

An Algerian and Aotearoa: Global ‘Aliens and Strangers’ and the Ethic of Hospitality

Andrew Shepherd

*A paper for presentation at the Australian Missiology Conference,
Melbourne, 26 to 30 September 2005*

At the beginning of the 21st century we live, so we are told, in a ‘global village’. With the emergence of a ‘global market’, we have the “establishment of the one and only world-system there has ever been”,¹ a world in which *all* people are gathered up and included in an economic system offering benefits and opportunities for all.

But despite the celebration of the new all-inclusive global-village/market many would argue that “the undeniable progress of inclusion” is built upon “the persistent practice of exclusion.”² In his book *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation*, Miroslav Volf suggests that there are three modes of exclusion that operate in the world: exclusion as *elimination* or in its more benign form as *assimilation*; exclusion as *domination*; and exclusion as *abandonment*. Volf’s categorisation of modes of exclusion provides a useful way of thinking about our current global reality and of understanding the plight of those who live as ‘aliens and strangers’, on the margins of global civil society.

In the new ‘global village’ our differences are subsumed and *assimilated* into our primary identity, as *producers* and *consumers* in the global world market. Perhaps the best representation of this *assimilation* is the new class of ‘international traveller’: the international migrant worker. These international migrants³, predominantly from ‘developing’ countries are critical to the functioning of the global economy. They are attracted to ‘industrialized/developed’ countries where economic rewards are greater and provide the cheap and unskilled labour required in industrialized economies, simultaneously assisting their ‘home’ economies through the sending back of remittances.⁴

Meanwhile, it could be argued that in the four years post 9/11 we have seen exclusion as *domination* come to the fore in the use of pre-emptive military power by the United States. Afghanistan and Iraq are brought, through the process of *liberation* (read *domination*) out of international exile and into the global economy, their oil, gas and other natural resources now available to trans-national corporations. Thus, in ignoring national boundaries and sovereignty, neo-liberal markets and neo-conservative foreign policy achieve the same result of ‘enforced inclusivism’.

But what happens to those who cannot contribute to this all-inclusive global system, who are unable or unwilling to participate as *consumers* or *producers*? Volf writes:

If others neither have the goods we want nor can perform the services we need, we make sure that they are at a *safe distance* and close ourselves off from them so that their emaciated and tortured bodies can make no inordinate claim on us.⁵

While international migrants are *assimilated* and ‘rogue nations’ *dominated*; global refugees, fleeing from the violence, oppression, and starvation that often wrack their countries are *abandoned*.

But if we live in a ‘global village’ in which we are all inter-connected how does one keep ‘the other’ at a *safe distance*? There is a chilling poignancy in a prophetic passage written over a decade ago by Jacques Attali:

By 2050, 8 billion people will populate the earth. More than two-thirds will live in the poorest countries. Seeking to escape their desperate fate, millions will attempt to leave behind their misery to seek a decent life elsewhere. But neither the Pacific nor the European spheres will accept the majority of poor nomads. They will close their borders to immigrants. Quotas will be erected and restrictions imposed. (Renewed) social norms will ostracize foreigners. Like the fortified cities of the Middle Ages, the centres of privilege will construct barriers of all kinds, trying to protect their wealth.⁶

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, Attali’s frightening vision of the future is being played out before our eyes. Disturbingly, at the same time as U.S. foreign policy and the ‘war on terror’⁷ exacerbates violence and instability in certain regions, contributing to a diaspora of global refugees, its domestic policy becomes more stringent, restricting access to the ‘land of freedom’ for would-be asylum seekers and refugees. This action of tightening restrictions for asylum-seekers is not unique to the United States but is a global phenomenon.⁸

The ‘gated-community’ phenomenon, characteristic in many cities of the world, would appear now to be the model being applied nationally and internationally. Global refugees and asylum-seekers are the ‘aliens and strangers’ of the 21st century: unsafe in their violence-wracked homelands and unwelcome in the ‘lands of plenty’.

But what about at the periphery of the village? Surely the further from the centre the less hold the system has on its citizens. While *domination* and *abandonment* of ‘the other’ may be norm at the centre of the village, is there more hope on the edges?

