

Justice Is Church's Mission

*Jin-Kwan KWON, Ph.D**

Abstract

The author suggests a three lateral, i.e., state-capital-labor, society as an efficient model for our discussion about the issues of justice in our times. He starts with the presupposition that God is the embodiment of justice and God the person of the embodied justice. Like the triune God our society has three subjects: State-Capital-Labor. Unlike other subjects, the labor is divided and di-sected by gender, ethnicity, regular/irregular employment, etc. In most societies, the labor is ruled and divided by state and capital. Unlike the triune God who is the embodied justice, the three-lateral and triune society is non-justice. In constructing authentic idea of justice in our context, the author discusses three paired issues and opts for the second in the respective pair: reciprocity versus love; persons free and equal versus the subaltern; harmony and equilibrium versus conflicts of interests. Author believes that his options for the second ones get his idea of justice closer to the Scriptural idea of justice than that of contemporary philosophers such as John Rawls.

Key-words: participation, justificatory power, three subjects of the society, conflicts of interests.

A justiça é a missão da Igreja

Resumo

O autor sugere uma sociedade de três partes, isto é, estado-capital-trabalho, como um modelo eficiente para nossa discussão sobre as questões de justiça em nossos tempos. Ele começa com o pressuposto de que Deus é a personificação da justiça e Deus é a pessoa onde a justiça é incorporada. Como o Deus trino, nossa sociedade tem três assuntos a serem discutidos: Estado-Capital-Trabalho. Ao contrário de outros assuntos, o trabalho é dividido e dissecado por gênero, etnia, emprego regular/irregular, etc. Na maioria das sociedades, o trabalho é governado e dividido pelo estado e pelo capital. Ao contrário do Deus trino, que é a justiça incorporada, a sociedade trilateral e trina é a não-justiça. Na construção da ideia autêntica de justiça em nosso contexto, o autor discute três temas pareados a seguir e opta pelo segundo: reciprocidade versus amor; pessoas livres e iguais

* Sungkonghoe University

versus o subalterno; harmonia e equilíbrio versus conflitos de interesses. O autor acredita que sua opção pelo segundo tema leva a ideia de justiça para mais perto da ideia bíblica de justiça do que a dos filósofos contemporâneos como John Rawls.

Palavras-chave: participação; poder justificatório; três temas da sociedade; conflitos de interesses.

La justicia es la misión de la iglesia

Resumen

El autor sugiere una sociedad tridimensional, es decir, estado-capital-trabajo, como un modelo eficiente para nuestra discusión sobre los temas de justicia en los tiempos actuales. Comienza con la presuposición de que Dios es la encarnación de la justicia y Dios la persona de la justicia encarnada. Como el Dios trino, nuestra sociedad tiene tres temas: Estado-Capital-Trabajo. A diferencia de otros temas, el trabajo está dividido por género, etnia, empleo regular / irregular, etc. En la mayoría de las sociedades, el trabajo está gobernado y dividido por el estado y el capital. Al construir una idea auténtica de justicia en nuestro contexto, el autor discute tres problemas igualados y opta por el segundo en el par respectivo: reciprocidad versus amor; personas libres e iguales frente al subalterno; armonía y equilibrio frente a conflictos de intereses. El autor cree que sus opciones para los segundos hacen que su idea de justicia se acerque más a la idea bíblica de justicia que a la de los filósofos contemporâneos como John Rawls.

Palabras clave: participación, poder justificativo, tres sujetos de la sociedad, conflictos de intereses.

I. Introduction

The context that surrounds us is unjust. The rich get richer, and the poor get poorer. It is a globalized context. Asian nations and countries are incorporated irresistibly into the globalized economy. There are inequalities and disparity in people within both underdeveloped and developed nations. The inequality and disparity in the global context contributes to the widening of the gap between the rich and the poor, the powerful and the powerless in the national and international contexts. As the globalization of market system widens its impact on each and every corner of the world, the wretchedness of the poor people is intensified.

