

Religion and Race

Open Access

Kevin P. Considine*

A Revitalization of Revolutionary Love: A Dialogue between Martin Luther King and Kim Chi-Ha

DOI 10.1515/opth-2016-0076

Received July 18, 2016; accepted November 9, 2016

Abstract: This essay investigates the power and limits of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s theology of revolutionary love through a dialogue with Kim Chi-Ha. I will argue that King's theology of revolutionary love may be revitalized within a globalized context through a dialogue with Kim's philosophy of *dan*, that includes an "agonized violence of love", in order to offer a continuing praxis of love of enemy and love of neighbor, salvation for sinner and sinned-against. I show how in King's theology, love subsists in justice and then how it is illustrated by and is challenged by the grotesque image at the conclusion of Kim's poem, *Chang Il-Dam*—a mutual beheading in which the heads of the sinner and sinned-against are switched in a new creation. I argue this because Kim envisions this violence as eschatological and salvific, leading to social transformation also based upon a kind of revolutionary love. As the global influence of King's theology continues to be studied, this particular dialogue shows how King's theology of nonviolent revolutionary love, as a "global flow", can be revitalized to highlight the costliness of justice and the nonviolent transformative nature of love that are embedded in salvation for sinned-against and sinner, oppressed and oppressor.

Keywords: Martin Luther King Jr., salvation, intercultural theology, *han*, nonviolence

And I say to you, I have also decided to stick with love, for I know that love is ultimately the only answer to mankind's [sic.] problems. And I'm going to talk about it everywhere I go. I know it isn't popular to talk about love in some circles today. And I'm not talking about emotional bosh when I talk about love. I'm talking about a strong, demanding love...I have decided to love. If you are seeking the highest good, I think you can find it through love. And the beautiful thing is that we aren't moving wrong when we do it, because John was right, God is love. He who hates does not know God, but he who loves has the key that unlocks the door to the meaning of ultimate reality.¹

There is perhaps no more difficult theological praxis than loving one's enemy and doing so within a social context of oppression and innocent suffering.² In particular, the Christian praxis of love of enemy is perhaps one of the most misunderstood and maligned of all Christian teachings. On the one hand, it can provide an overly-sentimental understanding that is a change in the emotional relationship between opponents. On the other hand, it can be the cover by which the oppressed continue to be subjugated by substituting an amorphous, and perhaps harmful, love of oppressor in the place of structural change that will lead to justice. King encapsulated this tension early in his career and pointed out that justice and

¹ King, "Where do we go from here?", 191-192.

² See, for example, Matthew 5:43-48.

*Corresponding author: Kevin P. Considine, Calumet College of St. Joseph, United States of America; E-mail: kconsidine@ccsj.edu

love exist in a relationship in which justice has the final say. As King stated in 1955, “But I want to tell you this evening that it is not enough for us to talk about love, love is one of the pivotal points of the Christian faith. There is another side called justice. And justice is really love in calculation. Justice is love correcting that which revolts against love.”³ For King, love subsists in justice and it this revolutionary love that will change not only the souls of sinners but the entire oppressive structures of society to approach the “beloved community” and “great world house.” It suggests God’s salvation for both sinner and “sinned-against.”⁴

This essay investigates the power and limits of Martin Luther King, Jr.’s theology of revolutionary love in the face of evil through a dialogue with Kim Chi-Ha’s poem, *Chang Il-Dam*.⁵ I argue that King’s theology of revolutionary love may be revitalized within a globalized context through a dialogue with Kim’s philosophy of *dan*, that includes an “agonized violence of love”, in order to offer a continuing praxis of love of enemy and love of neighbor, salvation for sinner and sinned-against. I will suggest that the grotesque image at the conclusion of Kim’s story—a mutual beheading in which the heads of the sinner and sinned-against are switched in a new creation—can act as a catalyst because it is both in continuity with and a challenge to King’s theology of revolutionary love. I argue this because Kim envisions this violence as eschatological and salvific when faced with the reality of intractable evil whereas King’s theology of revolutionary love was unconditionally nonviolent. Kim names it an “agonized violence of love”, which differs from King rooting his theology in *agape*, to bring about social transformation also based upon revolutionary love. Kim rooted this in a philosophy of *dan* (to cut off), a synthesis of Roman Catholicism, philosophies of nonviolence and revolution, and aspects of *Donghak* and Korean Shamanism meant to resolve the problem of *han* (abyss of pain/frustrated hope). Although I think that Kim’s philosophy ultimately would be rejected by King, his goal of mutual salvation for sinned-against and sinner would be embraced by King. As the global influence of King’s theology continues to be studied, this particular dialogue can shed light upon King’s theology of revolutionary love as a “global flow” that encounters Kim’s challenge and is revitalized to speak anew to the current situations of evil and injustice. King reminds us that justice is costly and love is both nonviolent and transformative.

I will argue this in several steps. First, I will provide an adequate heuristic for envisioning this intercultural theological dialogue, King’s theology of revolutionary love as a “global theological flow”. Second, I briefly will examine several of King’s works to show that, for King, revolutionary love means love subsisting in justice. Third I will provide an introduction to Korean Catholic poet and political dissident, Kim Chi-Ha, and his focus upon the problem of *han*. I will examine Kim’s story, *Chang Il-Dam*, to explain Kim’s philosophy of an “agonized violence of love”, based in a philosophy of *dan*, that is both in continuity with and also challenges King’s theology of revolutionary love. Finally, I will discuss how this dialogue revitalizes King’s theology of revolutionary love, within a globalized context, by emphasizing the cost of justice and the transformational nonviolence of love.

Foundation of Intercultural Dialogue: King’s Revolutionary Love and Nonviolence as “Global Theological Flow”

There is little evidence that Kim Chi-Ha was directly influenced by the life and work of Martin Luther King, Jr., nor is there evidence that he directly engaged with King’s life and thought. Although their lives overlapped, King (1929-1968) and Kim (b. 1941) never met and Kim’s international fame arose in the 1970s, many years after the assassination of King. Furthermore, the height of King’s international fame coincided with the dictatorship of Park Chung-Hee (1961-1979), a time when most South Koreans were not as concerned with

³ King, “MIA Mass Meeting”, 11.

⁴ The basic articulation of the term “sinned-against” is found in Fung, “Compassion.”

⁵ Before examining the philosophies of King and Kim, I should note what makes this dialogue possible. For the sake of keeping this essay concise, and because I have elaborated extensively on the method of intercultural hermeneutics elsewhere, it must suffice to indicate that such an intercultural dialogue, especially as imagined by an author who belongs to the culture of neither figure, is precarious and I take the greatest care in what follows through foundations in intercultural hermeneutics and the semiotics of culture. See Considine, *Salvation for the Sinned-Against*, 66-96.

international affairs as they were with their own survival and possible flourishing during Park's aggressive modernization plans. The Park regime constituted the primary target of Kim's political writings whereas the intertwined evils of American white supremacy, militarism, and unfettered capitalism were King's main targets. Like King, Kim was imprisoned on several occasions and wrote from prison and about the meaning of imprisonment. Unlike King, Kim was arrested by the KCIA, Park's secret police, tortured, received a death sentence for his anti-regime writings, and later had the sentence commuted to life in prison due to the outcry of the international community.⁶ He was released from prison for good after Park's assassination in 1979.⁷ In addition, the plight of Koreans was not an explicit part of King's global vision⁸ and in Kim's writings available in English, he mentions thinkers such as Frantz Fanon, James Cone, and Paolo Freire, but he does not mention King.

