

A Migrant Crisis: Does the prioritisation of citizens and restricting of economic migrants adhere to a Christian ethical view?

Andrew D Galpin

January 2018

A Research Paper submitted for the Degree of Master of Arts at Regents Theological College in part fulfilment
of the Modular Programme in Applied Theology. Reprinted with permission.

1 Introduction

Migration continues to be “an increasingly volatile and contentious political issue”.¹ Following the UK’s decision to leave the European Union this has only worsened. Immigration is now one of the leading areas of concern among people of low income and the issue perceived to be the most outside of their control.²

However, if we consider restricting migration and allowing sovereign-states to prioritise the needs of citizens over foreigners, we might assume that it conflicts with a Christian ethical perspective. We must, however, consider and understand the validity of these policies within the broader Christian ethical view and any potential conflicts within the opposing view. Otherwise, we risk damage to the unity of the church, as the divided opinion in culture begins to reflect in that of our church family. It appears that within a Christian ethical view there are grounds for a broader range of opinions on immigration policy including the belief that sovereign-states can restrict economic migration and prioritise the needs of citizens over the needs of foreign economic migrants. There are also several issues presented when reconciling the prevailing view.

2 Context and Definitions

In 2015, 244 million people resided in a country other than that of their birth.³ According to the UNHCR, at the end of 2015, there were 65.3 million “forcibly displaced”

individuals.⁴ In 2015, 40.8 million people were “internally displaced”, according to the IDMC.⁵ In other words, as a result of conflict and violence over 40 million people have been forced to move within their own country. 86% of refugees were hosted by developing nations (e.g. Turkey, Pakistan or Lebanon) leaving only 14% hosted by developed countries like the UK. This volume increased to 16% in 2016, with the overall number growing marginally to 65.6 million.⁶

In 2015, the volume of people migrating for economic reasons was over 178 million people.⁷ If you consider the UK individually, according to the UN over 9 million immigrants have made their home here,⁸ less than 2% of those are refugees.⁹ The word ‘migrant’ is often used as a catch-all term to refer to anyone migrating. The mainstream media in the UK prominently used ‘migrant’ when reporting on the aptly names ‘migrant crisis’ during 2014/15.¹⁰ This use of the word reflects the definition from the IOM (International Organisation for Migration) describing “the movement of a person or a group of persons, either across an international border or within a state”.¹¹ This definition includes economic migrants, refugees and asylum seekers alike. The main difference, as defined by Matthew Gibney, between a migrant and a refugee, is their genuine need for “the protection afforded by short or long-term asylum”.¹²

⁴ UNHCR, *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2015* (Geneva: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2016), accessed December 19, 2017, <http://www.unhcr.org/uk/statistics/unhcrstats/576408cd7/unhcr-global-trends-2015.html>.

⁵ Alexandra Bilak et al., *Global Report on Internal Displacement 2016* (Geneva: Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), 2016), <http://www.internal-displacement.org/asscts/publications/2016/2016-global-report-internal-displacement-IDMC.pdf>.

⁶ UNHCR, *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2016* (Geneva: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2017), accessed December 19, 2017, <http://www.unhcr.org/uk/statistics/unhcrstats/5943e8a34/global-trends-forced-displacement-2016.html>.

⁷ According to the IOM, with total migration estimated at 240 million (IOM) and the UNHCR, with forcible displaced people estimated at 65.3 million.

⁸ Department of Economic and Social Affairs, *International Migration Report 2015: Highlights* (New York: United Nations, 2016), accessed December 19, 2017, http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/publications/migrationreport/docs/MigrationReport2015_Highlights.pdf.

⁹ “Refugee Facts and Figures | British Red Cross,” *British Red Cross*, accessed December 22, 2017, <http://www.redcross.org.uk/What-we-do/Refugee-support/Refugee-facts-and-figures>. 118,995 refugees living in the UK, which is approximately 1.3% based on combining the figures with those from the UN previously stated.

¹⁰ Mike Berry, Inaki Garcia-Blanco, and Kerry Moore, “Press Coverage of the Refugee and Migrant Crisis in the EU: A Content Analysis of Five European Countries,” *United Nations High Commission for Refugees* (2015): 8, accessed October 17, 2017, <http://www.unhcr.org/protection/operations/56bb369e9/press-coverage-refugee->.

¹¹ “Key Migration Terms,” *International Organization for Migration*, last modified January 14, 2015, accessed December 22, 2017, <https://www.iom.int/key-migration-terms>.

¹² Mike Berry, Inaki Garcia-Blanco, and Kerry Moore, “Press Coverage of the Refugee and Migrant Crisis in the EU: A Content Analysis of Five European Countries,” *United Nations High*

¹ Daniel G. Groody, “Crossing the Divide: Foundations of a Theology of Migration and Refugees,” *Theological Studies* 70 (2009): 639.