The Journey of a Global Stranger:

Since leaving his homeland he had sojourned for almost a decade, through countries across three continents, in search of a place of ‘welcome’ for himself and his family. Eventually his travels brought him to an isolated nation located at the bottom of the world – a series of islands caught between the broad expanse of the Pacific and the frigidity of the Southern Ocean.

Arriving into the country on the morning of December 4th, 2002, his first action, after posting a letter to his wife and family informing them of his safe arrival, was to locate a police officer and indicate that he was seeking asylum. After a six hour wait an interpreter arrived and he underwent a first interview with an Immigration official and completed a refugee application. The ‘stranger’ fitted the “*particular 'profile' which customs officers are trained to look for in terms of suspected terrorists, which includes aspects of race and*

other indicia”⁹, and therefore after forty-eight hours of travel, twelve hours of waiting, and now, with no interpreter present, he underwent further questioning and searching of his luggage and person. Finally, at 2.30am he was taken to the police station at the airport to spend his first night in his new ‘home’ of Aotearoa/New Zealand.

The experience of Ahmed Zaoui, an Algerian exile, provides a fascinating case study of the factors at work against ‘aliens and strangers’ in our globalised world. It also reveals how our response to the plight of such individuals has the potential to change not merely their lives, but also our lives, and the potential to create a more ‘civil’ global society.

Zaoui, an Algerian academic-intellectual, was a member of *Front Islamique du Salut* (FIS), a moderate Islamic party that swept municipal and legislative elections in Algeria in 1990 and 1991 and appeared destined to become government until a military crackdown in 1991 ensured this did not eventuate. Forced to flee from Algeria as FIS members and supporters were arrested, imprisoned, tortured or ‘disappeared’, Zaoui and his family had sojourned through Morocco, France, Belgium, Switzerland, Burkino Faso, Ghana and finally Malaysia, in search of asylum. Back in Algeria, courts found Zaoui guilty *in absentia* of ‘terrorist’ activities, sentencing him to death on three occasions.

In each country Zaoui and his family entered a similar pattern ensued. With no official status and therefore no access to employment possibilities or support, the family would seek to ‘survive’ while repeatedly attempting, unsuccessfully, to gain official refugee/asylum status. In mid-2002, based in Malaysia, Zaoui became aware that plans may be afoot by the Algerian regime to detain him and return him to Algeria. Familiar with the *Tampa*¹⁰ case and the response of the NZ Prime Minister in this incident, Zaoui concluded that NZ was an ideal place to seek refuge.

Arriving in Aotearoa/New Zealand, Zaoui was soon to discover that even at the end of the world, the ‘siege and war’ rhetoric, increasingly prevalent in the ‘global village’, still existed. Despite its isolation, NZ’s understanding and interpretation of the world is still shaped by the perspectives of international media¹¹ and, post 9/11, a new vocabulary has emerged. With the declaration of the ‘war on terror’, the inclusive language of the ‘global village’ and ‘global citizenry’ has been replaced by the exclusionary ‘us and them’ language comprised of juxtaposed idioms such as ‘good and evil’, ‘civilization and tyranny’, ‘lovers of freedom and religious fanatics’, ‘holy wars and extremist violence’. In such a climate, ‘global aliens and strangers’ are no longer unfortunate victims of the global system to be shown compassion, but are feared as potential ‘terrorists’, or ‘security threats’.

While Zaoui remained in solitary confinement in a maximum security prison, and his lawyers engaged themselves in the legal process to gain him refugee status, local media speculated about the background and character of the detained ‘terrorist’. In the days following Zaoui’s arrival an article in the NZ Herald newspaper stated: “The name Ahmed Zaoui is linked to terrorist cells that have carried out bombings, beheadings and throat slitting from Algeria to France. The name crops up in connection with Osama bin Laden’s suspected Southeast Asian army...”. Drawing on internet sources, the “Militant Muslim”, the article suggests, may “be one of the leaders of the shadowy Armed Islamic Group (GIA)”, an organization whose

members allegedly “have carried out numerous assassinations, and not only of political figures. Among their targets were journalists, intellectuals, a psychiatrist, a singer, priests, other Christians, foreigners and many more.”¹²

