

Globalisation and Violence – A Challenge to the Churches?

*Contributions to a Consultation on
Justice, Peace and the
Integrity of Creation*

EDITED BY
JOCHEN MOTTE
THOMAS SANDNER



foedus-verlag

© 2004

foedus-verlag

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Umschlaggestaltung und Satz: *j.s.*

Gesamtherstellung: Breklumer Druckerei Manfred Siegel KG

Printed in Germany

ISBN 3-932735-92-7

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

Contents

JOCHEN MOTTE	
Globalisation and Violence. A Challenge to the Churches?	
3 rd International Consultation on Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation	7
GLOBALISATION AND VIOLENCE. A CHALLENGE TO THE CHURCHES?	
Message of the 3 rd International Consultation on Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation	11
REINER GROTH	
A Word of Welcome	17
ZEPHANIA KAMEETA	
Overcoming Violence as a Challenge for UEM	21
ULRICH MÖLLER	
Overcoming Violence as Challenge for UEM. – A Perspective from the German Region	25
RÜDIGER NOLL	
Violence in a Global Context from a European Perspective	37
FIDON R. MWOMBEKI	
Different Faces of Violence in Africa	51
THERESA C. CARINO	
Globalization and Violence: An Asian Perspective	61
BERTOLD KLAPPERT	
Conversion from violent religious and political Fantasies	75
SUNG-HEE LEE-LINKE	
Overcoming Violence in Biblical Perspective	89
SEONG-WON PARK	
Economic Globalisation and Economic Violence	93

JÖRG HÜBNER
Globalisation and Violence

109

CONTRIBUTORS

117

Globalisation and Violence. A Challenge to the Churches?

3rd International Consultation on Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation

JOCHEN MOTTE

From 1st to 7th February 2004 the United Evangelical Mission together with the Evangelical Church of Westphalia conducted a consultation on justice, peace and the integrity of creation. Under the theme „Globalisation and Violence. A Challenge to the Churches?“ 53 women and men from member churches of the United Evangelical Mission, other organisations and resource persons from Africa, Asia and Europe who are engaged in, and committed to, JPIC work gathered in the Church Academy of Iserlohn.

For the third time since 1995, JPIC contact persons within the UEM and others responsible for JPIC within churches and church related organisations came together to develop common strategies for joint action with the UEM and its churches.

The first JPIC workshop in 1995, one year before the UEM officially transformed from a German mission organisation into an international communion of churches; was hosted by the Methodist Church in Sri Lanka. We encountered many difficulties at the time to obtain visas and get people through immigration. The reason for this was the theme of the workshop „Blessed are the Peacemakers – Striving together for Justice, Peace and Integrity of Creation“, which was focussing on fact-finding work on human rights violations. At that time, human rights were considered a sensitive issue by the Sri Lanka Government, as it still is today in many other countries where UEM member churches are located.

In 1995 the foundations were laid for continuous networking among UEM member churches on JPIC and for the ongoing support of the churches' human rights, peace and advocacy work. In 2000, six months before the second UEM General Assembly, JPIC contact persons met for the second time in Namibia, as guests of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the Republic of Namibia, to learn more about its justice and reconciliation work and to share experiences from other countries such as Rwanda, Sri Lanka and South Africa.

In 2000, the participants restated the need to work more closely together on justice, peace and the integrity of creation. They also identified several obstacles that were making it difficult for them to raise awareness of these issues in their churches

and to effectively address their day-to-day challenges. This was reflected in both the recommendations and the decisions of the 2000 General Assembly, where UEM member churches were called upon to develop a comprehensive approach and adequate structures to protect those suffering severe human rights violations, living under conditions of war, marginalized through economic injustice, lack of access to education, health care, food, water, adequate housing or to racist and discriminatory politics in their countries. The General Assembly also initiated the establishment of a UEM Human Rights Commission through the Council. The Commission started its work in 2001.

Since the establishment of the JPIC department in the UEM in 1993, the UEM has often been requested to support the JPIC-related activities of its member churches and especially of those people in the churches who are active in this field through project support, lobby and advocacy work at an international level and by providing opportunities for further training in the field of human rights and peace work.

There have also been a series of JPIC regional meetings, for example in Northern Sumatra, Tanzania and Germany where churches are close to one another. More than 50 projects in the field of human rights, economic justice, creation and peace work have received support in recent years. The regional conflicts in Papua and Central Africa have been particular priorities. The launching of the Decade to Overcome Violence four years ago was fresh motivation for the UEM and the churches to identify and address violence in their local and regional contexts, as well as on a global scale. In the past three years 15 women and men from member churches in Africa, Asia and Germany had the opportunity to take part in conflict transformation courses in the United Kingdom

With regard to economic, social and cultural rights and the question of economic justice, the UEM, together with other ecumenical bodies and churches, but also with other NGOs, participated and still participates in several important campaigns and joint lobby activities such as:

- the Jubilee Campaign for debt release
- the Clean Clothes Campaign for fair labour conditions in the textile industries,
- the international Ecumenical Advocacy Alliance on HIV/AIDS and trade,
- the German campaign „Justice now!“ on trade,
- the initiative on economy and human rights to make transnational co-operations responsible for human rights violations and to oblige them to work in line with international human rights and labour agreements

In Iserlohn, the participants had the opportunity to share and discuss what has been achieved so far within the churches, jointly in the UEM, or together with other ecumenical bodies and non-governmental partners. The thematic focus of the Iserlohn

consultation was on the issue of globalisation and violence as a challenge to the churches. A message and recommendations were approved by the participants on the basis of the inputs that are published in this book, the biblical reflections, the discussions in groups and in plenary and the exposure programme (on the impact of globalisation in a German context – in industry, agriculture, the health system, the privatisation of the water supply and immigration).

The consultation was held in Germany, a highly industrialised country, which, in 2003, again became the world's leading exporting country and, in a study published by Newsweek in January 2004, was ranked the second most powerful country in the world. The setting therefore provided the participants with a unique opportunity to address the question what churches in the North are expected to do with regard to global justice. A question being asked by churches in the South that are experiencing the negative impact of globalisation in a much more direct and brutal sense than their counterparts in the North.

The words of Paul from Romans 12,1-2 may illustrate the task facing the churches in view of the present day challenges. Paul addresses the congregation in Rome:

„I appeal to you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship. Do not be conformed to this world but be transformed by the renewal of your mind, that you may prove what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect.“

The task, according to Paul, is to prove what the will of God is in the face of the complex reality, characterized today by the catchword „globalisation“. The world at the time of the Roman Empire had some similarities with our own when we look at its global impact on the social, political, cultural, economic and military life of the people in almost all parts of the known world at that time.

For Paul, the will of God is not in itself obvious. What is right and wrong, good and bad for Christians has not been fixed from the beginning or can be taken literally from the Bible. It has to be elaborated and to be proven again and again. This task of proving has to be faced within the UEM, so that its members, as the congregation of Jesus Christ, may effectively contribute to the protection of people from marginalisation, violence and the absence of law and justice in this world.

Special thanks for their co-operation and contributions in the preparatory process and in the implementation of the workshop have to be expressed to the Moderator and the Vice-Moderator of the UEM Dr Zephania Kameeta and Dr Ulrich Möller; to the members of the UEM Human Rights Commission and the UEM Council, Rev.

Wilfried Neusel and Ms Imelda Simangunsong; to the members of the preparatory committee from the Evangelical Church of Westphalia and the Evangelical Church in the Rhineland, Rev. Peter Ohligschläger, Mr Uwe Trittman and Ms Dorothea Seeliger.

Special thanks also to the editor and translator of many documents presented in this publication, Mr John McLaughlin.

Globalisation and Violence. A Challenge to the Churches?

Message of the 3rd International Consultation on Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation, Iserlohn, 1st to 7th February 2004

Message

We the 53 participants of the UEM JPIC-consultation, among them the Moderator, Vice-moderator and Council members, JPIC contact persons of the UEM member churches and people responsible for and engaged in JPIC work, resource persons and UEM staff, met from 1st to 7th February 2004 in the Evangelical Academy of Iserlohn/Evangelical Church of Westphalia (EKvW), Germany.

Four years after the second international UEM workshop on Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation (JPIC), we came together again from 11 countries in Asia, Africa and Germany.

This consultation was an implementation of the General Assembly decision in Windhoek 2000 in the context of the Decade to Overcome Violence (DOV).

I. Common Witness

„...bear witness to the Kingdom of God in striving for Justice, Peace and Integrity of Creation“ (UEM Constitution, § 2)

We see and experience the reality of globalisation for all the people in our world. As churches we are part of this reality. We use the positive effects of globalisation, which enable us also to take common action and to plan common strategies, e.g. modern technology and faster communication. However, there are also negative and dehumanising effects of globalisation: People are suffering from many kinds of violence. People are marginalized through unemployment. Others are maltreated through trafficking of people and sexual abuse. People suffer from HIV/AIDS, the consequences of colonialism, genocide, civil wars and ethnic tensions. Many of our members, especially in the South, are affected by socio-economic and environmental exploitation. In all our societies there are few beneficiaries and many losers as a result of globalisation.

We believe that the Church is called to serve the whole human being including their living conditions. Therefore we believe that the work for Justice, Peace and the

Integrity of Creation is an integral part of being the Church of Jesus Christ. As Paul writes in 1 Corinthians 12,26: „If a member of the body of Christ suffers, all members suffer“. That is why we have to give witness to God’s justice in our respective contexts in Africa, Asia and Europe as churches, being aware that we live in a world torn apart and that in this very situation it is our calling to commit ourselves to remain members of the one body of Christ. We experience the visible signs of being united in Christ’s church when we proclaim His Gospel in word and deed and when we celebrate His presence in sharing in Holy Communion.

We confess God’s justice and His preferential option for the poor as our guiding principles in the context of ethically unacceptable consequences of the present economic system. This means: We must take a clear confessing stance, speak out prophetically and seek dialogue and cooperation with all who are committed to exploring ways towards a development which is consistent with God’s household and his promise of the fullness of life without exclusion.

II. Sharing experiences

We joined in worship and shared witness and biblical reflections.

We listened to the analyses, reports and experiences of fellow Christians from churches in Botswana, Cameroon, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Germany, the People’s Republic of China, Indonesia, Korea, Namibia, the Philippines, Rwanda and Tanzania.

We gathered at Iserlohn/Westphalia in Germany hosted by our sisters and brothers of the EKvW with whom we shared enriching encounters during the reception by the church board in Bielefeld and in the exposure programmes. The international teams were introduced to the local effects of globalisation in five sectors: agriculture, health, the privatisation of the water supply, immigration, industry and unemployment.

During the consultation *we were confronted* with the many faces of violence and the various negative economic and social impacts of globalisation:

- increasing militarism, arms trade and proliferation, new wars, exploitation of resources to finance war and hegemonic security concepts
- religious fundamentalism, including Christian fundamentalism
- gross violations of civil and political as well as economic, social and cultural human rights

- gender imbalance, domestic violence and trafficking in women
- the growing gap between rich and poor, idolization of money, destructive competition, poverty, debt and precarious working conditions.

III. Facing challenges

The era of globalisation has led to the marginalization of millions of people all over the world. It is a challenge for us to recognize these „invisible people“ and to give them a voice and restore their dignity as human beings who are created in the image of God. In history and up to now, churches have contributed to dehumanising ideologies, for instance colonialism, racism and apartheid.

This year, Namibia and Germany are remembering the 100th anniversary of the uprising against German colonial rule in Namibia. The respective UEM member churches are commemorating the genocide and the atrocities committed by German colonial forces against the Herero, Nama and Damara.

It is a challenge for us today to critically examine our theologies, whether they contribute to marginalizing and excluding people. We therefore see the need to strengthen our joint efforts to strive for justice and to work for the full recognition and implementation of the universal human rights in this world.

Confronted with the current neo-liberal world economy, the privatisation of common goods, and free market system we must respond in order to ensure participation and justice for the benefit of all people. We cannot accept the false and inhuman ideology of that system which regards human beings only as efficient producers or extravagant consumers. We reject the use of war and militarism as an instrument to maintain world peace and security. We feel encouraged through different church initiatives and NGO activities here in Germany as well as in Africa and Asia to change this system.

IV. Commitments and recommendations

> to the General Assembly

Having assessed the DOV-process and the JPIC work within the UEM context with particular focus on globalisation, we recommend the following to the UEM General Assembly 2004:

- 1) to continue to give priority to JPIC and human rights within the DOV process and to foster the discussion about ways and means in which the UEM and its member churches can address the issues of violence in their respective contexts in the coming 4 years, e.g. in the following areas:

- a. violation of economic, social and cultural human rights
 - b. poverty and hunger
 - c. concentration of wealth
 - d. domestic violence
 - e. gender imbalance
 - f. civic and economic illiteracy
 - g. regional conflicts, e.g. West Papua and Central Africa
 - h. global militarism and increased expenditure for military resources, child soldiers
 - i. inter-religious conflicts
 - j. HIV/AIDS
- 2) to decide upon the following principles and guidelines concerning the UEM JPIC and human rights work:
- a. to promote the process of JPIC by building up sensitisation and cooperation on JPIC issues among the churches by doing human rights lobby and advocacy work and by supporting human rights, peace and environmental projects and by participating in campaigns on JPIC issues.
 - b. to further participate fully in the DOV and to assist and equip the churches for further capacity building on peace work and conflict transformation, human rights work and project management.
 - c. to give special attention to globalisation, to ensure that this is addressed in the various programmes of the UEM and to promote theological reflection in this matter.
- 3) to mandate the Council to assist the member churches in further capacity building on JPIC through
- a. scholarships
 - b. personnel exchange with special JPIC expertise in all directions
 - c. voluntary short-term exchange and visitation programmes
 - d. exchange of guest lecturers with special JPIC knowledge
 - e. designing and building up an early warning system to prevent violent conflict
 - f. providing platforms for exchange of experiences in human rights, mediation and peace work
 - g. strengthening solidarity among UEM member churches
 - h. promoting theological education on JPIC issues in member churches
 - i. supporting theological study processes on global issues (e.g. the Soesterberg „economy for life“-process)
 - j. promoting creative and innovative ways in doing JPIC work through the expression of the diverse cultures.