In the midst of miseries, atrocities and apathies inflicted on the subaltern and minjung, we ask who is our God? Our God is first of all a God of justice. God is the ultimate and unlimited source of justice, life and peace. God is a unifying source to build a subjective body that would carry out historical tasks for justice, life, and peace. God says, "But let justice roll down like waters and justice like an ever flowing stream." (Am. 5:24) As justice, God judges and makes null all fake gods and idolatries. In the Exodus, God says, "I am

the God who liberated Israel from Egypt.” In the Ten Commandments it is commanded that there is no God except Me. No Imperial God is allowed in this commandment. It commands not to misuse/spoil the name of God; it prohibits any ideological use of God's name. God's name is justice. In the New Testament, God is love, which contains a deeper meaning of justice.

God of justice annihilates inequalities in states, nations, ethnicities, races, genders, ages, and labor market. God is the embodiment of justice. God is personal, and a person who creates and embodies justice. Justice is the political truth operative in history and society. God calls us to be in the historical truth. Peace and justice, life should equally and mutually define each other. Justice requires peace. Peace creates life and becomes the condition for creative justice. One of my theses will be: Justice is always connected to the subject. Minjung theology affirms that the subject in history is minjung. Minjung are the ordinary suffering people, but they are subjects. Historical subjects are the agents to decide on the mode of a society.

In the age of empire, there are at least three subjects and partners operative in the society. One of them is the sector of the minjung, or the subaltern. The other two are the State and the Capital. I do not suggest here the civil society to represent the minjung or the subaltern. The civil society where intellectuals and middle class people take the leading position is rather considered as part of the other two: the state and the capital. I need to put an explanation about this conception. The reason I include the civil society in state and capital is that the leadership of the civil society is taken by those people who work closely with, or for the state and capital. Leaders of the civil society are workers in the regular official sectors in the society. They are, in a direct or indirect manner, in connection with the two areas, which are the state and the capital. The latter are major powerful subjects controlling the situation. The third and alternative subject, that is, the minjung, must emerge. I have here a tripartite model of society constituted by three subjects: the state, the capital, and minjung (or, the labor). In the age of globalization, there is another subject: the empire. Empire creates a context in which the three subjects and players interact. Empire, state and capital work together to divide the people and do not allow the alternative subject to emerge; minjung are much “bisected” “disected”, divided and dis-unified. Minjung are han-ridden because of their long sufferings.

Empire and global capital and the state are very often divisive and destructive powers. They divide the alternative collective body into voiceless

and powerless bisected parts, into irregular, regular, unemployed, part-time, casual workers. Minjung are divided and ripped open and ruled by the capital, the state and the empire.

II. A Relative Just Structure of Society: The Welfare State and Beyond

To alleviate the sufferings of minjung in the age of global empire, we may well envisage a relatively just society that is built on a three lateral structure. The three sectors of the structure are the state, the capital, and the minjung. It is an analogy of the three partners which are in a system of collaboration and balance in the welfare state: state-capital-labor. A healthy and just society is supposed to have these three sectors to be in an interactive and mutually balanced relationship.

The state and the capital stand on the same side, when they are in dispute with the labor or minjung. But, minjung are di-sected and divided due to the limited supply of employment, the cooptation of the significant segments of the minjung by the capital and the state, and the division of the modes of the employment in terms of the regular and the irregular. Healthy and just society is a society where minjung /laborers are unified and have the unified voice when they deal with the state and the capital.

Minjung theology and minjung movement share the common task of empowering the minjung to become a unified subject-body of history to be an equal partner with other partners, the state and the capital. Three sectors are sought to be balanced. The model of the relationship of the three sectors is the divine Trinity. In the Holy Trinity the three partners (God, the Son, and the Holy Spirit) are equal and distinct, and they are in a harmonious and collaborative relation. There is a secular trinity: State-Capital-Labor. The state must be neutral toward capital and labor. The state is to protect both capital and labor. However, one partner among the three, like the Spirit the third person of the Trinity is growing weak and intersected, di-sected, and becoming powerless in the history of the Christian Church. In fact, the Spirit quite often has been represented as the weakest partner in the Trinity. Like Spirit, minjung has been the weakest part in the tripartite society. Minjung has been divided and bi- or di-sected by nationalities, gender, age, race, the regular, irregular modes of employment, caste, class, etc., etc. Minjung, as the subjects of their own destiny, can cooperate together, and become in unity by enhancing their mutuality and cooperation.