After Zaoui’s initial refugee application was declined on January 30th, 2003 he immediately lodged an appeal with the Refugee Status Appeals Authority who delivered their report on August 1st, 2003. The Authority granted Zaoui refugee status and criticised Zaoui’s treatment at the hands of the media, Immigration Service and the prison system. Their broadside aimed at the NZ media decried the “inappropriate coverage of the appellant's presence in New Zealand as a refugee status claimant”, which threatened to pre-determine and undermine the legal process. They also criticized the role media had played in creating a story of “untruths”, stating:

The emergence of such untruths in New Zealand lends weight to the appellant’s contention that many of his problems over recent years stem from Western journalists’ and officials’ ignorance of Algeria and their preconceptions and fears about Islamic ‘terrorists’. The same untruths also constitute further instances of an important theme that has emerged from our consideration of the evidence, namely the process by which highly prejudicial misinformation concerning the appellant quickly acquires the status of received ‘facts’ – a process reinforced by the diffusion and recycling of these ‘facts’ by the media/internet as well as between intelligence services and immigration and other officials in a range of countries. As we have also seen, the creation of misinformation in respect of the appellant has been an intentional strategy of the Algerian regime and its allies in the ‘eradicator’ press. The regime’s misinformation has been disseminated through direct contacts with foreign, especially French, security and other officials as well as via the media for nearly a decade. The process remains ongoing. What has changed is the extension of the old “GIA” discourse to include a new post-September 11 “al-Qaeda” discourse, the Algerian regime’s propaganda, as always, being finely tuned to Western anxieties, and misconceptions, about the ‘Islamic threat’.¹³

While many suggest that new forms of media and information are powerful democratising tools in the hands of civil society, the Zaoui case in Aotearoa/New Zealand suggests that the salvific nature assigned to contemporary media may be seriously exaggerated. The global nature of media and information may well provide avenues for dissent and ‘truth-telling’ but it also provides an ideal system for disinformation and propaganda.¹⁴ Even on the edges of the ‘global village’ the discourse of exclusion has a powerful influence, imperceptibly entering our vocabulary and shaping the perceptions and attitudes of politicians, media, and civil society at large, all to the detriment of ‘aliens and strangers’. Volf notes the way that exclusionary practices are predicated on the use of exclusionary language stating “exclusionary practices would either not work at all or would work much less smoothly if it were not for the fact that they are supported by exclusionary language and cognition.”¹⁵

But is the exclusionary behaviour of *abandonment* simply the fault of the exclusionary rhetoric articulated by media and politicians? While media and politicians do have an important role in the shaping of public perceptions, citizens are still ‘free agents’. Media and politicians admittedly use exclusionary language for their own gain (whether that be the sale of newspapers or the gaining of political power), but to suggest that they possess an

‘Orwellian-like’ ability to ‘control’ the attitudes and behaviour of civil society is an overstatement. The question remains, why is it that the general public so easily digest the exclusionary languages and practices of our societies? Why does the misinformation and fear-mongering of media and politicians strike a chord with us? The problem, I suggest, has less to do with media or political and social arrangements and more to do with *us* – the social agents of our civil society.¹⁶

Understanding Inhospitability:

The image of Aotearoa/New Zealand presented to the world (and the image that attracted Zaoui) is one of multi-culturalism / racial harmony and egalitarianism. In day to day life the peaceful, multicultural environment and relatively harmonious race relations point to a country secure with its own identity. But periodically this myth is betrayed by incidents which we would like to believe are aberrations, but which suggest a deeper disquiet.¹⁷ Insecurity around issues of identity is heightened by ‘aliens and strangers’ whose presence “blur[s] accepted boundaries, disturbs our identities, and disarranges our symbolic cultural maps.”¹⁸ Such insecurity is fertile soil for the growth of fear. This fear then manifests itself in either violent attack on the one making us ‘uncomfortable’ or in a withdrawal from the world. Both responses make the welcome of the ‘alien and stranger’ an impossibility.

As well as *fear*, I suggest that the lack of engagement with ‘global aliens and strangers’ stems from *indifference*. Though geographically isolated, New Zealanders pride themselves on their knowledge and understanding of the world. As a people we are well-travelled and well informed, yet the living of self-sufficient and relatively affluent lives breeds indifference to the plight of others.

