

The International Conference on Minority Issues and Mission
Official Booklet

Spread the Tent of Inclusivity!

Spread the Tent of Inclusivity!

Follow-up Committee of the International Conference on Minority Issues and Mission

The date of Publication

June 1st, 2016

Edited by

Follow-up Committee

of the International Conference on Minority Issues and Mission

Korean Christian Church in Japan

Room 52, Japan Christian Center, 2-3-18, Nishi-waseda, Shinjuku-ku,
Tokyo 169-0051, Japan

TEL : + 81-3-3202-5398

FAX : + 81-3-3202-4977

E-mail : kccj.3icmim@gmail.com

Edited by

Follow-up Committee of the International Conference on Minority Issues and Mission



The International Conference on Minority Issues and Mission
Official Booklet

Spread the Tent of Inclusivity!

Edited by
Follow-up Committee of the International Conference
on Minority Issues and Mission

Table of Contents

Foreword

PART 1: Testimonies of minorities in Japan

1. Migrant Women's Experiences of discrimination <i>Leny Tolentino</i>	p8
2. Historical revisionism: Aggression against the Ainu <i>Ota Mitsuru</i>	p12
3. Constitutional reform and the Article 9: Perspective from Ryukyu/ Okinawa <i>Matayoshi Kyoko</i>	p20
4. Danger of exclusive nationalism <i>Song Hye-suk</i>	p25
5. Trauma and harm experienced by minorities targeted by discrimination and hate speech <i>Higashitani Makoto</i>	p30
6. Can the Church becomes a "healing community"? <i>Kim Shinya</i>	p34

PART 2: Churches confronting discrimination

1. You are the Salt of the Earth <i>Geevarghese Mor Coorilos</i>	p38
2. Learnings from WCC's Engagement: With Struggles Against Racism and Similar Forms of Discrimination <i>Deenabandhu Manchala</i>	p42
3. Perspective from Germany <i>Gabriele Mayer</i>	p49
4. A Cry from the heart: Dreaming of a just and inclusive society in Democratic South Africa <i>David Peter Carelse</i>	p55
5. Repairers of the Breach <i>Robina Marie Winbush</i>	p74
6. In Pursuit of Peace <i>Staccato Powell</i>	p80

PART 3: Lecture

What is the cause of "Hate Speech" and "Hate Crime"?: It is a structural discrimination which has been built through history <i>Niwa Masao</i>	p88
--	-----

PART 4: Bible Study

Hospitality and Shalom That Transcend Animosity: Pilgrim Abraham, Jeremiah and the Babylonian captivity, and the path of Jesus <i>Kim Sungjae</i>	p104
---	------

Appendix:

Joint Statement of the 3rd International Conference on Minority Issues and Mission	P122
--	------

Foreword

This year, on May 24, 2016, Japan's House of Representatives passed into law the Hate Speech Countermeasures Act. This law is limited in that it provides no penalty against acts of hate speech. Its initial lack of regard for minorities native to Japan needed to be patched with a supplementary resolution clarifying that it is wrong to interpret this law as permitting hate speech against people other than "persons of foreign origin" who are "residing (in Japan) legally."

It is undeniable that this law does not satisfy the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination, which the Japanese government signed in 1995 but continues to demur on Article 4, where it is written that a signatory nation "Shall declare an offence punishable by law all dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority or hatred, (or) incitement to racial discrimination." However, building upon what has been achieved so far, we must take hints from this Countermeasures Act to develop further societal means to curtail hate speech where we live, while continuing legal reform efforts to establish a domestic law that will prohibit hate speech and other hate crimes.

This booklet contains speeches and Bible studies that were shared at the 3rd International Conference on Minority Issues and Mission. The aim of com-

piling these into a booklet apart from comprehensive Conference records is, we wanted the material to be used by more people and churches to stimulate deeper thought and discussion about hate speech, xenophobia and problems of racism.

I pray that we may consider together, in many disciplines, how xenophobia and racism rob society of inclusivity, how they create an exclusive society that runs against multiethnic and multicultural coexistence, how they deeply hurt those who are victimized, and how they cause society to lose compassion and humanity. I pray that together we may overcome indifference toward these problems and stand against discrimination, and that the circle of cooperation will grow among people and churches so that hospitality, inclusivity and peace may be realized.

June, 2016

Kim Sungjae

Chair, Follow-up Committee of the

3rd International Conference on Minority Issues and Mission

PART. I

Testimonies of minorities in Japan

◊First appearance◊

- 「PART.I」 1. Leny Tolentino／2. Ota Mitsuru／3. Matayoshi Kyoko／4. Song Hyesuk／5. Higashitani Makoto／6. Kim Shinya
⇒ Conference Day 2, Minority's Testimonies Workshops.
- 「PART.II」 1. Geevarghese Mor Coorilos
⇒ Conference Day 1, Opening Worship Message.
- 「PART.II」 2. Deenabandhu Manchala／3. Gabriele Mayer／4. David Peter Carelse／5. Robina Marie Winbush
⇒ Conference Day 1, World Churches' Plenary Session 2 Reports.
- 「PART.II」 6. Staccato Powell
⇒ Conference Day 3, Evening Memorial Service Message.
- 「PART.III」 Niwa Masao
⇒ Conference Day 2, Keynote Address 2.
- 「PART.IV」 Kim Sungjae
⇒ Conference Day 2 & 3, Bible Study.

1. Migrant Women's Experiences of Discrimination

Leny TOLENTINO

ENCOM YOKOHAMA

(Catholic Yokohama Diocese Commission on Refugees, Migrants and People on the Move)

/ Kalakasan-Migrant Women Empowerment Center

From the life stories of migrant women who have consulted our centers, we find that the greatest struggle which they have experienced in Japan, is how to be accepted and treated as equals with dignity in the home, workplace and in the local communities in spite of the existing differences in culture.

The difficult part of this unequal relationship is that those who view themselves above and better than the migrant women are not aware that what they are doing is discriminatory. For them, it is natural to do things according to the Japanese ways because this is Japan.

Within the family the pressure to be Japanese is strong. Migrant wives are prohibited to speak their own language and they are pressured to learn how to speak Japanese by themselves. They are forced to learn and behave strictly according to the Japanese way of relating to others, of doing household tasks and caring for their children. Sending money to their families back home is not allowed. Failure to observe these expectations means that they are not worthy to be entrusted with important matters like finances, or to be consulted on important decisions the family has to make. Verbal abuse using demeaning words such as "liar," "money-lover," "poor" and "irresponsible" are dumped on them regularly. Likewise migrant women regularly share with us their stories of constant threats being showered on them, such as, 'You cannot live in Japan without me', 'You will be reported to the immigration or police if you leave the house', 'I will not extend your visa' and 'You are a foreigner so you cannot get the custody of our child.' Aside from the loss of self worth and identity,

migrant women who have been subjected to severe physical abuse have suffered damaged hearing and vision. Some are in and out of hospitals with severe psychiatric trauma.

In the workplace they are easily blamed for the wrongdoings they are not entirely responsible for. The pressure to work during holidays is common for migrant women resulting in migrant single mothers finding jobs doubly difficult because they have children to take care of especially on the weekends. And they are easily laid off in times when their places of work face economic slowdown. Many times they receive cheaper wages and are deprived of job promotion, because they are women and especially because they are migrants.

The neighborhood complains of the noise that migrant children make and, the women are suspected of not putting the garbage out in the right way. In fact, when trouble like this occurs neighbors complain to the real estate agents. Together, the real estate agent and neighbor tell the migrant woman aggressively, "why don't you go back to your country if you cannot adapt to life in Japan!" This attitude seen in neighborhoods is sometimes seen even among municipal caseworkers in charge of livelihood assistance (seikatsu hogo) in ward offices, when they treat the migrant women with scorn. Migrant women are denied the right to fully understand the information in the ward office during consultation, because consultations are still all in Japanese. And migrant single mothers are deliberately excluded from permanent residence status, because they are economically dependent on the government for livelihood assistance.

In the home, in the workplace, in the community and by the state, migrant women continue to be abused and discriminated against. The impact of this on the identity of migrant women's children is enormous, because discrimination against their migrant mothers is telling the children that a part of who they are is not acceptable in Japanese society.

But the government does not take this as a serious matter and maintains the position that there is no discrimination in Japan, or, if there is, it is not as bad as it is in other countries around the world.



Ms. Leny Torrentino's testimony (center)

Brief Background: Situation of Migrant Women in Japan

It has been three and a half decades since migrant women came to Japan and settled here. However the system has not changed much; rather it has sustained the exclusion and marginalized situation of migrant women and their children. It has supported the unconscious mindset of the majority that “Japanese ways are best because this is Japan.”

The early years of the 1980s marked the arrival of many migrant women, first from Asia, then Latin America and Russia. The majority of them came to work in the entertainment industry. Others came in the following years as brides or spouses of Japanese nationals especially in the rural areas. Many of the entertainers, especially Filipinos and Thai married Japanese nationals. Statistics show that half of the marriages of migrant women with Japanese men end up in divorce each year.

Until now migrant women continue to suffer domestic violence (DV). They and their children remain excluded in the mainstream of Japanese society; their rights are oftentimes ignored. For example, government support to single mothers in the form of livelihood assistance are considered humanitarian in nature not an entitlement of their rights. Receiving this support is also the basis for denying them the right to a permanent residence status no matter how long they have stayed in Japan or how they are taking efforts to care for their children. There is also a very limited support for the undocumented single mothers and their children and in many cases there is difficulty for undocumented children to enter school without the support from migrant NGOs.

The pressure to behave as Japanese in the home, workplace and in the neighborhood still prevails. What is different from the norm in Japanese society and considered substandard is unacceptable. This unconscious mindset of the majority has had a tremendous negative effect not only on migrant women but also on their children who see part of themselves as weak and undesirable in Japanese society.

It is the personal encounters with people in society - migrants, Japanese and other nationalities in their local communities - that gives us glimpses of small positive changes in this society of unequal relationships. Transformation in these relationships could be actualized if these small changes were being encouraged and supported with a national framework that prohibits discrimination and protects the rights of the minorities including migrant women and their children.

2. Historical Revisionism: Aggression against the Ainu

OTA Mitsuru

Ainu Language Teacher

1. Introduction

Discrimination against the Ainu has existed for some time in Japan, but the hate speech that has been growing in 2014 to 2015 possesses some characteristics previously unseen;

- 1.1. Denies the very existence of an ethnic Ainu people.
- 1.2. Supported by not only the Zaitokukai, a racist organization against Koreans in Japan, but also “Nippon Kaigi (Japan Conference),” a religious organization which is reported to have a deep connection with cabinet members of the Abe administration, as well as with public figures such as ONODERA Masaru (member of Hokkaido Prefectural Assembly) and KANEKO Yasuyuki (member of Sapporo City Assembly), who have led these hate demonstrations.
- 1.3. KONO Motomichi, an anthropologist and long-time researcher of Ainu studies, has played a central role in providing theoretical basis for the hate campaign.
- 1.4. SUNAZAWA Jin, son of a well-known Ainu artist and an active conservative journalist, has led the campaign. This has made false rumours sound convincing, causing people to say, “If a famous Ainu son says so, it must be true.”
- 1.5. A well-known manga/cartoon artist, KOBAYASHI Yoshinori has spread the hate campaign through his works.
- 1.6. On the internet, SNS and particularly Twitter has been used as a platform to spread various arguments and false rumours denying the existence of ethnic Ainu. We believe that at the centre of this there is one or more professional persons operating multiple

accounts by means of anonymous twitter bots.

In order to restore Ainu language I am active on the internet, and I came to know about the net-based hate campaign against Ainu from early on. As an Ainu, I raised an alert to fellow Ainu and other Japanese people, and have been engaged in a counter-movement against such hate campaigns. From my point of view not only as an observer, but also as an Ainu who is a target and who fights against the hate campaign, I would like to show you the background and the current situation, though my analysis is still not sufficient.

2. Hate campaigns against Ainu

Even before the campaign shifted into full swing, the leading figures I listed above had individual relations with Ainu issues in one way or another, and got involved in anti-Ainu actions. In the course of time they met one another, making strong links as well with the hate movement against Koreans in Japan, and became largely influential. I shall briefly explain to you the process of how these leading persons have linked together;

- 2.1. SUNAZAWA Jin started to be engaged in preservation of Ainu culture.
After he had some personal troubles, he started verbally attacking, mainly on the internet, the Ainu Association of Hokkaido (Hokkaido Utari Kyokai) and individuals who belong to the Association.
- 2.2. In 1980, ‘Ainu-shi Shiryo-shu (Compendium of Ainu History Resources)’ written by KONO Motomichi was published by Hokkaido Publication Project Center.
The Discriminative Book Trials: Ended with dismissal of appeals by the Ainu side, which was the plaintiff, both at the first trial in 2002 and the second in 2006. KONO Motomichi was, however, dropped from the Ainu History Compilation Project of the Hokkaido Utari Association.
With SUNAZAWA Jin’s elder sister, he requested ONODERA Masaru, a member of Hokkaido Prefectural Assembly, to investigate accounting irregularities by the Association.
- 2.3. The Association refused to be interviewed in November 2008, for an article on “Washi-sm,” a quarterly journal edited by KOBAYASHI Yoshinori. The No.28 issue of ‘Washi-sm,’ titled ‘Ainu as Japanese Nationals,’ was published

by Shogakukan with discriminatory contents. This issue became one of the racists' instructional texts.

- 2.4. MATOBA Mitsuaki, Chairperson of Asahikawa Pain Clinic, published "Ainu, the Indigenous people's Inconvenient Truth" in 2012. In 2014, a revised and enlarged edition was published.
- 2.5. In 2010, SUNAZAWA Jin appeared on "Channel Sakura" an extreme rightist internet channel associated with KOBAYASHI Yoshinori among others. They broadcasted a program called "The Truth of Ainu" on the internet with verbal assaults against Ainu. After this incident, a talk show with SUNAZAWA Jin, YOSHIIKE Hirosuke (member of the Diet), ONODERA Masaru (member of Hokkaido Provincial Assembly), and KANEKO Yasuyuki (Sapporo City Assembly) was broadcasted on the net. Personal internet broadcasting of SUNAZAWA Jin, as well as of KONO Motomichi, manipulated listeners' impressions by suggesting that a misdeed by one Ainu organization or individual implicates the Ainu people as a whole.

3. Hate campaigns against Ainu

Anti-Korean Movement and the birth of ethnic Ainu denialism:

- 3.1. Agitators tried to accuse the entire Ainu for irregularities by the Ainu Association, or some members of it, and tried to incite hatred among Japanese against the Ainu. However, it was unsuccessful, because the Ainu population is small and many Japanese have little interest, and because there is only a little information about Ainu and the image of Ainu was very positive.
- 3.2. Therefore they tried to raise the number of aggressors, by linking with the anti-Korean movement and historical revisionism movement. It was rather paradoxical; in 2008 the Parliament adopted a resolution that recognizes the Ainu as an indigenous people of Japan. However, the agitators claim that it is a disadvantage to Japan to recognize the right of indigenous people according to the "United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples;" and that the ethnic Ainu should not be recognized; that the Ainu existed before, but now are assimilated with Japanese and do not exist anymore; that even if there are descendants of Ainu, they are Japanese Ainu and not

ethnic Ainu; that there were ethnic groups in Hokkaido with different languages and cultures, but Ainu never existed; that there were Japanese in Hokkaido since early times (they do not say Ainu came to Hokkaido from other place); that Koreans impersonate Ainu and are committing, or have a plot to commit, anti-Japanese, anti-social acts (Zaitokukai created a new word, "Zainu," which takes the Zai from "Zainichi (Koreans in Japan)" and merges it with Ainu).

- 3.3. The "remark denying the ethnic Ainu" incident by KANEKO Yasuyuki, a member of Sapporo City Assembly.

On August 11, 2014, KANEKO Yasuyuki, who was repeating incorrect remarks against Ainu and Koreans, issued a tweet denying the ethnic Ainu as follows; "Ethnic Ainu don't exist any more. They are Japanese Ainu at best, and they are on a power binge, using special-interest politics. How preposterous. I cannot explain to tax payers."

This remark was widely reported. Ainu organizations and others demanded a retraction of his statement. He didn't, but rather insisted he is right, referring to a text written by CHIRI Mashiro, an Ainu linguist, found in an outdated encyclopedia published by Heibonsha. ONODERA Masaru (a member of Hokkaido Prefectural Assembly) and others organized a meeting to support Kaneko. Kaneko himself did not appear at the meeting, but MATOBA Mitsuaki and others joined and gave discriminatory speeches. Kaneko however came under great criticism from public opinion, which lead the Liberal Democratic Party to expel him, though the party in the beginning did not consider his remark as a problem. People did not readily accept the situation and collected signatures to demand his resignation from a public post. The Sapporo City Assembly also voted overwhelmingly in favor of recommending him to resign. Kaneko ignored the recommendation and continued to make hate remarks.

- 3.4. The rise of a counter-movement against hate campaign against the Ainu after the controversial remark by Kaneko

Having drawn public attention, an anti-Ainu hate demonstration was held in Tokyo. This was the first hate demonstration ever against the Ainu. Prior to the incident, CRAC, a counter organization against hate campaigns approached a handful Ainu

who were personally standing up, expressing their opinions against hate remarks on Twitter. CRAC members conducted a counter campaign when the said anti-Ainu hate demonstration was held. Counter organizations, some local newspapers and private citizens on the internet exchanged opinions against hate speech. Having gained experience countering anti-Korean hate speech, counter organizations responded quickly and effectively to the anti-Ainu hate campaign, and this led to success in weakening the hate campaign. At the same time young scholars/academe started to fight against hate speech, and their counter-arguments based on scholarly knowledge pushed aside the claims of Ainu deniers. In February 2015, ‘Ainu Minzoku Hiteiron ni Kousuru (Countering Ethnic Ainu Denialism)’ edited by Mark Winchester was published, compiling pieces by academics, journalists, intellectuals and Ainu as the person concerned. Concurrently with that, KONO Motomichi who was the brains of the hate campaign side passed away. ONODERA Masaru was quick to tweet a message that might be seen as distancing himself from the hate movement, saying that he was requested by the late KONO Motomichi and the late SUNAGAWA Chinita, to get involved in Ainu issues.

- 3.5. At the unified local elections held in April 2015, KANEKO Yasuyuki and other assembly members involved in hate speech lost their seats. ONODERA Masaru completed his term and did not run for re-election.

Thereafter harassment by nameless on-line right-wingers and bots has shifted to target contributors to the book, ‘Ainu Minzoku Hiteiron ni Kousuru’, and the hate campaign became weak and barely troublesome, with only some discriminatory remarks by Tokiura, an assistant of KOBAYASHI Yoshinori, on his blog.

This was a quick sketch of the hate campaign against the Ainu. The claims of those spreading hate speech is discriminatory and entirely intolerable. Among all their actions, the most impermissible was their posting on the internet, mixed with the names of a few Ainu who had committed misdeeds, real names of people who were completely unrelated to these injustices. At the same time some of their poor arguments, which evoked laughter rather than anger, received no support but rather gained sympathy for the Ainu and criticism

against hate speech.

While the haters’ claims might be nonsense, “patronage by wajin (Japanese)” that pours a good deal of tax money for supposed purposes of the Ainu, is still actively being skimmed off by political, economic, as well as bureaucratic circles. Some among the Ainu think that, in order to cover up for the resulting shortage of funds, false claims of “patronage by Ainu” might again be used and innocent people will face hate speech, as if Ainu took all of the money.

At the moment, restoration of Ainu culture is being called for, but the reality is that they wish to use the Ainu just as an instrument of tourism. With this fake hope and a small amount of money, the Ainu are deprived of even a capacity to resist. If hate campaigns in the future take place on a full scale, many who announce themselves as Ainu now will disappear. This cannot be helped. There have been warnings against coming difficulties, but many Ainu, doing the bidding of those who use and disempower us, scoff at and trample upon fellow Ainu who sound the warnings. Once in trouble, they shall ask for help and people with hearts may extend helping hands. This only gives a sense of satisfaction to the one who helps, but it does not help the Ainu. In order to help in a real sense, I believe that it is imperative to give wisdom as well as skills so that one can help oneself.

I have been building an ark, together with people who have wisdom. I wish to walk hand in hand even with those who have scoffed at us, if they change their minds, so we may make efforts together. When a catastrophic situation occurs, however, we may be able only to survive to the best of our ability, not being able to give help to others. It is easy just to say nice things. This is the reality of the Ainu, who refuse a chain of slavery and seek to live independently.

●Translator : Mari Suzuki

【Commentary】 Ethnic Ainu

The Ainu are indigenous people who called the vast area covering Yaunmoshiri (Hokkaido), Karafuto, Chishima Islands (Kuril Islands; it is unknown how Ainu from the Northern Chishima called their own areas) and the North-east part of Honshu Ainu Moshiri (the People's Land). The Ainu formed an ethnic group with their own language, rich culture, and history.

The life of the Ainu in earlier times was centered upon trading and included hunting, fishing, gathering and farming in some areas. Trading activities covered widespread areas of Honshu to the south, to the Kamchatka peninsula in the east, and to the north, areas surrounding the Amur River in Siberia. Their activities are described in many of the oral culture of the Ainu.

At the beginning of the 17th century, the Matsumae domain, which settled in the southernmost part of "Hokkaido" was given a black stamp by Tokugawa Ieyasu, which gave them exclusive privilege to trade with the Ainu. The Matsumae domain gradually limited the trading activities of the Ainu, and eventually the Ainu were able to trade only with the Matsumae domain. This brought great harm to Ainu society, which had long been engaged in free trade through channels of their own. In Japan, too, in the north-eastern part of Honshu and particularly the Tsugaru domain, this caused much harm. The Matsumae domain, despite resistance of the Ainu and other domains in North-east Japan, won victory in the economic war.

With no negotiation with the Ainu, in 1869 the Meiji government unilaterally usurped Ainu Moshiri, which came to be called "Ezochi" by the Japanese, and then was named "Hokkaido" as a territory of Japan. Under an assimilationist policy, Ainu language and traditional lifestyle were banned as inferior, and people were forced to speak Japanese. The government enforced the change of names to Japanese style, registration of the Ainu in the Japanese family register system, and called them "Kyu-dojin (former indigenous people)" and discriminated against them.

In 2008 both the Upper House and the Lower House of the Diet of Japan

passed a resolution that recognized the Ainu as indigenous people of Japan. A Comprehensive Ainu Policy Office was established in the Chief Cabinet Secretariat, and a Council for Ainu Policy Promotion was organized with an aim to establishing new measures and policies. But what is actually being promoted is the creation of a "Symbolic Space for Ethnic Harmony." Legislation that would recognize Indigenous rights are making little progress. This scheme of creating a symbolic space includes gathering excavated bones from Ainu graveyards (by the Department of Medicine of Hokkaido Imperial University and others) as a subject for study. There are growing concerns about issues surrounding theft of human remains, or new human rights violations.

The Ainu in Hokkaido (those in Karafuto and Chishima do not live on the ancestral land) still fight to restore Ainu language, pass down Ainu culture, and to restore the rights as an ethnic group who live independently on ancestral land, and to restore our aboriginal right to live according to our own culture and traditions, in other words to restore the Indigenous rights that has been deprived of in our land Yaunmoshiri.

MIURA Tadao

(Secretary, UNNJ Hokkai District, Ainu Peoples Resource Centre)



Mr. Ota Mtsuru's testimony (center)

3. Constitutional Reform and Article 9: From the perspective of Ryukyu / Okinawa

MATAYOSHI Kyoko

Okinawa Christian Center, Ginowan Seminar House and Syuri Church

1. Greetings

Hello, everyone. How are you all? I come from Ryukyu, Okinawa. My name is Kyoko Matayoshi. I am very happy to get acquainted with you. The theme of my talk will be, “the amendment of Japanese Constitution and Article 9 of the Constitution.” I will speak about my feelings and my thoughts on this issue, so please be patient until the end. Before starting, let’s pray to God the Lord’s Prayer, in Uchinaguchi (Okinawa dialect).

I would like to speak in Uchinaguchi until the end, but I am currently learning Uchinaguchi in order to regain the language. Therefore, since I cannot express myself enough in Uchinaguchi, I would like to continue in “Yamatoguchi” (Japanese language).

2. The Constitution and Okinawa

The Japanese Constitution was implemented on May 3rd, 1947. Five years after that, on April 28th, 1952, the San Francisco Peace Treaty and the Japan-US Security Treaty were signed into agreement. Japan as a nation and many Japanese people have understood that these incidents helped the country to regain its sovereignty.

However, we, Okinawans, as well as Amami and Ogasawara Islanders, have been under the control of the United States, and we did not have the same constitutional rights and privileges given to Japanese citizens under the the “Japanese Constitution.” For 27 years until the year 1972, although we have always wished for peaceful life, in reality, we have been forced to live a life dictated by military priorities, not being assured of our dignity as human-beings, nor our basic human rights.

This is why our elders in Okinawa, who worked hard for the “reversion” of Okinawa to Japan, have founded the “Okinawa Constitution Association,” with the aim to promote the Japanese Constitution in relation to our daily lives. This association has created a “pocket diary,” distributing it to young people who have just turned 20 years old. It also holds lectures on Constitution Day, May 3rd, every year. Because Okinawa had been constrained under military-prioritized orders for a long time, the implementation of Japan’s peace constitution was deeply meaningful, as something that had been finally won. Perhaps it is because of this movement to bring the Constitution to Okinawa, at my own house we have several books about the Constitution. On the outer cover of one book that was published in 1982 it is written, “The Constitution is the most basic promise, which determines our way of life.” A promise between who and who? Of course, it’s between “the state” and “the people.” When you read the Constitution, there are a great many promises that the nation must keep.

