Globethics Repository



Madang Journal [Vol 4, December 2005]

This page was generated automatically upon download from the Globethics Repository. More information on Globethics see https://www.globethics.net. Data and content policy of Globethics Repository see https://repository.globethics.net/pages/policy.

Item Type	Journal volume
Authors	Institute for the Study of Theology, Sungkonghoe University
Publisher	Sungkonghoe University
Rights	With permission of the license/copyright holder
Download date	2026-11-06 04:27:35
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/184062

마당 madang

International Journal of Contextual Theology in East Asia
Volume 4 (December 2005)

4 Foreword

Articles

7 Globalization, Intercultural Hermeneutics and Mission
Guen-Seok Yang

27 The global Economism and the global Ethics
Feng Lu

47 The Massacre of Civilians Before and After the Korean War : Feeling in the Darkness Towards a Christian Ethics Point of View
Chong-Hun Jeong

63 Social Movement as the Ground for Minjung Theology
Jin-Kwan Kwon

77 A New Understanding of Minjung-Messianism
Tae-Soo Yim

91 Respect for Life in Early Chinese Christianity
Andrew Linzey

Abstracts of Recent Doctoral Dissertations

103 A Study on the Formation of Gender Identity of Protestant Women in the Modern Age of Korea: Focusing on the Effects of Mainstream Discourses on Identity Construction
Sook-jin Lee

106 Theological Significance of the Critical Theory
Moon-Whan Kim

109 Looking For Elizabeth: A Feminist Religious Education for Empowering Women's Self-Identity
Hyun-Sun Oh

111 "Not in Persuasive Words of Wisdom" ?: Paul's Rhetoric in 1 Cor 1:18-2:16
So-Jung Yoon

112 A Study on William Temple's Christian Social Order and Welfare State
Ki-Yong Chang

Foreword

Justice, Forgiveness, and Reconciliation in History

Recently there is a fierce debate over how to deal with the historical past of the Korean people. It is to deal with the betrayal of the Korean people by the cooperation of the Korean leaders with the Japanese colonial power. Japanese colonial power forced the Korean leaders to capitulate and to cooperate with the Japanese imperial regime. This tragic experience involves the promotion of the "Comfort Women" to serve Japanese soldiers during the WW II. This also involves the promotion of the Emperor Worship and the Shinto Worship. Some of the Korean leaders were promoting these policies with various concrete acts. It is like some German leaders to cooperate with the Nazi policy of the persecution of the Jews.

Some Koreans took high positions in the colonial government and in the Japanese aristocracy. Some committed acts to cause personal and property damages to the Korean people and their communities as well as to the people in individual terms.

How do we deal with the historical situation and how do we account these historical realities to restore historical justice?

In the past, right after the liberation of the Korean people in 1945, the attempts have been made to account the past history to establish justice and to create unity of the Korean people. However, such attempts had not been successful or incomplete. This is primarily due to the national division of Korea. The North Korean regime dealt with the issue with his own political perspective, and the South Korean Regime aborted the issue upon pressure of the political right with the backing of the US military occupation force in S. Korea. Historical accounting was incomplete and distorted to say the least.

Recently some Korean intellectuals decided to publish a dictionary, which would contain the names of the collaborators with the Japanese colonial powers. Initially they have revealed about 3,000 names, including some very renowned people. This caused a fierce debate among the Korean people. Some opposed the project of the Dictionary from the conservative political motives; others supported from the progressive perspective. There is a wide consensus on historical accounting of the past; and yet there is no unity as to how this should be done.

There are some points for consideration in accounting the historical past. In the first place, it is the Minjung perspective that should be taken utterly seriously. The

Minjung suffered most at the bottom of the oppressive Japanese power. Their suffering should be accounted for. This means that the Japanese power should be on the table of historical accounting. It is agreed that the Japanese colonial policy was a most brutal one, for it exacted not only political loyalty and economic wealth; but it forced a cultural annihilation through assimilation and a religious loyalty, betraying their own religious faith. In the second place, the Minjung perspective does not allow any attempt of historical accounting from the point of view of the powerful in the Korean regimes. This means a radical democratic perspective of the Minjung. No leaders can claim any self-righteous position to judge the past. There should be a broad democratic consensus among the Korean people in the accounting of the past history in order to have a true justice and reconciliation for the unity of the people.

Another issue is the dimension of the collective guilt of the Korean people. All Koreans are somewhat involved in the historical responsibility in accepting the Japanese rule, although it could not be avoided. Historical accounting means a healing of the national collective guilt as well as the hurt of the Minjung of the Korean people.

We realize that the task of historical accounting of the past is a very difficult. Time has passed more that 60 years from the liberation of Korea. Truth and facts are difficult to determine, unless persons involved tell the truth of their guilt and responsibility with truthfulness. Historical records are not completeand memories are fading. Even if there are records about the perpetrators and their acts, most of them passed away and, therefore, they cannot defend themselves. Without their advocacy to defend legitimately themselves, the truth about them could be distorted and arbitrary.

Some people argue that such difficulty warrants closing of the historical books. Some people argue that historical accounting divides the people, and, therefore, the case should be closed. However, this is not acceptable for the sake of historical justice, of the healing of the Minjung, of national reconciliation and of the future of the people. We should not forget the past; for the past is the mother of wisdom to create new future.

Here are some historical examples from which we can learn. Jesus did not ignore the issue of justice. Jesus took the forgiveness as the heart of the power of healing the people. There was Peter, who betrayed Jesus in the court of Roman Empire. There is Judas who betrayed Jesus in collaboration with the authorities, which crucified Jesus. How do we account this past

history? Repentance and forgiveness has a place in history. Commission of Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa was said to have a power to forgive the perpetrators upon their telling the truths, upon their asking forgiveness and upon their reparation to the injured party as much as possible.

Some German pastors issued "Stuttgart Erklaerung" of repentance after the WW II. It was an antidote of healing among the German people as well as with their own neighbors. After German reunification, the people, who cooperated with the East German STASI and caused suffering upon the people, were told that they should go to the injured people and to ask their forgiveness. They were told that they should take some responsibilities through appropriate reparation and resigning from the public post. These measures may be not enough, but it is definitely a fine medicine for healing of the community. Is it wise to publish those names of the so-called betrayers and collaborators with the Japanese Empire? It would be imposing unjustly a moral guilt upon their children forever.

We have many tasks of historical accounting, for we have lived in complex conflict situations in our history. Experience of our people under the Japanese colonialism is only one of tragic experiences, which needs accounting. Our people lived in the ideologically divided situation and in the war situations. Our people lived under the military dictatorship. How do we account our historyto restore historical justice and reconciliation among our people, and to restore right relations with the people of the power nations of Japan, USA and USSR, including China.

How would Jesus account past history for justice and reconciliation among the people and with all living beings on earth?

Chief Editor, Kim Yong-Bock

Madang, Vol. 4 (December, 2005), 7-26

Globalization, Intercultural Hermeneutics and Mission

Guen Seok Yang*

The necessity of intercultural interpretation in theology and mission studies has been raised on two important backgrounds in recent times: (1) the "de-Europeanization" of Christianity in response to the historical result of the missionary movement and (2) the social phenomenon of globalization. The "de-Europeanization" of Christianity is, as Harvey Gallagher Cox said, the dismantling of the thousand-year old idea of "Christendom."[1] Borrowing from Samartha's terminology, here "Christendom" implies a mono-religious, mono-cultural interpretive tradition having a single scriptural interpretative center.[2] Therefore, the "de-Europeanization" or dismantling of western-style Christianity means that worldwide Christianity is now being expressed in various non-European cultural forms, and is beginning to realize its own life in relationship with multiple religious, cultural and scriptural traditions. In this situation, a new method of intercultural interpretation is necessary for understanding Christianity both internally and in relation to other religious

---

Guen Seok Yang is Professor of Biblical Hermeneutics and Mission Studies at Sungkonghoe (Anglican) University in Korea and Vice-President of the university. He received his Ph.D from Birmingham University. E-mail : ksyang@mail.skhu.ac.kr

1) Harvey Gallagher Cox, *The Silencing of Leonardo Boff: The Vatican and the Future of World Christianity* (London: Collins, 1988), 12.

2) S. J. Samartha, "Religion, Language and Reality: Towards a Relational Hermeneutics," *Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches* 2 (1994), 340-62.

and cultural traditions. Asian experiences of intercultural hermeneutics, which were already practiced even before the current discussion of globalization, can provide an example of this needed intercultural hermeneutic.

Another background for intercultural interpretation comes from a new social phenomenon known as "globalization." Roland Robertson says, "Globalization as a concept refers both to the compression of the world and the intensification of the consciousness of the world as a whole." [3] Globalization addresses the fact that human lives all over the planet have become increasingly interdependent and interconnected, far beyond traditional, national, or territorial boundaries. This new situation prompts us to think of this world as a whole. Responding to this changed phenomenon, which is a matter not only of economics but also of consciousness, globalization highlights our need to develop meaningful communication across cultural boundaries for the future development of global society. In this changed situation, intercultural hermeneutics can assist us in understanding the preconditions for healthy intercultural communication and the kinds of meaning and truth it can produce.

This essay focuses on intercultural hermeneutics from the view of globalization. But I also critically exam the general consensus that an intercultural approach is imperative in order to overcome territory-bound contextual theology and mission, particularly in the age of globalization in which boundary-crossing intercultural encounters are accelerated and a global consciousness is growing. I do this from the viewpoint of the victims of globalization, because this point of view can show us some points that the general consensus has overlooked. Furthermore, I will examine some implications of Asian experiences of intercultural hermeneutics for a hermeneutics responsive to the phenomenon of globalization. Through this critical dialogue, I will point out some elements that intercultural hermeneutics must reconsider if it is to be a useful interpretative tool for promoting the self-liberation of victims of globalization. Finally, I propose some implications of this new discussion of intercultural interpretation for the understanding of mission.

---

3) Roland Robertson, *Globalization* (London: SAGE, 1992), 8.

Globalization from the Viewpoint of the Victims

The word "globalization" began to be mentioned by policy makers in Korea in the early 1990s. The civil government that emerged after a long military dictatorship took "*Segehwa*," their own translation of globalization, as the long-term policy target. At that time, the word "globalization" still had a rosy glow. Although the dream did not last more than five years, at the time the policy dream-makers predicted that, through a policy of globalization, national per-capita income would reach twenty thousand dollars, and Korea would eventually become an economic world leader. Under the influence of this government propaganda, the whole country was filled with the fever for English study and preparation for study abroad. The demand for overseas travel and overseas corporate investments increased dramatically. This was Koreans' first experience of globalization. It was a process filled with the intoxication of a rosy illusion.

But before we could enjoy the smell of the rose, we were pricked with its thorns. "Globalization" for Koreans pointed out the short distance between heaven and hell. After 1997 national bankruptcy became a reality and the Korean economy fell under the control of the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The IMF imposed a structural-adjustment program and the dream of economic independence seemed to be shattered. Global financial capital restructured industry, financial, and labor markets in order to incorporate the Korean economy into the global economy, and the result was mass dismissals. An increase in unemployment, homeless people, undernourished children, and destitution followed. This was Koreans' second experience of globalization. It was a bitter and cruel experience for Koreans forced into globalization by the global power of capital, and not by their own decision.

From this Korean experience, we begin to understand the complex nature of globalization. First, it illustrates the Janus faces of globalization. As the chairperson of the Korean business conglomerate Daewoo, which was bankrupted after the IMF's readjustment program, wrote in his biography, "the world is wide enough and there are a lot of things to do." For wealthy elites like him, globalization offers the tantalizing promise of the unlimited exercise of freedom and the unlimited satisfaction of desires. But for those victims forced into the streets after losing their jobs and experiencing broken families, globalization is only the beginning of a

tragedy that declines into a state of despair. The two opposite understandings force us to reexamine what we mean when we speak of "globalization." I believe we have to take the side of the victims in our discussions of issues concerning globalization. We should be more sensitive to the negative effects of globalization, if we are to work toward a more humane global society for the future.

Second, we need to recognize the totalizing nature of globalization. The most disappointing fact in the economic restructuring process in Korea was the lack of any responsible, critical voice opposing economic injustice, despite the mass dismissals and the thousands of homeless forced into the street in such a short period. The democratization movement, including the Christian liberation movement, suddenly lost its voice in this most important moment. After national bankruptcy, the economic situation which Koreans experienced under the IMF's debt relief-financing was enough to spread a pervasive fear among the people, enabling the government to strengthen neoliberal market-capitalism in all aspects of society. The government claimed that mass dismissals and homeless people were an inevitable result of the struggle to survive in a world of unlimited competition. The logic grounding the push to strengthen Korea's competitive power overwhelmed any contrary logic of distributive justice. By reserving ethical value-judgments on this economic program, Koreans effectively legitimized economic values as absolute. From this situation, Kim Young Hwan, a Korean critic, wrote that "while the past military dictatorship's power was based on physical power," the current civil government supporting globalization exercised a "new power based on neoconservatism and an immoral ideology of the logic of competition."[4] While representatives of the new globalized Korean economy seemed to be very open in discussing the economic problems, and despite this apparent "openness," their unilateral logic of competition and the atmosphere of fear which their new economic power created were so pervasive that they functioned, in fact, as a new totalitarian ideology blocking all free, active discussion or opposition at the outset.[5] Thus, the leaders of Korea's new globalized economy were able to assume an unchallenged place in making economic values paramount in Korean society.

4) Yong-Hwan Kim, "Discussions: The Problem of *Segehwa* and Its Philosophical Criticism," *The Study of Philosophy* 38 (1996), 200-01.

5) Ibid., 201-2.

From the victims' point of view, it is even worse. The unilateral emphasis on economic competition is an ideology that functions to consolidate more power in investors and their political partners (who are regarded as the real competitors in the global market), to legitimize their economic violence and oppression, to suppress the resistance of victims, and to silence all critics. The totalitarian rule of this competition-ideology was the reason why the voices of victims were hardly heard at the moment of national crisis. Therefore, an urgent issue for us now is how the victims of globalization can make their voices heard in resisting the totalitarian nature and negative effects of globalization.

Third, globalization in Korea has created a social atmosphere of tacit approval for excluding the weak. The powers in the colonial and cold war period used more than just physical means to maintain the weak. Although it did not make economic sense, they attempted to insist on the ethical legitimacy of the weak. Even the East and the West in the cold war period continued ethical persuasion in order to colonize the weak countries under their rule. But the powerful in the time of globalization seem to feel no necessity to do so. The power which globalization unilaterally cedes to capital avoids any responsibility to persuade the weak. According to Zygmunt Bauman, global economic power is an irresponsible power and freedom released from all ethical burdens to address the results of economic exploitation.[6)]

In the past, society presupposed that the strong and the weak live together. The strong had a responsibility, in the face of resistance from the weak, to control their desires. But it is not so now. While the strong are free to ignore the weak who resist them, the options for the weak are very narrow, and their capacity to communicate with others is also very limited. The strong have no need to be disturbed by the "otherness" of the weak. While the strong enjoy the unlimited freedom of global interaction, the weak experience exclusion and isolation. In the past, there was a common understanding that society has a duty to listen to the voice of the weak, called *minjung* in Korea. In *minjung* theology, the weak were sometimes recognized as subjects searching for a new way of communication through their power of resistance. But the social and political response to the weak in the age of globalization is more cold-hearted. The homeless are sent to

6) Zygmunt Bauman, *Globalization: The Human Consequences* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 9-11.

isolated camps and excluded from society. The weak in this age are isolated and excluded from communication. Where is the way of solidarity and communion in this age of exclusion and isolation?

Fourth, globalization in Korea was a process in which social cohesion crumbled and the crisis of identity intensified. According to Satoshi Ikeda, the most serious sociocultural impact of globalization in Northeast Asia, including Korea, is "the scrapping of the social contracts that existed among the state, corporations, and the workers."[7] As entrepreneurs and capitalists acquire greater power, they have more freedom and power in the employment relationship. "The workers are left to compete with each other over limited employment opportunity and little chance to prosper in the global economy."[8] In the end, antagonism rather than concord is the result for relationships between capitalists and workers. A so-called intentional disorder and confusion is created, as the common goal of national development and the basic consent among social constituents is destroyed.

The social contract among the state, corporations, and workers is one of the most basic elements helping to promote the unity of society. It is a historical product, developed through struggle and conflict since liberation from colonialism. It is also a framework on which Koreans deconstruct past colonial identities while searching for new understandings of themselves, as they reexamine the external cultural influences and their own traditional heritage. It is also a process in which common social goals, like democratization and modernization, have been formed. Therefore, the destruction of the social contract and the fracturing of social cohesion mean that the hermeneutical presuppositions and foundations for self-understanding are now threatened. The process of globalization has generated an identity-crisis for Korean society.

The elite and affluent in Korean society may regard the dismantling of the traditional social contract as a hopeful sign. Because they have marketable skills and economic freedom to move across national and cultural boundaries, a social contract limited to just one society may be a hindrance to them. But for the socioeconomically weak, the disintegration of the national social contract seems to render their struggle meaningless

7) Satoshi Ikeda, "Globalization and the Future of Korea, China, Japan, and Russia: U.S. Hegemonic Revival, the End of National Economic Development, and Sociocultural Response in Northeast Asia," *Discourse* 201/4 (2001), 170-1.

8) Ibid., 171.

and to deprive them of any hope for self-realization, since globalization provides them with no alternative. New social signs have appeared in Korea, reflecting the despair of the weak increases in crimes, suicides, leaving home, homelessness, and family breakdowns. In this situation, problems of identity arise for the victims of globalization. The elite may address the identity-issue in terms of the freedom to move across all boundaries. They can easily hail their new found freedom from history and tradition, and over-extol hybridization and syncretism as their identity strategy. But for the victims of globalization, the socioeconomically weak whose history of liberation and weapons of resistance are ignored and denied and who lack the elite's freedom, the range of options is very narrow. As many critics have pointed out, the dangers of fundamentalism and essentialism grow in this situation. Therefore, in this limited and dangerous new situation, it is important to help the victims of globalization find a new way in which to reinterpret their history of resistance and struggle for liberation that will empower them even in these changed conditions of globalization, so that they can find their own voices and make them heard, rather than falling into the alternative dangers of fundamentalism.

I have tried to explain globalization from the viewpoints of the victims of globalization and the socioeconomically weak. I am not rejecting the general perceptions of globalization as a positive force in fostering a sense of greater interconnectedness, intensified interdependence, and growing global consciousness that enables us to see the world as a single whole. But I believe we need to ask what *kind* of interconnectedness and interdependency is now growing and towards *what* the global consciousness is directing us. We must be willing to acknowledge and address the negative, as well as the positive, impact of globalization. Furthermore, I am certain that such a critical approach, starting from the situation of globalization's victims, will show us the right way forward in tackling issues of globalization while doing theology and mission for the church.

Deterritorialization, Hyperdifferentiation, and Hybridization

Here, I would like to examine one influential theologian's understanding of globalization as a changed context for doing theology.[9] According to Robert J. Schreiter, under the impact of globalization, the concept of

9) Robert J. Schreiter, *The New Catholicity: Theology between the Global and the*

"context" in contextual theologies has been changed in three ways: It has been *deterritorialized, hyperdifferentiated, and hybridized.*[10] Given this change in "context," Schreiter advocates intercultural interpretation and syncretism as methods for the tasks of contextual theology. His understanding comes from general observation of global and local theological trends as well as globalization itself. However, when we look from the viewpoints of the victims of globalization, we can see a certain distance between the "context" of contextual theology and the living situation of globalization's victims.

Let me explain Schreiter's understanding of these three changes in context. He believes that, while "context" in past contextual theologies was defined by the geographical boundaries of territory, "context" in the age of globalization must be defined by other boundaries of difference besides geographical territory. These boundaries of difference "intersect and crisscross" without and within territorial boundaries. In an age of globalization, the emphasis on "context" in contextual theology lies not in "elements of commonality" in a limited geographical territory but on issues of differences that become the "basis of identity." These differences are not confined within territorial boundaries but include all peoples who experience the same difference. Therefore, the context of experience, reflection, and identity-formation is deterritorialized.

Hyperdifferentiation is related to deterritorialization. It refers to the phenomenon that "peoples are now participating in different realities at the same time." Hyperdifferentiation means that a person can have "multiple belongings" within various boundaries of difference. Hybridization for Shreiter is a concept that changes our understanding of culture. For him, the assumption of cultural "purity" (sometimes shared by past contextual theology) makes no sense in a globalized world characterized by accelerating cultural interaction. The hybrid is an important result of this cultural interaction, so he asserts that contextual theology should accept hybridity beyond a static understanding of culture.

Although I respect Shreiter's observations on the general trends in contextual theologies, I am struck by the thought that the living contexts of the victims of globalization are very different from Shreiter's theological

---

Local (New York: Orbis, 2002).

10) Ibid., 26-7.

understanding of context. We may agree that globalization is leading to a deterritorialization of context. It seems very clear, in fact, that even antiglobalization movements have been globalized in a certain degree. However, if we look from the opposite direction, we must also recognize that *reterritorialization*, along with deterritorialization, is also going on. In other words, what appears as deterritorialization for the elite means reterritorialization for the victims. Globalization's victims are restrained to a limited territory as much as they are localized. In order to go beyond their geographic boundaries, they must be ready to suffer or to be illegal migrant workers or "resident aliens." Here, territory is no longer a place that gives meaning or identity in their lives, but instead becomes a prison or shackle of a cruel fate. As Zygmunt Bauman observes, "Being local in a globalized world is a sign of social deprivation and degradation. The discomforts of localized existence are compounded by the fact that, with public spaces removed beyond the reaches of localized life, localities are losing their meaning-generating and meaning-negotiating capacity and are increasingly dependent on sense-giving and interpreting actions which they do not control so much for the communitarianist dreams/consolations of the globalized intellectuals." [11] This reterritorialization forcibly restricts the victims of globalization within a localized territory where the capacity for "meaning-generating and meaning-negotiating" is unrecognized in the globalized world. For those victims, to rediscover the meaning of locality and to restore the ability to negotiate with others seem to be more urgent.

Hyperdifferentiation also has little to do with the victims of globalization; the socioeconomically weak. As we have seen above, rather than having the opportunity to express their difference and otherness, the weak are now in danger of exclusion from the public spaces of society. Exclusion of various differences and segregation from the world is a more realistic fate for the victims of globalization than the possibility of having multiple belongings within those differences. As many third-world theologians already have discussed, it is true that there are differences among the excluded peoples and that we need "a multiaxial framework of analysis."[12] But the truth is that the differences of the victims and the weak are suppressed and localized not globalized. The issue for them, therefore, is

11) Bauman, 2-3.

12) Pui-lan Kwok, *Discovering the Bible in the Non-Biblical World* (New York: Orbis, 1995), 39.

not hyperdifferentiation but social exclusion and suppression of their differences.

Hybridization is also a specific characteristic only for elite globalized cultures. It is not a proper explanation of the experiences of excluded victims. We may accept that a presumption of cultural purity is untenable today. Moreover, we can say that all of us, including the victims of globalization, are touched by hybridization. But are these victims hybridizing or hybridized? Who is being hybridized, and how and for what purposes? I believe that the localized weak are being hybridized by the globalized strong. The weak are powerless observers in a situation in which their cultural products are deterritorialized or decontextualized in order to become elements of cultural hybridization among the strong. The weak become consumers of these hybridized cultural productions that have nothing to do with their own living context, thus throwing them into a state of self-alienation. Globalization may offer new opportunities for agency and self-realization among elites who can actively seek out new cultural opportunities for hybridization in actively constructing their new identities, but, for those who are hybridized the victims who have hybridization imposed upon them from outside, without regard for their own wishes or interests-hybridization simply generates a crisis of identity.