² Eleanor Taylor, Charlotte Saunders, and Mari Toomse-Smith, *Social and Political Attitudes of People on Low Incomes 2017 Report* (NatCen Social Research, 2017), accessed December 19, 2017, <http://www.bsa.natcen.ac.uk/media/39207/social-and-political-attitudes-of-people-on-low-incomes-2017-full-report.pdf>.

³ Global Migration Data Analysis Centre, *Global Migration Trends Fact Sheet 2015* (Geneva: International Organization for Migration, 2016), accessed December 19, 2017, http://publications.iom.int/system/files/global_migration_trends_2015_factsheet.pdf.

This paper will use the term migrant to refer to those driven to migrate due to economic needs, such as low standard of living or job prospects. Economic migrants have an element of choice in their decision to migrate; and could be motivated more by the ‘pull’ factors of the receiving country, than the ‘push’ factors of the origin.¹³

This definition is in line with the definition for migrant used by the United Nations to describe people who

“choose to move not because of a direct threat of persecution or death, but mainly to improve their lives by finding work, or in some cases for education, family reunion, or other reasons”.¹⁴

3 Political Theory

Amstutz and Gibney focus on two of the most influential theories of migration. Amstutz defines these as communitarianism, where the state cares for all people, but prioritises the needs of their citizens; and cosmopolitanism, where individuals are given priority over the “sovereign rights of territorial states”.¹⁵ These classifications differ slightly to the two Gibney uses. Gibney focuses on what he refers to as partiality (or partialism) and impartiality (impartialism). Partiality reflects what Amstutz calls communitarianism without the explicit addition of the responsibilities of the state to everyone.¹⁶ Impartiality aligns with Amstutz description of cosmopolitanism, which favours what is also known as an ‘open borders’ approach. Impartiality also aligns with the theory of the ‘liberal abstract citizen’ referred to by William R. O’Neill and William C. Spohn.¹⁷ Communitarians agree with cosmopolitans on the right to emigration, where they differ, is the inclusion of a states right to prioritise citizens over foreigners, based on the policy defined.

Amstutz sets out his bias towards the communitarianism view, acknowledging that although as an ideal cosmopolitanism may work; in a “society of nation-states” this would be difficult to realise.¹⁸ He goes on to review the Catholic, Evangelical and other mainline Protestant approaches to immigration policy before concluding with his recommendations.

Commission for Refugees (2015), accessed October 17, 2017, <http://www.unhcr.org/protection/operations/56bb369e9/press-coverage-refugee->

¹³ Ibid., 11.

¹⁴ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, “UNHCR Viewpoint: ‘Refugee’ or ‘Migrant’ – Which Is Right?,” UNHCR, accessed December 22, 2017, <http://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2016/7/55d80e536/unhcr-viewpoint-refugee-migrant-right.html>.

¹⁵ Mark R. Amstutz, *Just Immigration: American Policy in Christian Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2017), 13.

¹⁶ Gibney, *The Ethics and Politics of Asylum*, 23.

¹⁷ William R. O’Neill and William C. Spohn, “Rights of Passage: The Ethics of Immigration and Refugee Policy,” *Theological Studies* 59 (1998): 84–106.

¹⁸ Amstutz, *Just Immigration*, 15.

Gibney, on the other hand, critically evaluates both approaches and then reviews the policy of Germany, the United Kingdom, the United States and Australia before bringing to two together to conclude with his theory.

3.1 Cosmopolitan

The cosmopolitan theory states that “the only legitimate admissions policy is one that takes into equal account the interests (or rights) of refugees, [migrants] and citizens”.¹⁹ Although Gibney refers specifically to refugees, his opening statement is referencing “other needy people”, which at its broadest definition, would include migrants.²⁰ This definition remains relevant to the broader definition of migrants, as Amstutz supports, defining cosmopolitanism as a “unitary global society in which the individual rights of people take precedence over the sovereign rights of territorial states”.²¹ Gibney suggests that the root of the cosmopolitan view of “universal justification” stems from the Christian idea that human beings are all members of the same, single community.²² Amstutz breaks it down further identifying symmetry of this approach with three beliefs within the Christian world-view.

Firstly, that the wellbeing of a person is above all else, this stems from the biblical concept of imago Dei, the idea that we are all made in the image of God and equally worthy of value and dignity. Tim Keller said it best, that “being made in the Image of God means we have an irreducible, objective worth and that everyone else does”.²³ Secondly, that because people are equally “entitled to dignity and equality” the international community is a “coherent ethical society”. Finally, because of this, people have the right to migrate.²⁴ As Pope Francis said, in reference to migration “on this continent, too, thousands of persons are led to travel north... in search of greater opportunities. Is this not what we want for our own children?”²⁵ This symmetry could suggest why many mainline Christian denominations appear to support this view.²⁶

Martha Nussbaum, a political theorist, emphasised the importance of cosmopolitanism in driving people’s views away from the nation and towards the international community;

¹⁹ Gibney, *The Ethics and Politics of Asylum*, 23.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Amstutz, *Just Immigration*, 13.