Welfare state is a dream of less developed countries. Korea is far from being a welfare state when we compare it with European welfare states. But the welfare state itself leaves its welfare-receiving people passive and powerless. People have no right to participate in the decision making of the society. Participatory justice is necessary in both welfare states and underdeveloped states. In this case, justice is not only a matter of distribution, but of power and politics. Distributive justice and political justice (participatory justice) are minimal requirements for full justice. Without equal participatory privilege and power by each of the members of the society, justice therein cannot be justified discursively. Participatory justice is the minimal condition for the social structure to be justified as being just. But in the current world, states and their policy makers at the most focus on distributive justice leaving the recipients of welfare powerless and voiceless. Participatory justice is neglected and ignored. Participation takes place when there is a breathing space for mutual recognition and dialogue/communication within the society. Participation is created by such a “spiritual,” communicative space. Even wealthy welfare states in the West, not to mention authoritarian societies in Asia, lack this dimension of justice.

Democracy is generally defined by participation of the people; but, representative democracy replaces people’s participation, which is a major problem facing us. Free election is the core of democracy. But only the wealthy or their proxies can afford to run elections. The current democracies are dominated by wealthy and middle classes. Lower classes and castes are structurally excluded from representing themselves in this capital-intelligence (money and knowledge) dominant world. Lower people are less educated; their children do not receive good education, but only inherit poverty from parents. How can we drill a tunnel in the high mountain that obstructs the path for subalterns and minjung? Where is the solution? Where is the first step toward solution to the problems of distribution and participation? Where must our mission be located at this juncture of history, where neoliberal capitalism and its global market system is ever more widening the gap of the rich and the poor, leaving the poor voiceless and suffering?

The capital is mobile and global. In the globalized world, capital is getting more globalized at a speed much faster than its counter parts. It is like a flying chariot of God in Ezekiel. It can go over to any place. But labor and the state cannot go over the borders. Laborers are treated in foreign lands as illegal and discriminated.

The subalterns are treated as non-beings. They belong to a society, but they are invisible, and their presence is not recognized. Recognition is required first of all so that they can participate in the society. But they are consciously or unconsciously forced to be void and nothing in society. They are constantly sacrificed as scapegoats in the neo-, post-colonial and neoliberal capitalist society. But, the subaltern must become the real subjects in history, and for their own destiny. Minjung, the underclass people feel left out and do not participate in the public political arena. (RAWLS, 2001, p. 140) They are chronically dependent on the welfare subsidized by the state and by the church. They become powerless like powerless and weak God. Now, some theologians in the trends of postmodern and postcolonial mode of thought tend to speak out for the powerless God as opposed to traditional conception of the sovereign almighty God, because the latter has long served to support the oppressive secular powers. For me, instead of the powerless God, we need the conception of God with a compassionate and just power. Here we must walk into the territory of defining what we mean by a compassionate God with power of justice, and at the same time evade such wrong conceptions as the God for a just war/violence.

In order to establish justice in the world, each individual member of society must have power and the right to participate in deciding what scheme of the society is acceptable and legitimate in light of justice. But many people are becoming subalternized and subsidized into voiceless and left out without rights to participate. If minjung and the subaltern must be included in decision making for the society-building, the operative justice and its principles must be justified by the least benefited and the powerless discursively. This is the reason why I am using the term justificatory power, to borrow the term from Rainer Forst, a German political philosopher. Forst argues that because the idea of justice is so wide and obscure, that once it is fixed by some metaphysical foundations and principles and norms, it becomes out of context and can be invalid to our different contexts. So he uses the term justification to establish a valid idea of justice for a particular context. He argues that justice concerns and refers to the basic structure of society, and it must be understood intersubjectively and procedurally; in other words, the basic structure of society must be justified by principles that all members of society can agree upon. (FORST, 2012, p. 80) Therefore the criteria of justice are not authority but reciprocity (“without demanding more from others than one is also willing to concede, and without projecting one’s own

interests and convictions on others”) and generality (“without excluding any ones concerned and their needs and interests”) among members of society. (FORST, 2012, p. 81) So, people must be equal and free, as equally entitled participants in the discourses of justification for justice.