- 4) to mandate the holding of a 4th international JPIC consultation in 2008 in the Asian region with special focus on the results of networking and capacity building in JPIC work
- 5) to mandate the UEM Human Rights Commission to survey, together with the churches, the progress of the establishment of adequate church structures to respond to JPIC challenges
- 6) in view of the tasks mentioned above to strengthen the JPIC desk (e.g. through additional personnel and finances).

> to the UEM member churches and UEM office and regional offices

We are greatly thankful that some churches have been very active in JPIC work. But many church policies and statements regarding JPIC were not implemented and are not yet integrated into the ministry of the churches. We notice that the continued work is greatly dependent on whether church leaders are committed to JPIC and whether the church is itself threatened and has to take urgent action. Consequently we recommend to the member churches and the regional offices:

- 1) to draw up strategies for the churches to respond to the challenges to JPIC on the national, regional and global levels
- 2) to organize or strengthen structures that would carry out the JPIC work, especially building church awareness for JPIC, deliberate efforts to raise public awareness, peace-building, and networking
- 3) to put emphasis on the following issues:
 - a. awareness building on JPIC and human rights focusing on church leaders, pastors and congregations
 - b. improving the regular communication on JPIC between
 - the JPIC contact persons and their church boards
 - the UEM staff in the office and the regions and the member churches, including the regional church networks SEKBEB in North Sumatra and the dioceses of ELCT in Tanzania
 - c. establishing executive JPIC positions within the churches and providing the necessary financial resources and structures
 - d. cross-cultural courses in conflict transformation and mediation at different levels

- e. economic literacy and community-based projects (e.g. impact of free trade on the agricultural sector and the environment; income-generating projects and micro-credit systems)
- f. theological-biblical studies of socio-economic and political concerns

> *to ourselves*

Bearing in mind that awareness building in JPIC in our member churches is still needed, we commit ourselves to report and discuss the findings of this consultation with our church leadership and the delegates to the UEM General Assembly.

We remind ourselves that we are not alone. We are challenged to journey with a growing number of people resisting globalisation and violence.

V. Encouragement

„The Lord will dawn over you and His glory, His beauty, His holiness will be seen over you.“ (Isaiah 60, 2)

To work for JPIC can sometimes become very discouraging and also dangerous, because we have to face a lack of support as well as extreme challenges. But Isaiah encourages us to see the Kingdom of God coming in the midst of the hardships of our JPIC-work. It was because of this that our moderator, Dr Zephania Kameeta, in our opening ceremony called us „very special people“: not because we are better people, but because of the trust God places in us to confront globalisation and violence together.

A Word of Welcome

REINER GROTH

Dear friends, sisters and brothers in Christ,

On behalf of the *United Evangelical Mission – Communion of Churches in three Continents*, I'd like to welcome you to this international workshop under the theme "Globalisation and Violence – A Challenge to the Churches?" I wonder whether the question mark behind the theme indicates only a rhetorical question or a real doubt. I think there can be no question at all that globalisation and violence *are* a challenge for our member churches regardless of the region in which they are located.

The UEM constitution says: *Together they* (the member churches) *shall proclaim Jesus Christ to be the Lord and Saviour of all people and shall meet the present-day missionary challenges.* (§ 2, 2b)

The emphasis is on the word "together". In a rapidly globalising world with so many hidden and open forms of violence the UEM as a communion of churches can become a meaningful and relevant factor only by acting together and working hand in hand on these challenges.

The very purpose of the UEM is joint action in mission. The first step toward joint action is always to provide a forum or a space for people coming from different places and continents to share their *local* experiences and to reflect them in a *global* context.

Such an open space for reflection and action, for sharing and caring is not only provided by the UEM as a kind of service to its members but the UEM – understood as a worldwide communion of believers – is in itself such an open space for encounter and exchange, for *praise, prayer and action*, as it was said in the motto of our founding General Assembly 1996 in Bethel.

The UEM in itself can be understood as an alternative type of globalisation where people come together freely, speak out and share their concerns with others from other regions, thus not being mere objects of globalisation but taking things into their own hands and participating in a process where nobody should feel excluded or marginalized.

I understand this consultation to be part of this wider process. It is an integral part of our mission to take up the issues of justice, peace and the integrity of creation (JPIC).

I am proud to say that in the German context the UEM was the first missionary organisation to establish a fulltime position for JPIC and human rights. 10 years ago there were some sceptics who feared that the establishment of such a position would draw us too much into politics and turn away from our central tasks of preaching the gospel. This fear however has proven to be unfounded. Today we can observe with satisfaction and gratefulness that all UEM member churches have accepted JPIC issues as a legitimate concern not only for some outsiders and NGO activist but also as part of their own central mission.

Indeed what kind of gospel can we preach if it were not related to the transformation of all things in the light of God's coming kingdom? The reign of God means good news to the poor, freedom for the oppressed and the overcoming of violence in all its forms. It means *new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells* (2. Pet 3,13) and peace and justice kiss each other (Ps 85,10).

Therefore all UEM member churches have committed themselves *to bear witness to the Kingdom of God in striving for justice, peace and the integrity of Creation.* (UEM constitution § 2, 2c)

In the meantime a network of JPIC contact persons has been established in all three UEM regions; and many of the participants of this workshop are indeed part of this network. Analogous to the *Women's Working Group* the Council has established a *Human Rights Commission*, which serves as an advisory body to the Council. All this shows that we perceive and affirm the striving for JPIC as an essential dimension of our common witness.

In my humble opinion globalisation and violence are rather old phenomena. However they received new drive and dynamism after the break down of the communist world and with the rise of new technologies. The destructive potential in the hand of human beings has become frightening. Cain killed his brother Abel using very simple means. Today we have arsenals of sophisticated weapons and scientific-military-industrial complexes inconceivable in former times. On the other hand, law and order are breaking down in many parts of the world, creating unimaginable forms of cruelty and suffering for innocent civilians. How can we find new institutional safeguards against these threats?

Even before Cain committed the first murder in history, globalisation had already started! We should not forget that it started with a blessing when God blessed the first humans and said: "Be fruitful, multiply, fill the earth and subdue it" (Genesis 1.28). God said this to human beings created in his image. He wanted them to become his partners in reigning over the earth. What God's reign truly means has been revealed in Jesus Christ. Christ said: "Blessed are the peacemakers – and blessed are the gentle, the non-violent – they shall reign over the earth and have it as inheritance" (Mt 5,5.9).

God's words to Adam and Eve were the beginning of the true globalisation, an alter-

native model to what we see happening today. God's words of blessing initiated a participatory process of globalisation, a process of cooperation between God and humankind and between all humans willing to share all blessings of God's good creation.

In this perspective I wish you a blessed consultation and a fruitful cooperation during these days here in Iserlohn and I hope for good and meaningful results, which you can share with those who did not have the privilege of coming to this place but would like to know about what you have learned and experienced here.

God bless you all.

Overcoming Violence as a Challenge for UEM

ZEPHANIA KAMEETA

Dear Brothers and Sisters,

I feel very much honoured to be here together with all of you. This is the first time I've attended a conference of this nature within the UEM. The previous consultation in Windhoek was held just before my election as moderator of the UEM.

What I am going to do is share my personal insights with you, and my experiences in the field of working against violence for peace, justice and freedom. This year, we Namibians are commemorating the colonial uprising and the fight against German colonial rule in Namibia 100 years ago. Some of you were in Wuppertal for the launch of this commemoration, which we marked on the 11th of January in Namibia, the Sunday before the actual start of the battle against colonial rule on the 12th of January. You would have seen the photographs that were taken during that time. What is particularly striking when you look at these photographs are the people with big chains around their necks or legs, and the people hanging from trees. They are nameless. Yes, there are no names! We know well the policies of the German Kaiser at that time, that these people were regarded as half human and that it was therefore unnecessary to write down their names. It is interesting to look into the life of General von Trotha, who ordered the genocide of the Herero and Nama speaking people. He was sent by the Kaiser to Namibia because he had made a name for himself in China as a professional killer. So, after the atrocities committed in China he came to Namibia. You can clearly see the link here between all the oppressed people of the world. The expression „sub-human“ was pronounced by the Kaiser at that time in reference to the Chinese. When von Trotha then came to us he acted in the same way by treating our ancestors as „sub-human“. This is the explanation for the nameless photographs.

I don't think that many of those photographs were taken out of sympathy for those who were standing or hanging there on the trees, but probably to prove how the powerful regime was dealing with the „savages“ of that time. Now, these people with chains around their necks and on their legs were our grandparents. They were born in misery and died in that misery. They are not just people in the distant past: if they had been named – and they did have names – you would have recognized our names in their names. When I look at them, I always have to ask the question: „Who

were you?“ „Were you my grandfather?“ „Were you my grandmother?“ „Who are you?“

Yes, they were born in this misery and they died in this misery. Fortunately for us, because of that resistance and suffering, I was able to vote for the first time in my life when I was 44 years old. My father was 79 years old when he voted for the first time.

On Independence Day, the 21st March 1990, our hearts were full of joy. But we also cried. Why? We cried because we thought of all these nameless people. I wished they were there, all of them. All of them: women, children, men. We wished they could have been there to witness the lowering of the South African colonial flag and the hoisting of the Namibian flag. That is why our joy was mingled with tears. Of course it was impossible for them to be there, because they had been brutally murdered. The Colonial Powers, the German as well as the succeeding South African Colonial Power did everything in their power to make colonial domination and violence acceptable to the people of Namibia. They devised programmes, as I would say – and my brother Philip Tjerije will remember this slogan – „to win the hearts and the minds of the people“. The Military even established theological schools to teach a Theology to those who were being „deceived“ that colonialism, apartheid and domination are God-given virtues. I was not surprised last year when a former principal and teacher of the school told me something he wouldn't have said 14 years ago: that NETS – the „Namibia Evangelical Theological Seminary“ – was 100 % established by the South African Army, to counteract our Theological Seminary which was regarded as training Communists, Marxists and Terrorists.

The regime's response to our refusal to accept all this, as you can imagine, was to directly attack the churches with all means at its disposal: churches were destroyed, church institutions bombed, pastors imprisoned, our church members disappeared, brutally killed or poisoned. Some of you might have heard of the infamous medical doctor. Dr Wouter Basson, later known as Dr Death, who poisoned many Namibians as well as South Africans. In fact, shortly before independence, they were planning to inject all those who resisted the regime with HIV/AIDS. After independence, we heard all sorts of stories of what they had been planning. They had even planned to throw deadly poisonous snakes into our public meetings. Our resistance engendered the fury of the regime of the time. The church, in this case the confessing church, was told by the regime and those churches who supported the regime – that we should only be concerned with the souls of the people and that all other aspects of human life should be left to the Government. The responsibility and the task of the church was confined to the souls. This line of argument was used not only in Namibia. For here in Germany and in other parts of Europe when I was on visits, I was also asked the question: why are you, as a pastor, supporting a terrorist organisation? Is it not your task to win souls for Christ? These questions were not posed a

hundred years ago, but a few years ago, even within the context of the United Evangelical Mission and its member churches in Germany. We tried to explain our involvement in the struggle for liberation and peace in simple theological terms. We said: The church belongs to Jesus Christ, and He is the Son of God, who created heaven and earth, and, therefore, we cannot leave this world in the hands of the devil.

I remember very well that I had to wash my plates in the toilet pan while I was in solitary confinement in prison. After independence, those who made us do these things were accepted and even promoted by the new government as members of the Namibian police force. They would stand to attention for us Members of Parliament and we would smile at them and greet them in a friendly way. There were no feelings of hatred from our side towards these people. I never for a moment thought to take revenge for what had happened. That was not necessary, because we had indeed inherited the kingdom of God. The independence of Namibia had become a reality. But more than just the independence of Namibia, I felt that I had already inherited the kingdom of God and the earth, and so there was no real need to hate these people and have ill-feelings towards them. We became friends, very close friends. We could in fact embrace each other and discuss how to rebuild our country together.

May this JPIC Consultation contribute to a better understanding of our world and a change of hearts and minds, so that the terrible things that happened at the beginning of the last century will never be repeated.

Overcoming Violence as Challenge for UEM – A perspective from the German Region

ULRICH MÖLLER

Dear sisters and brothers in Christ, Bishop Dr. Zephania Kameeta with his contribution deeply touched me. With this mission history being part of colonial and structural violence – how can we as churches in Germany claim to overcome violence in the context of our Communion of UEM today? Would it not be too easy just to concentrate on actual challenges of violence only? Do we not have to start by seriously taking into account the impact of historically deeply rooted structural violence within our church to church relations within our joint mission history?