However, the presence of Japan’s “Self-Defence Force” (JSDF), which became stationed in Okinawa in 1972 with its reversion to Japan, has aroused questions toward the “peace doctrine” that is found in the Constitution. At this time, people who had experienced the Battle of Okinawa started talking about their real experiences of the Japanese military. One after another they said, “The Army does not protect the people,” and many voices and activities arose to oppose the stationing of the JSDF in Okinawa. Ever since then, Okinawa has had to deal with “U.S. Forces” and “the United States,” and with “the JSDF” and “Japan.” Literally, Okinawa is forced to deal with two different “bases” and “governments.”

Since that time until now, for 43 years, “the right to live in peace” that is enshrined within the Japanese Constitution has been an illusion in Okinawa. The most basic promise of the Japanese Constitution has been turned into a worm-eaten shell by words like “Enforced (by the Allies) Constitution,” or “Interpreted Constitution.” Our wishes for “removal of American bases” and “reversion to the same standards as mainland Japan” have not been achieved in reality. There is no exaggeration when I say, to this day, the basic principles of the Japanese Constitution have never once been applied in Okinawa. Amid this reality, there is currently much discussion about “amendment of the Constitution.” But before that, I’d like there to be discussion of whether or not we agree with the “Japan-US Security Treaty.

3. Article 9 and the Japan-US peace treaty

In many areas of Japan, Article 9 Associations have been established and a movement

to safeguard our “peace constitution” has been activated. The American army has taken over our land by guns and bulldozers, and still keeps our lands even after Okinawa’s “reversion” to Japan. These US bases in Okinawa have been used as the frontier bases for wars all over the world, and this takes our daily peaceful life and our human dignities away from us. Since our grandparents’ generation we have always promoted “base removal” and “peace.” It is unfair to locate 73 percent of the American bases in Japan on Okinawa Island, which is just 0.6 percent of Japan’s total land. We have protested to the government that this is not equal, and have been trying to tell everyone to relocate bases outside Okinawa prefecture.

In an incident which happened in 1995, three American soldiers raped a local girl. As Okinawans this incident changed our understanding: We recognized our deep responsibility as Okinawans for not being able to protect a child from them. Rather than by stressing the many human rights violations and “victims” of accidents or violence, we have been asking the 80 percent of the Japanese who support the Japan-US Security Treaty—believing the bases help to keep “peace and safety”—to take responsibility. We have turned this desire to lighten Okinawa’s excessive burden into words and action under the slogan, “Take the bases outside of Okinawa!”

I realized that the logic that made me believe “we do not need bases anywhere” was supporting the mindset that American bases should naturally remain in Okinawa. Also, sometimes I come across the unconscious, colonialist mindset of Japanese people, who think that the problems of “American bases” and the “Japan-US Security Treaty” are just “Okinawa Problems.” By saying “Keep Article 9” in a world where “peace and safety” is maintained under the “Japan-US Security Treaty,” one becomes a discriminator who ignores the lives and human rights of Okinawan people, who constitute just 1 percent of Japan’s total population. Although recently there have been many opposition movements against the “right of collective self-defense” and the “security-related bills,” it sadly remains true that 86 percent of the population supports the “Japan-US Security Treaty.”

When we speak of “the Okinawa problem,” or of “minority problems,” the “problems” are not with the “Okinawa” or “minorities” side. Vis a vis “Okinawans” it is the “Japanese,” and vis a vis “minorities” it is the “majority” that has the problems and issues that must be solved. Now is the time to ask ourselves; what kind of society do we want to pass onto the next generation?

●Translator : Madoka Hammine

Historical Facts of Ryukyu/ Okinawa <i>Okinawa Times Newspaper September 19th, 2015</i>		
Early-Modern Ryukyu period	1609 1666 1728 1816 1844 1853 1854 1871 1872 1874	Satsuma Clan invades Okinawa Choshyu Haneji becomes Regent (Sesshou) and implements political reforms that led from the Old Ryukyu to the New Ryukyu system. Saion (Gushikami Uekata), as one of the Council of Three (Sanshikan), establishes a system of civic governance. Basil Hall visits Ryukyu (friendly exchange) French ship visits Ryukyu, asking for trading, friendship treaty and the introduction of Christianity. Imperial ideology has spread to the Ryukyu. The number of foreign ships increases. Perry visits Ryukyu before his visit to mainland Japan. Ryukyu-America amity treaty signed “Ryukyuan Massacre” of Okinawan sailors occurs in Taiwan Ryukyu Han (feudal domain) is established. Taiwan Expedition: Meiji government sends troops to Taiwan, demanding responsibility for Ryukyuan Massacre. Claims Ryukyuans as Japanese national subjects.
Modern Ryukyu period	1879 1880 1894 1898 1911 1939 1941 1945	Ryukyu Disposition: Ryukyu Kingdom becomes Okinawa Prefecture Division of Islands Agreement with China (not signed) Japan is victorious in the Sino-Japanese War, Assimilation policy gains strength in Okinawa Conscription implemented: Some people welcome this, because military service entitles one to status of “Imperial Citizen,” while others resist service. “Ko-Ryukyu (Old Ryukyu), written by Iha Fuyu, is published World War Two breaks out. Asia-Pacific War begins The Battle of Okinawa. Nimitz Declaration declares Okinawa under U.S. jurisdiction
Post-War period (Before Reversions)	1953 1954 1955 1956 1959 1960 1962 1964 1965 1968 1970 1972	San Francisco Peace Treaty, Japan-US Security Treaty signed. Land Acquisition Order (Number 109) issued. Amami Islands revert to Japan Yumiko chan Incident. Forced acquisition of land by force (Isahama, Iejima) Islands Dispute begins. American military investigation group (Price Recommendation) Jet plane falls on Miyamori Elementary School (17 dead, 121 injured) Okinawa Reversion Committee (Okinawa ken Sokoku Fukki Kaigi) Established Ryukyu Law Court sends directly to all United Nations member states a copy of its decision by vote to declare Okinawa’s return to Japan, which cites the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Ryukyu Law Court again sends a request of solidarity for Okinawa’s reversion to Japan to the countries of the United Nations. Prime Minister Eisaku Sato states, “Our war period never ends without the realization of Okinawa’s reversion to Japan.” Chobyo Yara was elected in the first public election of Okinawa Teachers Association. “New Okinawa Literature” published a collection of anti-reversion ideas. The Koza anti-America action. Okinawa reverts to Japan

Post-War period (After Reversions)	1975	Okinawa International Ocean Exposition American soldier violence.
	1995	Public meetings held on the issues of reconsideration of SOFA (US-Japan Status of Forces Agreement) and decrees of American base.
	1996	In Japan's first-ever prefectural referendum, over half of Okinawa's voters agree; "We request reconsideration of the SOFA and the decrease of American bases in Okinawa."
	2000	Kyusyu-Okinawa Summit meeting is held
	2004	U.S. military helicopter crashes into the Okinawa International University campus.
	2007	Over 110,000 Okinawans gather at a citizens' public meeting to demand retraction of the Textbook Examination Opinion, which erased from textbooks references to the fact that the Japanese military forced Okinawans to commit mass-suicides during the Battle of Okinawa.
	2010	Democratic Party alters its stance, to relocate Futenma base to Henoko.
	2012	The Liberal Democratic Party gains government. Allows deployment of U.S. Ospreys in Okinawa.
	2013	41 heads of local government, from every municipality in Okinawa, march to demand relocation of the Futenma Base to a place outside the prefecture and reconsideration of the Osprey deployment.
	2014	Candidates opposing relocation to Henoko win in every electoral district across Okinawa, including Nago city mayor, Okinawa governor, and Diet members elections. Review of the Henoko relocation plan begins.
	2015	Okinawans gather for a citizens' mass meeting to oppose the Henoko base construction.



Mrs. Matayoshi Kyoko's testimony (fourth from the right)

4. Danger of Exclusionist Nationalism

Song Hye-Sook

"Omoni (mother)" of students of Korean School in Japan

I am a third-generation ethnic Korean resident born and raised in Japan. Currently my two children go to Chosen Gakko, or Korean School, and I myself went to Korean School from kindergarten to university.

Korean Schools in Japan were established right after the liberation in 1945 in order to teach the culture and the history that was deprived during the period of Japanese colonial administration to our children who were born in Japan. However, the Japanese government has been treating the Korean Schools discriminatively and has consistently sought to close them, instead of guaranteeing ethnic education to Koreans, in the light of restoring the original condition of the victims with a sense of responsibility, as the assailant of colonial rule.

We are now facing an issue of Korean Schools being excluded from the "tuition-free high school program" that was put in force in April 2010 to make public high schools tuition-free and provide students at private high schools including foreign national's schools with school enrollment subsidies, for the purpose of ensuring education opportunities to all high school age children living in Japan regardless of wealth and family conditions. The Japanese government, however, has excluded only Korean Schools among other foreign national's schools from this program, raising the subject of diplomatic matter such as the abduction issue between Japan and the DPRK, for which children who study at Korean Schools have no responsibility themselves.

Government-led blatant bias against Korean Schools, for me, has been creating prejudice among Japanese society against Korean Schools and the students, and further discrimination, xenophobia, and violence.

Since 2010 when Korean Schools was excluded from the “tuition-free high school program,” in prefectural levels in Osaka, Tokyo and Miyagi as well as municipal levels in Osaka City, Hiroshima City and Fussa City, following this government policy, local subsidies to Korean Schools have been cut or omitted. My children go to a Korean School in Tokyo and it has been five years since subsidy from the Metropolitan Tokyo government has stopped. Economic burden for us, parents continue to grow.

With such a burden, the reason why we still make our children go to Korean School is because we wish them to live as ethnic Koreans proudly even in foreign land, without hiding own roots. For us who were born and raised up in Japan, Korean Schools are special place to learn own language and history with friends with same roots, and develop and foster identity as ethnic Koreans.

Nevertheless, exclusionists have become intrusive on this special place for us to study to foster one’s identity.

In December 2009, an incident took place when members of “Zaitokukai” or the Group of citizens who do not tolerate privileges for ethnic Korean residents in Japan and “Society for Restoration of Sovereignty (Shuken-kai)” have surged in around the Kyoto Chosen Daiichi Elementary School. In front of the school gate, they kept on hurling abuses over a loudspeaker, such as “Konnan gakko yanai (This is not a school),” “Naniga kodomo ja. Supai no kodomo yanaika (Children or what? You are spies’ children),” “Omaera unko kuttoke, hanto kaette (Eat shit, and go back to the peninsula),” “Yakusoku toiunowane, ningen dousiga surumon nanndesuyo. Ningento Chosenjin dewa yakusokuwa seiritsu shimasen (Promise is made among us humans. No promise comes into effect between humans and Koreans).” Children, teachers and staffs of the school, as well as parents who heard of the incident and rushed to school, were horrified by these despicable attacks and insults by the exclusionists, disappointed by the police who just stood by and watch, and suffered a great deal of damage physically and emotionally. The school administrators and the parents were deprived of peace in everyday life, being forced to deal with continuous attack scares and actual offences by the exclusionists. A more serious problem was that the children were affected by the acts of the exclusionists. Since the assaults, a quite a number of children suffered from secondary damage; night-time crying, bed wetting, and getting scared of loudspeakers used by recycling or election campaign cars on the street. It is said that children started to ask questions such as, “Being Koreans is bad?” “Are we doing something bad?” “Chosen

gakkotte akanno? (Korean Schools are bad?).

Other than these direct assaults against schools, there are also effects of the rise of exclusionists. With rampant hate speech against Koreans and racist demonstrations being frequently reported in the media, my children now hesitate to speak out on the street in childish loud voice, “Annyeong haseyo (Hello)” or “Omma (mommy)” in Korean language. Children at Korean Schools, despite discrimination by the government, gathered signatures for their right to study, and got pelted with racist verbal attacks such as “Shine (Fuck off and die)” or “Go back to Chosen.” It is extremely painful as a parent and an ethnic Korean, to see them scared and hide their identity as Koreans, or cry over the harsh verbal abuse they suffer, or being excluded from the “tuition-free high school program”. As just described, the assaults by the exclusionists are dangerous, instilling negative image of own descent to growing minority children, damaging their feelings of self-esteem, and dividing the majority and the minority.

In August of last year, the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination completed its review of reports on the Japanese government, and urged the government to fight against prejudice which leads to racism, and tackle the fundamental causes of hate speech. As the committee pointed out, hate speech against Koreans in Japan is deeply rooted in colonialism, and consistent discrimination by the Japanese government against Korean schools creates biases within Japanese society against Koreans in Japan, spreading hate speech, and encouraging exclusionism.

In order to stop a series of assaults targeting Koreans in Japan by the exclusionists and to stop hate speech, it is imperative that the government itself take initiative to stop discrimination against Korean Schools. Furthermore, to change the environment that creates discrimination and exclusionism in incremental steps, it is required to provide human rights education at the national level to foster understanding and tolerance for minorities.

Voices of minorities are often unheard, but I, as a third generation Korean in Japan, will continue to let out my voice, without yielding to pressure from the exclusionists, I yearn for Japan, where I was born and grew up, to change into a society with deep and sincere remorse over the past, where one respects the other and people with different backgrounds deepen understanding of one another.

●Translator : Mari Suzuki

【Commentary】 About Koreans in Japan and Korean Schools

1. Who are Koreans in Japan?

The history of Koreans in Japan starts with Japan's colonial occupation of the Korean Peninsula (1910-1945). During this period Japan has deprived Koreans of their own land and destroyed the existing rural economy. Koreans who were impoverished had to come to Japan looking for a job. Japan deprived Koreans of our language, culture, name, and from the mid 1930's forcefully called us up as laborers in military as well as war industries, and what is more as sex-slaves.

When Japan was defeated in 1945, there were more than 2 million Koreans in Japan, and while most of them went back to the Korean Peninsula, some 600,000 Koreans had to stay in Japan due to various constraints to go back, not to mention lack of compensation. Because of the Cold War between the US and the USSR, the Korean Peninsula was under the state of general tension. The Peninsula was divided into the South and the North, and in 1965 the Treaty on Basic Relations between Japan and Republic of Korea was signed, unrepentant over responsibility for colonial occupation. Diplomatic relations with the DPRK is not yet normalized, and Koreans in Japan are still being discriminated in various ways.

2. Number of Koreans in Japan

Due to Japan's colonial occupation, it is estimated that about 430,000 Koreans in Japan, who originated from the Korean Peninsula, or are their descendants (Ministry of Justice, as of 2013). There are those who acquired Japanese nationality (some 350,000 between 1952 to 2013) and those who have Japanese nationality because one of parents are Japanese nationals (more than 160,000 between 1985 and 2013, confirmed by the Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare). The total number of residents with Korean nationality or ethnicity is therefore over a million population.

3. About Korean Schools

After liberation from colonial occupation of Japan, Koreans in Japan established Kokugo Koshu-jo (National Language School) in every corner to pass on language and culture, that was deprived during the occupation, down to children who were born and grew up in Japan. Instead of guaranteeing ethnic education of Koreans who were victims in the light of restoring original condition as the assailant of colonial rule, the Japanese government issued orders to close Korean schools and surpassed by force in 1948 and

1949. A number of schools were driven to be abolished and children had to transfer to Japanese schools. Part of schools that Koreans in Japan made a desperate stand and kept running has become the basis of Korean Schools now. As of now, Korean schools are, from Hokkaido to Kyushu, 38 kindergarten, 53 elementary schools, 33 junior high schools, 10 high schools, and 1 university.

Under the School Education Act of Japan, Korean Schools are not formal schools but under schools in the miscellaneous category such as driving schools and culinary schools. Therefore there is no subsidy from the national government, and even if there are subsidies from local governments that differ in terms of the amount, these subsidies are just about one tenth of the public schools or about one third of private schools in Japan, which makes management of Korean Schools always severe. Once approved as formal schools, various subsidies can be entitled, however, use of school textbooks authorized by the Ministry of Education is obliged, it is going to be extremely difficult to offer ethnic education to learn culture and history of one's own. This is why Korean Schools in Japan have been demanding both a respect to autonomy for education and a treatment equal to formal schools. The Japanese government is ever suppressing Korean Schools and taking a discriminatory policy since the end of the WWII, the main problem is now that Korean Schools are openly excluded from the "tuition-free high school program" since 2010. These direct discriminations of the national government against Korean Schools gave official go-ahead to local governments as well to stop providing subsidies to Korean Schools, and it becomes a cause again to encourage hate speeches against Koreans in Japan.

4. Hate Speech and Hate Crime

Hate demonstrations on the street against Koreans, which have been a social issue, started with incidents when Zaitokukai attacked Korean Schools (Korea University in 2008 and Korean Elementary School in Kyoto in 2009). Hate crime by private citizens against students from Korean Schools started in the 1960's as we know the facts. With open discrimination by the Japanese government, Korean School students are subjected to verbal as well as physical abuse by Japanese citizens at any time. Particularly from the late 1980's to the beginning of 2000's, there were series of incidents that female students' chima jeogori (traditional clothes worn as school uniform) was cut, which received criticism from the international community.

5. Trauma and Shock of the Minorities As Target of Discrimination and Hatred

Higasitani Makoto

United Church of Christ in Japan Buraku Liberation Center

Buraku where I live is located to the south of Osaka Prefecture. 80 years ago, Rev. Toshio Saito of Sakai Church and a Pastor who was from Buraku started missionary work together to tell the Love of Jesus Christ to those who were suffering from discrimination. Compared to the present it was much more severe 80 years ago, without freedom of choice in occupation, forced to live hand-to-mouth. Because of poverty, people from Buraku were not able receive education, which made them again difficult to find jobs. They did not have chance to get married to someone from outside Buraku. Residents in the area were leading a hard life because of discrimination and poverty.

Missionary work was started in the town, and a church building was built. In November this year we will celebrate the 80th anniversary and hold a thanksgiving memorial service. During the period of 80years, the church opened a kindergarten for children who were deprived of opportunities to receive education. I was one of the children there. Pastors we've had taught at community school for literacy education. The journey of the church was always with the community.

10 years ago, an incident happened just before the annual "Danjiri Festival" in autumn. "Danjiri" is wooden wheels that are pulled across towns by a crowd of people. It is a harvest thanks giving festival in autumn.

Someone from A district located next to Buraku came to ask permission to use a parking space owned by B from Buraku, so that they can park their "Danjiri" when they rest during

"Danjiri Festival." The chief of the neighborhood association and the chair of the young men's association of A district came to B, and B said no, with respect, and asked to look for other place just because his parking lot was rented by others and he couldn't ask them to make the space available for three days during the festival.

That night a flyer was distributed in the neighborhood of the house of B, that said "Chief of the neighborhood association and the chair of the young men's association of A district went to ask for a parking space with the head lowered, Etta (discriminately term that means a person from Buraku) has turned down with an attitude. Shindeshimae, minohodomo waki-maezu kotowariotte (Fuck off and die, for you forgot who you are and refused). You are not worth to live, Etta, just die already."

A member from the chapter of Buraku Liberation League where B lives went to protest against the two men from A district, but both of them denied the accusation. Police didn't treat it seriously because there is no law in Japan as of now to penalize such discriminative remarks and harassment. They tried to find the one who distributed flyers but failed. Since then for the past 10 years before "Danjiri Festival" in autumn, similar flyers have been distributed in the area every year.

A district is located in C Town where there is Buraku. Residents in A district continue to use "A Town", which is an old address that now doesn't exist, to avoid being mistaken as one from Buraku. They even receive postal mails addressed to "A Town."

Such discrimination is being allowed. The municipal office reminds residents from A district, but it is not easy to change long-term traditions. There is no law to ban or to penalize these attitudes and practices. The municipal office has programs such as human rights seminars, but residents from A district never attend to these programs.

We shall continue to be engaged in liberation from discrimination, with perseverance, in a careful manner, not get discouraged, and with hope.

●Translator : Mari Suzuki

【Commentary】 Buraku Liberation

Some 1200 years ago (older than the Nara Period), the Ritsuryo Codes divided people into two major classes, ryomin (law-abiding people) and himin (humble or lowly people). About 900 years ago (during Late Heian Period) in the Old Capital Kyoto, there were outcaste people who were called “hinin (the outcaste)” or “kawaramono (beggar).” Some of them were actors/actresses and others were engaged in religious rituals such as removing one’s foulness or burial service as faith healers. They also worked as street sweepers, were engaged in treating horse and beef carcasses as well as leather crafts, shoe-making and construction work, digging well and plastering walls, and create/build gardens, etc. In relation to foulness, gradually they began to be excluded and discriminated. In the ancient belief and a view of life and death, the concept of reincarnation and the cause and effect that taught people who slaughter or hunt animals go to hell is considered to have made a great influence to the formation of a sense of discrimination.

Some 500 to 150 years ago (from the Age of Provincial Wars in Japan to the Edo Period / from 1467 to 1868,) for daimyo or feudal lords it was important to secure supply of armors and saddlery. These feudal lords held the situation of those who were engaged in leather production, which became the basis of modern class system in Japan. In 1871 (in Meiji 4) the Meiji Government proclaimed Kaiho-rei, a law to abolish the class system of lowly people. Meiji Government, however, did not carry out any substantial emancipation policy amid the ongoing modernization; social discrimination has just restructured anew.

After 1912 (after Taisho Era) labor movement as well as peasant movement begun and a social climate of rising up and fighting for own rights and dignity arose, they started to have a view that “Discrimination never disappears by itself. We rise up ourselves and seek for the true liberation of Buraku.” On March 3, 1922 (Taisho 11), the Founding Congress of Zenkoku Suiheisha (National Levelers' Association) was convened at the Okazaki Auditorium in Kyoto, and the Suiheisha Declaration was adopted as a statement of hope to fight for a cause.

Discrimination against Buraku of our time determines a person by his/her parentage, ancestry, birth place, domicile, or occupation, and cases of serious discrimination are continuously reported in marriage or in employment, by land survey companies as well as the with the comprehensive lists of Buraku communities. Though a certain improvement was achieved by a

number of people who fought against discrimination, however, the problem still exist, deeply rooted in Japanese society by a group of people who accept discrimination against Buraku people.

The United Church of Christ in Japan (UCCJ) started an organizational struggle against discrimination against Buraku in 1975, and in 1981 established the Buraku Liberation Center in Daito City in Osaka. The Center has been carrying on campaigns towards elimination of all forms of discrimination. The main programs include “Day of a prayer for Buraku Liberation” movement, a series of appeals for retrial of the Sayama Case, liberation theater, theological schools advisory meeting for human rights education, Buraku Liberation seminar for youth, Buraku Liberation National Congress, Buraku Liberation caravan, Buraku Liberation Center overnight seminar, UCCJ Buraku Liberation Center early morning prayer gathering, activities of interns, protesting against discriminatory expression in documents and books, and networking with organizations working against various kinds of discrimination.

- UCCJ Buraku Liberation Center periodicals and our website.Newsletter ‘Yoki hi no Tameni’ issued 3 times a year;biannual English Newsletter ‘Crowned with Thorns’;Website: <http://www1.odn.ne.jp/burakuliberation>

Akira Kobayashi

(United Church of Christ in Japan Buraku Liberation Center)



Audience of Higasitani Makoto's testimony

6. Can the Church Become A “Community of Healing”?

KIM Shinya

Yokosuka Church, Korean Christian Church in Japan

1.

This question itself does not have an object. “Who” and “What” are to be healed? And if the “church” is assumed to be the subject, is this really possible, or right? The moment we start speaking of ourselves as a healing body, do we not fail to catch something? Do we not risk missing matters by not touching or facing a person (or some wound within ourself) that awaits healing?

2.

I work as a minister, but at the same time I am working at the social welfare institution Seikyusha’s “Children Culture Center” (Kodomo Bunka Center), which was built by Kawasaki Church, my home congregation. The purpose of this facility, which was built 27 years ago by the working-class city of Kawasaki, is to eliminate racial discrimination. It was a landmark event in Japan for a municipality to recognize the existence of ethnic discrimination.

Thirty years ago in Japan, there were many Koreans in Japan who had been discriminated, and many children were bullied at school. As a result, there were even cases of children who committed suicide. Children tried to hide their origins by changing their names into Japanese style names. Bullying against children reflects the bigger structural inequality that is present in society. In the 1970s, the first “International Conference on Minority Issues”

was held at a time when there was a struggle against incidents of discrimination in employment. In the 1980s, the church leads the movement to refuse fingerprinting, which symbolized discrimination. During the process of this movement, a mission agreement was reached between the KCCJ and Japanese churches. In the 1990s, influenced by the post-war redress movement taking place in North America, issues of war redress were raised here in Japan, too, and a large movement arose. Furthermore, with various movements building upon each other, we saw a spread of multiculturalism and the notion of “multicultural inclusivity.” It seemed that the feeling of respect for “others” had taken deep root in people.

However, this sense of respecting others is still not fully shared in 2015 in Japan? Why is that? The purpose of this session is to talk about this question.

3.

