

12-2018

Chapter 15: The Global Refugee Crisis and Religious Ethics: Questions to Ask

Laura E. Alexander

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/relfacpub>

 Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

Chapter Fifteen

The Global Refugee Crisis and Religious Ethics

Questions to Ask

Laura E. Alexander

Most readers of this text will be aware of what has become known in media, popular culture, and scholarship as “the global refugee crisis.” This phrase is shorthand for what has basically become a long-term humanitarian disaster in which 22.5 million people have been forcibly displaced as refugees from their homelands, the highest number recorded since the United Nations High Commissioner on Refugees began keeping statistics of refugee movements. Furthermore, there are currently 2.8 million asylum seekers and 40.3 million people who are internally displaced within the borders of their state of origin.¹ The majority of refugees are from Syria, Somalia, and Afghanistan, but many come from elsewhere, fleeing violence and persecution either from their governments or from various gangs or paramilitary groups.

Many find this crisis tragic, and some of us would say it is intolerable—but what is to be done? To address this question, religious people, leaders, thinkers, and organizations draw on the ethical thought and practice of their traditions, seeking to respond to the movement of people fleeing violence and oppression—and especially to the arrival of refugees in countries that are not always prepared to assist them. The theoretical and practical work of religious traditions will look different in different places, but there are certain basic questions that come up for anyone who seeks to do scholarly, advocacy, or charitable work that deals with the current crisis. It is crucial that those questions are named and understood, so that those who seek to stand with and assist refugees can articulate the value commitments that motivate their work and the facts about refugee movements, especially in light of much misunderstanding and a significant amount of vitriol directed at refugees. Scholars and activists alike should also recognize and examine the broad geopolitical conditions that have led to and shaped the crisis. With that in mind, the purpose of this chapter is to lay out and gain clarity on a

few basic questions that, I argue, the world's religious traditions must address both compassionately and incisively in light of the global refugee crisis.

These questions fall into five categories of concern. I describe both individual questions and the broader categories they fall into because when religious people seek solutions to the refugee crisis, especially when they disagree with or seek to educate their coreligionists or others, they ought to understand what category/ies of questions they are addressing and frame their contributions clearly. This helps to make clear their traditions' teachings about issues having to do with refugees and allows them better to address concerns that either mischaracterize refugees and the refugee crisis or suggest that nothing can, or perhaps nothing should, be done. The categories are these: 1) a religious tradition's teachings about hospitality, especially with interreligious or intercultural others, and its understanding of the meaning of "hospitality"; 2) the intersection of religious ethical thought with human rights considerations in light of refugee movements; 3) the need for a factual and nuanced understanding of practical concerns of economic life and security; 4) the nature of sovereignty and the contemporary global political order as a whole; and 5) the prevention of refugee movements before they happen. The first three sections of this chapter address questions in category 1; the fourth section, category 2; the fifth, category 3; the sixth and seventh, category 4; and the eighth, category 5.

Traditions' specific answers to the questions described below may differ, but one problem that arises in debates over how to respond to refugees is simply that different parties to the debates are often asking different questions, or are not clear as to which questions and concerns they are arguing about. This chapter aims to provide a framework for shaping our conversations so that, at the very least, we are all talking about the same thing.

I anticipate that this chapter may be of use to scholars who are newly approaching the field of theological, philosophical, ethical, and religious thought about refugee issues; to students for whom these questions may help both to clarify the dialogue they hear in the media and in academic scholarship and to provide guidance on questions they might ask of themselves, their colleagues, and their teachers; and to members of diverse religious traditions who are concerned about the refugee crisis and believe their or other traditions may have something to say, but are not certain where to start.

DOES MY RELIGIOUS TRADITION ENCOURAGE WELCOME OF REFUGEES?

Dangerous as it may be to claim that "all" religious traditions share any one idea, I will take the risk and assert that all religious traditions of the world encourage their practitioners to show hospitality to others in some way,

shape, or form. Whether it is the Sikh who sets aside food from her meal for a hungry person who may come by;² the Jew³ or Christian⁴ who follows Abraham's example by eagerly offering nourishment and rest, along with honor and reverence, to those who pass one's home; or the Buddhist who disciplines his mind to understand that no one is a stranger or unimportant⁵ and who gives offerings to all, knowing that anyone could be a saint,⁶ members of any religious tradition can quite easily find justifications—and more often mandates—to show hospitality to those they encounter, including and sometimes especially those who are not already known to them.

The question is how these encouragements, or mandates, to hospitable thought and action apply in the context of a global refugee crisis involving millions of people who need multiple sorts of hospitality: food and shelter to be sure, but also education, employment—and most complexly, inclusion in a stable political community in which they can find not only security but also political and social belonging and agency. Religious mandates to care for strangers would seem to imply that strangers' needs should be met wherever and however possible, but the fundamental texts and narratives of most of the world's religious traditions—certainly those of the largest and most influential—do not explicitly deal with the question of how to show hospitality when the “hospitality” that strangers most crucially need is a matter of incorporating them into the political community of a contemporary state, usually by granting citizenship. Hindus may be told in the *Taittiriya Upanishad* never to turn a guest away and to share food,⁷ but at a moment when the most-populous Hindu country, India, is governed by a Hindu nationalist party that understands India to be for Hindus in a way that it is somehow *not* for others,⁸ what sort of welcome could or should Hindus in India provide to refugees whose religious identity is not Hindu? Can they be welcomed in the polity as well as in the home or at the table? Similarly, how should Jews interpret biblical texts that in some cases seem to envision a “foreigner” who sojourns in the community without ever fully becoming part of it?⁹ And given that the majority of the world's refugees are Muslim, how do Muslims understand state boundaries that make distinctions between which fellow Muslims are in or out, when the Qur'an and the early Islamic tradition seem consistently to envision the Muslim community as united politically as well as religiously?¹⁰

All of this points to one of the most crucial questions for traditions that seek to apply, to a crisis of global proportions, mandates of hospitality and care for the needy stranger: is hospitality an individual act or can it—should it—be the act of an entire polity? And how can hospitality, which some (though not all) religious texts envision as hosting a wayfarer or someone who will eventually leave, be extended permanently by incorporating people who need citizenship into a country? Sacred texts in some traditions, for instance, Judaism, do at least address the question of how a polity (though not a contemporary state)

ought to relate to and, in some cases, care for needy strangers who come in from the outside. But most texts dealing with hospitality envision an individual or family group either sharing resources or inviting a stranger into their home, where the guest/host relationship may last indefinitely or for only a few days. What does hospitality look like at the level of policy?