²² Gibney, *The Ethics and Politics of Asylum*, 64.

²³ Timothy Keller, *Generous Justice: How God’s Grace Makes Us Just* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2010), 82.

²⁴ Amstutz, *Just Immigration*, 97.

²⁵ “Full Text: Pope Francis’s Address to Congress,” *Catholic Herald Co.Uk*, last modified September 24, 2015, accessed December 22, 2017, <http://www.catholicherald.co.uk/news/2015/09/24/full-text-pope-franciss-address-to-congress/>.

²⁶ Amstutz, *Just Immigration*, chaps. 6–8. Covering Catholic, Evangelical and other mainline Protestant policy.

leading us towards the second belief of an ideal of globally agreed morals and a coherent ethical society.²⁷

3.2 Communitarian

The communitarian theory recognises

“states as distinct cultural communities possessing a right to self-determination which justifies priority for the interest of citizens over those of refugees [or migrants] in entrance decisions”.²⁸

Again this definition applies more broadly than just refugees, as Amstutz demonstrates “a society of nation-states in which the primary responsibility of such states is to protect and enhance the rights and well-being of its own people while also caring for all people”.²⁹ This theory stems from a belief that people have the right to express publically their “shared culture” or identity.³⁰ And to protect the formation and expression of an identity that is “based on belonging, and not on accomplishment”.³¹

Communitarians believe that the importance of the role that culture plays, in decision making, freedom, and identity formation, justifies the protection of that culture, and by extension, the prioritisation of citizens above migrants in immigration policy. Modern Catholic social teaching recognises the legitimacy of the state in regulating the level of immigration to serve the common good.³² Without empowering states with the right to distribute entrance, you threaten people’s ability to “protect and reproduce their cultural identity”. Withholding from them a part of themselves that is “essential to their sense of who they are”.³³ Paul Collier argues that community is an essential human need and the management of migration is important to maintaining “mutual regard” of one another.³⁴

If one of the motivating factors for immigration policy is to maintain the cultural identity of the state, then the obvious question arises: who is best placed to determine when a state’s cultural identity is under threat? Communitarians would establish this from the inside; that the people who make up the community should decide how best to protect

it.³⁵ As the strength of society, claims Charles Taylor, is based on the strength of the bonds developed between its citizens.³⁶

4 The Right Solution to the Right Problem

Migration can be the solution to many issues, but consideration is required to determine if migration should be the primary solution to most issues. Gibney seeks to explain that migration is more appropriate to situations of “persecution” or “life-threatening states of affairs” rather than just those seeking to escape poverty.³⁷ Aristide Zolberg commented that it would be fitting to differentiate between those who can be helped through humanitarian aid; and those where the “provision of a new state” would be more suitable.³⁸

We also should consider the problems created by increased migration into states. Stephen Macedo comments that when we don’t prioritise the needs of citizens over those of foreigners; it’s often the neediest citizens who suffer.³⁹ Access to jobs for low-income workers becomes difficult when you have an influx of immigrants who will work equally hard for the same jobs.⁴⁰ Similarly, immigration can also lead to inequality, as the Rand Institute on Education and Training demonstrated in their 1997 study; immigrants, although equally productive and matched in skill, were paid less than the native workers.⁴¹ Migrants could affect the ability of the state to maintain the basic level of need and the security of their citizens. Frederick Whelan takes it one step further quoting Thomas Jefferson, openly acknowledging that high levels of immigration would influence American polity and in Jefferson’s opinion this would “render it a heterogeneous, incoherent, distracted mass”.⁴²

Mass immigration, Paul Collier argues, can damage “social capital”; impairing societies’ ability to cooperate and trust one another. Governments need to take responsibility for managing international migration.⁴³ Without controls, we can end up upsetting the

³⁵ Gibney, *The Ethics and Politics of Asylum*, 30.

³⁶ Charles Taylor, “Why Democracy Needs Patriotism,” in *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, by Martha C. Nussbaum (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996), 120.

³⁷ Gibney, *The Ethics and Politics of Asylum*, 12.

³⁸ Aristide R. Zolberg, Astri Suhrke, and Sergio Aguayo, *Escape from Violence: Conflict and the Refugee Crisis in the Developing World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 270–1.

³⁹ Stephen Macedo, “The Moral Dilemma of U.S. Immigration Policy,” in *Debating Immigration*, ed. Carol M. Swain (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 74.

⁴⁰ Amstutz, *Just Immigration*, 105.

⁴¹ Georges Vernez, *New Immigrants, New Needs: The California Experience* (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 1997), accessed December 22, 2017, https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB8015.html.

⁴² Frederick Whelan, “Citizenship and Free Movement: An Open Admissions Policy,” in *Open Borders? Closed Societies?: The Ethical and Political Issues*, by Mark Gibney (Santa Barbara: Praeger, 1988), 18.

⁴³ Amstutz, *Just Immigration*, 105.

²⁷ Martha C. Nussbaum, “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism,” in *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996), 7.