At the same time, it is difficult to claim that King's life and work had no influence on Kim. King is a monumental thinker whose global reach only recently has been studied in depth.⁹ Therefore, I suggest that an adequate heuristic for envisioning this connection is that King's theology of revolutionary love is saturated into the discourses carried by globalization and thus influenced Kim as a "global theological flow."¹⁰ Robert J. Schreiter points out that the term "flow" arose from the fields of anthropology, sociology, and communication studies. A flow denotes "...a circulation of information that is patently visible yet hard to define. Flows move across geographic and other cultural boundaries, and, like a river, define a route, change the landscape, and leave behind sediment and silt that enrich the local ecology" such as Paul Gilroy's concept of "The Black Atlantic."¹¹ To explain how a flow moves from cultural to becoming also theological, it is helpful to quote Schreiter at length:

Global *theological* flows, then, are theological discourses that, while not uniform or systemic, represent a series of linked, mutually intelligible discourses that address the contradictions and failures of global systems. They are theological discourses, that is, they speak out of the realm of religious beliefs and practices. They are not uniform or systemic, because of their specific cultural and social settings. Yet, they are intelligible discourses in other cultural and social settings that are experiencing the same failure of global systems and who are raising the same kind of protest.¹²

A precondition for the emergence of a "flow" is what has become known as the "glocal"; that is, the interaction where the local cultures adopt and reconstruct aspects of the global and when the global feels the need to tailor its offerings to the particularities of the local.¹³ In terms of theological reflection, as well

⁶ It can also be said with confidence that King's life was influenced by the violent physical, psychological, and spiritual terrorism of white racists and the F.B.I. under J. Edgar Hoover, among others.

⁷ Around 1989, the end of the Cold War, Kim began to turn his back on Roman Catholicism and Christianity. This is because he began to think that it was little more than a Western neocolonial import that was harmful to traditional Korean culture and religion. See Küster, *A Protestant Theology of Passion*, 148 n. 46. In addition, as Wu points out, Kim's poetry then takes an "inward" turn away from politics and towards the ecological context and employs elements of Buddhism and Shamanism. Wu, "Introduction", 15–33. Kim also begins to develop a philosophy of *salim* (bringing to life) and this is discussed in Kim and Kenzaburo, "An Autonomous Subject." For a critique of Kim's post-1989 change as abandoning the need for political and social change, see Suh Kyung-Sik, "A Letter to Mr. Kim Chi-ha."

⁸ This is not to say that Korea was excluded from King's vision, rather, that, unlike Ghana, South Africa, and other countries, King had not visited and did not name Korea as a specific concern.

⁹ See, for example, Baldwin, *Toward the Beloved Community*; Baldwin and Dekar, *In an Inescapable Network of Mutuality*; Lee, *The Great World House*.

¹⁰ For the purposes of this essay, the term "globalization" refers to the emerging social, economic, political and cultural confluence of modernity, neoliberal capitalism, Western democracy and postmodern consumerism that continues to penetrate and refashion the entirety of the world's cultures. In a more precise understanding of this term, Robert Schreiter observes that a set definition of it remains contested but that a base-line definition upon which most scholars agree is: "the increasingly interconnected character of the political, economic, and social life of the peoples on this planet." See Schreiter, *The New Catholicity*, 4–5. Schreiter goes on to observe that the phenomenon of globalization can be interpreted as beginning in the later decades of the 20th century or with European colonization in the late 15th century. Concurring with Schreiter, I too will use the understanding of globalization as beginning in the second half of the 20th century, the heights of the careers of King and Kim.

¹¹ Schreiter, *The New Catholicity*, 15.

¹² Ibid., 16. Italics added.

¹³ Ibid., 12.

as in production of culture, this context of the glocal—the sometimes violent and often unequal interaction and encounter between the global and the local—has become the basic venue in which humankind finds itself.¹⁴ The glocal has connected disparate sections of the world in shared theological concerns, or “global theological flows.”¹⁵

Here, I suggest that King’s work be understood as a global theological flow and recent work by King scholars adds credence to my claim. First, Lewis V. Baldwin has indicated that the current phase in King scholarship is focused upon his influence within the context of globalization. Although King’s life and work occurred well before the development of globalization theories, Baldwin has convincingly argued that an underlying thread in King’s thought is his understanding of a “world house”, or a global “beloved community”.¹⁶ As an early version of a “global theological flow”, King’s thought has influenced the local, philosophical ecosystems of many nations and peoples even if that influence remains implicit. As Hak-Joon Lee points out, “One finds in King one of the most articulate, persuasive spokespersons for global ethics, and a visionary for global community who greatly contributed to the global currency of many of these values and norms.”¹⁷ Moreover, Lee argues that a global Kingian ethic be understood in the 21st century as one located in “glocality”; the multitudes of locations where the global systems and the local systems meet, are interpreted and are negotiated.¹⁸ Having provided an adequate heuristic for envisioning this conversation, King’s work as “global theological flow”, I now turn to the work of King.

Love Subsisting in Justice: King’s Theology of Revolutionary Love

A sea of ink has been spilled discussing the biography, theology, ethics, intellectual influences, cultural significance, and religious background of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. since his assassination in 1968. In the almost fifty ensuing years, he and his theology have been elevated almost to the level of hagiography by those who have not taken the time to study the true King underneath the cultural accretions.¹⁹ In this section, I do not intend to offer a new interpretation of King’s own work. Rather, I intend merely to highlight and clarify King’s theology of revolutionary love as love subsisting in justice by examining several documents across different phases in King’s career.

Although King’s intellectual development and praxis are too complex to fit neatly into any one schema, for the sake of clarity I adopt one offered by James H. Cone and David Garrow both of whom employ a hermeneutics of suspicion towards white interpretations of King’s work. Cone provides an overarching narrative and Garrow the critical hermeneutics.²⁰ During the time of King’s adult career (1955-1968), Cone describes King’s development as moving from

an optimistic integrationist to a temporary separatist; from a social reformer to a militant nonviolent revolutionary; from an intellectual dependence on classical western philosophy to a call for the study of black philosophers...from his inspiring ‘I Have a Dream’ oration to his despairing assertion that ‘the dream I had in Washington in 1963 has often turned into a nightmare...’²¹

¹⁴ Ibid., 12.

¹⁵ Ibid., 20.

¹⁶ Baldwin, “Living in the World House”, 3-26.

¹⁷ Lee, *The Great World House*, 17.

¹⁸ Ibid., 14-16, 88-107.