Schreiter uses these three concepts deterritorialization, hyperdifferentiation, and hybridizationto advocate intercultural hermeneutics as a method for contextual theologies in a time of globalization. But, as I illustrated above, the life-contexts of globalization's victims is very different from the experiences to which these concepts point. Hence, intercultural hermeneutics based on these concepts carries the potential for uncritically serving the interests of the globalized strong, while ignoring the reality of the lives of the globalized weak. Instead, we need a more critical contextual theology that more closely approaches the reality of victims' lives. Such a theology can contribute more constructively to improving the lives of the victims as well as the future of the globalized world. Therefore, a critical reconstruction of intercultural hermeneutics from the living experiences of globalization's victims is also necessary.

Implications of Asian Experiences of Intercultural Hermeneutics

Here, my intention is not to develop fully an intercultural hermeneutics.

Rather, in reexamining Asian experiences of intercultural hermeneutics, I would like to draw out some significant implications for developing a constructive intercultural hermeneutics sensitive to the life experiences of the globalized weak. Intercultural hermeneutics in Asia has related more directly to decolonization and the liberation movement under dictatorship than to the situation of globalization or postmodernity. Most Asian countries faced the task of building an independent, modernized nation-state after liberation from colonialism, achieved through the deconstruction of colonial heritages and the discovery of new identities. For that purpose, a crucial task was reinterpretation and reappropriation of their own religious cultural traditions as well as modern elements imported from the west. The inculturation of theology and church could be a Christian response to the new situation developing after Asian colonialism. But the process of decolonization has been distorted by the various forms of dictatorship in many countries of Asia. In these cases, resistance and liberation from oppressive power, so-called development dictatorships, became an urgent task alongside the issue of decolonization. Asian liberation theologies, including Korean "*minjung* theology" and the Philippine people's "struggle theology" represent two Christian responses to the situation.

Both inculturation and liberation theologies intimately interacted with each other in Asia. One of the important theological agendas for Asian contextual theologians was how to bring together these two theological flows in the place of peoples' suffering and struggle. This attempt at some kind of union of theologies was very natural in Asia, where a variety of religious, cultural, and scriptural traditions long have coexisted. Searching for help from local traditions, therefore, was just as imperative for liberation theologies as for inculturation theologies. Liberation theologians, in particular, developed connections in an effort to join two different liberation traditions: the Christian Bible and Asian religious and cultural heritages. Aloysius Pieris's *An Asian Theology of Liberation*[13] and Seo Nam-dong's *The Study of Minjung Theology*[14] maybe the most important products of this effort. The various forms of Asian intercultural theologies with titles like crosscultural, interreligious, intercanonical, interscriptural, interpathic, and relational hermeneutics are in continuity with those Asian contextual theologies. In order words, they are serious endeavors to explain what is the

13) Aloysius Pieris, *An Asian Theology of Liberation* (New York: Orbis, 1988).
14) Nam-dong Suh, *The Study of Minjung Theology* (Seoul: Hangilsa, 1983).

right hermeneutical relationship among various religious and cultural traditions encountering each other in the place of Asian peoples' struggles.

This development toward an Asian intercultural hermeneutics was not an easy process. It resulted from the efforts of Asian theologians to change radically colonial mission-paradigms and to bring about a Christian acknowledgement of Asian religions and cultures in the expression of Asian Christianity. Borrowing from Sugirtharajah's terms,[15] orientalist paradigms by which western missionaries had made *a priori* judgments and definitions of Asian religions and cultures, and the Anglicist paradigm by which western biblical hermeneutics had been uncritically authorized as a scientific method, thus devaluing Asian scriptures and their hermeneutical traditions, maintained their power over Christian and biblical studies in Asia long after the liberation from colonialism. These colonial paradigms were based on the unequal power-relationship between missionary senders and Asian receivers, also translated into the unequal relationship between Christianity and other religions, and between the Bible and traditional Asian scriptures.

Despite their positive intentions, inculturation approaches to theology did little to address the basic problem that Asians and their religious and cultural traditions had no active role in interpretation. Interpretive authority during the missionary period clearly lay in the hands of the missionaries, and, even in the period of inculturation, biblical truth was first packaged in the west and then refashioned in Asian style.[16] In other words, interpretive authority has always been outside of Asia, and Asians have been alienated from Christian and biblical truth and its interpretation.

Moreover, Asian theologians saw that Asians' own interpretive abilities and potentials had been overlooked or negated. Based on this insight, Asian contextual theologies have moved toward a new stage in which Asians, as the subjects of interpretation, can reconceptualize and reformulate the meaning of Christian faith in their own terms, not merely restylize a truth already packaged outside of Asia.[17] As the result of this radical transformation of awareness, an equal relationship between Christianity and other religious and cultural traditions in Asia has been developed, and

15) R. S. Sugirtharajah, *Asian Biblical Hermeneutics and Postcolonialism: Contesting the Interpretations* (New York: Orbis, 1998), 3, 11.

16) Pui-lan Kwok, 10, 57.

17) Ibid., 578.

various forms of intercultural hermeneutics have emerged in Asia.

What hermeneutical implications can Asian experiences of intercultural interpretation point to for the intercultural hermeneutics demanded in a time of globalization? First of all, Asian intercultural hermeneutics upholds the standpoint of victims. Asian perspectives are intimately bound up with the liberation of peoples who suffered under colonial and dictatorial rule. Methodologically, this is an effort to reinstate the victims as the real subjects of interpretation. A representative *minjung* theologian, Seo Nam-dong, saw that *minjung* traditions in Christianity and in Korean religious and cultural history create a confluence in the *minjung*'s struggle for self-realization.[18] Chung Hyun-kung more directly described it as a "survival and liberation centered syncretism."[19] The *minjung* are the subjects of intercultural interpretation and their struggle is its locus or center. I think that the intercultural hermeneutics of the globalizing age must speak more clearly about the subject and the locus of interpretation. We must demand that any intercultural hermeneutics truly responsive to the forces of globalization ask how relevant its methods and interpretations are for the victims of globalization. They are the peoples who are localized and excluded by globalization; they could easily retreat to a segregated ghetto and become victims of fundamentalism. They lack the hermeneutical (and economic) means to avoid these risks. If intercultural hermeneutics is going to provide an alternative way for these victims, it must consider more seriously the life experiences of the victims.

Second, Asian intercultural hermeneutics recognizes the important truth that all religious and cultural assets are intimately combined in the life of the community practicing them. These assets are not resources to be freely commercialized whenever and however the capitalist wants. The diverse religions and cultures in Asia are not simply conceptualized texts, cultures, and religions; they are living communities. The globalized elites are the ones whose connections to community are being lost in the process of deterritorialization. When they separate the religious and cultural assets from a community, harvesting them for hybridization with other cultural fragments scavenged around the globe, such an intercultural play can be seen as cultural vandalism that ignores the victims who are still inevitably

18) Nam-dong Suh, *The Study of Minjung Theology*, 45-82.

19) Hyun-kyung Chung, *Struggle to be the Sun Again* (New York: Orbis, 1990), 113.

responsible for the community even after the elites have left. Intercultural hermeneutics, therefore, should address the life situation of victims' local communities. In order to do this, it must be more sensitive to the relationships existing between religious and cultural assets and the living communities instantiating them. Moreover, intercultural hermeneutics must be alert to the potential violence of an uncritical hybridization that proceeds through irresponsible deterritorialization or decontextualization without respecting or eliciting the voluntary participation of local communities.

Third, intercultural encounter in Asian theologies is understood as an interactive process not only among communities but also among scriptures and traditions of scriptural interpretation. It is an encounter among peoples and communities who have their own hermeneutical traditions. This means that the intercultural encounter must accord equal interpretive respect in the interaction between subjects, regarding interpretation as part of the internal self-development process of each hermeneutical tradition. Even hybridization or syncretism can be a constructive process, when it arises from the voluntary, internal needs of those hermeneutical subjects and traditions. Until this generosity, civility, and restraint in intercultural encounter is accepted, we may not expect a healthy intercultural ecology in which genuinely creative, constructive, and dynamic interactions among cultures and religions are possible. If we want a globalized world in which various cultures and religions coexist and cooperate actively and creatively, then we must ask whether the present intercultural encounter spredominantly practicing and praising syncretism and hybridization are really the ways to achieve such coexistence and creative interaction. Many peoples worry about cultural homogenization and the extinction of cultural and religious heritages. If we hope to overcome this fear and realize our hope for constructive, fruitful intercultural coexistence and creative interaction, I believe that intercultural hermeneutics will have to be more sensitive to the relationships between cultures and their subjects, who are interpreters belonging to their own distinctive hermeneutical traditions.

What we learn from Asian experiences of intercultural hermeneutics is that intercultural encounter and interpretation should be based on a clear recognition of the interrelation among culture, community, and text (or religion, community, and scripture). In a globalized world, it is said that actions and thoughts taken by individuals or groups are influenced by global flows and at the same time have global impacts. This means that all

responsible actions must be examined in the local as well as the global context. Our sensitivity to the relations among culture, community, and text is one of such global responsibilities one that intercultural interpreters must particularly keep in mind. While it is true that there is no pure culture and that cultural history is one of syncretism or hybridization, nevertheless constructive intercultural interaction should involve a process of interpretation in which all the related subjects can participate equally. Culture is not made for syncretism or hybridization, but vice versa. Syncretism and hybridization have provided ways for cultures to participate in the world. But today, there are trends that mistake the means for the end, particularly in syncretism and hybridization associated with the neoliberal globalization of capitalism. This mistaken approach, particularly the unequal cultural interaction of globalization, has produced many victims who now are being forced into hybridization or segregation in unbearable ghettos. Therefore, the most urgent agenda for intercultural hermeneutics must be to develop its potential to help those victims who want to be responsible subjects in a globalized world. I think this agenda is still awaiting our involvement and endeavors.

Intercultural Encounter and Mission

Let us begin from a well-known definition of the mission of God. The concept of missio Dei is an affirmation of God as the center, source, and author of mission. It grounds our understanding of mission in the very nature of the triune God. God shows us what mission is, through the loving activities within the Trinity: God sends Christ, and God and Christ send the Spirit, and the triune God sends the church into the world.[20] These activities are an outpouring of the love that is the very nature of God, a love reconciling all creatures. Therefore, mission in our time is God's continuing activity of love carried out through the Spirit. This classical understanding of mission is a good starting point for the discussion of mission. But we need to go one step farther to understand mission in the context of intercultural encounter.

We can find a clue from the Indian missiologist Lalsangkima Pachuau, who says that the activities of the inter-trinitarian life of God are boundary-

20) David J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (New York: Orbis, 1996), 390.

crossing activities. Moreover, "Christian mission is about the boundary-crossing activity of Christians or the church who themselves follow the example of God who crossed the boundary between God and the world (*missio Dei*) in and through Jesus Christ."[21] Here, he reminds us that "the call is to cross and not to crush the boundaries."[22] Pachuau offers some important points to consider for a new understanding of mission. While we clearly affirm God as the center and source of mission, the boundary between God and the world remains intact. The boundary is the place where an interactive communication occurs. Maintaining the boundary allows the interactive communication to continue. *Missio Dei* is not one-way traffic ignoring boundary-crossings. This is very true for the horizontal dimension of mission by which Christians or the church participate in a boundary-crossing relationship with their partners in the world. Therefore, I believe the concept of *missio Dei* generates a new insight not only about the content of communication but also about the *relationship* between subjects involved in that communication. The two areas of the content and relationship are exactly what intercultural hermeneutics has to deal with in boundary-crossing communications. Hence, we can say that intercultural hermeneutics is directly related to our search for the meaning of mission.

This is very clear in the discussions of mission carried on by theologians and churches in areas that experienced colonialism. As we saw in the Asian experiences of intercultural hermeneutics, Asian theologians wrestle with mission because of their experience with inequalities in the interpretive relationships between missionaries and Asian receivers, sending churches and receiving peoples, and speakers and hearers. Missiology also must address how the meaning of the Christian message is newly revealed in new conditions of communication. Radical assertions that the Gospels should be reformulated and reconceptualized, or that Asians should be reinstated as the subjects of interpretation, result not only from the most serious reflections on past experiences of mission, but also from missionary efforts to correct distorted communication relationships. Here, the correction of communication relationships is itself the mission of God to release oppressed peoples and heal the rift between God and humanity.

21) Lalsangkima Pachuau, "Missiology in a Pluralistic World: The Place of Mission Study in Theological Education," *International Review of Mission* 89 (2000), 549.

22) Ibid.

Globalization is surely an important challenge to the boundary-crossing mission of God. Globalization appears as a totalitarian system because the intensified intercultural and crosscultural relationships arising now are governed by a single value, the economic demand for profit or efficiency. Thus, many theologians see globalization as a totalizing system in which commercial cosmology rules. Although globalization looks like an extreme development of plurality and the highest development of communication, in reality it moves in the opposite direction from our expectations. Considering neoliberal market globalization, Malcolm Brown wrote:

> The whole philosophy of the free market takes as axiomatic the view that plurality has rendered moral consensus impossible and thus the only principle for the distribution of goods must be the amoral market mechanism, since any planned distributional goals are inevitably coercive on those who do not share the consensus around those goals. In other words, the market, which purports to celebrate difference and thus to transcend moral concerns because no grand narrative of morals is possible, has generated the hegemonic grand narrative of globalization which suppress all difference other than the ability to outwit the competition.[23)]

I think this statement clearly characterizes the relationships globalization creates. Globalization reflects not plurality's positive potential but its relativistic impotence. Although cultural plurality may flourish under globalization, it does not facilitate creative and productive intercultural communication but only meaningless and futile economic transactions. On this pessimistic vision of plurality, globalization rationalizes the rule of the market. Competing moral values, including distributive justice, no longer function as norms regulating socioeconomic relationships. When cultural plurality is understood simply as futile intercultural interaction, cultural subjects are ignored or silenced in cultural interactions and the relationship between cultures and subjects is torn apart for market purposes. Borrowing from Thomas Berry, the world becomes a "collection of objects" rather than a "communion of subjects."[24)] In this understanding of globalization,

23) Malcolm Brown, "Plurality and Globalization: The Challenge of Economics to Social Theology," *Political Theology* 2 (2001), 103-4.

24) Stephen Bede Scharper, "Democracy, Cosmology and the Great Work of

boundary-crossing communication is only a mechanical interaction of objects.

This outlook is a serious challenge to a Christian understanding of mission, that is, the boundary-crossing communication of the church for the flourishing of humanity and the world. A purely economic view of globalization that assumes the futility of meaningful cultural interaction tells us that the church's intercultural boundary-crossing mission is hopeless. The most important missionary task in this situation is to transform the intensified intercultural encounters that globalization has spawned into true boundary-crossings that allow mutual communication among equal subjects. For this, Christian mission must be very sensitive to the relationships among cultures and their subjects, as we have seen in the Asian experience of intercultural hermeneutics. Furthermore, mission must resist all kinds of irresponsible and commercial cultural interactions, whether hybridization or syncretism, that deterritorialize, decontextualize, or separate cultures from subjects against their wills, and that treat intercultural encounters as interactions of objects, not subjects. Eventually, we must show that a Christian intercultural boundary-crossing mission truly is a fruitful possibility for working out an alternative, healthier vision of humanity and the worldin place of the cold smile of globalization's "commercial cosmology."[25)]

Another challenge to a Christian understanding of mission comes from globalization's mechanisms of exclusion. Globalization's victims are economically poor and socioculturally excluded. In a world dominated by the "commercial cosmology," the weak are those defeated in economic competition, and who become excluded and invisible. As Niall Cooper has observed, globalization raises the question of the exclusion and invisibility of the poor.[26)] Their "otherness" is rejected and uncommunicated. They have no role as subjects of communication. In this situation, a Christian boundary-crossing mission's task must be to reinstate the weak as subjects of their own lives; to restore their agency as communicators. The church's mission must cross the boundary to embrace those whom society has excluded and rendered invisible. In light of the new kinds of "contexts" that globalization has created, boundary-crossings or intercultural missionss

Thomas Berry," *Worldview* 5 (2001), 190.

25) Ibid.

26) Niall Cooper, "Tourist or Vagabond?" *Political Theology* 4 (2001), 74-90.

hould not be limited to interactions among geographic territories, religions, or cultures. They must include as well boundary-crossing communication between victims and victors of globalization. It is never an easy job to make possible communication between victims and victors. It may be a very difficult process involving conflict, confrontation, and resistance. However, I believe it is a criterion by which other boundary-crossing intercultural communications and missions can be evaluated, because the boundaries between victims and victors are the places where globalization's problems are most clearly revealed. By helping to lower and erase these boundaries, we can help globalization escape from its inhumane captivity to exclusively economic values.

In concluding this essay, I want to remember a teaching of Latin American liberation theology. Liberation theologians explain that Christian base communities, the seedbeds of liberation, were born from the confluence of two movements:[27] (1) the movement of the church to become poor, in its effort to be faithful to the message of Jesus of Nazareth, and (2) the movement of the poor into the church to manifest their despair and hope. The meeting of these two movements may be seen as a boundary-crossing communication or missionary event between the church and the poor. Through this boundary-crossing encounter, the church helped to empower the poor to express their needs and to communicate them to the world. I believe the boundary-crossing mission of the church is still a message of hope for the excluded and invisible victims of globalization. The encounter between the church and globalization's victims can be a catalyst for boundary-crossing communication between victims and victors. But in the globalizing world, there are many religions and cultures recognizing the same responsibility to communicate with the victims of globalization. Christian churches are not the only institutions actively engaged in boundary-crossing encounters with victims. Although they are different in their religious and cultural commitments, these religions and cultures can discover common ground when the suffering and liberation of the victims of globalization are concerned. With their specific contributions for the larger society, each can cross boundaries, meet together, and make a common vision for the society. The mission of the church also has to meet them in its effort to communicate with victims. As Samartha wrote, "to identify them, support them, cooperate with them, suffer with them, pray for

27) Armando Lampe, "The Globalization of Poverty," *Exchange* 28 (1999), 332-3.

them, and even die with them is part of Christian mission."[28] In this boundary-crossing, intercultural or interreligious mission of the church, we also can expect the emergence of the new vision of humanity and the world beyond economic globalization. I hope that intercultural hermeneutics can serve this mission of the church, which includes both boundary-crossing communication with victims and intercultural and interreligious communication.

28) S. J. Samartha, *One Christ Many Religions: Toward a Revised Christology* (New York: Orbis, 1991), 151-2.

Madang, Vol. 4 (December, 2005), 27-46

The global Economism and the global Ethics

Feng Lu*

I

Human beings cherish both freedom of individuals and the order of society. Pursuing freedom, people approve pluralism of values and beliefs. When they feel the danger of fragmentation of society and realize the importance of social order, they will expect certain universal laws and moral codes. Modern people are swaying between pluralism and universalism. Cherishing freedom, they are afraid of over unification. But the unification of the market economy and science and technology globalizes human lives. Today, all people in the world are living in the village of the Earth. But it does not mean that people live together peacefully. Now the questions arise: how can we make a good balance between freedom and order? What is the root of contemporary wars? If pluralism at a certain level is irrevocable, which level is it? If we must have certain universal norms what should they be? How can we minimize wars? These are the questions I will try to answer in this paper.

Feng Lu is the professor in Department of Philosophy, Tsinghua University, China. He studied maths in Anhui Normal University, philosophy of science in Shanxi University, and analytical philosophy in Wuhan University. Now he mainly teaches and studies ethics, philosophy of science and technology, and is especially interested in reflection on modernity. His main publications include : Human Home: A Critical Reflection on the Contradictions of Modern Western Culture; After Enlightenment; Applied Ethics, etc.. E-mail: lufeng@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn

II

From the point of view of modernity, we can see that the unifying of comprehensive beliefs is a terrible thing. Since the Enlightenment, western people take liberty of thought as one of the basic human rights, and now liberty of thought has become a value accepted by all people in democratic societies. If a state enforces the unifying of belief for individuals, it inevitably violates individuals' liberty of thought. People can share a common language, and also common sense and some ideas, but they can never completely share the same system of thought. Different groups of people usually have different ideas about the world, society, values and selves. To use John Rawls' terminology, different groups of people usually have different "comprehensive doctrines." In this sense, the tragedy of western societies in the Middle Age was the unification of religion enforced by power. The terrible religious wars or other horrible things such as Bruno's death and the trial of Galileo stemmed from the intolerance of different thought. In the age of the Enlightenment, Kant thinks, what the Enlightenment requires most is the freedom of thought, "and indeed the most harmless of all that may be named liberty, to wit, that, to make a *public* use of one's reason in every point." [1] After the Enlightenment, the public culture of democracy grew up gradually in western societies. In Rawls' opinion, "the diversity of reasonable comprehensive religious, philosophical, and moral doctrines found in modern democratic societies is not a mere historical condition that may soon pass away; it is a permanent feature of the public culture of democracy." [2]

But this superficial diversity of "comprehensive doctrines" or "reasonable pluralism" has concealed an extremely important fact: in the modern public culture of democracy, there is a relatively unified comprehensive doctrine, i.e., economism. It isn't religious and transcendental, perhaps, but it is comprehensive. Economism, as the mainstream of western ideologies, even of many Asian countries' ideologies today, can be summarized as follows:

1. Basically all behavior is economic in nature.

---

1) Simon Eliot and Beverley Stern (ed.), *The Age of Enlightenment,* Vol. *2* (The Open University Press, 1979), 251.

2) John Rawls, *Political Liberalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 36.

2. Well-being depends absolutely on economic factors. Where productivity is high, and the economy is expanding, people will be well off. Where the economy is underdeveloped or stagnant, people will be badly off.
3. Because of this, an indefinitely expanding economy is desirable.
4. This expansion is to come from natural population growth, and more immediately from the development of new technologies. Hence the close connection that economism draws between knowledge and economic policy.[3)]

Today, few people will justify that economic expansion is to come from natural population growth, but almost everyone believes that the progress of science and technology will support an indefinite expanding of economy.

Someone might deny that economism is a comprehensive doctrine in Rawls' sense. But it is. It contains the most popular views about values and meaning of human lives. Contrasting to the values of the Middle Ages in the west, it does not take economic activity as the only necessary activity for human lives, but as the ultimate value or meaning for human lives. It presupposes that the ultimate meaning or concern of human beings is to be rich in material wealth and to get the Greatest Happiness. To use John Stuart Mill's words, "…the ultimate end, with reference to and for the sake of which all other things are desirable (whether we are considering our own good or that of other people), is an existence exempt as far as possible from pain, and as rich as possible in enjoyments."[4)] What Mill expresses is the idea of hedonism, of course, but there is intimate connection between economism and hedonism (or classical utilitarianism which contains hedonism). People who believe in economism think that economical growth is the only resource of human happiness and enjoyments. Ian Davison regards economism as a new religion in modern times. He says, "The structure of economism closely parallels that of Protestant Christianity from which it developed. Hard work and individualism remain as primary virtues, but welfare replaces salvation as the final goal."[5)] In contemporary

3) Ian Davison, *Values, Ends and Society* (Brisbane: University of Queensland Press, 1977), 174.
4) From James Rachels, *The Elements of Moral Philosophy* (McGraw-Hill, 1993), 91-92.
5) Ian Davison, *Values, Ends, and Society* (Brisbane, University of Queensland Press), 170.

times, economism has led to consumerism and consumerism proclaims that the ultimate meaning of human beings is the enjoyment found in consumption. Furthermore, with the function of "the logic of capital," consumerism leads to contemporary consumer societies.