While *fear* and *indifference* are important factors explaining why people (in Aotearoa/New Zealand and globally) fail to engage with the plight of ‘global aliens and strangers’, a third factor may be, as Volf suggests, that “we desire *what others have*. More often than not, we exclude because in a world of scarce resources and contested power we want to secure possessions and wrest the power from others.”¹⁹ Following both Volf and Attali’s insight, is it fair to conclude that the erecting of legal fences (such as tougher anti-asylum legislation) and literal fences by governments, is less due to *fear* and *indifference*, and stems more from pure *selfishness*?

If this is the case, then what ethical response is required? How do we respond practically to the ‘aliens and strangers’ of our global society, but also how do we conscientize the *fearful*, *indifferent* and *selfish* citizens who inhabit our societies? What behaviour do we need to cultivate to ensure our global society does not collapse into a new feudalism, but is a ‘world for all’? Central to our ethical response, I propose, is an understanding and practice of the traditional concept of hospitality.

Jesus & Hospitality:

Hospitality as an ethical virtue and imperative occurs throughout the Christian scriptures.²⁰ At the heart of these Scriptures is the figure of Jesus. In the narratives of his birth, life and death we find the material for a theology of hospitality that shapes our ethical response both to the ‘alien and stranger’ and to our *fear*, *indifference* and *selfishness*.

In the prologue of John’s gospel the author writes:

“*The Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us*” (John 1:14)

In contrast to the world of information saturation, the Triune God breaks through the chaos of rhetoric and comes to us in human form. The author’s allusions to the tabernacle (Ex. 25:8) and the tent of meeting (Ex. 33:7) take on a new poignancy in a world of refugees. The *logos*, through whom the universe was created, enters the world not in the form of dominating or exclusionary discourse but rather as a transient sojourner. The same Triune God who journeyed with the people of Israel in the harshness of the desert is born into an unwelcoming world, infused by the violence and political turmoil of occupied Palestine. Matthew’s gospel vividly portrays the instability, danger and inhospitable nature of this context, recounting Jesus’ birth and then his escape from the infanticide about to sweep the region. (Matthew 2:13-18) While in Genesis 18 the Triune God experiences hospitality at the hands of Abraham, Jesus’ entry into the world is characterised by inhospitality and violence reminiscent of Sodom (Genesis 19). Jesus’ experience as ‘guest’ in the world is marked by uncertainty, fear, and homelessness – emotions shared by many in the contemporary world who dwell under the canvas tents of refugee camps.

Jesus’ ministry is characterised by a new sort of hospitality. In contrast to the social conventions of the time in which hospitality increased the prestige and status of hosts and reinforced obligations on guests, Jesus’ actions (accepting and sharing hospitality with those considered ‘aliens and strangers’ such as lepers, tax collectors, Gentiles, women and prostitutes) blurred the established boundaries between ‘guest’ and ‘host’, and created relationships built on reciprocity and mutual respect.

This authentic hospitality, *divine* hospitality, is most powerfully demonstrated at the very place where humanity’s inhospitality appears to have reached its nadir: the Cross. In the creation narrative of Genesis the Triune God is the *host* who suffers at the hands of his ungracious garden-guests; in the incarnation he comes as *guest* into the world and suffers the violence of an inhospitable world. In the Cross these roles of violated *host* and *guest* are merged. On the cross Jesus is the representative ‘alien and stranger’, the refugee, and *guest*, who seeks to ‘dwell among us’, and yet who faces abuse, rejection and exclusion. Simultaneously, as the divine, though unrecognized *host*, he is dishonoured and shamed.

The Triune God experiences rejection as both the world’s *host* and *guest*, and yet it is in Jesus’ open arms of embrace on the cross that the inhospitality and violence of the world is overcome. Faced with the “self-donating” love of the suffering *host-guest*, the inhospitality of the world is exposed.—Forgiveness is offered, nevertheless, to the very guests who have engaged in violence and abuse, and these guests are welcomed once again to experience the divine hospitality of God.