WHAT DOES “HOSPITALITY” MEAN FOR GUESTS AND HOSTS? HOW CAN TRADITIONS ADDRESS POWER IMBALANCES IN THE GUEST/HOST RELATIONSHIP?

The guest/host relationship is not simply one of giving and receiving; it is a relationship fraught with social power. If refugees are fundamentally in need of a stable and secure community in which they can have a place and a voice, then religious people who hope to address the global refugee crisis must examine how and whether their traditions ask them to craft relationships with strangers in need that are, or at least will become, relationships between those of equal power and standing. Without a commitment to equal relationships and to the principle that all people ought to hold at least some measure of control over their own life in a community, the crisis threatens to become (indeed, multiple refugee crises have already become) a quasi-permanent event in which entire generations of people are denied political power because they have no place in a stable political community in which their voices may be heard and rendered effective.¹¹

In this sense, the guest/host relationship described in many religious accounts of hospitality can actually be troubling because it does not (always) allow for the development of a more-equal power relationship between the host who has, gives, and welcomes and the guest who receives and is welcomed. Certainly hospitality is often understood as an exchange of some sort, perhaps between the one who gives alms and the Buddhist saint who can bestow blessing,¹² or between the generous host and the holy guest who can bring a long-awaited miracle, as when Abraham’s hospitality to God in the guise of the three visitors paves the way for the fulfillment of God’s promise that Abraham and Sarah would have a son.¹³ Nevertheless, hospitality is often envisioned as an act in which I, the gracious host, give something to the guest in need. I may be doing a kindness and obeying the demands of my tradition, but I remain in the position of power since, in practice, I decide whether and how to welcome the stranger or to give generously.

Christian thought in the United States on immigration and hospitality has begun to address these concerns. (This is not because Christian thinkers are more insightful or more aware of power dynamics; it is simply because the Christian tradition has been, and for now remains, the majority tradition in

the United States, and there is more writing available from Christian thinkers.) Christian ethicists have shown how immigrants (refugees included) do in fact provide benefits to those who are positioned as “hosts,” and they have advocated for a new understanding of life together that acknowledges the power and agency of immigrants/refugees and commits to overcoming unequal power relations. Kristin Heyer emphasizes the *contributions* of immigrants (not only but including refugees) to social life in the places they enter, as well as to religious thought itself.¹⁴ Luke Bretherton argues that hospitality must mean not only providing for someone who has nothing but also and especially crafting a new political and social world in which all have as-equal-as-possible agency to shape a shared life together.¹⁵ Miguel De La Torre, in a foreword to a work by Nell Becker Sweeden that also addresses this concern, reminds us that often the reason the host is able to welcome the stranger into “her” home is because that home was already built through the cheap labor and exploitation of that stranger—which is to say that the “host” has *already* received significant benefit from the “guest.”¹⁶ The relationship between guest and host is therefore complicated and often marked by prior injustice, and the goal of “welcoming the stranger” ought to be the leveling out of unequal power relations and recognition of the gifts all bring to the table.

Thinkers in non-Christian traditions are in early stages of addressing these concerns, often from the perspective of the immigrant or refugee who tends to be perceived in the role of “guest.” Hussam Timani, in the present volume, provides an intriguing Islamic examination of how Muslim immigrants are called to live in neighborly concord with non-Muslim neighbors, integrating into and contributing to the community.¹⁷ Zeyneb Sayilgan, too, points out that Muslims can enhance dialogue on immigration and hospitality from the point of view both of one who receives a stranger as a guest, and one who is received.¹⁸ These works provide insight into a thorny but crucial question religious people and thinkers must address in considering their responses to the refugee crisis: if some sort of “hospitality” is called for, what should we make of the power imbalances that so often come even with well-intended hospitality—and should we work to address the refugee crisis in ways that at least mitigate those imbalances?

HOW SHOULD RELIGIOUS TRADITIONS NAVIGATE INTERRELIGIOUS RELATIONSHIPS AND THE PRESENCE OF RELIGIOUS OTHERS?

In many cases, the entry of refugees into a political community brings in a great number of people whose religious traditions differ from the traditions

of those currently living in the community.¹⁹ Both those who move and those whose communities receive religious others therefore have to ask: how should people in different traditions relate to each other, and what happens when countries and communities become more pluralistic? These questions arise whether refugees come as citizens, permanent residents, or “temporary” occupants of camps or urban settings. The presence of large numbers of people who practice and believe much differently from the current citizenry inevitably leads to a rethinking of what it means to be “religious” in public; what sorts of religious practices are acceptable in public or private; whether and how to honor freedom of religious choice and expression for all; and how people can relate to one another at an individual or small-group level when their fundamental religious ideologies differ significantly.

The rise, both globally and certainly in net immigrant-receiving countries, of interfaith and interreligious initiatives demonstrates that religious individuals and communities are working to address these concerns.²⁰ The current refugee crisis makes it yet more pressing—in some cases a matter of life and death—that religious people deal with questions of, to hearken to the title of this work, the meaning of their neighbor’s faith; what their own religious traditions teach about living alongside the other and whether it is possible to work together for some sort of shared social good;²¹ and how to craft a social and political space in which members of multiple religious traditions (including those who hold atheist, agnostic, or less-common spiritual views) relate as equals and have real, shared agency in crafting conversations, connections, and policies.²²

SHOULD RELIGIOUS PEOPLE USE THE LANGUAGE OF HUMAN RIGHTS?