²⁸ Gibney, *The Ethics and Politics of Asylum*, 23.

²⁹ Amstutz, *Just Immigration*, 13.

³⁰ Gibney, *The Ethics and Politics of Asylum*, 24.

³¹ Joseph Raz, *Ethics in the Public Domain: Essays in the Morality of Law and Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press, USA, 1996), 117.

³² O’Neill and Spohn, “Rights of Passage: The Ethics of Immigration and Refugee Policy,” 99.

³³ Gibney, *The Ethics and Politics of Asylum*, 31.

³⁴ Paul Collier, *Exodus: How Migration Is Changing Our World* (New York: Oxford University Press, USA, 2013), 61.

“happy medium” where both host country and those left behind benefit mutually from migration.⁴⁴

If a cosmopolitan ideal was adopted universally, it could call into question the level of protection states could offer those under persecution. If all are free to enter and leave at their will, what protection can we really provide?⁴⁵

5 The Bible: Moral Guidelines or Political Policy?

Amstutz states there are an underlying number factors at play in the formation of immigration policy by Christians. Although the Bible plays a definite role in this, we don't live in a theocracy, and it's often our differing views of the international community that help shape the differences in our approaches. This conclusion presents us with a question about the exact role of the Bible in the formation of policy.

The CRC (Christian Reformed Church) immigration study⁴⁶ and the National Association of Evangelicals' 2009 study on immigration both agreed that the Bible does not offer us a “blueprint of modern legislation”.⁴⁷ Faith and religion are very different to a political ideology. When considering the scope to which we are to apply the biblical narrative to the formation of immigration policy, it would be wise to recognise the Bibles' natural limitations in policy formation.

Daniel Carrol goes as far as saying that “there is no explicit teaching on immigration in the gospels”.⁴⁸ Attempts to do this are met with criticism by Amstutz in his review of Catholic, Evangelical and other mainline Protestant policy. Amstutz challenges evangelicals specifically for advocating “uneven and unbalanced use of scriptural norms... distort[ing] divine revelation... [and] potentially undermin[ing] the church's moral authority” within their policy.⁴⁹ Amstutz cites examples from the Southern Baptist Convention and Evangelical Covenant Church, both of which set out a clear biblical foundation to build from. Examining passages like Romans 13; and the areas of hospitality, government and church. They then proceed to make recommendations that aren't derived from the original foundation set out. In some cases, the recommendations outlined conflict with the biblical foundation previously established.⁵⁰ Amstutz references evangelicals support for the legalisation of unauthorised immigrants in the

name of mercy.⁵¹ This example conflicts with the principle already defined to obey authority and the stated responsibility of the government to control borders.⁵²

The Bible isn't prescriptive on policies. Instead, God offers through His Word, as John C. Bennett said, “ultimate perspectives, broad criteria, motives, inspirations, sensitivities, warnings, moral limits”.⁵³ Treating these as policies would be to extend them beyond the scope of their original intention. What they can do, is serve as a guide in the formation of political policy.

From this, we can conclude that it wouldn't be fair to place the Bible on the side of one specific political theory, regarding migration. What we can do is look at how each theory lines up with some of the principles prescribed within the biblical text.

6 Political Theory within the Broader Christian View

6.1 Government

The Bible gives us a clear mandate that governments are a morally legitimate authority in the lives of Christians. Philosopher Nicholas Wolterstorff demonstrates, after careful analysis of the biblical text, that governments were established “as part of God's providential care for his human creatures”.⁵⁴ In the Bible Jesus calls us to “render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's” (Matt. 22:21, (ESV)) and in 1 Timothy 2:1-2 Paul reminds us to be praying for those in government.

The Bible respects the role of government in our day to day lives. Where the Christian policy fails, in following a cosmopolitan theory, is in its tendency to “overemphasise social inclusion”.⁵⁵ Amstutz makes the point, in his review of Catholic, Evangelical and mainline Protestant policies; that they often go as far as “de-emphasis[ing] obedience to lawful authority”.⁵⁶ The church may exist without boundaries, but the states we each live within do not. Although our ultimate obedience as Christians is to God, the Bible also calls us to be obedient to those in authority.⁵⁷

Paul is clear, in his epistle to the Romans that “...every person [should] be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except God, and those that exist have been instituted by God” (Rom. 13:1). Exception from this is only found when the governing authorities contradict what God has said.⁵⁸ Peter is equally firm in his first letter stating that we should “be subject for the Lord's sake to every human institution,

⁴⁴ Collier, *Exodus*, chap. 12.

⁴⁵ Amstutz, *Just Immigration*, 101.

⁴⁶ *Committee to Study the Migration of Workers* (Christian Reformed Church, 2009), 11, accessed December 22, 2017, <https://www.crcna.org/sites/default/files/Migration.pdf>.

⁴⁷ “Immigration,” *National Association of Evangelicals*, last modified January 1, 2009, accessed December 22, 2017, <http://www.nac.net/immigration-2009/>.