Someone might deny that economism is a doctrine with universal influence. But it is. Before the end of the cold war, perhaps it was only generally believed in by people in capitalist countries. After the cold war, almost all people in the world have come to believe in it. There are many religious people, of course, but they are also influenced heavily by economism. If they are not, they won't take money as the most important thing for their lives. So today's religionsare the ones within the framework of economism, and many religious people don't take their faith as the ultimate concern, but as the instrument with which to enjoy secular happiness. For example, many people who seem to believe in Buddhism just hope that Buddha will give them health and bless them so that they make good money. Liberals might think that laws and institutions in modern societies are neutral to different religions or "comprehensive doctrines," but actually they are ideology-loaded. Modern institutions encourage all efforts to make money, without violating the laws, of course, but they never encourage Henry David Thoreau's living-way in Walden.

Nowadays many thinkers and scholars are worrying about the increasing fragmentation of society, the disintegration of community, estrangement of the individual and the lack of consensus on a common moral authority. There are factual reasons for their worry. But they neglect the danger from this pursuing of consensus.

It is a horrible thing in those countries in which the state enforces the unification of conviction, because individuals lose their freedom of thought and speech in such a political condition. Confronting today's situation of human beings, we should realize that **consensus on economism all over the earth is much more horrible**. The distress brought about by dictatorship of thought can only be the loss of people's freedom of thought. But the consensus belief in economism and global economic activities is leading humankind "peacefully" to catastrophe. As Henry David Thoreau said, just as men waged war against each other, they waged it on the natural world.[6] With the encouragement of modernity, especially that of

6) Kim Heacox, *Visions of a Wild America* (Washington, D.C: National Geographic Society, 1996), 25.

economism, people have squeezed the Earth for centuries. That's the war humankind wages on Nature. This war brings human beings into aserious ecological crisis. If we cannot get out of the crisis, we might destroy everything. Unfortunately, many people don't realize the great danger of the war that people are waging on Nature, though they may oppose any unjust wars among people. Actually, modern war can destroy humankind because of the use of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, and the **modern war that people wage on Nature can also destroy humankind because of the polluting technology and the damage to the Earth's biosphere.** Human kind is confronting the threat of two kinds of wars: wars among states, and wars between human beings and Nature. The root of the two kinds of wars is belief in economism.

It is easy to understand why the root of the war between human beings and Nature is economism. With the institutions of modern societies and the modal of economy, damage to the biosphere is the precondition of the growth of economy.

It might be doubted that economism is also the root of the wars among states. But it is true. James L. Doti, an American economist, proclaims clearly that capitalism is founded on people's greed, and takes richness and power as its ultimate goals. And he says, to lead a life based on greed does conflict with Christian ideas, but is suitable for the fulfillment of our goals to make a rich and powerful society, and to benefit all people who live with us.[7] Capitalism is one form of economism. In human history, capitalist culture is the sole culture which encourages everyone to release his/her greed rationally. In all pre-modern societies, the rulers were usually greedy in their personal lives, but they used religions or ideologies to persuade all others to work hard and to be abstinent. Only capitalism encourages everyone to do their best to maximize their self-interests. In such a culture, the virtue of temperance becomes out-of-date, and people's desires are always expanding. Those who earned one hundred thousand dollars want to earn one million, those who earned one million want to earn ten million, and so on. Being greedy, the subjectivity or activity of human beings is shown as all sorts of expansion and individuals' expansion is combined socially. That is manifested necessarily as the expansion of states.

Some economists try to argue that the expansion of capitalism can be

7) James L. Doti and Dwight R. Lee (ed.), *The Market Economy: A Reader* (Nanjing, Jiangsu People's Press, 2002), translated by Lin Jihong, 12.

kept peaceful because capitalism has weakened religious and ideological fanaticism greatly. Within the framework of capitalism people know an absolute truth from economics, i.e., others' happiness will become yours at last, and the scientific foundation of the truth is that trades are always reciprocal, the growth of economy always brings about more opportunities for people to get jobs, and wars have never brought about any good.[8)]

But why do wars happen in the world today? This is because there is another truth during the period of preparation for a war, military expenditure increases rapidly and military purchasing grows greatly, and that can drive the general needs of a state and stimulate the growth of its economy. John Maynard Keynes was an economist who caused a revolution in the history of western economics. He brilliantly illuminated the relationship between economical growth and war. He says, if the officials from the ministry of finance put a huge sum of money into a box, and bury the box in a useless mine with a lot of rubbish from cities, and then let all the business companies try to find it and get it according to the principle of the free market, then the problem of unemployment will disappear, and the actual income and wealth of society will become much more than before. Therefore the function of digging in the useless mine is the same as that of mining gold in the real world. When the depth of a gold mine is within the extent of human mining, the wealth of the world will increase rapidly. So gold mines are very important for human civilization. Just as politicians take war as the sole business which is worth borrowing huge sums of money to do, so bankers take gold mining as the sole reasonable activity to dig in the earth. Both wars and gold mining are proved to contribute to human progress. In Keynes opinion, to bury a lot of money and then let people try to dig the earth to find the money can also make contribution to human progress, just as wars and gold mining can.[9)]

Since wars can stimulate the growth of the economy and economic growth is taken as the ultimate aim of capitalist society, it is easy to understand why there are so many politicians, entrepreneurs and financiers being enthusiastic about wars. The logic of capitalism (or economism) is just as such: to pursue economical growth permanently; when conflicts

8) George Gilder, *Wealth And Poverty* (Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House, 1985), translated by Chu Yukun, 11.

9) John Maynard Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* (Beijing, The Commercial Press, 1999), translated by Gao Hongye, 134.

occur in international trade, firstly will be political strategy and then when political efforts fail, war will follow. People say that war is the continuing of politics, but it is also the continuing of economy. When the second Persian Gulf War started in 2003, some mass media claimed that the war was making the American and the world's economy worse off. But different states had different ways of economical reckoning and within a state, different classes or groups had different reckoning. The makers of munitions definitely made great money and American politicians could show that the war would safeguard economical prosperity for America, even for the world.

Therefore economism is also the root of wars among states. Some think that human beings are rational enough to fight wars in a controlled way; i.e., rational enough not to use nuclear and biological weapons. But I am not sure. The potential catastrophe of nuclear wars exists in the world because economism is the mainstream of ideology.

The domination of Christianity or any other religions is not desirable, nor is that of economism. Human kind needs real "reasonable pluralism."

III

Reasonable pluralism might be justified from a point of view of epistemology and logic. We can take dogmatic universalism (a special form of universalism) as the antagonism of "reasonable pluralism." Dogmatic universalism in metaphysics usually presupposes the metaphysical realism that is the main target of Hilary Putman's criticism in his Reason, Truth and History. Putman describes metaphysical realism as having the view that "… the world consists of some fixed totality of mind-independent objects. There is exactly one true and complete description of 'the way the world is.' Truth involves some sort of correspondence relation between words or thought-signs and external things and sets of things." [10] Putnam holds that the favorite point of view for metaphysical realism is "a God's eye point of view." [11] The view that there is exactly one true and complete description of 'the way the world is' is extremely important for dogmatic universalism. The point is that there is exactly one system of truth that is the complete

10) Hilary Putnam, *Reason, Truth and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 49.

11) ibid.

description of the real world. We can use the capital "Truth" to denote this system of truth. Any other discourses or system of thoughts that are different from the Truth are false. Therefore all people who are in a normal mind should believe in the Truth, but only very few prophets can discover the Truth or the Way to find the Truth first. We can call this theme monism of truth. I myself am a realist in some sense, and I don't think that all themes contained in the metaphysical realism defined by Putnam are false. But I refuse monism of truth without compromise. The mainstream of analytical philosophy also refuses it. Agreeing with John R. Searle, I regard the view as sound that there exists a world independent of human minds. [12] But I don't think that any scientist, or group of scientists, or school of sciences, or philosopher, or group of philosophers, or school of philosophy, or religious thinkers, or religions, or politicians, can discover the whole of the truth about the world, and give the "exactly one true and complete description of 'the way the world is'." Human beings are finite, though they aspire to be infinite, and they should be conscious of themselves as finite.[13] Because human beings aspire to be infinite, they dream to establish one system of truth including all the secrets in the universe the dream which John Watkins calls the Bacon-Descartes' Ideal.[14] But this dream or ideal is a crazy one. God does not want to let human beings build a Tower of Babel. To use the language of naturalism, Nature does not want human beings to know all her secrets. After the Enlightenment, science is the most influential course of intellectual exploring. But the philosophy of natural sciences from W.V. Quine to Thomas Kuhn and Paul Feyerabend proves clearly that there is no absolutely objective criterion for scientists to choose an absolutely true theory among rival theories.[15] Therefore even scientists have no way to construct a unified scientific theory which includes all branches of science

12) Cf. John R. Searle, *Mind, Language and Society* (Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House, 2001), Chinese translation by Li Bulou, 4.

13) Cf. A. W. Moore, *Points of View* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 253-254.

14) Cf. John Watkins, *Science and Scepticism* (Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House, 1991), Chinese translation by Qiu Renzong and Fan Ruiping, 23.

15) Cf. W.V. Quine, "Two Dogmas of Empiricism", in Paul Benacerraf and Hilary Putnam (ed.) *Philosophy of Mathematics* (Prentice-Hall, 1964), 346-365; T.S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970); and Paul Feyerabend, *Against Method* (London: New Left

and excludes all false theories. The movement of unifying science launched by logical positivists has failed definitely. In the history of science, there were illusions sometimes that science would end with a complete system of truth.[16] But these illusions never come to reality.

To sum up, the monism of truth is untenable. There exist reality, orders or laws independent of the human mind. Every inquirer might discover some partial truth, but none can discover the whole of truth. So we should always be tolerant to different ideas, beliefs and ideologies. And we should always be conscious that we might be wrong and others might be right.

In pre-democratic times, many powerful rulers tried their best to unify the beliefs of their subjects, but they were never successful, i.e., they were never able to get rid of all heresies by force (political power). In pre-democratic societies, the orthodox religion or ideology oppresses all other comprehensive doctrines, and the rulers oppress all those who don't believe in the orthodox religion or ideology. The rulers could get benefits from the unification of beliefs by force, for they could keep political order stable by this way and unification of beliefs helps to form the powerful mainstream of ideology, religious or not religious.

Every era has its mainstream of ideology, and it may be religious, but may be also secular. In a pre-democratic society, the mainstream of ideology is supported **directly** by the political power or state force. So minorities in society who don't believe in the orthodox religion or ideology have to keep silence. If they are not careful enough they may be punished by the political power. In modern democratic society, it seems that the mainstream of ideology is not clearly defined and is **not** supported **directly** by the political power or state force. As Liberal thinkers claim, the state is neutral to all "comprehensive doctrines." But actually the mainstream of modern ideology, i.e., economism, is well supported by the political and economic institutions, and the institutions are supported by the political power and state force. Therefore **modern mainstream ideology is indirectly supported by political power and state force.** But anyway it is a great political progress from pre-democratic society to democratic society. It is good that everyone's basic human rights can be guaranteed and the

Books, 1977).

16) Cf. Sir William Cecil Dampier, *A History of Science and its Relations with Philosophy and Religion*, Vol.2, (Beijing: The Commercial Press, 1995), Chinese translation by Li Hang, 285.

minority who don't believe in or who oppose the mainstream ideology can break the silence to express their different ideas.

To diagnose the symptom of modernity, we can find that the illness of modern civilization is twofold: one is the incommensurable differences and quarrels in moral discourses, as A. MacIntyre points out,[17] another is the misleading of "modern religion" economism. The incommensurable differences and quarrels have close relevance to the diversity of "comprehensive doctrines." Since "reasonable pluralism" is a permanent feature of the public culture of democracy, we can't remove all moral differences and quarrels and expect to get consensus on every moral issue. Maybe we can get certain minimal consensus. But the most important thing is how tochange the direction of development led by economism. Only when we change the orientation of economism, can we get out of the terrible crises we are facing. The effort of getting minimal consensus on moral issues should be consistent with the effort of the change.

IV

We are in the time of globalization. We need a global ethic or universal ethic to regulate people's action and to live peacefully on the earth (or to do our best to minimize wars). As Hans Küng said in the 1990's, "Today, no one can still have serious doubts that a period of the world which has been shaped more than any before it by world politics, world technology, the world economy and world civilization, needs a world ethic. That means a fundamental consensus concerning binding values, irrevocable standards, and personal attitudes. Without a basic consensus over ethics any society is threatened sooner or later by chaos or a dictatorship. There can be no better global order without a global ethic." [18] Karl-Otto Apel gives a good argument for the necessity of universal ethics from another perspective. He says, "The main fact of our situation today is that our activities now are not the same as they were a thousand years ago. Today's effects are always planetary effects for which we have to take responsibility. That can only take place by means of co-responsibility for these different traditions and

17) Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue* (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984), 6.

18) Hans Küng and Helmut Schmidt (ed.) *A Global Ethic and Global Responsibilities* (London: SCM Press, 1998), 41.

forms of life."[19] So, we have "the urgent need for a macroethics which in Apel's opinion "is the prominent new task of philosophical ethics in our times,"[20] and macroethics in Apel's sense is just the universal ethics or global ethics.

In Kant's opinion, the moral imperative is the certain universal. So ethic in a real sense is always universal. The central term in Kant's ethics may be "Categorical Imperative." He thinks that categorical "oughts" are possible because we have reason. Categorical "oughts" are binding on rational agents simply because they are rational. How can this be so? Kant says, because categorical oughts are derived from a principle that every rational person must accept. This principle is his famous Categorical Imperative. In his Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals, he expresses the Categorical Imperative like this:

Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law.[21]

So, it is not a problem for Kant to set up universal ethic. But in the cultural field[22] of modernity, doing so is quite dubious, because relativism about values and ethics is quite influential for a long time, and in the framework of modernity, relativism and pluralism are twins. But I think pluralism is different from relativism. The real obstacle of universal ethics is not pluralism, but relativism. I think we can refute relativism with good arguments, but that isn't the task of this paper. We can make more and more people accept that we need universal ethics. And this can be the good foundation for us to establish it.

To establish a universal ethic, we have to answer two questions:

1. What approach should we take?
2. What should be the basic content of it?

Let's answer these questions in order.

---

19) Sander Griffioen, *What Right does Ethics Have? Public Philosophy in a Pluralistic Culture* (VU University Press, 1990), 13.

20) Ibid, 23.

21) From James Rachels, *The Elements of Moral Philosophy* (McGraw-Hill, 1993), 119.

22) "The cultural field" means the social atmosphere fostered by a certain culture. In such atmosphere, people's actions or choice of actions are deeply influenced by the whole of the culture.

It is obvious that the job cannot be done only by individual thinkers like Kant. We cannot just think and write in our studies and construct a system of a moral code and then declare it to all people in the world and ask them to obey it autonomously. We need profound and comprehensive philosophical thinking, but it must have practical validity. How to make a universal ethic have practical validity? The only way is to make most people in the world reach a consensus approval of it. How can we do this? **Through dialogue among all nations in the world!** Though the framework of modern civilization stems mainly from the west, the future of humanity can't be led continuously by western modernity. Today, eastern nations are coming to a revival. They should and can make contributions to human civilization in the future. There are rich resources of thinking in eastern cultures. We can find valuable elements from them to construct a universal ethic for the human future. When we highlight the importance of eastern thinking and culture, we don't mean that the whole of western culture should be abandoned. We only mean that the universal ethic must be based on dialogue among all the nations, and that dialogue between west and east has a special significance.

Among the eastern cultural traditions, the Chinese tradition is a special one and is able to make a special contribution to a universal ethic. Since the 17th century, China has got behind in science and technology, and within the framework of modernity China can hardly make any original contributions to world civilization. But traditional Chinese thoughts are rich resources for postmodern thinking.[23] Liang Shuming, a famous modern Chinese philosopher, says, Chinese philosophy is the premature thought for human civilization which appeared in the ancient orient. It is not suitable for industrial civilization, but suitable for post-industrial civilization.[24] We are at the turning point of the history of mankind. Many ideas expressed by ancient Chinese thinkers are suggestive for us to reflect on the moral dilemma we are confronting. In talking about a universal ethic or global ethic, many authors emphasize that we should take global responsibilities

23) When I talk about postmodernity, my approach is quite different from that of Rorty, Derrida and Lyotard. I claim that within the cultural field of modernity, humankind cannot get out the crises they are facing today, but I don' t think that we should appeal to relativism.

24) Cf. Liang Shuming, *A Summary of Orient Academic Thoughts* (Sichuan Classics Press, 1986), 14.

"*for the effects of our collective activities*, especially in view of the ecological crisis," as Apel points out.[25] But many people understand "global responsibility" in terms of anthropocentrism, presupposing that we should be concerned only with the interests and well-being of people in the world and that we should exclude all non-human beings from the moral considering. But in order to get out of the ecological crisis, we must transcend the framework of anthropocentrism. In this respect, traditional Chinese thoughts can be an important resource for us to use. The idea of the "unity of Nature and humans," for instance, is very heuristic for us to construct a non-anthropocentric global ethic. Mencius thinks that a person should try to be a *tien min* and indeed not only a citizen of society, but also a citizen of the universe. Such a one not only performs his/her duty as a citizen of society, but also performs this duty as a citizen of the universe.[26] According to Confucianism, Tien (Nature) has this good and interests, therefore a *tien min* should not only care for human welfare, but also for Tien's good and interests. A *tien min* has not only responsibilities for humankind, but also for Tien.

We cannot take ancient thoughts as the final truth, of course. Suggested by the idea of "unity of Nature and humanity," we can transform naturalism into transcendental naturalism. And from the point of view of transcendental naturalism, people have no competence to perform responsibilities for Tien (Nature), but do have competenceto perform responsibilities for the ecosystem in the earth. To understand the relationship between humankind and Nature with transcendental naturalism, we can understand the co-responsibilities of humankind correctly.

There should be certain principles for the dialogue to establish a global ethic. To consider this problem, it's well worth noticing the discourse ethics developed by Apel and Habermas. Habermas says, "Only those norms can claim to be valid that meet (or could meet) with the approval of all affected in their capacity as participants in a practical discourse."[27] Apel claims that there are "necessary presuppositions which we must have acknowledged as people who, as members of a communication community, have entered the

25) Cf. Sander Griffioen, *What Right does Ethics Have? Public Philosophy in a Pluralistic Culture* (VU University Press, 1990), 39.

26) Cf. *Selected Philosophical Writings of Fung Yu-lan* (Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 1991), 202.

27) Jurgen Habermas, *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*

enterprise of argumentation." He says, "Here we must proceed very cautiously. I must strictly stick to what I can find as presuppositions which cannot themselves be called into question without performing a performative self-contradiction." This is his meta-criterion, and can be denoted as the criterion of performative self-contradiction. He says that he tries to test all those thoughts that come to him about what he always must have acknowledged. Then he suggests the following principles that we must acknowledge and which nobody could call into question without committing a performative self-contradiction when we enter a discourse of argumentation or join a communication community:

1. All members of this community have equal rights. And it is in principle an indefinite community. You cannot exclude someone but have to give reasons for it. And there must be advocates of the rights of others who are absent from the discourse. For example, the members of the next generation cannot come to the discourse to defend their own rights but they must be taken into account. This principle can be summarized as: we all have equal rights as members of an indefinite community of argumentation.
2. We all have equal duties, in one word, co-responsibilities, *Mitverantwortung*. In Apel's opinion, a single person today cannot be made responsible for the effects of industrial activities. We are all equally responsible with respect to the problem of pollution, for instance.[28)]

Apel emphasizes that these would be the procedural principles for practical discourses, but not the substantial principles.[29)]

It's important for us to consider the rights and interests of those who cannot enter the dialogue or discourse. But we should not only care about "the members of the next generation," but also nonhuman beings such as animals and plants, if we want to get out of the global ecological crisis.

When Apel proclaims that we all have equal duties, he is right in some sense. It is generally true that no single person can be made responsible for the effects of industrial activities. But in specific levels, we cannot admit

(Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995), translated by Christian Lenhardt and Shierry Weber Nicholsen, 93.

28) Cf. Sander Griffioen, *What Right does Ethics Have? Public Philosophy in a Pluralistic Culture* (VU University Press, 1990), 16-17.

29) Ibid, 18.

that every individual has the same responsibility for the effects of industrial activities such as ecological crises. A person like Henry David Thoreau shouldn't be made responsible for them. Thoreau refused to join the mainstream of industrial and commercial society through all his life and always lived consciously on the margin of society. It is the leaders of industrial society, such as entrepreneurs, bankers, politicians and so on, who should have more care for the consequences of industrial activities. Similarly, we can not say that everyone has the same responsibility for the consequences of the second Persian Gulf War. But anyway, everyone has an equal duty to change their living habits fostered by consumer society.

V

Now let's consider the contents of the universal ethic. Because my concern is mainly philosophical, I cannot deal with the concrete articles of any proposals. I would like to argue for a well-known principle about the content of universal ethic. It might be denoted as the principle of the minimum. We are in fact living in a world with a diversity of cultures. People in different cultures pursue different values and have different ideas about morality. People can never have consensus agreements on every issue about values and morality. But people are people, and they have something in common. And *there is an overlap of values and moral norms of all cultures*. The Golden Rule, for instance, is contained in all cultures, though it has different expressions in different moral traditions.[30] This proves that the overlap of values and moral norms of all cultures is at least not empty. If we can identify the overlap as largely and exactly as possible, it can be the basic content of a universal ethic. We can only identify the overlap by dialogue among all cultural traditions, of course. The overlap is not a fixed object. Every cultural tradition is changing, so the overlap is also changing. We cannot expect to establish a universal ethic once for all. If we can have a good beginning, we have to go on to revise it by perpetual dialogue. And through perpetual dialogue we can make the universal ethic more and more mature.

The principle of the minimum is obviously derived from a democratic principle. We have the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights. To

30) Cf. Hans Küng and Helmut Schmidt (ed.) *A Global Ethic And Global Responsibilities* (London: SCM Press, 1998), P.68.

establish a universal ethic doesn't mean to reject the Declaration of Human rights. "However, a declaration on a global ethic should provide ethical support for the UN Declaration of Human Rights, which is so often ignored, violated and evaded," as Hans Küng points out.[31] Just because we should respect everyone's human rights, we should also respect different ideas when we try to reach consensus. We should make all people realize that everyone is really confronting common problems and crises. Only when our actions involve the common interests of all people and security of the planet, should we take our duties or co-responsibilities, by obeying a universal ethic. As Apel explicates, "what we need today is indeed a universally valid ethics for the whole of mankind; but this does not mean that we need an ethics that would prescribe a uniform style of the *good life* to all individuals or to all the different socio-cultural forms of life. On the contrary, we can accept and even oblige ourselves to protect the *pluralism* of individual forms of life so long as it is guaranteed that a universally valid ethics of equal rights and of equal co-responsibility for the solution of the common problems of mankind is respected in each single form of life."[32] Here we can find that universal ethic and "reasonable pluralism" can coexist in human civilization. And we can live in the balance or necessary tension between the freedom of individuals and the universal orders.