International institutions, and a great many of the discussions about the refugee crisis in the media, tend to consider the refugee crisis in terms of human rights. Refugees’ rights have been violated, we are told, by persecution from a hostile government or some other group that commits or threatens violence, or simply due to the misfortune of being caught in the middle of a conflict. In this interpretation, what is needed is for human rights to be honored and protected. People must be understood to have the right to life, certain freedoms, a measure of personal security, and the ability to access resources to support the basic needs of life—and those rights must be upheld in practice by government and other institutions. Refugees need either to have their rights restored in their country of origin so that they may return, or to live under some sort of governance in which those rights are recognized and protected.

The conversation about rights is crucial, but it is also quite obvious that the decades of discussion and even policy change since the signing of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other documents have not eliminated problems faced by refugees (and others). Though it might someday suffice, the mid-twentieth-century human rights regime has not yet provided all the conceptual and practical resources needed to ensure the well-being of all refugees, nor of all people. Furthermore, the world's religious traditions are far from being in agreement—among themselves or with each other—about whether the idea of “human rights” fits with the moral and anthropological concepts laid out in their texts, traditions, and practices. A Buddhist might argue, for instance, that the idea of human rights can serve as a meaningful tool for advocacy, but people's well-being is, in the end, not as well served by claiming one's “rights” in an adversarial manner as it is when more and more people seek to live harmoniously with others.²³ More than one Muslim thinker has stated that Islamic moral thought and human rights concerns are highly compatible,²⁴ but some Muslim leaders have also argued that the specific rights set out in the UDHR are not precisely those that Muslims ought to recognize as properly human rights.²⁵ Religious thinkers in multiple traditions have worried about the possibility that the idea of human rights is too individualistic, too adversarial, or too based in modern Western conceptions of property rights to be genuinely compatible with their traditions.²⁶

So is human rights discourse the best discourse for religious people to use in speaking and thinking about the refugee crisis? For those who accept the discourse in some fashion, it provides a possible common ground for moral discussion and debate—perhaps even a “law of nations” that mediates between fundamental religious ideas and the practices of particular communities, as John Witte and M. Christian Green suggest.²⁷ Human rights talk is important in the international sphere, and I myself do not shy away from it here or elsewhere. But the relatively secularized discourse of human rights is not necessarily the most useful discourse for religious communities to use, whether internally or in dialogue with other traditions, as they address the refugee crisis. One can imagine, for instance, the Jewish, Christian, and Islamic traditions, with their (complicatedly) shared narratives and moral mandates, finding greater common ground around notions of justice for the oppressed than they do on the question of whether the human rights of refugees ought to be upheld. Insofar as the question of how religious traditions relate to basic human rights ideas remains very much an open one, while the global refugee crisis is a matter of great human suffering *now*, religious people, thinkers, and communities ought to find areas of connection and agreement on how to address the crisis in whatever way they can, whether that involves human rights talk or no.

DO REFUGEES ENHANCE OR DIMINISH THE ECONOMIC WELL-BEING AND SECURITY OF THE COMMUNITIES THEY ENTER—AND DOES IT MATTER?

When states consider how to address the global refugee crisis—most especially when they consider taking significant numbers of refugees into their own polities—concerns are often raised about whether refugees will be a “drain” on economic resources and whether refugees pose a security risk to the nations they enter. Economically, most refugees need some measure of support upon first arriving in a new country, although in many cases that support is only provided for a few months.²⁸ Security-wise, there have been individual examples of crimes committed by people who have been resettled as refugees, including the well-publicized New Year’s Eve 2015 attacks in Cologne, Germany, in which groups of men molested, and in at least one case raped, women who were attending holiday festivities. It is not clear that all the men involved in the attacks were immigrants, and certainly not all were refugees. But the crimes and the botched response to them by German police led some to claim that immigrants and refugees are too culturally dissimilar from native-born Europeans to be willing to honor principles of gender equality and respect for women’s personal security.²⁹

Some fears are understandable, especially when a story like the Cologne attacks hits the news. Yet the broader data actually support the opposite conclusions, though issues of security are a bit more complicated than economic questions. To take the economic question first, economists have shown many times over that refugees bring economic growth and vitality to the countries they enter, especially in a place like the United States, which allows (and in fact requires) refugees to find work quickly.³⁰ Regarding security issues, in the United States, the crime rate among all immigrants, refugees included, is significantly lower than the crime rate among the native-born population—although second-generation immigrants do “catch up” to (but do not exceed) their native-born peers in the rate of crimes committed.³¹ The story in Europe from 2012 on, where refugees have fled across borders in larger numbers and a less-organized fashion than in the United States, is more complicated, with some countries experiencing a rise in crime and some a drop. The details seem to matter here: countries or regions that receive more young men tend to see crime rates go up,³² where countries that receive migrant or refugee groups with a mix of men, women, and children have crime rates that hold steady or decrease.³³ Whether or not refugees are able to integrate into broader social and economic life seems to be important as well. According to one study, the rise in crime that Germany experienced in 2015 and 2016 was largely driven by asylum-seekers from North Africa and not by refugees or those seeking

asylum from Syria or Afghanistan.³⁴ One of the study's authors noted that there were "huge differences between various refugee groups depending on where they came from and how high their chances were of staying and gaining legal status in Germany"—essentially, that refugees or asylum-seekers who had good chances of being allowed to remain and integrate committed very few crimes, while those who "find out as soon as they arrive that they are totally undesirable here" committed more.³⁵

So it is incorrect to claim that the question of refugee resettlement is one of balancing humanitarian with economic or security concerns, since refugees—especially if they are welcomed and integrated—improve the economic life and relative safety of the countries they enter. But religious people should ask, nevertheless, how to address both the facts of and *perceptions* of refugees' impact on economic life and security. Religious leaders in Western countries should seek to highlight the contributions of refugees and to emphasize that refugees do not pose any greater security risks than any other populations (and less than some), even as they also appeal to their coreligionists' moral commitments to hospitality and compassion. Furthermore, there are ways, often not or not solely based in repetition of moral demands or appeals to bare facts, to mitigate incorrect perceptions that paint refugees as economic parasites or security risks. Narratives are often more meaningful than data; religious communities often connect their members personally with refugees by working alongside resettlement organizations to assist newly arrived refugees; and it is not uncommon for religious leaders and communities to offer educational groups or events where these concerns might be discussed.

