

# ***Reciprocity and Migration: The Interface between Religions***

***Endale S. Mekonnen\****

## ***Abstract***

*Much has been said on migration in current scholarly discourses within and multi-disciplinary debates. But no sufficient input has been generated towards the discourse from a religious perspective, albeit extremely needed insofar as people migrate with their religion. This inquiry examines the interplay between reciprocity and migration from a religious perspective using primary and secondary source analysis. It also suggests that cultivating religions' cultural ideology of positive, responsible and balanced reciprocity in a societal relationship based on mutual benefits mediates a healthy co-existence between the native and the migrants despite their invariably differing and competing religions. Such reciprocity could be spawned through the sacred texts of religions that espouse either general or positive balanced reciprocity. In the course of the analysis, the work brings the Golden Rule into focus as the best candidate for a test case.*

**Keywords:** Migration, reciprocity, ideology, and interface between religions.

## ***Introduction***

Without demur, international migration is a rapid and a non-stop growing phenomenon in our modern world according to international migration report 2015. The number of migrants reached 244 million in 2015 which was 222 million in 2010 and 173 million in 2000 (United Nations 2016). Of which 74 million live in Europe, 75 million in Asia, 54 million in North America, 21 million in Africa, 9 million in the Caribbean and 8 Oceania. The majority of migrants worldwide originate from the middle - income group and it has increased from 2000-2015 and reached 150 million in 2015. Regarding country of origin, 104 million were born in Asia, 62 million in Europe, 37 million in Caribbean and 34 million in Africa (United Nations 2016:1). The reason for such influx of migrants is ascribed to the interconnection of the world through diverse modern technology which has made all communication and transportation very easy.

---

\* Research Associate, Stellenbosch University. Email: esebsebe@yahoo.com

Migration, however, entails its own pros and cons. Countries of destination gain economic and knowledge benefits such as labour, an increase in taxes, entrepreneur and scientific inventions are some among the many contributions of the migrants. Likewise, the sending country is receiving its own economic share through remittance. Nonetheless, migrants are the most susceptible of the society to violence, abuse and loss of job. Similarly, receiving countries might as well suffer from violence and terrorism as recently documented heinous and barbarous terrorist incidents in Western countries.

Migration is a normal human phenomenon, and it is not confined only to economic needs, although most of the migrants were pushed out of their countries due to poverty, desire for a better life, conflict and war. Particularly migrants not only come with their interest to sustain a better life, but also with their native values, cultures, religions and worldviews. Such make things harder for peaceful co-existence between the native and the migrants. Nevertheless, keeping the positive reciprocal benefits or advantages and curbing the disadvantages for both the native and the migrants demands an inclusive approach to the problem. Such enterprise to the problem has already been underway for a while.

Consequently, several research projects on migration have been carried out in different disciplines via theories and methods fitting to address specific queries. It is also the interest of the present work to address “what contributes to building a peaceful co-existence between the natives of destination countries and migrants coming from varied religions and nations?”

Our method of inquiry would be analysing selected relevant texts from primary and secondary sources. The study, basing its assumption on Golden Rule, will argue that the ideology of responsible and balanced reciprocity is fundamentally important in constructing migration policy, positive social interaction, and peaceful coexistence at the secular as well as the religious level. Accordingly, multidimensional approach to the problem of migration, differing views on the Golden Rule, the Golden Rule as a reciprocal ideology, and reciprocity and migration in the interface between religions will be discussed respectively.

### ***Multidimensional Approach***

Migration theories are in the making. No single coherent international migration theory has ever been developed to date. Contemporary endeavours to address current issues of migration from different disciplines evince that it

demands a multidimensional approach and state of research questions. Each discipline undertakes a specific question and hypothesis. Brettell & Hollifield (2015:4) have listed eight disciplines' questions; namely: Anthropologists' question, "How does migration effect cultural change and affect cultural identity?" Demographers investigate, "To what extent do immigrant and native populations become more similar over time? It is an attempt to understand assimilation. Economists inquire, "What explains the propensity to migrate and its effect? It is an inquiry into maximizing utility. Geographers seek to understand "What explains the socio- spatial patterns of migration? It is about incorporation, network and location. Historians investigate "How a phenomenon has (e.g. causes, structures, processes, consequences of migration) or a relationship (e.g. gender and migration) changed or persisted over time? It is concerned about period. Lawyers attempt to answer the question: "How does the law influence migration?" It is a concern for human right. Political scientists ferret out the reasons "Why do states have difficulty controlling migration? It is concerned about controlling migration. Sociologist attempts to respond to the question "What explains incorporation and exclusion?" It investigates the issue of integration.

Although anthropologist and sociologist respond to the social and cultural dimension of migration, they do not look at it from a religious perspective. Recently, a right-based approach to migration from a moral perspective related to development is espoused (Dinbabo & Carciotto 2015). Such a valuable attempt with a focus on the leadership level and international law and policymaking needs a complementing theoretical base to achieve a full-fledged and comprehensive approach to address issues at the grassroots level not least the peaceful co-existence of migrants with the natives of the receiving country.

It can be argued that crafting a religious theoretical and conceptual model is mandatory in order to respond to the question what contributes to the peaceful co-existence of the natives of the receiving country and migrants coming from varied religions and nations. The attempt in the present work is not to craft one, but to test a possible working concept that might contribute to the process, namely: general and balanced reciprocity in the formulation of the Golden Rule.

### ***The Golden Rule: Differing Perspectives***

What is the Golden Rule? According to the Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy, the golden rule is defined as:

Any form of the dictum: *do unto others as you would have them do unto you. In some form this is found in almost all religions and ethical system.*  
[Blackburn, Simon. "Golden Rule."]

Examples of such formulations are "Treat others how you wish to be treated" or "Do not do to others what you do not want others to do to you"(Wattles 1996:56) or "whatever you wish that men would do to you, do so to them..." (Matt 7:12). However, its meaning, application and usefulness are debated. For our present concern, the Golden Rule, albeit diverse in formulation, is understood as a positive and responsible reciprocal societal relationship.