“My mom told be that we only have 380 yen left of our living assistance, so I have not eaten anything since yesterday.” (Elementary school 5th grade). “It is painful not to have dinner two days in a row.” (Junior High 2nd grade). “I cannot think of hope. I mean, what is hope?” “We are poor, so we will be forced to go to the war, right?”...Children who come to visit us at the center say such things. These are their “voices.” This is the one aspect of 21st century reality in Japan. These “voices” do not always come to the surface, but when we occasionally do catch it, even if there is no immediate “healing,” Christian staff members say to each other, it feels like an “invisible church” suddenly appeared.

Something that was in the silence of comfort women, something in their breathing that couldn’t be captured by hearing. That “cold” feeling you feel deep in the bones when you hear the “voice” of hate speech. That vague, stagnant feeling that a gay person feels when angered by the words of a colleague, “Don’t you think it’s disgusting, homosexuality?” The feeling that is behind the voice of a young man living in Minami soma, near the Fukushima nuclear accident, as he accepts a job at nuclear power plant and says, “It’s for economic recovery.”

I imagine that at the beginning of every movement someone must have caught a “voice (-less voice)” like this. But what if our sensitivity to such “voices,” which is supposed to be the source of movements, deteriorates as a movement develops? In order to spin a new movement, at this time we should perhaps become more sensitive to the questions; what voices that should have been healed did we fail to hear, or are we still failing to hear?

4.

Amid eruptions of ugly hatred, “Is it possible for the church to become a community of healing?” As a person who has received exhibitions of hatred, unguarded; as a person who could do nothing except overlook exhibitions of hate, as a person who cannot but feel hate within himself. Recalling the image of Jesus, who is the true subject of “healing,” I would like to learn from the voices of 1st-generation Koreans in Japan.

●Translator : Madoka Hammie



Rev. Kim Sinya's testimony (First from the left)

PART.Ⅱ

Churches confronting discrimination

1. You are the Salt of the Earth (Mtt.5:13)

Geevarghese Mor Coorilos

Moderator of WCC's Committee on World Mission and Evangelism

I have chosen a very familiar text, a verse which is part of the great Sermon on the Mount. The passage, "You are the Salt of the Earth" (Mt.5:13), has great relevance for today's context, especially for minority communities everywhere.

Salt is an integral part of our daily life. In the ancient world, salt was highly valued.

There was a Roman expression in Latin which said:

Nil Utilius Sole et Sale ("There is nothing more useful than sun and salt")

When we look at the Old Testament we find that the Hebrews had plenty of salt reserves. There was even a river by name 'salt river' (Dt.3:17). Salt was used in sacrifices (Lev.2:18). There was also a practice of applying salt on the body of the newborn babies. (Ez.16:14). Salt symbolized life, faith and commitment. I should like to focus on these aspects of salt that are pertinent for our being and becoming, our identity and mission, especially as minority communities.

Firstly, Salt Affirms Life and Resists threats to Life.

One of the greatest characteristics of salt is its power to preserve life from decay, degeneration and corruption. All you need is a very tiny quantity of salt. In the ancient world, salt was the most common preservative. According to Plutarch, salt was like a new soul inserted into a dead body. Salt, therefore, represents life. It fights corruption and protects and preserves life from degeneration. In a world that is marked and marred by a culture of death, degeneration of moral values of God's reign, and corruption, minority communities, like salt, has the task to affirm and preserve life wherever life is under threat, be it in the form of wars, poverty, discrimination, exploitative economic systems, ecological crisis and so on.

To be the salt of the earth, therefore, is to exercise an antiseptic influence on a society that is corrupt and decaying. As salt provides flavor to food, we must transform the world that we live in, into a just world where fullness of life, life with dignity, is enjoyed by everyone, not monopolized by an elite few.

In my younger days, shop owners used to keep huge sacks of raw salt outside their shops and they were never locked inside. There was hardly any fear of salt being stolen. It was considered a public property that every one could afford to have. Now, these sacks of raw salt has become a thing of the past. They have been supplanted by attractively treated salt powder packets. Salt, one of the essential things in life has become a privatized and expensive market commodity. "You are the salt", in the context of globalization, therefore, is a powerful reminder that we should resist the trend where life and livelihood are being commercialized and privatized.

In order to affirm life, we must confront the forces of death, systems that corrupt and deny life to many, systems such as market-driven and profit oriented neo-liberal economy that thrives by exploiting the poor and the environment, neo-colonial systems that commodify life and privatize the sources of livelihood, systems that discriminate people on the basis of race, caste, creed, gender, ethnicity, language, sexual orientation, ability, medical status and so on.

I come from a country where salt played a historic role in our struggle against colonial/imperial regime. Salt symbolized resistance against imperialism. When the British Raj in India imposed salt tax on people, Gandhi organized an action campaign against it. It was called "Salt Satyagraha" or "Dandi March". Through this struggle, Gandhi 'illegally' produced salt from seawater. This was a non-violent protest against the British salt monopoly. This became an important part of Indian independence movement and sparked a nation wide civil disobedience movement. The movement began with just 78 people (a minority) but eventually became a nation wide resistance against the imperial imposition of salt tax that drew worldwide attention. Salt here was a symbol simultaneously of resistance against colonialism as well as a symbol of life and livelihood. For Gandhi, salt was deeply a symbolic choice. Salt is something which every Indian uses. This is important to replace the salt content that is lost through sweating in India's tropical climate. Being an item of daily use, salt could resonate more than an abstract idea for human rights with every one. As Gandhi said, "next to air and water, salt is perhaps the greatest necessity of life". Thus, salt symbolized resistance

of people against powers that be, unjust systems and empires. Being the salt of the earth, therefore, is to resist the forces that deny life to people, especially to the weaker sections of our society. Being the salt of the earth, then, is to transform the world into a just and inclusive community.

Secondly, Salt is Self-Emptying.

Another important feature of salt is that it easily dissolves and disappears wherever it's added. In an age of 'selfies' where people are inclined to project themselves, salt reminds us about the nature of Christ, that of kenosis, of self-emptying, emptying oneself for the sake of the other. Phil. 2:5 is a classic passage on kenosis. As Jesus reminds, it's only when we risk and even lose our lives for others that we gain them (Jn.)

The real identity of salt becomes a meaningful one only when it gets dissolved in where it is mixed. Food without salt is insipid, but if salt is not dissolved and integrated in the food, it would taste too salty and even sickening. Christian presence, especially in minority contexts, ought to be like that of dissolved salt in food. Our acts of resistance against forces of death and corruption would be a risky one as they could lead us onto the Cross of Christ where we would be called to empty ourselves, even to the point of death. To put it in different words, our transforming presence as a minority community should eventually be a presence that would not be really visible. Martyrdom is not a thing of the past any more. Christians, especially where they are a minority faith, are living out this challenge every day, these days, be it in Egypt, Syria, Iraq...you name them. Like salt, their presence dissolves and disappears in the midst of severe persecution and torture. Although their presence is no more visible, their transforming impact continues. Even when they stood in front of guns and knives, their faith and commitment were salt solid. Salt, we may recall, was also a symbol of strong faith and commitment. In the Old Testament, there was even a covenant that was called "salt covenant" (Numb18:19; 2Chr. 13:5). The early Church was another example of being the salt of the earth, of standing for faith without compromising to the empire even at the cost of their lives.(Stories of Bishops kidnapped in Syria, 20 Egyptians beheaded, and of a newly converted pastor in Khandamal)

The plight of minority communities is at its worst where the State itself turns repressive, fascist and anti-people, particularly against minority communities. We have a number of examples of this scenario in many countries. It's imperative that minority communities join together with civil society initiatives that work for human rights and justice concerns. Church

must become an interlocutor in civil society. "You are the salt of the earth" entails such a commitment. It is a call to be in service to the world, to be agents of social justice and transformation, to ensure fullness of life, life with dignity (to add taste as salt does), and to find the real church among local embodiments of the marginalized communities. The image of "salt", in other words, involves a mandate and a call to get immersed in people's struggles for humanity and dignity.

To conclude, when the going gets tough for minority communities, the Biblical reminder that we are meant to be "the salt of the earth" should instill courage and commitment to face the challenges boldly, to be a transforming presence in a world that is corrupt and unjust, to identify ourselves with the margins and get dissolved in their struggles for a better and more just world, to resist forces of death and discrimination and to stand firm for truth and justice. May God help us to be the salt of the earth.



Bishop Dr. Coorilos's Message in Opening Worship

2. Learnings from WCC's Engagement With Struggles Against Racism and Similar Forms of Discrimination

Deenabandhu Manchala

Common Global Ministries, USA

Good Morning, dear Friends,

At the outset, I would like to thank the Korean Council of Churches in Japan for inviting me to be part of this historic event and also to make a presentation on the theological rationale for the continued engagement of churches with the challenge of racism and similar form of discrimination.

Before I do that, I would like to present three communities of partners who accompany me while I share my reflections.

I am here as a partner, representing the Global Ministries which is a common diaconal instrument of the United Church of Christ and Disciples of Christ Church in the US. I bring greetings to you from Rev. James Moos and Rev. Julia Karimu Brown the co-executive directors and from Dr. Xiaoling Zhu the Area Executive for East Asia and the Pacific who is known to many of you. Along with Rev. Dr. Edward Davis, Rev. Dr. Sharon Davis and Rev. Dr. Elizabeth Leung who are representing the UCC, we are here with you now with our stories of resistance and hope from our struggles against racism on the US, and in anticipation of what you might teach us.

I am also here in solidarity bringing with me stories of struggle for dignity, justice and life of the Dalits, the victims of India's heinous caste system. The Dalits, numbering around 250 million in South Asia, are perhaps the most discriminated and brutally oppressed community anywhere in the world today. According to recent 2014 statistics, there have been 17,000 cases of atrocities against Dalits which include murders and massacres, rape

and sexual assaults and burning of houses. Along with the tribals (Indigenous peoples), all other victims of caste system, and with Bishop George and Ms. Manuella Ott, the ardent and unwavering partners of the Dalits in their struggles for justice, I express my solidarity with you in your vocation of transformation of the Japanese society.

I make this presentation as an activist theologian, reflecting on my experience of working with the World Council of Churches' Just and Inclusive Communities programme till recently. This programme brought together the experiences of the most marginalized and discriminated sections of the society and the church with a view to insist that their perspectives and visions of the new world are crucial for churches' pursuit of God's mission. I am, therefore, accompanied by my dear brothers and esteemed former colleagues – Dr. Jooseop Keum and Dr. Dong Sung Kim who strive to ensure that the ecumenical vocation of the World Council of Churches makes sense first to the God's special people - the discriminated and excluded people of the world, and in that finds its purpose.

Let me, therefore, start with a brief overview of the engagement of churches in the WCC with the challenge of discrimination and then go on to identify the lessons learnt.

An overview

The challenge of racism has been integral to ecumenical thought and action right from the beginnings of the modern ecumenical movement. The Jerusalem and Oxford conferences of the International Missionary Council in 1928 and 1937 already held racism as a challenge to mission. The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam in 1947 asserted that "prejudice based upon race or colour and from practices of discrimination and segregation as denials of justice and human dignity" and wanted the churches to overcome the national and social barriers in order to help society to overcome those barriers. The fourth Assembly of the WCC in Uppsala in 1968 that met against the backdrop of the assassination of the US Civil Rights' leader Dr. Martin Luther King Jr, called on churches to work together to eliminate racism. The Central Committee in the following year while mandating for the establishment of the Programme to Combat Racism, stated, "racism is not unalterable feature of human life. Like slavery and other social manifestations of man's sin, it can and must be eliminated." ("Racism", Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement, 2002) At a follow up consultation in Notting Hill, UK in 1969, the Programme to Combat Racism (PCR) took shape, continued its journey and remains to this day as an unparalleled landmark in the his-

tory of the World Council of Churches as it brought the churches worldwide to accompany the movements and initiatives that saw the end of the apartheid regime in South Africa. This engagement also asserted the purpose and relevance of the WCC.

While combatting white racism preoccupied its initial stages of work, the PCR also began to engage with movements and communities in struggle against similar forms of discrimination and exclusion - the Dalits in South Asia, the Indigenous Peoples in many parts of the world, the ethnic minorities, migrants in Europe, the Burakumin in Japan, etc. These partnerships resulted in highlighting the interplay between race, gender and class as well as religion, ethnicity and nationalism, thus calling churches to recognize the necessity to understand and explore further the complex and dynamic nature of the cultures of discrimination and domination, as part of their efforts towards faithful witness in the world today.

However, with the changes and restructuring at the WCC since 1994, the PCR could no longer remain visible on its programmatic agenda. ‘Programme to Combat Racism’ became one of ‘Overcoming Racism’ to resonate with the spirit and approach of the Decade to Overcome Violence which was launched in 2001. At the United Nations First World Conference Against Racism in Durban, South Africa in 2001, the WCC advocated for reparations for slavery and land dispossession. With the new awareness of the different expressions and experiences of discrimination in many parts of the world, the WCC as part of its pursuit of justice proposed ‘Transformative Justice’ as a distinct response and strategy of churches to overcome racism and other forms of discrimination. God’s justice is asserted as distinctly biased towards the poor and the vulnerable and as such it heals and restores the victims and also confronts and transforms all those that deny them life with dignity and freedom.

After the 2006 Assembly in Porto Alegre, Brazil, the focus shifted inward to explore the extent of changes that WCC’s long engagement against discrimination had effected within its member churches. An honest acknowledgment of the cultures and practices of discrimination right within inspired the WCC to launch the programme on Just and Inclusive Communities. This programme brought together the networks and resources of people involved in anti-racism work, of the Indigenous Peoples, Dalits, people with disabilities, and the forced migrants, in an effort to challenge the churches to be and to effect the just and inclusive communities. These voices also found their articulation in the “Mission from the Margins” section of the new mission statement of the WCC – Together Towards Life.

Learnings

WCC has bequeathed to the member churches a sensitivity towards racism as an outrage against God, and a heresy against the belief that all people are born equal and in the image of God, and that all human suffering was a mark against God. It held forth common action against racism and similar forms of discrimination as a moral imperative for churches. This long legacy has taught many lessons. Let me attempt to highlight a few. First, justice and dignity for all, especially for those who are disempowered by social, economic and political structures and cultures, are held as inevitable features of Christian vocation. In doing so, it asserted the distinctness of God’s justice as one that favours the victims of unjust structures and cultures. Secondly, these struggles against racism and similar forms of discrimination, in other words, unjust human suffering, became reasons for churches to covenant to work together. And lastly, it motivated many churches to continue to work diligently not only to challenge diverse forms of discrimination, but also to promote greater understanding and acceptance across multicultural and religious lines. And the legacy continues though not at the level that one would wish.

However, when the engagement with the anti-apartheid struggles ended, some in the WCC seemed to have felt that racism is not anymore a serious issue, and quickly moved over to other, albeit, equally urgent and crucial issues and challenges. The engagement in South Africa did not seem to have an impact in the home turf. Some overlooked or even justified structurally embedded forms of injustice and discrimination in the name of culture and tradition. Those who were convinced of the continued need to overcome racism were satisfied with changes at personal and limited local levels but left out the larger structural expressions of institutional racism. A consultation commemorating the 40 years of PCR in Cleveland deplored: “When Christ’s disciples fail to call into question personal prejudices, discriminatory practices, and dehumanizing social structures in their midst, then the churches have extinguished their light; their salt has lost its savor; and the glory of God has been obscured”.

Discerning the way ahead for ecumenical action against discrimination

Racism and similar instruments of discrimination continue to plague many populations throughout the world. People of African descent, the Dalits in South Asia, the Indigenous peoples, the ethnic, linguistic and religious minorities here in Japan and in many places in the world continue to be more discriminated and marginalized than before on account of

the changing economic, political and social conditions that the present world has entailed. The presence of these insidious forms of economic, social, cultural, and political exclusion reflects that the struggle against dehumanizing discriminatory practices continues and that our churches must assume a greater leadership role in challenging them in their old and new forms and expressions.

One experience that was consistent throughout my time of working with churches on issues of the marginalized groups is that if the affected people do not speak up for their rights and space, others are rarely sensitive and ready to speak up. Experiences of discrimination and injustice do not, unfortunately, seem to provoke the moral sensibilities of those who are aware but are not affected by such. Be that as it may, even if some ignore or trivialize the prevalence and role of cultures and practices of discrimination, what is necessary to recognize is that today's racism and similar forms of discrimination are not based on the straight forward binaries of the past but are extremely complex phenomena bringing several forces and factors together into play. These are subtle, virulent and complex with varying criteria for discrimination, posing serious challenges to the sanctity of life – both human beings and the creation. There are no easy answers. However, we, as churches, may perhaps reflect on the following challenges and possibilities:

1. Racism or any similar form of discrimination do not have ideological or structural expressions anymore like the way they had South Africa. These operate as cultures, as instruments of power and domination, and of subjugation and depravation. These influence and express themselves through attitudes, views of oneself and of the other. In a context where racism and other forms of discrimination are being allowed and justified as inevitable cultural influences, what alternative discourse can the churches offer through their own presence, options and actions? How do we overcome or help people overcome oppressive cultures to which our lives are intertwined?
2. More and more millions of migrants and refugees are exposed to discrimination and abuse each day in many parts of the world. These are abused, discriminated and exploited because they were dispossessed, disempowered and forced to flee from poverty and war caused by human greed. The goals of economic growth, development and security of the political, economic and military powers seem possible only through a blatant abuse of human beings and nature. How do we counter / challenge this ruthless exploitation and institutionalized injustice?

3. The resurgence of the religious right worldwide and its connivance with political and economic powers poses serious threat not only to their victims but also the sanctity of human relationships. Reconnections and new connections are being made with national and ethnic identities and are asserted in ways that exclusion of people is accepted as inevitable in many contexts. Narrow definitions of community and contours of human behavior that benefit and sync with the interests of the powerful are being set and circulated. The ‘other’, the outsider and the one who is different is always seen as a problem, an unwanted intrusion or a cheap commodity. Most world religions, including Christianity, while furthering their self-perpetuating missions, have played a major role in a process of ‘othering’ those who are different. Operating alongside nationalism, ethnicity, racism, patriarchy, and in my Indian context casteism, religions have always encouraged people to nurture inflated self-understandings and detrimental understandings of those who do not belong to their fold. In fact, this common but often ignored trait of ‘othering’ has been the source of most evils. Colonialism and neo-colonialism, slavery and modern forms of slavery, violence against women, child labour, environmental exploitation and consequent destruction, corruption and abuse of power – all have their roots in this dynamics of ‘othering’. While there are many NGOs and civil society organisations dealing with the challenges above, dealing with these detrimental notions of the “other” is something that faith communities alone can do and make a difference.
4. Churches are called to be just and inclusive communities, not only seeking unity among themselves but making that unity real by becoming inclusive within. The ecumenical movement has always asserted that the unity of the church is essentially for the mission of the unity of human kind. As part of their witness they have the responsibility to confront and transform these cultures of violence and death that deny, abuse and destroy life. Unfortunately, churches are not immune to these influences and are, therefore, not able to overcome cultural influences, economic interests and personal preferences in spite of what our faith tells us and that which we affirm. How then do we expand the horizons of our religious affirmation and practice to be celebratory, inclusive and open rather than as self-perpetuating pre-occupations, consolidating power and loyalty through rigid doctrine and tradition?

It is time for a new movement. It is time for a new world, one that is just and inclusive.

It is time for a new spirituality that values human togetherness and interdependence, calling us to embrace the presence of God in all creation. It is time for the churches to be instruments of change in an increasingly exclusionary and unjust world.

3. Perspective from Germany

Gabriele Mayer

Evangelical Mission in Solidarity, Germany

1. Introduction

Thank you for offering me this opportunity to share my perspective as a Christian, as a woman, as a German regarding overcoming the abyss after the Holocaust / Shoah in Nazi Germany during 1933-1945.

A fragmentary perspective

Seventy years after the end of WW II / Great Pacific War many developments, discourses, studies, publications and new political developments emerged. For this presentation I only can identify a few markers how Christians, how churches in Germany tried to come to grips with the incredible devastation German National Socialism brought to other countries and to minorities within its own communities.

My personal approach

In 1994 I was privileged to continue theological studies in United States. It was abroad where I met Jewish students and I discovered emotional ballast [könnte verharmlosend klingen] from my family history regarding the Holocaust. Those encounters lead me to the dissertation project on “Post-Holocaust religious education for German Women”.

Overview

First, I will talk about three target groups who were exposed to discrimination, persecution and even systematic killing; namely the Jews, Gypsies (Sinti and Roma) and Homosexuals.

At the end, I will name briefly a few “lessons learnt”.



Rev. Manchala presents during Plenary

2. National Socialism persecuting and extinguishing people, sisters and brothers...

2.1. Jewish Population in Europe

Only after May 8, 1945 the whole terror of the murderous system became slowly visible. A Lutheran source summarizes: "In total 5,6 million Jews fall victim of the NS racial fanaticism by gasification, shooting, injection, medical experiments, killing through work or starving to death; 2,7 million in the concentration camps. The victims came from German Reich (about 160,000), and from all occupied countries, in particular Soviet Union (1 million) and Poland (3 million).

Churches' Reactions

In August 1945, church leaders convened and decided to make a new beginning by creating "Evangelical Church in Germany" (EKD). In October 1945 Ecumenical guests from Geneva (Ecumenical Council of Churches) were invited and the EKD Council addressed them with the so-called "Declaration of Guilt".

"The Council of the Protestant Church in Germany welcomes representatives of the Ecumenical Council of Churches at its meeting in Stuttgart on 18.-19. October 1945. We are all the more grateful for this visit, as we not only know that we are with our people in a large community of suffering, but also in a solidarity of guilt.

With great pain we say: By us infinite wrong was brought over many peoples and countries. That which we often testified to in our communities, we express now in the name of the whole Church: We did fight for long years in the name of Jesus Christ against the mentality that found its awful expression in the National Socialist regime of violence; but we accuse ourselves for not standing to our beliefs more courageously, for not praying more faithfully, for not believing more joyously, and for not loving more ardently...

Thus we ask at a time, in which the whole world needs a new beginning: Veni creator Spiritus! (Come, spirit of the creator!)" translated by Prof Harold Marcuse, Santa Barbara

This guilt declaration was a first beginning, but its formulations were not clear enough compared with Bonhoeffer's proposal as early as in 1940: "*(The church) was silent, where*

she was supposed to cry out, because the blood of the innocent was crying towards heaven... She became guilty of the lives of the most weak and defenseless brothers of Jesus Christ (sc the Jews)."

In 1950, the EKD addressed the "Jewish question" as a more clear statement regarding the guilt at Israel. This was primarily the result of ecumenical pushing and anti-Semitic turmoil. *"We request all Christians to break away from any Anti-Semitism and to resist where it emerges again, and to meet Jews and Jewish Christians in a spirit of brotherliness..."* (Declaration of Berlin-Weißensee, 1950) Since Anti-Judaism was deeply rooted within theology and church thinking, it took decades to address this century old hostility between church and synagogue. Martin Luther himself was filled with hatred towards Jews. This had implications on generations of theological students and pastors.

Transformation was a long way to go...

~ Persons opened the door for a new dialogue: i.e. Martin Buber, Helmut Gollwitzer, Schalom Ben Chorin, Eberhard Bethge, Pinchas Lapide, Johann Baptist Metz.

~ In 1958 "Aktion Sühnezeichen-Friedensdienste" was founded. Thousands of young volunteers have worked in projects in Europe, Israel and the US, seeking greater international understanding by facing the traces of Nazi history, and dealing with their ongoing presence in many people's lives.

~ In 1977, at the Protestant Church Convention (=Kirchentag), Eberhard Bethge made clear:

"Our theology cannot be the same like the one before the Holocaust." Many theologians contributed to a renewed reflection of a theology after Auschwitz. In 1983 Dorothee Sölle was a courageous and prophetic voice in Vancouver at the VI. Assembly of the WCC: *"I talk to you as a woman, coming from one of the richest countries of the earth; a country with a bloody past reeking of gas, which some of us Germans can never forget...a country with the highest density of atomic weapons... I talk to you with enrage, in critique and in mourning..."*

~ In 2006 "Bibel in gerechter Sprache" (Bible translation in just language) was published and caused intense discussions. The scholars identified their hermeneutical principles when interpreting the texts from the original languages Greek or Hebraic: Justice as a key theme

of the Bible was applied to insights from the Christian-Jewish dialogue and thus very sensitive to Anti-Judaism of former translations.

2.2. Persecution and eradication of Gypsies

More than 600 years ago gypsies were migrating to and living in Germany. Centuries old prejudices and negative stereotypes lead to decree that named them as outlawed, without any protection and rights. Similar to the treatment of the Jewish population, the Nuremberg laws (1935) ruled that Sinti and Roma were excluded from the German people and labeled as "foreign to the species". Later they were gathered and deported; most of them were gassed in Auschwitz. About 500 000 persons became victim of a systematic genocide but unlike the Jewish Holocaust, the genocide of Sinti and Roma was denied for decades after the end of NS.

Most Sinti and Roma were/are Roman-Catholic, but despite being church members, the church authorities opened their books and supported the search of the Nazis for "unwanted citizens". The biologicistic concept of "race" transformed deep-rooted discrimination into a deadly NS policy. Churches remained silent. After 1945, those few who had survived were exposed to a continued discrimination. No advocates were speaking up for compensation or demanded the acknowledgment of atrocities by the state or the churches.