This movement within the biblical narrative of the Triune God as *host* (in the doctrine of creation), to *guest* (the doctrine of incarnation) and then *guest-host* (the doctrine of salvation) is encapsulated in the Emmaus road story contained in Luke’s gospel. In the story, the resurrected Jesus joins two of his followers on the road from Jerusalem to Emmaus. The disciples, though having journeyed with Jesus through his ministry, do not recognize him.²¹ It is to a *stranger* that they pour out their perception of recent events, shaped by fear and confusion, but also by selfish, nationalistic and liberationist interests (24:21 “*we had hoped that he was the one who was going to redeem Israel.*”) Reaching the village, the disciples invite Jesus to join them as a *guest*. Receiving their hospitality, Jesus’ action of breaking

bread evokes the actions of the Last Supper (Luke 22:19). The story that Jesus had outlined on the road, a story of *divine hospitality* broader than Israel's nationalistic and exclusive dreams, a story testified to by the prophets and evidenced in the suffering of the Messiah (24:27), becomes, in the sharing of hospitality, vividly alive. The disciples' eyes are opened and they realise that their dinner *guest* is the crucified and resurrected Jesus, the body broken for them, the divine *host* whose self-giving love is powerful enough to overcome their fear, and their selfish and exclusionary perceptions of the world.

The Ethic of Hospitality:

So how does this theology of hospitality work out in practice?

First and foremost, human hospitality flows from an encounter and experience of divine hospitality. Such an encounter begins the process of overcoming our indifference and selfishness. However, we are still left with the natural human tendency to *fear* the unknown. Thus, while 'aliens and strangers' are opportunities for us to practice hospitality we are still inhibited by fear of 'the other'. The tension that exists in this practice of hospitality, is inherent in the very word itself. One of the key Greek words used in Scripture for "hospitality", *philoxenia*, is a combination of the general word of "love" or "affection" *phileo*, with the word for "stranger", *xenos*. The stem, *xen*, means "foreign" and "strange" and yet also means "guest", while the verb *xenizo* means "to surprise", "to be strange", but also "to entertain". In Latin the term for "host", *hospes*, is closely related to the term for "enemy", *hostis* (from which our word *hostile* derives.)

Our desire to respond to our experience of divine hospitality by welcoming the 'alien and stranger' conflicts with our hesitancy stemming from fear of the unknown. This means that the practice of hospitality always involves risk, the same risk faced by the Triune God in the acts of divine hospitality.

What happens if we take the risk? While there is always the risk of abuse and violence, the practice of hospitality at its best can be a radically transformative experience. As we engage personally with the 'alien and stranger', develop trust, hear their stories (in contrast to the stories told about them by media or others) our fear of 'the other' slowly dissipates. As the process continues, mutual understanding, trust and respect develop and boundaries between *host* and *guest* blur as a genuine friendship arises. The natural fear of the unknown, rather than being hardened or brutalised into a fear of the stranger (*xenophobia*) is transformed over time into a love of the stranger; that is, authentic hospitality (*philoxenia*). Thus, the practice of hospitality is the entry point to an ongoing relationship in which the *abandoned* 'alien and stranger' is welcomed into a new home, enriching both them and ourselves.

Behind prison walls and unable to speak with media, Ahmed Zaoui, for two years has been a name, a 'shadowy figure'. Used as a 'political football', the object of a media-circus, the New Zealand public has been unable to meet the man behind the labels and speculation. However, in December 2004, following the decision of the NZ Supreme Court, Zaoui was released on bail into the care of the Dominican Friary in Auckland. Here, the "professor of Islam who worships Allah... lives harmoniously with members of an ancient order of Dominican friars who worship Jesus."²²

Since his release, the NZ public has had an opportunity to put a human face to the “suspected terrorist”. His ordeal as an ‘alien and stranger’ is still not over. A Security Risk Certificate issued in March 2003 (based mainly it would seem on the disinformation campaign of the Algerian regime spread through international media) has still to be lifted. In the meantime, as Zaoui speaks at Universities (on peace, democracy, and religious fundamentalism), appears on television and radio and spends time with the Catholic fathers and University students at the Priory, it is clear that the processes of ‘humanizing’ and ‘personalizing’ are beginning to take place. For those who have the opportunity to meet Zaoui in person similar sentiments are expressed: reflections on the peaceful, friendly and humble nature of the man.

In an interesting reflection on the power of hospitality to transform our own prejudices and fear, Father Chris, one of the Catholic brothers at the priory, notes that while Zaoui has had many guests “not a single one of his detractors has called. He wonders if they should: ‘So often in New Zealand, human contact solves these crazy reputations.’”²³

Hospitality and Inter-Religious Relationships:

The power of the practice of hospitality to overcome our fear and lead to mutual understanding and respect means that such an ethic is fundamental to one of the biggest challenges facing global civil society in the twenty-first century: religious violence.