I am convinced that this is true indeed. Recognizing our responsibility as perpetrators in the face of this history of violence for us as churches in the German Region there was and is no alternative but to repent in relation to God and to our sisters churches in the South – not only individually but as churches. This is true for the ambivalence of our mission history – on the one hand missionaries sacrificing their life in order to bring the Gospel to the peoples in Africa and Asia, on the other hand being involved in the history of colonialism. This is true also for the involvement of our churches in Nazi-Germany in the 20th century. It was and is essential to my own self-understanding as a Christian in Germany that my church did not resist enough against the racist ideology, the de-humanizing policy of the Nazis that lead towards discrimination first, then towards persecution, aggressive war to conquer and subdue the world and towards the Holocaust. Yes, there was the confessing church – this year we remember the 70th anniversary of the Barmen Synod 1934 with its famous confession, The Barmen Theological Declaration, the basis of the confessing church during these times and also for us as church today. However: the majority of our church at the beginning was open to adapt the nationalistic and racist ideology of the Nazis within the church. And the church struggle was not a victorious one from the side of the confessing church either. However – what we could learn out of these times of temptation and denial is that church has no boundaries of nation and race; that we cannot claim to have God on our side against others. Quite the opposite: as churches in specific contexts we do belong to the one worldwide people of God. In all contextual diversity we have to bare witness to the Gospel together.

Sometimes names and faces more than anything else speak as a symbol of change. Worldwide, Nelson Mandela is maybe the best known example of today. In our UEM communion as well we have a similarly outstanding person, as the most

speaking sign of what I mean: The Bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the Republic of Namibia, representing his people, who 100 years ago were victims of the genocide under German colonialist rule and fought for their freedom. This bishop, famous as a prophetic church leader for his non violent fight against apartheid and for his commitment for rebuilding the new society in Namibia afterwards, this bishop, our dear brother Dr. Zephania Kameeta today as UEM-Moderator is the highest representative of our UEM-communion of churches in three continents. We praise God for this miracle as well as for this special gift God is giving our communion with his leadership.

My contribution from a German perspective mainly will focus on three aspects. As there will be contributions dealing with violence in the context of wars, civil wars and peace, I will not address specifically these issues, although they are of utmost importance. Just prior to the recent US-lead Iraq war the General Synod of my church, the Evangelical Church of Westphalia, issued a very clear and differentiated peace-statement under the title „Peace through justice and law“ (English version under www.ekvw.de). As you may know, the Churches in Germany together with many Churches worldwide were very outspoken against this war. In several countries of our UEM member churches war or civil war is ongoing and we as UEM-family are trying to be in active solidarity with our member-churches to enable and strengthen them to play an active role of peace-building under very difficult circumstances. This is an acid test of the spiritual communion of ours. We will have time to come to these very important issues later in our conference.

In my contribution, however, I will now concentrate on a smaller ecclesiological chapter and a larger chapter addressing the challenge of globalisation with regard to our UEM-communion, followed by some remarks on the level of practical engagement within the UEM-member-churches in the German Region.

1. The renewed communion of UEM-member churches as an ecclesiological challenge to overcome violence.
2. Overcoming the violence of injustice in the process of economic globalisation as a challenge to the UEM communion
3. Responses from UEM member churches in the German Region with regard to the challenge of overcoming violence

1. The renewed communion of UEM member churches as an ecclesiological challenge to overcome violence

At the beginning of the new UEM there was the conviction that structural violence within the ecumenical relations between the former German Mission Society with its decision making organs in the North and dependent recipient churches in the

South had to be overcome in order to achieve a joint responsibility as equal members in God's mission.

As the Constitution of UEM as Communion of Churches in three Continents committed to the purpose of cooperation in mission points out, we have decided to understand our commitment towards Justice, Peace and Integrity of Creation as a basic dimension of our mission. I quote from § 2 Mandate and Tasks:

„The United Evangelical Mission – Communion of Churches in three Continents ...

In a world torn apart, they commit themselves to remain members of the one Body of Christ,
and therefore ...

... bear witness to the Kingdom of God in striving for justice, peace and the integrity of creation.“

1. This means: As **communion of churches** we have to **bear witness**. We are not just an NGO or development organisation. In a world torn apart we are called to give witness to God's justice in our respective context in Africa, Asia and Europe, being aware that we live in a world torn apart and that in this very situation it is our calling to commit ourselves to remain members of the one Body of Christ. Therefore this involves that our bearing witness to the Kingdom of God in striving for justice, peace and the integrity of the creation has not only an ethical but also an ecclesiological dimension. Therefore we jointly share our concerns in this regard, through the Regional Assemblies, the General Assembly, the Council and through those within our churches who are in a special way affected by these challenges, and gifted and committed to live out this commitment.
2. Looking back we can be thankful for many signs of this kind of commitment within our churches. Within our member churches as well as between the churches in the three regions as well as in joint actions between the regions.
3. The General Assembly 2000 took the decision „that the UEM and its member churches shall participate fully in the Decade to Overcome Violence launched by the WCC.“ (Decision 65/00). And it also suggested this international JPIC workshop in this context.

2. Overcoming the violence of injustice in the process of economic globalisation as a challenge to the UEM communion

The UEM General Assembly in Windhoek also took a decision regarding the broader ecumenical process of confessing regarding global economic injustice and ecological destruction, initiated by the WARC General Assembly 1997, supported by the WCC General Assembly 1998. In the context of the theological theme of the

UEM GA „Let us keep firm in the hope we profess“ it suggested that the UEM should support this process. „Concrete steps to be implemented should focus on the specific contributions of the UEM and its member churches to the strengthening of this broader ecumenical process of confession and action. Brother Dr. Song Wong Park from the World Alliance of Reformed Churches will elaborate more on this broader process tomorrow.

But briefly let me scratch the background from which we as churches within the UEM perceive the present project of globalisation.

2.1 Church perspectives towards the present globalisation project

The international finance markets of today are the result of the liberalization, deregulation and privatisation of the increasingly globalised economy. How do the churches react to the predominant neo-liberal project of globalisation and its consequences for people and nature? The churches confess: „*The earth belongs to God, the creation and all, who live in it.*“ (Psalm 24.1) Liberty according to the Christian tradition therefore is not the freedom to maximize the own benefit, but the freedom to serve God as his co-workers. Gods will, however, is that everyone in his creation may live in dignity as a foretaste of his promise to bring „life in abundance“ (John 10.10).

From this perspective the scandal of worldwide injustice is the central challenge, when it comes to shaping global development responsibly. „*If a member of the body of Christ suffers, all members suffer*“ (1. Corinthian 12.26). This is essential to us as communion of Churches within the UEM. Gods promise of the fullness of life, his justice as the basis for justice on earth and his preferential option for the poor and excluded are the guiding perspectives, when we as churches try to follow Jesus our Lord and head of the church. In the context of ethically unacceptable consequences of the present economic system this demands both: a clear confessing stance and a prophetic voice, where it appears to be a necessary implication of our belief in God, and to seek dialog and cooperation with all who are committed to explore ways towards a development, which is consistent with God's household and his promise of the fullness of life without exclusion.

2.2 Efficiency and Justice: different approaches regarding the present international finance order

On the basis of our Constitution, Art. 2, our witness in the sphere of economy is connected with the center of our faith, following Gods preferential option for the poor as basic theological paradigm. Now, in which regard is this compatible with different present approaches concerning the main tools of global governance of today? There are different levels to address. One is related to the question of trade liberalization and poverty reduction, especially with regard to the least developed countries.

One is the question of international debt-release. Another is the question of the international finance institutions. There are still more. And they are all interrelated. Within the given time I will limit myself by addressing from our German perspective the question:

What are our challenges as UEM-member-churches to overcome violence in the context of economic injustice with regard to the role of the international finance institutions?

To avoid to deal with this question only in an abstract or an „ideological“ way, I find it helpful to answer this question by following the proposal of Martin Büscher and Lukas Menkhoff in their recently published article on „Justice and efficiency – Options for a just international financial order“¹. The key category in the discussion about international financial markets is efficiency. According to Büscher/Menkhoff the predominant neo-liberal market economy approach is aiming at **efficiency without justice**. It is in the interests of the strongest market players to stabilize the present system of the international finance market, where they set the rules. Therefore the neo-liberal approach wants the IFIs to remain almost unchanged. Hence, efficiency turns from an end into an end in itself when the non-economic goal of the economic view is not reflected upon.² In this respect, „efficiency“ is a category that initially has no ethical content. It may be applied both to liberalisation policies but also other strategies. Efficiency along neo-liberal economic policy increases the predominance of purely economic ideas at the expense of other values and subjects everything under economy, as if it represented a worldview. Theologically speaking the so called „market justice“ is an idolatry, claiming sacrifices and victims under those, who are the weak, exploited and excluded. This approach is ethically and theologically totally unacceptable and requires the clear resistance of the church.

According to Büscher/Menkhoff there are three different paradigms to connect efficiency with justice:

A *first approach* is to reform the IFIs in the framework of the limited view of **participatory justice**, which largely argues in *economical* terms to enable participation in economic competition. Based on the idea that a market is only effective if all *sui-*

1 Martin Büscher / Lukas Menkhoff: Gerechtigkeit und Effizienz – Optionen für eine gerechte internationale Finanzordnung. Zum Brückenbau zwischen wirtschaftsethischen Ansatzpunkten und finanzmarktpolitischen Instrumenten. Zeitschrift für Evangelische Ethik (ZEE), 47. Jg. 2003, S. 210-222. The following chapter up to a large extent is based on and follows their argumentation.

2 This is precisely the question to be raised with regard to the degree of freedom of capital movement and monetary transactions on the international markets – for example the focus of the very controversial debate on taxing international capital flows.

table participants have free access to the market, only those market participants that are able to effectively participate in the market fulfil the minimum requirements. „Weak“ participants being exposed to the market, have no chance but to loose – which would not be just. Accordingly, the developing countries partially need to be isolated from the international financial markets, which results as well in an inclusion of macro governance as in a time-lag in terms of the reforms in industrialized and developing countries. Participatory justice requires that all parties affected should be involved and hence have a right to co-determination. Therefore the political consequence is to strengthen the developing countries’ participatory rights in international organisations that help to shape the overall conditions of the international economic order; in particular, therefore, there is a backlog of demand for such measures with regard to IMF and World Bank.

A *second concept* criticises the predominance of the economy and questions the fact that currently a less efficient use of capital is „punished“ by a withdrawal of capital in the light of the dramatic consequences for the tens of millions of people affected, living in abject poverty (e.g. the new poverty in South East Asia resulting from the Asian crisis). This concept emphasises the need of **justice of results**.³ Ethically, people’s entire existence must not be subjected to the criterion of economic efficiency and therefore indirectly to a maximization of the material standard of living. Other values are equal in rank. Instead of accepting the international financial markets as the „fifth power“, the predominance of the economic logic has to be oriented to overriding criteria of sustainable development. To achieve justice of results therefore requires that free financial markets are given clear limits by a strong macro-economic governance.

Regulatory instruments of financial market policy are to create the preconditions to ensure that capital markets do not just follow their own logic but function meaningfully and efficiently in the interest of just results based on political will.

A *third approach* is concentrating on **Justice for the poorest of the poor**.

The ethical concept of the **option for the poor** focuses on the (economic) effect of measures for the poor in a given society. This perspective raises a fundamentally different question compared to the question of more or less efficiency, currently debated in the framework of the reform discussion. The market basically knows neither justice nor mercy, but rewards the strong (efficient) and punishes the weak (inefficient). Therefore, the only way to protect the weak is by means of regulating the markets. A reform proposal oriented to an option for the poor is therefore based

3 Cp. Büscher/Menkhoff, pg. 216.

on a strong International Monetary Fund. Only a supra-national institution is able to regulate the market in a way that ensures the protection of the interest of the poor – a feature that tends to reflect the idea of participatory justice – or that these goals are even realised by means of explicit measures „against“ market results – a feature that tends to represent the option for the poor. The aim is not just economic growth per se, expecting a „trickle down“-effect for the poor as consequence. The aim is much more specific: sustained pro-poor-growth!

If this idea is being followed up, it results in a far-reaching reform of international financial institutions such as the IMF, World Bank or regional development banks. Their task would shift from economic efficiency criteria towards the absolute goal of poverty reduction in terms of macro-economic stabilisation and funding of development activities. This would logically result in a clear shift in decision-making powers in these institutions towards states with the largest populations of poor people.

Low- and middle-income countries as a group comprise 84 % of the worlds population, yet they have only 30 % of IFI votes and less than half the seats on the Executive Boards. This allocation of votes leads to two inter-related problems: Firstly developing countries – directly affected by and dependent on IFI decisions – are unable to significantly shape IFI policies. At the same time the G-7 countries have such a voting power that they can agree on policies outside the IFIs and implement these policies through them – in other words – determining on their own what policy the IMF and the World Bank implements in virtually all developing and newly industrializing countries. And – even worse – the USA, constantly propagating unilateralism and undermining the UN and other instruments of the world community, have a veto power to stop any attempts to reform the IFI structures or to develop new tools of just and sustainable development, as they already proved to do (by stopping the attempt of developing an international insolvency-law within the World Bank). This remains a big stumbling block on the road to transformation.

2.3 Critics and reform proposals for the Governance structures of the IFIs

„The existing system of global governance is inefficient and needs structural reforms, for otherwise the global political goals, the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), including halving worldwide poverty by 2015, cannot be achieved.“ This harsh judgement from one of the World Bank Directors frankly states the fundamental need for reforms by adding, „it is unmistakably clear that there are also governance problems within the Bank itself. At heart, these are about how the shareholders, that is, the member countries, deal within the Bank itself.“⁴

4 Eckhard Deutscher: The World Bank calls for reforms. On the inefficiency of the multilateral development structures. Magazine for Development and Cooperation 8/9/2003, pg. 1. Dr Eckhard Deutscher is the German Executive Director at the World Bank.