Notwithstanding its popularity, the Golden rule has been criticised by different fields of scholars. Based on Jeffrey Wattles' (1996:5-7 and 77-86) discussion of criticism against the golden rule, the objections can be subsumed under five reasons. One of the major objections is that it is too general to be a moral guide in the day-to-day relationship and embarrassing at the philosophical discourse and seriousness. Objection exemplified "what if a sadomasochist goes forth to treat others as he wants to be treated?" Second, it is based on the assumption that human beings are the same and does not do justice to the difference. In other words, the rule assumes that what we want is what others want. There is no differentiation of desire. Third, it implies that what is good for ourselves is also good for everyone. If this is the case, the rule only applies to those who have similar beliefs and similar needs. Four, the rule makes ordinary wants and desires as the criterion of morality, therefore it is too low a standard. For instance, a judge would not be in a position to sentence a criminal if the principle of the Golden Rule is enacted in the court. Fifth, the rule also criticised in its artificial and abstractedness. Six, it is connected to religion, but moral intuition and moral reason can operate without reference to any religious foundation.

Despite such serious criticism, the Golden Rule enjoyed a significant attention among scholars and practitioners to address a universal moral principle. Some even claimed that it is sufficient for ethics and all duties may be inferred from it. Others insisted that it is a necessary criterion for right action or an evaluative tool that tests actions (Wattles 1996:5). For instance, its importance is well stated by Marcus G. Singer's comment. It reads:

*The golden rule has been widely accepted, in word if not in deed, by vast numbers of greatly differing peoples; it is a basic device of moral education; and it can be found at the core of innumerable moral, religious, and social codes... The nearly universal acceptance of the*

*golden rule and its promulgation by persons of considerable intelligence, though otherwise of divergent outlooks, would ...seem to provide some evidence for the claim that it is a fundamental ethical truth.” (Marcus Sing, 1967:365-367).*

Deciding its meaning is also another baffling issue for scholars to ascribe to it a universal moral principle. Wattle, however, argued that albeit meaning involves context, it does not negate commonality insofar as conceptual similarity could be experienced beyond cultural boundaries (Wattles 1996:4). For Wattle, concepts are cross-cultural and unbounded. Yet, since the golden rule requires identification of the agent with the other its exercise needs a thoughtful practitioner. In the context of religious discourse, however, the context of Golden Rule is paramount before seeking harmony at the conceptual level. In the ensuing discussion, we will focus on three areas where the concept and text of the Golden Rule as reciprocal relationship have been discussed, namely: Greco-Roman world, Matt 7:12 and Hadith 13. Studying Greco-Roman concept of reciprocity would serve as a conceptual and ideological framework for the discussion of Mat 7:12 and Hadith 13.

### ***The Golden Rule as Reciprocity: Ideology***

Ideology, in the present work, is concerned with “conscious or unconscious enactment of presuppositions, dispositions, and values held in common with other people” (Robbins 1996:98). It is “an integrated system of beliefs, assumptions, and values” reflecting “the needs and interest of a group or a class at a particular time in history” (Davis 1975:14). Our interest in this section is primarily limited to examining reciprocity as an ideology in Greco-Roman world with a brief comparison of modern concept of ideology in light of migration and reciprocity.

### ***Greco-Roman World***

Studying Greco-Roman world’s reciprocal relationship would be an unrealistic ambition in such a brief undertaking; therefore, only selected sources related to the Golden Rule as reciprocity would be treated. But at the outset a semantic problem precludes us from directly delving into the discussion of the text. For one, none of the single Greek or Latin words we can use to express the contemporary concept of reciprocity can express univocally the English term “reciprocity.” Secondly, the earliest closest words of Greek and Latin are used to convey economic exchange not ethical sense (Berchman 2008:40). However, at the later stage, ethical sense of reciprocity began to appear in the

Latin for instance Cicero used *amicitia* (equal return in friendship). Thirdly, there is no direct statement of the Golden Rule in Archaic, classic and Greco-Roman sources. Nevertheless, in *Nicomachean Ethics* (NE, 1166a1-b29) Aristotle introduces the concept of reciprocity in its ethical sense by defining friend as another self (probably “another Heracles.” cf. Aristotle, *Eudemian Ethics* (EE, 1245a30).

It should be noted that in ancient Greece the Golden Rule/reciprocal ethics/ could not be found in its salient form instead doing good to friends and harming enemy was prevalent due to frequent war and clashes between cities and among individual. In such environment, doing good to friends and harming enemies was a tool for protecting oneself from danger. Particularly, Isocrates advocates the notion of helping friends and harming enemies in order to unite and stand against city enemies (Wattles 1996:29). Although Homer, Socrates and Plato had discussed reciprocity, our discussion would focus on Aristotle and others who came after him.

But Aristotle’s concept of ethics as a reciprocal obligation to the other is inherited from earlier sources such as Homer, Socrates, and Plato who claimed that reciprocity entails moral, social as well as political obligation (Berchman 2008:41). Bercham adumbrates three natures of reciprocal obligation as an essential feature of the Golden Rule: (1) aims at the ethical and social, (2) independent in desire, aim, without partiality (preference of individuals), and (3) autonomous desire and feeling of the agent. Reciprocity is about specific virtues and rationally taken actions considered to be good and admirable to benefit others not necessarily benefiting the agent. For Aristotle, the beloved one or a friend is another self (NE 1166a1-b29; EE 1245a). The connection between Aristotle loving another self and the Golden Rule is that in both an attitude one has for himself is reciprocally given to the other. Aristotle argues that a human being is a social being and by nature designed to share his life (NE 9.9.1169b18-19). Something is missing in the good of man if all the concern is self-interested (NE 1097a28-b21; Aristotle, *Politics*). This social nature of the human being is the basis of justice, which is good in itself (NE 1129b11-1130a5). Justice embraces all the virtues, because it is practically towards the other. Virtues people value the good of others for the sake of other people, in doing so, they seek virtuous action for their own sake. For Aristotle, there are three kinds of relationship: character friendship (based on virtue/goodness), friendship grounded in pleasure, and friendship grounded in utility (advantage) (NE 8.2.1155b17-8.3.1156b32; EE 7.1.1234b29-7.2.1237a36).

The latter two kinds of relationship are based on self-advancement, but the first one is concerned for the other just because of herself/himself and for her/his own sake. One has to love oneself before loving the self in another (politics 1106b36-1107a2; 1105b25-28). He argues that for the good of oneself requires concern for the good of another. But such relationship does not exist in the absence of reciprocation (NE 8.2.1155b17-1156a5). Although Aristotle does not speak of returning evil for harm, he argues restoring proper proportion of property wrongly taken or unjust distribution. And punishment should be administered because not one is an enemy, but because of violating proper action (Wattles 1996:37).