Response of the Churches

In 1993, during the official Japanese-German Church Consultation in Leipzig, Japanese Churches asked the EKD regarding their cooperation with German Sinti and Roma. At that time, no cooperation existed. In the 1990s a German pastor (Hoffmann-Richter) served in Japan and worked with the Buraku. Before his return to Germany, he was commissioned by the Japanese friends to pay attention to discriminated groups in Germany – the Sinti & Roma. And Synod members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Wuerttemberg were invited to get to know the anti-discrimination work of the Buraku Liberation Center. These travelers founded the "Task Force Sinti and Roma and Churches in Baden-Württemberg". This was the start of a cooperation between the four churches in Baden-Württemberg to address the ongoing discrimination of gypsies in Germany. The secretariat of that ecumenical task force is part of EMS. In an effort for more inclusion curricula and schoolbooks are screened and a new publication addresses the situation of Sinti and Roma in Germany.

2.3. Persecution and Criminalization of Homosexuals

Around 8,000 gay men were murdered by the Nazis. An unknown number of lesbians were incarcerated in concentration camps as "asocial" and had to serve in camp brothels.

Churches' reaction

70 years after the end of World War II, homosexual victims were remembered. In June 2015, at the first day of the "Kirchentag in Stuttgart (Protestant Church Convention) President Andreas Barner admitted that the Church played a role in the ostracism of gays and lesbians between 1933 and 1945. "It is our moral duty to not let their suffering be forgotten," he said, adding that discrimination against homosexuals in modern society had to be eradicated.

Barner admonished that " in 1945 the Nazi regime ended, but the discrimination of homosexuals still subsists.



<http://www.dw.com/en/german-protestant-church-opens-biannual-congress/a-18495436>

3. Some "lessons learnt"

* Overcoming such an abyss and building bridges for reconciliation is a task for decades and takes several generations.

* Deep-rooted prejudices and centuries-old hatred needs to be untangled and made visible

in its many forms and subtle secrets.

- * Unsettling one's belief system, deconstructing and transforming theological constructs has to become a decisive threshold for mature Christians who really face the Anti-Judaism contributing to the "Final solution".
- * Ecumenical sisters and brothers offered a sustainable and a challenging fellowship that pushed the churches in Germany to move forward
- * There is a need to become humble and honest in recognizing that outside mainstream churches people were often closer to the truth and noticing social realities of discrimination (cf. overcoming prejudices against gypsies and sexual minorities).
- * Speaking up for marginalized and discriminated groups is a true expression of Christian witness. Even if it means to address human rights violations in Israel, still a challenge for church leaders and politicians in Germany
- * Discerning between guilt (related to concrete actions), and shame (as a collective emotion) and responsibility (in searching new ways for reconciliation). These are challenges in particular for the second, third and even fourth generation after the Holocaust. Individuals and families untangle their hidden history, and in congregations and church communities people embarked on learning processes out of silence of the first generation, and paralysis of the second generation.



Dr. Mayer's report in Plenary Session

4. A CRY FROM THE HEART: DREAMING OF A JUST AND INCLUSIVE SOCIETY IN DEMOCRATIC SOUTH AFRICA

David Peter Carelse

United Reformed Church in South Africa

INTRODUCTION

They remembered that evening these words from 1 Pet 3. In many ways they recognized themselves in the people to whom Peter is writing – in the same way that the church has done this so often, again and again, in so many historical situations. Peter writes to “aliens” and “exiles,” believers who feel marginalized and insignificant, excluded and threatened, minorities without respect, victims of ridicule, having to deal with hardships and suffering – who therefore consider giving up their faith, losing their hope, failing the love to which they were called. Peter pleads with them, reminding them of who they are, of the hope they have inherited..... They remembered that evening the long tradition in which they stood and the worldwide community to which they belong.

Dirk J. Smit

The above-mentioned quote from Smit is an extract from the sermon which he has preached at the 25th celebrations of the Confession of Belhar. Smit is a renowned professor in Systematic Theology at the University of Stellenbosch and is also regarded as the principle draftsman of the Confession. What he articulates in the sermon must be understood within the historical context in which the Confession was adopted by the then Dutch Reformed Mission Church (DRMC). The quote reflects on the experiences of suffering, despair and humiliation during the Apartheid era. That evening in 1982 the opening words of the Report

from the Commission who had been appointed to draft a Confession were: “In fulfilling its task, your Commission took 1 Pet 3: 15-16 as guideline.” Why? Because the DRMC recognized their painful experiences and cries in the painful experiences and cries of the people of Asia Minor to whom Peter is writing: exclusion, aliens and exiles, marginalized, insignificant, excluded and threatened, minorities without respect, victims of ridicule, hardships, suffering. The believers of 1982 linked their yearning for recognition and their dream for a just and inclusive society with the living hope proclaimed by Peter. The hope lived within them, the hope was in their minds and hearts (Smit, 2006:2). But isn’t this in some ways also true of the Korean Christian Church in Japan? When the members of the Korean Christian Church in Japan celebrated the 60th anniversary in 1968 under the Theme: Forward, Following Jesus Christ into the World, they surely remembered the Korean students who started to worship together in 1908 under difficult circumstances; they surely remembered pastor Han Sok-Po and his missionary work since 1909; they remembered the migration of mothers and fathers because of political and economic reasons and how these founding members fought for recognition. They remembered how those heroes of faith spoke the Word without fear because the life, death, resurrection and promised coming of Jesus gave them hope. The histories of God’s people across the globe affirms that we have a common memory of suffering, exclusion and the denial of basic human rights. The suffering in the global context make us one big family, because, to let Yong-Bock Kim speak, “the globe is a ‘System of Apartheid.’” In my view, this Conference thus wants to reflect with careful discernment and bold hermeneutical choices on the imaginative possibilities of God’s liberating, healing love over the broken realities of our lives and the global world. A world full of people with a cry in the heart. And further, to critique and resist any form of exploitative power. Thanks for the invitation. I feel truly blessed in your midst.

The aim of this paper is to describe how certain injustices have slowed down the process to create sustainable, just and inclusive societies in the Republic of South Africa. In order to do so, the paper will first describe the nature and impact of inequality. Second, it will focus on racism as ideology and its impact on people’s human dignity. This part will also reflect on the joint ministry of the Dutch Reformed Church and the Uniting Reformed Church to combat racism. Third, it will explore the harm that hate speech causes on the well-being of minorities, as well as the jurisprudential treatment of hate speech in South African Courts.

Fourth, it will argue that Belhar’s dream for a merciful, just and holy community is a dream with which the global ecumenical Churches can identify themselves. I will below turn to the landscape of inequality.

ECONOMIC INEQUALITY

The Church of Jesus Christ in South Africa, finds herself since April 1994 in a democratic society. The Preamble to the Final Constitution states that the people of South Africa committed themselves to improve the quality of life of all citizens; to free the potential of each person living here; and to heal the divisions of the past. Section 9 contains the Equality provision clause. Equality is formulated as both a value and a right and means that everyone is equal before the law. Equality includes the full and equal enjoyment of all rights and freedoms. The state must not discriminate unfairly against anyone and no person may unfairly discriminate against anyone. Twenty one years after the reconstitution of the South African legal order the people can look back and be proud on many achievements. The Country however, still faces serious injustices of which inequality is but one. I will now describe briefly describe the nature and magnitude of this injustice and the reasons why the Church should care about inequality.

Describing inequality and the reasons to care about it

Stan du Plessis, economist at the University of Stellenbosch, is of the opinion that talking about inequality is not so easy. According to him people or communities can be unequal along a number of different dimensions: income, consumption, assets, opportunities, education, influence and abilities (du Plessis 2015:3). Based on these dimensions economists tend to operate with four concepts of inequality:

- We can measure gaps between the top and bottom
- Or try to measure the entire distribution
- Or measure just sensitive parts of the distribution
- Or measure the persistence of the distribution over time

He continues by asking: Why should the Church care about inequality? To answer this question the Church must look at normative reasons. Inequality may reduce happiness. It

keeps people from living a quality life. The absence of resources to live a quality life is morally objectionable and in conflict with the values of a just and inclusive society. Economists and theologians often focus just on market inequality and not on the inequality that arises from exploitation of the other (du Plessis, 2015: 3). The Church must also consider the positive reasons why she should care about inequality. Where inequality is a major challenge it may undermine social stability in the society and/or encourage leisure as opposed to work; it may lower economic growth; it is always the cause of persistent poverty, and lastly, it may distort the political system – through special interest politics and the creation of oligarchy (du Plessis, 2015:5). Let me continue with a glimpse into the situation.

A glimpse into the situation

The inequality that caused massive poverty in the Apartheid era did not disappear. Terreblanche, in his fascinating study, *A History of Inequality in South Africa*, argues that the overall situation, since the dawn of democracy, has not changed significantly, especially for the poorest of the poor. This economist refers to the 2001 Annual Report of Statistics South Africa (SSA), which states that the top 20 percent of households (approximate 17 percent of the population) received more than 70 percent of the national income. The poorest 49 percent of households (about 50 percent of the population) received less than 3, 5 percent of the national income. The improvement in the quality of life of the poor did not improve meaningful because in 1996 at least 41.4 percent of all households lived in poverty, i.e. they had to live on an income of between 601 and 1000 Rand (Terreblanche, 2005:132). In the previous year (1995) statistics have shown that 65 percent of black people between the ages of 16 and 24 – especially in rural areas – were unemployed (Terreblanche, 2005:133). The economic liberation of black people is limited to a new, growing, black elite. The gap between the rich white and the poor white, the rich black and the poor black is increasing, and amount to, in South Africa at least, an infringement of the poor's constitutionally guaranteed rights. Terreblanche put some blame for this unacceptable economic situation on (i) the economic premise that a high growth rate will automatically lead to massive employment and eradication of poverty, (ii) the failure of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). His criticism is that the TRC refused to face the consequences of the pre-1994 economic policies and is therefore in a deliberate manner guilty of “bringing about and sustaining, white wealth and white privileges on the one hand, and black poverty, black deprivation and

black humiliation on the other” (Terreblanche, 2005). The premise of growth is for him a myth and naïve optimism. Other causes mentioned for this huge inequality in South Africa and in Africa are toxic leadership instead of life-giving leadership (Kretzschmar, 2010: 159), the legacies of colonialism (Naude, 2010:57; Thompson, 1997:45), the legacies of legal injustice over decades (Lebacqs, 1987:75), insufficient moral will and political imagination (Bruggeman), modernism, separation of life from morality” (Smit, 2007:84-85) In his lecture for the 13th annual Nelson Mandela lecture for 2015 the French Economist, Thomas Piketty, gave the audience a clear understanding of the inequality in South Africa: the top 10 percent in the country currently earn two-thirds of the total income, 80 percent of them being white; this scenario is far worse than that of Brazil, where it is closer to 55; in Europe the percentage is around 30 to 35 percent; South African has many structural inequities; the inequality resulted in an unsatisfactory education system; the very rich continue to rise to a higher income level because of a lack of transparency of who owns what; this retards growth and development. It is now time to engage with racism.

RACISM

In Nairobi to Vancouver, Phillip Potter writes that the Program to Combat Racism goes as far back as 1969 when the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches (WCC) decided that “any form of segregation based on race, colour or ethnic origin” is contrary the Gospel. The WCC took a clear stand that racism does not only challenge the integrity of the Church but it also violates the wholeness and credibility of the Christian faith. The mandate, which was renewed in 1974, was to be “responsible for working out World Council policies and programmes combatting racism giving expression to solidarity with the racially oppressed, organising action-orientated research projects, assisting the churches in the education of their own members for racial justice, and the operation of the Special Fund to Combat Racism.” In the light of this broad Program of the WCC is it impossible to discuss the nature, origin, manifestations and presence of racism in South Africa in depth in one paper like this. Nor is it possible to find one definition of racism that can capture adequately the personal and structural hurt, alienation and disadvantage caused to victims. I will however start with the nature, manifestations and presence of racism.

The nature, manifestations and presence of racism

In a well-argued contribution titled Racism in Post-apartheid South Africa Nico Koopman, professor in Ethics at the Faculty of Theology at the University of Stellenbosch, maintains that any definition or description of racism must “sufficiently describe the pain and destruction racism causes to so many people and societies.” (Koopman, in Kretzschmar et al 2013:153). He continues by saying that any definition or description runs the risk “of underestimating the magnitude and the mystery of the suffering this evil has had on millions all over the world. Therefore, it is wise that the direct victims of racism play a prominent role in defining racism” (Koopman in Kretzschmar et al, 2013:153). According to Koopman a conceptualization of racism must take the various elements, such as ethnic, religious, political, cultural, biological, educational, economic and social difference into consideration. He concurs with Hans Opschoor and Theo Witvliet, *The Underestimation of Racism* (1983:563), that racism is an “ideology which organizes and regulates the exploitation and dependence of a specific race on the basis of the assumed cultural and/or biological inferiority of the race.” (Koopman in Kretzschmar et al, 2013:155). Koopman argues further that racism is not only a matter of political governance. Ideologies also influence our interpretation of God’s Word, how we think and how we construct our world-view.

The people with more or less the same physical and biological features and attributes and the same cultural affiliation view society in a way which implies that the group to which they belong is superior to other groups and that society must be structured in terms of this perceived superiority and inferiority. One should also not forget that economic power is a tool used to maintain this ideology. When an ideology is perceived to be the genuine interpretation of the characteristics of the Church as *una sancta catholica*, it becomes a pseudo-religion and a “gospel” opposing the very nature of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Racism then becomes a religious and political world view or mind-set that denies the biblical truth that all human beings are created in the image of the God and father of Jesus Christ. (Kretzschmar in Kretzschmar et al, 1998:182).

Racism and the legacies of apartheid

The question whether the adoption of the Constitution and the hearings of the TRC brought an end to all racial disharmony in the Country is answered differently by academics. Jakes Gerwel, the well-known education academic and former rector of the University of

the Western Cape made his views known in an article “National Reconciliation: Holy Grail or Secular Pact” which appeared in *Looking Back, Reaching Forward* (Gerwel in Villa-Vicencio et al, 2000:277). According to Gerwel the South African country was ten years after the starting of negotiations for a new political order a nation in relatively good health. We must avoid, Gerwel argues further, to confuse politics and theology because then we will fail to see “a united South African nationhood”. Gerwel stated emphatically that South Africa is not an unreconciled nation (Gerwel in Villa-Vicencio et al, 2000:279). Beyers-Naude on the other hand, has said: “So much injustices has been inflicted upon so many millions of people over so many decades in so many spheres that part of the terrible material, psychological and spiritual damage which has been inflicted can never be recovered.” (Beyers-Naude in Alberts et al, 1991: 220). It has been argued by academics and ordinary citizens that racial incidents that are currently occurring at schools, universities, on the roads and in other public buildings cannot be attributed to Apartheid. Van der Water is of the opinion that whoever makes such statements in the public media, conferences or newspapers, do so either because of a lack of historical consciousness, or out of extreme naivety, or because they are in a state of perpetual denial about the harsh present and future legacies of the past (Van der Water in Kretzschmar et al, 1998: 141). Villa-Vicencio is even more harsh in his analysis of the immoral situation: “The past will continue to haunt South Africa for years to come” (Villa-Vicencio in Du Toit, 1994:101). That apartheid legacies is well alive, cannot be denied. The levels of racism as an apartheid legacy are still very high. Despite progress in this regard racism between black and white is also still prevalent on both subtle and explicit levels. The history of racism has not been just personal. Racism in the past and up to now is also a system of advantage and not just a matter of social choice. Needless to say, the legal and political system cut people off from other human beings and divided them in schools, universities, other public buildings, and Sunday worship (Koopman in Kretzschmar 2013:156).

The destructive nature of racism

The divisive nature of racism is always the result of a destructive social ethics and of sin as “the failure to worship God as God.” (Niebuhr, 1967:121). The type of faith underlying such racism as natural faith. It is also a national faith that has as purpose the protection of natural interest. This natural faith determines the boundaries between love and hate, between

friend and foe. The selfish heart which is driven by relative values divides people within themselves and from others. The “theology” is directed at self-defensiveness because it becomes a weapon in the struggle for self-defence and hence also for the gods to whom this theology swears allegiance. The society becomes a closed society with relative values such as self-interests, the nation, the cultural group, pleasures, or the glorification of heroes as if they are absolute. Niebuhr claimed that the South African racism provides an example of such a defensive, and therefore divisive and destructive social ethics (Niebuhr, 1963: 124).

Joint URCSA and DRC initiative to address racism

The World Communion of Reformed Churches (WCRC) has called our members to a consultation of what communion means. The consultation took place in Grand Rapids, USA on 4 – 7 February 2014. One of the important issues that hampered communion in and between churches that was raised at the consultation was racism. In consultation with the President of WCRC and members Churches WCRC support was given to start a programme in South Africa to address racism. The Uniting Reformed Church in South Africa (URCSA) and the Dutch Reformed Church (DRC) embarked on a joint research project to address racism constructively in all its forms in Church and in all structures of society through academic, theological and other programmes. The aim is to assist and empower churches to restore people’s human dignity and bring about healing and reconciliation. The two Churches declared that racism on various levels, personal and institutional, is toxic to interpersonal relations and to society. It destroys the core of communion in the church amongst God’s people and in society. Racism operates with the assumption that certain persons or groups of people are superior to others. These assumptions determine our thinking, or attitudes and our actions towards others. Racism prevents people to contribute to one another so that we all may benefit in the fullness of life. Due to the fact that racism perpetuates itself within society if left unchallenged, it cripples society. It scars people. It harms people and society. It destroys people and society. The DRC and the URCSA are convinced that if there is an institutions in society that still have the credibility and also the trust from society to engage in public affairs, then it is the Church as a faith community. There are various reasons why the church should be part of the solution to foster human dignity by addressing racism in a constructive way, namely:

1. In South Africa churches have been directly and indirectly involved in the establishment of racism and racist attitudes and behaviour. Churches provided a theological basis for race discrimination. The churches owe it to themselves and to society to embark on a journey to undo their legacy.
2. The church is witness to the Gospel of Jesus Christ that brought salvation to all humankind. In Christ all is restored in their human dignity.
3. According to the Gospel Christ has broken down the walls that separated people.
4. The church has the ministry of reconciliation
5. The church has the ministry of justice.
6. The church is strategically placed in society by having congregations everywhere and is therefore able to reach people from all walks of life at grassroots level.

I will now turn to Hate Speech.

HATE SPEECH

The transition from apartheid to democracy

The political change of South Africa in 1994 from a racist oligarchy to an open and democratic society, brought about an evolution in almost all the legal arrangements. The final Constitution adopted by the Constitutional Assembly in 1996 brought about a permanent new legal and political order. The Republic of South Africa became one sovereign, democratic state founded on the values of non-racialism ad non-sexism, the rule of law, advancement of human rights and freedoms, human dignity, the achievement of equality (s.1). Parliamentary sovereignty of the British colonial era and the apartheid era, was replaced by constitutional sovereignty. The legal implication hereof is that the Constitution (and not the parliament anymore) is the supreme law of the Republic. The Constitution now reigns supreme, and is the measure against which all other law (e.g. customary law, common law) is tested by the courts (s. 2). The Constitution contains a Bill of Rights that sets out a list of civil, political, and socio-economic rights. The right to freedom of expression is a political right. Hate speech is regulated together with freedom of Speech.

The constitutional framework of hate speech

The history of pre-1994 South Africa is filled with painful incidents and brutal incidents

of the suppression of citizens and the press or other media to speak freely. Before the promulgation of the Interim South African Constitution in 1993, freedom of expression was a residual common law - Roman Dutch - freedom (De Waal, 1998). The right to freedom of speech and the description of hate speech is contained in Section 16 of the Constitution:

Freedom of Speech

16. (1) everyone has the right to freedom of expression, which includes –
 - (a) Freedom of the press and other media;
 - (b) Freedom to receive or impart information or ideas;
 - (c) Freedom of artistic activity;
 - (d) Academic freedom and freedom of scientific research.
- (2) The right in subsection (1) does not extend to –
 - (a) Propaganda for war;
 - (b) Incitement of imminent violence
 - (c) Advocacy of hatred that is based on race, ethnicity, gender or religion, and that Constitutes incitement to cause harm

Like any other constitutional right, the right to freedom of expression is not absolute. It is limited by the rights of others and by the legitimate needs of public society. In the light of South Africa's history of the brutal abuses of human rights, it is recognized that safety, public order, health and democratic values justify the imposition of limitations on the exercise of all fundamental rights (De Vos 2014:347, 347; Erasmus in De Waal et al, 1998:325). Therefore freedom of expression too may be limited by complying with the provisions of the general limitation clause in s.36. (Basson, 1994:50). Section 16(2) cited above is regarded as an internal limitation of the right to freedom of speech and it operates independently of section 36. The scope of the s.16(1) right to freedom of speech is circumscribed by s. 16(2) which means that the right to freedom of expression or speech does not extend to the three actions listed in s. (2)(a) – (c) (Van Basson, 1994:52). Christa Van Wyk, professor in Comparative Law at the University of South Africa, argues that this internal limitation signals a clear message to all citizens and all others living in South Africa that hate speech will not be tolerated (Van Wyk 2002:4). According to her hate speech is of nature degrading, insulting and of low value. Hate speech, which is often regarded as synonymous with expressions of racism

and racial hatred, has also a destabilizing and divisive effect on society. It encourages discrimination between groups which may lead to violence and a breakdown in public order. Hate speech amounts not so much to hostility between individuals, but rather involves groups or the individual's membership of an ethnic, gender, racial, or religious group is involved (Van Wyk 2002). Hate speech can consist of words, songs or any other expression which amount to incitement, encouragement or indoctrination of a group and that may cause harm to the targeted group. Harm such as financial, physical, or emotional harm. Hate speech thus has an impact on the human dignity, self-worth and need for acceptance of the individual or his/her group.

To strengthen the advocacy of hatred from constitutional protection, South Africa has created other measures which can also deal with hate speech. These are:

- The South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) (s. 181(1) (b)).
- The Equality Court.

Section 9(4) of the Constitution provides that “national legislation must be enacted to prevent or prohibit unfair discrimination”. This section 9 authorized to the birth of the Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act (PEPUDA), Act 4 of 2000. The Act established the Equality Courts (which began operating in 2003). A general prohibition on hate speech was enacted in section 10 of this Act (read with section 12) and does place limits on several kinds of speech (De Vos, 2014:545). From the criteria and list of grounds it is clear that the prohibition on hate speech in PEPUDA is more far reaching than the description of hate speech in s. 16(2)(c) of the Constitution. Section 10 provides:

“10. Prohibition of hate speech.—(1) ...No person may publish, propagate, advocate or communicate words based on one or more of the prohibited grounds, against any person, that could reasonably be construed to demonstrate a clear intention to—

- (a) be hurtful;
- (b) be harmful or to incite harm;
- (c) promote or propagate hatred.

The Constitutional treatment of hate speech

It is the genius of law to provide a space in which unheard voices can be heard and responded to; it is our task as lawyers to realise this possibility.

I will deal with two judgments.

South African Jewish Board of Deputies v. Bongani Masuku

An interesting case that was decided by South Africa courts on the issue of hate speech is the matter of Bongani Masuku. He was investigated by the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) for a complaint of hate speech lodged by the South African Jewish Board of Deputies (SAJBD) on March 26, 2009. The SAHRC ruled to uphold the complaint, finding that statements Bongani Masuku had made did amount to hate speech.

Afri-forum and Another v. Malema and Others.

The Equality Court had to consider whether Malema had engaged in hate speech when he sang the song,

'Awudubula (i) bhulu.....

Dubula amabhunu baya raypha

(translated as 'Shoot the Boer/farmer

Shoot the Boers/farmers they are rapists/robbers).

In his interpretation and application of the relevant provisions the honourable Judge Lamont relied on international law and foreign law, the Court's duty to protect minorities and the jurisprudence of Ubuntu. I start with the protection of minorities

The protection of minorities

Judge Lamont states that it must not be forgotten that minority groups are particularly vulnerable. It is precisely the individuals who are members of such minorities who are vulnerable to discriminatory treatment and who in a very special sense must look the Bill of Rights for protection. The Court has a clear duty to the assistance of such affected people.

He continues to rule that minorities are not to be denied the right in community with other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practice their own religion, or to use their own language. Minorities have no legislative or executive powers and are compelled to approach the Court to protect their rights. They are particularly at risk due to the expense involved in such approaches. The fact that they are minorities and experience such difficulties frequently results in them being driven to protect their identity by invoking and enforcing within their group, customs practices and conventions which are believed to be appropriate. In addition, they are fragile in that they are readily assumed by the mass and lose their identity. With reference to the judgment in *Freedom Front v South African Human Rights Commission* judge Lamont argued that a Court which hears a matter must, while balancing the rights in question take into account in the construction of what hate speech is, the fact that it is directed at a minority.

A jurisprudence of Ubuntu

Ubuntu is an concept of African philosophy which has received a wide range of recognition and application in theology. It is described as a sense of belonging, the wholeness of joy, being allowed to be truly human (Mazamisa in Villa-Vicencio et al 1994:210). Ubuntu is also a vital metaphor for the people of South Africa because it calls us, as a dialogical discipleship, into a community structure. Ubuntu fosters dialogue. Therefore it is Ubuntu to love and care for others, to be kindly towards others. To be hospitable. It is Ubuntu to be just and fair, to be compassionate and to help others in distress. It is Ubuntu to be the Church in Africa (Botman in Buchanan et al 1995:169). Ubuntu further designates the authenticity and credibility of the Church. When we hear today a call for an authentic African Church, we are actually calling for an Ubuntu Church; A Church that acts kindly to others; A Church that is homely; A Church that cherishes truth and honesty; A Church that upholds good morals; In short, a Church for others." (Mogoba in Smit, 1997:391).