Despite the increase of global risks the core problem of development policy remains the same: development problems are seen as only marginal ones, and the governments of most OECD countries are cutting their development budgets. World Bank President James Wolfensohn never tires of pointing out that the development goals proclaimed by the international community will not be realised. The figures speak clearly: worldwide, US\$ 900 billion per year is spent on arms, \$ 350 billion on subsidies and only \$ 57 billion on development cooperation (of which only about half flows to the developing countries in cash).

In short, the World Bank, rightly, sees here a problem of political responsibility and legitimisation of the political systems – of the national governments and the supranational and multilateral organisations. The existing system of global governance is inefficient and needs structural reforms, for otherwise the global political goals, the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), including halving worldwide poverty by 2015, cannot be achieved. At the 2003 Spring Meeting of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, the WB made clear that an annual sum of \$ 100 billion was required to attain this goal. At the same time, the German Governor at the World Bank, Federal Development Minister Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul, lamented about how easy it was to mobilise vast sums for military operations, whereas financing for poverty reduction came up against great resistance.

But what would be necessary, besides more money, is also greater coherence of policy. The industrialised nations must enable access to their markets, reduce the subsidies to their farmers and distance themselves from the neo-liberal privatisation fetish with regard to services, since privatisation by no means increases effectiveness in every country and in every sector. The developing countries must achieve new qualities in their politics, overcome clientele-like policies that disadvantage the poor, and undertake effective reforms of their public sectors.

Reform of the governance structures of the World Bank, however, cannot be seen in isolation. The entire system of multilateral cooperation and its instruments need reform. It is absolutely necessary that the subject of global governance of the UN system and the international financing institutions is put back prominently on the agenda of the international debate. The UN Secretary-General is currently working on solutions that have been demanded for years. Reform of the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) has been discussed for just as long. For the IFI that means that besides the efficiency of the operative businesses, the division-of-labour relationships to the UN system, the regional development banks, the EU and the bilateral donor community must be reassessed.

The question of overcoming poverty is thus more than short-term raising of the per capita income; it is namely the form with which a persons capabilities could be enlarged. In order to develop these capabilities, one has to take into account the so called initial conditions determined by the endowments. It is not about being against growth,

but about inverting the terms: Not the people are instruments for growth, but growth and with it human development only make sense if they lead to the development of endowments (land, work tools, goods, labour, money) and capabilities (education, health...) converting them into entitlements (e.g. rights of use and ownership).

2.4 The specific chance and challenge of the UEM-communion

Dear sisters and brothers, as UEM member churches in Africa, Asia and Germany we have a special common history and we have long standing experiences of practical cooperation on the field with regard to these challenges of injustice and poverty.

It is obvious that it takes a joint ecumenical approach from the South as well as from the North to advocate such fundamental changes, which affect the present imbalance of power in the international institutions. The World Council of Churches is the main tool worldwide for the Christian churches together to work on this. However, in this framework there is a specific chance and task as well for us as UEM family. This is not in competition with the WCC. I rather see it as a specific chance and task we have to support this ecumenical challenge in close cooperation with the WCC. And this is precisely, why we have representatives from Geneva with us in this workshop. In our UEM communion we are committed to an inter church communion deeply rooted at the grass-roots-level of our churches. There is no communion of churches with so many church district to district partnerships like the UEM. This is a very specific gift to assist each other as churches to witness to the Gospel in a contextual way within our different regions. Together as churches committed to Mission we can develop joint programs within our regions to bring the liberating Gospel to the poor, promoting self sustainability of the poor and pro poor growth.

From our side as churches in the North we have to take seriously that we do profit from the present dominance of economical and political power in the North, even if more and more the gap between winners and losers of globalisation, between the rich and poor is growing wider as well in our own country. Therefore it is very important that as part of this JPIC-workshop you are exposed to areas of church of society here in Westphalia, where you can see and discuss the ambivalent and negative impacts of globalisation with people affected in our context.

We need each other, building trust and challenging each other in the one body of Christ. The UEM-vision as well as its participatory organisational structures, its joint decision making bodies, professional departments and joint programs can be most effective tools in this regard. We just have to grow together and to make use of them in the light of this vision step by step.

This is one reason why growing together as a witnessing communion includes the challenge to overcome a giver-recipient-mentality between our churches on both side and together to develop aim-oriented cooperation in the light of our common

UEM vision. This includes to develop binding ways of cooperation, where on the basis of joint decision making processes the effective implementation of empowerment-programs are constantly being monitored and evaluated. I see it as challenge to our entire organisation as well as a special chance and responsibility within the cooperation between the new Regional Teams and the JPIC-desk. In this regard the JPIC-contact persons within our churches may also play an important role.

3. Encouraging responses from UEM member churches in the German Region with regard to the challenge of overcoming violence

The UEM as a communion of churches at the same time is a joint tool of the respective churches. This means: there is a specific quality of the joint witness of this communion of churches, which is more than the sum of the witness of its single member churches. At the same time it means: not everything the UEM is doing is been done by the UEM organisation. Much more: the UEM is an important tool to strengthen the churches within the three regions to carry out their witness as part of the joint witness of the UEM-family. Within this framework there are still many shortcomings within all of our churches. But there are also many fruits growing within our churches. From the limited perspective of my home church, the Evangelical Church of Westphalia, I will indicate some fields of commitment within our church, from the local congregational level, the church district level, the specific institutions within our church and from the church board and General Synod. Similar examples could be named from the other UEM member churches in the German Region. And –in the German Region there is a close cooperation between our churches in this regard, bilaterally as well as through the organs of the UEM Region Germany.

3.1 JPIC commitment in our own context in the German Region

- Church Advocacy work and diaconical assistance for asylum seekers and refugees in our German UEM member churches
- Church as an initiator and mediator of „Round tables on poverty“, bringing together all relevant groups of society addressing private indebtedness, homeless people and long-term unemployment
- Church involvement in local and regional Agenda 21 processes promoting ecological, social and economic sustainable development
- Promoting fair trade products in one world shops and beyond
- Promoting the *Clean Clothes Campaign*
- Promoting *Oiko-Credit* as tool of economic empowerment in the South through fair and professionally assisted micro-credits for development
- As a Church promoting social-ethical and environmental sustainable investment

and asset management. UEM and the Evangelical Church of Westphalia (EKvW) together have launched a pilot project of sustainable asset management investment.

- UEM as an active member of the Human Rights Forum in Germany
- Getting involved in the Decade to Overcome Violence on the congregational and church circuit levels, for example in the EKvW:

Official opening of the ecumenical „*Decade to Overcome Violence*“ under the theme „stand up – resist – walk upright: overcoming violence together“.

A church circuit puzzle makes visible in all 32 church circuits of the EKvW, where violence is to be found and experienced and how ways of overcoming violence are being practiced at the local level. Two examples with their symbols:

 1. Church circuit Soest: a red heart as symbol for the church run forensic clinic Eickelborn: „where the heart learns again to speak out“ pastoral care for violent criminals combined with pastoral care for the victims of criminal violence.
 2. Church circuit Herford:
 - A Zebra for the S.O.S.-Group on racism : a youth group since 1990 working for prevention of violence in the field of youth work
 - A large carpenters nail for youth bridge-building for peace and reconciliation: every year youth groups go to a work camp to Kalodsina in Byelo-Russia to renovate houses of victims of German occupation during World War II.
 - A round table stands for the joint attempt of the protestant and catholic church to promote activities for tolerance and civilian courage.
 - A homosexual symbol stands for projects to overcome violence against homosexual people.
 - A foreign passport stands for the advice centre „Nadeschda“ of the church women work offering advocacy and assistance to women from other countries who are victims of trafficking and prostitution in Germany.
- Facing the violence of our German colonial and missionary past (this year: 100 years anniversary of the German colonial war and genocide against the Herero, Nama and Damara people in Namibia). What are the lessons we have to learn and the responsibilities we have to take in Germany ?
- Doing justice to migrant congregations of foreign origin and language in Germany, welcoming them as sisters and brothers in Christ, and advocating for their rights, fighting with them to overcome xenophobia, discrimination and racism. Together with them exploring intercultural dialogue, tolerance and respect and mutual enrichment by sharing different ways of spirituality.
- Maybe the biggest challenges concerning the witness of the churches last year was the *Iraq war*. The US lead war against Iraq was a blunt violation of international law and an insult against the United Nations. The claimed right of an preemptive war was a fall-back behind the international approach of sustaining

peace by means of mutual security. It was an important step that the churches in Germany unanimously rejected this war. For our Westphalian church this position was firmly founded on the position paper published in January 2003 under the Title „Peace through law and justice. Present challenges of peace ethics and the churches' action for peace.“ However, what we will have as a severe challenge ahead of us is how to deal with the newly developed military strategy of NATO as well as of the European Union.

3.2 Advocacy work in solidarity with and support of our sister churches in the South

UEM as an alternative form of globalisation has special opportunities. A special challenge to the German member churches is to become aware of the situation of their partner churches in Africa and Asia, which in many ways is characterized by poverty, exclusion and violence. On the basis of such an awareness building the next step then is together with their sisters and brothers in the South to explore ways to protect those affected by injustice and violence.

- Supporting the „Justice now!“ – World-Trade-Campaign
- Working on the issues of justice and globalisation within our church districts and congregations with materials under the theme „Globalisation – there are Alternatives!“
 - A. „analysing economic globalisation“
 - B. „church as a global player“
- Campaign on the negative impacts of privatisation of Water by TNCs „Water: source of life“
- Agenda 21 Project of the UEM member churches in North-Rhine-Westphalia (NRW) in the context of the coming Soccer World Championship 2006 in Germany: *Fair Play – Fair Life: Soccer World Championship in NRW 2006* promoting fair trade among the youth, schools, soccer-clubs
- *The business sector has HIV / AIDS, too* – Agenda 21-project between the UEM member churches in NRW and the protestant churches in Southern Africa (including UEM member church ELCRN to fight HIV/AIDS) through workplace policy programmes in small and medium sized companies

These are but a few expressions of how we can live out concretely our belonging together in the one body of Christ and our UEM church communion. We need our ecumenical fellowship in our UEM family in this regard. In a world torn apart we need to express our belonging together in Christ through these different dimensions of what the UEM constitution asks as to do to live out our Mission to proclaim the Gospel. May this workshop encourage us to bring our churches to a joint witness in this regard. May God bless these days to come.

Violence in a Global Context from a European Perspective

RÜDIGER NOLL

As I understand, this consultation has as its frame of reference the ‘Conciliar Process for Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation’ and the ‘Decade to Overcome Violence’. Both ecumenical processes are very dear to me. But I wonder whether both processes have the same underlying agenda. Certainly, they are complementary. In the JPIC process the ecumenical movement wanted to establish concrete mutual commitments in view of the challenges that the global community faces. I am not sure, given the emphasis of the ‘Decade’, whether such mutual commitments between the churches would actually be possible today. At most I see that being a part of the Decade to Overcome Violence. Its scope is bigger.

Firstly, I see an emphasis of the ‘Decade’ in raising awareness regarding issues of violence. Secondly, the ‘Decade’ attempts to deal with some underlying structures of violence and/or reconciliation:

- addressing holistically the wide varieties of violence;
- to relinquish any theological justification of violence and to affirm anew the spirituality of reconciliation and active non-violence;
- creating a new understanding of security in terms of cooperation and community
- to cooperate with other faiths and to reflect on the misuse of religious and ethnic identities in pluralistic societies.

Following these underlying issues, the ‘Decade’ also seeks to address substantive issues of violence, such as growing militarism and the proliferation of small armaments and light weaponry.¹

After the JPIC process had identified the issues and led the churches to make commitments, it seems to me to be the aim of the ‘Decade’ to move the churches from words to action. This is why the ‘Decade’ attempts to address some of the underlying issues, which has so far prevented the churches from implementing what they profess.

Konrad Raiser, the former General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, sought to summarise the goals of the ‘Decade’: *„It is the goal of the Decade to con-*

1 cf. A Basic Framework for the Decade to Overcome Violence. Working Paper adopted by the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, 26 August – 3 September 1999 (www.overcomingviolence.org)

*tribute to overcoming violence and to building a culture of peace.*² „*The Decade, therefore, focuses not so much on the different, specific manifestations of violence, but rather on the common cultural patterns which links them*“³ „*The main objective of the Decade is to move the commitment to peace and to the peaceful resolution of conflict away from the margins into the centre of the life and work of the churches.*“⁴

In my presentation I want to use the results of the conciliar process for Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation in relation to some aspects of European and global history as a starting point. Against this background and the stated aims of the ‘Decade’, I then want to look at the recently adopted European Security Concept in order to stimulate debate from a European perspective.

What is violence? In the JPIC process, we have learnt that the issues of Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation are inseparably interconnected, no matter which point of entry one chooses. Therefore which manifestations of violence need to be addressed by the Decade? Does the whole JPIC agenda come back under a different name? „*No attempt has so far been made to offer a ‘definition’ of violence*“⁵ and that is as good as it gets. Any definition which would limit the types of manifestations of violence and exclude others would be cynical vis-à-vis the victims of violence. Victims – and therefore we too – cannot afford to make distinctions between more or less important manifestations of violence.

Nevertheless, I could not cover the whole range of violence and its manifestations in one short presentation. Therefore I was pleased when the organisers of this consultation suggested to me to emphasise ‘peace politics and security issues’. My present work vis-à-vis the European Institutions and certain recent developments on the European level has also influenced my choice.