Imperial Rome's social and political relationship is also an essentially reciprocal relationship. Studying the relevant literatures of the time, Saller (1982:37) argued that reciprocal relationship "permeated the Roman society and there appears to be little justification for the hypothesis that the language can be dismissed as a "jargon of bureaucrats." In the Roman republic, reciprocity was enforced by the Law and religious mores (Saller 1982:5).

Whether such relationship was changed during the imperial Rome is debated. Scholars such as Blok (Blok 1969) argued for its discontinuity particularly because the increase of bureaucracy eliminated the exercise of patronage. However, a number of scholars have convincingly argued for its continuity. For example, Badian (1958), Gelzer (1968), Wallace-Hadrill (1989), Saller (1982) and Kalinowski (1996) insisted that patronage /reciprocal relationship was not just a central cultural experience and a vital conscious Roman ideology but it continued until the late antiquity of the Roman empire (Wallace-Hadrill 1989:65).

Granting such relationship in the imperial Rome would raise the question of whether it was ideological (in the sense of an integrated system of beliefs, assumptions, and values) or political (in the sense of power, status, system of cohesion). A detailed discussion of the issue is beyond the purview of this work, but for our purpose, suffices it to discuss representative texts focusing on Cicero, Dionysius and Seneca. According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (4nt.Rom. 1.4.2), Rome dominated the world because of its institutions, established by Romulus, of which patronage was par excellence. Borrowing from stoic's universal friendship, Cicero also contended that the key to maintain civilization is mutual support among humans (Cicero- de officiis 1.7.22). Reciprocity is epitomized by nature as giving to and receiving (skills, labour, and talent) from one another to unite the human society closer.

Likewise, Seneca maintains the same stance, arguing that the benefits are the chief means of bonding human society (Seneca. *De beneficiis* 1-4.2). Such instances adduce the fact that reciprocal social relationship is of ideological in imperial Rome, i.e., it is concerned with moral duty, honour and identity than material things.

Cicero, for instance, views that the goal of generosity is to earn goodwill in return through gifts of service rather than money (Cicero. *de officiis* 1.15.47-48). Seneca unequivocally expressed the same view writing, “a benefit cannot possibly be touched by the hand; its province is the mind... and so it is neither gold nor silver or any of the gifts which are held to be most valuable that constitutes a benefit, but merely the goodwill of him who bestows it (Seneca-*De beneficiis*. 1.5.2). For Seneca, therefore, bestowing benefit is not so much about reaping a return as it is public display of virtue. However, he contends that the receiver of the benefit is obligated to return gratitude in the form of publishing the virtue of the benefactor everywhere (Seneca- *De Beneficiis*, 2.22.1).

However, reciprocity entails material and political benefits. Cicero is unequivocal in stating the relationship of reciprocity on political arena such as providing games, banquet and doles to groups would place an obligation upon the receiver groups to vote for the benefactor to civic office, although he defended that men of true talent like himself did not need to spend money for such purpose (Cicero. *De officiis* 2.16.57-2.17, 58.). Material benefit surrenders the receivers’ heart to the benefactor’s service (Cicero. *De officiis*, 2.6.21) such as political loyalty (Seneca. *De beneficiis*. 6.9. 1-2). Seneca and Dionysius (Seneca, *De beneficiis*, 1.4.3 Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant. Rom.* 2.10.4) also attest competition among the patrons for winning client for political purpose.

In post-Augustinian proses, the terms patrons and client are infrequently used as they connote inferiority and degradation (Saller 1982:9). Unlike the patron and client, *amnesty* does not convey the concept of differential social status because *amicus* is an ambiguous concept that can accommodate a social relationship between equal and unequal. The relationship, particularly *amicitia*/friendship/ is based on virtues. According to Seneca, *amicus* based on utility is temporal and falls in the time of hardship (Ep. ad Luc. 9.8 f.; 48.2-4; Pliny, Ep. 9.30.1). However, such a philosophical idea speaks of an ideal relationship that is based on common interest and selfless services. But in practical terms, *amicitia* carries a reciprocal relationship, particularly of

*officium* (Saller 1982:15). Saller understands *officium* in terms of “favour” but it can also be understood in the sense of utility as satisfaction from good and services in its current economic sense. Cicero exhorts patrons “to become good calculators of duty, able by adding and subtracting to strike a balance correctly and find out just how much is due to each individual” (De Off. 1.59 and also 1.47). Such notion of calculating benefits has an economic sense, although one embraces the caveat of Saller not to read it in an absolute literal sense. In fact, it is hard to calculate satisfaction, but in order that the reciprocal relationship to be maintained both parties must get satisfaction for the service they rendered. However, such calculation leaves the reciprocal benefits ambiguous in the sense that both parties feel under obligation to satisfy the other despite the imbalance return one gets from the other (Saller 1982:17). Whether the relationship is a binding moral obligation or not, it is based on benefit or utility from the relationship. Reciprocity, therefore, is a foundational element in their societal relationship in the form of obligation or rules, although it was not exercised in a simple one to one exchange (Saller 1982:15).

The language of exchange permeated in major aspect of the social life to conceptualize the relationship of man to god, family and friendship (Pliny, N.H. 12.1; Quint., Decl. 268; Seneca, Ep. ad Luc. 8.3). Particularly, reciprocal ideology was exercised between migrants and the natives. For instance, citizenship can be gained because of reciprocal obligation as in the case of Pliny, who requested Trajan to grant citizenship to his friend, Arpocras, an Egyptian migrant, who attended him while he was sick (Ep.10.5). Arpocras attainment of citizenship is not because of fulfilling some kind of legal requirements, but because of the service, he rendered to Pliny.

At the time, migrants flowed from different countries and occupations to the city of Rome. For example, from Asia minor slaves, professional and traders of various kind, from Syria war-captives who were players of harp, and flute, actors, jester from the mimes, jugglers, differing law-class performer; and from Egypt philosophers, astrologers, experts in divination, soothsayers, physicians, teachers, artists, actors, priest of Isis, merchants, occults, mathematician and physicians (Piana 1927:193). Noy, based on Seneca’s categories of motivation of migrants into Rome, discusses four motivations: education, government and politics, and provision of good and services, family and religion (Noy 2000:90–127). However, Rome values morality, food security, peace and political stability. Any foreign religious group or individual

philosopher must comply with the imperial values for reciprocal benefit and if such values are threatened expulsion would be the ultimate measure.