III. Minjung as counter-subjects against subalternization

Counter, alternative subjects are ripped-open, down-trodden, silenced, bisected by the state and the capital, and become subaltern subjects. Subalterns are mute or muted; silent or silenced. Counter subjects are divided and mutilated and forced to be non-beings in society. But the society may be transformed when these non-beings and nothings become historical subjects. Subjectivation is like transformation from dried bones to a live army. Justice in the context of monolithic imperial neoliberal system must be a resisting justice. Justice in the context of conflicting subjects is first of all the resubjectivating the subalternized people. Subjectivation is a key concept for both justice and mission.

But both subalternizing process and scapegoating process of minjung are rampantly undergoing. The people in North Korea in the global context is being subalternized and muted and mutilated, but they resist to survive. The majority of the South Korean people are also becoming subaltern scapegoats. Mission is a reverse process of subalternization and a process toward subjectivation, becoming agents of justice.

Institutions of representation such as the parliament and the investigative and prosecutorial system are not effective in faithfully representing the needs and demands of the poor. In fact, the parliament and the national bureau of prosecution are the representative body most criticized by ordinary people for they do not faithfully respond to their real needs and demands.

In order to show how the representation system has fallen down in Korea, I would like to illustrate the case of Sewol-ho, a ferry that sank into the sea off the southwest coast of Korea, sacrificing 304 lives, the majority of whom were high school students on the journey to Jeju Island for school vacation. Ordinary people who watched the TV broadcasting the scene of the sinking ferry, was shocked and outraged, because the marine police and other security officers did not do anything to rescue them, simply watching from afar the sinking ferry. The marine police was not ready for or capable of rescue of them. There was plenty of time before the ship totally submerged

into the sea. It was a crucial and precious time in which even some of the victims might be rescued by the marine police and divers and other equipment. But no one was rescued from the sinking ferry except those who were on the deck. It was discovered that the ferry had been dangerously rebuilt from original shape, and was overloaded by shipments. So the ferry was clearly unsafe to sail in the sea. The inspections by the authorities had been done in negligence; such an unsafe ferry had been validated as safe. It is apparent that there had been connections between the company and the authorities. The ferry company is owned by a religious charismatic figure who has led a sectarian group. Recently he was found dead. The company hired a retired captain, at a temporary employment base, and paid him less than half the salary of the ordinary captain. The captain was the first who escaped from the sinking ferry with his crew members. He and his crew did not make announcement that the people on board should move quickly and orderly to escape from the sinking ship. Instead the announcement that was repeated was: "Stay. Don't move from your present location." The crew escaped at that moment from the ship.

People began to demand justice about this human-caused disaster. It was an accident, but it was not such an unpreventable one like a tsunami. The families of 300+ victims demanded a thorough investigation of this incident. Their mistrust of the prosecutorial authorities of the government led them to demand to form an investigatory commission where experts on this matter and the victims' family members and that the commission be entitled to the power of prosecution. People know that this incident occurred because there were corrupt, exploitative, neoliberal power structures behind the incident. People call for a thorough investigation into the whole of structured evil. But recently the government and the parliament decided not to accept the demands of the victim families and to go on with existing investigative and prosecutorial authorities.

People and victims' families demand that they be the agents, not simply remain recipients and clients in the matter of justice. Participation as subjects and agents with effective power is the core of the demand of justice by the victims and families and other conscientious people. But the established power is afraid of people's participation and their power that may disclose the scandalous practices of the authorities including the state president and disrupt the status quo of the representative system.

Participatory justice is an indicator of a healthy democratic society. If not for participatory justice, there will be perpetual mistrust and instability in society. Because our Asian society used to be an authoritarian one due to the lack of democratic reforms and revolutions by people's power, and furthermore it has been dominated by colonial powers and later by globalized neoliberal capitalist market system, it is doubly distorted and skewed with respect to the participatory justice. Ordinary people remain recipients and clients, while the state and the elite are active patrons. In such situation, participatory justice with effective power is a requisite element of justice.