The churches’ witness to non-violence in the light of recent European history

For more than fifty years of its recent past, Europe was a divided continent. Europe was divided along political lines by the Berlin Wall and the Iron Curtain – a division between a democratic west and a communist east. For many years European security thinking was determined by east-west confrontation. Security meant deterrence.

2 Konrad Raiser, *For a Culture of Life. Transforming Globalisation and Violence*, (WCC Publications) Geneva 2002, p. 90

3 *ibid*, p 86

4 *ibid*, p 84

5 *ibid*, p 87

This east-west confrontation was not without repercussions for other parts of the world. As Jean-Paul Lederach puts it: „it ... exacerbated conflicts in the developing world. ... The Cold War was, for most part, cold only in Europe and North America. In many parts of the developing world it was in fact very hot.“⁶ The „Cold War meant, that weapons, the loans needed to finance the purchase of weapons, and ideologies came from the North; the South contributed its environments, peoples, and national economies“.⁷

In the '70s, before and after the Nairobi Assembly, the ecumenical movement discussed how the North-South conflict and the East-West conflict related to each other and how a 'division of labour' could be achieved. At that time, the decision was taken that the Conference of European Churches, the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA and the Canadian Council of Churches would place greater emphasis on the East-West Conflict and the security and human rights agenda, whilst the WCC would continue to address the North-South issues and the economic justice and development agendas.

In the JPIC process these two streams came together again. Following the WCC Vancouver Assembly in 1983 and its call for a conciliar process of mutual commitment, in May 1989, six month before the fall of the Berlin Wall (but still under the impression of the east-west confrontation), all churches in Europe came together for a first European Ecumenical Assembly. At that stage they formulated a vision of Europe, the vision of a common European home and established some house rules:

- „the principle of equality of all who live there, whether strong or weak
- the recognition of such values as freedom, justice, tolerance, solidarity, participation
- a positive attitude towards adherents of different religions, cultures and world views
- open doors, open windows: in other words, many personal contacts, exchange of ideas.“

With regard to the theme „violence, war and peace“, the two key sentences of the final document of this European Ecumenical Assembly included the commitment to „dialogue instead of resolving conflicts through violence“ and the firm affirmation: „There are no situations in our countries or on our continent in which violence is required or justified.“ Violence and the use of force were ruled out as appropriate means to solve conflicts.⁸

6 Jean-Paul Lederach, *Building Peace. Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies* (United States Institute of Peace Press) Washington, DC 1997, p 5/6

7 *ibid.*, p.7

8 cf. Final Document of the European Ecumenical Assembly PEACE WITH JUSTICE FOR THE WHOLE CREATION, in: *Peace with Justice. The official documentation of the European Ecumenical Assembly, Basel, Switzerland, 15-21 May, 1989* (Conference of European Churches), Geneva 1989, p33-65

Both sentences have been key statements ever since. They presuppose that there are conflicts and that conflicts will continue to exist. But as Christians we are committed to non-violent ways of dealing with conflict. Our witness to society is not to avoid and especially not to neglect conflicts, but the way in which we deal with them – a clear commitment to non-violence, which later in the document translates into concrete recommendations.

The two basic sentences were formulated especially for the European context, but they were not meant to be Eurocentric. We therefore amended the metaphor of the common European home to „*the common European home in the village of the world*“. Immediately following the vision of Europe, the next paragraph reads: „*as churches in Europe, we are part of the worldwide body of Christ. Our orientation, therefore, is essentially not towards the future of Europe alone, but of the world, of God’s creation.*“ (69) The fact, that they were not formulated for a global context from the start, probably has two reasons:⁹

The question of the continuing struggle against apartheid regimes, notably in South Africa, still had to be addressed. As Europeans we did not want to pre-empt discussion on whether or not in the struggle against unjust regimes liberation movements may use violence as a last resort. This is a question to which we should return. It re-occurred recently with a slightly modified terminology – the issue of „humanitarian intervention“ or better „military intervention for humanitarian purposes“.

The second reason for not formulating the non-violent option globally has to do with the fact that the European Ecumenical Assembly was meant to be a regional contribution to the World Convocation, which took place in Seoul during the following year (1990). This reaffirmed the commitment to non-violence in the personal and private context as well as for the global political context. Seoul, probably for the first time in an ecumenical document of that status, spoke of a „culture of non-violence“.

The Seoul Assembly resulted in a Covenant, in which the participants *inter alia* committed themselves to engage their churches to work:

- for a community of the churches which claim their identity as the body of Christ through providing witness to the liberating love of God
- for a comprehensive notion of security that takes the legitimate interests of all nations and peoples into account; this common security has to grow from a realisation of peace with justice and should include the defence of God’s creation
- for a halt to militarisation, especially of the third world-countries
- for the demilitarisation of international relations and the promotion of non-violent forms of defence
- for a culture of active non-violence which is life-promoting and is not a with-

9 ibid

drawal from situations of violence and oppression, but is a way to work for justice and liberation.¹⁰

The World Convocation was also instrumental in affirming the links between justice, peace and the integrity of creation. It was the churches from the northern hemisphere which were threatened by the logic of deterrence and found these to be the key issues, while the churches from the South emphasised issues of economic justice. A somewhat forgotten and unpublished text from Seoul is the message of the Peoples' Forum, which preceded the Seoul Convocation. The Peoples' Forum stated, „*justice should be at the heart of the JPIC process and that people should be at the heart of the JPIC process*“. The key obstacle to justice was identified as the „unjust accumulation of wealth and power in our societies and in our churches“.

A New Europe!?

In the few months between the Basel and Seoul Assemblies, the world had changed radically. The Apartheid regime in South Africa had crumbled and the Iron Curtain, dividing Europe (and the world) for so many years, had fallen. The changes in Europe had come about by largely non-violent („velvet“) revolutions by the people in Eastern Europe. And the churches had made important contributions. Pope Jean-Paul II in his early visits to his home country supported civil right movements such as ‘Solidarity’. The demonstrations in the GDR most often began and ended in churches. The churches provided the space for the growing movement to meet and to strategise. It gave the demonstrations a shape; one might say „a liturgical frame“, which contributed to non-violence. Soon after the fall of the Berlin Wall, many church people who were involved in the preparations for the Basel Assembly found themselves in leading positions, moderating roundtables of civil society and government. They even became political leaders themselves.

In 1990 the heads of states and governments met in Paris to adopt and proclaim the „Charter of Paris for a New Europe“. The new Europe was to be a Europe of peace, built on democracy, human rights and the rule of law. It included values such as solidarity within the wider world: „*Aware of the dire needs of a great part of the world, we commit ourselves to solidarity with all other countries. Therefore, we issue a call from Paris today to all the nations in the world. We stand ready to join with any and all States in common efforts to protect and advance the community of fundamental human values.*“¹¹

10 cf. Between the Flood and the Rainbow. Interpreting the Conciliar Process of Mutual Commitment (Covenant) to Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation, compiled by D. Preman Niles (WCC Press) Geneva 1992, p 164-190

11 Charter of Paris for a New Europe

But the reality proved to be different. In times, which people rather associated with opportunities than with dangers, war in Europe became possible again. In 1991 the disintegration of Yugoslavia led to violent wars in South-Eastern Europe, especially in Bosnia and Kosovo. These were the most violent confrontations Europe had seen since World War II. And they were not limited to South-Eastern Europe. Violent conflicts also continued in Northern Ireland and they emerged in the Caucasian and Central Asian region, with the two devastating wars in Chechnya as a climax.

It is important to notice, though, that some of the features of wars in the '90s had changed compared with previous periods. Though the overall number of wars globally did not increase, Europe did witness an increase. The number of smaller conflicts also increased. Most of these wars were within states and not between states. They can be described as „identity conflicts“. The enemy therefore is not to be found half way around the globe, but somewhere close to home. He is not anonymous, but has a face. At least a quarter of these conflicts and wars were long. These new features make it even more doubtful whether traditional methods of intervention, especially military intervention, could be effective. They provide a strong argument for a community-based approach to conflict prevention, reconciliation and non-violent management of conflicts.

Conflict Prevention

Take the two wars in Chechnya and perhaps the war in Kosovo as examples. They were predictable. The first war in Chechnya led to a ceasefire, but not to peace. Timelines attached to the ceasefire had clear indications as to when the issue of the independence of the Republic had to be taken up again and it was therefore foreseeable when violent conflicts were likely to re-emerge. In 1997, in between the two wars in this part of the Caucasian region, all European churches had come together again for their second European Ecumenical Assembly, where they re-affirmed the sentence from 1989: „*There are no situations and conflicts in our countries an in our continent in which the use of violence is required or justified.*“ One of the recommendations reads: „*We would request that the churches take on an active and persistent role in the peaceful transformation of conflicts (e.g. in Northern Ireland, in Cyprus) and in peace and reconciliation processes following violent conflicts (such as those in Bosnia, Croatia, Serbia, Chechnya).*“¹² The conflict in Chechnya continues today with devastating effects on the population and the country. Facing this

12 Reconciliation – Gift of God and Source of New Life. Documents from the Second European Ecumenical Assembly in Graz, ed. by Rüdiger Noll and Stefan Vesper (Verlag Syria), 1998, p.51

situation, I find the churches' witness (except in the area of humanitarian aid) extremely weak.

The war in Kosovo and finally its bombardment by NATO forces in March 1999 are equally an example of failed conflict prevention. Through the OSCE, the biggest-ever peacekeeping mission, the so-called Kosovo verification mission on the European continent, with 2,000 international peacekeepers, was agreed and was in the process of being established. The international community never met this target of 2,000 peacekeepers and mediators. Instead, the decision for a military intervention was taken and those peacekeepers, which were just commencing their work, were withdrawn within a couple of days.

Irrespective of whether we are committed to total pacifism or whether we accept the use of violence as an *ultima ratio*, we have to explore all possibilities for the prevention of violent conflicts. This certainly did not happen in the case of Kosovo and Chechnya. We have to shift the paradigm beyond rhetoric from crisis intervention, crisis management and reconstruction to „conflict prevention“. Everyone would agree, that in all dimensions prevention of violent conflicts is less costly than intervention and reconstruction, but the investment in time, energy, thinking and resources in our societies as well as within the churches do not live up to this insight.

Already in 1992, just after the war began, the Conference of European Churches together with the Council of European Bishops' Conferences tried to engage the religious communities in South-Eastern Europe as common witnesses for peace. It was precisely the sentence of the 1989 Basel final document that was the starting point: *'There are no situations in our countries and on our continent, in which the use of violence would be required or justified'*. Quoting the sentence, the two regional ecumenical organisations sent a letter to all religious communities in the region and asked what common witness derives from it in a situation of violent conflict. The approach of the two European ecumenical organisations at the time was to refrain from making their own statements for the sake of offering a platform for communication among the religious communities, which in public were identified as nationalistic forces in their respective camps. This approach proved to be a real test case for the ecumenical movement. Many expected the ecumenical movement to take a clear stance on human rights violations, naming oppressors and victims.

But even just offering a platform for dialogue proved to be difficult. Several meetings between the religious communities were organised and took place on neutral ground, e.g. in Switzerland and Hungary. They adopted important self-commitments, for instance to remain committed to peace and to distribute humanitarian aid to all people in need, irrespective of their religious affiliation. But after all, it would be difficult to say that these meetings led to a break-through in the sense that the religious communities agreed upon a common witness which dissociated them from their respective national clout. It was too late. Once the war had started, and the reli-

rious communities had seen their main commitment in being as close as possible at the side of their respective people, it was difficult to move them to a much needed joint witness for the whole region.

Again, conflict prevention would have been important. Here, the words of the former Deputy General Secretary of the World Council of Churches and Director of the Programme on Inter-Religious Dialogue come to mind: *„Dialogue is not so much about attempting to resolve immediate conflicts, but about building a ‘community of conversation’, a ‘community of heart and mind’ across racial, ethnic, and religious barriers where people learn to see differences among them not as threatening but as ‘neutral’ and ‘normal’.*¹³ *„Dialogue is not an ambulance service; it is a public health programme! ... We were doing ambulance service where public health education and immunisation were called for long before the outbreak of the disease!”*¹⁴

This means that the question of channelling resources is also a question for churches, religious communities and us. Just think about how difficult it was and increasingly is to raise funds for ecumenical dialogue establishing relationships that prove to be stable in the case of arising conflicts. Just think about how inter-religious dialogue was the Cinderella of the churches’ agenda before 11 September.

The ambivalence of the sacred

As we have seen, the message of the churches and religious communities is clear. It is a message of peace and reconciliation, a message of non-violence. Many churches in Europe have, over the years, gained a lot of competence in non-violence training and mediation. Christians and also other religions have a vision of the world (the oikoumene) transcending national borders. They are organised on local, national, regional and global levels, which for successful mediation processes is an important asset.

Simultaneously we experience that those who have gained competence in mediation and non-violent conflict management have to act at the fringe, rather than in the centre of the churches. There is a secular organisation called the „European Platform for Conflict Prevention“. It now consists of more than 400 NGOs. Most of them were originally from a religious background or with religiously trained personnel in leadership positions. Obviously they felt they had to organise themselves outside the churches. In conflict situations, we have seen that religious communities

13 S. Wesley Ariarajah, *Not Without My Neighbour. Issues in Interfaith Relations*, (WCC Publications) Geneva 1999, p.14

14 *ibid*, p.12/13

became too closely identified with one of the conflicting parties to serve as peace brokers and initiators of reconciliation processes. It did not need the attacks of 11 September to make many politicians and political institutions think of religion rather as a part of the problem than as part of the solution. None of the recent violent conflicts in Europe was a religious war, but many of them had a religious element to it. To deny that, as is so often done, is part of the problem.