⁴⁸ M. Daniel Carroll R., *Christians at the Border: Immigration, the Church, and the Bible* (Ada: Baker Academic, 2008), 123.

⁴⁹ Amstutz, *Just Immigration*, 131.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 132.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 179.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 177.

⁵³ John C. Bennett, *Foreign Policy in Christian Perspective* (New York: Scribner, 1966), 36.

⁵⁴ Nicholas Wolterstorff, “Theological Foundations for an Evangelical Political Philosophy,” in *Toward an Evangelical Public Policy: Political Strategies for the Health of the Nation*, by Ronald J. Sider and Diane Knippers (Ada: Baker Books, 2005), 160.

⁵⁵ Amstutz, *Just Immigration*, 104.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 117.

whether it be to the emperor as supreme, or to governors as sent by him..." (1 Pet. 2:13-14).

Although Christians would agree; cosmopolitan theorists would argue that the purpose of those in governments is to represent the "good of all people".⁵⁹ as Michael Oh argues. Oh does, however, recognise the limitation of the "geographic, authoritative, and location-specific limitations" of each governing body. If states were to apply a cosmopolitan approach to immigration, it would turn, what Michael Walzer refers to as, "affluent and free countries" into the state we currently observe at elite universities; where applications overrun them.⁶⁰

A cosmopolitan view can focus too much on the future "ideal" state of government where, as Oh describes; every nation will find its ultimate authority in God.⁶¹ O'Neill and Spohn argue that the heart of the cosmopolitan argument is the idea that "social obligations are moral only when they are autonomously assumed".⁶² The flaw in this, they continue, is demonstrated by a lack of will to submit more than the bare minimum of national sovereignty to organisations like the United Nations, or at a smaller level, the European Union. This scarcity, they claim, is because we have little confidence in the institutions ability to protect our individual rights.⁶³

As Christians, it's clear we are to be under the authority of those who govern. As a result, if the Bible doesn't provide clear guidelines in areas such as immigration (which it doesn't); and if the policy determined by the governing authority isn't in contrary with scripture; then there are grounds to accepting, as Christians, the policy defined by the ruling authority.

6.2 Diversity

Right from Genesis to Revelation the Bible demonstrates a commitment to diversity. But diversity, if it is to be maintained, needs to be protected. God's promise to Abraham in Genesis 12:3 speaks of the blessing of all the *peoples* of the earth, through Abraham. God's plan, outlined in Genesis 22:18, was always to use Israel as a nation to bless *other* nations.

⁵⁹ Michael Oh, "The Purpose and Role of Government | ESV.Org," *ESV Bible*, accessed December 21, 2017, <https://www.esv.org/resources/esv-global-study-Bible/the-purpose-and-role-of-government/>.

⁶⁰ Michael Walzer, *Spheres Of Justice: A Defense Of Pluralism And Equality* (New York: Basic Books, 1983), 32.

⁶¹ Oh, "The Purpose and Role of Government | ESV.Org."

⁶² O'Neill and Spohn, "Rights of Passage: The Ethics of Immigration and Refugee Policy," 92.

⁶³ Ibid.

In Revelation 21:3, the Greek, Piper suggests, speaks of God's 'peoples', not 'people', again reinforcing that diversity is part of God's plan.⁶⁴ Although only a small number of translations reflect this; Piper backs up his claim with mainstream NRSV bible and quotes commentaries from "Heinrich Kraft, Leon Morris, Robert Mounce, and G.K. Beale".⁶⁵ This rendering of the text highlights the presence of multiple people groups in Luke's revelation of the end times; that God would dwell among numerous people groups; as opposed to a single people group.

The danger the cosmopolitan theory poses to diversity is summed up, although in an exaggerated example, by Myron Weiner. Weiner goes on to say that if a group, more extensive than the residing population of Burma were to migrate, it would substantially change the cultural and political landscape of that country. Burma would change so dramatically, that it would "no longer be Burma".⁶⁶ Controlling, or limiting immigration is essentially to protect the existing cultural and political landscapes of different states, and maintaining diversity.

Amstutz points out that the way we live life in community expresses elements of our humanity. He goes on to suggest that the proximity of these social ties influences their strength, and concludes by saying that being a member of these communities is highly significant to our well-being. The well-being of all people, as previously discussed, is incredibly important within the Christian ethical view.⁶⁷

6.3 Citizenship

Modern society uses the legal status of citizenship to maintain and protect access to the state. Cosmopolitan political science Professor Joseph Carens argues that citizenship is not too dissimilar to the medieval "feudal status".⁶⁸ Assigned at birth, Carens continues that it has a "major impact" on the opportunities that person has in life and that the individual is practically unable to change it.⁶⁹ Although an agreement with Carens conclusions can be found within the Christian worldview; Christians wouldn't necessarily draw the same negative findings.