Anyway, a universal ethic can be consistent with the principle of democracy. The advanced countries have fostered the spirit of democracy within their states, but the principle of democracy has not been carried out in their international relationships and affairs. Within the countries such as the U.S. and U.K., the democratic institution is quite mature and human rights are protected by the institution. But in international affairs, they don't obey the principle of democracy, but the principle of nationalism. The Bush administration regards every country which doesn't obey the U.S. as a "rascal country" or as being on the "axis of evil," and lets the U.S. function as the international gendarme. It thinks that the world order can be maintained only by the action of the American army of justice. No country which doesn't take liberalism as ideology can make a nuclear weapon. But a country which has a terrible record during the Second World War has been overlooked and even supported by the U.S. just because this country always

31) Ibid, 54.

32) Sander Griffioen, *What Right does Ethics Have? Public Philosophy in a Pluralistic Culture* (VU University Press, 1990), 33.

obeys the will of the U.S.

Within a state only the real criminals can be tamed by force. But the use of force must be strictly in the light of the procedure of democracy and laws. That is the pre-condition of democracy. There is not an international agency of justice, but there is the UN at least. If most nations in the world regard a certain country as a rascal country and judge that it will be very dangerous to the world, they should crack down on or attack it according to international laws and the decision must be made in the democratic procedure of the UN. In 2003, the U.S., U.K. and several other countries attacked Iraq, regardless of the opposition of many countries and without the permission of the UN. Does it accord with the principle of democracy? Within a democratic society, it is obvious that only the law-ruled use of force is reasonable. It is the same with international societies.

Today, all people are living in the earth-village. If the democratic principle and the rule of law is offended in international society, people's faith in democracy will waver. Whether western countries can be beyond the interests of states and observe the democratic principle in international affairs is the key to the fate of democracy in the future. But within the framework of modernity, it is impossible for western countries to observe strictly the democratic principle in international affairs because the basic competition within modernity is that of economy every country tries its best to be rich and powerful. Therefore every country takes the interests of the state as the most important thing in international affairs. In order to have a democratic international society and the rule of law in the world, we have to transcend modernity. People must cultivate more their argumentative reason and become more reasonable animals. They not only should use argumentative reason to calm down the conflicts within a state, but also should use it to calm down the conflicts in the world. The use of force should be governed by law both within a state and in the world and international laws have to be supported by a universal ethic.

Though a universal ethic is minimal, it can and should be transcendental. When Apel emphasizes that *we always have to proceed in such a way that we do not forget those who are not present*, he has transcended the horizon of economism. Under the guidance of economism, we will do everything according to the laws of the market economy. And the basic presupposition of liberal economics is that people always maximize theirself-interests. With such persons in the communication

community, those who are not present can never be accounted. Only when people are mature enough to transcend the laws of the market economy, can they care about those who are not present. It might be easier for people to care about their future generations than to care about nonhuman beings. But in fact humankind as a species has to coexist with the whole ecosphere. If we really care about our future generations, we should care about the balance of the ecosystem in the earth. To do that we need to transcend anthropocentrism.

VI

Now I will come to the last point of the paper. The validity of any moral norms is dependent on people's beliefs, religious or philosophical. Only when people have pious beliefs and the moral norms are well supported by people's beliefs, are moral norms valid in practice. In modern society, morality is impotent to regulate people's behavior, just because many people have no religious or philosophical beliefs. To be exact, they have no ultimate concern, and no consciousness about Ultimate Reality. Ultimate Reality here means infinite being which is the absolute Subject and on which human beings are absolutely dependent. In Christianity, the Ultimate Reality is God. But in the framework of my transcendental naturalism, it is Nature.[33] Since the Enlightenment, westerners have changed their ultimate concern, and have no communication with any Ultimate Reality or don't listen to an Ultimate Reality anymore. They think humankind themselves can be the master of themselves. And they think that humankind can conquer Nature with the weapons provided by science and technology, therefore they can become the master of Nature. And they think humankind can get closer and closer to God's omniscience and omnipotence with the

33) In my opinion, Nature is an infinite being that can speak in its own language which is not a human language, and human beings are absolutely dependent on Nature. But only when people are modest and humble enough to listen to Nature piously can they understand Nature's speech partially. Because Nature is infinite and she has limitless secrets, human beings can never expect to know her secrets completely. Human beings should always respect Nature, because she is their Mother and she fosters them. Human beings should always revere Nature, because she has supreme power to punish them when they make terrible mistakes and commit terrible evil.

infinite progress of science and technology. But they don't admire God's divinity and perfection any more. So, the ultimate meaning of human life is not salvation but the welfare of economy. Then economism comes into the mainstream of modern society. With the encouragement of economism, many people spend most of their time and energy to find material resources from the earth, manufacture commodities to satisfy all sorts of the people's desires, do research on science and technology which serve the commercial business and military affairs, and so on. The rational institutions of economy and politics assemble the energy of thousands of individuals and make it a terribly powerful unitary force. By the use of this unitary force humankind has created a splendid material civilization which meanwhile leads humankind to double crises: spiritual crisis and ecological crisis.[34)]

When humankind change their ultimate concern and cease to listen to Ultimate Reality, they think that moral norms are only the contracts among people and they have nothing to do with nonhuman beings. According to Kant, morality comes from human reason, and humankind themselves make moral laws for the human community. But actually, moral norms must have their ontological base. The approval of people's consensus is the necessary condition for moral norms to have a universal validity of binding, but this approval is not the sufficient condition. It's not that there is no moral code with universal approval in the human community in modern times. At least the moral norms derived from utilitarianism and anthropocentrism are acknowledged by most people in the modern societies. Nevertheless we can never forget that agreement by majority is not the guarantee of truth. Only when people cure their anthropocentric arrogance and begin to listen to Ultimate Reality again, can they make right moral laws. When we are beyond the horizon of anthropocentrism, we can establish the ontological basis for our moral thinking and code. In my framework of transcendental naturalism, listening to Nature is extremely important. And listening to Nature means to obey the natural laws discovered by natural sciences(especially ecology). And moral norms can be supported by natural laws. Moral norms prescribed by ecological ethics, for instance, can be supported by ecological science and environmental science. Thus there is no sharp distinction between fact and value (or "to be" and "ought to be")

34) The argument in detail on the point can be seen in Lu Feng, *Human Beings' Home, A Philosophical Reflection on the Contradictions of Modern Culture* (Hunan University Press, 1996).

as Moore and logical positivists proclaim. But natural science is only the emissary between Nature and human being. It might be wrong now and then. It cannot be taken as absolute truth. A scientist who listens to Nature with humility will never declare that natural science is the absolute truth. Such a scientist will always take scientific enterprise as the way to listen to the speech of Nature. By listening to Nature humbly, we can make the relatively correct choice between right and wrong.

Thus it can be seen that it is only the first step to discover the overlap of values and moral norms from all cultures and to make an outline of a universal ethic. To make the universal ethic have practical validity, we have to promote the deep transformation of modern culture. We should appeal to a deep conviction to support a universal ethic. And the deep conviction here means the belief in the existence of an Ultimate Reality. When people have such convictions they will have their transcendental ultimate concerns again. And when people have transcendental ultimate concerns, they won't regard making money and consumption as ultimate meaning for their lives and will know that the validity of the universal ethic not only comes from the consensus agreement of people but also from the Order of Ultimate Reality.

But we don't want to return to the Middle Ages. We don't want a united religion. And "reasonable pluralism" should be encouraged. Different cultures and groups can have different deep convictions, and people can have different understandings about Ultimate Reality. People with different beliefs should be tolerant of each other. And they should ceaselessly communicate with each other to reach the blend of their horizons. Of course we cannot expect such a world in which nobody is a steadfast believer in economism and consumerism. But the truth I have to emphasize here is: only when such people become a minority in the human community and economism and consumerism drops out from the mainstream of human lives in the future, can the universal ethic have practical validity and our future generations live safely on the earth.

I hope that my treatise has proved the conclusion: **there are already unitary dimensions in world civilization, that is in the activities of economy, science and technology;we can never be unified in the level of deep faith, but we can be in the level of an ethic with minimal contents**. Beyond modernity and with a democratic principle supported by a universal ethic, we will have fewer wars, both wars within the human community and those against Nature.

Madang, Vol. 4 (December, 2005), 47-61

The Massacre of Civilians Before and After the Korean War : Feeling in the Darkness Towards a Christian Ethics Point of View

Chong-Hun Jeong*

Introduction

In the ceremony for the 59th anniversary of Korean Independence Day, which took place on August 15, 2004, the South Korean President Rho Moo-hyun made a speech in which he said something that no former South Korean president had ever attempted. His words included the statement of his will to clarify the truth about some points in Korea's recent history.[1)]

The first point was that even now, facing the 60th anniversary of independence, the vestiges of Japanophilism still hadn't been removed, and that even the truth of history hadn't been unveiled correctly. The patriots and their descendants, who fought for independence and walked the right path of history, are still suffering in poverty and neglect, while the ones who were the pioneers of Japanophilism are acting as leaders of society and even persecuting them. Even though in reality it is difficult to punish and deprive

Chong-Hun Jeong is teaching Christian Ethics at Yonsei University. He received his Dr. theol. from Georg-August University at Göttingen. His doctoral thesis is Die deutsche evangelische Sozialethik und die Demokratie seit 1945: Der Beitrag der EKD-Denkschriften zur Demokratie. He also works as a Chaplain of Yonsei University. E-mail: chjeong59@yonsei.ac.kr

1) *The 59th Anniversary of Korean Independence Day*. (August 15, 2004), in: www.bluehouse.go.kr the Presidential Office website.

the vested rights of the counter-nationalist Japanophilists, certain facts should be clarified and reflection should be done in order to create an upright future, where justice and conscience is alive.

The second point is that the truth about the government's encroachment on human rights and their other illegal acts will be examined, so that no such thing will ever happen again. As a solution to this issue, he proposed establishing a special committee a committee to examine the truth about historical issues. There has been criticism of concealment or the uncooperative behavior of the government whenever there was an investigation into the truth, but the government should confess what has been done and draw a new start in order to set up an upright authority for itself.

As President Rho spoke in his speech, the disruption and antagonism among us (Koreans) comes from our distorted understanding of history. In order for us to establish our history correctly, we must first face our disgraceful past. We must not only face it, but we must come up with a solution to avoid that disgraceful history repeating itself.

This essay cannot contain every example that can be seen in contemporary Korea of such "disgraceful history." It is impossible to do so. Therefore, I will deal, from a Christian ethics point of view, with the issue of uncovering the history of the mass killings of civilians committed by the public powers before and after the Korean War.

First, we will be looking at the objective condition of the massacre of civilians, the necessity of its recollection, and seeking a solution for recuperation. Also, we will be seeking an ethical duty for Christians which will help to reach the ultimate direction that the memory of these massacres is pointing towards peace making. I hope this treatise will bring forth an in-depth discussion on the issue of the massacre of civilians before and after the Korean War; an issue which is still being kept silent among the Christian community.

Civilian massacre before and after the Korean War

To us Koreans, contemporary Korean history is placed in a territory of ignorance, silence, and forgetfulness. The generation which experienced the war, let alone young people today, has no proper knowledge of the conditions of the civilian massacre which occurred at that time.[2)] Even

victims or family members of victims, who should have some knowledge of the incidents, were forced to keep silence by the guilt-association system. In most cases, they treated the fact as taboo, intending that they would lose sight of it. Kim Dong-chun insists in his essay, which deals with the issue of the civilian massacre, that the Korean government has made a blunder of committing murder against its civilians three times.[3] The first murder is the massacre during the time of war. The second time is when the effort to build a cemetery to restore the honor of the victims of the 4.19 movement (a national movement in 1960 by students against the corrupt government and for political democracy) was obstructed. This was done by the military government which took power in the coup of May 16, 1960. The third time was when the family and the descendants of the victims were accused as communists, when they were already suffering from the loss of family members. The Korean government has committed murder three times shamefully against the civilians as Kim Dong-chun pointed out above. Would it be possible to remove the resentment, created by the massacre of citizens, and held by the people against the government? Regardless of the answer to this question, it is important to understand the problem and how it should be dealt with. If the Korean government tries to get away with this issue, or to approach it with the logic of McCarthyism, it would be the same as committing another murder against the victims and their families.

In order to deal with this issue properly, it is necessary for us to recognize the reason for using the expression massacre of *civilians* (min-gan-in) rather than massacre of *good citizens* (yang-min). "Good citizens" (yang-min) means those who were innocent, those who were free from being suspected as radicals or as rebellious. This can imply that, since *good* citizens should not be involved in massacre, it is all right to massacre those who are not good citizens (the radicals). This also means that national ideology becomes a priority over human rights.[4] We know that before and after the Korean War, ordinary civilians, who were neither of left nor right wing views, were massacred innumerably. We also know that even if a civilian

2) Dong-chun Kim, "A Salvation of the civilian Slaughter during the Korean War; and its meaning," *Yeoksabipyeong*, [History Critic] (Spring 2002), 17.

3) Dong-chun Kim, "Why and how we must we solve the cirilian slaughter during the Korean War?" Symposium Manuscript for the civilian massacre, (12 June 2002), 11.

4) Ibid. 2

should have a belief towards one side or the other, that is no reason to kill such a citizen. Therefore, as a guideline for the future, it is more appropriate to use the expression *civilian massacre* instead of *massacre of good citizens.*

Another thing that we should recognize is the problem that although the identity of the perpetrators of the massacre is ambiguous, the victims clearly exist. This may come from the fact that there was no single convincing explanation that came from the government or the civilians. What has been said comes mostly from the government's position, which being the assaulter itself, had the authority and the advantages coming from that. Kang Seong-hyeon gives an appropriate explanation of this issue, "At that time, the Rhee Syngman administration unhesitatingly commented that all the citizens of Jejudo were radicals. These comments were made regardless of whether they were actually radicals or not, but it was done because the citizens of Jedudo were anti-government suspects who were standing against the administration, and for this reason alone the citizens of Jejudo were branded as radical or communist… The Rhee Syngman administration ordained that whoever stood against them were rebels or rioters, and during the process of quelling the uprising they maximized the punishment and massacre instead of shortening it. Jejudo was a victim of the process of establishing a strong anticommunist government." [5] Also, in the ideology of McCarthyism during the cold war, those people who gained vested rights justified and glorified the barbarism done by the perpetrators of the massacre. They were setting up propaganda by saying such things as that the massacre was a communist riot movement caused by North Korean instigation, "The leaders of the punitive force have shown an impassive attitude towards their troops' massacring the citizens for no reason; it was justified as a direct execution of communists or potential communists." [6]

Among the massacre of civilians before and after the Korean War, we can count some events such as: the Jeju 4.3 affair and the Yeosun civilian massacre before the Korean War, the civilian massacre from the incident of the League of Guidance at the beginning of the Korean War, and the civilian massacre during the Korean War.[7] We can estimate the number of such civilian deaths to be at least one million.[8] We will be looking at the Yeosun

5) Seong-hyeon Kang, "The 4.3 Affair and the Mechanism of the Civilian Slaughter," *Yeoksayeongu* [History Study], Vol. 11, 219.

6) Ibid, 222.

7) Those who killed civilians before and after the Korean War were army troops

incident as an example showing the characteristic of civilian massacre in general: "The civilian massacre which occured in the Yeosun incident was a mass murder involving the death of 5% of all the citizens of Yeosun and Sunchun. It was done in an organized way through a chain of command. A slanderous murder has been done by the same race. It was blown up from political ideology. People then killed each other for vengeance. The indiscriminate massacre included women and children. The method was barbaric and brutal. It was done without any sense of guilt." [9] Realizing that the facts about the Yeosun incident (as listed above) are not only limited to the Yeosun incident alone, but are characteristic of all the civilian massacres before and after the Korean War, we note how extensive is the barbarism and shame that comes from such massacre. We also should make a request to the Korean and American governments to open up to the public the official documents from that time in order to bring an objective view to the concealed historical facts.

Reasons why we should remember the civilian massacre

Some say that remembering such a shameful past will hold us back and interfere from moving on to the future. Others say that it might disrupt public opinion due to the views of people with different interests and bring about an economic crisis. Some others even refute the need to pick on the past, which they say should be left alone. But these reactions seem to result from not reading past history and from being irresponsible towards the present and the future. The economic crisis has no direct relationship with past history, and disruption of public opinion is more likely to result from covering up the past instead of revealing it.[10] Now, we will be looking at the reasons why the past history of the civilian massacre should be remembered.

The first reason is to seek the truth. Jesus said let your "yes," be "yes," and

---

from South Korean, North Korea, U.S.A., China as well as radical civilians, South Korean policemen, etc.

8) Jeong-gu Gang, "The Korean War and National Unification: Conquering a War by the Unification of Peace and Reconciliation", *Gyeongjae wa sahoe* [Economy and Society], Vol. 48 (Winter 2000), 256-259.

9) Seong-hyeon Kang, 215.

10) CBS News Interview with Lee-hwa Lee, (21 August 2004).

your "no," "no," and that it is wicked not to do so.[11] Saying "no," to a "yes," or saying "yes," to a "no," is falsifying the truth, and this is an evil which brings suffering to many. The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission has classified four types of truth:[12] (1) The factual truth from objectifying the cause of violence that has been done and the conditions of its development, (2) the personal truth from the experiences of both the victim and the assaulter, (3) the social truth that has been built up by sharing a variety of experiences in places such as a hearing, and (4) the recuperative truth from an attempt to understand the suffering and to retrieve the pride of the victims by listening closely to them. If the objective fact is the only truth, it results in neglecting humans the main subject of history itself. If the personal truth is the only truth, then the various and conflicting experiences would cause chaos. If the social truth is the only truth, it would not be able to cure both the victim and the assaulter, who is wounded and suffering from the pang of conscience. If the recuperative truth is the only truth, that wouldn't be an essential remedy, but only a temporary one giving the disgraceful history an opportunity to repeat itself. Therefore, we should objectify the factual truth, collect the personal truth, attain the social truth by agreement in order to not only bring recovery to all people who are involved in the civilian massacre, but also establish the right direction so that our future history may move onward.

The second reason is to live today towards a healthy future by not repeating the shameful past. Jesus proclaimed that new wine should be put into new wineskins.[13] One who has a desire for God's kingdom shall not live their life as it has been. Therefore, one should amputate the shameful past, but also remember it for repentance. An Byung-uk said that clearing the past is correcting and purifying what has been done wrong. It is a process of avoiding the repetition of the mistakes that have been made by unveiling falsified historical facts.[14] Doing such things as gathering the victim's remains, building memorial towers, and preserving the massacre scene is an effort to make the shameful past a warning for people living

11) Matthew 5:37.

12) Seong-hyeon Kang, "The Responsibility and Task of Clearing the Past," *Tonghanui meari*. [Echo of Bitterness], Vol. 15 (30 June 2004), 11.

13) Luke 5:37.

14) Byeong-uk Ahn, "We can' t make a political compromise of history," *Hankyoreh Shinmun* [Hankyoreh Newspaper], (19 August 2004).

today. A shameful past cannot be covered up nor forgotten. Attempting to do so will only make it worse by including another disgrace. It might be possible to cover it up temporarily, but at that very moment it leaves the risk of repeating the same mistake. Any possibility of repeating the shameful past is a threat against the present and the future, "Inquiring the right and wrong about the past might bring about an inevitable dissension, or could cause a chaos of the values by the propagation of certain parts of the truth and untruth. But if the past gets covered up because of such circumstances, it would be impossible to gain the chance of throwing off the mistakes of the past and to make a new start. Covering up the past is not more than building up a tower of deception and falsehood." [15] Therefore, we should recognize that mentioning the shameful past is a movement towards a bright future, and that it also gives a concrete direction to our present lives.[16]

The third reason is to move onward to national reconciliation and harmony. Jesus has taught us that when one stands before an altar to give one's offerings and realizes that one resents a brother or a sister, one should stop immediately and reconcile with the resented brother or sister, and then after that one can give one's offerings.[17] It is God's ultimate will and order since the time of creation that all the people of the nations should be at peace with one another and in harmony.

When a massacre first occurred, the victim and the perpetrator of the massacre were clearly distinguishable. The ones who led the massacre were the assaulters, and the ones who were killed or suffered were the victims. But the assaulters would, in many cases, aggravate the victim's agony by forgetting their assault or by not recognizing what they had done. In other cases, some assaulters might suffer from a pang of conscience because it wasn't their intent to do what they did. On the other hand, the victims are likely to remember and internalize the casualties from the past and carry them on to their present lives. In this way, the victims and the assaulters would not be able to build up an intact relationship with one another unless the past has been cleared in a proper manner. They would each live their life in atrophy, and in the end everyone is likely to become a victim.[18]

---

15) Editorial, *Kyunghyang Shinmun* [Kyunghyang Newspaper]. (18 August 2004).

16) The National Commission inquiring into the real truth concerning the civilian massacres before and after the Korean War insisted that we all become historical sinners, if we now lose the chance. (7 September 2004)

17) Matthew 5. 23-24.

Therefore, the assaulter should free his/herself from his/her cramped past by confessing his/her assault to the victim, and the victim should free his/herself from the agony that has been carried from the past by declaring forgiveness to the assaulter. We should confront the fact that genuine peacemaking can be done only when the victim and the assaulter set themselves free from the past and cooperate with one another.

A plan to recover from civilian massacre

Who are the ones who have been wounded in the past, and are still being wounded in the present day? The victims are the ones who have been wounded the most. The victims are those who were massacred without even knowing any reason, and their family members who have had to live their whole life in prejudice just for being a family member of the victim. Their deep wounds cannot be offset by anything. The perpetrators of the massacre are also deeply wounded. Living in a time of sudden change, most of them were either forced into an indiscriminate participation with the masses, without even having a chance to establish their own ideological positions, or they had to follow orders from the upper hands of the power system, disregarding their own will. And finally, the people who are neither victim nor the assaulter, but those who lived at the same time as them must also be wounded by the incident also. Most of these people are likely to make a misjudgment from receiving falsified historical information, and if history repeats itself because it hasn't been cleared, these people have a chance of being deeply wounded as well.

The reality is that it is impossible to cure the damages from civilian massacre completely. The lost lives cannot be revived, the lives that suffered from prejudice cannot be brought round, and the experience of the massacre and its falsified history cannot be removed. But the wounds will grow bigger if the people abandon the past history or avoid taking responsibility for it on the basis of the impossibility of doing so. Therefore, we shall make an effort to cure the wounds as much as possible.