While the twentieth century supposedly heralded the end of religious-motivated conflict, the flames of religious violence, post 9/11, have been re-ignited. In the days since 9/11, moderate voices within both Islam and Christianity have been at pains to point out that the conflict is not between ‘religions’. But the reality must be faced that many religious leaders (both Islamic and Christian), their theology based on an apocalyptic millenarianism, do see the physical-military struggle as part of the cosmic battle between ‘good and evil’. In NZ, as elsewhere, secular politicians are not averse to using the theological perspectives of a minority to create a distorted picture of a whole faith tradition, in a bid to spread fear and gain political advantage. Thus populist M.P. in NZ, Winston Peters states:

This two faced approach is how radical Islam works – present the acceptable face to one audience and the militant face to another. In New Zealand the Muslim community have been quick to show us their more moderate face, but as some media reports have shown, there is a militant underbelly here as well. These two groups, the moderate and militant, fit hand and glove everywhere they exist. Underneath it all the agenda is to promote fundamentalist Islam. Indeed these groups are like the mythical Hydra – a serpent underbelly with multiple heads capable of striking at any time and in any direction.”²⁴

At a time when ‘religious extremists’ and ‘politicians’ seek to burn bridges and fan the flames of inter-religious hatred, how do faithful ‘religious’ people, who see their faith being ‘hijacked’, respond?

The ethic of hospitality has, I posit, a critical role in inter-religious relationships capable of building mutual understanding and respect. Historically, inter-religious dialogue has often

been an activity engaging theologians, clerics and religious leaders in venues such as conference centres, religious institutions or universities. But in a world saturated with discourse and rhetoric, do more words, even in the form of ‘civil’ dialogue, provide the necessary elements for cultivating understanding between religious devotees? Does inter-religious dialogue foster the reciprocity essential to the formation of civil society?

Some suggest that the foundation of inter-religious exchanges is not *dialogue*, but rather *hospitality*. Pierre-Francois De Bethune writes:

Hospitality belongs to the realm of *ethos*, which consists in letting the other in, of ourselves entering the other’s space. Communication is made by gestures, less explicit than language but also less ambiguous. It means sheltering a stranger or offering food. *It is antecedent to logos and goes beyond it*. It is essentially an experience. Therefore time, and still more warm-hearted attention, must be given to it.²⁵

Bethune continues:

the stranger, coming as God’s messenger, can save us from turning in on ourselves, from inbreeding, degeneracy. He offers us an experience of going out of ourselves, a truly religious experience of transcendence. Hospitality can help us transcend our exclusiveness.²⁶

Luke’s crucifixion narrative (Luke 23:39-47) provides a powerful image of the ability of divine hospitality to overcome all boundaries of exclusion. As the Jewish insurrectionist (read ‘terrorist’) hangs beside Jesus, naked and broken, his campaign of ‘liberative terror’ ended, he inquires as to whether there is room in the divine kingdom for one such as him. Jesus replies: “I tell you the truth, today you will be with me in paradise.” A few verses later, with Jesus’ death, Luke’s account has a Roman centurion declare: “Surely this was a righteous man.” At the climax of Luke’s narrative we see a Jewish insurrectionist (read “terrorist”) and a Roman centurion (read “oppressor”) recognising the divine hospitality being offered.

Human hospitality transforms the individuals involved, overcoming fear, indifference and selfishness, creating mutual understanding and respect. But more than this, in *our* practice of human hospitality we may experience the transcendence of the divine. The practice of human hospitality which crosses barriers and welcomes ‘aliens and strangers’ is an ethic central to the functioning of civil society and testifies to the eschatological reality in which we will experience divine hospitality first-hand.

Andrew Shepherd is currently engaged in PhD research at the University of Otago in Dunedin on a theological/ethical perspective on ‘development’. He lectures in missiology and theology and has spent ten years working alongside university students.

¹ Nicholas Boyle, *Who are We Now? Christian Humanism and the Global Market from Hegel to Heaney* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), p.74.