¹⁹ For “de-mythologizations” of the life and work of King, see Dyson, *I May Not Get There With You*, Baldwin and Burrow, *The Domestication of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, and Cone, *Martin, Malcolm, and America*.

²⁰ I am assuming the relative adequacy of James Cone’s and David Garrow’s hermeneutics of suspicion towards white interpreters of King’s work, like myself, in my choice of these documents. However, the hermeneutical position I am adopting from Cone and Garrow is from 1986 and thus is somewhat outdated in the current academic debates on King, although I have not found evidence to invalidate their position. In addition, Cone’s and Garrow’s hermeneutics of suspicion are helpful in avoiding the continued danger of domesticating and sanitizing King. Having taught King’s thought to undergraduates for many years, King’s life and legacy remain overly domesticated and sanitized in many, if not most, of the minds of my students.

²¹ Ibid., 30.

Cone also highlights that justice should be understood as the guiding principle of King's work as opposed to love.²² They coexist, but Cone thinks that emphasizing love over justice leads to a sanitized, fictional King created by the white imagination seeking comfort as opposed to social change.²³

David J. Garrow offers an analysis that is more strictly focused upon King's intellectual development that is of use for the hermeneutical task of approaching King's theology.²⁴ Garrow argues that the most dependable analysis of King's work must be based upon the large number of (until recently) unpublished sermons and speeches that provides a more adequate portrait of King. Garrow does not think that King's more popular published works are unhelpful, although he explicitly warns against two particular publications;²⁵ rather, he thinks that in order to adequately interpret King's work one must approach him in this manner. Garrow takes this position because he argues that much of King's published work was often revised and edited by advisors or even sometimes fully ghost-written by them without King's review.²⁶ These works are helpful for providing insight into the collective movement that King represented and acted as the voice but are less helpful for an attempt to exegete the theology and praxis of King himself.

Therefore I will utilize works from different periods within King's career that fit within this hermeneutic, namely: "Address to the First Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA) Mass Meeting" (1955),²⁷ "Letter from Birmingham City Jail" (1963), "Address at the Freedom Rally in Cobo Hall" (1963) and "Where Do We Go From Here?" (1967). Of these, I assign the most importance to King's 1955 address and assume its theological functioning in interpreting the others. Here, in his address orated at the outset of the Montgomery Bus Boycotts, King offered an image of love subsisting in justice. Near the conclusion of the speech, King provides a fundamental theology of revolutionary love based in this relationship: "But I want to tell you this evening that it is not enough for us to talk about love, love is one of the pivotal points of the Christian faith. There is another side called justice. And justice is really love in calculation. Justice is love correcting that which revolts against love."²⁸

This is a justice that King roots in the Living God who is active in human history and who punishes political entities that refuse to participate in God's justice for the poor and the oppressed.²⁹ As King states, "Standing beside love is always justice, and we are only using the tools of justice. Not only are we using the tools of persuasion, but we've come to see that we've got to use the tools of *coercion*."³⁰ This shows that King's theology of love could only be understood with respect to justice. For King, love was a Christian ideal that he contextualized to be the means for pursuing justice for the oppressed. It was not yet an all-encompassing nonviolent love even though King was no advocate of violence.³¹ Rather, this love was the

²² Ibid., 29-31.

²³ King's words in 1967 also reflect this dilemma: "Now what has happened is that we've had it wrong and mixed up in our country, and this has led Negro Americans in the past to seek their goals through love and suasion devoid of power, and white Americans to seek their goals through power devoid of love and conscience...It is precisely this collision of immoral power with powerless morality which constitutes the major crisis of our times." King, "Where do we go from here?", 186-187.

²⁴ For the standard schema of King's development, see Smith and Zepp's excellent work, *Search for the Beloved Community*.

²⁵ Garrow argues that the works "Pilgrimage to Nonviolence" and *Why We Can't Wait* should only be employed with the greatest of caution when understanding King. See "The Intellectual Development of Martin Luther King, Jr.", 17 n.1.

²⁶ Ibid., 5, 14.

²⁷ See King's *Stride Toward Freedom*, 430-438, for a contextual account of the time in which he gave this speech.

²⁸ King, "MIA Mass Meeting", 11.

²⁹ As King states, the God of Israel is One who does not merely say "I love you." Rather, King declares, "...God...stands up before the nations and said: 'Be still and know that I'm God, that if you don't obey me I will break the backbone of your power and slap you out of the orbits of your international and national relationships.' Standing beside love is always justice." Ibid., 11-12.

³⁰ Ibid., page 12. Italics added.

³¹ Garrow points out that until the middle days of the Montgomery bus boycott, King attempted to buy a gun for the self-defense of his family and at one point had a gun in his home. Garrow, "Intellectual Development", 10-11. This is not at odds with Gandhi's praxis of nonviolence that also is not fully consistent in itself. See his provisional acceptance of situational violence in Gandhi, *All Men Are Brothers*, 88-89.

beginning of a public spirituality³² and a tactic for shrewdly participating in God's saving action in the world. As King indicates, the protesters of Montgomery will not inflict violence upon their white oppressors even though they have had much violence inflicted upon them. They will settle for nothing less than justice, but they will accomplish this without perpetrating violence. Their action is guided by a political love. King observes, "...I want to say that we are not here advocating violence. We have never done that...We believe in the teachings of Jesus. The only weapon we have in our hands this evening is the weapon of protest. That's all."³³ Cone highlights this section of King's speech. He remarks, "Even as King urged blacks to keep 'God in the forefront,' his emphasis remained on justice and not love, *coercion* and not persuasion"³⁴ and Garrow agrees with this assertion.³⁵ Here, King shows that an isolated theology of love is not sufficient in order to understand the action in which the protesters are engaged. Rather, it is a theology of love subsisting in justice that includes divine judgment and a political love as a means to this end.³⁶

King continued to employ this idea of revolutionary love, love subsisting in justice, throughout his career. It is his foundation for nonviolent direct action discussed in "Letter from Birmingham City Jail", where King tactically explains how love is embodied and manifest in the nonviolent movement.³⁷ It also is King's foundation for explaining nonviolence as revolutionary love in Detroit. King states, "...this method has a way of disarming the opponent. It exposes his moral defenses. It weakens his morale, and at the same time it works on his conscience, and he doesn't know what to do."³⁸ Regarding love, King states,

Nonviolence...calls upon [us] to engage in that something called love. And I know it is difficult sometimes. When I say 'love' at this point, I'm not talking about an affectionate emotion. It's nonsense to urge people, oppressed people, to love their oppressors in an affectionate sense. I'm talking about something much deeper. I'm talking about a sort of understanding, creative goodwill for all men [sic].³⁹

The tactic or means by which to attain those ends is a kind of political love, one always oriented towards justice. Even though the white oppressors mainly understood the "language of the gun", a phrase used by Malcolm X⁴⁰, King was convinced that the oppressed cannot achieve liberation through speaking this language of the oppressor. Rather, King advocated and practiced the language of nonviolent resistance, a language meant to pre-empt and ultimately dismantle the oppressor's very ability to speak the language of the gun. For King, militant nonviolent resistance was a form of *agape*-love. It could lead to the conversion and transformation of the white oppressor from serving an idol of death and inflicting harm upon the Black

³² Weaver writes, "For King, a proper spirituality meant that the inner piety of prayer was always accompanied by the outer piety of social action: 'pray for racial justice but use minds to develop a program . . . pray for economic justice, but make social changes that make for a better distribution of wealth.' King never claimed a privileged relationship that set him above others in the Civil Rights Movement; rather, he believed that God's presence was experienced through the movement. A life of prayer was practicing the presence of God in the fight for justice..." Weaver, "The Spirituality of Martin Luther King, Jr.", 59. See also Baldwin, *Never to Leave Us Alone*. King's is similar to the Roman Catholic idea of discipleship to Christ as both mystical and political. For two helpful explanations of this Catholic understanding, see Schillebeeckx, *On Christian Faith*, and Metz, *A Passion for God*.