First, a meeting should be arranged which will be an opportunity to tell and share the wounds of the civilian massacre in public. This is to acknowledge, through this event, that it is not only the body that has been

18) Bong-jin Kim, "Forgiveness and Reconciliation, A remote and near Way," *Munyeundong* [Art and Literature Movement] Vol. 67 (2000), 393.

massacred, but also the words, thoughts, and the truth as well.[19] Some among us say that there is no point of digging up the old wounds, but Kim Dong-chun provides a persuasive answer for that argument, "In this world where individuals ought to live in harmony with others, it is absolutely necessary to ask an authority or an individual who has taken away the life of another individual without a personal animosity to take responsibility for this. If this does not happen, the administration will lose its stability, and the social relationships will not be established. In other words, the social relationship will not be recovered unless a punishment or a pardon has been sentenced after examining a group or an individual who has taken away the lives of others. Also, the mutual enemies will have a stiff relationship, which will bring about a failure not only to the victims but also the assaulters, and eventually to all the people affected." [20]

The story of the victims should not be suppressed and kept as a secret among themselves only, but should be a story publicly owned. The hidden story of the assaulters should be confessed openly to the public. The shameful acts done by the government creating victims and assaulters should be open to the public, "A healing begins by talking about the pain. If such things as "how much does it hurt?," "where does it hurt?," "what are the difficulties?" remain unsaid, thenhealing does not occur. Only by talking about the pain, one can be free from the filthiness of the pain. It might be hard in the beginning, but it must be done." [21] We shall make an effort to come up with a method so that the stories of sufferings can be shared by the victims themselves, and also try to spread the story through the mass media, which will start a genuine healing.

Second, the story of pain should lead to the confession of sin. K. Jaspers, a German philosopher, has recognized the barbarism of the Hitler administration and has classified the four types of confession; (1) a **legal confession** which consists of the violations of the law that can be objectively established, (2) a **political confession** which consists of the acts of the politicians who lead the people, and the acts of the people who

19) Wan-uk Choi, "The Civilian Slaughter is Continuing Now," *Tonghanui meari*. [Echo of Bitterness], Vol. 15 (30 June 2004), 18.

20) Dong-chun Kim, "A Salvation of the civilian Slaughter during the Korean War; and its meaning." *Yeoksabipyeong*, [History Critic] (Spring 2002), 22.

21) Un-san Son, "From Story of War to Story of Healing and Reconciliation," *Gidokkyo Sasang* [Christian Thought], Vol. 44 no. 6 (June 2000), 28.

followed the politicians, (3) a **virtuous confession** which consists of the unmoral behavior that has been done by an individual, and (4) a **metaphysical confession** which consists of all filthiness and the solidarity of the people who were in immorality.[22] We should build an environment where the confession of guilt can be continued, so that the stories of suffering won't be without result. This has to be done because the confession of guilt is the only responsible way for those who have committed assaults. If the assaulters have personally committed a legal crime to take an advantage of their relationship of interest, such as to collect property or power, they should confess to doing so and accept a suitable sanction of law. Politicians and their followers, who might not have been involved in the civilian massacre directly but who decided upon an excessive massacre due to a misjudgment of the conditions should also confess their political guilt and provide the associated documents of their acts. The people who although they might not have done an illegal act, but who have assisted others in perpetrating a massacre by taking an action conflicting with conscience, such as betrayal or fabrication of a document, should also confess their virtual crime and recover their conscience. And the people living today should face the immorality of the civilian massacre and should confess their metaphysical crime with the intention of taking the responsibility of the victim. We should keep our eyes open so that such events are unlikely to happen again. If these confessions such as listed above are fulfilled in every aspect, we will have the chance of turning over from the shame of this history of civilian massacre.

Thirdly, in compensation for what has been done, the honor of the bereaved family should be recovered so that the soul of the victim of the massacre can be acknowledged. It is impossible to compensate for the suffocated lives of the bereaved families, but an effort to make compensation has to be made for the virtual and metaphysical responsibility. In history, there is always an assaulter and a victim behind all barbarism. The assaulter loses his/her humanity by indulging injustice, and the victim also loses his/her humanity by being wounded from the casualty. History will continue to repeat itself unless the assaulter looks back on his/her own doings, or the victim frees him/herself from the assaulters' snare. The assaulters should now accept the fact that they have brought forth

22) K. Jaspers, *Die Schuldfrage. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Frage*, 4. Aufl., (Zurich 1947), 52.

a disgrace by committing civilian massacre, and should give compensation to the families of the victim. A confession without compensation is nothing more than self-intoxication. Therefore, the compensation for the victim and his/her family should be a priority instead of an easy recovery of the conscience of the assaulter. When the focus lies upon the assaulters' conscience, the victims will only be the means and their sufferings will not be genuinely healed but will be falsely used for the assaulters' wrong intentions. We might not have the legal right to be able to ask the assaulters or their descendents for compensation, but the people should rise up for the victims and their descendents and ask the government to be responsible for making compensation.

With such thoughts, it is proper that the 'Pan-national committee for the examination of the truth and the recovery of the honor upon the civilian massacre before and after the Korean War' has strongly asked in their declaration of foundation: "(To the Government) Make an apology to the bereaved families and to the people of the nation, and compensate them appropriately according to a thorough investigation of the civilian massacre perpetrated by the military and the police. Find out where the victims of the massacreare buried, exhume them immediately, erect a graveyard for them, and build a memorial tower and a center to cherish the victims." [23)]

Fourth, the falsification of history should be accepted as a fact, and efforts made to try to straighten up the truth. The story about the civilian massacre is being told only in fragments. Sometimes, the mutual contradictions of the stories perplex those who are listening. Also, the history text or the military histories which published by the Ministry of Defense, which can be considered as the authentic history, seem to be written from a right wing aspect. We have to acknowledge the fact that a falsified history cannot recover humanity, and cannot lead us to the upright teachings of history. We become angry with Japan when we see their avoidance or even glorification of their history of colonization and wars of invasion, and also when we see them worshipping at the shrine built for the war criminals. On the other hand, we respect and envy Germany for officially accepting the blunder of Nazism, pursuing and convicting the Nazi war criminals, and trying to be responsible for the nations and the

23) Declaration Statement for the Establishment of a National Commission to Inquire into the Real Truth Concerning Civilian Massacre Before and After the Korean War (7 September 2000).

people who were the victims of Nazism.[24] According to this fact, we can see that it is by only accepting disgrace in history as a genuine disgrace that one is able to turn around from that disgrace. Misunderstanding disgrace as an honor or attempting its glorification would only reproduce that disgrace. From now, we shall start to picture the civilian massacre in accordance to factual history, and to take responsibility for the reality. That is the only hope for the people of our nation.

The Christian-ethical task for turning the memory of the civilian massacre towards peacemaking.

We have to see the background to the fact that the victims and the family of the victims are rather trying to remain silent or forget about the civilian massacre because it is so painful for them. We can choose to forget, but that is a solution too easily chosen and forgetting is the beginning of a new pain. Because of that, memory can be considered as a new chance of eliminating the cause of pain. One who has no memory will be unable to figure out what to forgive, what to heal and what direction of life to aim for.[25] But a memory that has not reached reconciliation is dangerous, and can become a vicious circle of retaliation. Therefore, the ultimate intention of dealing with the civilian massacre issue should be focused on peacemaking. It was what Jesus, the son of God, focused his work on, and it is also a task for Christians, who have admitted Christ as their savior and became children of God. Now, we will be suggesting what the Korean churches and Christians ought to establish as a Christian-ethical task in order to reach peace from the memory of the civilian massacre.

The first suggestion is that the Korean churches and Christians, who were related as an axis of the civilian massacre and the falsification of history, sincerely confess their crime. The West-Northern youth association, which was established mainly by the young Christians who came over to the south from the north, was a recklessly right-wing association which took the initiative in the civilian massacre during the Jeju 4.3 incident.[26] The

24) Dakahasi Detsya, *The Responsibility of Japan after the Second World War: Politics of Memory, Ethics of Forgetfulness* (Seoul: Yeoksa Bipyeongsa[History Critic Press], 2000), 11.

25) Yeong-su Kim. *Reconciliation requires Memory more than Forgiveness* (Seoul: Dongin Press, 2001), 5.

Christian landowners in North Korea experienced the seizure of their land due to the land reformation of the North Korean government. They came down to the south and become extreme anti-communists, who were in active support of strengthening the cold war. Also, some Christians who have gained an advantage from the process of the civilian massacre have purposely chosen the anticommunism ideology not as an issue of the ideology but as a method to protect themselves. The Korean church should confess its apathy, irresponsibility, and incompetence. It should confess its lack in the mission of the king to bring God's kingdom near, of the mission of the prophet who goes against cruelty, and of the healing mission of the high priest. These missions have all failed due to the influence of taking an extreme side. Only by confessing the prominence of its own failings towards the civilian massacre and the period of division,[27] and by turning around from this, will the Korean church be capable of a dignified mission towards the world.

The second suggestion is to recover the conscience of the individual, strengthen the exponential level of conscience, and to become aware of the responsibility of the act of an individual or a mass. As Helmut Claβ explains generally about conscience: a corresponding understanding does not exist upon the subject of conscience. It works as a spokesman or a judge. Conscience is not a sound of God, nor a last expedient of distinction between right or wrong, but it is something formed by such things as legacy, environment, education, and value. The determination of conscience is not unchangeable, but it is related to the concrete decisions that are made simultaneously, and it may contain a fallacy. The conscience, which may contain a fallacy, does not always give the free will of conscience the privilege of an exemption of responsibility. It also contains a task of strengthening oneself through God's words.[28] We know that conscience is not unchangeable but changeable, not perfect but imperfect, not absolute but relative. But conscience is a base for making a decision not by the

---

26) Dae-sik Im, "The 4.3 Affair of Jeju and the Right Wing's Young Radicals," *History Institute, Researching on 4.3 Affair of Jeju* (Seoul: History Institute, 1999), 207-208.

27) Jong-hun Jeong, *Christian Social Ethics and Human Rights* (Seoul: The Christian Literature of Korea, 2003), 44-50.

28) H. Claβ, "Gewissen und Glaube," hg. *von Evangelische Kirchenamt für die Bundeswehr, Gewissen in Dialog*, (Guterloh 1980), 20-23.

external but by an internal process for the self on the self's own will, a last fortress of asking for human responsibility. Therefore, it is an important task for the Korean church, which confesses that God's will is good, to strengthen the personal conscience, which is closely related to faith, and enhance the conscience of society as a whole so that there will be an appearance of responsibility upon the past of the civilian massacre either individually or corporately.

The third suggestion is to disobey the government if they give a wrong order, because God should be considered one's priority over the structural system of obedience. The reason for any human's life is because God has provided it. It is our duty to follow God's command and glorify him throughout our lives. When an individual' s words correspond to God's words, it can be considered as listening to God's words. But, when an individual speaks of something that contradicts God's words, God's words should be a priority over the words of the individual. It is preposterous if humans should be governed not by the words of God but by human words or the demands of the world. Therefore, we should realize that there is nothing that can be compared or be prioritized over God in this world a world created by God. If the civilian massacre had been done by a concern of interests or an ideological operation not relating to God's will, and if we were capable of civil disobedience for that reason, then the conditions of that massacre before and after the Korean War would have been very different. The Korean churches should teach and strengthen the aspect of prioritizing God over everything.

The fourth suggestion is to warn about the civilian massacre and the barbaric war of negligence of human rights, and to use the doctrine of *just war* if that is necessary. Human rights are a right that everyone should be guaranteed just for being human. Regardless of race, sex, class, knowledge, and ideology, they are given from the birth of anyone, a creation of God and made in God's form. But war is barbaric and inhumane because of its ignorance of human rights. It is also, in the sense that it is violence that leads to mutual destruction, a declaration of the bankruptcy of politics. So, Christian pacifism should disapprove of any kind of war. But the theory of a just war requires a premise of a declaration of war (*jus ad bellum*) by a nation.[29] It requires a justified factor, a final means to be adopted to bring

29) John Macquarrie, *The Concept of Peace* (Seoul: The Christian Literature of Korea, 1980), 87-96.

changes, a declaration from a lawful authority, an assurance of victory, a suitable means for an aim, and peace as its ultimate goal. This theory of just war also has stipulations that should be fulfilled (jus in bello) during the war. These are, the proportionate principle of limiting the offensive damage to the level inflicted by the enemy, and a classification principle of protecting the civilians and facilities not participating in the war. A war that is based on the theory of just war cannot allow a civilian massacre in any circumstances. Therefore, the Korean Church should stand on the side of pacifism and oppose all wars. But, in the case of an occurrence of an inevitable war, they should make efforts to minimize the damage of the war by proclaiming the theory of the just war.

A final suggestion would be to recover the wounded association of Global Life and bring back its intactness. All creations in this world constitute the Global Life.[30] Global Life understands that individual lives form a big life that is genealogically and ecologically associated together. So, Global Life can be considered as one big life that embraces all the individual lives, forming a unit of self-sufficiency. If we accept all the creations of the world as members of the Global Life, we shall shake off the selfishness of the human-life-centered mind and preserve other lives and the world as a whole (God's creation) for the Global Life. Causing destruction or falsifying the lives or the created world of others will be the same as doing so to the Global Life, which includes oneself, causing danger to one's own life. We have to look at the issue of the civilian massacre in the same way as we look at Global Life. If there is a suffering victim, the associates of the Global Life also suffer. If the Global Life suffers, not only the victims, but other civilians, and even we will suffer. If we are forming a Global Life through one another, the suffering from the civilian massacre is also our own suffering.[31] Therefore, the Korean Churches should recognize the pain of the victim as the pain of our own, and by non-discriminating against the small ones, and following the life style that Jesus took, should endeavor pastorally and socially to cure the pain.

---

30) Hoe-ik Chang, "Modern Science and Whole Life," in: Hoe-Ik Chang, "Modern Science and Whole Life," Environmental Institute of Korea Church (Ed.), *Spirituality Toward Ecological Life* (Incheon: Naeil yeo-neun chaek [Book toward Tomorrow], 2000), 29.

31) Un-san Son, "Healing, Forgetfulness and Reconciliation," *Korea Journal of Christian Studies*, Vol. 35 (October 2004), 269-275.

Madang, Vol. 4 (December, 2005), 63-75

Social Movement as the Ground for Minjung Theology

Jin-Kwan Kwon*

I was still in my 20's during the 1970's when a theology called minjung theology began to spread among young and progressive Christians. I remember that minjung theology was a leading socio-political thought and cast a great influence upon the society as a whole. Thus, we could say that minjung theology was not only a theology that cast impact just on Christian churches and Christians, but also a socio-political thought that guided the whole nation and the whole society. Minjung theology during the 1970's was not fully accepted by society as a whole. It was rejected by the powerful sectors of Korean society especially by the military dictatorship governments who regarded minjung theology as pro-communist. Minjung theology was a liberating ideology of, and for, the people who yearned for a real democracy with freedom and social equality.

Minjung theology contributed to a new reading and writing of history, and to a new understanding of history. Minjung theology viewed history through the eyes of the lower people. If there were not the perspective of minjung theology, history would have been understood as the record of the

Jin-Kwan Kwon received his Ph.D from Drew University. He is Professor of the Department of Theology, Sungkonghoe University, Seoul, Korea. His research interests include minjung theology and the theological critique of the neo-liberal globalization. He published books entilted *Minjung and the Holy Spirit* (Seoul, 1993) and *The Holy Spirit: the Life of Minjung* (Seoul, 2001). e-mail: jkkwon@mail.skhu.ac.kr

work and accomplishments of the elite in society. But minjung theology changed that, viewing history as the work and accomplishments of the oppressed and the weak. The minjung theology that emerged in the midst of the struggles of the minjung for their own liberation in the 1970's was the voice of the suffering people. It carried within itself their han (a unresolved sentiment that is the result of long-term suffering) and aspiration for their new future.[1)] Minjung theology is a theology that attempts to unfold the history of a nation or a society with the minjung as its heroes and heroines, that is, the subjects of history and society.

Is the minjung still relevant?

Now, we have to define who the minjung are. The first generation minjung theologians were extremely cautious not to define who the minjung were. They state that by being defined by theologians and intellectuals, the minjung are distorted, manipulated and dictated to by them. However, we must try to make the meaning of the minjung clear as much as possible. The term minjung is a relative term. I would claim that some terms that could help explicate the meaning of the minjung are the proletariat, the citizen, the nation, and others or minorities.

1. The Proletariat: The proletariat is a term to designate people as the working class. The minjung includes the lower working classes. But the meaning of the minjung cannot be consumed by the term "the proletariat." The minjung is not a strictly economic term. It is rather a political term. It emphasizes the minjung as the actor of the society and history. Also, it is a cultural and historical term. When we talk about the minjung, we are talking about the minjung as cultural, historical, political and economic beings. Karl

1) Han can be defined as "a feeling of helpless suffering and oppression." It can be translated as "a feeling of unresolved resentment against unjustifiable suffering." Or, it is "a deep awareness of the contradictions in a situation and of the unjust treatment meted out to the people or a person by the powerful. And this feeling of han is not just a one-time psychological response to a situation but is an accumulation of such feelings and experiences." Suh Kwang-sun David, "A Biographical Sketch of an Asian Theological Consultation" *Minjung Theology: People as the Subjects of History*, ed. Commission on Theological Concerns of the Christian Conference of Asia (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1983), 24-25.

Marx and other socialists tend to use the term proletariat to designate industrial workers as the sole historical agents who are to revolutionize the entire society into socialism or communism. But, in reality Marxists consider the elite socialists (e.g. intelligentsia and party leaders) as leaders of the proletariat and give them a status superior to industrial workers. That is the reason why many socialist movements end up being authoritarian and hierarchical.

Minjung theology does not see the minjung as the proletariat. Nor does minjung theology considers the path of Marxist socialism and communism as the best and inevitable path the minjung must take in history. The minjung seek their liberation in their concrete historical context. The minjung are the actors who create their own stories, histories and destinies. They have potential power and capacity to make a new history. Minjung theology believes that the minjung are the bearers of the progress of society and history. The minjung theologian seeks to put the perspective of the minjung as the actors and protagonists in history immersed in his/her doing theology.

2. The Citizens: The citizen is similar to the minjung. In connotation, the citizen is distinct from the minjung. While the minjung do not enjoy at present time the full and substantial participatory membership in the society, the citizen by definition enjoys full membership of the society and country. The minjung may be citizens, but they are at most nominal citizens. They are citizens only by name, not in a substantial sense. So minjung are struggling to achieve a full and substantial membership of the society. We may cautiously say that minjung are still in a process of becoming full citizens in a society and in a country. Minjung is a loaded term; it has a long history to it. The concept of citizen is relatively new to us. The minjung emerge as citizens, as Korea has become a more democratic society. In 21st century Korea the minjung tend to show the characteristic of the citizen; however, the idea of citizen does not exhaust the meaning of the minjung.

When it comes to the citizens' movement in Korea, it shows its differences from the minjung movement. In the citizens' movement, the most active members and leaders are composed mostly of intellectuals and middle class people. Here we have to be aware that the term "minjung" goes mostly with the term "movement," and together both become "minjung movement." In Korean history, minjung emerge as the

protagonists of history in the minjung movement. Minjung theology views minjung not in a static way, but in a dynamic way. Minjung are seen as active protagonists in history. Minjung have been most active in various minjung movements in Korean history. In those minjung movements the minjung have created and practiced lofty cultural and religious ideals and values. The *Donghak* religion in the late 19th century is an example. The minjung art movement in the 1970's until the 1990's is another recent example. Much literature has been produced by the minjung in their struggles.

Here I need to emphasize that the minjung are relational entities. The minjung create history in cooperation with others, especially with intellectuals. The minjung align themselves with others for the common good. Minjung theology, however, views the minjung, not the intellectuals or any other sector of the society, as the protagonists in history. Is it a historical fact or just a religious belief? Many people argue that the minjung have never been the subjects and protagonists of history and that minjung theology's claim that the minjung are the subjects of history is false. I think the argument is correct. It appears that the minjung have never achieved the status of the master and protagonist in history. As I wrote above, the minjung have not been citizens in substantial terms. The minjung have been excluded from full participation in society. In their everyday life, the minjung are so immersed in the efforts for their survival that they cannot afford to participate in social issues with citizens' organizations. Minjung theology believes that the minjung must be the subjects of history. It is not a descriptive statement. It is an ought-to statement. The language of theology does not always present important aspects of reality according to their appearances. Rather, it often constructs a new reality. In a new society, the minjung together with others become the subjects of history. Otherwise, it is not new in a true sense. Thus, when minjung theologians consider the minjung as the subjects of history, as is shown in the subtitle of *Minjung Theology* published by Orbis Books, they do not mean that minjung are the subjects of history, in an exact meaning of the sentence. In history and society the minjung are isolated and oppressed. They could not be considered as the subjects of history. But, minjung theologians announce that the minjung are the subjects of history. To designate the minjung as the subjects of history is to speak of them in a futuristic perspective. Likewise, the minjung has been metaphorically referred to as "messiah" and suffering

servant of God. Subjects of history, messiah, and suffering servant of God are metaphors for the minjung. Minjung theology uses metaphors in order to understand the minjung in a futuristic way. These metaphors allow the minjung to go over their present situation. I believe that the employment of those metaphors for the minjung-talk is a more responsible way to account the most basic aspects of the reality of the minjung.[2)]

3. The Nation: Now, I would like to introduce another important concept in relation to the minjung. That is the nation. As a small nation within the region of North-East Asia, the Korean nation has been invaded and occupied by neighboring powerful nations such as Japan and China. The division of the Korean Peninsula was decided by the superpowers after World War II and the Korean War. Although the Korean nation has suffered for a long time, within the nation the minjung have suffered more from both external (foreign) and internal rulers. Thus, minjung theologians like Ahn Byung-Mu stated that in Korean history there had not been the minjung but for the nation, and that the minjung had been veiled and overshadowed by the nation. He argued that the minjung, the suffering lower classes, are the core of the nation. Then, the destiny has to be decided and carried out by the minjung, not the national elite. In the history of the Korean nation, the destiny of the nation has been controlled and decided by the collaboration of external powers and internal elites.

Minjung theology must take up the problem of the nation as one of its core tasks. The nation faces ever growing military conflicts and nuclear crises in the Korean Peninsula. The modern empire, the U.S.A., tries to control both North and South Korea on its own terms. In such a situation, the issues and problems of the nation are directly connected to those of the minjung. Peace and the resolution of all conflicts surrounding the Korean Peninsula is most urgent. Minjung theology must promote peace and security in the Korean Peninsula, see to it that the past history of dependence on powerful neighbors cannot be repeated, and open up the age

2) I believe that one of tasks of theology is to aim at socially and intellectually "responsible accounts of the most basic and general aspects of reality." I made use of a statement from an encyclopedia of philosophy, in which it is stated: "Philosophy aims at intellectually responsible accounts of the most basic and general aspects of reality." *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Vol. 5, General Editor Edward Craig (Longdon and New York: Routledge, 1998), 409.

of peace and life in North East Asia. The commandment of Jesus for his disciples to become peace-makers also applies to the minjung.

4. The Others and Minorities: Current comparative terms for minjung are such terms as the "others" and "minorities." The term "others" is being used among post-modernism thinkers in Korea for discussion on issues such as alienation and suffering in the modern world. Under the heavy influence of French and Western philosophy of post-modernism, whose political philosophy tends to emphasize a "radicalization of democracy." The post-modern thinkers look into the problems of modern, liberal democracy that draws lines between normal and abnormal, legitimate and illegitimate, rational and irrational, inside and outside, and its problem of hardening the boundaries along the lines of classes, races, ethnicity, sexes, etc. In this way, the others and minorities are created. This way of looking at the problems of modernity helps sensitize us to the problem of otherness. The political goal of quite a number of postmodern thinkers is "to highlight continually various modes by which the cognitive machinery and institutions of existing democracy spawn otherness."[3] They are less concrete and less practical in their conception of the alternative society. All they want to do is to simply disrupt the present conditions of modern, liberal democracy. In most of the cases, they do not provide ideas for alternative structures. Furthermore, they are suspicious of any well-intended alternatives because they believe they also end up being oppressive and alienating. This sometimes makes them turn to socio-political conservatism.