Reflection on this judgment

In the epilogue to the interim Constitution (Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 200 of 1993) the concept of Ubuntu was recognised. This concept was not repeated in the Final Constitution. This notwithstanding, there are a number of Ubuntu-based judgments. Judge Lamont followed these cases and applied Ubuntu to make his ruling. His description

of Ubuntu is: Ubuntu is a concept which dictates that a high value be placed on the life of a human being; is inextricably linked to the values of and which places a high premium on dignity, compassion, humaneness and respect for humanity of another; dictates good attitudes and shared concern; favours civility and civilised dialogue premised on mutual tolerance. Judge Lamont accordingly found that Mr. Malema had indeed engaged in hate speech. He further ordered that both Mr. Malema and the African National Congress be interdicted and restrained from singing the song known as Dubula Ibhunu at any public or private meeting held or conducted by them. This ruling of judge Lamont confirms a ruling of the Constitutional Court that the state has an obligation to regulate hate speech, since hate speech may pose harm to the constitutionally mandated objective of building a non-racial and non-sexist society based on human dignity and the achievement of equality.

Hate speech usually takes place in the Monday to Saturday daily life. How can the Church impact meaningful on the hate speech, racism, inequality? How and where must we envision, imagine, dream the good society?

PROPHETIC IMAGINATION...DREAMING GOD'S SHALOM

George Hunsberger, ordained minister in the Presbyterian Church (USA) and professor of Missiology at Western Theological Seminary in Holland Michigan, has a provocative Chapter “Missional Vocation: Called and Sent to Represent the Reign of God” in his Missional Church in North America. He is concerned about how the church can be faithful to its missional mandate. According to him it is the Church’s calling to embody the gospel’s “challenging relevance” (Hunsberger in Guder et al, 1998:79). The missional mandate is sometimes perceived as a crisis. He mentions that the Chinese character for signifying the idea of “crisis” combines two other characters, the one for “danger” and the other for “opportunity”. A crisis is made of both. I humbly submit that the Confession of Belhar does not only describe the dangers (injustices) but it also provides opportunities. In Part 3 Belhar confesses clearly:

That God by his life-giving Word and Spirit has conquered the powers of sin and death, and therefore also of irreconciliation and hatred, bitterness and enmity; that God, by His life-giving Word and Spirit will enable His people to live in a new obedience which can open new possibilities of life for society and the world.”

Park Seong-Won, a prominent theologian and ecumenical activist from Korea, gives great attention to this biblical metaphor of “dream and vision” in his struggle for economic justice and care for the environment. He regards John 10:10: “All may have life, and have it in fullness,” as the vision and purpose of Jesus’ coming. The adoption of the Accra Confession and the Confession of Belhar is for him a “recommitment to this dream and vision” of Jesus. Smit too, emphasise the importance of vision and dream in the search for good society declares that this Confession is not just an ordinary dream. (Smit in Cloete et al 1984:68) On the contrary, it calls into memory the biblical dream for a just, caring, and inclusive society. It calls into memory God’s shalom for His people ad the world. The DRMC invites other Christians to journey with them to fulfill this vision, ideal, dream in Church and Society.

When the prophets in the Old Testament challenged the injustices of their times, they did not merely preached the Law of Moses. In poetic and inspiring language they dreamed. They made God’s dream of a new humanity known. With poetic tendencies they imagined envisioned the good society, the Israelite, the good priest, the good judge, the good businessman, the good farmer, etc. Whether we are Catholic, Calvinist, Methodist, Baptist, Lutheran, Anglican or Presbyterian, Orthodox or any other Denomination, the dream is part of our faith. Our founding fathers and mothers could say like Martin Luther King jr.: “I have a dream...” I dare to say that the Korean students who started the worship in Tokyo decades ago whispered to each other like the young Joseph: “Listen to this dream I had” (Gen. 37:5) or “Listen...I had another dream.” (Gen. 37:9). Did this prophecy of Joel maybe became fulfilled in them?

“Afterwards I will pour out my spirit everyone:
Your sons and daughters will proclaim my message;
Your old men will have dreams,
And your young men will see visions. (Joel 2:28)

To dream God’s dream the ecumenical Church however has to see things differently. You first have to see before you can dream! We have to become humble and concerned about others need in order to see things from a totally different perspective (de Gruchy 2000:p.vii). We have to see like God sees. (Exodus 3:7). The global world needs new citizens who can see. Seeing plays a significant part in Karl Barth’s life. And I once again mention

that Karl Bart theology influenced Belhar heavily. He says Christians can look only where they see God looking and try to live with no other purpose than that with which God acts in Jesus Christ (Gods Self-revelation). Smit (2007:368) compares Stanley Hauerwas with Karl Barth on this decisive aspect. Hauerwas puts much emphasis on how we must envision the Just and Inclusive. The secret, he says, is “seeing correctly” or “looking in the right direction” (Smit 2007:368). And when talking about Barth’s ability to influence society, Hauerwas remembers Barth in this way: “As Bart uses it, the language of the Church is itself already an argument just to the extent that his descriptions and redescriptions cannot help but challenge our normal way of seeing the World.” But how do we learn to see in the right direction, differently? In the Worship, in the Liturgy!

A liturgy connected to daily life

The Confession of Belhar connects the Sunday worship to the daily life:

“That we share one faith, have one calling, are of one soul and one mind; have one God and father, are filled with one Spirit, are baptised with one baptism, eat of one bread and drink of one cup, confess one Name, are obedient to one Lord, work with one cause, and share one hope;...that we need one another and buildup one another, admonishing and comforting one another; that we suffer with one another for the sake of righteousness; pray together; together serve God in this world; and together fight against all which may threaten or hinder this unity...

The pray together; one baptism, eat of one bread, drink of one cup, confess one Name. The Confession understands Christianity as a “world-formative Christianity.” (Wolterstorff, 1994:48; 2011:57). The whole service (Sunday liturgy) must be directed at strengthening the faith of the worshippers for their obedient living Monday to Saturday (public liturgy) Worship is thus the liturgy for the liturgy. The bread and cup and prayers are food for the pilgrims for their journey into the world to create that desired good just society....When we have communion with him and one another like the disciples on the road to Emmaus then our eyes open....And then we see! (Bria 1996:45). We have to become holy. The theology of Karl Barth played a great role in the theology of the Belhar Confession. He describes “public worship as the centre of the whole life of the community; as the true act of its up-building.” (Barth, 1958:695). It is in liturgy that the Church becomes what it theologically

is. The four specific elements of liturgy in which the Lord is present according to Barth is included in Belhar namely Baptism, the Lord’s Supper, prayer and confession. There must be a direct link between the Sunday worship and our action in the world. In the liturgy the worshippers must be equipped spiritually and intellectually to do justice, to heal, to respect the human dignity of others, to live a holy life. The relationship of liturgy, holiness and justice is a preoccupation of the Sunday service. God’s justice is a manifestation of his holiness and our justice is a reflection of God’s holiness (Wolterstorff, 1991: 29). The Worship send us into the world to show solidarity with the wounded minorities, the downtrodden, the excluded.

Solidarity

The Confession of Belhar dreams of solidarity in the following manner:

We believe that God has revealed himself as the One who wishes to bring about justice and true peace among men; that in a world full of injustice and enmity He is in a special way the God of the destitute, the poor and the wronged and that He calls his Church to follow Him in this; that He brings justice to the oppressed and gives bread to the hungry; that He frees the prisoner and restores sight to the blind; that He supports the downtrodden, protects the stranger, helps orphans and widows and blocks the path of the ungodly; that for Him pure and undefiled religion is to visit the orphans and the widows in their suffering; that He wishes to teach His people to do what is good and to seek the right;

that the Church must therefore stand by people in any form of suffering and need, which implies, among other things, that the Church must witness against and strive against any form of injustice, so that justice may roll down like waters, and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream; that the Church as the possession of God must stand where He stands, namely against injustice and with the wronged; that in following Christ the Church must witness against all the powerful and privileged who selfishly seek their own interests and thus control and harm others.

Is solidarity possible without prayer? Can we protect the stranger without prayer? A good society, a just and inclusive society is a society that reflects the justice, peace, compas-

sion, friendship, love of the kingdom of God. We can work for the dawn of the kingdom only if we regularly pray in expectation: Let thy kingdom come! This prayer, writes Barth in *The Christian Life*, is the struggle for human righteousness (1981:205). Prayer is a fundamental ethical activity in the battle for renewal. Prayer is the first step in accepting responsibility for the doing of righteousness with the aim to transform our societies to JUST AND INCLUSIVE even if we have to swim, like Barth ever against the stream!

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper was to explore how certain injustices have a negative impact on the establishment of a just and inclusive society in South Africa. The aim was to the various ministries of the Church as caring, liberating, healing, forgiving spaces where people can flourish to their maximum spiritual, economic, social and emotional potential. This relationship between law and theology was also discussed. I ended off with the proposal that the Confession of Belhar can serve as a dream for the ecumenical Church especially because the global context is “a System of Apartheid.” It was also argued that the South African jurisprudence has transformative potential but that it has shortcomings and a partnership with the Church is therefore much needed. I conclude with two statements of law and theology. Our distinguished and learned Chief Judge, the honourable Justice Mogoeng wa Mogoeng makes this meaningful statement (Mogoeng in Coertzen et al 2014:262):

“I believe that we can only become a better people if religion is allowed to influence laws that govern our daily lives – starting with the Constitution. I hope to support this conclusion with particular reference to principles drawn from the Christian faith... The levels of maladministration, crime and corruption... that have permeated all facets of society, price-fixing and fronting included, would in my view be effectively turned around significantly, if religion were to be factored in the law-making process.”

I conclude this paper with a statement of Dirk Smit, world-renowned professor in Systematic Theology, from one of his many thought-provocative articles:

“It is obvious that civil societies, that democratic societies, that good societies, that just societies, need more than constitutions, laws, structures, institutions and systems.

A democratic, good, just society needs good people, responsible citizens of character and virtue, just people who practice justice themselves. A just society needs more than a prophetic, speaking church. It needs a worshipping church, subverting the everyday realities, reminding people, giving people hope, forming people, calling people to responsible and moral life, a life of justice, learning people to practice justice, to accept one another and to live in community, in solidarity, in care of the marginalised and the suffering, to give people their due.” (Smit 2007:391)



Rev. Dr. David Peter Carelse’ s report in Plenary Session

5. Repairers of the Breach

Robina Marie Winbush

Presbyterian Church (USA)

Brief Historical Overview

Race, Religion, and Faith have always been sources of contradictions within Christian communities in the United States of America. The concept of race in North America was closely linked to the European colonial enterprise and the development of white European superiority. This served to justify the genocide of indigenous persons, the enslavement of Africans, and the oppression of persons who were not of White Anglo Saxon Protestant ancestry.

Had the European settlers and enslavers understood Indigenous Persons and Africans as fully human, created by God with divinely given rights that Europeans expected to enjoy, then it may have been more difficult to participate in the holocausts committed against First Nations and enslaved Africans. Had Americans been willing to welcome Asian and Latin American immigrants as their sisters and brothers, rather than a worker class to be exploited, then history might have written a different story.

Initially, it may have been understood that the concepts of racial superiority and inferiority, otherwise known as racism, were to propagate an economic structure that maintained wealth in the hands of a few western European elite. However, it soon became a social structure designed to keep economically disadvantaged whites from developing economic and political allies with enslaved or former enslaved persons of African descent, Indigenous Persons, and exploited Asian and Latin American neighbors. Immigration laws that favored person from European countries and systematically disadvantaged persons from Africa,

Asia/Pacific Islands, the Caribbean, and Latin America, sought reinforced the social and economic structures supported by racism.

The white Christian responses to racism in the United States have always been mixed. White “Christians” developed theologies that justified the genocide of Indigenous Persons and enslavement of Africans. Some white “Christians” evangelized” Native Americans and enslaved African, baptizing and teaching them western doctrines of Christianity that reinforced their inferior social standing. Others white Christians had a very different understanding of the gospel mandate and actively worked to oppose systems of oppression as abolitionists. Many white Christians actively worked the “underground railroad” that gave shelter to enslaved persons seeking their freedom. Many Christian schools were established to educate communities that did not have access to western public education. However, in the case of First Nations, there was the problem of residential schools that sought to destroy language, culture, and the very identity of Native Americans.

Within the United States, historic African American denominations were born that created sacred space for African Americans to claim a theology and spirituality that often helped to counter the racist theologies that were used to maintain the status quo. The “Black Church” and/or Black religiosity often served as sources of inspiration for liberation movements.

Native Americans, Asian/Pacific Islanders, Latino/Hispanic persons that became Christian did not necessarily start their own denominations. However, they often worshipped in congregations where the majority if not all the members were from a similar racial/ethnic identity in communities that were predominantly of similar racial/ethnic backgrounds. Many African Americans were also members of predominantly Eurocentric denominations, however, often worshipped in congregations reflecting their own identity in communities of similar backgrounds. By the middle to late 20th century, we see the emergence of liberation theologies in all racial ethnic communities that has begun to shape both the theological discourse and the activism of the Christians.

Some historically white denominations split in during the U.S. Civil War over the issue of slavery. These denominations have reunited, however the legacy remains and the wounds remain tender. It is notable that many white hate groups in the U.S., claim a Christian identity, and even today, while denominations reject this movement, have been less vocal about call-

ing their own members to account who subscribe to such hate filled ideology.

This is a much too wide sweeping historical overview. However, I wanted to share the historical ambivalence and contradictions within Christianity in the United States. There is not a mono-lithic response and while many Christians and churches have been active in seeking to heal the historic wounds, race continues to remain a church dividing as well as human dividing reality.

Models of churches/Christians struggle to dismantle systematic racism and build just communities

Several denominations have recently in the last 50 years, issued apologies for their role in perpetuating racism in the church and society. The United Methodist Church entered a process of repentance and reconciliation with First Nation/Indigenous Peoples in the U.S.

They also held similar acts of repentance with African Americans who were pushed out of the denomination and formed their own denomination, and African Americans who stayed in the United Methodist Church, even in the midst of segregation.

In addition, the United Church of Christ, along with other denominations have begun the process of refuting the Doctrine of Discovery that has historically been used to justify the subjugation of First Nation peoples.

The Episcopal Church and the Southern Baptist Church have also issued apologies for their roles in supporting systematic racism.

The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) at its General Assembly next summer will commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Confession of 1967 (starting on p. 285 of The Book of Confessions) which addresses racism in society and also prayerfully take final action to include the Confession of Belhar (Confession of Belhar) which addresses racism in the church to its Book of Confession.

Several denominations have racial justice offices and organizations that address directly issues of racism in the church and society. This work may take the form of developing educational materials for congregational use, writing statements, advocacy campaigns to in-

fluence public policy, direct action demonstrations, and working with ecumenical and secular advocacy groups.

Several ecumenical organizations have stated commitments to address racism in society and the church. The National Council of Churches at one time had a Racial Justice Working Group whose membership was intentionally balanced with an equal number of denominational representatives and representatives from grass-roots organizations addressing issues of racial injustice. The grass-roots organizations brought critical issues before the churches and together with denominational representatives developed strategies for addressing the issues and mobilizing church members to become advocates. Unfortunately, this program was dismantled about 15 years ago due to funding constraints. However, it remains an excellent model of effective partnerships. A similar program was in the World Council of Churches. It was the Urban Rural Mission Program. It too has been discontinued.

One of the critical issues in the U.S. is currently around immigration, with particular attention to persons coming to the U.S. from Central America and Mexico. Several denominations have both advocated for just immigration reform and also work with persons being held in detention centers. The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A) developed a film and educational resources to share the stories of those involved in family detention.

Most recently, worldwide attention has been given to the number of unarmed Black women and men who have been killed by law enforcement or while in custody. The Black Lives Matter Movement has emerged as a movement of young adult and youth who actively protest these extrajudicial killings and to demand justice for the victims' families. While many involved in BLM are not necessarily affiliated with churches and churches have not necessarily been as visible in the movement, there have been some very helpful models of intergenerational partnership. During the protest in Ferguson, Missouri, following the shooting of Michael Brown, both local and national clergy and religious leaders marched with BLM and also formed circles of protection around protestors to give witness and support as they confronted law enforcement. <http://blacklivesmatter.com/> It is important to note that while BLM was started by young African American women, it involves people of all backgrounds committed to standing for justice and ending the continuing attacks on Black bodies.

Most recently, the historic Black Methodists Denominations initiated a call for "Liberty

and Justice for All” challenging to the churches to engage the hard work of eradicating racism.

It was a recognition that the churches and young activists must find ways to work together for a common cause.

The Samuel Dewitt Proctor Conference is a national organization of progressive African American religious leaders and their congregations committed to addressing issues of social justice facing the Black community. Through education, advocacy, and investigation they bring to the forefront such issues as Economic Disparities along racial lines, Mass Incarceration of African Americans and Latinos in the prison industrial complex, Voter Empowerment and Education.

The Fellowship of Reconciliation has been existence for 100 years and actively works to pursue justice, peace and nonviolence. While appealing to an earlier generation, their work continues to address the core challenges of racism and marginalization in the U.S.

The Moral Monday Movement began in North Carolina to demand just economic policies and statewide budgets that protect the most vulnerable in society. It addresses the intersection of race and class building a grassroots coalition that crosses several racial ethnic communities. It has found life in several states throughout the U.S.

In addition to these movements, several predominantly white denominations have focused their energies on breaking down barriers between Christians of different racial ethnic ancestries. There has been a focus on building multicultural congregations, supporting intentional anti-racism and anti-bigotry programs, building coalitions between racial ethnic communities experiencing similar treatments, and continuously offering cross-cultural opportunities for relationship building.

Justice as an opening to healing and reconciliation

While most of the models and programs I shared focused on addressing issues of systemic racism and injustice. It is believed that the healing of historic wounds cannot occur apart from addressing the continuing attacks on people’s dignity and life. The challenge remains to help individuals understand their own biases and complicity in maintaining unjust

systems. There is also the challenge for those communities most directly effected by systemic racism to address the internalization of this oppression and productive ways to resist oppression.

Christian churches in the U.S. from the dominant culture continue to struggle with ambivalence about how best to give witness to God’s expectation that we “repairers of the breach” as we pray God’s will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Some churches would like to focus on “reconciliation” and “can we all just get along?” However, racial reconciliation cannot be separated from racial justice. At the same time when communities come together to do the hard work of racial justice, opportunities to unmask wounds and heal historic breaches emerge and new relationships are birthed.



Report of Rev. Winbush in Plenary Session

6. In Pursuit of Peace

Staccato POWELL

African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church

For he himself is our peace, who has made the two one and has destroyed the barrier, the dividing wall of hostility; by abolishing in his flesh the law with its commandments and regulations. His purpose was to create in himself one new man out of the two, thus making peace, and in this one body to reconcile both of them to God through the cross, by which he put to death their hostility. He came and preached peace to you who were far away and peace to those who were near. For through him we both have access to the Father by one Spirit. (Ephesians 2:14-18)

Please permit me a moment of personal privilege to express my deep appreciation to the organizers of this conference and my good friend the Reverend Doctor Robina Winbush, ecumenical officer of the Presbyterian Church United States of America, for this opportunity to stand here as the mouthpiece of God. I am extremely humble and grateful.

On an extremely warm Wednesday as the sun continued to glisten in the early evening sky of the southern city of Charleston, South Carolina a small group of people whose pigmentation was filled with an abundance of melanin were gathered for the weekly study of God's word. When a young twenty one year old Caucasian male entered and sat among them as if he were a fellow believer. Most accounts say the young man was there for about an hour when he rose to his feet and gunfire erupted and interrupted the serenity of the setting.

In the aftermath, the Reverend and Honorable Clementa Pinckney, Cynthia Hurd, The Rev. Sharonda Coleman-Singleton, Tywanza Sanders, Ethel Lance, Susie Jackson, Depayne Middleton Doctor, The Rev. Daniel Simmons, and Myra Thompson, were lying in their own

blood as a result of a hate filled act of violence. "These are they who met the horrors of present-day racism head-on. These are the victims of the horrific mass shooting in the basement of the historic Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church, Charleston, South Carolina — one of the oldest black congregations in the South." This was the meeting place of Denmark Vesey, who as a freed slave organized what would have been the largest slave revolt in American history. Rev. Pinckney, just 41 years old, in the tradition of one of Emanuel AME's founders, Denmark Vesey — Denmark Vesey challenged slavery — and like him, Rev. Pinckney challenged the overt and covert voices and acts of racism that are still too much a part of the fabric our national society in America.

Charleston is not about the perpetrator, whom I will not name. The shootings at Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church are about us, about this culture, about the theologies we embody and practice. So many questions are raised. Why are we enthralled by violence? Why does our daily existence depend on racist structures that are evident to the marginalized but invisible to the powerful? How is it that so many of us engage in the relentless denial of both these realities? How could an individual sit in sacred space of among persons of faith discussing the holy writ and not be convicted to abort such a diabolical deed of destruction. What was wrong with HIM that led him to sit in Bible study and prayer with people, then voice horrific charges against them, and finally to take the lives of nine of those same people who had welcomed him? Perhaps most importantly: why do so many of us practice a willful ignorance of the pain of others?

The burning question for me is "What are people of faith going to do about it?" Are we to be paralyzed by these things? Or are we, as my Bible says, "Able to do more than we can ask or imagine through the power at work within us" and create the world we want?

The slaughter of nine saints in Charleston's Emanuel Church does not allow us to preach answers or sensible explanations. There are none. Make no mistake: we are in the depths. We are stuck there. Shackled to the bedrock by hate. For this is hardly the first time that a murderer chose a so-called sanctuary as the setting for terror. Ask those who knew the four young girls killed and others maimed by white supremacy in Birmingham's 16th Street Baptist Church. The mass shooting at "Mother Emmanuel" in Charleston is a tragedy of unimaginable proportions. There have been at least 6 such shooting incidents in just the past seven

years. They are all part of a storm of violence and hate that has permeated our society – and the church has not been left unscathed. Ask those who witnessed Óscar Romero killed at the altar by assassins from his own government. The forces of hate make their point clearly: we are never safe from evil and violence.

I concur with the Reverend Doctor Wil Gafney, Associate Professor of Hebrew Bible at Brite Divinity School: Fort Worth, Texas who contends: Racism is the original sin of the United States, enshrined in the Declaration of Independence (where Native Americans are called “savage”), the intentional silence on and therefore endorsement of slavery in the Constitution and the valuation of black bodies as 3/5 person. Likewise the history of American Christianity is also soiled with slave-holding denominations, churches, pastors and Christians in every denomination, including those that subsequently changed their position. It is clear that black folk are not perceived as fundamentally equally human, equally children of God in how we are treated in this society and that includes in Christian spaces.

The motive is hate. But let's name it. This hate is not just that of one white man but one nurtured by countless “innocent” stories about a nation’s history, of open frontiers, of “chosen-ness,” of upward mobility. Myths are held deeply, creating identity, excluding identities. White people cling to these myths and when they do not materialize, white rage finds causes and scape-goats Racism is perpetuated by national myths that begin history from a warped perspective. Now this rage has manifested itself blatantly.

Being Black in America is exhausting. Constantly having to navigate the perils of the color line and having to live within a system that repeatedly reminds you of your contested existence is beyond burdensome. And if this reality were not enough, imagine being a black preacher with the dual responsibility of having to speak life to hurting people while you too wrestle with finding meaning in the midst of social misery.

Far too often this has been my dilemma as a preacher of African descent in the United States of America. Yet, in the wake of the racist terroristic mass killing at Emmanuel AME church in Charleston, South Carolina, I find myself in this undesirable sermonic position once again.

This time the message is clear and simple. It is time to pray and pursue peace! Paul’s

admonition to the Church of Ephesus gives insight and instruction in this pursuit. Ephesians stresses that the Christian church has its origins within the history of the one people of God, the people of Israel. All that happened in the Old Testament story was a part of their own story and heritage. God did not make a fresh start with the birth of Christianity. Indeed, Christianity fulfills the story of the Old Testament.

In the text (2:14-18), the author speaks eloquently of the “peace” which God has brought into the world through Christ. The author asserts that Christ, Himself is our peace he has broken down the dividing wall, that is, the hostility between us” (2:14), referring to Gentiles and Jews who are believers in Christ.

The next verse (2:15) is striking in its sweep. In his coming to earth and through his death and resurrection, Christ “has abolished the law with its commandments and ordinances.” On first reading, that sounds astonishingly antinomian. But if one considers the word “law” to mean the Torah and its hundreds of commandments that characterize the Jewish way of life, the statement makes better sense. These commandments had often set up social boundaries between Jews and Gentiles. But Christ has torn down the wall, or boundary, that stands between Jews and Gentiles, creating one new humanity.

We are not told exactly how all are reconciled “through the cross” (2:16), but here the author relies on the common Christian tradition that claims the death of Christ was redemptive. In his death, he assumed the consequences of human sinfulness, and the results are forgiveness of sins and reconciliation to God. The result is peace for all believers and access to the Father.