As Amstutz recognises in Protestant political ethics, Protestants believe that God is sovereign over all created things, whether people or nations.⁷⁰ Protestants also hold to the belief of God's providence, that God has placed each of us in a specific time and place

⁶⁴ John Piper, *Let the Nations Be Glad! The Supremacy Of God In Missions*, 3rd ed. (Ada: Baker Academic, 2010), 221.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 208.

⁶⁶ Gibney, *The Ethics and Politics of Asylum*, 28.

⁶⁷ Amstutz, *Just Immigration*, 100.

⁶⁸ Joseph H. Carens, "Migration and Morality: A Liberal Egalitarian Perspective," in *Free Movement*, ed. Brian Barry and Robert E. Goodin (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), 26.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Amstutz, *Just Immigration*, 116.

for a particular purpose. A view that Calvinist Bible teacher, John MacArthur, describes in detail in his sermon on the book of Esther.⁷¹ Throughout the events recorded in the book of Esther, we see demonstrated God's divine providence; or as MacArthur put it, "behind this richly played out labyrinth of events is divine providence".⁷²

The cosmopolitan could argue that to prioritise the needs of a citizen over that of a foreigner calls into question the principle morally equivalency. But differentiating between "obligations to citizens and responsibilities to foreigners", according to Amstutz, does not conflict with maintaining this principle.⁷³ Instead, migration policy should both advance the interests of citizens and take into account the needs of foreigners.⁷⁴

When considering the issue of migration, citizenship, or where one should live; we can't be distracted as Christians from the core truth, that our ultimate allegiance is to God alone. Beyond, as Daniel Groody puts it, "any national and political boundaries".⁷⁵ But this doesn't detract from our dual-citizenship and our need to recognise the modern world we live in; one very much cemented in a system of sovereign nation-states.

The author of Hebrews and Paul seeks to explain this in Hebrews 13:14 and Philippians 3:20 respectively.⁷⁶ Recognising our dual citizenship – that of both our temporal home in the country we reside in and our eternal home as citizens of heaven.

Saint Augustine made this principle famous in his fifth century works "The City of God".⁷⁷ In the "City of Man", on earth, we are reliant on power, rules and authority to maintain order. Whereas in the City of God it's the love of God alone that maintains order. The ongoing conflict of nature and citizenship for Christians makes it difficult to differentiate between our responsibilities to the church and the state.⁷⁸ We must build immigration policy based on what maintains order in the City of Man. Liberals like Joseph H. Carens argue that despite this, we should continue to evaluate our current reality "in light of our highest ideals".⁷⁹ Which often leads us into more of a discussion around the ideal state, rather than one of practical policy we can implement. Benjamin Barber counters that although the destination is agreeable, the driving force of

cosmopolitanism as a political destination won't meet our innate human needs for things like community, culture, nationality, or identity.⁸⁰

6.4 Love

The Catechisms of the Catholic Church teach that we must "make ourselves the neighbour to absolutely every other person". In Luke 10:25-37 we have Jesus teaching on hospitality and compassion through the parable of the Good Samaritan. Cosmopolitans using this argument like this to emphasise the rights of all people to that hospitality, regardless of their legal status. But these alone are not strong principles from which to build good immigration policy. As Amstutz states "hospitality to strangers and compassion for migrants are inadequate pillars on which to build immigration policy".⁸¹

Thomas Aquinas makes the point in his teaching of Jesus' command to love thy neighbour that we must distinguish between our general obligations of neighbourhood love and our special obligations to love.⁸² Our responsibilities to strangers differ from our responsibilities to our brothers. We are still called to love everyone, but what that love looks like, Aquinas emphasises, is different. Aquinas speaks of the priority given to those closest to us, with the specific honour we are called to give to our parents (Exo. 20:12)⁸³ and the priority we are to give to our families (1 Tim. 5:8).⁸⁴

Reinhold Niebuhr argued that "Law of love" alone, is a poor, even heretical, theology and political ideology. To preach a gospel of love in the absence of our sinfulness is to preach no gospel at all. Love alone, without a recognition of human sinfulness, is insufficient to build and sustain human community.⁸⁵ It's in this recognition of our sinfulness that God ordains government to "sustain communal order and foster social and political justice".⁸⁶

6.5 Human Nature

Sin is universal. Romans 3:23 says we are all fallen; while at the same time in the next verse it states that Christians have been justified (Rom 3:24). Sin compromises us all. We must be wary of, and pursue political involvement with humility, recognising our natural

⁷¹ John MacArthur, "Esther: For Such a Time As This," *Grace to You*, last modified 2012, accessed December 22, 2017, <https://www.gty.org/library/sermons-library/80-392>.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Amstutz, *Just Immigration*, 102.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Groody, "Crossing the Divide: Foundations of a Theology of Migration and Refugees," 660.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 661.

⁷⁷ Saint Augustine, *The City of God*, trans. Marcus Dods (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009).

⁷⁸ Amstutz, *Just Immigration*, 122.