³³ Ibid., 9.

³⁴ Cone, "Theology of Martin Luther King", 31. Cone argues that King's change from a focus on justice to a focus on love was due to the increased involvement of his editors and advisors in his work. Ibid., 32.

³⁵ Garrow, "Intellectual Development", 16.

³⁶ Garrow demonstrates that King's thought was influenced by the dialectical strategy of G.W.F. Hegel and the Christian Realism of Reinhold Niebuhr. The relationship between love and justice seems to include each of these elements. See Garrow, "Intellectual Development", 11-14.

³⁷ King, "Letter", 290-291. King's understanding of nonviolence as within justice and love becomes clear in King's description of the four phases of any campaign for nonviolent action. These include: contextual analysis to uncover any injustice, negotiation with the political powers for change, self-purification and spiritual preparation for action if negotiations fail, and the direct action itself that must remain nonviolent. These four steps demonstrate a similar sensibility to King's 1955 address with regard to love subsisting in justice. The overarching aim of these steps is the real achievement of justice for the oppressed in the here and now but using the morally "most excellent" method possible.

³⁸ King, "Cobo Hall", 66.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Malcolm X, "With Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer", 106-108.

community to serving the God of Life and becoming an ally in the fight against white supremacy. The goal was political and social revolution through transformation and rehabilitation as opposed to elimination and replacement. It was love subsisting in justice.

In King's 1967 speech before the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, "Where Do We Go From Here?", King's theology of revolutionary love, love subsisting in justice, continues to sharpen. His theology and rhetoric parallel that of the 1955 "MIA Mass Meeting" while also being informed by his reflections on praxis in his "Letter" and his triumphs and defeats in the ongoing nonviolent movement. After discussing direct actions such as Operation Breadbasket, he moves to the non-negotiable importance of revolutionary love. He declares to the SCLC attendees:

Now we got to get this thing right. What is needed is a realization that power without love is reckless and abusive, and love without power is sentimental and anemic. Power at its best...is love implementing the demands of justice, and justice at its best is love correcting everything that stands against love. And this is what we must see as we move on.⁴¹

In sum, Martin Luther King, Jr., the foremost Christian theologian, interpreter and practitioner of militant nonviolence in the 20th century, placed revolutionary love—love subsisting in justice and connected to the Greek term *agape*—at the core of his life and work. For King, *agape* was love of all humankind, oppressors and oppressed, because God loves them.⁴² King thinks it is a form of participation in God's work of fragmentary salvation. If not conclusive, I believe that my brief analysis of selected works from King's large *oeuvre* provides enough evidence to make this claim plausible. I now move on to place King's theology of revolutionary love, as a global theological flow, into dialogue with Kim.

Kim Chi-Ha: Advocate of the *Minjung*, Priest of *Han*

Korean Catholic poet and political dissident, Kim Chi-Ha, most likely is an unfamiliar figure to students of King's life, thought, and global influence. At the height of Kim's international fame, he was nominated for the Nobel Prizes in Peace and in Literature, was the recipient of the Lotus Prize, and was named an international "prisoner of conscience." Consequently, Catholic activist Daniel Berrigan characterized Kim as a "Catholic resister ... who so clearly embodies the healing, the heroism, the chutzpah, the lyrical and tragic, the mask of grotesquerie—and perhaps most important of all, the spinal courage, the articulated, stalking, indomitable no which today is the chief ingredient of that vocation. Quite a human. Quite a Christian."⁴³

Kim Chi-Ha's (b. 1941)⁴⁴ context was the *minjung*⁴⁵ revival in South Korea in the 20th century and his international fame reached its zenith in the 1970s. The word *minjung* (民衆) consists of two Chinese characters, *min* meaning people and *jung* meaning the masses. David Kwang-sun Suh remarks that the term *minjung*, although essentially untranslatable, points to those who have been "politically oppressed, economically exploited and culturally alienated."⁴⁶ This revival was the 20th century continuation of a centuries-old struggle of the Korean masses against the rich Korean minority in power. Kim, along with many other writers, artists, students, and activists, was part and parcel of the modern *minjung* movement and helped to articulate its primary concerns and goals: the liberation of the *minjung* from their *han*.

⁴¹ King, "Where do we go from here?", 186.

⁴² For an early articulation of love, and in particular King's distinction between *eros*, *philia*, and *agape*, see King's 1957 sermon, "Loving Your Enemies." King later develops this philosophy to more explicitly show and demand a robust social and political dimension, or political love, but it is more implicit, rather than absent from this early sermon. Also see Thurman, *Jesus and the Disinherited*, for the classic treatment of love of enemy that undergirded King's thought.

⁴³ Berrigan, "From a Korean Prison", 16.

⁴⁴ A much more extensive discussion of Kim and his theology is found in Considine, "Kim Chi-Ha's *Han* Anthropology". Some of this section is a reworking of that article.

⁴⁵ In this essay, I employ the Revised Romanization of Korean into English rather than the McCune-Reischauer system whenever possible.

⁴⁶ Suh quoted in Küster, *A Protestant Theology of Passion*, xii–xiii.

