of sanctuary policies on crime and the economy. *Center for American Progress e National Immigration Law Center*. Disponível em: <https://www.immigrationresearch.org/system/files/SanctuaryJurisdictions.pdf>

ⁱ Doutor em Administração pela Universidade Nove de Julho, São Paulo, SP, Brasil e Pós-doutorado em Métodos Quantitativos pela Universidade de São Paulo – USP – Departamento de Administração FEA. Mestre em Educação, Administração e Comunicação pela Universidade São Marcos, graduado em Engenharia Mecânica (1988) pela Universidade de Mogi das Cruzes. Professor do Programa de Mestrado e Doutorado em Administração e do Programa de Inovação em Ensino em Saúde, ambos da Universidade Municipal de São Caetano do Sul. Professor do Curso de Ciências Biológicas da Universidade Paulista.

ⁱⁱ Mestrado profissional em Administração em Governança Corporativa pelo Centro Universitário das Faculdades Metropolitanas Unidas, São Paulo, SP, Brasil. Professor de graduação da Faculdade de Informática e Administração Paulista – FIAP, São Paulo, SP, Brasil.

ⁱⁱⁱ Doutorado em Ciências Contábeis e Administração. Fundação Universidade Regional de Blumenau - FURB, Blumenau, SC, Brasil. Professor e Coordenador do Mestrado Profissional em Administração e Governança Corporativa do Centro Universitário das Faculdades Metropolitanas Unidas. Atualmente é professor e coordenador do Mestrado em Governança Corporativa do Centro Universitário das Faculdades Metropolitanas Unidas, professor visitante da Universidade Federal de São Paulo.

^{iv} Doutor em Comunicação e Semiótica pela Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo - PUC/SP. Mestrado em Comunicação Social pela Universidade Metodista de São Paulo/SP. Pós-doutorado em Comunicação e Cultura pela Universidade Paulista – UNIP – SP – Brasil. Professor do Programa de Mestrado e Doutorado em Administração da Universidade Paulista – UNIP, São Paulo, SP, Brasil.



^v Mestrado em Farmácia pela Faculdade de Ciências Farmacêuticas da USP – SP - Brasil, Doutorado em Farmácia pela Faculdade de Ciências Farmacêuticas da USP – SP - Brasil e Pós-doutorado pela Faculdade de Ciências Farmacêuticas da USP – SP - Brasil e Univesitá deli Studi di Verona (2002). Professora e Coordenadora do Curso de Ciências Biológicas da Universidade Paulista– UNIP, São Paulo, SP, Brasil. Professora dos Cursos de Medicina e Odontologia da Universidade Municipal de São Caetano do Sul.

^{vi} Mestre em Administração pela Universidade Municipal de São Caetano do Sul - USCS. Especialista em Qualidade e Produtividade pela Universidade de São Paulo - USP. Professor da Escola de Negócios da Universidade Municipal de São Caetano do Sul - USCS.