² Miroslav Volf, *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996), p.60

³ In 2005, it is estimated there are between 185-192 million³ migrants worldwide (up from 175 million in 2000), 2.9% of the total global population.

Source: United Nations, *Trends in Total Migrant Stock: the 2003 Revision*.

- ⁴ For example, the Philippines receives approximately US\$8 billion, (almost 10%) of its total GDP from remittances sent home by migrant workers. Quoted on Radio New Zealand 'World Watch', 25/7/2005.
- ⁵ Volf, p.75, Italics added.
- ⁶ Jacques Attali, *Millenium* (Random House: New York, 1991), pp.74-78.
- ⁷ Re-branded during the writing of this article to: "struggle against violent extremism"
- ⁸ UNHCR figures reveal significant drops in asylum applications in the five-year period between 2000 and 2004: Netherlands-78%; Denmark-74%; Australia-76%; New Zealand-63% and the United Kingdom-59%. In the years between 2001 and 2004 the US and Canada recorded a 48% drop. Figures drawn from UNHCR and the Migration Policy Institute. See: www.migrationinformation.org
- ⁹ Refugee Status Appeals Authority (New Zealand) – Refugee Appeal: 74540, par. 919.
- ¹⁰ In August 2001, a Norwegian cargo ship, *Tampa*, sought to disembark 400 would-be asylum seekers (mostly Afghans) who had been rescued from an overcrowded and sinking Indonesian ferry headed for Australian shores. Australia refused to allow the *Tampa* to bring the refugees to Australia and had the refugees transported to Papua New Guinea and then on to New Zealand and Nauru for processing by the UNHCR. The New Zealand Prime Minister allowed 150 of these refugees to settle in NZ, while the Australian government gave a \$10million grant to the small Pacific island of Nauru for services provided! It is widely believed that this hard-line stance by Australian Prime Minister John Howard was crucial to his election victory later that same year.
- ¹¹ I take it as axiomatic that all media sources function within specific ideological parameters (or as Chomsky and Herman would say 'filters'). See: Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988)
- ¹² Catherine Masters, 'All the Wrong Connections', The New Zealand Herald, 14.12.02.
See: <http://www.nzherald.co.nz/index.cfm?ObjectID=3009243>
- ¹³ Refugee Status Appeals Authority New Zealand, Refugee Appeal No.74540, par. 955-958.
- ¹⁴ For further discussion of the way in which disinformation and propaganda has influenced the Zaoui case see: Selwyn Manning, Yasmine Ryan & Katie Small, *I Almost Forgot About the Moon: The Disinformation Campaign Against Ahmed Zaoui* (Auckland: Multimedia, 2004).
- ¹⁵ Volf, p.75.
- ¹⁶ Volf notes that while it is important to consider *social arrangements*, perhaps more important (at least for theologians) is to reflect on the *social agents* of which our civil society is comprised, asking, "what kind of selves we need to be". Volf, pp.20-21.
- ¹⁷ Similar to other Western nations, post 9/11, New Zealand has witnessed attacks on synagogues, mosques and has increasingly seen politicians campaigning on issues of immigration and race-relations etc.
- ¹⁸ See Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge, 1966), quoted from Volf, p.78.
- ¹⁹ Volf, p.78 Italics original.
- ²⁰ See e.g.: 1Timothy 3:2, 5:10 1Titus 1:8, Romans 12:13, 1 Peter 4:9
- ²¹ Cf. John 1:10
- ²² Catherine Masters, 'Zaoui a reluctant celebrity', The New Zealand Herald, 25.6.05.
See: <http://www.nzherald.co.nz/index.cfm?ObjectID=10332554>
- ²³ *ibid.* It is interesting to note the process of 'personalization' also evident within the media, since Zaoui's release. Compare this article to 'All the Wrong Connections' by the same journalist.
- ²⁴ 'The End Of Tolerance': An address by Rt Hon Winston Peters to members of 'Far North Grey Power', Kaitaia, 28.7.05, See: http://www.nzherald.co.nz/index.cfm?c_id=1&ObjectID=10338138
- ²⁵ Pierre-Francois De Bethune, *By Faith and Hospitality: The Monastic Tradition as a model for Interreligious Encounter*, (Leominster, Herefordshire: Gracewing, 2002), pp.2-3
- ²⁶ *ibid.*, p.24.