As post-modernists argue, there have always been minorities, others, or strangers in society. But these terms do not help identify who they are. These minorities may be migrant workers from other countries, Korean Chinese in Korea, women, children, and other social groups with different backgrounds. But it seems hard to identify the minorities or the others with the minjung. The minjung denotes the multitudes and ordinary people who are in a position of being governed and sometimes being oppressed by the powerful. Minorities are mostly governed and oppressed, too. But, whereas minorities, by the meaning of the term, remain playing minor roles in society, the minjung are to play the major role in society and history. At

3) Here, I employ the idea of postmodernism introduced in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Vol. 7, General Editor Edward Craig (Longdon and New York: Routledge, 1998), 591.

least we minjung theologians cannot but think the minjung must be seen as the subjects of history, and view the whole reality from the perspective of the minjung being the subjects of history and society. Also, when it comes to the others and minorities, they by their literal meanings are rather inactive in history and society. By employing the terms of minorities and others, I am afraid that we may lose the progressiveness and pro-activeness of the minjung in history. We may, however, be able to imagine by employing these terms a society where these minorities and others are the subjects and protagonists. But that is at best just imagination. What I want to emphasize is that we cannot talk about history and society in a transformative and progressive way only with the terms of the minorities and others. We need more a historically and culturally loaded term which also has utopian vision in its meaning and helps easily identify them in our times. For the Korean context, the minjung are more suitable and of service to our purpose than nation, proletariat, citizens, minorities, and the others. In this sense, the idea of minjung and the theology of minjung are not obsolete and out-dated. They are viable and usable today.

The Goals and Basic Strategies of Minjung Theology

Minjung theology has the goal of contributing to the minjung in their efforts at becoming the subjects of history. So then, minjung theology participates in the liberating actions of the minjung. In reality, however, the minjung are mostly inactive and kept in the bondage of everyday survival games. The minjung are kept under surveillance and controlled in a very subtle but inhuman manner by the institutions of liberal democracy. Minjung theology contributes to their liberation from such oppressive conditions and help them become the subjects of history and the carriers of substantial democracy where the minjung are participatory actors and decide on both the destiny of their own lives and that of the society as a whole. Minjung theology is a practical theorythat reflects on and promotes minjung movement. Minjung theology is a practical theology that reflects on the minjung movement in the tradition of the movement of the historical Jesus. If the minjung theologian would employ the movement of the historical Jesus, which is told in the New Testament especially in the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John, as a prototype of the minjung movement and review the current minjung movement from the viewpoint of the will,

activities and faith of Jesus, what is the role of the rest of the Bible for minjung theology? Jesus inherited the liberating aspects of the Old Testament tradition and furthered them to be more humane and liberating, but rejected or corrected misunderstandings of the Old Testament writings regarding the God of Jesus. We may well say that Jesus had inherited the God of his forefathers and foremothers of the Old Testament and transformed it into a God of love, justice and peace in a radical way. There have been innumerable theologically solid statements about the love, justice and peace in and of God. So it is at most a repetition, if I discuss again about the God of Jesus.

But as a practical theologian, I need to be more specific about our situation and justify the need for theological answers to that. In fact, we live in a time when the serious dilemmas and queries of our situation provoke us to search for theological answers or even Christian answers. In our world and times science and technologies are highly advanced and developed. The material and physical development advances far faster than spiritual and mental development. Humanity needs to be newly spiritualized, reawakened and newly conscientized. Otherwise, humanity cannot intervene and prevent the violent nature of the global capitalism. It is a world of violence. Ever more dangerous instruments are now in the hands of the human being. The global powers compete with one another and roam around to snare victims, impose all blameon them, and to destroy them. North Korea and also South Korea may become the victims of the competition among the powerful empires and nations. In a world where the search for scapegoats goes on in order to maintain peace and prosperity which are always vulnerable to competitions and rivalries among the powerful nations and groups, the weak nation like Korea can be in danger of becoming a scapegoat.[4)] The survival and self-reliance of the nation emerges as a top priority today.

The Learning Process of the Minjung. This violent situation of the world intensifies when it comes to the Korean Peninsula. As is mentioned above, the Korean Peninsula is surrounded by very powerful nations such as the U.S.A., Japan, China, and Russia. Now, it is again the minjung who are to emerge as the messiah or the subjects of history. The most realistic

4) About the victimization process, refer to Rene Girard, *I See Satan Fall Like Lightning* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2004).

way for overcoming the powers that seek to sacrifice the weak nation and people is taught in the Gospel of Mark: "Prepare the way of the Lord, and make his paths straight" (Mk 1:3). The minjung would not automatically assume the role of the messiah. The minjung go through the learning process. In history we can see that an authentic minjung movement always has gone through a learning process. The Donghak Religion in the late 19th century, a late period of the Korean Dynasty, for example, provided this process for the *Donghak* peasants. The minjung must be awakened to the new historical mission, and then they can become the subjects of history. The awakening of the intellectual elite is not enough. The paths of the history dictated by the powerful can be changed by the power of the minjung, the multitude of the people. It was the *Donghak* minjung who struggled for the liberation of the nation from foreign domination and for the change of the corrupt and inert late Korean Dynasty. The *Donghak* thought, (literally Eastern Learning), was a minjung theology that integrates into itself Korean traditional religions and thoughts such as Confucianism, Buddhism, and Shamanism in a way that corresponds to its times and social-political context. If minjung theology is to initiate the learning process for the minjung, it must be a theology that articulates and discerns signs and tasks of our times from the perspective of the Biblical tradition and the minjung traditions.

Now, as for the learning process of the minjung, I would like to explore more into the historical experience of the minjung during the 1970's and the 1980's. The minjung theology emerged at a time when Korea was dictated by the military governments. The authoritarian military governments carried out economic development plans at the expense of intolerable sufferings of the minjung. The labor movement by industrial workers took its root within the society; it became an insurmountable phenomenon and the political powers oppressed it but in the long run it failed. The labor movement at that time was supported by the Urban Industrial Mission (UIM).

Hundreds of thousand of young men and women, boys and girls, were drawn from poor rural families into urban industrial areas by the government economic policies. They were simply country boys and girls who had been more accustomed to rural life. Gradually they began to realize the miserable conditions of labor and living in industrial areas. The UIM invited these young people to group activities such as sing-along,

classes for labor laws, worship, and Bible studies. Those who participated in those activities became more critical of the conditions they were in. These workers became heroines and heroes in history through voluntarily taking the risk of enormous suffering for their struggles for justice and democracy.

After two decades of the labor movement, they often say that the industrial workers' movement including the UIM was a learning process. The minjung movement of the 1970's and the 1980's provided a significant context of learning process for the ordinary workers and the poor who could not otherwise have gone through the process of learning how to construct and live out democracy and participation in society as a whole. The minjung movement of that period transformed inert masses into active subjects of history and society. The minjung movement contributed to the construction of democracy; it transformed the underclass people into active citizens. In fact, there are many stories about the former industrial worker activists who are still participating and playing important roles in many different areas of concerns in the society. The minjung movement has the educational element as the most crucial. Through the learning process a new minjung emerge and a new person is created.

The Source of the Learning Process. The minjung theology is closely connected with the minjung movement and must contribute to the learning process of the minjung. Then, what is the ultimate source of the learning process of the minjung? If the minjung do not experience the learning process, a process of learning a different authentic way of life for justice, peace and life, they simply remain as passive masses submerging in, and following this capitalistic and competitive society. The ultimate source for the learning, we minjung theologians believe, comes from Jesus, who embodied the mind and will of God. In fact, Jesus represents a most strong alternative to this capitalistic, violent, life-negating world. Also, we, minjung theologians believe that there have been rich sources for learning in Asian and Korean traditions and religions, much of which may well be seen as the work of the Holy Spirit that apparently had come and worked in Asia long before Christianity was introduced to Asia by Western missionaries.

A theology must not be like other disciplines such as philosophy, sociology, and other human sciences. It must have its distinct feature. Otherwise, it can be submerged into other disciplinary discourses and finally disappear. Minjung theology employs many other disciplines. It is

distinct in that it draws upon the deep wisdom in Jesus and the Bible and the Asian spiritual sources, and creates a critical dialogue between these sources and our current social-political-spiritual problems. Also, among the sources, Biblical and Asian, we need to create dialogue in order to reach a new understanding of these spiritual sources. "Beyond Dialogue to Learning from Each Other" is our catchword in this regard. Because of Asian traditions and religions, minjung theology has an aspect of a theology of culture.

However, it does not remain a theology of culture. It aspires to be a political theology. It draws upon our culture in order to critique the current world. It does not remain simply a political theology, which analyzes and brings into light political functions of theological discourses. It aspires to be a direct social and political thought for our society. This idea came out when I came to a dialogue with the Juche Thought of North Korea. The most impressive aspect of the Juche Thought is that it maintains depth and width as a political thought to lead the North Korean society. The Thought of Juche, whose literal meaning is self-reliance, is a political ideology that guides the people who aspire to independence from the intervention and invasion from outside powers and to the construction of self-reliant and developed political-economic systems in North Korea. It is, to a great extent, a holistic political thought. One of the recent phenomena in minjung theology is that the latter stays away from being involved in politics, ironically focusing more on cultural matters.

In the 1970's and the 1980's, the minjung theology was a social-political thought that led the people in the direction toward a realization of democracy and human rights. It was a leading social and political thought that affects other intellectual and cultural disciplines and thoughts as well as the society as a whole. Minjung theology seems to have become a small talk and a narrow discourse. We have to make every effort to recover the comprehensive and holistic aspect of minjung theology.

However, our world has become more complex and complicated. It seems not possible to think out a unifying and comprehensive social-political thought. But the minjung theology aspires to become an open-ended political ideology or thought that may be possibly able to lead the people and the society as a whole. If these requirements are be satisfied, the minjung theology has to be a name that incorporates a bunch of different theologies. In this sense, minjung theology is a theological movement. It

incorporates and brings into solidarity different theologies. These theologies may be different in their particular emphasis and areas. One may be more cultural and traditional, and the other may be more political and social. But, these theologies have the same goal: the restoration of the subject-hood or subjectivity of the ordinary people in history, culture, and society. Minjung theology, therefore, demands those theologies that regard themselves within the boundary of the minjung theology to be more aware of their direct task: the liberation and subject-hood of the minjung in today's social and political situation.

Concluding Remarks

I would like to make some concluding statements that I hope may well bring into light what I have discussed in the above. The minjung are historical entities; they cannot be identified by a certain definition. But the term minjung is closely related to such terms as the proletariat, nation, citizen, minorities, and the others. In fact, it is not wrong to say that minjung is proletariat, nation, citizen, minorities, and the others. Minjung may be all these. But each ofthese terms by itself is not able to cover the whole meaning of the minjung. They express certain aspects of the minjung, but do not cover the whole meaning that the minjung could carry. In various phases of history, the minjung emerge as historical entities that reveal, in each of the historical phases, more predominantly the characteristic of the proletariat, the nation, the citizens, the minorities, or simply the others.[5] The minjung are those who have demonstrated as historical actors themselves by carrying out historical missions in different phases of history. Thus, the minjung can be understood in connection with historical circumstances. The constant factor is that the minjung have been always powerless and suffering, and at the same time, they have the historical mission to become historical subjects. In this sense, the minjung is an eschatological being. They are not yet the subjects of history, but have already become the subjects of history. Eschatology is an important element in minjung theology as much as in the message of Jesus' proclamation of

5) I discussed before the different characteristics the minjung assumed in different phases in the Korea history. Refer to Kwon, Jin Kwan, "A Survey on the History of Minjung Theology Centered on Its Main Characteristics" *A Historical Survey of Korean Theology* (Ewha Women's University Press, 2003).

the coming of the Kingdom of God.

Another suggestion this paper is making is that minjung theology can be seen as an overarching theological movement that incorporates different theological efforts and works into a certain direction and solidarity. There cannot be one minjung theology. There cannot be the minjung theology. Or, there is no such thing as an orthodox (the doctrinally right) minjung theology. But minjung theology cannot be without some integral elements, without which it would be difficult to call it minjung theology. What are these elements that may give the epithet minjung to a theology? We may innumerate many. In this paper, I tried to be minimal in defining minjung theology. I suggest in this paper that contributing to the increase of the subject-hood of the minjung in history and society be the most integral element for a minjung theology. This element is intrinsically political and makes the project of minjung theology political. In this sense, minjung theology is a political theology and must be a political theology.

As mentioned above, minjung theology should not have a narrow perspective. Its analysis should reach the social-political-economic-cultural reality of society. It is also a historical and public theology. It has impacted on the transforming process of the society. It must continue to do it, as a leading political thought in our society.

Madang, Vol. 4 (December, 2005), 77-89

A New Understanding of Minjung-Messianism

Tae-Soo Yim*

In the early 1990s people said, "There is a crisis in minjung theology," or "the time of minjung theology is fading away." It is true, more or less, that the interest in minjung theology is gradually decreasing both domestically and internationally and it is undeniable that minjung theology has not been very active since the 1990s. There are several reasons for this phenomenon. I think the two main reasons are due to external and internal factors. The external reason is the collapsing of socialist countries and the internal reason is the theological problems within minjung theology itself. I will examine Minjung-Messianism, one of the theological problems of minjung theology, and give an alternative rendering of Minjung-Messianism for minjung theology. Minjung-Messianism is one of the representative theologies in minjung theology. After I examine Minjung-Messianism as it originated from Ahn Byung-Mu and Suh Nam-Dong (two fathers of minjung theology), I will propose what I call Jesus-Messianism and the messianic role of the minjung. An untiring supporter of minjung theology, J. Moltmann was surprised at the statement of Ahn Byung-Mu that 'the Lamb of God' in John 1:29 is not Jesus but the Minjung.[1)]

Tae-Soo Yim received his Dr.theol. from the Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms Universitaet Bonn, Germany. He is Professor of the Department of Theology in Hoseo University, Cheonan, Korea. He is Chairman of the Korean Old Testament Society and Director of the Institue of Minjung Theology. His research interests include the minjung theology and second reformation. He published following books: Das Davidbild in den Chronikbuehern; Old Testament and Minjung Theology Towards Second Reformation. e-mail: yimtaesoo@hanmail.net

1) J. Moltman, "Minjung Theology for the ruling Classes", in: *Minjung &*

J. Moltmann thinks that Ahn Byung-Mu's thesis that the 'minjung is Messiah' is improper and inconsistent from the context of John 1:29. J. Moltmann expected a reasonable explanation about Minjung-Messianism, but he could not get a satisfactory answer from Korean Minjung theologians. Therefore he did not pay attention to minjung theology and withdrew from it. I think many others withdraw from minjung theology for the same reason. Therefore I would like to examine the Minjung-Messianism of Ahn Byung-Mu and Suh Nam-Dong and reformulate the messianism of minjung theology.

Ahn Byung-Mu's Minjung-Messianism

Ahn Byung-Mu asserts that "Jesus is not the Messiah" by denying the traditional titles of Jesus such as 'Lord of redemption,' 'Messiah,' 'Son of God' and 'Son of Man,' Also, he does not admit that Jesus is a divine being. Ahn Byung-Mu says in his book *A Story on Minjung Theology*: "We must start to cut off the vicious circle of revenge by the thought that the minjung are suffering for the world. Through the suffering of minjung for the world, the ultimate Kingdom of God and the reign of Messiah will be fulfilled. In this sense the minjung are Messiah." [2)]

His work in Minjung-Messianism can be stated as, "The minjung are Messiah and Jesus is not the Messiah, Lord of redemption or Son of God." His Minjung-Messianism is based on John 1:29, Matthew 25:31-46 and Hebrews 13:12-13. Let's examine these texts one by one.

The Lamb of God is Minjung (John 1:29)

"The next day John saw Jesus coming toward him and said, 'Look, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world!' " (John 1:29)

The primary text for the Minjung-Messianism of Ahn Byung-Mu is John 1:29. His Minjung-Messianism is described mainly in his book *A Story on Minjung Theology*. The logic of his Minjung-Messianism is that "the Lamb of God, who carries the sin of the world is the minjung." For Ahn Byung-

---

Theology, Vol. 4 (The Institute of Minjung Theology, 2000), 29.

2) Byung-Mu Ahn, *A Story on Minjung Theology* (Korea Theological Study Institute, 1987), 96.

Mu the sin of the world does not mean sin in the ethical-religious sense. Sin is rather political and economic inconsistency. We all ought to carry these political and economical inconsistencies and burdens, but in reality the minjung alone carry these burdens and suffer instead of us. Therefore, the minjung are "the Lamb of God who carry the sin of the world."

Two questions must be asked of him. First, does "sin" in John 1:29 mean only political and economic sin? Second, is the Lamb of God really the minjung? Ahn Byung-Mu says that the sin of the world in John 1:29 refers to political and economical inconsistencies. Whenever he sees the suffering minjung, he feels that the minjung are carrying the sin of the world. It is certain that the minjung are carrying the burdens of the world. Nevertheless, the sin of the world includes not only political and economic sin but also individual ethical-religious sin. The Greek word for sin, 'hamartia' primarily means individual sin towards God (Mark 1:5; Matt. 1:21; Acts 2:38; John 9:41; 15:22). In other words sin in John 1:29 primarily means religious sin rather than political and economical sin.

Ahn Byung-Mu insists that "the Lamb of God" here does not mean Jesus the individual but rather the plural mass of the minjung. However, the text in John 1:29 does not permit such an interpretation. First, the word 'Lamb' occurs 4 times in the New Testament (John 1:29.36; Acts 8:32;1 Peter 1:19) and the Lamb in all of these contexts refer to the sinless Jesus who suffered and died for us. Many scholars, such as O. Cullmann and R. Bultmann say that the Lamb in John 1:29 refers primarily to the suffering servant of Yahweh in Isaiah 53 and reminds us of the Passover Lamb. Secondly, according to the context it is difficult to say that the Lamb in John 1:29 is the minjung. In John 1:27, John the Baptist says, "He is the one who comes after me, the thongs of whose sandals I am not worthy to untie." In this context, it is obvious that 'he' here means one person, Jesus, not many persons, like the minjung. The one person here is not anyone else but 'Jesus.' John the Baptist says here that Jesus is "the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world." John the Baptist mentions the pre-existence of Jesus in 1:30, "This is the one I meant when I said, 'A man who comes after me has surpassed me because he was before me." The mention of pre-existence does not fit in with the idea of the minjung as the Lamb of God. In John 1:33 he says, "He will baptize with the Holy Spirit." If the minjung are the Lamb of God, then the minjung must baptize with the Holy Spirit. But the minjung cannot baptize with the Holy Spirit. Therefore, from John 1:29

we can conclude that "the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world" is not the Minjung, but Jesus.

The Suffering Minjung are Messiah (Matt. 25:31-46)

Ahn Byung-Mu says that "a chain of messianic volcanoes erupted as an active volcano in Jesus of Nazareth." The Christ event occurs not only with Jesus of Nazareth, but it occurs continuously in our history just like volcanic chains of eruption. In this sense Ahn Byung-Mu thinks that the event of Jesus does not have a unique and once for all quality. In other words, the event of Jesus is not different from other Minjung events in terms of quality. He gives an example of this from Matthew 25:31-46. He interprets this text as saying that," Christ exists among people who are in prison, poorly clothed, starving, poor or captive." [3] For Ahn Byung-Mu these people are the minjung and therefore "the minjung are Christ."

But from the text we cannot say that these people are Christ himself. In the text, Christ is the Lord and judge in the Last Judgment. The minjung cannot become the Lord and judge in the Last Judgment. The text distinguishes between the Lord and the minjung. The aim of the parable of the Last Judgment is not to say that the Christ and the least of his brothers are the same, but rather to say that we are to serve as Christ served. We should not confuse these two. This does not mean that Christ is simply absorbed into his disciples or the least of his brothers. The Christ here still acts as Lord and judge. As such he met them, the least of his brothers.

3) Participating in the Suffering of the Minjung

> "And so Jesus also suffered outside the city gate to make the people holy through his own blood. Let us, then, go to him outside the camp, bearing the disgrace he bore" (Heb. 13:12-13).

Ahn Byung-Mu speaks concerning the meaning of Hebrews13:12-13 as follows:

> "Hebrews 13:13 says, 'Let us, then, go to him outside the camp, bearing

3) Ibid., 105.

> the disgrace he bore'.…It is shameful to visit him who went out to the city gate. But Christ is existing in the place that is abandoned and alienated thoroughly from the world. Let us go out there. There is no Christ inside the city gate now. Christ does not exist in the places that people recognize." [4)]

From Hebrews 13:12-13 Ahn Byung-Mu concludes that the one who was suffering outside of the city gate was not Jesus but the minjung. However, verse 12 speaks about Jesus Christ's redemptive death and verse 13 exhorts the congregation: "Let us, then, go to him outside the camp, bearing the disgrace he bore." In this text 'he' and 'us' are clearly distinguished. 'Us' here indicates the Christian congregation and 'he' indicates Jesus. Verse 13 means that we should join in Christ's suffering through our going out of the city gate where he suffered, because we become holy through Christ's blood. We should not remove the difference between Christ and the minjung and should not absorb Christ into the people. Definitely "the 'one' outside the camp" is Jesus Christ, not the minjung. Hebrews 13:12-13 does not merge Jesus into the Minjung or absorb the Christ into the minjung. The Epistle to the Hebrews distinguishes between these two. As we have seen above, we cannot find any solid ground for Minjung-Messianism in John 1:29, Matt. 25:31-46 and Hebrews 13:12-13. We cannot find any other grounds for Minjung-Messianism in the Bible. Therefore, Minjung-Messianism as understood by Ahn Byung-Mu should be reconsidered.

Suh Nam-Dong's Minjung-Messianism

Suh Nam-Dong also argues that 'the minjung are messiah' but he recognizes Jesus as the Messiah unlike Ahn Byung-Mu. In this aspect, Suh Nam-Dong's Minjung-Messianism is different from that of Ahn Byung-Mu. Let's examine Suh Nam-Dong's Messianism.

Jesus is the Messiah (Christ)

1) True God-True man

Let's consider what Suh Nam-Dong says about Jesus:

---

4) Ibid., 105.

"Jesus says his own words without relying on the law and God..... In this sense, he himself is God and true Man." [5]

"The God who comes to the poor, the oppressed is Jesus." [6]

"The purpose of the coming of God, who became a human being, is to serve people wholly, not to be served by people." [7]

"Christian theology until today speaks of the transcendence of God, but Jesus' story speaks of God's incarnation." [8]

From these quotes of Suh Nam-Dong we see that he follows the traditional Christian doctrine which confesses Jesus as "true God, true Man" (*vere theos vere homo*).