And if there does turn out to be some sort of balance to be struck in a few specific cases, say between hospitality and security concerns, religious people also do simply have to ask what their traditions demand of them in terms of balancing caution or unease against mandates of hospitality. The New Testament letter 1 John, for instance, tells Christians that "[p]erfect love casts out fear," and the Buddhist tradition teaches that the desire to hold onto economic or personal security is itself our source of suffering. Religious people may well find that they just simply are tasked with letting go of their fears and anxieties, however they manage it.

WHAT GOODS IS THE POLITICAL ORDER TASKED WITH UPHOLDING, AND HOW CAN IT BEST UPHOLD THOSE GOODS?

Even granting the importance of the concerns above, the *most* pressing area for thought and action regarding the refugee crisis is the international political

order. At present, the world is organized into a system of sovereign states that have relatively firm, clear boundaries and that maintain a strong commitment in principle, if not always in practice, to their own and other states' self-determination. Political and religious thinkers have recognized for decades that this system, though it solves certain problems of international relations, causes or deepens others.³⁶ Although the sovereign state is not going anywhere anytime soon, no religious tradition that I am aware of upholds the contemporary state as *the* practically or morally best means of organizing human beings in political community forever and always, though many would argue that it is *a* morally *appropriate* means, and perhaps the best in our current moment.³⁷ In fact, though few thinkers argue for a return either to empire or to monarchy, the foundational texts of most of the world's traditions are in a sense easier to understand and apply in those contexts, since those are the contexts in which most were composed.

The question religious traditions face when confronted with the global refugee crisis, which is a crisis of national borders and state sovereignty as much as anything, is this: What fundamental purpose does political order and authority serve? What good is it meant to uphold in the world and for humankind (and perhaps other species), and what sort of political structures and institutions can most fully uphold that good? The world's traditions are almost certain to answer this question in different ways; a Hindu thinker may focus on protecting *dharma*,³⁸ a Jewish thinker on justice, law, and care for those who are socially vulnerable. Catholic Christians often follow Thomas Aquinas in stressing the responsibility of a ruler to defend the common good, while Protestant thinkers have traditionally emphasized order and the restraint of wrongdoing. Out of these long and complex traditions of thought, religious thinkers and religious people should ask: what sort of a political system accomplishes, in this moment, the goods that my tradition teaches it should? Does it look like what we have now, or a modification of what we have now, or something else?

If these questions are seriously addressed, religious thought has the potential to help scholars, citizens, and political leaders think beyond contemporary assumptions about sovereignty and the responsibilities of rulers, especially in a time of heated debate over whether the leaders and citizens of sovereign states have an obligation to take in people who have fled conflict and/or persecution in other states. The Roman Catholic Church has often taken a lead role in calling on political leaders to take in refugees and other migrants who are in great need, arguing that human well-being takes at least *prima facie* precedence over control of borders.³⁹ At the same time, religious traditions arise out of and shape communities that have ties to particular places and some sense of communal bonds. There are rich resources here for examin-

ing how the human need for localized, emplaced community intersects with mandates toward hospitality and care for the vulnerable. In particular, given the connection of many indigenous traditions to particular places and the suffering indigenous communities have themselves undergone at the hands of powerful states, indigenous communities have a powerful and unique perspective on contemporary political order. The thought of indigenous religious scholars and traditions does and should, therefore, add a crucial voice.⁴⁰

WHAT CAN COLONIZED AND DIASPORIC TRADITIONS TEACH US ABOUT SOVEREIGNTY AND POLITICAL ORDER?

Indigenous thinkers are also particularly, though not exclusively, able to speak in and to a postcolonial setting in which the legacy of colonialism continues to shape international order, conflicts between and especially within states, and migrant and refugee flows. Self-determination is extremely important for and valued by previously colonized states, as shown in their leaders' arguments during debates over the enforcement of global ethical and legal norms. Think of the report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty in 2001, which, after listening sessions with political, religious, and grassroots leaders of formerly colonized states, acknowledged the deep concern that challenges to state sovereignty in the name of human rights could be, or be perceived as, a form of "neo-colonial imperialism," and that local ownership of political processes is absolutely necessary as soon as possible in the aftermath of a conflict.⁴¹

At the same time, the idea of the contemporary state itself grows out of the political context of Europe in the modern era, and its structure was imposed on colonized people by European colonizers over the course of almost five hundred years. It is not obvious that maintaining an ideology of absolute, or even nearly absolute, state sovereignty is the best imaginable way for previously colonized people to live flourishing lives, especially when the sovereign states that have been forged in processes of decolonization bear the borders and often the ethnic and religious divisions imposed by the colonizers. Holding political power in a sovereign state is likely the best *de facto* way, currently, for previously colonized religious, ethnic, and language groups to determine their own destiny and have a place at the international table. But the presence of 22.5 million refugees in the world—refugees who are often fleeing from formerly colonized states—gives the lie to any idea that the self-determination of sovereign states will lead to the self-determination, in peace and security, of all individuals and communities. Indeed, the suffering that refugees experience has its roots precisely in their having been pushed out of the contemporary

system of states with their various mechanisms of protection. Religious traditions, in conversation with and drawing on postcolonial thought, have a great many issues to address here. And precisely because they have no essential tie to the international system of states—traditions do, or at least should, value the state as a means to promote fundamental goods, but not as an end in itself—their contributions may be able to break us out of a seeming stalemate between an ideology of sovereignty and a concern for those whose well-being is harmed by that ideology. Of particular interest here may be voices from traditions that do not lay claim to dominance in any particular state. For instance, Sikh religious thought in the wake of the failed effort to establish a Sikh-dominated state of “Khalistan” during the 1970s and 1980s has brought a fascinating postcolonial viewpoint to questions of sovereignty, including putting forth the possibility of “recognition of difference” as an alternative to the perceived need for an ethnic or religious group to hold state power in order to thrive in the global order.⁴²

HOW CAN REFUGEE MOVEMENTS BE PREVENTED BY ADDRESSING ROOT CAUSES?