Allow me to lift up several salient features as we seek calm in the midst of chaos. There are some critical and compelling lessons we must acknowledge:

According to this passage, PEACE IS A PERSON. The peace we must seek and pursue is not an amorphous and esoteric concept. Peace is not a mere vision. Peace is the pristine personification and miraculous manifestation of the prophetic utterance of Isaiah 9:6. The “Prince of Peace” has come and His name is Jesus.

We are now living in one of the most trying times our world has ever faced. There are threats of terrorist activities in our homeland, fears of nuclear war globally, and increasing

challenges of Christians and Christian values. We have sensed such a loss of the feeling of safety and security. Yet, these are also times for Christianity to triumph, and for Christians to bear a bold witness to our Lord, and His saving grace. In Him, we have peace.

It ought to be evident that we cannot find peace in science. There is no peace in technology, for our greatest gadgets fail to provide us any protection. There is no peace in new age philosophies, or humanistic ideology. There is One and only One who can give us peace, and that is Jesus who is the Christ.

He is the Prince of Peace. He holds the world in His hands, and He has unlimited power. In John 14:27, when Jesus was about to leave this earth, and return to His Father, He spoke these words to His disciples: "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid."

We can find peace in our relationship with Him, if we know Him by faith. Our souls are always in unrest until they rest in Jesus. He is our peace. He can give us a calm in the midst of the storms of our life that no other can. He cast out all fear.

The person we know as **PEACE HAS A PURPOSE**. He is intentional. Though it may not be obvious in this moment, ALL things are working together for our good. Those of us who love Him and are called according to His purpose to meet the condition for the fulfillment of this promise.

The purpose of peace is set forth in verse 15 as "His purpose was to create in himself one new humanity out of the two, thus making peace." Reconciliation is the requisite purpose for which the Person of peace has come.

And so the great problem of the human race is, how can we be reconciled to a holy God from whom we are estranged because of our sin and rebellion? And, how can we be reconciled to one another? We need peace between nations in this war-torn world. We need peace in our communities. We need peace in our churches, which are supposed to be models of Christ's love, but often are marked by division and strife. And, we need peace in our immediate and extended families. But, how?

Paul addresses this vital subject in our text. Reconciliation is both vertical and horizontal.

The logical way to deal with the topic would be to start with reconciliation with God and then go on to reconciliation on the human level. Being at peace with God is the foundation for peace with others.

But Paul begins here with peace between formerly alienated people (2:14-15) and then goes to the underlying cause of this reconciliation, namely, reconciliation between those groups and God (2:16-18). Perhaps his heart was burdened with the very real danger of the Jewish and Gentile wings of the church splitting into factions. So he begins with the problem at hand and then goes deeper to the foundational reconciliation with God that results in reconciliation between formerly hostile groups. He is saying, through the cross, Christ reconciled us all to one another and to God.

The incident at Mother Emanuel did not catch God by surprise. We dare not place the blame of this horrific act on a compassionate God. However, those martyred was not in vain. One of the many outcomes of their shed blood was the removal of the Confederate flag from the State Capitol. An emblem of the racial strife and reminder of the lingering, sweltering insidious hatred. Years of protest and boycotts could not bring the flag down. What the enemy meant for evil, God has worked for good. He is intentional!! We know the Person and Purpose of peace, but there is more involved as we pursue peace.

We must embrace **PEACE AS PRACTICAL**. It is common for people to experience various problems involving conflict. Usually they are upset, troubled, discouraged, or angry. They report all the terrible things the other person has done and all the reasons they are justified in being so angry. In most instances they really have two problems. And the one they have not mentioned at all is the one you must start with. Their basic problem is that they do not have any peace themselves. They are upset, angry, and emotionally distraught. And everything they do is colored by that emotional state. And it is impossible to solve the problem until they themselves acquire peace. In order for peace to work it must be practiced.

This is not mere doctrine. If you are having a conflict with anybody, this is the way of peace. True peace is oneness. It is not merely the cessation of hostility, the absence of conflict; it means being one. Anything else is superficial and temporary and highly unsatisfactory. You know this to be true. You have made peace on superficial terms and have found it only external. If you merely agree not to fight, it is not peace. And invariably it results in a new

outbreak, with all the previous animosity surging to the surface once again. This is why what we call peace among nations never lasts--because it is not really peace. It is not oneness at all. It is only a weariness with warfare, an agreement to stop it for until we can all recuperate and retaliate. Then it breaks out all over again, because nothing is ever settled.

But here the apostle tells us the secret of peace. When Christ Jesus makes peace--between individuals or between nations--that peace will be a satisfying, permanent, and genuine peace. What Paul is saying is that in order to live at peace, you must have peace put it into practice. The problem with most of us is that we want to start by clearing up only the results of conflict. God never starts there; He starts with the person. He says peace is a Person, and in order for you to live at peace with someone else, you must be at peace with the Person of Christ. If you have His peace, then you can start solving the conflict around you. But you never can do it on any other basis. So the place to start, the origin of peace, is the settling of any problems between you and Jesus Christ.

But this is the promise of God to Christians: He is our peace. And once their attitude is changed, once their heart is settled, once they have put the matter into the hands of the Lord and they see that He is active in it, that He has a solution, and their own heart is therefore at peace. Then they can begin to understand what is happening and can apply some intelligent remedies to the situation that will work out the problem. Where I am from they declare There is profound psychological insight in the fact that the apostle begins with the declaration that Christ is our peace. He alone can accomplish it.

In the words of the hymnologist Horatio Spafford:

When peace, like a river, attendeth my way,
When sorrows like sea billows roll;
Whatever my lot, Thou hast taught me to say,
It is well, it is well with my soul.
Though Satan should buffet, though trials should come,
Let this blest assurance control,
That Christ hath regarded my helpless estate,

And hath shed His own blood for my soul.
My sin—oh, the bliss of this glorious thought!—
My sin, not in part but the whole,
Is nailed to the cross, and I bear it no more,
Praise the Lord, praise the Lord, O my soul!

For me, be it Christ, be it Christ hence to live:
If Jordan above me shall roll,
No pang shall be mine, for in death as in life
Thou wilt whisper Thy peace to my soul.

But, Lord, 'tis for Thee, for Thy coming we wait,
The sky, not the grave, is our goal;
Oh, trump of the angel! Oh, voice of the Lord!

Blessed hope, blessed rest of my soul!
And Lord, haste the day when the faith shall be sight,
The clouds be rolled back as a scroll;
The trump shall resound, and the Lord shall descend,
Even so, it is well with my so



Rev. Dr. Powell's message in 3rd day's Evening Memorial Service

PART.Ⅲ : Recture

What is the cause of “Hate Speech” and “Hate Crime”?

It is a structural discrimination which has been built through history

Masao Niwa

Lawyer

1. Introduction

Recently, in Shin'okubo, Tokyo and in Tsuruhashi, Osaka, there have been more and more actions by groups using discriminative and anti-foreign assertions, which incite racial hatred and ethnic discrimination among people. In these places, people appear with placards containing discriminative words, such as "Hang yourself, Koreans," "Drink poisons and jump from the top of a building," "Kill all the Koreans, no matter if they are good or bad," or "Put all the Koreans into Gas Chambers." Also, there are some people who take direct harmful actions against the lives and bodies of people. These actions, or "Hate Speech and Hate Crimes" have been promoted by some populations in these areas.

In addition, in front of the Kyoto Korean School, there were three intimidating acts, shouting sentences such as "Kill the Koreans in the shelter," or "Cockroach Koreans, Grub Koreans, Go back to Korea." Kyoto District Court has sentenced that these discriminative actions by anti-foreign groups constitute acts of racial discrimination, and has required a high amount of compensation for damages. The Osaka High Court affirmed the original decision of Kyoto district court and added, "These activities obviously go beyond the limits of what should be protected by the freedom of expression," and this was later upheld at the Supreme Court.

These actions by discriminative anti-foreigners groups, both acts of direct harm against people's lives and bodies, as well as speech that incites racial and ethnic discrimination, have intimidated minority people currently in Japan who have their roots in Korea. At the same time, these movements are violating deeply the personal rights and individual dignity guaranteed by Article 13 of the Constitution of Japan, and also violating the principle of equality under the law, which is written in Article 14. Moreover, these actions trample upon the efforts of people who are working toward peaceful symbiosis with social minorities, including "Zainichi Koreans" (permanent ethnic Korean residents in Japan). The ideal symbiotic society which the constitution pursues is the society in which peaceful life is guaranteed for everyone, no matter where they are from, and in which people recognize and respect each other's identity. These movements which incite racial hatred and ethnic discrimination prevent the construction of multi-ethnic and multicultural symbiosis in our society.

Japan has ratified the International Covenants on Human Rights, which has the second

greatest legal weight, next to the Constitution, within the country. Within its covenants, Article 20, Section 2 states, “Any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence shall be prohibited by law.” In addition, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, also which Japan has ratified, states in Article 2, Section 1 (d), “Each State Party shall prohibit and bring to an end, by all appropriate means, including legislation as required by circumstances, racial discrimination by any persons, group or organization.” Thus, under these international human rights laws and the Constitution, the Japanese nation and society have the responsibility to eliminate movements which could incite an increase of racial hatred and ethnic discrimination.

However, today, 70 years after the war, the Japanese nation and society do not have a legal system which prohibit racial discrimination. What is worse, the prohibition of racial discrimination does not yet exist as a social norm. Furthermore, it is an undeniable fact that we still have discriminative legal and administrative systems, which are based on nationality as a matter of course and legal doctrine, and that hate speeches by public figures and anti-foreign ideology at the grass-roots level still prevails in this society.

2. What is the cause of “Hate Speech and Hate Crime?”

Questions of Japanese responsibility for “invasion and colonization,” which are asked by the world

The Empire of Japan accepted the 13 Articles of the Potsdam Declaration, which officially marked Japan’s defeat in the war. This acceptance of the Potsdam Declaration also marked the first step toward the new, post-war order under the so-called “Peace Constitution.” In this Declaration, the following is clarified: “There must be eliminated for all time the authority and influence of those who have deceived and misled the people of Japan into embarking on world conquest, for we insist that a new order of peace, security and justice will be impossible until irresponsible militarism is driven from the world.” (Article 6) also “The terms of the Cairo Declaration shall be carried out and Japanese sovereignty shall be limited to the islands of Honshu, Hokkaido, Kyushu, Shikoku and such minor islands as we determine.” (Article 8) Related to this, the Cairo Declaration (signed by the United Kingdom, the United States, and China on December 12th, 1943) states, “Paying attention to the en-

slaved status of the Korean people, we confirm our determination to make Korea free and independent,” and therefore Japan accepted international legal responsibility and, by “returning all areas which Japan stole before back to China,” signified that Japan apologized for the 50 years of colonizing history which began Sino-Japanese Peace Treaty in 1895, which carved away Taiwan. Besides, Article 10 declares that “We do not intend that the Japanese shall be enslaved as a race or destroyed as a nation, but stern justice shall be meted out to all war criminals, including those who have visited cruelties upon our prisoners,” and that “The Japanese Government shall remove all obstacles to the revival and strengthening of democratic tendencies among the Japanese people. Freedom of speech, of religion, and of thought, as well as respect for the fundamental human rights shall be established.” Furthermore, regarding war compensation, “Japan shall be permitted to maintain such industries as will sustain her economy and permit the exaction of just reparations in kind, but not those which would enable her to re-arm for war,” which means the post-war economy of Japan would be rebuilt in order to enable war compensation toward the Asian region.

The current situation of Japan’s War Responsibility, Post-War Responsibilities and Responsibility for Colonial Rule

① Incineration of Important Materials related to War Crimes

Article 10 of the Potsdam Declaration promises, “stern justice shall be meted out to all war criminals.” In the two weeks between the surrender of Japan in the war and the start of General MacArthur’s occupation of Japan, the ruling elites who were controlling Japan’s colonizing war incinerated every relevant evidentiary document in order to escape the stern justice toward war criminals. Thus, the after-war period of Japan started with the “annihilation of colonization” and this fact was investigated as a criminal act in the International Military Tribunal for the Far East (Tokyo Trial).

② Tokyo Trials and Nuremberg Trials

In order to pursue responsibilities for colonization and brutalities by German and Japanese leaders, the Allies enacted the London Agreement (August, 1945) and the International Military Court Ordinance. In the Nuremberg trials in Germany (November, 1945 - October 1946) and the Tokyo Trials, which were based on this ordinance, in addition to ordinary “war crimes” (B class), two new categories of crime were instituted under international: 1. “Crimes against Peace” (A class: namely, planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a

war of aggression, or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurances, or participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the foregoing) and 2. “Crimes against Humanity” (C class: namely, murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population, before or during the war; or persecutions on political, racial or religious grounds in execution of or in connection with any crime within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal, whether or not in violation of the domestic law of the country where perpetrated). Criminals were judged under these three categories.

The features of the Tokyo Trials were 1. No questioning of the war responsibilities of the Emperor, 2. Non-adoption of the Crimes against Humanity category, 3. Exclusion of responsibilities over colonization, and 4. Placement of America’s responsibility for the atomic bombings outside of the Trial’s jurisdiction. Furthermore, bacterial infection experiments, human experimentation, or vivisection activities performed by the so-called “Unit 731” were ignored by the Trials, in exchange for the surrender of these records to the United States.

In the trials for B and C class crimes, 5,700 people were convicted and 984 people executed. It is a significant that 148 Koreans and 173 Taiwanese, all who were forcibly conscripted, were convicted as B- and C-class war-criminals, and 23 of these Koreans and 21 of the Taiwanese were executed. These men were entrained as prison guards at the frontiers of the colonizing war and sentenced as war criminals, but on the other hand were excluded (treated as non-Japanese) based on the “nationality clause” of the post-war legal regime, receiving absurd treatment as persons “having committed crimes, but not offering assistance.” The Japanese government has accepted this result of the Tokyo Trials (April 28th in 1952, San Francisco Peace Treaty, Article 11).

③ After-War Compensation

A special feature of Japanese war compensation is that it was effected by “Aid Care Legislation,” such as “Public Officers Pension Act” for soldiers and their families. With the exception of legislation concerning the Atomic bombings, war sacrifice among civilians during the war, including damages by air raids, was excluded from the legal framework for compensation as “something to be tolerated.” In addition, again with the exception of A-bomb-related laws (Atomic Bomb Medical Relief Law, A-bomb Survivors Special Measures Law), people from former colonies were excluded by inserting a “nationality clause.” Sim-

ilarly, civilians who were sacrificed during the war in Okinawa, including by forced mass deaths, military massacres of residents and the snatching of food from civilians, were categorized as “voluntarily war participants (sub-soldiers),” and by applying to them aid care legislation for military war casualties and war dead, were used to distort the reality of the Battle of Okinawa. And finally, “war dead” to whom these “relief laws” were applied were almost automatically enshrined at Yasukuni Shrine, to build up the structure of honouring them as heroes, with even zero-year-old infants among them.

Based on the San Francisco Peace Treaty, Japan paid about ¥1,036,257,000,000 not to individual victims but as a “social profit return,” in, for example, the form of dam constructions. However, almost all of the money was used to pay Japanese industries contracted to build dams, then counted as Official Developmental Assistance (ODA). The Japanese government, in the Japan-South Korean Claims Agreement of 1965, states that the Annexation of Korea was legal and has maintained the claim that its \$500,000,000 donation was economic assistance. In documents of the Ministry of Finance it is summarized that these foreign payments “presented an ideal stepping stone for Japan Japan’s economic re-entry to South-East Asia.”

On the other hand, within Japan, payments guaranteed by “relief laws” are provided to individuals, and the total is estimated to be ¥33,000,000,000,000 from 1952 to 1991, each year paying ¥1,600,000,000,000 out of approximately ¥2,000,000,000,000 to soldiers. Currently the payments are ¥1,000,000,000,000 annually, and the total sum has reached ¥50,000,000,000,000.

In the case of Germany, which was also a “war lost” country, they instituted the “General War Consequences Law” for compensation of civilians in the war, “the Federal War Victims’ Relief Act” “the Prisoners’ of War Relief Act” for the families of victims, and also the “Equalization of Burdens law.” Also, there is a “Federal Compensation Law (1956)” for war victims of the Nazis, which guarantees about ¥9,600,000,000,000 without differentiating nationalities. From the 1980s, they also have guaranteed compensations for “the forgotten victims” (Roma, homosexuals, disabled, forced sterilization victims and communists). Compensation to forced laborers during the Nazis period has been made by establishing, with the participation of industries, a “Reconciliation Fund.” The strong motivation behind these initiatives came from Prime Minister Willy Brandt, who knelt down in front of the victims’ memorial of the Jewish ghetto in Warsaw in December, 1970, which in turn led to an exchange of his-

tory and geography textbooks between Germany and Poland and the elimination of legal prescription in 1979. On May 8th, 1985, on the 40th memorial of the loss of Germany, President Richard von Weizsäcker made a forty-year memorial speech (known in Japan by the title “Areno no 40nen”), in which he stated, “Anyone who closes his eyes to the past is blind to the present. Whoever refuses to remember the inhumanity is prone to new risks of infection.”

By contrast in Japan, on August 15th 1985, Prime minister Nakasone made a speech titled, “Japanese citizens shall leave disgrace behind and advance in search of glory” under the slogan, “Total reassessment of post-war politics.” After this speech, in the same year, he paid an official visit to Yasukuni shrine.

Hollowing Out of the Order established under the Peace Constitution

The primary reasons for the hollowing out of the order established by the peace constitution were the Cold War structure and the Korean War. It was in the Four Nations Foreign Ministers Conference of March 1947 that created the structure of Cold War. In Japan, in February of the same year, the “February 2nd General Strike Termination Order” was issued by GHQ (General Headquarters of the Allied Occupational Forces) and in the United States, in March of the same year, the “Truman Doctrine” was published, implementing the strategy of containment toward the international communist movement from the Soviet Union. By these cold war policies, the occupation’s policy toward Japan shifted to “transformation into an anticommunist base” and “industrialisation of the country” in order to serve the U.S.’ East Asia strategy. The Korean War represented the actualization of the Cold War in the form a hot conflict, and this eventually led to the split and immobilization of the Korean Peninsula into South and North.

The second reason for the hollowing of the peace constitution order was the structure established by the San Francisco Peace Treaty implemented on April 28th 1952. In this Treaty Conference, none of the countries the Soviet Union, Republic of China, People’s Republic of China, Republic of Korea, or Democratic People’s Republic of Korea attended. It was in reality a one-sided peace regime established by the “western powers.” Although Japan regained its sovereignty after the implementation of the San Francisco Peace Treaty, on the same day, by a document from the Chief of the Civil Affairs Bureau (April 19th, in 1952), the Japanese government eliminated the Japanese nationality of people from former colonies,

thus turning former “citizens” into objects of a law and order regime. Simultaneously, Japan signed to the Security Treaty, which gave administrative rights over Okinawa to the United States, and this laid the foundations for the Japan-US Security Treaty. This “1952 system” paved the way for Japan to escape from the deontic logic of the Japanese Constitution, as well as its post-war-responsibilities under the Potsdam Declaration and Cairo Declaration. The hollowing out of Article 9 of the Constitution has been embodied as the National Police Reserve (in 1950), the Police Reserve Force (in 1952), and the Self-Defense Force with three types of troops (in 1954).

The third cause is the Japan-America Security System. The revised Japan-America Peace Treaty, which was signed on January 19th 1960, clarified in Articles 5 and Article 6 the co-operation of Japan and America within the Japanese administrative territory. It allows the United States to have “the use of its land, air and naval forces from facilities and areas in Japan” for the maintenance of “international peace and security in the Far East.” The placement of almost 74 percent of American military bases in Japan on Okinawa soil is based on this Article 6. This 1960 Japan-US Security Treaty remains the only explicit security treaty between the two countries. However, by the revision and agreements forged between the governments with the “Japan-US Guidelines,” the Japan-US security treaty has been transformed into a de facto Japan-US military treaty, and the governments are moving toward military cooperation at the world level.

The current trend of politics under Prime Minister Abe is toward a “Nation that does War.” By implementation of the National Security Guarantee Conference (December 24th, in 2014), enactment of the “Act on the Protection of Specially Designated Secrets (6th December, in 2013), the passage by Cabinet of the National Security Treaty, the New Defense Program Outline and the Mid-Term Defense Program Outline (December 17th in 2013), the cabinet decision of Defense Equipment Relocation Three Principles (April 1st, in 2014), the Cabinet approval of the Right of Collective Self-Defense Exercise (July 1st, in 2014), and finally by the “Japan-US Guideline” agreement, the government of Japan has agreed to “military cooperation without any break from peacetime to emergencies” without any special, geographic or temporal limitation with a purpose of supporting the US military worldwide. The “War Bill” of the Abe cabinet, whose formal title is the “Peace Safety Legislation,” was forced to be approved on September 19th 2015. However, the purpose of these legislations is to realize “support for American military on a global level,” and to eliminate the prevailing historical understanding of “colonization and invasion.” It could possibly be eval-

uated as a type of political coup d'état, which overthrows constitutional democracy.

The Principle of Historical Revisionism and the increase of discriminative and anti-foreign ideology at the grass-roots

① Problems in Textbook Authorization

The movement of historical revisionism at the national level became incarnate, starting from the textbook authorization problem in 1982. Professor Saburo Ienaga initiated a trial against the modification, under the textbook authorization system, of the Nanjing Incident in history textbooks. In 1993, it was judged at the third appeal to be illegal, and on August 29th 1993 the Supreme Court affirmed the “illegality of textbook authorization by the Ministry of Education.”

The 1990s saw the speech in Singapore by Prime Minister Kaifu (1991), and the statement of regret on colonization and invasion by Prime Minister Hosokawa (1993). However, against these speeches made by two Prime Ministers, the Japan War-bereaved Association criticized strongly, insisting that these are masochistic remarks influenced by history of Tokyo trials.

Later, in August 4th 1993, the statement regarding the “comfort women” was issued by Deputy Chief Cabinet Secretary Kono and, on August 15th 1995, Prime Minister Murayama stated that “through its colonial rule and aggression, caused tremendous damage and suffering to the people of many countries, particularly to those of Asian nations.”

② Historical Revisionism

1997 was the year of change in historical revisionism. In addition to “Kono Statement” and “Murayama Statement,” every junior high school textbook for the year 1997 was required to state the facts of “comfort women” issues. This motivated people to organize the “Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform” (Chairman: Kanji Nishio, Vice Chairman: Nobukatsu Fujioka), which criticized the “masochistic historical understanding” of current textbooks. In February, politicians from the Liberal Democratic Party created the “Society of Young Lawmakers for Japanese Future and History Education” (Representative: Shoichi Nakagawa, Secretary: Shinzo Abe, 62 members of the House of Representatives). This association demanded the elimination of statements related to invasion and colonization, including “comfort women” issues from junior high school textbooks. In May, the “National

Conference for Protecting Japan,” which is composed of academics and industry leaders, and the “Society for Protecting Japan,” which is an association of right-wing nationalists with religious affiliations, were combined together to form the “Japanese Conference,” which is the biggest right-wing association in Japan. As a group of Parliament Members, association of “Japanese Conference of Parliament Members” was started. Most members of the current government officials of Prime Minister Abe are also members of “Japanese Conference of Parliament Members,” so it could be said that the current government itself is based on “historical revisionism.” The core philosophy of this “Japanese Conference” is to revive the old Japanese empire before the war, including the historical understanding of war soldiers as heroes at the Yasukuni shrine.

The core philosophy of historical revisionism is as follows: The “Asia-Pacific War was for empowering Asian countries and its purpose was only for self-protection and existence as a nation,” “The Annexation of Korea Treaty was legal and colonization was a humanistic approach for the good,” “There was no Nanjing Massacre,” “The mass suicide in Okinawa was not under the order of government,” “The Tokyo Trials were judged illegally by war victorious nations,” “The Japanese Constitution was a product which was forced upon Japan by the GHQ,” “There was no forced movement of Chinese and Koreans from their own country to Japan,” “All compensations toward other Asian countries have been made, completely and thoroughly,” and “Let’s take back the honor of the Japanese nation and Japanese people.”

These claims of the historical revisionism movement represent not only the core principles of the current government of Prime Minister Abe, but also are the expressions of local discriminative and anti-foreign ideology, forming a part of the “hate-speech and hate-crimes” of right-wing groups.

③ Zaitoku-kai

In the media, conservative magazines such as “Shokun” or “Seiron” have influenced other media such as the Sankei newspaper, Yomiuri newspaper and other anti-Korean publications, resulting in the series of attacks upon reports about the “comfort women issues” in the Asahi newspaper.

Especially the “Zaitoku-kai” (Citizen Group That Will Not Forgive Special Privileges for Koreans in Japan), which first united under the first government of Prime Minister Abe

in January, 2007, have been working together with so called “Net-Uyoku” (Net Right-wing) people, promoting racist movement by discriminative and anti-foreign demonstrations. (Net-Right-Wing is a common term in Japan, referring to right-leaning individuals and groups that use the internet as a platform for hate speech, and occasionally as a means to mobilize assemblies.) A series of shooting incident in Kyoto at a Korean Primary school, which happen on three days in December 2009 and January and March in 2010, led to a guilty verdict in a criminal trial, court recognition of racial discrimination, a ¥12,000,000 as a compensation for the loss, and the prohibition of discriminative activities within a 200-meter radius, in a civil trial. Their extreme right wing discriminative and anti-foreign ideological activities have become more and more evident since January 2013. These activities have even extended to explicit threats of wiping out Koreans in Japan, who presence here is the result of the history of Japanese society.