⁷⁹ O'Neill and Spohn, "Rights of Passage: The Ethics of Immigration and Refugee Policy," 94.

⁸⁰ Benjamin R. Barber, "Constitutional Faith," in *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, by Martha C. Nussbaum (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996), 36.

⁸¹ Amstutz, *Just Immigration*, xi.

⁸² Thomas Aquinas, "Question 26. The Order of Charity," in *The Summa Theologiae of St. Thomas Aquinas*, 2nd ed., 1920, sec. 6, accessed December 22, 2017, <http://www.newadvent.org/summa/3026.htm#article6>.

⁸³ Ibid., 8.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 7.

⁸⁵ Reinhold Niebuhr, "Why the Christian Church Is Not Pacifist," in *The Essential Reinhold Niebuhr: Selected Essays and Addresses*, ed. Robert McAfee Brown (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 111.

⁸⁶ Amstutz, *Just Immigration*, 120.

lean toward self-love and pride, as Reinhold Niebuhr put it.⁸⁷ We must remember the critical role sovereign-states play in guarding against the decisions and sinful motives of individuals and collectives alike.

The weakness of the cosmopolitan theory is that it fails to account for the Bible teaching on the multiple dimensions of human nature. To focus on one aspect of human nature, our ability to love or to be generous, as John Stott describes it, “the glory of humanness”, would support the cosmopolitan view well.⁸⁸ But that’s only half the picture. The recognition of the Bible that “all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God” (Rom 3:23) adds an element of difficulty to the idealistic view of the cosmopolitan.

7 Conclusion

After considering the role of the Bible and some critical areas within it, we can conclude that there are grounds within the Christian ethical view for a broader range of ideals outside that of the cosmopolitan. This range of ideals includes that of the communitarian; who believes that the sovereign-states should be able to restrict migration and prioritise the needs of citizens over the needs of foreign migrants.

For this reason, we must make room within our church walls, and our culture for people who hold a view on migration closer aligning to that of a communitarian. Accepting that the Bible does not prescribe immigration policy or provide a clear-cut view of our approach; and that the cosmopolitan view also presents Christians with a number of problems. An open and accepting view of multiple opinions would lead to a more fruitful and positive impact on relations within and outside the church. Acceptance would also lead to the development of better solutions for migrants and citizens alike as policy is formed from a broader perspective.

However, further research is needed to understand the limits of the communitarian view from the perspective of economic migration; or in the formation of our policy toward refugees and asylum seekers. Gibney strongly criticises the appearance of hostility towards refugees and asylum seekers alike within the communitarian theory.⁸⁹ Only then could we begin formulating an opinion on what Christian migration policy should look like.

⁸⁷ Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man: A Christian Interpretation: Human Nature*, vol. 1 (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 16.

⁸⁸ John Stott, (1994) as quoted in Amstutz, *Just Immigration*, 101.

⁸⁹ Gibney, *The Ethics and Politics of Asylum*, 34–35.

8 Bibliography

- Amstutz, Mark R. *Just Immigration: American Policy in Christian Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2017.
- Aquinas, Thomas. “Question 26. The Order of Charity.” In *The Summa Theologiae of St. Thomas Aquinas*. 2nd ed., 1920. Accessed December 22, 2017. <http://www.newadvent.org/summa/3026.htm#article6>.
- Augustine, Saint. *The City of God*. Translated by Marcus Dods. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009.
- Barber, Benjamin R. “Constitutional Faith.” In *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, by Martha C. Nussbaum. Boston: Beacon Press, 1996.
- Bennett, John C. *Foreign Policy in Christian Perspective*. New York: Scribner, 1966.
- Berry, Mike, Inaki Garcia-Blanco, and Kerry Moore. “Press Coverage of the Refugee and Migrant Crisis in the EU: A Content Analysis of Five European Countries.” *United Nations High Commission for Refugees* (2015). Accessed October 17, 2017. <http://www.unhcr.org/protection/operations/56bb369c9/press-coverage-refugee->.
- Bilak, Alexandra, Gabriel Cardona-Fox, Justin Ginnetti, Elizabeth J. Rushing, Isabelle Scherer, Marita Swain, Nadine Walicki, and Michelle Yonetani. *Global Report on Internal Displacement 2016*. Geneva: Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), 2016. <http://www.internal-displacement.org/assets/publications/2016/2016-global-report-internal-displacement-IDMC.pdf>.
- Carens, Joseph H. “Migration and Morality: A Liberal Egalitarian Perspective.” In *Free Movement*, edited by Brian Barry and Robert E. Goodin. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992.
- Carroll R., M. Daniel. *Christians at the Border: Immigration, the Church, and the Bible*. Ada: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Collier, Paul. *Exodus: How Migration Is Changing Our World*. New York: Oxford University Press, USA, 2013.
- Department of Economic and Social Affairs. *International Migration Report 2015: Highlights*. New York: United Nations, 2016. Accessed December 19, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/publications/migrationreport/docs/MigrationReport2015_Highlights.pdf.
- Gibney, Matthew. *J. The Ethics and Politics of Asylum: Liberal Democracy and the Response to Refugees*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Global Migration Data Analysis Centre. *Global Migration Trends Fact Sheet 2015*. Geneva: International Organization for Migration, 2016. Accessed December 19, 2017. http://publications.iom.int/system/files/global_migration_trends_2015_factsheet.pdf.
- Groody, Daniel G. “Crossing the Divide: Foundations of a Theology of Migration and Refugees.” *Theological Studies* 70 (2009): 638–668.
- Keller, Timothy. *Generous Justice: How God’s Grace Makes Us Just*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2010.