These two faces of religion are what Scott Appleby calls the „Ambivalence of the Sacred“¹⁵. What is behind churches being perceived as fuelling conflicts? One often mentioned root cause seems to be too close a link between churches and nations, between churches and ethnic groups, and between church and state. For many churches the call to be close to its peoples is a constitutive element of their theology. The problem arises when this turns too easily into an over-identification with ethnic groups, nations and states. Globalisation, the feeling of powerlessness vis-à-vis decisions that are taken behind closed doors and ever more distant from the people reinforces this tendency.

It also becomes difficult when churches and religious communities claim to be the only true church, the only true faith. This often leads to the establishment of depictions of an enemy, expressions of superiority and defensive attitudes – even more so when churches after a time of suppression gain a feeling that their time has come.

It did not need the attacks on 11 September to prove how dangerous religious fundamentalism may become. It must be our task across religious borders to support each other in combating extreme nationalism and fundamentalism. We need to resist the erection of any new dividing lines, be they political, economic or religious.

Instead, we need to strengthen our efforts towards tolerance and anti-discrimination. Jürgen Habermas, a German philosopher not known for his religiosity, spoke a couple of years ago of „religion in a post-secular society“. He saw a new role for religion in societies, a role which religion could fulfil, not in seeking dominance, but in accepting plurality, tolerance and non-violent settlement of conflicts.

There is likely to be no progress in inter-religious dialogue if we cannot respond to the question: „What is the place of the other in my faith and in my life?“ In the Conference of European Churches we have started a reflection and consultation process on this question with the religious communities in the war-torn South-East Europe. In parallel, we offer training in non-violent conflict management for multi-religious groups and we try to increase encounters and communication among religious communities.

Our vision for Europe and the world is one of diversity – a diversity of cultures, convictions and religions. In the ecumenical movement we have developed the

15 cf. R Scott Appleby, *The Ambivalence of the Sacred. Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation*. (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc), Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford 2000

metaphor of „unity in diversity“ or „reconciled diversity“. To give an example as to how we as religious communities deal with diversity is probably the biggest contribution we can make to the European integration process and towards establishing a global civil society. The churches in Europe have recently adopted a Charta Oecumenica with guidelines for relationships among still-divided churches. These guidelines centre on some of the crucial issues that cause divisions and conflicts among the churches.

As a next step we need mechanisms for meditation in conflict situations. These could include regional and global conciliation commissions, pools of trained mediators and perhaps truth commissions, as suggested by the Latin American WCC conference in the framework of addressing globalisation.

A New EU Security Concept¹⁶

In Europe and globally, the European Union is becoming an ever more important player. Therefore, having looked at the European churches and their contribution to peace, reconciliation and security, I want to relate the findings to the newly adopted Security concept of the European Union. Less than two months ago, on 12 December, the European Union adopted a new security concept – largely unnoticed and overshadowed by the debate on a EU Constitution. As the Church and Society Commission of CEC, we drafted a preliminary response for circulation and comment to our member churches. We also need to see how to react to it and to lobby the European Institutions accordingly.

From the outset it seems to be good for the EU to make progress towards a Common Foreign and Security Policy and to develop a common security concept. Before the US invasion in Iraq, it became evident how important unity among EU member states would be in order not to be divided thus becoming a ball in the hands of the US Administration.

Security versus a culture of peace

As churches, however, we need to raise the issue whether the term „security“ is compatible with what ecumenical documents call „a culture of non-violence“. Already this difference in terminology should make us remain critical. By definition, the term security indicates that security is to be established over and against someone else, whom one regards as an enemy or a risk to one’s own security. Is full security possible? Bonhoeffer spoke of „risking peace“, „peace needs to be risked“. There never can be complete security. We have to live with different cultures, con-

16 cf. European Security Strategy, European Council Doc 15895/03, adopted 18 Dec 2003 (Website: <http://register.consilium.eu.int/pdf/en/03/st15/st15895.en03.pdf>)

cepts and convictions. Even if we have identified clear evil, such as terrorism, all the security measures imaginable will not be able to guarantee full security. Not at least because of this, as the Conference of European Churches, we remained critical of infringements of human rights in the name of security.

The global dimension

The European Union concept, it has to be said positively, recognises its responsibility not only for Europe but also for the whole world: „Europe should be ready to share in the responsibility for global security and in building a better world.“

The global dimension of security, however, pops up also at another place within the adopted EU Security Concept. It sneaks in, in a very short sentence, with – what I believe to be – great consequences. The concept reads: „with the new threats, the first line of defence will often be abroad“. Again, critical questions need to be raised: is that a *carte blanche* for out-of-area military engagement? Is this a *carte blanche* for so-called „preventive“ military strikes abroad? The Iraq war triggered a new paradigm, moving away from the use of the military for the purpose of defence to the employment of the military for preventive measures. This is certainly not covered by present international law, although the new EU Security Concepts wants to see itself in the framework of international law explicitly promoting the priorities of the UN Security Council in determining cases of defence and subsequent military intervention. I believe, beside the issue of the so-called „humanitarian intervention“, the issue of „preventive military engagement“ is a key issue, which the churches and the religious communities must take up in the Decade to Overcome Violence.

New threats to security

What are now the supposed new threats to security? The adopted document lists terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, regional conflicts, state failure and organised crime. Among these, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is identified as „potentially the greatest threat to our security“. No one could probably deny that all of the above are indeed existing threats. However, the thought occurs that the above list also appears as heavily influenced by the agenda of the US administration, its approach to Iraq and to what they classify as „rogue states“. This suspicion seems to be all the more justified as the EU itself in 2001 adopted a document at the Gothenburg Summit on conflict prevention. In this document the list of actual threats reads somewhat differently. It mentions „drugs, small arms, natural resources, environmental degradation, population flows, human trafficking and to some extent, private sector interests in unstable situations.“ It seems that behind those lists of potential or existing threats are different concepts of response, conflict prevention mechanisms on the one side and the employment of military force on the other. Is one of the guiding aims of the 2001 EU security con-

cept to prove the EU states to be a credible and by no means difficult partner in the transatlantic and NATO cooperation? Are the new threats to security to serve as an argument for the build-up of military force?

Root causes of violent conflict – just a „new environment“?

The new EU security concept is, of course, not so imprudent as to deny that there are other underlying root causes for today's actual and potential violent conflicts. Nor does it deny the need for multi-faceted approaches to security risks. The document speaks of a changed environment. It mentions that the „competition for natural resources – notably water – which will be aggravated by global warming over the next decades, is likely to create further turbulence and migratory movements in various regions.“ It mentions that in much of the developing world, poverty and disease cause untold suffering and give rise to pressing security concerns“. The problem, however, is that this „new environment“ in comparison with the list of immediate threats to security is hardly taken into account, when it comes to the ways and means as to how to counteract today's unstable and „unjust distribution of wealth and power“. While the JPIC process identified poverty and infringement of human rights as root causes for conflicts and would therefore emphasise the combating of poverty and the full implementation of human rights, for the EU concept „security is a pre-condition of development“.

In the policy document of the Conference of European Churches on a Pan-European Security Community the opposite connection is made: „Peace is not just the opposite of war or absence of direct violence. Genuine peace means that we must overcome the underlying or structural violence, which manifests itself in social injustices, oppression, lack of freedom, violated human rights and other factors, which prevent people from living a life in dignity. ... The only way to create a peaceful world in the long-term is through preventive measures, by redressing the underlying, fundamental causes of conflict, and through developing non-violent ways of dealing with conflict.“

In addressing the root causes of violence, we are grateful to the World Council of Churches and the World Alliance of Reformed Churches for launching a process of addressing the neo-liberal economic underpinnings of globalisation. Together we have organised two separated consultations for western and for eastern European churches. The letter to churches in western Europe states very clearly: „Economic globalisation is guided by a logic which gives priority to accumulating capital, unbridled competition and the securing of profit in narrowing markets. Political and military power are used as instruments to secure safe access to resources and to protect investment and trade.“

In the process of responding to globalisation we have listened and we continue to listen to the voices of those who are the victims. It is now our task as a regional

ecumenical organisation to activate the churches in the process. We are currently collecting the responses to the letters sent by the consultation. It is our task to lobby to challenge the international organisations and structures to review their economic and trade policies in the light of economic justice and conflict prevention. The next step with regard to the European Union will be to monitor the implementation of its security policy, to influence its neighbourhood policy and the establishment of its budgetary framework for 2006 and beyond. In the letter to the churches, they were encouraged to refuse „to go along with the justification of wars, militarisation of global politics, and increasing military spending in the name of ‘war against terrorism’ instead of using the resources for abolishing the root causes of terrorism by social and economic justice through better international co-operation in the multi-lateral UN system“.

The EU concept recognises, that it needs a „full spectrum of instruments for crisis management and conflict prevention at our disposal, including political, diplomatic, military and civilian, trade and development activities“. But it reads as a whole like a justification for building up military force. The concept calls for the „need to develop a strategic culture that fosters early, rapid and when necessary, robust intervention.“

The role of civil society and the churches

Aiming at developing a capacity for „robust intervention“, conflict prevention, which should be at the core, becomes an undervalued factor. Actors of civil society, including the churches, which have over the years developed an extraordinary competence in conflict prevention and mediation, do not appear at all among the partners in implementing a new European security concept.

But civil society, including the churches, has an important role to play when it comes to conflict prevention and the striving for reconciliation and sustainable peace. There are many factors, which call for a strong involvement of civil society, for instance the fact that

- violent conflicts are increasingly intra-state with combating parties meeting each other face to face;
- conflict prevention can only be achieved by direct dialogue of opposing parties and – in the age of globalisation – by global networking
- reconciliation is a process of long duration, which can only be achieved by involving the conflicting parties
- it needs a multi-facetted approach to peace processes with several parties involved on the local, national, regional and global level.
- (last but not least) change and alternatives arise from listening to the stories of the victims and the affected.

I believe it must be one of the main aims of the Decade to Overcome Violence to

support the networking of a global civil society. And this is why meetings like this on a global scale are so important.

In the world of today, working for conflict prevention and non-violent conflict management does not seem to be the easiest task. But there is also no need to despair. To quote one of my teachers: „We are not impaired by a lack of resources, if we choose to invest wisely and practically in peace. We are limited only by how far we are willing to cast our vision. We must not despair about the depth and breadth of the challenge, but rather rise to meet it. Reconciliation is possible. The house of peace can be built.“¹⁷

17 Jean Paul Lederach (cf footnote 8), p. 152

Different Faces of Violence in Africa

FIDON R. MWOMBEKI

Introduction

I feel greatly honored to be asked to offer „a specific African perspective on global and regional violence and strategies towards peace and justice,“ something I am instructed to accomplish in about 40 minutes. The task sounds too big and the time too short. However, I will try to highlight some aspects of the different faces of violence in Africa, and suggest some strategies the churches, particularly those in the UEM family would consider, and more specifically for the churches in Africa. As almost a third of the Decade to Overcome Violence (DOV) has swiftly gone by, this is a very good time for us to hold this consultation, which is yet another proof of UEM unwavering commitment to the decade.

The Face of Militarism

Africa is part of the increasingly global community, or global village. Though in many ways with which many of us here are familiar Africa has been short-changed in this global community, it is very much part of it. It is no longer easy to talk of any local aspect, which is not affected by globalization. Even militarism, which is raging in Africa, has local, regional and global faces, all commingled in quite inseparable ways.

Undeniably, Africa has the largest share of military dictatorships, armed conflicts and civil wars. I live in Tanzania, in the Northwestern corner of the country. All of our neighbours in that area are engaged in some form of military violence—Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, and Democratic Republic of Congo. Should we move further north, almost all the countries we come across have military activity—Sudan, Somalia, Ethiopia, and Eritrea. In Western and Central Africa, we all know what has been the demise of promising countries like Sierra Leone, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Guinea, Gambia, Mauritania, Morocco, Chad, Central Africa Republic, Burkina Faso, and Nigeria. All the optimism of what was expected to be the „African Renaissance“ and the hope we had in the people President Bill Clinton labeled the „New breed of African leaders“ vanished in thin air in a few short years. What a pity! We thank God in the South things are cooling off, particularly in Mozambique, Angola and South Africa.

But one wonders, how could African countries, most of which are in grinding poverty and most of their people living in sub-human conditions ever acquire the arms, the fuel and money needed to wage these everlasting wars? That is where globalization plays its part. We are all aware of the now gone cold war reasons of civil wars, where Africa was pulled and sliced in parts according to ideological divisions of former powers, now it is economics. We have heard about „conflict diamonds“ in Angola and Ivory Coast as well as the „Coltan factor“ in the Rwanda-Congo war. Without a global dimension, the political militarism in Africa could have been long gone, just as we witnessed in Angola. The moment the big countries stopped to support Savimbi, the war in Angola ended. Now it is happening in Sudan. However, the desire for arms markets, as engines of economic growth in the producer countries seem to indiscriminately fuel tribal and national conflicts. This quest for economic boom in arm-producing countries, when mixed with poverty and African leaders' greed for power produce a very fertile ground for endless arms trade. No wonder, therefore it is the developed countries which oppose ban on small arms and landmines production. The whole scenario is reminiscent of the violence slave traders instigated among African chiefs to get prisoners of war whom they then bought as slaves to boost the economic growth in Europe and „New Lands.“

At the local level within nations, it is appalling to see the proliferation of small arms. In many African countries, as we witnessed in Somalia and neighboring countries, guns, from crude hand-guns to highly deadly automatic guns are in too many hands, illegally.