Hence, the attitude towards the migrants differs: positive, neutral, and negative (Noy 2000:31–34). Cicero and Seneca, who were themselves migrants, expressed a neutral position i.e. migration is neither bad nor good. Juvenal and Lucan (who was also an immigrant from Spain) hold a negative attitude to immigrants. The accusation against the migrants was that they brought corruptions, vices and ill practices with them, which lowered the standard of the Roman life by infiltrating all activities and offices and classes and in the end the state would be taken over by such people who were one's slaves. In fact, after a few years the next generation of slaves and freedmen began to play a major role in the court of the emperor and in the government being given the right to vote.

The despise came because the foreigners did not comply with the traditions of the Roman "mores maiorum." Their lack of 'gravitas' as the obvious mark of congenital inferiority and the 'decorum' of the lofty Roman race (Piana 1927:228–230). However, Noy (2000:37–45) argues that despite such negative attitude there were not that many expulsions from imperial Rome except the very few that happened due to ideologically suspect group, immorality and scarcity of food. The expulsion related to religion is limited to certain religious categories such as astrologers, Jews, worshipers of Asian gods Sabazus, and Christians. Expulsion took place because of allegedly immoral relationship with the elite, breach of security and political involvement. Therefore, migrants in Rome allowed to stay as long as they reciprocate by sharing and holding the values of Rome.

Hence, one can safely conclude that reciprocal relationship in early imperial Rome had both ideological and political nature that governs both the native and the migrants. Such social and political interaction reciprocates the benefits. While the receiver enjoys favour, protection, and material benefits, the giver benefits increase status, goodwill of the receiver, acknowledge of public gratitude, loyalty, attracting the attention of the emperor, lasting memory in the society (Kalinowski 1996:33–35). Migrants serve as labour resource, entrepreneur, increase revenue and social capital while they benefit from the Roman's treasure such as education, peace, wealth and status. Therefore, such an exchange involves both material and non-material benefit between unequal social status as well as equal status. It is a relationship based on utility/being useful/ within society.

But the problem of imprecision of the term “reciprocity” must be sorted out, not least because the ethical sense of the word is associated with friendship, at other with neighbourliness, and sometimes with imperial trade relationship. Furthermore, Geoffrey MacCormack (as cited in Kirk 2003:674) rightly signalled that generalized application of the term “reciprocity” obscures the differences. As a solution to the conundrum, Marshal Sahlins (1965:147) in his study of primitive exchange offers three genres of reciprocity: general, balanced and negative. General reciprocity is putatively altruistic and an intimate relationship, open-ended, generous sharing and obligation in the form of gratitude. It is not time bounded. But the material flow is maintained through social relationship. Such reciprocity is found within a patron - client relationship (unequal relationship). Balanced reciprocity is an equivalent exchange (model of market exchange) with a defined obligation with a set of time, hence it is a distance relationship where self-interest and material concern take priority. Social relationship is maintained through material flow. Negative reciprocity is maximizing one’s benefit at the expense of the other. Its most extreme mode is exploitation and retaliation (Kirk 2003). Such scheme of reciprocity offers theoretical and conceptual framework for understanding the interface between the native’s and migrant’s religion in a given country. But before moving to examining religious texts, it is necessary to examine whether there is connection between ideology and migration not least in our modern world.

### ***Ideology and Migration***

Tuen A. Van Dijk (2000:93) employs a multidisciplinary approach analysis of ideology and defines ideology as “fairly general and abstract mental representations which govern the shared mental representations (knowledge and attitudes) of social groups.” Van Dijk lists thirteen criterion of ideology and contends that although ideology is belief systems, it is not any socially shared belief system because it must be found at the basic level. It is formed by the basic proposition of cultural values that represent what is bad and what is good. Ideology controls perception (as a mental model), interaction and intragroup actions. It polarizes groups in terms of **Us** and **Them**. It presupposes competition, conflict, struggle, or differences of opinion and knowledge between groups (Van Dijk 2000:94–95).

Ideology, therefore, has direct bearings on the interplay between the natives and the migrants as a social group, especially at the leadership level. In our modern world, it plays important roles in creating migration policies. For

instance, in 1975, Sweden constructed a migration policy based on multicultural ideology. The policy was based on three values: equality, freedom of choice and partnership (Akeson 2011:218). Although practically such policy did produce unsatisfactory result, the same ideology was used to create the 1997 integration policy which involves everyone in Sweden for the success of integration. Accordingly, multicultural ideology in integrating migrants was promoted among the citizen and therefore it assumed a prominent place at official debate as well as at the grass-root level (Akeson 2011:220).

Van Dijk presents two deferring positions in British parliament discourse held on March 5, 1997, as an example of how ideology controls discourses on the crafting of policies of asylum seekers. His analysis of the discourse evinces that those who rejected granting asylum-to-asylum seekers (from outside of Europe) is based on a negative mental model that pictures asylum seekers as bogus and criminals therefore they cause problem and difficulties costing lots of money which could be spent on British elderly citizens. On the other hand, an opposing view in the same parliamentary discourse propagated a positive perspective based on humanitarian ideology. In such representation the plights of the migrant and the value of democracy, international law, and solidarity with the oppressed were highlighted (Van Dijk 2000:101–113). Obviously, the conversation did not confine within the parliamentary discourse. It would disseminate through different media shaping the mode of populace at the grass-root level which would influence the manner of coexistence between the natives and the migrants.

The above examples might indicate that ideology not only influences how and what kind of decision should be made and policies should be crafted but also its ramification affects the social relationship between migrants of different kinds and the natives within a given country. Either it promotes conflict, polarization (Us and Them), and antagonism or it promotes shared value and peaceful coexistence among the migrants and the natives. Religious ideologies are not different in their contribution towards the relationship between the migrants and the natives insofar as they are important aspect of cultural values of a society. Religions exist as organized institutions to maintain and disseminate their values (in the form of ideology) with an engraved (either negative or positive attitude) model of the Other.

Therefore, the underlining question with regard to migration (as epitomized by the above examples) would be “what does the receiving country benefit from migrants?” The answer to this question constructs either a negative or a positive ideological stance. But ultimately, since migration is unavoidable phenomenon, the favourable underpinning ideology would be negotiation i.e. reciprocity. Migrants are both threat and at the same time potential resource of various kind to the receiving country and are objects of exercising democratic values such as international human right. Similarly, for the migrants the destination country is uncertainty, bewilderment, loneliness, misunderstanding, cultural shock and fear, but hope for safety, employment, and a better life. An intersection between the needs of the migrants and the natives can only be achieved through an ideology that promotes a responsible reciprocity of benefits that either of the parties offer.