Kim's own focus was the resolution of the *han* of the people. In short, *han* (恨) is a cultural anthropology that refers to a deep woundedness, a "black hole in the soul" that is the consequence of being sinned-against. Andrew Sung Park describes *han* variously as "frustrated hope", "collapsed feeling of pain", "resentful feeling of bitterness", and "the division of the tissue of the heart caused by abuse, exploitation, and violence..."⁴⁷ Wang-Sang Han provides a sharp, visceral description, "Han is a sense of unresolved resentment against injustices suffered, a sense of helplessness because of overwhelming odds against one's feeling of total abandonment, a feeling of acute pain and sorrow in one's guts and bowels"⁴⁸ and Chung Hyun-Kyung points out that women's collective *han* is the most prevalent, most severe, and often overlooked.⁴⁹

To these descriptions of *han*, theologian Suh Nam-Dong describes a particular socio-political "fourfold dimension" to *han* that was formed through the unfolding of Korean history: colonization and invasion by regional powers such as China, Japan, and Mongolia that threatened the very existence of the Korean people; the tyrannical rulers who inflicted great suffering upon the Korean people; neo-Confucianism's strict subordination and oppression of women, so that "the existence of women was *han* itself"; and the overwhelming number of Korean peasants who were officially registered as hereditary slaves and thus treated as government property throughout Korean history.⁵⁰ Reflecting upon this long history, Korean Quaker writer and activist, Ham Sok-Hon, observes that Korea's history can be called a "Queen of Suffering." Ham writes, "This land, this people, events big and small, its politics and religion, its art and thought—all that is Korean bespeaks suffering. It is a fact, however shameful and painful."⁵¹

Kim places himself within this context of *han* and once described himself as a Shamanistic "priest of *han*." Kim thinks *han* is the *minjung's* experience of oppression that also carries the energy for social transformation. Kim writes that "accumulated *han* is inherited and transmitted, boiling in the blood of the people", and possesses "the emotional core of anti-regime action."⁵² Kim also emphasizes the intense negativity of *han*, for, as Wonhee Anne Joh points out, *han* is never innocent.⁵³ Its deep negativity cannot be underestimated, and one of Kim's sharpest descriptions of *han* is "a people-eating monster."⁵⁴ For him, *han* is a "ghostly creature" that "appears as a concrete substance with enormous ugly and evil energy."⁵⁵ The problem of *han* is at the core of Kim's work before 1989.⁵⁶

⁴⁷ Park, *Wounded Heart of God*, 20.

⁴⁸ Han quoted in Joh, *Heart of the Cross*, xxi.

⁴⁹ Chung, *Struggle to Be the Sun*, 42. See also Yoo, "Han-Laden Women" and Kim, "Oppression and Han."

⁵⁰ Suh, "Towards a Theology of Han", 58. For a sustained intercultural interpretation of *han*, see Considine, *Salvation for the Sinned Against*, 97-161.

⁵¹ Ham, *Queen of Suffering*, 22.

⁵² Kim, quoted in Suh, "Towards a Theology of Han", 64.

⁵³ Joh, *Heart of the Cross*, 25-27.

⁵⁴ Kim quoted in Suh, "Towards a Theology of Han", 64.

⁵⁵ Kim quoted in *Ibid.*, 64.

⁵⁶ Kim's retrieval of the *Donghak* rebellion against the ruling class provided a historical and philosophical source to inform and embolden the masses crying out for political revolution. Hwang, *A History of Korea*, 118-138. *Donghak* (Eastern Learning) was a response to the influence of Western, especially Catholic learning (called *sohak*) and encompassed aspects of Shamanism, Buddhism, Daoism, and perhaps, interestingly enough, Christianity. In Kim's work, he retrieves the importance of the *Donghak* peasants' rebellion (1894-95) and its founder's claim that "humanity is heaven." The importance of this awakening—what African-American philosophers might call a realization of "somebodiness" as opposed to "nobodiness"—cannot be overstated. The vast majority of the population of Korea were poor, landless peasants from before the Three Kingdoms period (892-936), through Goryeo (936-1392) and remained as such through the Joseon Dynasty (1392-1910) and into the Japanese invasion and occupation of Korea (1910-1945). A similar oppression of the poor majority continued into the late 20th century. This period in South Korea was defined by the military dictatorships of Park Chung-Hee (1961-1979) and Chun Doo-Hwan (1979-1988).

The Story of *Chang Il-Dam*

It is within this culture and context, and often while in prison, that Kim Chi-Ha envisioned a story entitled *Chang Il-Dam*. Kim's notes⁵⁷ shows that Chang, the title character, is a *han*-filled person through personal lineage and socio-political circumstance. Chang overcomes his *han* through a religious experience of enlightenment that is a "complete conformity with the *han* of abyss.' This refers to his experience of becoming one with those who are cursed and expelled by society, such as robbers, murderers, defrauders, etc."⁵⁸ This conformity with *han* occurs while Chang encounters a prostitute in labor with a child and Chang becomes a kind of messianic figure who struggles for the salvation and liberation of the poor and despised of South Korea. He comes to the realization that "humanity is heaven", gathers disciples, and retreats into the mountains to teach them a mystical-political praxis for salvation and liberation of those who suffer. They make a triumphant return into Seoul and proclaim liberation and salvation for the oppressed masses of women and men and thus make enemies of the rich and powerful. Chang soon is betrayed by one of his disciples, is arrested, tried, and executed. Three days he later rises from the dead and it is here that the story takes a surprising and grotesque turn. The Risen Chang beheads his betrayer, and himself, and then places his head on the neck of the betrayer. They are now fused into something new, albeit grotesque, that embodies and proclaims salvation and liberation. A new creation has emerged and Kim thinks that this is a symbol of salvation for sinner and sinned-against. An act of calculated, eschatological violence was necessary in order for this salvation to come about and be revealed to others. This is what Kim calls an "agonized violence of love" through a practice of *dan*. It is based in what Kim calls "the unity of God and revolution", or, "humanity is heaven."

Exegesis: *Dan* and *Chang Il-Dam*

Chang Il-Dam, and its agonized violence of love, is a story not of violent retribution but rather a strange kind of love and salvation for the oppressor based upon a practice of *dan*. It shows justice subsisting in love, however, both love and justice may include limited violence through an interplay between *Donghak* and Christianity. Like the founder of *Donghak*, Confucian scholar Choe Je-u, Chang has the revelation that "humanity is heaven" and that all human beings are of the divine. Like Jesus of Nazareth, proclaimed Messiah and God's own Son by Christians, Chang encounters God most robustly among those deemed "unclean"; those saturated with *han* through being sinned-against. Suh Nam-Dong observes that Chang "...arrives at the deep realization of the truth of new life (God) comes into the filthy cesspools of humanity."⁵⁹

Like each figure, Chang begins to preach immanent salvation and liberation to the people and gathers disciples. Differing from these figures, however, Chang teaches them the practice called *dan*. As Kim explains, *dan* is a remedy to *han*. It is the cutting off of *han* in order to break the vicious cycles of suffering, revenge, and unjust violence it perpetuates. *Dan* is akin to a necessary amputation of a gangrenous limb in order to save the rest of the body from infection and death. Kim thinks that this practice includes the confluence of personal asceticism, detachment from the world, and a purified re-engagement with the world for the purpose of social transformation. Kim writes, "*Dan* is to overcome *han*. Personally, it is self-

⁵⁷ The text of the poem itself, *Chang Il-Dam*, has been lost. It was confiscated by the Park dictatorship when Kim was arrested in 1974. He never attempted to reproduce the poem but has published references and notes. There are conflicting accounts of the character of Chang and of the plot and I have attempted to synthesize some of the commonalities among them. The sources upon which I rely include Suh's essays: "*Missio Dei* and Two Stories in Confluence", "Towards a Theology of *Han*", and "Historical References for a Theology of *Minjung*." In addition, I use Kim's "Declaration of Conscience." Kim's Declaration, however, was actually penned by his friend, Park Young-nae. Küster, *A Protestant Theology of Passion*, 81 n.11. This is a similarity between Kim and King; neither was directly responsible for everything attributed to his name. For some works, each acted as a kind of editor-in-chief rather than author, per se.