Some of the features of “Zaitoku-kai” are; agitations toward murder and harm of life and body, attacks toward social minorities, discriminative statements by public figures, unification with statements related to historical revisionism, argument for the exclusion of Korean schools from the national law providing free high school fee and elimination of government economic support toward Korean schools, and negation of education for ethnic minority children.

The essence of the realities of “hate speech and hate crimes” is that these acts harm the universal dignities and human rights recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and trample upon the rights of every human to live in peace. These acts cause psychological damages such as continuous feelings of hatred, loss of confidence, self-hatred and PTSD, and murderer of the soul. They produce multi-layered victimization among victims and in society, by reinforcing a particular “mind map,” causing one to losing the place where one can gather comfortably, enforcing a silencing effect, marginalizing suffering and making it invisible, violating human dignity, destroying the co-existence of diverse ethnicities and cultures, changing society into a discriminative and anti-foreign society, spreading hatred in society, thus forming a part of the “expanding chain of violence and menace and leading toward genocide and war. Most importantly, and more essentially, “hate speech” and “hate crimes” are the products of structural discrimination, which was manifested through the history of colonization, slavery system and societal hierarchy.

④ Constitutional Reform and Historical Revisionism are two sides of the same coin

Recently the Abe government is moving toward demolition of the order that has been upheld by the peace constitution, calling it a “departure from the post-war regime,” or the “progressive peace doctrine,” or “reform without sanctuary.”

⑤ Revising Constitution

On April 27th 2012, the Liberal Democratic Party agreed to the “amendment plan of the Japanese Constitution.” The national and societal system that is the goal of the current Liberal Democratic Party is expressed in the doctrine of demolition of constitutionalism (standardization of governmental orders over civilians), the establishment of nation based on sovereign right (nation with sovereign power over civilians), Japan as a nation of the Emperor (making the Emperor the head of state), Nation building for wars (National Defense Army and exercise of the right of collective self-defence), limitation of basic human rights based on considerations of “public benefit and public order,” gender discrimination based on revivalist patriarchal management of families, elimination of welfare, legal limitation toward labor rights public-sector laborers, and fossilization of popular sovereignty by the easing of conditions for constitutional reform required under Article 96 of the Constitution.

⑥ Murayama Statement, Kono Statement and Revision of History

On August 15th 1995, the so-called Murayama statement “On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the war’s end” was published. The core concept in Murayama’s statement was, “during a certain period in the not too distant past, Japan, following a mistaken national policy, advanced along the road to war, only to ensure the Japanese people in a fearful crisis,” and, “through its colonial rule and aggression, caused tremendous damage and suffering to the people of many countries, particularly to those of Asian nations. In the hope that no such mistakes will be repeated in the future, I regard, in a spirit of humanity, these irrefutable facts of history, and express here once again my feelings of deep remorse and state my heartfelt apology.” In addition to this statement, on August 4th 1993, the statement of Chief Cabinet Secretary Kono regarding the result of an investigation into the comfort women issue (in which he acknowledged that “The then Japanese military was, directly or indirectly, involved in the establishment and management of the comfort stations,” that “They [comfort women] lived in misery at comfort stations under a coercive atmosphere,” that “in many cases they were recruited against their own will, through coaxing, coercion, etc.” and expressed heartfelt apology and regret), has been the basis for constructing peaceful relations

with other Asian nations including China. Moreover, the Murayama statement has been handed down through successive cabinets and has been explicitly quoted in the Japan-Korea Partnership Statement (October 1998) and Japan-South Korea Joint Declaration (September 2002).

However, Prime Minister Abe established the “21st century Structure Conference” as a private advisory group with the purpose of reconsidering the Murayama statement, and this year, on August 14th, he published an “Abe Statement” which made responsibility for invasion and colonization extremely ambiguous. The action toward reconstruction of Japan as a “nation for war” and historical revisionism by the Abe Cabinet can also be observed in his public worship visit to Yasukuni shrine on December 26th 2013.

⑦ Movement toward Nationalistic Education to Promote War

One of the crucial policies by the Abe Cabinet is the promotion of nationalistic education. During the first Abe Cabinet, in December 2006, his government modified the Fundamental Law of Education, which was initially implemented in 1947, stating, “respecting cultures and traditions, we love our nations and our homeland.” Besides this, they modified educational administration and created a way for nation and government to influence educational contents. Furthermore, national safety treaty strategy now mentions “nationalistic education as a social basis of national security assurance” and “national security assurance” and “nationalistic education” are intended to be combined. In the field of education, the Abe government made it compulsory for teachers and pupils to follow national orders regarding flag raising (Hinomaru) and singing of the national anthem (Kimigayo).

In 2014, in terms of the strategy of the Liberal Democratic Party, it aims at accepting textbooks with historical revisionism, as well as establishing “nation-selected textbooks” for schools, explaining that “in compulsory education, in order for children to be able to have pride in Japanese history and traditional culture without being influenced by masochistic historical understanding, we will take necessary measures concerning decisions over publishing, editing and adopting of textbooks, and we will actively publicize every procedure.”

⑧ The Policy of Abenomics as a Neo-Liberal Economic Policy

In addition, the Abe Cabinet has promoted global economic capital and economic policy prioritizing large enterprises, which is widening the gap between the rich and the poor by

naming it a destruction of “hard-rock regulations,” or regulatory reform without exception, and touting this developmental strategy as a means to making Japan “the best country in the world for companies to succeed.” The main features of the Abe Cabinet’s general revision of the post-war labor law system (such as the Labor Standards Act of 1947) are; 1. attempts to deregulate basic labor rules by means of identifying areas of national strategic interest, 2. with regard to restrictions on firing, legalization of monetary solution and the freedom to fire, 3. with regard to direct hiring and permanent employment, promotion of indirect and fixed-term employment, and making permanent the labor dispatch law, 4. establishment of a “high level professional policy,” which intends to eliminate overtime pay for labor outside working hours. Moreover, by naming these changes a shift “from fixed employment type to mobile labor type,” they intend to classify and divide the labor system such that it will create a pyramid-type environment of employment which divides workers into “non-limited-employee,” “limited-employee,” “non-official employee,” “foreign skilled employee” and “immigrant workers.” This reform result in poor social conditions including long-working hours, deaths due to long labor, increase of depression and an increase of disposable workers. As a result, a generation of “poor” young people might increase the number of people who want to work in “self defense army,” leading Japan to become what we might call an “economic conscription system.” Furthermore, what they call “utilization of women” promotes an increase in female unofficial workers in workplaces, as well increased use of foreign probationary skilled labor, who some call “modern slavery workers” in industries.

Finally, through the promotion of a unified economy of military and industry featuring exports of atomic power plants and weapons, they seem to aim at “nuclear armament” in the near future.

3. What should we do? – Responsibility and cooperation for the future

The change in Article 9 of the Constitution, the institution of war policy, and reconsideration of Japan America-guidelines are steps toward becoming a “nation for war.” This means the elimination of historical accounting, which includes facing the responsibilities of colonization, war, and post-war relations. These are the very factors which cause “Hate-Speech” and “Hate-Crimes.” It has never before been so important as it is now to examine the quality of genuine cooperation with Asian people and to engage in cooperative activities

with them.

Currently in Japan, there are two ways forward; whether to move toward “nation for war,” or not. It is a question whether or not to break this trend, to learn our history of “colonization and invasion” and make efforts toward a multi-ethnic or multi-cultural society of co-existence. It is now that we must create a “chain of cooperation” in which workers, people, civilians are all connected beyond our nationalities, based on the common frameworks of “no-war,” “no killing and no being killed,” “no discriminative nor anti-foreign ideology,” “no historical revisionism.”

With our current government, which has many historical revisionists among its core members, in today’s climate where “hate speech and hate crimes” spread locally by way of discriminative and anti-foreign attitudes among grass-root society, there is an urgent need for reform of social understanding toward “multi-ethnic and multi-cultural co-existing society” and for the establishment of human rights laws, such as a racial discrimination prohibition law. In order to do so, we need to deepen our understandings of Japan’s history as an aggressor, and to build exchanges and cooperation among international citizens based on human dignity and equitable society. These are the only ways for Japanese citizens to gain true trust from Asian people, Koreans in Japan, and Okinawan people. Finally, we need to reflect on the issues of “comfort women,” “forced-labor,” the “Nanjing Massacre,” “Hiroshima-Nagasaki” and the “reality of the Battle of Okinawa” in our history and reconstruct the historical facts, including those of “invasion and colonization” and “loss in the war.”

1. Why did Japan and Japanese citizens commit these aggressive historical crimes?
And what were the causes and backgrounds for them?
2. What are the causes of current “hate speeches and hate crimes”? How can we eliminate discriminative and anti-foreign ideology?

Even after the Cold War at global level, in north east Asia there is still a division of the Korean peninsula and a militaristic situation. Japan has accepted the Potsdam Declaration and thereby accepted responsibility under international law and expressed “determination to make Korea free and independent, noticing the slavery situations of Korean people.” However, Japan in the post-War period has assisted the division of Korea and the ossification of the situation in the peninsula by the Japan-America Security Arrangement System, and she has failed to even achieve even the normalization of relations with North Korea. More-

over, Japan continues to implement colonial discrimination and assimilation policy toward Koreans in Japan and their children without providing them ethnic education rights or local suffrage. We citizens of Japan need to realize equal and non discriminative rights for Koreans in Japan, including citizen’s rights and ethnic education rights, and we need to move toward a solution of division of Korean peninsula.

In order to realize the “Nuclear Weapon Free Zone Declaration of Korean Peninsula,” which was published between North and South Korean governments in 1992, Japan, North Korea, and South Korea should sign a “North East Asia Nuclear Weapon Free Zone Treaty” and make joint efforts toward realization of a “situation without nuclear weapons and a structure of peace.”

Most importantly, deeper understanding of our aggressor history, upholding the Peace Constitution as a promise of renunciation of war, and the establishment of laws to control racial discrimination are urgent subjects for elimination of discrimination as well as for the creation of a society of multi-racial, multi-cultural, co-existence.

●Translator : Madoka Hammine



Keynote Address from Mr. Niwa

PART.IV : Bible Study

Hospitality and Shalom That Transcend Animosity:

Pilgrim Abraham, Jeremiah and the Babylonian captivity, and the path of Jesus

KIM Sungjae

The Korean Christian Church in Japan

I. Sojourner (*ger*), hostility, and hospitality as our themes

While drifting along the flood of information, wealth, and people, we live in the age of fear for hatreds toward different ethnicities and religions. In this situation, what are faithful Christian churches doing, or attempting to do? Can we assert that “we are not involved in this” in the face of God’s final Judgment? We, who live in the 21st century, have to search for the way to fight off the evil and to evangelize the possibility of coexistence. In this international conference, KCCJ, the direct proposer of the conference, has the responsibility to confront the reality of hate-speech toward our fellows zainichi-Koreans, to identify the truth, and to shed theological lights on the search of missionary means that enable to overcome these issues as a church dispatched to the world. As the basis of these missions, we are trying to initiate a Biblical observation about hatred.

Let us observe three concepts in this Biblical studies; “hatred (or animosity),” “immigrants,” and “hospitality.” How are these three related to one another? “Hatred” we will discuss today specifically refers to that as a social violence, such as discrimination toward minority, rather than to daily emotional conflicts among individuals. We will thus focus on the concept of “sojourners” in the Old Testament as a highly useful Biblical concept.

II. Sojourner (*ger*) in the Old Testament

In the Old Testament, the concept of *ger* appears over 170 times, including its verb. The concept is divided broadly into two types. The first is *ger* in the community of Israelites. This mainly refers to the “foreigners who are accepted and ought to be protected” by the community, although distinguished from Israelites. The second type refers to specific significant characters in the Old Testament, such as Abraham and Moses, and Israel per se.

When we regard the concept of *ger* as a theological theme, we should analyze it not only by mere division into two categories, but also by seeing how those two types are deeply theologically connected, and how the concept gives meanings to the understanding of God and Israelites, and the covenant relationship between God and Israelites.

A. *Ger* in the Old Testament

In the Old Testament, <*ger/gerim*> appears 92 times, and its verb <*gwr* (=temporarily reside, stay)> appears 81times. Those can be divided by the contents into two types as below:

(1) ‘ger’ within the Israelite community

<a> ‘ger’ as subject of protection

 ‘ger’ as subject of inclusion to the Israelite community

(2) Israel as ‘ger’

<a> ‘ger’ as charismatic ancestors, leaders, and prophets

- patriarchs: Abraham, Lot, Isaac, and Jacob

- Moses

- *ger* as prophets (Elijah)

 Israel as ‘ger’

- Israelites

- Levites and their descendants

- poets

Ger; when analyzed sociologically, referred to agricultural workers who had to migrate, either in short or long terms, from one community to another because of the loss of land ownership or economic deficiency, and refugees that sought protection from natural disasters and political conflicts. The concept is occasionally used in Genesis for Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who spent nomadic lives. *Ger* in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy often points to the minority immigrants that must be accepted, protected, and equally treated by the Israelite community.

B. *Ger* in the history of ancient Isreal: the age of innovation by Hezekiah (the latter 8th century BCE)

Archaeological evidences show that a huge number of refugees from northern Samaria avalanched into Jerusalem and thus its population exploded from previous 8,000 to 25,000, and that the western wall of Jerusalem was reconstructed in order to expand residential space. These are the backgrounds for the legislations related to impartial treatments of the immigrants.

The Hezekian regime, in the late 8th century BCE, required a theological reason to accept those inrushing people. From the northern wall of Jerusalem, numbers of refugees, whose villages and homes were demolished by Assyrians, surged in, escaping from Judaea and its periphery. It was not easy for Jerusalem with small space and few resources to accept

those refugees. There would naturally be strong oppositions for refugee-acceptance. Hezekian regime was between two fires.

On the other hand, from the north came not only the refugees, but also records of prophets who lived in northern Israel around 9th~8th century BCE, such as Elijah, Elisha, Amos, and Hosea, and records of traditional social law and culti in northern Israeli society. These records were brought into Jerusalem by the hands of regional priests, Levites, and groups of prophets' pupils, who have advanced southward with the refugees. Because of this, all the lore that had been discrete since the division of Israel to south and north were gathered under biblical secretaries under Hezekiah. It was, for sure, the time of political, economic, and social crisis, but it was also a Renaissance of biblical texts. Concretely speaking, the original form of texts from Genesis to Numbers, which had existed prior to the Babylonian captivity, and culti and social laws that appear in Deuteronomy were filed under Hezekian administration.

In this regard, *ger*, that is ought to be socially protected upon God's request, was the tradition and the concept enabling theological justification for consequential acceptance of refugees in Jerusalem. The typical script that urges protection of *ger* was the “book of covenant” (Exodus 20:22 - 23:33), which held great significance for Hezekian administration.

“Do not mistreat or oppress a foreigner, for you were foreigners in Egypt.” (Ex. 22:21, NIV)

“Do not oppress a foreigner, you yourselves know how it feels to be foreigners, because you wer foreigners in Egypt.” (Ex. 23:9, NIV)

These two passages of ‘*ger* protection’ have philological significance as well, for the lore of humanitarian law intending the poor, orphans, and widows as recipients of protection are written between these two passages. This comprehensive human rights law for the sake of the socially deprived became the basis of legal tradition for protection and inclusion of *ger* and vulnerable groups, which developed comprehensively and synthetically in ceremonial laws and social laws in Deuteronomy.

III. The Problems of Sojourners, Hostility, and Hospitality

A. GR as common etymology in ancient Middle and Near Eastern languages

Let us consider the origin of Hebrew word *ger* which means “sojourner.” The etymology of *ger* is the verb *gwr*, meaning “to sojourn, abide, or immigrate.” However, when we observe *GR* included in terms *ger / gwr*, we find interesting facts.

The Hebrew verb *gwr* is used for three meanings in the Old Testament; 1) “to sojourn and to abide,” 2) “to stir up strife and to quarrel,” and 3) “to be afraid of, or to stand in awe.” The meaning most frequently used as is “to sojourn.” Especially, we never see, in any translation, the term used as to mean “to fight” or “to fear” in scenes where *ger* (sojourner/s) appear.

However, when we observe the common origin of *GR* in ancient Near/Middle East, for instance, Akkadian verb *geru* (to be hostile or to start a lawsuit), *gurru* (to open up hostilities, to make war, to start a lawsuit), or noun *geru/garu* (enemy, foe, or adversary). The characteristic of Akkadian language is that *ger* did not refer to “sojourner” or “to sojourn” in its origin.

In Ugaritic, verb is *wgr:nn* (to attack/to survive, to surround, to tarry, or to take possession of) and noun is “*gr* (resident alien),” as it is in Hebrew.

Moreover, later Aramaic *gwr*, Phoenician *gr*, Arabic *gara*, southern Arabic *gr*, and finally, Ethiopian *gor/tagawara/gē yur* commonly mean “to sojourn, to abide, and guests.”

The focal point here is the fact that the common derivation *GR* straddles multiple meanings from “to sojourn,” “to be hostile/to fight,” and to “possess fear.” In other words, although “sojourner,” “hostility,” and “fear” do not appear, in the Old Testament, with explicit connections to each other, the social-linguistic relation between these three concepts is undeniable.

B. Linguistics of “sojourner,” “hostility,” and “hospitality” - clues from E. Benvenist and J. Derida –

Benvenist provides interesting observation of the term “guest” in Latin language. In Latin, there are two words which mean “guest”; *hostis* and *hospes*. These two connect, and

become *hosti-pet-s*. In fact, the English word “hospitality” originates in this compound Latin word. Moreover, what is worth noting is that *hospes*, *pet*, and *pot-* mean “host.” Thus, *hospes* has dual meaning of “guest” and “host.” Additionally, *hosti-* means “hostility,” “hostile,” and “enemy,” and thus the English words “hostility/hostile” originate in this Latin word. In Latin, “guest/sojourner,” “hostility,” and “hospitality” are connected in terms of their fundamental linguistic structures. Therefore, this reflects the socio-historical norm that favorable guests and sojourners are welcomed by hosts, and those unfavorable are recognized as enemies and excluded.

A notable thinker Derida philosophically analyzed the issue of “sojourner,” “hostility,” and “hospitality” by using Benvenist’s reference noted above. In other words, Derida was concerned about where the dichotomous relations between “hostility” and “hospitality” led us to. Derida argued that once the socio-politically strong welcome only the selected, favorable guests among the socially weak such as sojourners, “hospitality” loses its essential meaning.

“Hospitality must wait and not wait,”

“The awaited *hote* (thus invited, anticipated, there where everything is ready to receive him) is not *hote*”

Derida critically argues that human society has constructed and implemented a tradition or a system of conditional hospitality, but the justice of hospitality presents an unconditional and unlimited justice to our faces. Confronted by this challenge, a host becomes a hostage of this questioning, and on the contrary, the guest who was invited by the host becomes the “master of the host” because of this questioning. Derida called this as the “law of hospitality.”

In sum, what Derida signifies is that the present situation of human society, which the hosts, or the strong, select and sequence the others based on whether they are beneficial to the society or not, is challenged by the tension between the justice of conditional of hospitality intrinsic in our law and the justice of unconditional hospitality, and the awakening to the true, unconditional justice. Thus, by the awareness of unconditional hospitality, a way for severing the chain of internal hostility can be discovered.

IV. Blessing and Curse as God's Promise to Abraham

Journey of Abraham, blessed by God, begins in Genesis chapter 12. However, if described more accurately, the story of Abraham and his family as *ger* (sojourners/outsiders) living in Harran begins from Gen 11:27. When we consider the fact that Abraham's birthplace, Ur, by the Euphrates, is the same area as the Plain of Shinar, where the Tower of Babel, whose story appears in Gen 11:1~9, was constructed, we discover an interesting thing. When we compare and observe the old stories of "the Tower of Babel" and "Blessing of Abraham," excluding Gen 11:10~26 which is considered to be inserted as priestly documents later than the Babylonian Captivity, we can find two interesting contrasts.

First, people of Babel attempted to gain fame by constructing a tower that reaches heaven. It was exactly an idolization of their names upon power and wealth, and one can find the origin of political mythologies, such as emperor system, built on imperialistic nationalism. This was eventually demolished by God. On the other hand, Abraham, immigrated to Harran at the north of Euphrates as *ger*, was recognized by God, received a promise of God's blessing by solely God's reasons, and was encouraged that his name will be spread by God's work. God shed light on an outsider, *ger*, who was living in the dark corner of the society and called him for His purpose. God uses the socially weak for His superior purpose, by casting His affectionate eyes on them. Abraham was, in this way, sent to Canaan from Harran, with God's mission, and used by God as His blessing for the local peoples.

Secondly, while the story of the Tower of Babel ends with scatter of people, dismantling of human communality, and formation of groups of different languages.

However, Abraham and his family's journey begins from that point; he was sent for God's mission from his domicile Harran to Canaan, the land he would encounter with distinct people. If we transcend the problem of time difference produced by insertion of genealogical table (Gen 11:10-26), we can understand that Abraham and his family departed from the catastrophic reality, which the aim of human beings to construct a tower and reach God had failed, and the communality of power and wealth had dissolved.

What did God provide Abraham when He called and sent him to Canaan? The answer is densely written in Gen 12:2. The passage says that God would make Abraham "into a great nation," would "bless" him, and would make his "name great," but these are understood

as mere concomitants of God's real purpose which is to be realized by sending Abraham to Canaan as *ger* once again.

Then, what was the actual purpose? The true purpose was to make Abraham a "blessing" among the people in Canaan. What does it mean that Abraham himself becoming a blessing for the people? Let us think about this by once again referring to the three relating meanings of *GR* ("to sojourn," "to fight," and "to fear"), the dual meaning of Latin words *hostis*, *hos-pes*, and *hosti-pet-s* ("host" vs. "guest or sojourner" / "hospitality" vs. "hostility"). Seen from these perspectives, Abraham was ought to become a sojourner (*ger*) or an outsider that evokes hospitality of local people at the land where he was sent to by God. Therefore, it can be said that this is not only about God's blessing for Abraham, but also God's fight against this world's hostility. In order to conquer hostility with hospitality, God has chosen and used Abraham who was banished from Ur, where the ambition of Tower of Babel had failed, and was staying in Harran as an outsider, a stranger, or a sojourner.

In verse 3, God told Abraham, "I will bless those who bless you, and whoever curses you I will curse." I think these God's words represented His prediction that Abraham was entering a world where it was uncertain whether he would be either welcomed with hospitality or faced with hostility. Moreover, Abraham had a mission to evoke blessing (hospitality), but God dominated the mean of retaliation, which is curse, or hostility. Thus, sojourner Abraham was imposed a mission to bring blessings to the people by educating or evoking hospitality from the world occupied with hostility. Although the majority of the society were the people as "hosts" with overwhelming power, the weakness of *ger* possessed an ability to reduce local people's fear as the origin of hostility and to induce hospitality out of them. God gave over this paradoxical ability to Abraham.

However, the Bible indicates in the story of Abraham the extreme toughness of actually educating hospitality out of local people at the land where he reached. Abraham, who tried to escape from famine in Canaan, disguised his wife Sarah as his sister and entered Egypt. That was because Abraham feared that, if an influential person asked for Sarah as an exchange for the hospitality to Abraham, her being Abraham's wife would be lethal. This was the sorrow of sojourners, and women, in this case Sarah, had to undertake the final responsibility of this problem. It was God Himself who rescued Sarah, who always remained silent and was deprived of the right of self-determination in the face of men's decisions, from the

predicament at Pharaoh's bed chamber. Here, we can see the evidence that God realized the promise that "whoever curses you (Abraham) I (God) (would) curse," as well as the proof of danger and difficulty of evoking hospitality at a new land.

In Genesis chapter 26, the story of Isaac who abided at Philistine depicts the issue of hostility and hospitality in an ideal form. After Abraham's age, Isaac followed what his father did in the face of famine and tried to evacuate to Egypt, but God stopped Isaac from doing so and ordered him to "stay" (Gen 26:2~3) in Philistine. Although Isaac moved from his original residence because the locals begrimed his success, he obeyed God's order and continued living in Philistine, by a water well his father Abraham had dug. However, when Isaac recovered the well which had been demolished by the locals and was about to restart a new life, again he was accused falsely. Isaac named the well "Esek (dispute)," and moved to another well. However, the same thing reoccurred, and Isaac named the well "Sitnah (animosity)." When he moved again and dug another well there were no quarrels anymore, so he named it "Rehoboth (enough room)." After that, the local king Abimelech came to visit Isaac, saying "We saw clearly that Lord was with you..." (Gen 26:28). Isaac and Abimelech made a contract and held a feast. We can confirm this account of Isaac thoroughly following God's order and reaching the well of Rehoboth as an example of transformation of hostility into hospitality by the existence of a sojourner.

We can see, in this story, God's victory over the battle of transforming hostility into hospitality by choosing and using a sojourner for His purpose. Isaac never retaliated by violence against the reality of hatred and animosity, which was symbolized by "Esec" and "Sitnah" against Isaac. What gave Isaac a sustained power to fight through the oppression and carry on the journey to the well of Rehoboth was, as written in Gen 26:23~25, the spiritual service at his tent where he could keep on listening to God's blessing words. Isaac and Abraham's tent as a spiritual space for communicating with God was indispensable for sojourners to sustain their hopes, despite the hostility they faced, and for Isaac and Abraham to obey the words of God who was fighting against hostility for the sake of hospitality and peace. The spiritual space for tent service possessed the significant meaning in terms of transforming "fear, anger, and retaliation" that might have emerged within sojourners into hope for peaceful coexistence.