As those who work with refugees know, many refugees were displaced for years or decades before the current crisis began, and many more are likely to be displaced for years to come. Even if states and institutions somehow find the will to work toward real solutions for the current crisis, it would of course be preferable that people not be forced out of their homes by conflict or persecution in the first place. So just as pressingly, religious thinkers, leaders, and people do and should ask how refugee movements might be prevented or mitigated. There are any number of systemic issues here that must be addressed at the highest levels of national and international institutions: extreme poverty; climate change; ethnic rivalries; inequality, both within and between countries; and the need for governments to commit to and truly honor international law, human rights, and the global common good.

What religious traditions have to offer in particular, and what religious people would do best to focus on, are two things: those aspects of refugee crises that have to do with religion specifically, and the long-standing concern of religious traditions (at their best) for peace building in the spirit of honoring, respecting, and showing compassion to all. In the first case, although religion is actually less likely to be a major reason for conflict than multiple other social factors,⁴³ there are certainly cases in which conflict begins or (more commonly) is exacerbated by religious differences. These include, for instance, Christian-Muslim conflicts during the wars in the Balkans in the 1990s or in

the Central African Republic from 2012 to the present day. Relatedly, religion may make a difference in how refugees are viewed and treated, as Jessica Wong points out in this volume. In our world with its legacy of European and Christian colonialism, it is especially the case that unconscious notions of what sorts of racial and gender characteristics make someone a “good Christian,” “civilized/civilizable,” or both,⁴⁴ affect perceptions of refugees and can deter more well-resourced communities from resettling or otherwise assisting them. As daunting as the task is, religious thinkers, leaders, and adherents must continue the work many are already doing to understand what aspects of their religious traditions encourage or allow vitriol against particular groups, and to dialogue not just interreligiously, but with coreligionists, to shore up and emphasize their traditions’ mandates to hospitality.⁴⁵

To the second point, religious practices, beliefs, and connections reach into the depths of our personhood and communal lives, for both good and ill: they can stoke hatred and promote violence out of our deepest convictions, and they can also draw out great mercy, self-sacrifice, peaceableness, and unexpected moments of brotherhood and sisterhood. It is not hard to find examples of either of these things: the way in which Rohingya Muslims are “othered” and dehumanized by the government and army of Myanmar due to their religion (among other things); the demonizing of Catholic immigrants by American Protestants in the late nineteenth century, and now of Muslims by many American Christians; but also the invocation of religious ideals to support causes of justice and equality by leaders like Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr.; and the work of those who act within religious communities and reach across religious lines to find common moral ground for peace building, like the Women of Liberia Mass Action for Peace who brought an end to the Liberian civil war in 2003. Many religious individuals and organizations have certainly drawn on foundational claims within their traditions as reasons for working to ameliorate the current refugee crisis, whether through humanitarian aid, resettlement, or lobbying for action from states and the international community.

Religion is not alone in tapping into and drawing on deeply rooted affective and spiritual impulses and fundamental convictions that can lead people both to extreme violence *and* to rock-solid, self-sacrificial commitments to peace building. But religious thought has particularly salient and long-considered ways of talking about these impulses and convictions. At its best, it directs such impulses toward practices of hospitality that both provide for the other and honor her agency, dignity, and the gifts she has to offer. One way that religious people ought to respond to the global refugee crisis, then, is to recognize that human beings *do* have these deep instincts, and that we must draw on religious (and other!) resources to channel our instincts in the

direction of peacebuilding worldwide, so that crises like the one the world is seeing now are arrested before they can begin.

NOTES

1. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, "Figures at a Glance," UNHCR, accessed December 7, 2017, <http://www.unhcr.org/en-us/figures-at-a-glance.html>.
2. Karamjit K. Malhotra, *The Eighteenth Century in Sikh History: Political Resurgence, Religious and Social Life, and Cultural Articulation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 4.
3. Edward K. Kaplan, "The Open Tent: Angels and Strangers," in *Hosting the Stranger: Between Religions*, ed. Richard Kearney and James Taylor (New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2011), 67–68.
4. Lee Roy Martin, "Old Testament Foundations for Christian Hospitality," *Verbum et Ecclesia* 35, no. 1 (Feb 2014): 1–2.
5. John Makransky, "The Awakening of Hospitality," in Kearney and Taylor, 111–12.
6. Andy Rotman, "Buddhism and Hospitality: Expecting the Unexpected and Acting Virtuously," in Kearney and Taylor, 120–21.
7. Frank Clooney, "Food, the Guest and the *Taittiriya Upanishad*: Hospitality in the Hindu Traditions," in Kearney and Taylor, 140–42.
8. For one media report on relatively recent developments in the Bharatiya Janata Party, India's current ruling party, see "Mr. Modi's Perilous Embrace of Hindu Extremists," *New York Times*, March 23, 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/23/opinion/mr-modis-perilous-embrace-of-hindu-extremists.html>.
9. Christiana van Houten has provided a thorough study in her work *The Alien in Israelite Law* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991). In particular, page 164 summarizes the various stages of development of biblical texts, some of which allow for integration of the stranger, foreigner, or alien into the Israelite political community, and some of which do not.
10. Dana Sajdi notes the tension between the acknowledgment of different cultural customs and the supposed unity of those who follow Islam in "The Dead and the City: The Limits of Hospitality in the Early Modern Levant," in Kearney and Taylor, 124. Souran Mardini discusses *Sūras* in the Qur'ān, which describe Muhammad's early consultation with his Companions over political matters such as war or punishment, in order to determine the best course for the political community of, at the time, all Muslims. Souran Mardini, "Fundamental Religio-political Concepts in the Sources of Islam: The Shūrā in the Islamic Umma," *Hamdard Islamicus* 9, no. 4 (Winter 1986): 30.
11. Hannah Arendt cogently makes the point that it is the *polis*, the political community in which one resides and of which one is a member, that gives some level of permanence, and certainly effectiveness, to the speech and political action of human beings. See Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 198.