Recently Thomas Piketty, the author of *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, argues that "we live in 'patrimonial capitalism'." By the latter term, he means "inheritance-based capitalism." In the 21st century, the wealthy get wealthier because they have inherited wealth from their parents. (MULLINS, 2014, p. 25) Such tendency has become stronger since the mid-1970s, when policies of the social welfare state in the West were dropped in favor of neoliberalism, Reagan and Thatcher's major policy. It was also the case in Korea.

It is important to define the conception of power and to estimate its status in theology. Some theologians and philosophers upholds a new idea of God that is not only not sovereign, but also powerless. (John Caputo, Catherine Keller, and others who are in the tradition of deconstructionism and post-colonialism) With this idea, they view power negatively as one without any positive value. But power in reality is a necessary element for the matter of justice. A relevant conception of justice in our conflictual and suffering situation does not ignore the matter of power, but includes it as a necessary element of justice. Persons participating in society must not be viewed simply as recipients of redistributions, but as independent agents of justice. This makes them persons with dignity and autonomy. Justice in this sense is political justice. (FORST, 2012, p. 196)

In the time of Jesus, justificatory power was so disproportionately distributed, the poor and powerless in the Jewish society did not have any power to demand their voices heard. They did not have dignity and autonomy in the Roman imperial and Jewish theocratic societies. In matters of justice, the first thing is power and its schema; here power is first of all justificatory power. (FORST, 2012, p. 197) What is justificatory power? It is "the discursive power to provide and to demand justifications, and to challenge false legitimations." (FORST, 2012, p. 196) The fundamental justice

is violated when justificatory power is unequally distributed and violated within the most important institutions. (FORST, 2012, p. 197)

In a society and a world where any change of the basic trends is not possible due to the disproportionate power allocations, despair builds up. There are disparities in power. The poor and the weak are becoming the majority. Only few hold the decision making positions. In such a situation, there is grave despair about the future of the world. It is a world of inequality in power. One side dominates the other. There seems no possibility to change it.

IV. What is theology all about?

Theology is not an ideology, nor a religious science. Theology must be an “originary possibility” rather than a determinate theology, which would necessarily take the form of ideology. The sacred and holy give us the space of the most originary possibility. (CROCKETT, 2011, p. 58)¹ For me, theology by definition is not a compilation of dogmas or articles of faith, which plays much like an ideology. It is rather a structure of ideas that bring the impossible possibilities to light in a discursive and practical way.

What are the major theological problems we are facing in Asia and specially in Korea? They are: 1) While facing such a broken state of the *minjung* who are dissected by the divide and rule strategy of the empire, the state, and the capital, domestic and global, our theological camp is not quite well equipped with the enough number of critically minded and conscientious thinkers, experience of the praxis, and support from the church and other institutions. 2) A strong tendency of the academic world tilting toward capitalist and mammon-oriented spirituality, erasing critical consciousness. It results in the disappearance of the historico-politico-prophetic tradition in theological academia. Thus, no longer a mode of wholistic thinking exists in our theology. 3) Most fundamentally, our theological thought is much dependent on the West. If not so, the theological-philosophical thought in Asia especially in Korea does not stand firm on its feet on its soil. Repetitions of the ideas originated in and derived from European and American academia are common phenomena in our theological context. In such a context, true Asian voices of Asian theological communities that theologically and

¹ Originally from Jacques Derrida, “Faith and Knowledge: The Two Sources of Religion at the Limits of Reason Alone,” trans. Samuel Weber, in *Religion*, ed. Jacques Derrida and Gianni Vattimo (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1998).

philosophically reflect on the present situation of the people in Asia is lacking. The responsibility to construct true Asian theological thoughts arising from Asian contexts falls upon us, minjung and dalit thinkers and theologians. The knowledge, ideas and insights originated in and derived from the West tend to be indifferent to the real conditions and agenda of Asian peoples.

V. Some Political Theological Discussions

Now I would like to discuss theologically and critically a few ideas that popped up from our discussions above. They are reciprocity versus love, free and equal persons versus the subaltern, and a conception of a society of equilibrium (an idea of liberal democracy in the West) versus a conception of a society of power and domination, that is, a society composed of members and parties that have different interests but employs reason to reach an agreement, versus a society with different interests conflicting each other seemingly never being able to reach an agreement.