⁵⁸ Suh, "*Missio Dei*", 65.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 65.

denial. Collectively, it is to cut the vicious circle of revenge.”⁶⁰ Here, it is helpful to quote Kim at length in his explanation of *dan*:

to cut all adherence to the secular world in order that one may be for the revolution of the secular world. It is to sever the link which permits circulation. There is a terrible accumulation of *han* which will burn in endless hate, massacre, revenge, and destruction. Therefore we need the repeated cutting which stops the vicious circular explosion and sublimates it to a higher spiritual power.⁶¹

Through *dan*, Kim hopes that good will triumph over evil and the oppressed will be liberated because God and revolution are intertwined.⁶² Through a practice of *dan*, Kim thinks that despite *han*'s intense negativity, it can be sublimated and channeled to foster healing, justice, and peace. *Chang Il-Dam* shows that the philosophy of *dan* entails both a commitment to nonviolent resistance while also accepting the possibility of resorting to an “agonized violence of love.” Although not ideal, it may be a pragmatic necessity in order to foster salvation and liberation.⁶³ To this end, Kim writes, “I reject dehumanizing violence and accept the violence that restores human dignity. It could justly be called a violence of love.”⁶⁴ Kim continues, “I welcome the violence of love, yet I am also an ally of true nonviolence. The revolution I would support would be a synthesis of true nonviolence and an agonized violence of love.”⁶⁵

Chang's resurrection embodies an “agonized violence of love” due to the fusion of victim and victimizer into new creations. The limited, agonized violence and cutting of *dan*, for Kim, is necessary in order for these new, reconciled persons to arise. They are a product of *dan*, have been fully separated from the cycle of *han*, and by their very embodied existence transform its negative energy into positive energy that can foster healing, liberation, forgiveness, and reconciliation. Kim's resurrection image of Chang shows one possibility of *han* being resolved through *dan*.⁶⁶ As Suh observes, “This peculiar combination of the body of the evil man and the head of truth indicates that Kim Chi-Ha thought that even the most wicked villain will be saved in the end. Through the carrier that is the body of the evil man, Chang Il-Dam's good news of liberation, like a wild and stormy wind, goes everywhere.”⁶⁷

⁶⁰ Kim, quoted in Suh, “Towards a Theology of *Han*”, 65.

⁶¹ Kim, quoted in Suh, “Historical References”, 179.

⁶² Kim developed the phrase the “unity of God and revolution” through synthesizing the God of Catholicism with the *Donghak* revolutionary cry that “humanity is heaven!” as the peasants marched against the ruling class. Kim reflects: “I’ve been grappling with that image for ten years. At some point, I gave it a name: ‘The unity of God and revolution.’ I also changed the phrase ‘man [sic.] is heaven’ into ‘rice is heaven’ and used it in my poetry. That vague idea of the ‘unity of God and revolution’ stayed with me as I continued my long arduous search for personal and political answers, and as I became very interested in contemporary Christian thought and activism.” See Kim, “Declaration”, 12.

⁶³ Contemporary Christian theologians have criticized Kim's proposal of a philosophy of *dan*. For example, Joh critiques Kim from a critical feminist and post-colonial perspective and argues that even a limited, “agonized violence of love” is not a solution. Instead, Joh argues for a nonviolent praxis of *jeong* that is truly transformative and salvific. She argues that a praxis of *jeong*, in which relationships between victim and victimizer are transformed through nonviolent relationships, is a better method for realizing justice. Joh, *The Heart of the Cross*, 26–27, 91–115. Lee also offers a critique of Kim's philosophy of *dan*. For Lee, a continuous practice of psychological *dan* cannot lead to health and well-being. Although conflict and confrontation are necessary, Lee argues that these must be measured and limited so as not to exacerbate the wounds of *han* and unintentionally lead to more violence. Lee thinks peace and balance within the psyche is the ultimate goal and *dan* cannot achieve it. Lee, *The Exploration of the Inner Wounds*, 155–158.

⁶⁴ Kim, “Declaration”, 10.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 10.

⁶⁶ Jung-Young Lee, “Introduction”, 10. Suh describes four steps in Kim Chi-Ha's understanding of *dan*, which Kim derives from the unity of “God and revolution”, as he interprets both Catholic Social Teaching and also *Donghak* religion. “The first stage in this process is *Shichonju* (worshipping God in the mind), the second stage is *Yangchonju* (nurturing the body of God), the third stage is *Haengchonju* (practicing the struggle), and the fourth stage is *Sangchonju* (transcending death and living as a single, bright resurrected fighter for the people).” Suh, “Towards a Theology of *Han*”, 67.

⁶⁷ Suh, “Historical References”, 179.

Dialogue: Violence, Justice, and Love

Kim's story, *Chang Il-Dam*, with its undergirding philosophy of *dan* and an "agonized violence of love" presents a challenge to Martin Luther King, Jr.'s theology of revolutionary love. On the one hand, Kim and King both look to a new creation, a glimpse of realized eschatology, as embodying and proclaiming God's salvation that is already present but not yet in its fullness. It is God's work that calls for human participation, is indeed a new creation, and is inextricably linked to love, and in particular love of enemy, subsisting within justice. On the other hand, Kim's philosophy of a new creation through a practice of *dan*, which includes an agonized violence of love, is incommensurate with King's theology of revolutionary love in which the new creation is realized through militant nonviolence. For his part, Kim endorsed and practiced militant nonviolent resistance, however, he also was convinced that small acts of violence may be necessary and redemptive. Although later in his career King was shaken by the breadth and depth of white racism,⁶⁸ King never abandoned his conviction that nonviolent resistance, a revolutionary love rooted in justice, was the only way to fully participate in God's work of justice and liberation. Hence, for King even an agonized violence of love ultimately would be unacceptable.

Also, it is difficult to imagine King using such grotesque imagery as Kim to discuss the radical revolution needed to achieve the "beloved community" and "world house." If we recontextualize and re-imagine Kim's protagonist, Chang, as a Black messianic figure rooted both in African traditions and African-American Christianity who proclaims salvation and liberation to oppressed Blacks, his betrayal by perhaps a white disciple, eventual execution, and then Resurrection narrative in which he decapitates his white betrayer and exchanges heads with him, would be unlikely to have the same meaning as in its Korean context. A deeper, semiotic analysis would show that the meaning changes significantly as it moves from one culture to another.⁶⁹

Nevertheless, Kim's imagery may be closer to King's theology of love than it initially appears and may revitalize aspects of King's theology that have become dormant: the cost of justice and an insistence on nonviolent transformational love. Chang's agonized violence of love is an act of eschatological violence both to himself and his enemy. It is a strange image of a reconciliation based in Jesus Christ's Resurrection, interpreted through Shamanism and *Donghak*. Oppressor and oppressed are irrevocably fused together in a new creation, albeit grotesque. The point is for the sinned-against to become one flesh with the sinner. Kim's image is one of reconciliation, not retaliation. If it were mere eschatological vengeance, the traitor would remain dead and humiliated. But this is not the case. For, as Kim writes, "It is an expression of Chang's conflicting thought that this is revenge but at the same time also the salvation of vicious men."⁷⁰ Or, as Suh observes, "the head speaking justice and truth is bonded to the body carrying injustice and falsehood..."⁷¹ Kim creates an image that conveys a similar outcome to that for which King struggled: conversion of one's enemy into an ally in the fight for justice. The painful violence represents the cost of justice and the new creation the transformative power of love that gives life.