If this conceptual frame is granted, in the ensuing sections, I will examine two texts: one from the New Testament (NT) and the other from the Hadith in light of the ideology of reciprocity with respect to migration in order to examine reciprocity from a religious perspective. The texts represent the two largest world religions which affinity might be demonstrated.

### ***NT (Matt 7:12) and Bukahri Book 1-Volume 2: Hadith 12***

Mathew 7:12 and Hadith 12 are normally taken as the Golden Rule in the traditions of both religions. Therefore, our discussion is limited to the concept of reciprocity and migration. First, Matt 7:12 will be analysed within the context migration and then Hadith 12.

#### ***Matt 7:12***

The Gospel was preached and practiced in the world of Roman Empire and, as it went away from Jerusalem, it became a migrant religion. Such imperial milieu ought to be taken into consideration while reading the gospels.

Matthew in particular introduces his gospel with a number of characters who had been migrants, albeit his intention is Christological. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Ruth were migrants in the genealogy (Matt 1:1-6). This connects Jesus as a descendent of strangers (Campese 2012:22). Especially, the story of Jesus family and the infant Jesus are the salient examples of forced migrants or refugees in Egypt to save their lives (Matt 2:13-23). God is involved as the initiator as well as guider of the migration. In fact, the story evokes Israel's migration to Egypt (Matt. 2:15).

Evoking the story of Israel in Matthew 2:15 reminds the story of liberation from slavery in a foreign country and the awful life of migration. As a result of their experience in a foreign country, God reminds them to treat strangers or migrants as a neighbour not as an enemy who came to compete resources with them (Lev. 18:10; Deut 26:1, 12-13)(Garcia 2007:5). The story of Matthew begins with listing the lineage of Jesus and his migration to Egypt with his family and ends with Jesus commanding his disciples to go to the whole world (Matt 28:16-20).

In light of such a broader context, the discussion of Matt 7:12, which is normally called the Golden Rule in the synoptic Gospel, is limited to searching the reciprocal nature of the text with a special reference to migration or stranger. Therefore, it would neither be a detail exegesis nor source and redaction criticism. The text reads: "so whatever you wish that men would do to you, do to them; for this is the law and the prophet" (Matt 7:12) and in Luke 6:31 it reads "And as you wish that men would do to you, do so to them." The sayings are placed in a different context: while Matthew places it within the larger context of the Sermon on the Mount and a closer context of prayer, Luke inserted it within the context of teaching of love.

Matthew's context is intriguing because Jesus used human father son relationship in order to describe disciples -God relationship in prayer. The father is a giver, while the son is the receiver, such context of receiving good from the father for Matthew is an appropriate place to compose the Golden Rule. In such context, the golden rule would be the Law and the prophet.

Perfect human relationship, however, is modelled after God's relationship with human beings - loving enemies. Love among the same group (5:46) and love among same family (5:47) are not the standard, but God-like love makes one true son of God. Father-son relationship is an implicit reciprocal relationship as the son is the receiver and returns with honour and obedience (Mat.7:21-23) which could be categorized as a general reciprocity. For Jesus, a balanced reciprocal relationship is not the standard: "if you love those who love you" or "if you salute only your brethren, what more are you doing than others?" And he also dismissed negative reciprocal relationship such as retaliation (Mat 5:38-39). The concept of general reciprocity immediately follows Jesus' love teaching in Mt 6:1-2. But Jesus rejects the act of piety intended return in the form of honour from the community of faith. Piety is understood in terms of Father-son relationship. The father rewards his

children because of doing good to someone else. Such is the general reciprocal relationship between the disciples and God.

Although the Golden Rule is an expression of the Law and the prophets, its formulation in the positive, instead of prohibiting from doing evil, demands proactively doing good. The good is assumed from the context because the context of prayer is to receive good things from the father. But the return is not clearly stated as it does not say “whatever you wish that men would do to you, do so to them so that you may gain a positive return.” But the absence of a lucid reciprocal goal does not mean that Jesus is not teaching a reciprocal relationship. The command “love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you” (Mt. 6:44) in itself is a reciprocal language not least because it is a response of the disciples to persecution and hatred coming from other fellow persons. The reciprocal is materially different from what they are receiving from their persecutors i.e. reciprocal of dispensing positive benefit for a negative benefit as an imitation of God’s model. Such reciprocity agrees with Sahlin’s (1965:147) general reciprocity that states “Failure to reciprocate does not cause the giver of the stuff to stop giving: the good move one way... for a long time.” Such reciprocity differs from “principle of reciprocity and equivalence” which is important to justice (Kirk 2003:669).

The Golden Rule in light of general reciprocity unpacks the reciprocal nature of Jesus’s Golden Rule “whatever you wish that men would do to you, do so to them.” The disciples do not want to be persecuted or treated badly by their fellow persons (the first sentence). Therefore, they should not repeat the wrong act of their persecutors instead they should do good to their persecutors (the second sentence) the good things they wish their persecutors could have done to them, however no explicit expectation of return is stated in Jesus’s Golden Rule.

Whether the principle of reciprocity applies to God’s generosity towards the evil ones is debated because God gives disinterestedly. However, Kirk (2003:638) argues that applying the cultural ideology of Greco-Roman reciprocity for the purpose of initiating gratitude and creating social bond applies to God as a supreme benefactor of human beings. For instance, in Seneca the benefactor likens his action of generosity to the benevolence of gods in nature (Ben. 1.1.9-13; 4.25.2). Using the divine paradigm, ingratitude on the side of the receiver does not deter patrons from being generous. But Seneca criticises those who fail to reciprocate to the benefactors (Ben. 1.1.3-13). Although God’s generosity is freely bestowed in Matthew, the response to

his will is desired and encouraged. In fact, disobedience will result in rejecting from entering into his kingdom.

“*Whatever* you wish that men would do to you, do to them; for this is the law and the prophet” (Matt 7:12) addresses a plural subject “you” referring to the Jesus followers as a community who might be expecting persecution from unspecified outsiders to proactively and positively reciprocate in the situation. Such injunction, although distinct in its formulation, attitude, and context, fairly fits into its cultural ideology of reciprocity in societal relationships of the Imperial world of Rome. But the reciprocity here is a general reciprocity expecting return from God as a father, if not from the social relations.