1. Reciprocity versus Love

This is actually the problem of the relation between justice and love. Christian theologians delved into the problem arising from the divergence of love and justice. But many theologians conclude that they are not separated, but distinct. To my knowledge, Paul Tillich and recently John Crossan forcefully stated that love is at the core of justice, and vice versa. Tillich states that love is the principle of justice. (TILLICH, 1960, p. 71) Crossan states that without justice love becomes “banality,” and without love justice becomes “brutality.” (CROSSAN, 2007, p. 190)

If reciprocity is the core of justice as many political philosophers argue, it does not consider the prevalent disparity of power, intelligence (education), property and self-esteem of the parties involved in the process of constructing justice through discourses and practices. For example, we can think of the relationship between North and South Korea in terms of reciprocity. The relatively wealthy and more powerful South Korea demands reciprocity from North Korea. South Korean government argues that if S. Korea gives some aids to N. Korea, the latter must return something alike (or, peace gesture) to S. Korea. The idea of reciprocity is that the other party is assumed to act like me. The principle or criterion of reciprocity means that all parties involved are supposed to act according to normative principles

that are reciprocally agreed upon by them.² The political philosopher Jiwei Ci argues that “the concept of reciprocity” limits the bounds of justice. He states, “With the concept of reciprocity, we are able to set the upper and lower bounds for the disposition to be just.” According to Ci, the major element that helps distinguish justice from benevolence (love) is reciprocity. (CI, 2006, p. 195) In contrast to justice, benevolence, “as an example of a completely altruistic virtue, consists in the willingness to perform certain kinds of actions, regardless of whether the beneficiaries of those actions or abstentions do likewise.” (CI, 2006, p. 195)

My contention is that if justice is required to have the element of reciprocity, then justice cannot be love. If justice ultimately is love, justice must go beyond reciprocity. Further, I would argue, reciprocity itself cannot be expected in a society where basic structure is unjust and undemocratic. In a normal and democratic society, reciprocity may well be a necessary element for justice. But in a society where economic-political power dominates the political procedure of a society, rational and mutual reciprocity among members is almost unthinkable. The wealthy people finance politicians and monopolize educational resources and information and the like. Reciprocity can be a practical criterion for justice in a liberal democratic society. Of course, we can provide all kinds of means of self-improvement to the weak partners in society, so that they become partners reciprocal to stronger partners. This can be realized only in democratic participatory just state. But how can we achieve such a state is problem for us to tackle with. I believe the social goal of minjung theology is the participatory just state, which goes beyond common welfare states. Participatory justice is on a fundamental and primary agenda of modern society.

Reciprocity is not always a value for us to achieve and realize. It is a kind of relationship. Justice seeks right relationships. The Hebrew term for justice is *Tzedekah*. It stands for right relationships. Relationship is not the same as reciprocity. Sometimes, justice in the sense of love and compassion must pour resources into the needy even if the latter do not, but actually and very often cannot afford to, return alike. Such justice may be called “justice as care.” Relationships must be alive, even if reciprocity is not so alive. Although relation is to aspire to be a reciprocal relation, relation itself

² As I have already stated in the above, major thinkers like John Rawls and Rainer Forst adopts the criteria of reciprocity along with that of generality as integral in defining justice. Refer to Forst, 195.

must be maintained in affection and love, even if there is no reciprocity existing in the relationship. Some think that justice is structure/order-oriented, while love is person-oriented. They say that justice is impersonal and love is personal. But if love must be socially activated to restructure the society, love is justice and vice versa.

2. Persons free and equal versus the Subaltern

Colonialism had brought hard hit to colonies in Asia; furthermore, globalization of the neoliberal market system has brought another hard hit to former colonies, leaving people of the latter in poverty and powerlessness Asia. Many people in Asia are being minjung-ized and subaltern-ized; but, on the other hand, they become conscientized subjects/agents to decide their own destiny. In order their voices to be heard, they jump into the social-political arena as actors and break the silence of servitude and oppression. For them to be treated as free and equal is far from reality. From the status of being unfree and unequal, people emerge as the subjects of history. This is the typical process of the politicization of the people in the Third World. In the West, on the other hand, from the status of being free and equal, people emerge as participants/subjects in society and as agents for their destiny. This is the reason why there can be people's movements and struggles, in a genuine sense, in the Third World.