12. Rotman, 121.

13. Harold W. Attridge, Wayne A. Meeks, and Jouette M. Bassler, *The HarperCollins Study Bible: New Revised Standard Version, including the Apocrypha/Deuterocanonical Books* (San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 2006), Genesis 18: 1–15.

14. Kristin Heyer, *Kinship across Borders: A Christian Ethic of Immigration* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2012), 113.

15. Luke Bretherton, *Christ and the Common Life: A Guide to Political Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, forthcoming), chapter 9, “Toleration and Hospitality.”

16. Miguel de la Torre, foreword to *Church on the Way: Hospitality and Migration*, by Nell Becker Sweeden (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2015), x.

17. Hussam Timani, “On Being a Muslim in a Non-Islamic Society: Seeing Islam in the ‘Other,’” in *The Meaning of My Neighbor’s Faith: Interreligious Reflections on Immigration*, ed. Alexander Y. Hwang and Laura E. Alexander (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2018).

18. Zeyneb Sayligan, “Islamic Creation Theology and the Human Being as Migrant,” in Hwang and Alexander, 3–16.

19. It is common, of course, for refugees to flee to countries whose members generally share their religious tradition. Many Syrian refugees, for example, now live in Lebanon, Jordan, or Turkey. And even when religious traditions are shared, questions of difference of belief, practice, or culture may arise. But the question of how religious people should respond when Muslim immigrants flee to Europe, for instance, where Christianity is the historically dominant religious tradition and where many citizens are nonreligious (though perhaps influenced by their Christian history), is one of the most pressing for those who seek to address or who are concerned about the refugee crisis.

20. For example, Religions for Peace was established in 1970; the United Religions Initiative in 2000; the Doha International Center for Interfaith Dialogue in 2007; and the King Abdullah bin Abdulaziz International Centre for Interreligious and Intercultural Dialogue in 2012.

21. See, for instance, Sumner B. Twiss and Bruce Grelle, eds., *Explorations in Global Ethics: Comparative Religious Ethics and Interreligious Dialogue* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1999), the work of the *Journal of Interreligious Studies*, now in its twenty-second year; and the companion volume to this one: Hussam S. Timani, Allen G. Jorgenson, and Alexander Y. Hwang, eds., *Strangers in This World: Multireligious Reflections on Immigration* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2015).

22. Bretherton, chapter 9.

23. Sallie King, “Buddhism and Human Rights,” in *Religion and Human Rights*, ed. John Witte Jr. and M. Christian Green (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 114–16.

24. Abdulaziz Sachedina, *Islam and the Challenge of Human Rights* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); Abdullahi Ahmed An-Na’im, “Why Should Muslims Abandon *Jihad*? Human Rights and the Future of International Law,” *Third World Quarterly* 27, no. 5 (2006): 785–97, especially 786.

25. The *Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam* is the product of one attempt to ground human rights in Islamic thought and to make what the member states of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation understand to be an appropriate list of human rights, which differs somewhat from the list of rights in the UDHR. United Nations, General Assembly, *The Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam*, A/CONF.157/PC/62/Add.18, June 9, 1993, accessed April 15, 2018, <http://undocs.org/A/CONF.157/PC/62/Add.18>.

26. See, out of many examples, Joan Lockhart O'Donovan, "The Concept of Rights in Christian Moral Discourse," *Lion and Lamb* 26 (Autumn 2000): 20–25; and Joseph C. W. Chan, "Confucianism and Human Rights," in Witte and Green, 87–102.

27. Witte and Green, "Introduction," in Witte and Green, 17–19.

28. In the United States, adult refugees are generally eligible to receive cash assistance for eight months, while refugee families with children are eligible for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program for up to five years. (Exact details vary by state, but these are fairly standard figures.) Refugees may also be eligible for certain forms of social welfare, such as medical assistance and food stamps. As an example, the Minnesota Department of Human Services website has information about its Refugee Cash Assistance program here, accessed April 15, 2018: http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/idcplg?IdcService=GET_DYNAMIC_CONVERSION&dDocName=cm_003003&RevisionSelectionMethod=LatestReleased.

29. For a report on the events in Cologne shortly after they happened, see "Germany Shocked by Cologne New Year Gang Assaults on Women," BBC Online, January 5, 2016, <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-35231046>. The *Washington Post* provided updated numbers indicating that two thousand men may have been involved in attacks on women in multiple cities. Rick Noack, "Leaked Document Says 2,000 Men Allegedly Assaulted 1,200 German Women on New Year's Eve," *Washington Post*, July 11, 2016, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2016/07/10/leaked-document-says-2000-men-allegedly-assaulted-1200-german-women-on-new-years-eve/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.9d2e7d2c2e22.

30. For one example, see William N. Evans and Daniel Fitzgerald, "The Economic and Social Outcomes of Refugees in the United States: Evidence from the ACS," National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 23498, accessed April 15, 2018, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w23498.pdf>.

31. Rich Morin, "Crime Rises among Second-Generation Immigrants as They Assimilate," Pew Research Center, October 15, 2013, <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2013/10/15/crime-rises-among-second-generation-immigrants-as-they-assimilate/>.

32. Riham Alkousaa, "Violent Crime Rises in Germany and Is Attributed to Refugees," Reuters, January 3, 2018, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-europe-migrants-germany-crime/violent-crime-rises-in-germany-and-is-attributed-to-refugees-idUSKBN1ES16J>.

33. Patrick Scott, "Data Analysis: The True Scale of Immigration and Crime in Sweden in Five Charts," *Telegraph*, February 22, 2017, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/02/22/data-analysis-true-scale-immigration-crime-sweden-five-charts/>.

34. Alkousaa.

35. Ibid.

36. Hannah Arendt's work again comes to mind here, particularly when she asks how the "rights of man" can possibly be protected when people are stateless. Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (San Diego, CA: Harcourt, 1985), 293. The principle of Responsibility to Protect, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 2005, speaks to the concern for what happens when a state is unwilling or unable to protect the rights of its people, though it does not clearly address questions about human migration. United Nations, General Assembly, *2005 World Summit Outcome*, A/RES/60/1, October 24, 2005, http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_RES_60_1.pdf. Matt R. Jantzen's chapter in this volume examines the contradictions that can arise when bodies like the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops express support for migrants without challenging assumptions about sovereign states' right to control their borders in our current global system. Matt R. Jantzen, "Immigration and the Theological Problem of Sovereignty: Catholic Social Teaching, Carl Schmitt, and the Theopolitical Foundations of the Modern State," in Hwang and Alexander, 187–98.