The well of Rehoboth, where Isaac finally reached after continuously resisting the op-

pression and animosity by local people, does not merely mean spatial largeness. The original form of noun "Rehoboth," *rachab* (broad or wide), is translated as "free" in Psalm 25:17 as the following.

"The troubles of my heart has multiplied; free me from my anguish." (Psalm 25:17, NIV)

What has happened in the process of the shift from "Esek (dispute)" and "Sitnah (animosity)" to "Rehoboth (wide, liberation)"? At least, it means that hatred and hostility were transformed into hospitality. What did Isaac do for this transformation? Facts we can learn from the Bible are 1) Isaac obeyed God's words and stayed at Philistine, 2) he did not get revenge, 3) he kept digging wells, and 4) he held tent services. What did Abimelech, who was the host had been hostile against sojourner Isaac, do? Even though with conditions, he initially welcomed Isaac. However, as Isaac succeeded at the land, Abimelech began to envy him and this relationship collapsed. Then, as Isaac kept digging the well, Abimelech changed his attitude and hospitality emerged. While previously expelling Isaac, Abimelech told him that he came back to him because he "saw clearly that God was with" Isaac (Gen 26:28). Thus, host Abimelech experienced the existence of God through sojourner Isaac. This means, if I cite Derida's expression, that the host became a guest invited to a horizon of unconditional hospitality through the existence of the guest/sojourner.

Isaac must not have known what was happening in the process. However, exactly because of this, Isaac kept his faith in God's promise of blessing. Isaac kept digging wells at the destined land as a faithful sojourner, and also expanded the spiritual space to worship God who has become the God of sojourners. Isaac's hope for faith and God's promise was thus renewed day by day. This was because he had already had a spiritual experience of Rehoboth within his faith, which was to realize in the spiritual space of his tent sooner or later. This was a sojourner to live as God's blessing, which God had promised to Abraham in Genesis 12:2. Said differently, this was to dig a well upwards toward God's promise at tent services, while simultaneously digging a well downwards, despite harsh oppression from others, so as to reach a water vein of coexistence which transcends the hierarchical master-guest relationship. The path Abraham and Isaac took was the exact opposite of that of the people who aimed to reach heaven and to gain power and wealth by priding man-power through the construction of the Tower of Babel.

God gave three blessings to sojourners Abraham and Isaac, who bore the destiny and

dichotomous meanings of “hatred, hostility, conflict, and fear” and “hospitality, coexistence, and peace.” First blessing was protection of sojourners from hatred and hostility, the second was the power to transform “hatred, hostility, conflict, and fear” into a relationship that evokes “hospitality” through the path of *ger*, and the third was the spiritual Rehobthean space that convert sojourners’ fear to hope, by listening to God’s words; “Do not fear. I am with you. I will make you into a great nation and I will bless you.” The fear in people’s heart is absorbed by God who is always with sojourners, and transformed into an obedient faith and hope for following God who leads the fight for educating hospitality.

Then, we have to think what justice is. Justice is not only a standard that rejects evil of hostility and hatred appointed to sojourners and guests, but also the power to transform hatred and hostility into hospitality. Therefore, justice did not merely stop the oppression by Abimelech and the locals, but moreover made them seek for reconciliation with Isaac and hold a feast of peace contract (Gen 26:30). This power worked not only on Isaac; it worked to realize Pharaoh, when he was at his chamber with Sarah who disguised herself as Abraham’s sister, that what he was about to do was an injustice (Gen 12:17). At this point, Abraham was, as well as Isaac, powerless and ignorant what was happening at Pharaoh’s bed chamber. The common feature of these two events is that human beings are truly powerless, and thus God intervenes in the moment when justice must be realized.

When we look back on world history, we see that militarization, which is analogous to present Japanese military nationalism, and intensified xenophobic segregation and oppression have happened simultaneously like the two sides of a coin. This is also applicable to the relationship between the construction of the Tower of Babel and hatred and hostility against sojourners at that time. In the Biblical story, the construction fell into bankruptcy. However, it is also written that those people became unable to communicate with one another, divided, and dispersed. Did this scene prophesy the dispersion of hatred and hostility on earth? Then it can be described in other words, that the real identity of a huge monster Leviathan, which represents the Tower of Babel, militarization, and military nationalism, had its root in hatred and hostility such as racism and xenophobia.

In today’s society where racism and xenophobia pervades, Christian churches are urged to reproduce a spiritual Rehobothean space in sojourners’ tents within their missionary work, from the standpoint of a guest/sojourner, so as to implement justice using the existence of

sojourners, and to obey God who promises His blessings and produces hospitality.

V. Shalom in the Babylonian Captivity: The Way to Evoke Hospitality from Hospitality

How can we relate to our theme and express the Babylonian Captivity, experienced by south Judahites around 6th century BCE, in few words?

For Israelites that were taken to Babylonia, the Babylonian Captivity was an experience of being forced to live as sojourners. Moreover, it was also an experience to be surrounded by enemies because captivity meant that the conquered were carted off to the land of the conqueror. We can see, in Jeremiah 29:4~7, that the central message Jeremiah delivered to the crowd of sojourners was “shalom.” Chapter 1~28 in the Book of Jeremiah thoroughly reprimands the corrupted faith in South Judah in 7th century BCE. In other words, the prophet prophesies God’s judgment and urges the people to *choub* (to get back/to repent). However, after the prophecy of God’s judgment, he prophesies, with hope, the reconstruction of the People of God upon God’s forgiveness and a new covenant. The key-word for this is “shalom.”

Jeremiah 29:4~7 record the words in Jeremiah’s letter to captives in Babylonia which was written around 6th century BCE. These words came out of Jeremiah after he had fought with a false prophet Hananiah who had attempted to agitate the captives with nationalism. After the destruction of Jerusalem Temple, the captives were either enthused with nationalism or were being anemic and introvert. Jeremiah thus encouraged them to actively root themselves in Babylonia for a stable life with their family, and to pray for shalom to come to Babylonia. I pay attention to Jeremiah’s use of the word “shalom.”

Jeremiah presented “shalom” in an innovative, and non-ethnocentric way to the people. This was a completely new perspective, compared to the traditional, especially Deuteronomic, idea that places other than Canaan, which was given by God as “the Promised Land,” were unclean. Because of Jeremiah’s new perspective, shalom refers not only to intra-communal peace, but also to peace that should be realized between hostile ethnic communities. Translation of shalom is not only “peace,” but also “welfare” in a broader sense. Having the life of sojourners protected is an inseverable issue of peace and welfare.

In the Book of Jeremiah, *shalom* appears 31 times, including those that can not necessarily be translated as “peace.” What deserves attention is that, up to chapter 29, Jeremiah uses *shalom* mostly in a negative sense, to criticize fictitious peace, such as, “why do you say peace while there is no real peace?” On the other hand, there are only few occasions that Jeremiah uses *shalom* in a positive meaning; four times in the words to the captives (three times in 29:7 and once in 29:11), 33:6, and 33:9. Thus, in the Book of Jeremiah, *shalom* is used in complete different meanings prior to chapter 29 and chapter 29 onward.

We can discover Jeremiah’s theological prospect from here. After *shalom* is used in an affirmative sense and the captives are prompted pray for *shalom*, a new theological idea of “new covenant” appears in chapter 31, and is developed through chapter 31~33. This means that although the original covenant was broken due to unfaithfulness and betrayal of the Israelites, God still keeps His hope on the people living as captives in Babylonia for the reconstruction of the People of God, based on the new covenant between God and the “returned/repented (*choub*),” “remaining people (She’erit)” (Jeremiah 31:7). Therefore, Jeremiah urges the captives to overcome inter-ethnic hostility, and pray and live for peace and welfare, or *shalom*, that transcend ethnic borders as a preparation for this coming future. The repenting faith in the presence of God is awakened within the sojourners in Babylonian captivity, and thus becomes the starting point of the way to the “new covenant.” It can be said that, therefore, *choub* and *shalom* are inseverable in Jeremiah’s theology.

Shalom that prophet Jeremiah handed to the captives in Babylonia was not a way of reluctant concession or violent retaliation against their enemies, but the ultimate way to actively resist and overcome hatred and hostility. In other words, the path of transforming hostility and hatred of the majority into hospitality was equivalent to pray and work for *shalom*.

God tried to gather the “remaining people” as the people that follows the path, and the realization was placed not on the establishment of post-Babylonian Captivity Judaism, but on the Jesus’ evangelization of kingdom of God and Christian church community.

VI. Hospitality/ *Shalom* as a fight against Hostility

Jesus discussed this theme of sojourner, hostility, and hospitality as moral issues of ultimate dimensions using the parable of Good Samaritans (Luke 10:25~37). The motive of

Jesus showing this example is because a rabbi asked Him, “Who is my neighbor?” at last. Lord knew that there was no way for Samaritans who were in the relationship of hatred and hostility against Jews for hundreds of years. That is why He first dared to mention a Jew dying of serious injury. Both a priest and Levite, who happened to be Jews, avoided him. On the other hand, a Samaritan, a mortal enemy of Jews, who was just a sojourner on the land of Jews, saved him with unconditional hospitality. After telling the story, He asked the Jew rabbi back who was the neighbor for that dying Jew. The rabbi had no choice but to reply that was the Samaritan. However, this answer also was a declaration of surrender against the hostility and the hatred inside the rabbi. In other words, Jesus proved that hospitality and love of one’s neighbor is the real tool to win against the human hostility and hatred. That is the reason this discussion had taken place.

First, what can we tell from a Samaritan walking past Jericho Road? We can tell that he was in the land of Jews. Hostility and hatred against Samaria and Judea had continued for a long time. It goes back to the division of Kingdom of Israel in late 10th century BC and especially in the fall of Samaria in Assyrian empire in 721B.C., the forced emigration of racial minorities from Babylonia, and the hostility grew even more in Babylonian captivity in late 6th century B.C. and it remained in the time of Jesus. Therefore, the Samaritan in His story was in the land where hostility and hatred toward his ethnicity existed. In other words, he would never have received hospitality there. Nonetheless, from the moment he made a decision to save the person (probably a Jew), he abandoned the hostility and hatred against Jews. The Samaritan instead served as a “host” and treated the injured person as a “guest” by rescuing him. What would happen to the hatred and hostility toward Samaritans? We would never know what happened unfortunately from this speechless injured person. However, we cannot see any hatred and hostility from the Jew hostler who did not reject the favor of the Samaritan, and from the Jew rabbi who was told the story by Jesus and answered that the Samaritan was the injured person’s neighbor. Thus, the story of Good Samaritan shows how hatred and hostility can change into hospitality and love of one’s neighbor, as each character changes its standpoint as “host” and “guest” throughout the story.

There is a instance of eschatological judgment of the Lord is issued under the King’s name to two groups of sheep, which are classified as sheep of Jesus and sheep of wilderness. That instance ends in the following passage.

“The King will reply, ‘Truly I tell you, whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me.’”(Matthew 25:40)

We can reconsider this instance from Biblical theological standpoint as following. Who Jesus really blessed was who offered unconditional hospitality, not ones with authority. This is the unconditional hospitality, which is not host giving an invitation to a formal guest to treat nicely, but it is serving a guest who came without prior notice, as Derrida claimed. We could also say this as impossible hospitality or eschatological hospitality shown in the Bible, according to Derrida. There lies spiritual space and time where nothing (for example, politics or calculation) can interrupt, and we can only listen to the Lord and make the moral decision there.

Nowadays, a group of people is attacking the minorities (such as racial minorities, refugees seeking safety, and migrant worker). Christianity churches would stand aside citizens who would deal with the group with hospitality of Kant (i.e. with hospitality and generosity). However, how much would the spirit of generosity and the reason of hospitality endure the hate crime with hatred and hostility, with people shouting that their resource will be threatened? If we were to bear till the limit of patience and generosity, would generosity and hospitality claimed by Kant really compete against the hatred and hostility that humans have in their innermost part of their heart? We see no illusion in church. However, the Gospel itself will continually challenges Christians, and have them stand in front of Him through one of the least in the Kingdom of Heaven. That is the God of Missio Dei who would continue to knock the gates of church from the reality. Therefore, we, the Christianity churches are guided not to lose our hope, to overcome the established limits and conditions, to pray together for the new hospitality, and to give even better hospitality.

One of hate crimes, hate speech, which should be considered as violence, has caused humongous amount of destructive effect in public society and human relationships, and also the connivance of it has created horrifying massacre in the history. We must think of this critically and speak its danger out loud.

Racial minorities who became a victim cannot sit back and be silent but have courage and speak out how destructive it was. Even in this country, in churches, some people are so indifferent about this matter that they say “The Ministry of Justice has announced that hate speech is not public consensus on its web page.”

- The seriousness of wound remaining on Korean residing in Japan, who were the victims of hate speech happened already.
- Hate speech is ongoing still
- Hate speech is ongoing not only down the streets but also is being done online
- We cannot regulate this violent action in Japan, for that Japan is not a nation ruled by laws
- The whole society has xenophobic atmosphere, discrimination and prejudice, ignorance and misunderstanding against Korean residing in Japan underneath hate speeches done down the street and online
- We are in a danger of war and massacre through the government quickly tilting on right wing and historical revisionism
- This country has actually made a horrible mistake and tragedy in early 20th century; the prosecution against Korean peaceful march in their own land in March, 1919, the massacre against Koreans in Great Kanto earthquake in September 1923, the reign of terror through the Maintenance of the Public Order Act in 1925, Kanto Army going out of control from the middle of 1930's, and the capture of comfort women for invasion of China.

Without these insights, Christian churches may have no choice but to remain silent. Their only choice is to say that they are not involved in hate speech and remain still. We should now listen to the words of Pastor Martin Niemöller,

“First they came for the Socialists, and I did not speak out—
Because I was not a Socialist.
Then they came for the Trade Unionists, and I did not speak out—
Because I was not a Trade Unionist.
Then they came for the Jews, and I did not speak out—
Because I was not a Jew.
Then they came for me—and there was no one left to speak for me.”

We are now witnessing the world scale racial (and religious) hate crime along global-

ization. Globalization implies globalizing of domestic capital. Therefore, in order to protect the capital the globalized enterprise would surely demands the originated government to protect its capital and human resources. Japanese capital allocated all over the world has long been the second largest, the USA the first. Now Japan is letting Self Defense Force go outside of the national territory. To remove the obstacle of Article 9, the government is agitating its citizens by using media, by creating political tensions among the neighboring countries on purpose. As the government reforms its education into more nationalistic way, which would emphasize the national pride, it would fall for history revisionism. Additionally, these policies will polarize the economic situation of its citizen and that will easily lead them to nationalism and xenophobia through their uneasiness of the economic status.

In these circumstances of the world, the inevitable responsibility of Christian churches mission work in 21st century is to become scapegoats of minorities who are facing discrimination. You should hear His voice through the cries of the minorities. Churches must listen to that voice and construct the worldwide network to work together as a prioritized problem that addresses theology, missionary, and form of churches.

What churches need to do is neither to be silent about this country's future to march towards the rapture as the Tower of Babel (Japan being a nationalistic military state), nor to be careless of Sodom, which the whole society will collapse (hate speech/ hate crime), and focus on evangelizing. We must create a new paradigm that would allow us to do all clarifying our stance, voicing that we are against the violation and war, and pursuing peace and welfare to construct the society where we can live together regardless of our race in addition to the formations of churches and missionary work. Therefore we must face the problem of hatred and hostility against the minorities for that is the core of the problem. We must face the problem of racism now.

Where should we stand, and how should we address the problem? From this study of the Bible, we were lead to the position of "sojourner". The word "sojourner" is not only the sociological term for foreigner, immigrants, or refugees, but in this 21st century of globalization, this position needs to be paid attention by everyone who obeys the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Today, Japanese government is exposing its lack of understanding of human right that it cannot even pass the law to prohibit the hate speech as serious violation of human rights.

They even failed to pass the law as principle law, which does not involve criminal punishment. We, as Christian church must work patiently and cooperatively with citizen movement to pass the law. However, at the same time we, Christian church must confront racism (hatred and hostility) from our own standpoint of evangelical faith.

This is to come to have a cross to bear for the fight of the Lord, who will lead us to hospitality from hatred and hostility from a "sojourner's" perspective, who is threatened and abused by racism. Without going through this hardship, neither the restorative justice nor the cure about racism would take place. Are we listening to the lords' voice now, which He definitely will later ask "What were you doing when that one of the least of the Heaven was discriminated?"

●Translator : Yuuki Nakao



Bible Study from Rev. Kim Sungjae

Joint Statement of the 3rd International Conference on Minority Issues and Mission

Truly I tell you, just as you did it to one of the least of these who are members of my family, you did it to me. (Matthew 25:40)

The 3rd International Conference on Minority Issues and Mission was held in Tokyo, Japan from November 18 to 21, 2015 at the Korean YMCA in Japan. Under the theme, "Together toward a just and inclusive society in Japan -- Justice and inclusivity in Japan, in partnership with all of Japan and the world," 133 people attended, consisting of minorities such as Koreans in Japan, immigrants, Ainu, Okinawans, discriminated Buraku, and LGBT persons, as well as representatives of the World Council of Churches, and churches in South Africa, USA, Canada, Germany, Australia, India, Taiwan and Korea. Aboriginal people of Taiwan and Dalits from India also participated. In the main Conference we shared with each other about the present situation and challenges of hate speech in Japan, and also the global challenges posed by xenophobia and hate crime, and held discussions with the aim to realize a just and inclusive, multi-national/ethnic, multi-cultural society.

In Japanese society until now, violence that is rooted in discrimination against Koreans in Japan and other minorities has been repeated, such as in the case of a physical assault upon a Korean school girl in uniform. And yet, furthermore, today hate speech that incites racial hatred and ethnic discrimination against Koreans in Japan and other minorities is being made in public places by organizations, which causes fear and pain by using discriminatory and exclusionary slogans, like "maggot," "cockroach," "subhuman," "die," or "kill." In spite of the fact that these words and actions advocate direct harm toward the lives, spirit and bodies of minorities, including even children, and dehumanize those who are targeted, there still exists in the state and society of Japan no legal system to prohibit racial discrimination and violence that is based on it, and acts of discrimination have been allowed to continue unchecked. Past cases around the world show that when hate speech is left unchecked, this will lead, in the future to crimes that are accompanied by more serious violence.

It is clear that historical revisionism that tries to obliterate historical awareness of Japan's colonial rule, war, and war responsibility, and of its victimizing past of violations against human dignity, serves to legitimize hate speech. In order to root out hate speech and build a society in which human dignity and equality are realized, it is imperative that the state and society of Japan examine historical facts again, and establish a legal framework for the protection of human rights, beginning with a law to prohibit racial discrimination.

In spite of this, in the face of accusations made by victims from the Asia-Pacific war, historical facts are distorted and manipulated in Japan to deny the facts of war-time victimization, and historical revisionism that justifies these distortions runs rampant. Furthermore, many national legislators including Prime Minister Abe have joined this, thus placing historical revisionism at the state's core. We have confirmed that state-led historical revisionism encourages discrimination and exclusionism and fuels the birth of hate speech and hate crimes, and furthermore leads to militarization and the promotion of war.

In today's world, the gap between the rich and the poor, transcending national and ethnic boundaries, is growing rapidly. Uncertainty about the future and economic and social contradictions cause intolerance, and events in which minority immigrants are targeted by outbursts of hate and fear are becoming frequent. This problem of xenophobia is making it difficult in many countries to engage in humanitarian emergency acceptance of refugees. Under the current system of conditional and selective, hierarchic immigration, immigrants will be no more than objects of assimilation. But, it is through our concrete encounters with immigrants that we are made to realize that immigrants are neighbors who possess "dignity of life." It is through this process that we are able to break our inner chain of enmity.

In this Conference we confirmed that the Christian Church must seek both the path of peace that clearly opposes the path toward armament and war, and the path toward construction of an inclusive society in which peace and welfare are shared with all people, and that for this we must hear the call of Jesus Christ in the cries of minorities. The Church must answer the call of Christ and spread the overtent of inclusivity in a global network, and for this purpose must share this problem as an important challenge of theology, mission and church formation.

Today, in this world of growing intolerance, segmentation of society is proceeding by the abandonment of the weak. Thereby the lives and dignity of many people are being seriously injured through the rise of hate and conflict. As Christians, we are filled with a strong sense of crisis at these things.

Today, amid rapid advances in the globalization of information and wealth, many societies are in crisis and at risk of devastation by hate-filled violence. In this world where a storm of racism and xenophobia spreads together with globalization, today's Christian Church must search for a mission path that resists hate and spreads the tent of inclusivity in order to restore the whole of humanity in God's image. We are able to know from the Bible that God showed us the way to break the chain of hate and lead us toward reconciliation, through the presence of sojourners (foreigners and immigrants). To welcome sojourners, or to place one-self in the position of a stranger, is necessary in order to have fear and anger changed into the hope for inclusivity, and for God's blessing to be realized in this world. The Christian Church must profess to today's society that the love of neighbor, shown to us by Jesus Christ, is the true power that overcomes human enmity and hate. The Churches of Japan confess that we stood aside and watched as minorities suffered under the violence of hate speech. We resolve to engage these issues and seek the realization of peace and inclusive societies on this earth, by accepting this as the call of Gospel mission entrusted to us as Christians living in this time.

We, who have attended the 3rd International Conference on Minority Issues and Mission, propose the following to the government of Japan, to Japanese society, to the churches of Japan and to the churches of the world:

- 1 To the government of Japan we demand that it act now, as a member of the world and of Asia, to address the following matters.
 - 1.1 In order to eliminate racial discrimination, follow the recommendations of the UN Human Rights Committee and Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination, and act quickly to institute domestic laws such as the "Basic Law for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination," "Basic Law for Foreign Residents," or a law of equal effect, which will outlaw hate speech and other forms of discrimination.

- 1.2 In order to continue peaceful dialogue with neighboring nations, thoroughly inculcate a fair-minded historical awareness that is clearly conscious of war responsibilities and reflect this in school education.
 - 1.3 In order to eliminate prejudice and discrimination toward minorities, guarantee the right of education to minorities, beginning with the (equitable) provision of no-cost education for Korean high schools, and systematize multicultural education.
- 2 We call out to citizens of Japan to do the following:
 - 2.1 In order to realize the vision of an inclusive multi-ethnic, multi-cultural society that does not permit hate speech, listen to and respond to the voices of minorities and work toward social, political, economic and cultural participation by minorities.
 - 3 In order to bear the work of Gospel mission entrusted to the church, we call upon the churches of Japan to do the following:
 - 3.1 Hear, recognize and share the pains that are experienced by people who are marginalized and excluded, for these point toward injustices in Japanese society.
 - 3.2 Make it a mission strategy in each denomination to pay attention to the needs and concerns of minorities, to provide periodic opportunities for ecumenical discussion of these issues and to create opportunities for collaborative action.
 - 3.3 Cooperate in the building of a domestic minority network and continue discussion, within and among, the various denominations toward establishment of a "Minority Mission Center", which the KCCJ is calling for.
 - 3.4 With people of other faiths and civil society groups within Japan, engage in collaborative work to address discrimination toward minorities.
 - 4 In order to spread the tent of inclusivity to the world, we call upon churches of the world to do the following.
 - 4.1 Utilize world-wide networks to facilitate the sharing of stories of churches that are overcoming discrimination toward minorities, or building inclusive community, and share effective practices for these purposes.

- 4.2 Actively support youth programs that engage with the various issues associated with minorities.
- 4.3 Call on global ecumenical bodies for a renewed re-commitment to resist the revival of racism in many parts of the world, and act to affirm the life and dignity of marginalized people.
- 4.4 On March 21, the UN Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, pray for the minorities of the world.

November 21, 2015

Participants of the 3rd International Conference on Minority Issues and Mission

Korean Christian Church in Japan／National Christian Council in Japan／United Church of Christ in Japan／The Church of Christ in Japan／Japan Baptist Convention／Japan Baptist Union／Catholic Commission of Japan for Refugees, Migrants and People on the Move／Wesley Foundation／World Council of Churches／World Communion of Reformed Churches／Anglican Episcopal Church in Japan／United Church of Christ／Presbyterian Church in Taiwan／The Syrian Orthodox Church／The United Church of Canada／Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)／The Presbyterian Church in Canada／Evangelical Mission in Solidarity／Association of Protestant Churches and Missions in Germany／United Methodist Church／Uniting Church in Australia／Uniting Reformed Church in Southern Africa／African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church／Korean Methodist Church／Presbyterian Church of Korea／Presbyterian Church in the Republic of Korea／Korea Evangelical Holiness Church／National Council of Churches in Korea／Korea Church Women United／Anglican Church of Korea



The date of Publication

June 1st, 2016

Edited by

Follow-up Committee

of the International Conference on Minority Issues and Mission

Korean Christian Church in Japan

Room 52, Japan Christian Center, 2-3-18, Nishi-waseda, Shinjuku-ku,
Tokyo 169-0051, Japan

TEL : + 81-3-3202-5398

FAX : + 81-3-3202-4977

E-mail : kccj.3icmim@gmail.com