The process of subjectivation of the people in the former colonial Asia takes different form than that in the West. In the West, to become subjects and agents in society and history is obtained from normal educational and other social processes. Because in the Third World subalterns and ordinary people inherit poverty, malnutrition, poor education and other shortcomings from their parents and ancestors, from the state, they do not enjoy enough opportunities to enhance themselves to be free and equal members of society. Usually the established structure does not provide them such opportunities, but informal structure does. Informal structures are constituted by grass-roots organizations and movements.

3. Society of Harmony and Equilibrium versus Society of Conflicts of Interests

Harmony and equilibrium among social powers are to be desired by all societies, but it is far from actuality in Asia. The society in the Third World is fundamentally torn by conflicting interests. In the West, such conflicts are

veiled and sometimes overcome by institutions of representations, arbitrations and concessions. But in the Third World, due to the lack or inefficiency of such institutions, the society is in naked conflicts of interests. People's movement is inevitable in order for its case to get on the table of negotiation and agreement for socio-politico arrangements in society. Such direct participation of *minjung* and the subaltern in political arena occurs mainly due to the underdevelopment or inefficiency of the representative institutions such as parliament and judiciary systems. For example, anti-corruption bureau and commission for human rights, another typical representative bodies, are inexistent, or inefficient and sometimes serving the interests of ruling classes. People's direct participation and intervention is necessary anyhow, because otherwise such representative bodies may end up subserving the interests of ruling classes.

Therefore, people's spontaneous and informal movements are always necessary and they serve as a source of spirituality to ever renew and restructure the society. Christian mission must engage itself with such movements. Christian mission is not to expand the boundaries of the influence of Christianity but lies in all kinds of work for restructuring the society according to principles of justice. Principles of justice by which to organize the society must be agreed on by all the members of a society. Principles of justice may vary depending on contexts. There are no permanent principles for justice. Principles must be relevant to particular and specific contexts. The principles must be justified by and to all participants. And all the participants including the people in spontaneous movements are expected to agree to the justification. But because the established structure's suppression of the people's aspiration is harsh and strong, they must empower themselves by organizing themselves in order to confront it. Empowerment of weak partners in society to assist them to become agents and subjects in decision making processes of the society should be a major task of Christian mission.

Empowerment of the weak sectors of the society takes such an essential part in mission that we need to again think of God in terms of power. As mentioned in the above, some postcolonial and postmodern theologians speak of a powerless God as opposed to a sovereign, omnipotent theistic God. Their tendency of a negative valuation of power is so strong that they even seem to demonize power in itself. But as Paul Tillich and others has powerfully demonstrated, power is a necessary ingredient of justice and love. Without power justice and love are simply ineffective and abstract

in the social and public arena. But it is my belief that the use of power must be harnessed and guided by love and justice. Power is necessary but not in the way terrorists employ; justice is a power game, that is, political. People's struggle is an activity of showing people's power by moral justification (the qualitative dimension), by power of number (the quantitative dimension), and by tactics and strategies (the organizational dimension). God is not simply powerless God. God does not want us to be passively suffering in face of social and political hardships. God is the God of love, justice and power. Thus we may well say that empowerment of people and waging the power in love and justice is an integral part of mission.

At this point, I would like to touch upon the most essential Christian events. They are cross and resurrection. On the one hand, Crucifixion is negative; it is scapegoating and sacrificing; it is an effort of the Empire and the Power at stifling and mutilating the subjecthood of the people for the history. On the other hand, Cross is positive; it is the passion for justice. Passion means both suffering and intense desire. Cross is the suffering caused by the intense desire for justice. Thus, authentic subjects of history must go through crucifixion in the process of reclaiming the subjecthood in history.