Such reciprocity of doing good without considering either the disposition or action of a person but on the bases of self as a standard for a positive action toward the other demands a mental representation of the Other as another “I” (NE 1166a1-b29; EE 1245a). One’s own self is reciprocally given to the Other. It is identifying oneself with the other. Reciprocity in such sense is vicarious. It is considering the other neither as an enemy nor a threat but as a replica of oneself who has a similar need. Even enemies should be treated not with retaliation but with actions that reverses the chain of evil. Such ideology of reciprocity of self creates a new paradigm of treating strangers in the Gospel of Matthew. Jesus heals the daughter of the stranger- a Canaanite woman and praised her faith (Matt 15:22). For example, according to Matthew 25:35-46, Jesus identifies himself with the Other: the poor, the stranger, the sick and the prisoners. The stranger /ξένος/ is a migrant who is a replica of oneself and should be treated as another self. Matthew’s vicarious reciprocal ideology perceive migrants as fully human and neighbour who should be welcomed and treated as oneself or equal. The disciples of Jesus were sent to take the Gospel to the whole nation and make them disciples of Jesus (Matt 28:18-20) and Jesus promised them to be with them. In so doing, Jesus created a mental model of humanity as one community to be disciple in his teaching. Such assignment requires a life of migrant or going out beyond the boundary of ones own nation and embracing the Other as a neighbour and equal. The resurrected Jesus also now crosses the boarder of the nation of Israel once again to create a community of different nations. In such context, the Golden rule as reciprocity functions as means of building social bonding between the migrant with a new religion and the native as a potential disciple. Above all, the Golden rule communicate an ideological of a responsible vicarious

reciprocity with a high valuation of the other which obligates to treat the migrant as another self.

***Bukhari Book 1-Volum 2: Hadith 12<sup>1</sup>***

Islam came as religion in the six and seven century C.E in Arabia. Pre-Islamic state, hospitality and generosity was highly regarded as an important value of the community. But the Golden Rule did not exist because in those days protecting tribe was one of the prominent things to do through retaliation and vengeance (Homerin 2008:99). The motto was "In evil is salvation when goodness cannot save you." Revenge protected the clan. Although after the coming of prophet Mohammed a new ideology of religious worldview was introduced, the *lex talioni* was still practiced for redressing murder and physical injuries inflicted upon a victim (Q. 2.178; 4.92). However, the contexts of these texts show a concern for the believing community and exclude the unbeliever.

Quran emphasizes on individual responsibility for whatever deeds, bad or good, one does on earth will be judged on the Day of Judgment (Q. 2.261-62; 273-74; Q. 83.1-6).

On that Day, people will come forward separately to be shown their deeds, and, so, whoever did an atom's weight of good will see it, and he who did anatom's weight of evil will see it (Q. 99.6-7).

The concept of positive and negative reciprocity is reflected on divine-man relationship. Correct doctrine and correct deeds bring a positive reward or reciprocal benefit from the divine. But the Quran does not have an explicit Golden Rule statement as the Gospels have it. Some argue that Qur'a'n 83.1-6 is an implicit Golden Rule but a closer expression is found in Hadith, which is second only to the Quran. A most often cited Hadith for Golden Rule reads:

*None of you believes until he loves for his brother what he loves for himself* (Bukhari Book 1-Volume 2: Hadith 12)

The religion of Islam differentiates a Muslim (one who submits to Allah) from a believer (*mu'min*). The former refers to someone who profess to be a believer whereas the latter refers to one who believes in God and his revelation deep in the heart (Homerin 2008:103). The text quoted above, therefore, might be

---

<sup>1</sup> All the texts discussed under this submission are taken electronic source : namely, Ebook-University of California MSA site.

referring to the latter. However, the text explicitly sets goals for exercising positive reciprocity. It is a way of stepping on the ladder of faith from submission to a believer or growth in the faith of Islam. Reciprocity is not an expectation of return from a fellow brother, although such reciprocity might be associated with that of general reciprocity. However, as the text interpreted by Muslim scholars it does not aim at reciprocity so much as humility. Therefore, the text is about becoming or progression in the faith. But a contrasting statement of Jesus to the Haddith 12 is that it is not just enough loving a fellow brother who has possibly been among the same community, but one will be called sons of God by loving one's enemy. Quran, on the other hand, denies its adherents closer relationship with Christians and Jews or others who may wish to harm them (Quran 2. 120, 5.51, 5.82). Nonetheless, the basic general reciprocal concept and ideology cannot be avoided in both statements.

The word "brother" is primarily understood not as referring to an outsider or as the whole humanity, albeit the universal intention is claimed by some Muslim scholars (Homerin 2008:106). In the Sufi tradition, elimination of selfish desire by putting the needs of others before one's own without expecting a return is encouraged (Homerin 2008:106). After examining Quran, Hadith and Muslim tradition, Homerin (2008:113–114) concluded that this text "may be understood to apply all humanity, not only selected group" but his final conclusion states "Muslims have interpreted and applied the Golden Rule in several contrasting ways." Multiple interpretation traditions of the Golden Rule based on theological stance evinces that it is understood in diverse manner including the current *lex talionis* of Osama Bin Laden negative reciprocal ideology (Bin Laden 2005).

With regard to migration, however, Quran assumes many religious figures who are also found in the Bible as migrants, namely: Adam, Abraham, Noah, Jonah, Jacob and Moses (Saritoprak 2008). Islamic tradition speaks of different migration due to religious persecutions. But our discussion will be limited to the first hijra- migration of approximately 82 Muslims converts into Abyssinia (current-Ethiopia) around 617CE (Hussain 2014:173–175). According to the tradition, Prophet Mohammad commanded his persecuted followers to migrate to the land of a Christian king whom he described as just and kind hearted. In accordance with the words of the prophet migrant went to Ethiopia and enjoyed peace and security. Having heard of a peaceful existence of the migrant in Abyssinia, the Qurayshites sent their emissaries with present to the

Negus to instigate him against the migrant for extradition. However, having questioned the migrant about their religion and evaluating the difference between his Christian faith on his terms and Islam, he found that the difference was minor and therefore he vowed to protect the migrant granting them freedom to exercise their religion.