37. To take just one example, Muslim thinkers have struggled with the question of the contemporary state due to the modern history of colonization and artificial boundary drawing in Muslim-majority countries. See, for instance, Amr G. E. Sabet, *Islam and the Political: Theory, Governance, and International Relations* (Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press, 2008), especially 134–40. Abdulaziz Sachedina, meanwhile, argues for the compatibility between Islam, the contemporary state, and liberal democracy in his work *The Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

38. Raj Balkaran and A. Walter Dorn make this point in the context of considering criteria of just war in the *Ramayana* in their article "Violence in the Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa: Just War Criteria in an Ancient Indian Epic," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 80, no. 3 (September 2012): 666.

39. For a recent call to welcome migrants and refugees, see Pope Francis, *Message of His Holiness Pope Francis for the 104th World Day of Migrants and Refugees 2018*, Vatican: The Holy See, January 14, 2018. https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/messages/migration/documents/papa-francesco_20170815_world-migrants-day-2018.html. See also Jantzen's discussion of Catholic Social Teaching in this volume.

40. For instance, George Tinker's *American Indian Liberation: A Theology of Sovereignty* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2008), which interweaves Christian and North American Indian religious thought.

41. International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, *The Responsibility to Protect* (Ottawa, ON: International Development Research Centre, 2001), 45.

42. See especially the work of Arvind-Pal Singh Mandair, including *Religion and the Specter of the West: Sikhism, India, Postcoloniality and the Politics of Translation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009), which discusses both sovereignty, and the construction of "religious traditions" as a colonial category, through a postcolonial lens. Giorgio Shani discusses Sikh nationalism from an international relations perspective in *Sikh Nationalism and Identity in a Global Age* (New York: Routledge, 2008).

43. Institute for Economics and Peace, *Five Key Questions Answered on the Link between Peace and Religion* (New York: Institute for Economics and Peace, October 2014), 6–8.

44. Jessica Wai-Fong Wong, “The Christian Criteria for Assimilation: Racially Reading Christianity, Civility, and Social Belonging in the Modern Western World,” in Hwang and Alexander, 89–104.

45. In my own city of Omaha, a unique undertaking called the Tri-Faith Initiative encourages and faces this sort of dialogue head-on. The initiative brings a Jewish temple, Christian church, and Islamic mosque together on one campus of land, so that congregations worship in their own spaces but regularly share programming, fellowship, and dialogue. It is also envisioned as a means of provoking dialogue *within* traditions related to these groups’ desire for neighborliness among the three traditions and what they have learned about their own traditions in light of dialogue with others. See <https://trifaith.org/>. The very existence of this initiative has intriguing ties to refugee movements: the Jewish community in Omaha and the surrounding area includes Jewish refugees from the Soviet Union and their descendants, and much of the recent growth of the Muslim community stems from refugee resettlement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alkousaa, Riham. “Violent Crime Rises in Germany and Is Attributed to Refugees.” Reuters, January 3, 2018. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-europe-migrants-germany-crime/violent-crime-rises-in-germany-and-is-attributed-to-refugees-idUSKBN1ES16J>.
- An-Na’im, Abdullahi Ahmed. “Why Should Muslims Abandon *Jihad*? Human Rights and the Future of International Law.” *Third World Quarterly* 27, no. 5 (2006): 785–97.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- . *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt, 1951. Reprint, 1985.
- Attridge, Harold W., Wayne A. Meeks, and Jouette M. Bassler. *The HarperCollins Study Bible: New Revised Standard Version, including the Apocrypha/Deuterocanonical Books*. San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 2006.
- Balkaran, Raj, and A. Walter Dorn. “Violence in the Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa: Just War Criteria in an Ancient Indian Epic.” *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 80, no. 3 (September 2012): 659–90.
- BBC Online. “Germany Shocked by Cologne New Year Gang Assaults on Women,” January 5, 2016. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-35231046>.
- Berepas, Martine. “An Asian Ethics of Hospitality: Hospitality in Confucian, Daoist and Buddhist Philosophy.” In *The Routledge Handbook of Hospitality Studies*, ed. Conrad Lashley, 194–207. Florence: Taylor and Francis, 2016.
- Bretherton, Luke. *Christ and the Common Life: A Guide to Political Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, forthcoming.

- . *Hospitality as Holiness: Christian Witness amid Moral Diversity*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006.
- Chan, Joseph C. W. “Confucianism and Human Rights.” In Witte and Green, *Religion and Human Rights*, 87–102.
- Clooney, Frank. “Food, the Guest and the *Taittiriya Upanishad*: Hospitality in the Hindu Traditions.” In Kearney and Taylor, *Hosting the Stranger*, 139–45.
- de la Torre, Miguel. Foreword to *Church on the Way: Hospitality and Migration*, by Nell Becker Sweeden, vii–xi. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2015.
- Evans, William N., and Daniel Fitzgerald. “The Economic and Social Outcomes of Refugees in the United States: Evidence from the ACS.” National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 23498. Accessed April 15, 2018. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w23498.pdf>.
- Francis, Pope. *Message of His Holiness Pope Francis for the 104th World Day of Migrants and Refugees 2018*. Vatican: The Holy See, January 14, 2018. https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/messages/migration/documents/papa-francesco_20170815_world-migrants-day-2018.html.
- Heyer, Kristin. *Kinship across Borders: A Christian Ethic of Immigration*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2012.
- Hindu-Catholic Dialogue of Canada. “Expression of Support in Canada’s Role in Welcoming Refugees.” *Ecumenical Trends* 45, no. 5 (2016): 15.
- Institute for Economics and Peace. *Five Key Questions Answered on the Link between Peace and Religion*. New York: Institute for Economics and Peace, October 2014.
- International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. *The Responsibility to Protect*. Ottawa, ON: International Development Research Centre, 2001.
- Janzten, Matt R. “Immigration and the Theological Problem of Sovereignty: Catholic Social Teaching, Carl Schmitt, and the Theopolitical Foundations of the Modern State.” In *The Meaning of My Neighbor’s Faith: Interreligious Reflections on Immigration*, edited by Alexander Y. Hwang and Laura E. Alexander. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2018.
- Kaplan, Edward K. “The Open Tent: Angels and Strangers.” In Kearney and Taylor, *Hosting the Stranger*, 67–72.
- Kearney, Richard, and James Taylor. *Hosting the Stranger: Between Religions*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2011.
- King, Sallie. “Buddhism and Human Rights.” In Witte and Green, *Religion and Human Rights*, 101–18.
- Kumar, Priya. “Beyond Tolerance and Hospitality: Muslims as Strangers and Minor Subjects in Hindu Nationalist and Indian Nationalist Discourse.” In *Living Together: Jacques Derrida’s Communities of Violence and Peace*, edited by Elisabeth Weber. New York: Fordham University Press, 2013.
- Lashley, Conrad, ed. “Religious Perspectives on Hospitality.” In Lashley, *The Routledge Handbook of Hospitality Studies*, 141–51.
- . *The Routledge Handbook of Hospitality Studies*. Florence: Taylor and Francis, 2016.
- Little, David. *Essays on Religion and Human Rights: Ground to Stand On*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