A Revitalized Revolutionary Love

In sum, King and Kim agree that love must subsist in justice and that justice includes salvation for both sinned-against and sinner. The goal for both thinkers is a realization of God's new creation, albeit fragmentary, in a "beloved community" or fusion of sinner and sinned-against. Although Kim's philosophy of *dan* ultimately may be incommensurate with King's theology of revolutionary love, Kim's grotesque

⁶⁸ As Cone describes: "Hope was carved out of the suffering and disappointments [King] experienced in fighting injustice in urban ghettos (especially Chicago), in dialoguing with black power advocates, and in taking his stand against the war in Vietnam. He placed love and justice in an eschatological context, with an emphasis on bearing witness to God's coming freedom by taking a stand for justice *now*, even though the odds against its establishment are great." Cone, "Theology", 30.

⁶⁹ See Garcia-Rivera, *St. Martin de Porres*, 25-39.

⁷⁰ Kim, quoted in Suh, "Towards a Theology of *Han*", 67.

⁷¹ Ibid., 67.

image of betrayed and betrayer becoming one flesh contains a surplus of meaning that, when in dialogue with King's theology of revolutionary love, highlight and revitalize King's theology within a global context. Kim's shocking, eschatological image reminds a society that justice and reconciliation among sinners and sinned-against, oppressors and oppressed, is costly. Justice requires pain and sacrifice from the oppressors (Chang's betrayer) but love directs the praxis as transformation towards new life and not mere vengeance or death (new creation of Chang and his betrayer). As King wrote in his posthumously-published essay, "A Testament of Hope", "White America must recognize that justice for black people cannot be achieved without radical changes in the structure of our society. The comfortable, the entrenched, the privileged cannot continue to tremble at the prospect of change in the status quo."⁷²

In this way, through highlighting King's theology and praxis of a costly yet nonviolent and transformative revolutionary love, those who encounter King may encounter his continuing importance for the global and local. For example, racialized injustice is both global and local and requires engagement through love subsisting in justice.⁷³ Those implicated in perpetuating racialized social sin must pay a cost in order to bring about a greater measure of justice. As Edward Schillebeeckx has argued, God does not will injustice and innocent suffering and therefore Christians must be involved in the work of social justice. At the same time, such justice must be achieved through nonviolent transformation of one's enemy into an ally and of social structures from dehumanizing to life giving. Whiteness and racialization are false anthropologies intertwined with global and local economic, political, and social structures that perpetuate and reinforce racialized denigration, inequality, and oppression. Those who benefit must allow his and her privilege to be transformed in order to benefit the victims of sin.

The sacrifices required from the privileged powerful and demanded by the disinherited in the cause of justice, however, may be radical but they will not be achieved through violence and brutality. Rather, these sacrifices must be achieved through nonviolence, through transformational love subsisting in justice. Kim's image may shock both oppressed and oppressors and draw them into the need for and the cost of true justice and reconciliation. But King's theology of revolutionary love guides and reinterprets this image away from violence, even an eschatological violence based in a kind of love, to show that justice must be achieved through nonviolent love of enemy. It is within this space that Kim's image revitalizes King's theology within a global context. King's militant nonviolence demands much from oppressed and oppressor for there is a real cost to revolution that Kim highlights through an agonized violence of love. Together, they show that the powerful will be shaken in their souls, lose influence, and have their resources reconfigured to the needs of the powerless. They must learn to love their neighbor, the one bleeding in the streets or being ground to dust by oppression—and accept the cost of doing so. The powerless must take hold of their righteous anger, their yearning for justice, and channel it into a kind of love of enemy. Their *han* must be addressed and resolved through love subsisting in justice.

References

- Alexander, Michelle. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of "Colorblindness"*. New York: The New Press, 2010.
- Baldwin, Lewis V. "Living in the World House." In *In an Inescapable Network of Mutuality: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Globalization of an Ethical Ideal*, edited by Lewis V. Baldwin and Paul Dekar, 3-24. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2013.
- Baldwin, Lewis V. *Never to Leave Us Alone: The Prayer Life of Martin Luther King Jr.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010.
- Baldwin, Lewis V. *Toward the Beloved Community: Martin Luther King, Jr. and South Africa*. Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 1995.
- Baldwin, Lewis V. and Rufus Burrow, Jr., eds. *The Domestication of Martin Luther King, Jr.: Clarence B. Jones, Right-Wing Conservatism, and the Manipulation of the King Legacy*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2013.
- Baldwin, Lewis V. and Paul Dekar, eds. *In an Inescapable Network of Mutuality: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Globalization of an Ethical Ideal*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2013.
- Berrigan, Daniel. "From a Korean Prison: A Path to Life." *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, 9:2 (April–June 1977), 16-19.

⁷² King, "A Testament of Hope", 314.

⁷³ It is beyond the scope of this essay to offer a more adequate treatment of the global work of racial justice. That must be laid out in a separate essay. To better understand the history and globalized nature of racialized injustice, see Carter, *Race*, Jennings, *Christian Imagination*, and Douglas, *Stand Your Ground*.