Political Face

Within nation-states, there is widespread political violence of different types. Africa has young democracies where people's rights are grossly violated. Police brutalities, political intolerance in changing political settings, tribal conflicts, are rampant. Many African governments use violence to suppress their political opponents in a quest to hold on the power. As we are going into political multi-party systems, it is difficult to hear countries where political parties are contesting for votes without violence, including my own country Tanzania. Very few of us could believe what we learnt later that the Moi government was doing to its citizens who dared challenge the authority, in the infamous „Nyayo House.“ It is difficult to find a difference between what was done by the apartheid regime and Moi government. If Kenya was doing it, how much more probable are other more closed countries.

First, Africa is in transition from small kingships to large, nation-states seeking modern democracy. Many leaders still possess the kingship mentality, and thus do not accept the reality that they lead for a limited time, and when the time runs out

and they must hand over power and let others take over. As a result, reputable presidents like Yoweri Museveni, Bakili Muluzi, and notorious ones like Robert Mugabe, share the same characteristic. They do whatever is possible to stay in power, and in order to achieve their goal, they repress many in unbelievably violent ways. Second, too many of the present leaders started as guerrilla fighters, used to bush tricks. When they transform themselves into political non-military leaders, they still use guerrilla tactics. They breed violence.

As a result, in some countries freedom of expression is absolutely curtailed, as well as freedom of movement. The violence of state organs to their people is appalling. At the local level, even more goes unsaid, because of political immaturity and the violent reactions from state organs. We long to see governments that truly belong and act in responsibility to the people who elect them.

The Gender Face – Female

Unfortunately violence, more often than not, has a female face. Whether we are talking about economic, cultural, social or domestic violence, the female gender sustains most of the violence. It is well-known that many parts of Africa; women's economic rights are violated. Many of them live in oppressive cultures that give women no rights to economic gain from their own labours. Most work many hours a day, but economic benefits accrue to men in their communities. Inheritance and property laws are oppressive to women.

Several cultures in Africa have oppressive customs that violate the rights of women to selfhood and inflict intolerable life-long pain on the bodies and psyches of these women. A good example is that of Female Genital Mutilation which, thank God, is not in all cultures. Marriage and sexual customs violate the rights of women not only before but also within marriage. It is very sad to admit that it is all too common to hear of sexual exploitation of girl-children, through brutal raping. For example in December 2003, I was in Kenya where I saw on TV the story of a 30 year old man who violently raped a four year old girl and caused her permanent injuries. This man unashamedly admitted committing the crime in court. The image of the small girl in the hospital, unconscious, was simply devastating (even though her face was not revealed). In the same month, back in Bukoba, we found our church, through HUYAWA program, was involved in a terrible case of a 14-year-old girl who was tricked by her sister-in-law to be forcefully married to a 28-year-old man in the village she was visiting. The girl was in primary school, innocently visiting her sister, and she was almost forced to leave school to get married. A case is pending in court, and our church is standing firm with this girl.

Domestic setting is where the female face sustains intolerable violence, even in

countries that are otherwise peaceful and prosperous. Brutality against children and wives in homes is such an epidemic that the whole world needs to work together to bring to light. It is simply despicable and grotesque. Many children and women sustain untold and intolerable violence in domestic settings. We were all shocked, for example, when we heard the then Vice-President of Uganda, Dr. Specioza Kazibwe declare in public that she was repeatedly battered by her husband and decided to divorce him. If such a thing could happen to such a high national figure, one of the very few (if not only) Vice-President in Africa, we can just imagine how many more are battered with no social and economic possibility of breaking themselves loose from that despicable violence. But her eventual departure from government after the disclosure might show how much more improbable for poorer women and girls who would be forced out of their livelihoods would they dare defend themselves. We have reports of children abandoned by their parents (including their own mothers). Statistics show clearly that girls are much more likely to be denied education than boys. We are working very hard in our church schools to make sure that the girls are given equal opportunities. In addition, we see how the school performance of girls is in general much lower than that of boys, for reasons yet to be established.

The Economic Face – Poverty

It is well known that there is a positive correlation between violence and poverty. In every country, the poorer the neighbourhood the more the violence. Mwalimu Nyerere, while working as mediator in the Burundi conflict and reflecting on the infamous Rwanda genocide, once said that the problem of Rwanda and Burundi is not tribalism (the supposedly Tutsi-Hutu intrinsic hatred). It is simply poverty, he said, only manifesting itself in this form—too many people in a small place fighting for meagre resources. He said, if Rwanda was as rich as Luxemburg, there would be no tribalism, no genocide. Africa suffers from poverty as a continent; therefore, violence in the whole continent is disgusting.

Africa is the most economically poor continent, where the real GDP per capita has been consistently falling over decades, where the majority of the people live below the (albeit questionable, arbitrary) poverty line.

„The 1990s saw an actual decline in average African per capita income and an increase in the number of people living on \$1 per day or from 241 million in 1990 to 315 million in 1999—nearly half of Africa’s population. Economic stagnation, combined with declining levels of development aid and private investment, deteriorating terms of trade, an unsustainable debt burden, and the ravages of conflict and HIV/AIDS and other diseases, have left Africa with fewer resources to invest in development, and more vulnerable to global economic

shocks and environmental disasters like droughts and floods.“ Michael Fleshman, „Africa Struggles to Attain Millennium Goals“ in *Africa Recovery* Vol. 17 no 3 (October 2003): p.10

Truly, the world economy has grown tremendously, and therefore has sufficient wealth for all people of the world to live well. The tragedy is that most people are far away from being part of this global success. The economic globalization, that assumes the power of the market to generate income and distribute it in a trickle-down fashion (the supply-side economics) has left communities impoverished and violated economically. The wealth of Africa is senselessly siphoned away by powerfully protected Trans – National – Corporations (TCNs). African governments (which have no capacity to bargain forcefully as the international trade rules are negotiated) are left with no legal, political or economic power to provide for and protect their own people. Their natural resources are taken away at throwaway royalties under unjust rules. Phony investors are mistreating the native people—taking them out of their homelands wherever it is of value in what the state governments call „national interests.“ International trade and commerce is increasing speculative and unethical, where the winner takes all and everyone is for oneself. The selfishness we see internationally caused the breakdown of the WTO negotiations in Cancun.

However, within Africa as a continent, there are serious discrepancies in general wealth, where some countries are better than others are. Unfortunately, even in Africa, the wealthier countries are trying to dominate the poorer countries just as we see at the global stage. Within countries, regions and districts have different economies and, most significantly, as globalization spreads, there is a dangerous trend to an increasingly larger gap between the rich and the poor individuals within countries. Some wealthy neighbourhoods in our cities are unbelievably wealthy. However, those neighbourhoods are spending increasingly on their home and personal security than ever before. One of the fastest growing businesses in Africa is security guard companies, some of which are quickly becoming continental (Group 4 Security, Securicor, etc.)

As the majority of the people are becoming poorer, they resort to violent means of getting their livelihoods. Obviously, when it is only just a few who have what most others need but don't, they are, violence is almost a given. Armed robbery is increasing everywhere, as well as shocking street brutality. When you are walking in Nairobi city centre, or shopping in an affluent super-market in Dar es Salaam you are advised to take off your watch and jewelry as thugs may simply come and take them away from you in broad daylight without any assistance from the looking public, as it has become all too common. What would we expect in a city with thousands of young people without work, without shelter, without education, without hope, and thousands of street children growing up into such a hopeless and violent environment?

Strategies to overcome Violence

The strategies of the churches to overcome violence will always be negotiated and formulated according to local situations and challenges, from time to time. However, they all must be based on sound theologically grounded principles. Some of such principles include the following:

The value of all life. Life comes from God, and God intends all creation to celebrate it. Every kind of pain and discomfort that people face is normally inflicted on them directly or indirectly by fellow human beings. As such, it is not acceptable that some people live in discomfort and pain because of human violence since every life has value before the author of life. We therefore cannot stand by when someone is in danger, in pain, or being exploited.

The right of everyone to enjoy life. In the words of Ecumenical Advocacy Alliance, all people have: „rights to food, to health, to education, to just and favourable conditions of work, to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications, and to an adequate standard of living (all economic, social and cultural rights)“. The human rights premise should be the one underlying our strategies for overcoming violence. These rights are divinely instituted.

It is a vocation. God calls the church to be in solidarity with the vulnerable, the discriminated against, the marginalized as our neighbours wherever they may be. We must therefore join forces and accompany those who are fighting for their life, for their rights. Of course, the practical aspects of this solidarity are not comfortable because the fight is long, tough, and painful. We can only do this as a vocation, a matter of faith.

We are in God's mission. We are called and sent to be God's instruments to proclaim the message of the Kingdom of God, to bring hope and to strengthen those in the struggle. The proclamation is for both the violator and the victim. The violator is supposed to hear the message of God who sets the violator free from the prison of violence. The victim hears the proclamation of hope, of God who comes in action to liberate. While the mission is to condemn the acts and structures which perpetrate violence, it also empowers the victims to stand up and claim their rights of a life free of violence.

Bearing in mind these principles, the churches strategies in Africa should aim to take specific actions in the struggle to overcome violence. Such actions include:

First, there is a great need for **community sensitization** that violence is rampant, and that it must be overcome. There are cultures and norms that people simply accept with no questioning or as if they were God-given. For example, domestic

violence (wife battering), Female Genital Mutilation, under-age marriages, and child molestation and physical torture are entrenched in many cultures. The male dominance in our patriarchal systems should be challenged as evil and human instituted. It will take the church and Christians significant efforts, resources and time to show that they are not right and to change peoples' assumptions. However, changing these beliefs and traditions of people is not easy, as we have seen when fighting these evils. Communities must come to a point where they cannot accept the violence, and can robustly stand for justice and peace of each life. Fortunately in this area, churches have unrivalled advantages of widespread grassroots coverage, as well as moral authority to sensitize the communities. We should never lose this opportunity.

Second, there is a need for **capacity building** for churches in Africa, to enable them to analyze and understand the violence in their countries and communities. The issues are vast and complicated. Many times the churches have no sufficient capacity to address the issues due to lack of relevant data, expert analysis and effective coordination. For instance, churches should be able to analyze local customs, national laws, and actual situations in countries, to identify structural violence, to be able to articulate their existence and make a case against them. The capacity of the churches must also be built in areas of global and national economic dynamics. Issues like the WTO negotiations, the World Bank and IMF policies and what they mean to national social-political-economic realities, new neo-liberal ideologies that the powerful are trying to market as universal, all need great human and financial capacity. Political violence is an area that needs bold approaches and can be at times dangerous. It will take churches with properly enhanced capacities to analyze with credibility and agile arguments, what is going on and face the authorities. Most churches do not have this capacity. Certainly, it boils down to capacity in general, but financial means in particular. We must equip the African churches to address these matters from Africa with agility, credibility and originality.

African churches need **networking**. Networking is inevitable since in this era of globalization, lone doves cannot fly successfully. There must be lively networks of churches within countries, within the continent, and globally that follow the issues of rights violations in different fields and different geographical areas. Therefore, African churches must be accommodated in networks like Ecumenical Advocacy Alliance, UEM, and even with other non-church network and initiatives as we witnessed the success of Jubilee 2000. It will not work for Northern alliances to continue „working“ for their African friends, without a meaningful participation of those on the ground in Africa. While I really appreciate the concern and dedication of our northern partners (those native in the North as well as „Africans in diasporas“ in the North) I would challenge them to

work more closely and in solidarity with the Africans themselves, to ensure originality and credibility of initiatives. It is crucial for partners to make it possible for African actors, who live the tragedy, to fight for themselves, but stand in solidarity with them.

Hold governments accountable. The churches must learn strategies of how to hold their governments accountable to the people. This is one of the ways to overcome national structural violence. The violence inflicted on the people by state organs like police forces, corrupt officials, and irresponsible authorities must be overcome by targeting the governments themselves.

Churches must **deplore global militarism.** Particularly at this time when the whole world is engulfed in what is seen as „the global war on terror,“ the danger of glorifying militarism is threatening. After the tragic September 11, the USA is leading, or rather misleading the world to think that violence and terrorism will be overcome by enhanced and more sophisticated militarism. The increased spending in military ventures which we have witnessed in the USA, and calls for such increases in the EU to counter-balance the USA, threats of solving global conflicts in problem areas like North Korea and Syria, threatens to throw the whole world into the frenzy of military race reminiscent of the cold war. Churches must always stand firm to deplore such ideologies, and work on alternative approaches to build world peace.

Churches need to **support successful peace and justice initiatives.** We are witnessing in within Africa the unprecedented peace initiatives by Africans themselves. The successful paths taken in connection with Burundi, Rwanda, Democratic Republic of Congo, (a bit) Liberia, Sierra Leone, and lately Somalia and Sudan need to be upheld, recognized and supported vehemently so that they can spread infectiously. Several peace deals have been signed in the last year, the latest of which is Sudan. I have been impressed by the reports that the „Christian Right“ in the USA has remarkably exerted significant pressure on President Bush to encourage and work for the peace initiatives in Sudan, where even today slavery is active. What have the mainline churches done in initiatives such as the IGAD on Somalia, and in Rwanda to foster reconciliation where the credibility of the churches suffered a devastating blow during the infamous genocide?

Churches in Africa and their partners need to **encourage and support NEPAD.** Its weaknesses and shortcomings notwithstanding, NEPAD (New Partnership for Africa's Development) has a great potential to be a platform for reform throughout the continent. With its special focus on economic transformation (even if its underlying principles are debatable), its commitment for governments to hold

each other responsible to the people, and its peace initiatives, it is a platform worth our support.