- MacArthur, John. "Esther: For Such a Time As This." *Grace to You*. Last modified 2012. Accessed December 22, 2017. <https://www.gty.org/library/sermons-library/80-392>.
- Macedo, Stephen. "The Moral Dilemma of U.S. Immigration Policy." In *Debating Immigration*, edited by Carol M. Swain. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. *The Nature and Destiny of Man: A Christian Interpretation: Human Nature*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.
- . "Why the Christian Church Is Not Pacifist." In *The Essential Reinhold Niebuhr: Selected Essays and Addresses*, edited by Robert McAfee Brown. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism." In *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1996.
- Oh, Michael. "The Purpose and Role of Government | ESV.Org." *ESV Bible*. Accessed December 21, 2017. <https://www.esv.org/resources/esv-global-study-bible/the-purpose-and-role-of-government/>.
- O'Neill, William R., and William C. Spohn. "Rights of Passage: The Ethics of Immigration and Refugee Policy." *Theological Studies* 59 (1998): 84–106.
- Piper, John. *Let the Nations Be Glad! The Supremacy Of God In Missions*. 3rd ed. Ada: Baker Academic, 2010.
- Raz, Joseph. *Ethics in the Public Domain: Essays in the Morality of Law and Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press, USA, 1996.
- Taylor, Charles. "Why Democracy Needs Patriotism." In *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, by Martha C. Nussbaum. Boston: Beacon Press, 1996.
- Taylor, Eleanor, Charlotte Saunders, and Mari Toomse-Smith. *Social and Political Attitudes of People on Low Incomes 2017 Report*. NatCen Social Research, 2017. Accessed December 19, 2017. <http://www.bs.natcen.ac.uk/media/39207/social-and-political-attitudes-of-people-on-low-incomes-2017-full-report.pdf>.
- UNHCR. *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2015*. Geneva: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2016. Accessed December 19, 2017. <http://www.unhcr.org/uk/statistics/unherstats/576408cd7/unhcr-global-trends-2015.html>.
- . *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2016*. Geneva: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2017. Accessed December 19, 2017. <http://www.unhcr.org/uk/statistics/unherstats/5943e8a34/global-trends-forced-displacement-2016.html>.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. "UNHCR Viewpoint: 'Refugee' or 'Migrant' – Which Is Right?" *UNHCR*. Accessed December 22, 2017. <http://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2016/7/55d0e556/unhcr-viewpoint-refugee-migrant-right.html>.
- Vernez, Georges. *New Immigrants, New Needs: The California Experience*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 1997. Accessed December 22, 2017. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB8015.html.
- Walzer, Michael. *Spheres Of Justice: A Defense Of Pluralism And Equality*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.
- Whelan, Frederick. "Citizenship and Free Movement: An Open Admissions Policy." In *Open Borders? Closed Societies?: The Ethical and Political Issues*, by Mark Gibney. Santa Barbara: Praeger, 1988.
- Wolterstorff, Nicholas. "Theological Foundations for an Evangelical Political Philosophy." In *Toward an Evangelical Public Policy: Political Strategies for the Health of the Nation*, by Ronald J. Sider and Diane Kruppers. Ada: Baker Books, 2005.
- Zolberg, Aristide R., Astri Suhrke, and Sergio Aguayo. *Escape from Violence: Conflict and the Refugee Crisis in the Developing World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Committee to Study the Migration of Workers*. Christian Reformed Church, 2009. Accessed December 22, 2017. <https://www.crcna.org/sites/default/files/Migration.pdf>.
- "Full Text: Pope Francis's Address to Congress." *Catholic-Herald.Co.Uk*. Last modified September 24, 2015. Accessed December 22, 2017. <http://www.catholicherald.co.uk/news/2015/09/24/full-text-pope-franciss-address-to-congress/>.
- "Immigration." *National Association of Evangelicals*. Last modified January 1, 2009. Accessed December 22, 2017. <http://www.nae.net/immigration-2009/>.
- "Key Migration Terms." *International Organization for Migration*. Last modified January 14, 2015. Accessed December 22, 2017. <https://www.iom.int/key-migration-terms>.
- "Refugee Facts and Figures | British Red Cross." *British Red Cross*. Accessed December 22, 2017. <http://www.redcross.org.uk/What-we-do/Refugee-support/Refugee-facts-and-figures>.