- Burrow, Jr., Rufus. *A Child Shall Lead Them: Martin Luther King, Jr., Young People, and the Movement*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014.
- Carter, J. Kameron. *Race: A Theological Account*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Chung, Hyun Kyung. *Struggle to be the Sun Again: Introducing Asian Women's Theology*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1990.
- Coates, Ta-Nehisi. *Between the World and Me*. New York: Spiegel & Grau, 2015.
- Cone, James H. *Martin, Malcolm, and America: A Dream or a Nightmare*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1992.
- Cone, James H. "The Theology of Martin Luther King, Jr." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, 40:4 (1986), 21-39.
- Considine, Kevin P. "A 'Collective Black' Liberation in the Face of 'Honorary White' Racism? A Growing Edge for U.S. Black Liberation Theologies." *Black Theology: An International Journal* 8, no. 3 (2010): 286-306.
- Considine, Kevin P. "Han and Salvation for the Sinned-Against." *New Theology Review* 26:1 (2013), 87-89.
- Considine, Kevin P. "Kim Chi-Ha's Han Anthropology and its Challenge to Catholic Thought." *Horizons: The Journal of the College Theology Society*. 41:1 (June 2014), 49-73.
- Considine, Kevin P. *Salvation for the Sinned-Against: 'Han' and Schillebeeckx in Intercultural Dialogue*. Missional Church, Public Theology, and World Christianity 5. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2015.
- Douglas, Kelly Brown. *Stand Your Ground: Black Bodies and the Justice of God*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 2015.
- Dyson, Michael Eric. *I May Not Get There With You: The True Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York: Free Press, 2000.
- Fung, Raymond. "Compassion for the Sinned-Against." *Theology Today*, 37:2 (July 1980), 162-169.
- Gandhi, Mahatma. *All Men are Brothers: Autobiographical Reflections*. Compiled and edited by Krishna Kripalani with an Introduction by Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan. New York: Continuum, 2008.
- Garcia-Rivera, Alejandro. *St. Martin de Porres: The "Little Stories" and the Semiotics of Culture*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1995.
- Garrow, David J. "The Intellectual Development of Martin Luther King, Jr." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, 40:4 (1986), 5-20.
- Ham, Sok-Hon. *The Queen of Suffering: A Spiritual History of Korea*. London: Friends World Committee for Consultation, 1985.
- Hopkins, Dwight. "The Last Testament of Martin Luther King, Jr." *Theology Today*, 65:1 (April 2008), 67-80.
- Hwang, Kyung-Moon. *A History of Korea: an Episodic Narrative*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010.
- Jennings, Willie James. *The Christian Imagination: Theology and the Origins of Race*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.
- Joh, Wonhee Anne. *Heart of the Cross: A Postcolonial Christology*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2006.
- Kim Chi-Ha. "Declaration of Conscience." *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 9:2 (1977), 8-15.
- Kim, Chi-Ha. *The Gold Crowned Jesus and Other Writings*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1978.
- Kim, Chi-Ha. "Twelve Poems of Kim Chi-Ha." Trans. Susie Jie Young Kim. *Korea Journal* (Autumn 1995): 67-84.
- Kim, Chi-Ha and Oe Kenzaburo. "An Autonomous Subject's long Waiting, Coexistence." *Positions*, 5:1 (1997), 285-313.
- Kim, Grace Ji-Sun. "Oppression and Han: Korean Women's Historical Context." *Journal of Asian and Asian-American Theology*, 3:1 (1999), 55-70.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. "Address to the First Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA) Mass Meeting." In *A Call to Conscience: The Landmark Speeches of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.*, edited by Clayborne Carson and Kris Shepard, 7-12. New York: Grand Central Publishing, 2001.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. "Address at the Freedom Rally in Cobo Hall." In *A Call to Conscience: The Landmark Speeches of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.*, edited by Clayborne Carson and Kris Shepard, 61-73. New York: Grand Central Publishing, 2001.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. "Letter from Birmingham City Jail." In *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, edited by James Melvin Washington, 289-302. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. "Loving Your Enemies." In *A Knock at Midnight: Inspiration from the Great Sermons of Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.*, edited by Clayborne Carson and Peter Holloran, 41-60. New York: Warner Books, 1998.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. "Pilgrimage to Nonviolence" in *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, edited by James Melvin Washington, 35-40. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. "Showdown for Nonviolence." In *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, edited by James Melvin Washington, 64-72. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. "Stride Toward Freedom." In *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, edited by James Melvin Washington, 417-490. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. "A Testament of Hope." In *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, edited by James Melvin Washington, 313-328. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. "Why We Can't Wait." In *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, edited by James Melvin Washington, 518-554. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986.
- Küster, Volker. *A Protestant Theology of Passion: Korean Minjung Theology Revisited*. Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Large, Ron. "Martin Luther King, Jr: Ethics, Nonviolence, and Moral Character." *Journal of Religious Thought*, 48:1 (1991), 51-63.
- Lee, Hak-Joon. *The Great World House: Martin Luther King, Jr. and Global Ethics*. Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 2011.
- Lee, Hak-Joon. *We Will Get to the Promised Land: Martin Luther King, Jr's Communal-Political Spirituality*. Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 2006.
- Lee, Jae Hoon. *The Exploration of the Inner Wounds—Han*. American Academy of Religion Publication, 1994.
- Lee, Jung-Young. "Introduction." In *An Emerging Theology in World Perspective: Commentary on Korean Minjung Theology*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1995.

- Malcolm X. "With Ms. Fannie Lou Hamer." In *Malcolm X Speaks: Selected Speeches and Statements*. Edited by George Breitman, 105-114. New York: Grove Press, 1966.
- Metz, Johannes Baptist. *A Passion for God: The Mystical-Political Dimension of Christianity*. Edited and translated by J. Matthew Ashley. Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1998.
- Park, Andrew Sung. *The Wounded Heart of God: The Asian Concept of Han and the Christian Doctrine of Sin*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993.
- Rah, Soong Chan. *Many Colors: Cultural Intelligence for a Changing Church*. Chicago: Moody Publishers, 2010.
- Schillebeeckx, Edward. *On Christian Faith: The Spiritual, Ethical and Political Dimensions*. Translated by John Bowden. New York: Crossroad, 1987.
- Schreier, Robert. *The New Catholicity: Theology Between the Global and Local*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1997.
- Smith, David and Ira Zepp, Jr. *Search for the Beloved Community: The Thinking of Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York: Judson Press, 1998.
- Suh Kyung-Sik. "A Letter to Mr. Kim Chi-ha; or, The Pain of the Split Self." *Positions* 5:1 (1997), 315-320.
- Suh, Nam Dong. "Historical References for a Theology of *Minjung*." In *Minjung Theology: People as the Subjects of History*, edited by The Commission on Theological Concerns of the Christian Conference of Asia (CTC-CCA), 155-182. Singapore: Christian Conference of Asia, 1981.
- Suh, Nam Dong. "Missio Dei and Two Stories in Confluence" in *Asian Contextual Theology for the Third Millennium: A Theology of Minjung in Fourth-Eye Formation*, edited by Paul S. Chung, Kim Kyoung-Jae and Veli-Matti Karkkainen, 51-67. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2007.
- Suh, Nam Dong. "Toward a Theology of Han." In *Minjung Theology: People as the Subjects of History*, edited by The Commission on Theological Concerns of the Christian Conference of Asia (CTC-CCA), 55-72. Singapore: Christian Conference of Asia, 1981.
- Thurman, Howard. *Jesus and the Disinherited*. Boston: Beacon, 1976.
- Weaver, C. Douglas. "The Spirituality of Martin Luther King, Jr." *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 31:1 (2004), 55-70.
- Wu, Chan J. "Introduction: Cosmic Buds Burgeoning in Words; Chiha Kim's Poetics of Full Emptiness." *Heart's Agony: Selected Poems of Kim Chi-Ha*, translated by Won-Chung Kim and James Han, 15-33. Fredonia, NY: White Wine Press, 1998.
- Yoo, Yani. "Han-Laden Women: Korean 'Comfort Women' and Women in Judges 19- 21." *Semeia* 78 (1997), 37-46.