2) Trinity

Suh Nam-Dong recognizes the trinity as follows:

"Chiliasm, which was removed from the Church after Constantine the Great, reappears as the Third Age of the Holy Spirit as a variation by Joachim de Floris in the 12th century. Joachim de Floris does not understand the Trinity of Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit as a diachronic three form, but as an historical succession of ages of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit." [9]

"God developed his own existence like this. Through this gradual process of revelation the Son surpasses the Father and the Holy Spirit surpasses the Son God is heading in an eschatological direction. So in the last days, God will pour out his Holy Spirit on all people. This is the ground for minjung theology." [10]

3) The Messiah

Suh Nam-Dong comments on the Messiah as follows.

"Jesus, the resurrected, lives continually as their Messiah among the

5) Nam-Dong Suh, *A Study on Minjung Theology* (Han-gil-sa, 1983), 54.
6) Ibid., 13.
7) Ibid., 189.
8) Ibid., 299.
9) Ibid., 58.
10) Ibid., 59.

minjung that are oppressed and alienated socially and economically." [11]

"As the Bible promises, when the time is fulfilled and the Kingdom of Messiah comes...and if the Messiah invites me to the table of communists, then I will be embarrassed a little and hesitate to take part in it." [12]

"If Messiah comes, all people belonging to him, dead or alive, will be resurrected all together at once in the Kingdom of the Messiah." [13]

"At every moment when the Kingdom of Messiah comes, we will be resurrected and connected to the resurrected Messiah." [14]

4) The Lord

"In the last supper the Lord took bread and said, "Take it. This is my body." This Lord is the same Lord who said, "I was hungry and you gave me something to eat." [15]

"From the first the evidence of the Lord's resurrection has been like that" [16]

"The resurrection is the resurrection in the Kingdom of God (Chiliastic Kingdom)...When the Lord comes again, people who belong to him will hear the calling of the trumpet...from that moment the Kingdom of the Messiah will begin." [17]

5) The Lord of Redemption

"If we suppose that Jesus died of infirmities of old age, or of disease such as gastric cancer, can we think we can get our redemption and liberation through his death?" [18]

"Jesus' death is not only a death for our redemption, but also a light

11) Ibid., 55.
12) Ibid., 34.
13) Ibid., 123.
14) Ibid., 132.
15) Ibid., 108.
16) Ibid., 253.
17) Ibid., 319.
18) Ibid., 318.

> which makes us to find death for our redemption in the world continually." [19]

From these sayings of Suh Nam-Dong, we can confirm that he recognizes Jesus as the true God, the incarnate God, Christ, Messiah, Lord, Lord of redemption and one person of the Trinity.

The Minjung Play a Role of the Messiah

Now I will examine Suh Nam-Dong's standpoint on the relationship of the Minjung and Messiah.

1) The Minjung are Messiah

Suh Nam-Dong says that the minjung are Messiah too. But he expresses this idea seldom and with a different meaning than that of Ahn Byung-Mu.

> "Participating in the suffering of the minjung is the way of becoming a true human and a way of salvation. According to this understanding of salvation, the suffering minjung are Messiah. Therefore the minjung become the subject of history." [20]
>
> "Why are the suffering minjung Messiah?…The Messiah approaches us as suffering neighbors in disguise. In this sense the minjung are Messiah." [21]

Suh Nam-Dong's expression of "the minjung are Messiah" does not mean that the minjung are everyone's savior and guide to the Kingdom of God. In other words, Suh Nam-Dong's Minjung-Messianism differs from his own Jesus-Messianism. As seen above, for Suh Nam-Dong, Jesus is the true God, the incarnate God, the Christ, the Messiah and the Lord of redemption. But for him, the minjung are none of the above. Suh Nam-Dong does not say that the minjung and Jesus are ontologically identical.

2) Minjung Play a Role of Messiah

---

19) Ibid., 351.
20) Ibid., 181.
21) Ibid., 217.

In order to distinguish Jesus-Messianism from Minjung-Messianism, Suh Nam-Dong prefers to use vocabulary such as "the messianic function of the minjung," "the messianic character of the minjung" or "the messianic role of the minjung" rather than "the minjung are messiah." Then what is the messianic role of the minjung which Suh Nam-Dong has in mind? The role of which he speaks does not mean that the minjung have any divine power to redeem other people. In order to explain the messianic role of the minjung, Suh Nam-Dong gives two biblical examples. The first example is the man who fell into the hands of robbers in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:30-35). Suh Nam-Dong interprets this story as follows.

> "The man who suffered at the hands of the robbers plays a messianic role, a role of Jesus Christ. If someone goes to the dying man and treats him, then he/she becomes a true human. But if he/she ignores him and passes by, then he/she becomes a beast. Whether I make my sleeping human nature realize true humanity or not, depends on whether I hear the groan of the suffering man and help him or not." [22]
>
> "Minjung can play a role of Messiah because the suffering of the minjung itself plays a role of Messiah. Participating in the suffering of the minjung is the way to become a true human being and it is the way of salvation. If we understand Minjung-Messianism like this, then we can understand that the minjung are Messiah. In this way the minjung become the subject of a new age." [23]

From these two statements of Suh Nam-Dong we can see that the minjung can play a role of Messiah not because the minjung have any supernatural divine power, but because paradoxically the minjung are weak and suffer. Suh Nam-Dong explains a messianic role of the minjung in the parable of the Last Judgment in Matt. 25. He argues that serving the stranger, people who are hungry, thirsty and sick is serving Jesus. Serving the poor and the oppressed is serving Jesus. In other words, he understands that the poor, the oppressed and the sick, that is, the minjung, play a role of Jesus and Messiah. But, here is an important point we must not misunderstand. In the parable of the Last Judgment, Jesus says that serving the minjung means serving Jesus himself. But in this parable the minjung

22) Ibid., 180.
23) Ibid., 180-181.

are not Jesus himself. In other words, the minjung and Jesus are not identical ontologically.

In sum, Suh Nam-Dong does say on occasion that the minjung are Messiah, but he never means to say that the minjung are the same as Jesus. Therefore, in order to distinguish Jesus-Messianism from Minjung-Messianism, Suh Nam-Dong prefers to use words such as "the messianic function of minjung," "the messianic character of the minjung," "the messianic role of the minjung" rather than saying that "the minjung are messiah."

Reaffirmation of Jesus-Messianism

As we have examined above, Ahn Byung-Mu denies the traditional titles of Jesus, such as: Lord of redemption, Messiah, Son of God and Son of Man. He openly declares that "Jesus is not the Messiah." He also does not believe that Jesus is God. On this basis, Ahn Byung-Mu establishes his Minjung-Messianism, namely, "the minjung are Messiah."

On the contrary, Suh Nam-Dong accepts all of the traditional titles of Jesus as mentioned above and does not apply these titles (except Messiah) to the minjung. He makes a distinction between Jesus and the minjung. As to his divinity, he says that Jesus is God incarnate. As to his humanity he is a minjung in his role as Messiah. In other words, according to Suh Nam-Dong, the minjung remain limited as human beings and play a role and function of Messiah through bearing the Messiah's remaining suffering. His understanding of the relation between Jesus and the minjung is not well known. I believe that minjung theologians must follow his understanding of the relationship between Jesus and the minjung and that in the interests of the long-term development of minjung theology that it is imperative to confirm the basic understanding of the relationship between Jesus, the minjung and the Bible as follows:

Jesus is the Christ and the Son of God.

Jesus became a human being, the ultimate minjung. Simultaneously, however, he is also the transcendent God, Messiah, Son of man, Son of God and Redeemer who differs from the minjung and humanity in general in significant ways. If we do not recognize this vertical dimension of Jesus, we

will stop being Christian. Minjung theology has contributed to the Church, in both Korea and the world, to a considerable degree by emphasizing the horizontal dimension of the Christian faith. This horizontal dimension must continue to be emphasized in the future. Nevertheless, the vertical dimension should not be given up at the expense of the horizontal. The necessity of the vertical dimension is requested very much in the minjung church and is emphasized continually there. We should not cover our ears to hear this voice from the Minjung Church. The power of participating in the minjung movement of the horizontal dimension is derived from this vertical dimension. We should not forget this. The task of second generation minjung theology is to strengthen the strong points of the horizontal dimension and at the same time to reinforce it with the vertical dimension. I believe minjung theology must be developed on Peter's confession that "Jesus is the Christ and the Son of the living God" (Matt. 16:16). Only if it does this can minjung theology become a theology built on a solid rock from which it can do its mission.

The Minjung Play a Role of Messiah

The minjung are not equal to Jesus who is the Messiah and they cannot save themselves without Jesus Christ. The minjung need salvation from Jesus Christ. The minjung as the subject of history carry the burdens of people in history and play a role of Messiah in two ways. One way is in a passive way as is shown in the parable of the Good Samaritan. A man fell into the hands of robbers and they stripped him of his clothes and beat him. He was half dead and cried out for help toward passersby. This groaning and crying for help plays a role of Messiah. The minjung in Matthew 25:31-46 who are hungry, poorly clothed and kept in prison, also play a role of Messiah in a passive way. The other way is a role of Messiah in an active way which is to accomplish the salvation and liberation of God in the world through leading social reform and revolution by the minjung as the subject of history. However, we must not overlook the fact that minjung can become the subject of history under the leadership of God who is the subject of history.

The Bible is the Canon.

Ahn Byung-Mu does not recognize the canonicity of the Bible[24] and Suh

Nam-Dong says that the Bible is a point of reference or a reference book.[25] According to them the point of reference or reference book includes not only the Bible but also church history and the minjung tradition of Korea too. Suh Nam-Dong insists that theologians must take these minjung traditions as materials for minjung theology too. Yet a problem lies in the fact that the contents of minjung traditions are diverse and different. Their value systems are not only diverse, but also contradictory and antithetical to each other sometimes. Even if they are important minjung traditions, we cannot say that all contradictory minjung traditions are right. We must have a criterion that can measure and judge various minjung traditions and discern between good and evil, true and false. I believe that that criterion is the Bible. The Bible is a book different from other minjung traditions. If we do not recognize the Bible as our criterion or canon, then we will be confused and fall into a confusion of values. Therefore it is right to steer clear from saying that the Bible is just a point of reference or reference book, even though we may sympathize with the intentions of Suh Nam-Dong. I believe that Suh Nam-Dong does not equate the Bible with the Korean novels such as Hong Gil-Dong or Seopyeonje (a traditional Korean narrative song), even though he thinks that the Bible and minjung traditions are points of reference. We can and must use minjung traditions as well as the Bible, but we must distinguish the Bible from minjung traditions and recognize the Bible as our canon.

Conclusion

If we understand Jesus, the minjung and the Bible as explained above, then many misunderstandings about minjung theology will be dispelled. But some will raise the following objections: "Such a minjung theology does not differ substantially from the traditional European theology if Jesus is Messiah and the role of the minjung is limited to merely a role of Messiah." Or "if the role of the minjung is not different from the role of the minjung in traditional European theology, then the specific character of minjung theology will be lost, if we understand that Jesus is the only Messiah and the minjung play only a role of Messiah." They will doubt the special character

24) Byung-Mu Ahn, *A Story on Minjung Theology*, 73.
25) Nam-Dong Suh, *A Study on Minjung Theology*, 166, 184.

of minjung theology and ask, "What is the specific character of minjung theology? What is the role of the minjung in the history of salvation and liberation under this new understanding of minjung and Jesus?"

I believe that the specific character of minjung theology will be preserved and will not be discolored even under this new understanding of minjung theology that teaches that Jesus is the only Messiah and the minjung play a role of Messiah. Rather than diminishing minjung theology, I believe that minjung theology can stand on firmer ground, be more fruitful and contribute more fully in the life of the Church and society under this new understanding of the relationship between the minjung and Jesus.

Madang, Vol. 4 (December, 2005), 91-101

Respect for Life in Early Chinese Christianity

Andrew Linzey*

I

During the last thirty years, there have been intense philosophical debates about how we should treat animals and specifically about the concept of "animal rights." At first sight, this concern for animals might appear a Western import, perhaps even a concession to modern, predominantly secular, Western thinking that is sometimes unfavourably characterized as suffering from a surfeit of sentimentality about animals. This reaction, however understandable, is seriously mistaken.

Consider: in the ancient Confucian temple of Xian, there is a stone stele (monument) originally erected in 781. It tells the story of an ancient religion called "the Religion of Light." led by a monk called Aluoben, who first visited China during the Tang Dynasty. It describes how - when the Emperor heard its new teaching - he was struck by its "mysterious and wonderful" quality, and allowed Aluoben to establish a monastery in the Da

Andrew Linzey is a member of the Faculty of Theology in the University of Oxford, England, and holds the world's first post in theology and animal welfare the Bede Jarrett Senior Research Fellowship at Blackfriars Hall, Oxford. He is also Honorary Professor of Theology in the University of Birmingham, and Special Professor at Saint Xavier University, Chicago. He has written or authored twenty books, including Animal Theology (SCM Press/University of Illinois Press, 1994). This article is a revised version of the Preface to the Chinese edition of Animal Gospel published by the University of China Politics and Law Press, 2005. Email: andrewlinzey@aol.com.

Quin province.

The Stone offers this description of the new religion: "To penetrate the mysteries, to bless with a good conscience, to be great yet empty, to return to stillness and be forgiving, to be compassionate ··· to help them understand the nature of things, to maintain purity, to nourish all things, to respect all life, and to answer the needs of those whose beliefs come from the heart these are the services the Religion of Light Church can offer." At first sight, these aspirations might appear largely Buddhist or Taoist, yet the Stone continues:

> The True Lord of the Primordial Void, in absolute stillness and constant naturalness, crafted and nourished all things. He raised the earth and established the sky. *He took on human form and His compassion was limitless*. The sun rises; darkness is banished; and we are witnesses to the true wonder.[1)]

The reference to the "True Lord ··· taking human form" is so unmistakably Christian that it is difficult not to conclude that this "Religion of Light" was Christian in origin and that monk Aluoben and his followers were none other than early Christian missionaries.

Consider further: in the Da Quin province, where the monks first settled, can be found a pagoda that dates back to the seventh century and which, remarkably, bears the marks of early Christian worship. Excavated in 1999, with the support of the Chinese Government, the second floor of the pagoda shows the remains of an eighth- to ninth-century sculpture of the nativity with the Virgin Mary in a reclining position, as sometimes depicted in Russian icons of that period. Unusually, the plaza of the pagoda runs from east to west (as do all Christian churches) unlike Buddhist or Taoist temples, which characteristically run from north to south.

Consider yet further: at the now famous cave in Dunhuang various ancient manuscripts were discovered at the end of the nineteenth century

1. Martin Palmer, *The Jesus Sutras: Rediscovering the Lost Religion of Taoist Christianity* (London: Piatkus Publishing, 2001) [hereafter, "Palmer"] verses 3:54-55 and 3:70-73, p. 223; my emphases.

and, sad to say, largely looted by Westerners and sold to private collectors. Among the Buddhist and Taoist manuscripts were some apparently Christian ones, later described as "the Jesus Sutras." The Second Sutra the Sutra of the World Honoured One - tells us that it was written "after the physical manifestation took place [i.e. Christ's birth] 641 years ago," [2] - which dates the manuscript closely to the visit of Aluoben in the seventh century. The same Sutra echoes the familiar gospel idea that God cares even for sparrows, and the second Sutra the Sutra of Cause and Effect and Salvation - speaks of how the "One Sacred Spirit looks with compassion on all life." [3]

In the Fourth Sutra the Sutra of Jesus Christ the fifth "covenant" or commandment requires that "any living being should not only not take the life of another living being, but should also teach others to do likewise." Again, elsewhere, "God protects all that lives: everything that lives does so as a result of this. It is forbidden to take a life even for sacrifice, for these teachings forbid taking any life." [4] John the Baptist is described as a vegetarian: one "who dwelt in the wilderness and who, from his birth, had never eaten meat or drunk wine, but instead lived on vegetables and honey gathered from the wilderness." [5] The meaning of Jesus' death is described in universal terms: "The Messiah gave up his body to the wicked ones for the sake of all living beings … In his compassion he gave up his life." And, remarkably, the day before the resurrection, when Jesus hung upon the Cross is described as the "sixth cleansing, vegetarian day." [6]

For this narrative, and the translations of the Jesus Sutras, I am indebted to the pioneering work of Chinese scholar Martin Palmer.[7] His work makes remarkable reading. If Palmer is right (and I have no reason to doubt his evidence), there existed in China an early Christian church whose "teachings on charity, vegetarianism, anti-slavery, equality of men and women, and care for nature …offer models of personal behaviour that draw

2) Palmer, 7:34, p. 67.
3) Palmer, 1:11, p. 139.
4) Palmer, 4:20, p. 164.
5) Palmer, 5:15, p. 166.
6) Palmer, 5:41 and 5:46, pp. 167-68; my emphasis.
7) See also Ray Riegert and Thomas Moore, *The Lost Sutras of Jesus*, trans by Jon Babcock (London: Souvenir Press, 2004).

on the best in Christianity and in other ancient spiritual traditions." [8)]

II

Many questions crowd in. Who was Aluoben? Was he a monk, or actually a bishop, sent (possibly) by the Syrian or Persian churches? Why do we apparently have no other records of him? Why would Aluoben and his followers have been given such special treatment by an Emperor not usually known for his non-violent convictions? What were the precise doctrinal beliefs of the Church, and how extensive were its contacts with Taoism and Buddhism? And how many other "Jesus Sutras" might there be hidden in private collections, which could yet spread further light on the phenomenon of early Chinese Christianity?

Many of these questions are not yet susceptible to anything like complete answers. But unless the research is utterly tendentious (which I doubt), it does seem indisputable that there existed an authentic Christian Church in China long before the Jesuit missionaries arrived in the late sixteenth century. And, what is more, this Christian community was committed to a doctrine of non-violence to animals as well as humans, lived a vegetarian life, and preached a Gospel of compassion for all living beings.

Some scholars might argue that the "Religion of Light" was obviously a syncretistic faith, which borrowed freely from Taoism and Buddhism, and this in turn explains its apparent concern for the compassionate treatment of animals. That there is some Buddhist and Taoist influence in the Sutras is undeniable. Just a few examples will suffice. The reference to "karma" and the "five skandas" in the Second Sutra are explicable in relation to Buddhist sutras, though even here, despite the formal similarity, the point behind the reference to "karma" is an explanation of what it means to be saved "from" - presumably in a context in which the notion of "sin" was not easily comprehensible. Elsewhere, in the Fourth Sutra there is a reference to the Buddhas (semi-divine beings) who orbit the Messiah, and also the acknowledgement that there are "great teachers, such as the Buddhas" but, in context, such teachers are understood to be "moved by the Wind" (which appears to be a reference to God the Spirit), and are clearly subordinate to

8) Palmer, p. 253.

this power.[9)]

It would be astonishing, of course, if early Christianity learnt nothing from its cultural setting in China, as it has learnt and borrowed from its development in other contexts whether they be Greek, Roman or Syrian. All preaching of the Christian message is radically influenced necessarily so by its environment. What can be understood obviously determines what is said. The real question is: was the development of what may be loosely called "Taoist Christianity" a legitimate one?

In fact, what is remarkable about the Sutras is the way in which, despite a vastly different cultural setting, they maintain strongly orthodox theological leanings, and indicate a process of theological development. The case of animals illustrates this. The First Sutra says:

Watch the birds: they don't plant or harvest, and they have no houses to worry about. They do no work, yet are fed and watered and never worry about what to wear, because [of] the One who cares for them. You are more important than birds, so why do you worry?[10)]

These words are obviously based on St Matthew's Gospel 6:25-26, or on an oral or written tradition known to both. They reflect entirely accurately the spirit of Matthew's recorded saying of Jesus, which concerns God's providential care as Creator of all. The Second Sutra, possibly under Taoist influence, speaks of how "The One Sacred Spirit made a vast multitude of beings. Everything under Heaven is filled with this Sacred Space," [11)]and goes on to describe the various qualities of the individual soul. The Third Sutra repeats this same point, but elaborates: "All that exists does so as the manifestation of the beingness of the One Sacred Spirit." [12)] And the Fourth Sutra describes Jesus as the embodiment of compassion for all living beings.

These are entirely orthodox reflections, albeit influenced by other cultural thought-forms. The starting point is that God as Creator cares for all living beings, his Spirit enables other God-given breathing lives, which are therefore manifestations of the same divine Spirit, and finally, Jesus as Messiah expresses the sovereign care of the Creator by dying for the redemption of all creatures from earthly suffering. The Sutras make explicit

9) Palmer, 1:3 and 1:15, pp. 159-160.
10) Palmer, 2:15-17, p. 57.
11) Palmer, 2:6, p. 140.
12) Palmer, 3:16, p. 149.

what is actually already implicit in canonical scripture - for example, in the Prologue to St John's Gospel, and in St Paul's letter to the Romans where he speaks of suffering creation awaiting its deliverance from "bondage to decay" (Rom. 8:18-24, RSV).

III

Some may argue that even if this is so, the emphasis on vegetarianism is surely Buddhist rather than Christian. Even that claim bears some examination. Like most theologians, I have assumed, in accordance with the canonical gospels, that Jesus ate fish, and probably (but not certainly) meat. But that view needs to be balanced by three other considerations, which raise some difficult (perhaps unanswerable) questions.

The first is the existence of an early gospel called the Gospel of the Ebionites. We know that it existed because it is attacked as "heretical" by Epiphanius, the fourth-century Bishop of Salamis, in his principal work *Panarion*, which lists and condemns various heresies. The Ebionites were, it seems, a Jewish-Christian sect whose written Gospel was regarded by Epiphanius as a distortion of the Aramaic Gospel of Matthew. His attack refers to some of the actual lines of their Gospel:

(i) And it came to pass when John was baptized, that the Pharisees came to him and were baptized, and all Jerusalem also. He had a garment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins. And his meat was wild honey, which tasted like manna, formed like cakes of oil.

(ii) They say [the Ebionites] that he [Jesus] is not begotten by the Father but created like one of the archangels, being greater than they. He rules over the angels and the beings created by God and he came and declared, as the gospel used by them records: "I have come to abolish the sacrifices: if you do not cease from sacrificing, the wrath [of God] will not cease from weighing upon you."

(iii) Those who reject meat have inconsiderably fallen into error and said, "I have no desire to eat the flesh of this Pascal Lamb with you." They leave the true order of the words and distort the word which is clear to all from the connection of the words and make the

> disciples say: "Where do you want us to prepare for you to eat the Passover?" To which he [Jesus] replied, "I have no desire to eat the flesh of the Paschal Lamb with you." [13)]

We do not know whether Epiphanius represents the Gospel of the Ebionites fairly or accurately, but we may be struck by the apparent similarity between the depiction of John the Baptist as a vegetarian and also the rejection of animal sacrifices in both the Ebionite Gospel and the Jesus Sutras. (The rejection of the idea that Jesus ate the Pascal Lamb also seems to resonate with the otherwise inexplicable idea in the Sutras that the last day of crucifixion was a "vegetarian day" or, alternatively, it may be due to reflection on the sixth day of creation as depicted in Genesis 1:29-30 where God decrees a vegetarian diet.) This raises the question whether the Gospel of the Ebionites is actually a source for the Jesus Sutras, or whether both are utilizing a common written or oral source, which may have had wide provenance in the ancient Eastern world. Some, like Keith Akers, have argued that this original community of Jewish Christians faithfully recorded the witness of Jesus to a non-violent way of life (inclusive of animals) marked by a special concern for the poor (hence their name, "Ebionite" derived from the Hebrew term *EBIONIM* meaning "the poor" Christians).[14)]

The second consideration is allied to the first. From the existence of the Ebionite Gospel, we know that vegetarian Christians existed until a long period after Jesus' death. The Ebionite Gospel was probably (but not certainly) written at the beginning of the second century AD. From Epiphanius's attack - sometime in the fourth century - we may assume that an Ebionite community had existed for a considerable time, and may still have been active in his life-time. The question should therefore be raised as to why there were *any* Christian vegetarians at all - if their grounds for vegetarianism could be so easily rebutted by those who could give contrary testimony even by those who may have been living witnesses to Jesus'

---

13) The Gospel of the Ebionites, from Epiphanius, adv. Haer., paras 30.13, 30.16, and 30.22, cited and discussed in J. K. Elliott (ed), *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation based on M. R. James* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1993), 15-16. See my discussion of these texts making some of the same points, and nine other apocryphal texts, in http://www.godandanimals.com/PAGES/linzey/apocry.html.

own meat-eating?