As a result, in the Hadith (37 Battles (Kitab Al-Malahim, Hadith no 4288), Prophet Mohammed reciprocates by banning Jihad against Abyssinia. It reads "Let the Abyssinians alone as long as they let you alone..." The positive reciprocation is conditional as it says "as long as they let you alone." But such a favour towards the Abyssinians stemmed out of reciprocal ideology. But for Islam reciprocation is not a flat positive one as it could either be positive or negative depending on the reaction and action of the Other. However, the model of the Abyssinian Christian king is taken as a good example of just treatment of migrants which might serve in the Muslim tradition as the Golden Rule in action and the interface between religions.

The two traditions Matt 7:12 and Hadith 12 (plus Hadith no 4288) convey that migrants should be treated as oneself with just and kindness. However, while for Matthew it is a vicarious reciprocity, for the Hadith it is conditional and evaluative, therefore, it could result in either in positive or negative relationship. Hence, reciprocity is an ideology that creates responsible bonding between the migrant and the natives for a peaceful co-existence despite their differing religious commitment.

Having said this, however, in the next section we need to analyse how such ideology of reciprocity contributes to a peaceful coexistence of the migrants and the native who have differing religions, values and mental models of each other.

### ***Reciprocity, Migration and the Interface between Religions***

Religion serves as a point of positive interface between the migrant and the natives of the same religion in the destination countries, although language and race might be a bit of a challenge. The newly arrived migrant would be another 'I' of receiving community of the same religion. It serves as a home, especially if the community of the same religion is from country of the same origin. In such milieu, a general reciprocity is a religious normal practice.

Particularly the Golden rule obligates such reciprocal relationship towards a community member despite country of origin. In addition to Christianity and

Islam discussed above, other religions have their own formulation of reciprocal propositions:

**Hinduism:** Mahabaratha ch.5 – “This is the sum of duty; do not do unto others what you would not have them done unto you”

**Judaism:** Hillel, Talmud, Shabbat 31a - "What is hateful to you, do not do to your neighbour. This is the whole Torah; all the rest is commentary."

**Buddhism:** The Buddha-Udara-Varga-5:18 - "Treat not others in ways that you yourself would find hurtful."

**Confucianism:** Confucius Analects 15:23 - "One word which sums up the basis of all good conduct... Loving-kindness. Do not do to others what you do not want done to yourself."

**Taoism:** Lao Tzu, T'ai Shang Kan Ying, P'len, 213-218. - "Regard your neighbour's gain as your own gain and your neighbour's loss as your own loss."

**Baha'i Faith:** bahauallah. Gleanings - "Lay not on any soul a load that you would not wish to be laid upon you, and desire not for anyone the things you would not desire for yourself."

But as regards the interface between religions, conjoining seemingly conceptually similar texts of religious literature does not necessarily bring a positive result, particularly in the context of migration due to the complex nature of religion itself and migration. First, religions by nature bear distinctive traits (Neusner 2008:55–56). According to Neusner, “a proposition that is shared among several religious systems will not play a major role in the construction of any particular religious system.” In other words, common propositions among several different religious tradition does not fit with the particulars of any one of them (Neusner 2008:56). Second, in reciprocity, invariably, two incommensurable notions of value are at play: strict calculation and elusive moral value (right, fair, play and justice). These are both in tensions. Reciprocity is strictly calculative (balanced reciprocity) and as the same time elusive moral values (general reciprocity). Therefore, reciprocity involves a continuing struggle. Third, the way we measure or perceive the world and the way we experience it in many ways are different. All these variables deter us from being optimistic about proposition as a bridge for the interface between religions in some form of human existence.

Nonetheless, reciprocal relationship is fundamental to human nature and the basis for social life and language because human nature is fundamentally interpersonal and relational. Such notion of reciprocity is well attested by its

ubiquity across different religions, albeit application is different. However, the categories of reciprocity must be noted. General reciprocity serves as the bonding within the cultural homogeneous community as it functions without expectation of return. The difference between self and the other is blurred. There is a dependency, empathy and physical intimacy.

An example would be the relationship between mother and child, a patriot and the motherland, and believer and his/or their religion. Such reciprocity is not prevalent among the heterogeneous community. But balanced reciprocity is an interplay between intentions and actions in which a sense of justice as fairness is at work. In such relationship each party deems necessary for its very existence. Balanced reciprocity might serve bridging across the social network of culturally distinct and differentiated migrant religion. The repercussion of not exercising either general or balanced reciprocity leads to the negative reciprocity where self and other are asunder, and polarized, i.e. the existence of one is the annihilation of the other where absolute antipathy and violence is a norm.

Assuming interdisciplinary theoretical endeavour, social exchange theory bases its assumption on economic theory arguing that human behaviour is an exchange of rewards between actors. Their social interaction is characterized by reciprocal stimuli and an exchange of activity: tangible and intangible (Zafirovski 2005:1-3). The theory also claims that individuals establish and maintain social relationship on the expectation of such relationship is mutually advantageous and benefits. In the course of reciprocal interaction, as an outcome, actors attempt to satisfy their needs by attending to the needs of the other (Zafirovski 2005:3, 11). Neurologist Donald W. Paff also perceived that human beings have the capacity for fair play and they are “wired for reciprocity” (as cited in Green 2008:171).

Therefore, reciprocity is not just an ideology but it is the human behaviour. In the context of migration, the natives and migrants’ peaceful interaction and co-existence in the destination country cannot be achieved without it. Reciprocity of benefits is fundamentally important for the peaceful co-existence of migrants with the natives of the country of destination for several reasons.

Among the many, suffice it to mention some here. First, reciprocity creates bond and trust among actors (Zafirovski 2005:4). Because of shared value and a two directional flow of benefits and advantages, the native and the migrants meet each other’s needs (tangible and intangible needs). Second reciprocity creates confidence, belonging, participation and sense of value. In the

reciprocity, the natives value migrants because they would be perceived as contributors not as parasites or threats. Such valuation also creates confidence in the migrant to see themselves not just as receivers, or strangers, but as positive contributors towards the advantage of the receiving country. Third, reciprocity allows migrants and the natives to exercise control over each other's actions and resources (Zafirovski 2005:7). Reciprocity is not without power but it is not domination. The power would be functional in a sense of one controlling the resource that the other needs. In such interaction, the resources can be reciprocated among themselves creating the power of negotiation. Therefore, the migrant whether they are labour migrants or asylum seekers can be perceived as potential resources, of course, without denying they could be potential threat. However, social exchange theory argues that exchange relationship would be positive if they mutually reinforcing, and negative if they preclude one another (Zafirovski 2005:9). Fourth, reciprocity imposes responsibility based on obligation on the part of migrants and the natives in order to maintain conscience reciprocal relationship that produces a long-term benefit for both actors.