- Makransky, John. "The Awakening of Hospitality." In Kearney and Taylor, *Hosting the Stranger*, 109–14.
- Malhotra, Karamjit K. *The Eighteenth Century in Sikh History: Political Resurgence, Religious and Social Life, and Cultural Articulation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Mandair, Arvind-Pal Singh. *Religion and the Specter of the West: Sikhism, India, Postcoloniality and the Politics of Translation*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.
- Mardini, Souran. "Fundamental Religio-political Concepts in the Sources of Islam: The Shūrā in the Islamic Umma." *Hamdard Islamicus* 9, no. 4 (Winter 1986): 25–35.
- Martin, Lee Roy. "Old Testament Foundations for Christian Hospitality." *Verbum et Ecclesia* 34, no. 1 (February 2014): 1–9.
- Morin, Rich. "Crime Rises among Second-Generation Immigrants as They Assimilate." Pew Research Center, October 15, 2013. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2013/10/15/crime-rises-among-second-generation-immigrants-as-they-assimilate/>.
- "Mr. Modi's Perilous Embrace of Hindu Extremists." *New York Times*, March 23, 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/23/opinion/mr-modis-perilous-embrace-of-hindu-extremists.html>.
- Noack, Rick. "Leaked Document Says 2,000 Men Allegedly Assaulted 1,200 German Women on New Year's Eve." *Washington Post*, July 11, 2016. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2016/07/10/leaked-document-says-2000-men-allegedly-assaulted-1200-german-women-on-new-years-eve/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.9d2e7d2c2e22.
- O'Donovan, Joan Lockhart. "The Concept of Rights in Christian Moral Discourse." *Lion and Lamb* 26 (Autumn 2000): 20–25.
- Rotman, Andy. "Buddhism and Hospitality: Expecting the Unexpected and Acting Virtuously." In Kearney and Taylor, *Hosting the Stranger*, 115–21.
- Sabet, Amr G. E. *Islam and the Political: Theory, Governance, and International Relations*. Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press, 2008.
- Sachedina, Abdulaziz. *Islam and the Challenge of Human Rights*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- . *The Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Sajdi, Dana. "The Dead and the City: The Limits of Hospitality in the Early Modern Levant." In Kearney and Taylor, *Hosting the Stranger*, 123–31.
- Sayilgan, Zeyneb. "Islamic Creation Theology and the Human Being as Migrant." In *The Meaning of My Neighbor's Faith: Interreligious Reflections on Immigration*, edited by Alexander Y. Hwang and Laura E. Alexander. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2018.
- Scott, Patrick. "Data Analysis: The True Scale of Immigration and Crime in Sweden in Five Charts." *Telegraph*, February 22, 2017. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/02/22/data-analysis-true-scale-immigration-crime-sweden-five-charts/>.
- Shani, Giorgio. *Sikh Nationalism and Identity in a Global Age*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

- Timani, Hussam S. "On Being a Muslim in a Non-Islamic Society: Seeing Islam in the 'Other.'" In *The Meaning of My Neighbor's Faith: Interreligious Reflections on Immigration*, edited by Alexander Y. Hwang and Laura E. Alexander. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2018.
- Timani, Hussam S., Allen G. Jorgenson, and Alexander Y. Hwang, eds. *Strangers in This World: Multireligious Reflections on Immigration*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2015.
- Tinker, George. *American Indian Liberation: A Theology of Sovereignty*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2008.
- Tri-Faith Initiative. <https://trifaith.org/>.
- Twiss, Sumner B., and Bruce Grelle, eds. *Explorations in Global Ethics: Comparative Religious Ethics and Interreligious Dialogue*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1999.
- United Nations, General Assembly. *The Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam*. A/CONF.157/PC/62/Add.18, June 9, 1993. <http://undocs.org/A/CONF.157/PC/62/Add.18>.
- . *2005 World Summit Outcome*. A/RES/60/1, October 24, 2005. http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_RES_60_1.pdf.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. "Figures at a Glance." UNHCR, 2017. Accessed December 7, 2017. <http://www.unhcr.org/en-us/figures-at-a-glance.html>.
- van Houten, Christiana. *The Alien in Israelite Law*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Witte, John, Jr., and M. Christian Green, eds. *Religion and Human Rights: An Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Wong, Jessica Wai-Fong. "The Christian Criteria for Assimilation: Racially Reading Christianity, Civility, and Social Belonging in the Modern Western World." In *The Meaning of My Neighbor's Faith: Interreligious Reflections on Immigration*, edited by Alexander Y. Hwang and Laura Alexander. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2018.
- Ziebertz, Hans-Georg, and Gordan Črpić, eds. *Religion and Human Rights: An International Perspective*. Cham: Springer, 2015.