In fact, we know that Christian vegetarians existed right from the beginning because St Paul also attacks them in his letter (around AD 60) to the Roman Church. He writes, "As for the man who is weak in faith, welcome him, but not for disputes over opinions. One believes he may eat anything, while the weak man eats only vegetables" (Romans 14:1-2, RSV). The apparent cause of the disagreement concerned the propriety of eating meat offered in sacrifices to idols, but although the controversy took this precise form, it is possible that it hid a deeper disagreement about the propriety of eating meat in the first place. Although St Paul regards the issue as simply one of "conscience," he nowhere explicitly states what one would have expected him to say, namely that since our Lord ate meat, there should be no problem about his followers doing so. But if Jesus ate meat, possibly meat offered to "idols," even (according to one scholar) sacrificing animals himself,[15] why should there be any Christian vegetarians at all, let alone some to whom Paul is prepared to make concessions of "conscience"?

The third consideration arises from the apparent fact that James, the brother of Jesus, was a vegetarian. This raises the obvious question about Jesus' family history. It is unclear whether the references in the tradition to the vegetarianism of James are due to ascetical or moral objections, or a combination of both. But one recent scholar, Robert Eisenman, in an exhaustive study, relates the issue back to the Noahic covenant, which suggests that James adopted a form of theologically inspired vegetarianism, which had an ethical dimension.[16] Given that there were Christian vegetarians who apparently appealed to Jesus himself as their authority, the

---

14) Keith Akers, *The Lost Religion of Jesus: Simple Living and Nonviolence in Early Christianity* (New York: Lantern Books, 2000), 26. The foreword is by Walter Wink.

15) Richard Baukham, "Jesus and Animals II: What did he Practise?" in Andrew Linzey and Dorothy Yamamoto (eds), *Animals on the Agenda: Questions about Animals for Theology and Ethics* (London: SCM Press/University of Illinois Press, 1998), 49-60. Baukham's work repays careful study, but one is left with a paradox: Jesus apparently taught kindness to animals, and fulfils Jewish messianic hopes, including an endorsement of the "original vegetarianism of all living creatures," but was not himself a vegetarian and even personally sacrificed animals at the Temple. If that is true, it is difficult,

question arises as to the nature of their vegetarianism and how it was understood. Was it simply a cultic, ascetical rejection or was it based on some rejection of the morality of killing animals for food?

Some scholars have been eager to view vegetarianism as an expression of ascetical rather than moral concern. Roger T. Beckwith describes the vegetarian practice of the Therapeutae as the "vegetarianism of the ascetics." While the Therapeutae were (as far as we know) first century monastics and therefore generally ascetic in character, their desire to keep their table "pure from the flesh of animals" (as Philo remarks) seems to owe its origin to the Old Testament prohibition against eating blood. It was therefore, as Beckwith acknowledges, a theologically inspired vegetarianism which led to a rejection of the Temple and the sacrificial system itself. But it is difficult to think that this so-called "spiritualization of the sacrificial law" had absolutely no moral content.[17] When one combines this with the decree of the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15:20 regarding abstinence from "what is strangled with blood" (who else is "strangled" but animals for food rather than sacrifice?) one begins to wonder whether there are deep-seated motifs at play here of which we are only partly or dimly aware. At any rate, it is worth reflecting on the simple known fact that there were theologically inspired Christian vegetarians at a very early point in the Church's life.

These considerations do not, of course, close the issue of whether Jesus was a vegetarian. There is serious evidence on the other side, most notably Jesus' fish eating and his apparent breaking down of food restrictions (Mark 7:19). The debate is still open and it is unwise to be dogmatic. But it is possible, at least *thinkable* that early Jewish-Christian groups have faithfully preserved Jesus' example of vegetarianism and his objection to animal

---

inter alia, to account for both the traditions of Christian vegetarianism and the fact that the early Church effectively abolished animal sacrifices (see my critique, pp. 3-7).

16) Robert Eisenman, *Jesus the Brother of Jesus: Recovering the True History of Early Christianity*, Vol. 1: *The Cup of the Lord* (London: Faber & Faber, 1997), see 258-390.

17) Roger T. Beckwith, "The Vegetarianism of the Therapeutae, and the Motives for Vegetarianism in Early Jewish and Christian Circles", *Revue de Qumran*, Vol. 13, Nos 49-52, October 1988, p. 409. I am grateful to Dr Beckwith for this reference and for other insights.

sacrifice, and that is the same tradition which the Ebionites represent in their Gospel, and which in turn is reflected in the Jesus Sutras. Scholars have yet to wrestle with the implications of the fact that there was an early sub-tradition of Christian vegetarianism, which apparently claimed dominical or canonical authority.

In short, then, while we may be tempted to view the Sutras as reflections of contemporary Buddhist thought or practice, it is by no means clear that this is actually the case. It is possible that contact with Buddhism reinforced, rather than originated, an ethical concern for other living creatures. It would not be the first time that a religious tradition's creative encounter with another has re-activated authentic elements within its own.

IV

It will be seen that the debate about animals how we should live with them and how we should treat them is by no means a modern one, least of all a purely secular one. Rather, it is a deep spiritual issue that emerges within many world religious traditions unsurprisingly, perhaps, there is also a similar debate in Buddhism about whether the Buddha himself was vegetarian, and whether all Buddhists should be vegetarian today.[18] Whether we are Christians, Buddhists, Taoists, or of no faith, it is difficult to speak meaningfully of compassion without also extending that notion to our treatment other creatures capable of suffering pain. If Taoists and Buddhists have helped Christians to re-discover something essential to their faith then Christians should be truly thankful. The generous God - or "the Sacred Spirit" - is not confined within human thoughts or human traditions, however well-intentioned or noble.

The Taoist Church lasted, it seems, until the collapse of the Tang Dynasty in 906. It subsequently suffered such persecution that the Da Quin monastery and many others were completely destroyed, and only the stele Stone and the (now restored) pagoda remain as visible symbols of the world

18) See, for example, Philip Kapleau, *To Cherish All Life: The Buddhist Case for Vegetarianism* (Rochester, New York: The Zen Center, 2nd edn 1986), pp. 29f., and Bodhin Kjolhede, "The Buddhist Case for Vegetarianism" in Andrew Linzey (ed), *Animal World Encyclopaedia* (Plymouth: Kingsley Publishing, forthcoming 2006). And for a seminal work on ahimsa, see Christopher Key

these early Christians sought to create. But there are still believers, like myself, who are eager to see the rebirth of an authentic non-violent and compassionate Christian faith.[19] In fact, Chinese and Asian Christians have an opportunity perhaps a unique one in world Christianity to engage thoughtfully and constructively with the new movements of ethical sensitivity for the environment, vegetarianism and animal protection, and to demonstrate how these emerging concerns resonate with the deepest aspirations of authentic Asian Christianity.

Chapple, *Nonviolence to Animals, Earth, and Self in Asian Traditions* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993).

19) Some of the non-violent and compassionate themes that emerge from a study of Asian theology are explored in Choan-Seng Song, *Theology from the Womb of Asia* (London: SCM Press, 1988). But, despite the author's admirable concern with creation and ecological issues, the tradition of vegetarianism and non-violence to animals is entirely overlooked.

Abstracts of Recent Doctoral Dissertations

A Study on the Formation of Gender Identity of Protestant Women in the Modern Age of Korea: Focusing on the Effects of Mainstream Discourses on Identity Construction

By Sook-jin Lee Ph.D

This study aims to analyse what effects the mainstream discourses have had on the formation of gender identity of Protestant women in the modern age of Korea. The Protestant mainstream discourses can be also called patriarchism, which played a major role in producing obedient church women conformable to the male-dominant value systems and institutions. Why and how has the patriarchism been influential among church women?

It is important to recognize the chronological and spatial elements of the formation of personal (or collective) identity. It leads to the analysis of the way that modern Western concepts of time and space affected the reformation of identity of Korean Protestants. From the late nineteenth century to the early twentieth century in Korea, Protestantism was a main carrier of modernity and introduced a new kind of time consciousness to Korean people, with criticizing that the traditional notion of time was stagnatory and superstitious. It was Protestant missionaries that tried to replace the traditional concepts of time by modern and Christian ones. They were sons of the modern society as well as preachers of Gospel, who aimed to civilize and evangelize/Christianize Korea by cooperating or competing each other. Protestantism also created a new space for church women. By interpellating the women from a private sphere into a public sphere such as churches or schools, Protestantism contributed to liberating women from the ancient regime of Confucian patriarchy.

However, there were side effects brought about on church women's liberation. The liberating Protestantism also created a newly gendered hierarchy for them. Protestantism was based upon and reinforcing modern private/public dualism, which forced church women to accept the gendered

role without resistance in the name of sacredness. In this way, Protestant women came to get the autonomous yet docile identity.

We can find two kinds of discourse had a profound influence on the formation of religious identity of Protestant women. One is the discourse on sin. An awakening of sin and its public confession was an entirely new experience in Korean religious history. But it is ironic that when Protestant women discovered that they were sinners before God, their identification as sinners contributed to producing a submissive female subject. Since the myth of original sin and fall of Eve was established, the militaristic metaphors on sin/judgment and the patriarchal notion of God had coerced church women to be submissive to the patriarchal order. In other words, sinner identification served as an ideology that transformed the dogma of obedience to God into the logic of submission to the patriarchal system. The other is the discourse on saint (true believer), which provided saint consciousness to Protestant Christians. Such true believer consciousness excluded other religions by the Christianity/paganism dichotomy and invented incessantly heresy by the dichotomy of orthodox/heterodox. Saint consciousness led to the politics of exclusion based upon the dichotomy of purity/impurity. Such a mechanism placed women as a secondary believer and an assistant of men in the faith community. And the negative and passive image of women was gradually accepted by church women. Saint consciousness, like sinner identification, also played a major role in producing a passive female subject in the Protestant church.

Seeing from the view of national identity, patriarchism also affected the formation of national identity of Protestant women. During the Japanese occupation period, the Protestant churches held two kinds of mainstream discourse on the nation — the nationalist and the colonialist discourse. The former was anti-Japanese imperialism and the latter was pro-Japanese imperialism. The two were politically in conflict, but they shared the patriarchal ideology. Protestant nationalists and protestant colonialists all interpellated women in the logic of patriarchism. Patriotic women(愛國婦人) were the product of nationalist discourse and *chonghubuin*(銃後婦人) that of colonialist discourse. There emerged the logic of mobilization. According to the logic of nationalism and colonialism, the primary duty of Protestant women was identical in that they should be a devoted supporter for their husband and children and should reproduce the offspring. Although the two discourses advocated equality between men and women as a

member of nation, they conferred nothing more than secondary roles and rights to women. They argued Protestant women could be a real member of a nation, only if they did as Moses's mother had done, who reared her sons to be strong and patriotic heroes. The nationalist discourse often used the metaphor of "the mother of nation" and tried to sacralize the motherhood and de-sexualize women with appropriating Confucian patriarchal image of women. It was Christianity schools and churches that served as a core channel for inspiring such a gender ideology in Protestant women.

This study explored how the mainstream discourses of the Protestantism interpellated women, by focusing on the concepts of sinner identification and saint consciousness, patriotic women and *chonghubuin*. To conclude, Protestantism in the modern age of Korea disseminated patriarchal discourse by appropriating the patriarchal elements immanent in Confucianism, Christianity, modernity, and Japanese imperialism. Through those various discursive practices Protestantism reinforced the old gender hierarchy and produced the submissive female subject.

Ewha Womans University, Korea. 2005.
e-mail: sookjin@ewhain.net

Theological Significance of the Critical Theory

By Moon-Whan Kim Th.D.

Trying to reveal the origins of modern civilization tragedies and in search for a fundamental and realistic measure to face them, the critical theory always pointed out the unrestricted expansion of instrumentalist rationalism and the enhancement of critical ability to confront it. This paper will summarize the basic assumptions of the critical theory surrounding Marcuse and Horkheimer and, in succession, try to affirm the realistic character of the theory by extending it to the fields of art and religion.

The critical theory, always being a means of critic to the linear positivist view of absolute reality, criticizes from its theological perspective traditional solifidianism, with all its appending aspects of subjectivity, spirituality and theodicy. This is related to refusing the negation of negation to be affirmative and, instead, affirming "restricted negations." The materialistic and negative theology of critical theory rather denies the expression of god than god itself, and draws near to the traditional Jewish prohibition of idols. Hence, it does neither mean the denial of a better future in sense of justice, freedom, solidarity and beauty. The aspiration and hope for this absolute other, critical theory names theology.

From the same perspective, critical theory criticizes the claim on the unfunctional function of art as an ideological one. Actually, to some extend art draws a picture of the world of absolute affirmation and therefore shows a positive culture by encouraging the flight from reality. But on the other hand, especially modern art also encourages the reflection on and the practical surmount of modern civilization, by trying to show its hidden reality. This understanding of art also criticizes the philosophy of identity, which puts nature as a mere extension in a subject-object-relationship. Hence it offers points of connection to the thought of ecology.

This paper shall show that these reactions of critical theory on the challenge of modern civilization can also be found in modern theology and hence point out the theological significance of critical theory.

Modern theology regards the traditional "deus ex machina" as mythic, supernatural and religous; in short as idolization. From the perspective of

the theology of hope, this paper understands the essence of modern theology as the yearning for historical deliverance and apocalyptic salvation and seeks its connections to the theology of play, which can only be understood from a political view of theology. Bearing a many connotations of aesthetics, the theology of play, hoping for joy and play in freedom, understands salvation and deliverance as a divine play of love and satisfaction.

The author believes that Moltmann's "spiritual holism" can provide a framework to understand all these aspects and therefore will treat it also in the paper.

Of course, the critical theory's understanding of human society and future and that of modern theology differ in many aspects. Nonetheless, both are in pursuit of freedom and deliverance; both disassociate with excessive egoism and the loss of individuality in the nameless mass; both point out that the technical alienation of modern society will eventually lead to a crisis of humanity; and both are determined to overcome this situation and finally find hope.

In this paper it is pressed forward that, in order to openly face the social problems surrounding the modern individual, modern theology has to abandon its distrust in sociological critics of religion. When it confronts itself with modern sociological theories, especially those, who - like the critical theory - cope with the deep concern on humanity, a lot of new and helpful perspectives will open up.

So called political theology is the result of such an encounter: The gathering of dialectical social philosophy and modern theology left the latter with a new understanding of salvation, transcendence, deliverance of the individual and the society, etc. This paper also sets sight on the aesthetic aspect of critical theory and assumes that it build the link to modern theology, especially political theology, theology of play and ecological theology. This is not restricted to the theoretical work, but is also expected to open new perspectives on the renewal of worship and the innovation of the church itself.

This paper, however, will focus on reciting the basic assumptions of critical theory, in order to show how it could be possible to escape the trouble inflicted by the modern civilization on the human individual, the society and the nature. Also by connecting it to various modern theological theories, this paper tries to surface the theological meaning of critical

theory.

Sungkonghoe University, Korea. 2005.
e-mail : moonsoo777@nate.com

Looking For Elizabeth: A Feminist Religious Education for Empowering Women's Self-Identity

By Hyun-Sun Oh Ph.D.

This dissertation is an expression of my continuing commitment as a religious educator to the liberation of women. It addresses the need of the formulation of an appropriate theory of feminist Christian religious education for empowering women in Korea based upon their needs, their struggles, and their hopes for a better life.

There is currently no theory of religious education related with women's particularity and reality in the Korean churches. Especially, poor women and their issues are not given any special attention nor are they considered important in matters of the church and theology. This project helps them understand who they really are and promote praxis that expands their dreams for women's fuller humanity.

As the primary methodology, I use the interviews with 33 Korean poor women including 8 activists who are working in solidarity with them. The second method is an analysis of written materials produced by various institutions and organizations which support the poor in Korea and a critical review of existing literature and the communication of other authors' perspectives from Minjung theology, Asian feminist theology, and Western feminist religious education.

This effort dreams poor women to grasp and reclaim confidence in themselves as participants in society who have the knowledge and energy to transform social realities. They possess the most practical force to bring about transformation because of the strength and wisdom they have accumulated through their life experiences. Once they have a chance to realize this potential and are freed to share their stories, experiences, and wisdom, they will be empowered to push the liberative force beyond the personal. Working together, women of poverty will have enormous power, presenting an irresistible challenge to oppressive realities. This is precisely what a feminist theory of religious education proposed in this study will do. To listen to the voice of women and help them speak out from their places of suffering without fear is essentially the beginning of feminist religious education in Korea.

The religious education envisioned in this study I want to create provides Korean women with hope for changing self, church, and society and enables them to realize their potential by sharing their vision and work.

Claremont School of Theology, USA. 2004.
e-mail : hyunsuna1@hanmail.net

"Not in Persuasive Words of Wisdom"?: Paul's Rhetoric in 1 Cor 1:18-2:16

By So-Jung Yoon Ph.D.

Paul's rhetoric in 1 Corinthians has been the focus of scholarly argument, but not much attention is paid to his inconsistent attitude towards rhetoric. Although Paul shows a refined rhetorical skill in his discourse, he is critical of rhetoric when he states that his proclamation of the gospel is not in persuasive words. Such deprecation of rhetoric was not unfamiliar to the people of Paul's time as can be seen in philosophers and orators who responded to public critique of rhetorical manipulation by dissociating themselves from it. And why does Paul deny that he speaks "in persuasive words of wisdom"? The dominant opinion has been that Paul was critical of using rhetoric in Christian proclamation because the Corinthians so much cherished it. But considering the apparent level of education of the Corinthians--"not many of you were wise by human standards"(1 Cor 1:26)--it is unlikely that they were rhetorically skilled. Rather Paul appears to respond to the Corinthians' doubt about his using rhetoric while at the same time persuading them to set aside their spiritual freedom as a sign of factionalism and unite under his authority.

This study argues that it was the Corinthians who preferred spiritually inspired speech and thought that eloquent speech did not contain the power of the Spirit. Paul, then, was the person who favored rhetoric and was criticized by them for his rhetorical skill. In the digression of 1 Cor 1:18-2:16 Paul attempts to prove himself agreeable to the Corinthian congregation by denying the persuasive power of rhetoric in his proclamation and claiming to demonstrate the spirit. Yet Paul's emphasis on intelligible speech in 1 Cor 12 and 14contradicts this apparent preference for spiritual power over eloquent speech in 1:18-2:16. This confirms that Paul's criticism of rhetoric is a rhetorical device necessary to prepare the audience to accept his direction.

Graduate Theological Union, USA. 2004.
e-mail : sojungyo@yahoo.com

A Study on William Temple's Christian Social Order and Welfare State

By Ki-Yong Chang Ph.D.

This study is aimed to investigate the ethical principles of modern welfare state that has been suggested in William Temple's 'Christian social order.' Capitalism has drastically developed since the Industrial Revolution, resulting in numerous inherent contradictions and problems such as polarized society where the rich become richer, and the poor, poorer, and the problem of the slums and isolation of the socially disadvantaged, to enlist shortly.

William Temple dreamed up the Christian social order that is to overcome the faults and contradictions of capitalism by accommodating the Anglican Christian social tradition and ecumenical movements. He was the first to generalize the terminology, 'welfare state' with the presentation, through Christianity and Social Order in 1942, of guidelines and principles that Christianity should support the welfare state. The presentation was significant in which it shed light on the basic principle that the state should take the responsibility of providing welfare benefits to the socially disadvantaged on the national level. It also contributed to winning the sympathy of the British people with the value of welfare state, and actually supplied the theoretical base to build up a welfare sate on after the Second World War. What is implied in the welfare state that has been suggested by Christianity? What kind of social values and regulations are cherished? Welfare state is generally conceived to build up social safety nets with the state's responsible facilitation of welfare benefits to socially isolated disadvantaged.

What this study intends to propose is expanding the horizon of welfare state beyond the dimension of material needs of the socially disadvantaged to that of spiritual needs. Hence, what should be emphasized in this study is that the goal of welfare state cannot ignore the basic human desire for happiness, in other words, the pursuit of human dignity and realization of values. Surely, human self-realization is impossible without satisfying material needs. A state society must labor to maximize social justice through fair satisfaction of the needs. However human nature is apt to go

contrary to the initial goal of love and justice, as is sharply pointed out by Reinhold Niebuhr, hence many examples of non-profit organizations lapsed into interest groups exist as a matter of fact. Therefore inner motivation for more ultimate values is required in order to transcend the mere pursuit of material desire. William Temple suggested significant principles from the above point of view: human freedom, fellowship, and service. Through these principles were proposed his points that at the core of the Christian social order are the significance of labor, the realization of human nature inclined for social solidarity, and the respect for human dignity. According to the principles, Temple strongly emphasized the state responsibility to the socially disadvantaged and the state duty of social security measures such as full employment, healthy welfare, improvement of poor residential conditions, education and social security system, etc.

Despite the historical and chronological gaps, the theological base of Temple's proposal-Incarnation and Sacramental perspective-is necessary to be reinvestigated and reevaluated, which will enlighten the fact that essential human self realization takes place in incarnation, which lies beyond the theory of human rights and labor economics as observed by sociologists and political scientists. Building up a welfare state has also been the prime task of Korean administrations since independence and used for various political campaigns and public pledges in every administration. But the development of its spirit continued with series of 'discrimination' and 'exclusion.' Worsening it were the dominance of neo-liberalism in the wave of globalization and the resulting transformation to the third way, named 'productive welfare policy" with the launching of the Kim Dae Jung administration in the turmoil of financial crisis and IMF bailout. Neo-liberalistic free trading and the dominance of transnational hedge fund have necessarily weakened the public characteristics of society and reduced the state-led welfare measures. The most plausible partner to respond and cooperate with churches to draw out social consensus and enable practices on the policy level appears to be NGOs. Further studies on the relation between churches and NGOs and the role of their partnership are certainly expected from the viewpoint of Christian social ethics.

Yonsei : University,Korea. 2005.
e-mail : changky@mail.skhu.ac.kr

Donated by

Charles Lee, Jean-Hyun Chung, Yang-Soon Choi,
Yeon-Jin Chong, Yeup Yoon, Sun-Duk Lee, Ki-Heung Chun,
Keun-Sang Kim, Kyeong-Moon Kim, Kyong-Soo Lee