Likewise, the interface between religions reciprocity plays a major role in creating a peaceful co-existence. However, reciprocity that bridges the interface between religions of migrants and the natives in the country of arrival is the combination of general reciprocity (within the religious community) and balanced reciprocity (an interaction with the Other). Particularly the latter is mandatory for the peaceful co-existence of different religions at any place because religions, according to their ideology of reciprocity, assume a conscious responsibility for fostering a positive social relationship among human beings in general and between migrants and the native in particular.

### **Conclusion**

Greco-Roman world informed us that reciprocity is a natural phenomenon as a human being is a social being designed to reciprocate life. Social exchange theory and neurologist has confirmed this. Such reciprocity is also part of major world religion succinctly formulated in such a way that it can be memorized easily. Concern for the good of oneself demands concern for the good of the Others. Hence, relationship does not exist in the absence of reciprocity. Reciprocity is ideological. It is a system of exchange of both tangible and intangible benefit based on mutual honour, mutual moral duty, and shared values. Ideology as a mental model influences migration policy

makers at the leadership level, the interaction of the native and migrant at the grassroots level. The ideology of reciprocity manifests itself in different categories: general, balanced or negative which also exists in the major religions of today's world. Such kind of reciprocity produces social bonding, trust, confidence, self-esteem, participation, positive obligation and power of negotiation between the native and the migrants both at the religious and secular level.

### **References**

Akesson, Lisa 2011. Multicultural ideology and transnational family ties among descendants of Cape Verdeans in Sweden. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 37, 2, 217–235.

Badian, E. 1958. *Foreign Clientelae*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Berchman, Robert. M 2008. The Golden Rule in Greco-Roman Religion and Philosophy. In J. Neusner & B. D. Chilton *The Golden Rule: The Ethics of Reciprocity in World Religions*. Continuum, 40–49.

Bin Laden, Osama 2005. *Message to the World: The Statement of Osama Bin Laden*. B. Lawrence London: Verso.

Blok, A. 1969. Variations in Patronage. *Socziologische Gids* 16, 365–378.

Brettell, Caroline B. & Hollifield, James F. 2015. Introduction: Migration Taking across Disciplines. In C. B. Brettell & J. F. Hollifield *Migration Taking across Disciplines*. New York and London: Routledge, 1–36.

Campese, Gioacchino 2012. The irruption of migrants: theology of migration in the 21st century. *Theological Studies* 73, 1, 3–32.

Davis, David Brion 1975. *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770–1823*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Dinbabo, Mulugeta F. & Carciotto, Sergio 2015. International Migration in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Call for a Global Research Agenda. *AHMR* 1, 2, 153–176.

Garcia, Jaume Flaquer 2007. *Notes on an inter-religious theology of migration*. From <<https://bit.ly/2yYsdyG>> (Retrieved October 24, 2018).

Gelzer, M. 1968. *The Roman Nobility*. London: Basil Blackwell.

Green, William Scott 2008. "Wired for Reciprocity": Some Concluding Reflections. In J. Neusner & B. D. Chilton *The Golden Rule: The Ethics of Reciprocity in World Religions*. Continuum, 170–171.

Hinnfors, Jonas, Spehar, Andrea & Bucken-Knapp, Gregg 2013. Ideology and entry policy: Why center-right parties in Sweden support open-door migration policies. In *The Discourses and Politics of Migration in Europe*. Springer, 171–190. From <<https://bit.ly/2yuXkmf>> (Retrieved October 24, 2018).

Homerin, Th. Emil 2008. The Golden Rule in Islam. In J. Neusner & B. D. Chilton *The Golden Rule: The Ethics of Reciprocity in World Religions*. Continuum.

Hussain, Amir 2014. Toward a Muslim Theology of Migration. In E. Padilla & P. C. Phan *Theology of Migration in the Abrahamic Religions*. Palgrave Macmillan's Christianities of the World. Palgrave Macmillan US, 173–186. From <<https://bit.ly/200LZr9>> (Retrieved October 24, 2018).

Kalinowski, Angela V. 1996. *Patterns of Patronage: The Politics and Ideology of Public Building in the Eastern Roman Empire (31BCE - 600 CE)*. Canada: University of Toronto.

Kirk, Alan 2003. „Love your enemies,“ the Golden Rule, and ancient reciprocity (Luke 6:27-35). *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122, 4, 667–686.

Neusner, Jacob 2008. The Golden Rule in Classical Judaism. In B. D. Chilton *The Golden Rule: The Ethics of Reciprocity in World Religions*. Continuum, 55–64.

Noy, David 2000. *Foreigners at Rome: Citizens and Strangers*. Duckworth with the Classical Press of Wales.

Piana, George La 1927. *Foreign Groups in Rome During the First Centuries of the Empire*. Literary Licensing, LLC.

Robbins, Vernon K. 1996. *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretations*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Sahlins, Marshal 1965. On the Sociology of Primitive Exchange. In M. Banton *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*. Tavistock Publication limited, 139–186.

Saller, Richard P. 1982. *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire*. Cambridge University Press.

Saritoprak, Zeki 2008. The Qur'anic Perspective on Immigrants: Prophet Muhammad's Migration and Its Implications in Our Modern Society | The

Journal of Scriptural Reasoning. From <<https://at.virginia.edu/2KHoAlW>> (Retrieved October 24, 2019).

Singer, Marcus George 1967. "The golden rule". In *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Paul Edwards. New York: Macmillan.

Van Dijk, Teun A. 2000. Ideologies, racism, discourse: Debates on immigration and ethnic issues. *Comparative perspectives on racism* 91–116.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1989. Patronage in Roman Society: from Republic to Empire. In A. . Wallace-Hadrill *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London and New York: Routledge, 63–87.

Wattles, Jeffrey 1996. *The Golden Rule*. Oxford University Press.

Zafirovski, Milan 2005. Social exchange theory under scrutiny: A positive critique of its economic-behaviorist formulations. *Electronic journal of sociology* 2, 2, 1–40.