Resurrection is the denial of the destruction and deconstruction of the minjung-subject in history. Resurrection is the reconstruction of the subjecthood of the trodden and mute subjects. Jesus is the new being and the symbol of the new subjects in history, which minjung and the subaltern must imitate and realize in their lives. The resurrected body of the minjung and the dalits is the collective politicized body that has regained its subjecthood in history. Resurrection is a transformation from the dried dead bones into the live and proactive subjects, and a transformation of the whole society into a society of love and justice, by the power of love and justice of subalterns and minjung.

VI. Some Concluding Remarks

I have tried to learn from some major political thinkers on the matter of justice. Contemporary political thinkers such as John Rawls, Juergen Habermas, and Rainer Forst, were keen at the rights of every individual to equality and participation. Rawls's theory of justice promotes the equality of all people at the starting place of their life. His idea of justice is that the starting point must be equal for every person as much as possible, although the outcome of life may vary. (JOHNSTON, 2011, p. 202) Furthermore,

the total outcomes and products made by all members of society should be distributed in a just way. Rawls' theory of distribution is to determine the proper shares of "goods that are generated by the joint efforts" of all members of the society by principles of distribution. The sum of social goods can be distributed unequally for the sake of efficiency only on the condition that the least advantaged get greatest benefit out of it. (RAWLS, 1971, p. 303) John Rawls has two main principles that would be reached voluntarily by all persons involved: "the first requires equality in the assignment of basic rights and duties, while the second holds that social and economic inequalities, for example, inequalities of wealth and authority, are just only if they result in compensating benefits for everyone, and in particular for the least advantaged members of society." (RAWLS, 1971, pp. 14-15) John Rawls and other political philosophers in the West imagines a hypothetical situation namely, "original position," "in which the agents come together to reach an agreement that will shape the terms on which the society operates." (JOHNSTON, 2011, p. 210) Rawls ends up contriving the two principles shown in the above from such a hypothetically-conceived initial position. The latter is understandably a "conception that enables us to envision our objective from afar." (RAWLS, 1971, p. 22)

But I believe that we need a different hypothetical position out of which we may well construct principles of justice. My hypothetical picture of a typical society in our globalized world is a "tensed" world of conflict, not a world of equilibrium and contract. Having set up the hypothetical position as a tensed world full of conflicts among different subjects, my question is: On what basis can we reach the justification of the terms on which we believe our society must operate? Because Asian society has gone through colonial domination and recently neoliberal globalization, groups and classes of different powers and interests dispersed to a point where a reasonable contract or agreement would not be reachable. In such situation, the model of justice as fairness, which is a contract model, is not relevant. The cry of "the subaltern cannot speak" makes the contract model further irrelevant in the present Asia. The procedural and contractual model does not recognize transcendent principles and commandments in the divine Scriptures. It only recognizes reasonable justification made within and by a free and egalitarian community. The Christian Scriptures clearly identify the causes and demands of the poor with the "truthful" words of God and Jesus (Matt. 25:31-46). Then, in the conflictual and tensed world, the basis for justification of the

principles of justice lies in the movements of the poor and the subaltern to be the subjects of their destiny. The causes for the subaltern must be respected and clearly heard in a just society. The subaltern must be recognized as participatory agents and subjects in society. The subaltern and the minjung as the least advantaged in society must have the right to veto to the principles and laws of the society that favor the wealthy and the powerful.

Bibliography

- Ci, Jiwei. *The Two Faces of Justice*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University, 2006.
- Crockett, Clayton. *Radical Political Theology*. N.Y.: Columbia Univ. Press, 2011.
- Crossan, John Dominic. *God and Empire*. San Francisco, CA: Harper, 2007.
- Forst, Rainer. *The Right to Justification*. Trans. Flynn, Jeffrey Flynn. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 2012.
- Johnston, David. *A Brief History of Justice*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.
- Mullins, I.K. *Capital in the Twenty-First Century by Thomas Piketty—Summary, Key Ideas and Facts*. U.S.A.: Brief and to the Point Publishing, 2014.
- Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- Rawls, John. *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*. Ed. Kelly, Erin. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Tillich, Paul. *Love, Power, and Justice*. London, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.