Conclusion

Violence in Africa has several ugly faces. All the faces need to be faced and overcome by special strategies, which need to be developed by churches with a credible grounding in our faith. Nevertheless, we can overcome, in solidarity with the peace lovers of the whole world.

Certainly, it boils down to capacity in general, but financial means in particular. We must equip the African churches to address these matters from Africa with agility. Even though the challenges are paramount, we are reminded of one wisdom saying. „How does one eat an elephant? One peace at a time.“

Globalisation and violence: An Asian perspective

THERESA C. CARINO

Asian experience of war and peace in the 20th century:

The 20th century, perhaps more than any other century, has been a period of war and extreme violence for Asia.

The beginning of the 20th century ushered in a period of revolutionary struggle against colonialism in some Asian countries even as Western imperial nations sought to consolidate their grip on power in the Asian subcontinent. The outbreak of the Second World War brought more widespread violence in Asia. Japan's aggression led to massacres in China and other parts of Asia. As the Allied Forces retaliated against Japan, Asia became an experimental ground for the testing of new weapons of mass destruction. Nuclear bombs were dropped by American bombers, for the first time, in 1945, over Hiroshima and Nagasaki, killing hundreds of thousands and affecting future generations with their long-term deleterious effects. The dropping of the nuclear bombs effectively brought the Second World War to an end but did not put a stop to war in Asia. As the old imperial powers withdrew from the region, and the new American empire sought to flex its muscles, the region became the battlefield of nationalist wars of liberation and revolution. It became the region where the Cold War became hot: we recall the Korean War and the Vietnam War; and where experimentations with ideologies led to unrestrained atrocities and killing fields (as in Cambodia)

The violence led to streams of refugees, women and children, old and young, fleeing from their homes in the countryside to live in slums in the cities. Others had to flee their countries, torn apart by war. They crossed mountains on foot or risked the dangers of the high seas in rickety boats, often only to arrive in areas where people were as hostile as their tormentors back home. Looking back at the 20th century, it seems that for many Asians, peace has been an elusive experience and few countries in the region, if any, have been able to escape the miseries and suffering of war and revolution in the last 100 years.

The end of the Vietnam War in 1975 may be regarded as the end of one of the major wars in the region and it gave Asia a brief reprieve from the destruction and suffering of unmitigated violence. When East and Southeast Asian economies began to prosper, towards the end of the 1980s and early 1990s, it was met with a eupho-

ria that was not surprising. Set against almost a century of war and destruction, to find Asia rising from the ashes was nothing short of a miracle. And pundits did talk about the Asian miracle. This was, of course, until the Asian financial crisis of 1997 crushed these illusions, and Asians began to ponder if the 21st century would really be the Asian century.

Today, three years into the new millennium, Asians are much more cautiously optimistic about the future. Experts now hesitate to proclaim miracles as Asia has reeled from one shock to another. Even as the US had its September 11, Asia experienced the Bali bombing. The war in Iraq, volatile stock markets, the outbreak of SARS and now, an epidemic of bird flu, have all weighed heavily on the Asian psyche. This is not to say, though, that the appetite of Asian states for economic and military power has in any way been diminished by such set backs.

Asia: region of rapid economic growth but also of rapid military build-up

In fact, Asia's new found economic prosperity, even though growing now at a slower and probably more realistic pace (with the exception of China, which had a record high of 9% GDP growth in 2003), has been accompanied by increasingly higher levels of investment in military hardware and weapons of mass destruction.

Judging from the record, governments in Asia are much more willing to invest in military security than in social security. They are modernizing their armies and investing in both nuclear and conventional weapons at a rate that far surpasses any investment in education, health and infrastructure.

Among the top procurers of arms in the region are China and the United Arab Emirates. China spent US\$11.3 billion on arms procurement over the last 4 years while the United Arab Emirates bought US\$9 billion worth of arms over the same period. India's military expenditure has increased to US\$12.9 billion in 2002 from US\$ 9.4 billion in 1998. It also ranks as the third largest producer of arms among developing nations, selling 8 billion dollars worth of arms between 1999 and 2002.ⁱ

Between 1998 and 2002, Pakistan's military budget increased from US \$2.8 billion to US \$3.2 billion which accounts for almost 5% of its GDP.ⁱⁱ Both India and Pakistan, in addition to China, have acquired nuclear weapons and show no restraint in trying to accumulate more.

i See the paper by Mathews George Chunakara, „Emerging Geopolitical Trends in Asia“ delivered at the Asia Regional Group Meeting of the World Council of Churches held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 24-29 November 2003.

ii Ibid.

South Korea spent 1.9 billion dollars on arms while Taiwan is one of the biggest buyers of US weapons. Between 1990 and 2001, it was the second biggest buyer (next to Saudi Arabia), spending US \$14.6 billion worth on sophisticated military hardware ostensibly to counter a possible attack from mainland China.ⁱⁱⁱ Not to be left out, the Philippines, whose economic growth rate is still trying to catch up with its population growth rate, is also trying hard to modernize its armed forces and acquire military hardware. By being a part of the „coalition of the willing“, it has been promised US \$100 million in military aid from the US.

Whether large or small, Asian countries are engaged in an intense arms race. Accompanying this proliferation of both conventional and non-conventional weapons are new and shifting political and military alliances. These alliances revolve around the dominant military and economic role of the United States in the region. They have to do with the „globalisation project“ of the United States, which may be defined as „the movement toward a unified market, through which the world economy and its financial institutions become increasingly integrated and linked to one another.“ While globalisation is facilitated by new communication technologies and democratisation, its driving force is the application of market criteria to almost all areas of life. Advocates of globalisation speak of a borderless world and the need to bring down barriers to free trade. But the barriers to so-called free trade are not falling down without resistance. Thus, where the free flow of goods and services is impeded, then, according to Thomas Friedman, an ideologue of globalisation, the „invisible hand“ of the „free market“ requires an „iron fist“ of political and military power.^{iv} That power is currently wielded by the United States, the only superpower left in this world. Not one to mince his words, Ninan Koshy has described the present phase of globalisation as „militarised globalisation following the imperial designs of the USA“.^v

US economic interests in Asia

For America's „globalisation project“ Asia is crucial. Asia holds 61% of the world's population and so constitutes one of the largest markets for American products. It accounts for a third of the world's GDP. Trade between the US and Asia now

iii Ibid.

iv Quoted by Philip Wickeri in his paper „Globalisation and the crisis in World Christianity“ delivered at the 50th Anniversary Celebration of the Hong Kong Christian Council, January 15-17, 2004 at the Waterloo YMCA in Hong Kong.

v See Ninan Koshy, „The Present Phase of Globalisation“ in *Quest*, Vol. 2, No. 2, Nov. 2003, ACUCA.

amounts to US \$500 billion and US investment in the region amounts to US \$150 billion. Another indicator of US engagement in Asia is the fact that more than half a million US citizens (excluding military personnel) live, work and study in Asia.

Ensuring adequate supplies of oil and mineral resources for itself and its allies in the region, from the Gulf of Persia to the Asia Pacific Ocean, is a primary concern. Controlling the waterways and air space over which such resources are transported to the US and its allies is of strategic importance. American prosperity and power largely depends on trade with Asia and on controlling a sizeable proportion of the energy and raw materials from this region.

To maintain its political, economic and military hegemony, the US considers it necessary to contain the political and military power of China, fast emerging as the major power in East Asia with a potential to challenge the US on the global stage. It is not surprising that the US is beginning to form a strategic alliance with India. The Indian navy has in recent years launched a 30-year programme to construct a fleet capable of projecting power into the South China Sea. In May 2002, the US-India Defense Policy Group met to map out joint defence strategies, which included planning joint naval patrols of the Malacca Straits. According to US think tanks, India has the economic and military strength to counter the „adverse effects“ of China's rise as a regional and world power.

It should be noted that India is also developing a strategic alliance with Israel and the latter is now the second largest supplier of high technology weapons systems to India. Pakistan, on the other hand, has relied on China for developing its nuclear program. With China's assistance, Pakistan is making significant strides in its ballistic missile programs. The strategic alliance between the two has been of concern to India. The effort to achieve a mutual balance of terror between India and Pakistan continues to be a source of instability in the region.

Worrisome too is Japan's rising ambition to be a military power in the region. A crucial ally for the US in Asia, it is now being encouraged by the US to strengthen its „defence“ capabilities, under the TMD (Theatre Missile Defence System) strategy of the USA. During the Afghan War, Japan deployed naval forces overseas – the first time it had ever done so since the Second World War. Recently, it deployed forces to Iraq in support of the war effort of the US. Although the Japanese Constitution restricts the Japanese military to a defensive force, and it has been called „the Self Defence Forces“, in reality, Japan has one of the most sophisticated armies in the world. It is one of the top five military spenders in the world with a US \$47 billion budget in 2002.^{vi} The events of September 11 and the US-led „war on

vi Japan has an annual military budget of around US\$ 50 billion, about one-eighth of that of the US. See Tim Kelly, „In Japan, defense profits beckon“, International Herald Tribune, Feb. 2, 2004.

terrorism“ gave Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi the opportunity to promote a special measures bill „to combat terrorism“ which allows „restrictive involvement“ of Japanese forces in the US-led war on terrorism. It marks a significant departure from Japan's post-war pacifist constitution. The Bush administration wants Japan to play a stronger security role in the region, no doubt as a counter weight to China's growing power and has indicated willingness to support revisions in its constitution that will allow its further military expansion.

Australia has also been approached to provide bases for US forces, for its combat and reconnaissance aircraft. It is closely related to Washington's concerns with Islamic fundamentalists in Southeast Asia, especially in Indonesia. Australian Prime Minister, John Howard, echoed Bush's doctrine of pre-emptive strike by threatening to launch pre-emptive strikes against terrorists in Southeast Asia. Although this elicited protests from the governments of Malaysia, the Philippines and Indonesia, there was explicit support from Washington for this position.

The „war on terror“ has allowed the US not only to re-station troops in the Philippines, but to become involved in civil strife. It has been involved in military operations against the Abu Sayaf (an Islamic group fighting for Muslim autonomy) in Mindanao, in Southern Philippines. The Philippines alliance with the US could involve as many as 2,000 US soldiers and thousands of Filipino troops and the figure could increase.

At the APEC summit held in Bangkok in October 2003, Bush pushed for trade and security to be linked in unprecedented ways, claiming that the threat of global terrorism has made the two inseparable.

The new agenda, pushed by the US for more trade related security measures raised new concerns among many Asian leaders that „rigid US security requirements on trade flows are in the offing and that these could hamper the free flow of trade.“ Asian countries are being required to intensify their security measures, which will require major new investments in computing, energy and shipping and port security – if they want easy access to US markets. Raising security insurance costs will make Asian goods more expensive in the US. It could become a new type of non-tariff barrier to US markets for Asian companies. According to some Asian leaders, „the Europeans use health standards to protect their agricultural markets, now it appears the US is using security issues as a protectionist tool.“

Globalisation, Religious Fundamentalism and The War on Terror

Indeed, since the September 11 attack on the World Trade Centre, the US has used the issue of its national security, not only for economic advantage, but to launch unrestrained attacks and „pre-emptive strikes“ on groups and countries that do not

conform to its vision of a „globalised world“ – a world safe for democracy and free markets. It used the tragedy of September 11 to gain support for a brutal attack on Afghanistan that not only crushed the unpopular Taliban regime but brought widespread devastation and death to the people of Afghanistan, coldly referred to in military parlance as „collateral damage“. (It is interesting to note that while we know exactly how many US soldiers died in Afghanistan or in Iraq, to this day, the Western media has not even attempted to seriously assess the number of civilians killed and wounded by US bombing missions either in Afghanistan or Iraq.)

The debate in the UN Security Council over the search for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and the US push for war, almost a year ago, demonstrated very clearly that the US, flush with victory from the war in Afghanistan and conscious of its status as the world's only superpower, was ready to wage war unilaterally. It undermined all the rules of international diplomacy, trying to invent new rules to suit its objectives. It twisted arms, it bought allegiance, it inflated information from questionable sources into so-called „solid evidence“. The debate revealed all the weaknesses of the United Nations.

Although the majority in the UN rejected the idea that there was sufficient evidence to go to war with Iraq, there was implicit acceptance of the idea of the „pre-emptive strike“ which justifies military intervention by one state against another, without overt provocation, if the evidence is strong that the state produces weapons of mass destruction or hosts „terrorist“ groups. The idea of a „pre-emptive strike“ allows the US and its allies to invade those it regards as „rogue nations“ or belonging to the „Axis of Evil“. Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi has intimated that Japan should be able to launch „pre-emptive strikes“ against countries that his government considered to pose an imminent threat. This was echoed in Australia by Prime Minister Howard.

These statements provoked strong reactions from other Asian leaders, particularly from Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines. This could have been expected since it is in these countries where Islamic fundamentalist groups have become a political force and it is in these countries where some extremist groups have established bases from which to launch their „terrorist attacks“. There is no evidence that these extremist groups receive any state support or approval. As a matter of fact, in all these three states, the authorities themselves are trying to curb the growth of religious extremism.

It is important to stress that Asia has traditionally been the home of moderate Islam, and for that matter, other religions known for their tolerance. It is only in the last two decades that extremist religious groups have emerged in some countries. Much of the fervour of these groups to establish Islamic states has to do with the reaction to globalisation and its association with injustice. Among the young intellectuals who constitute the leadership of the Islamic conservatives (or fundamental-

ists) are many who have been educated overseas in the 1970s and 80s and who have become frustrated with the political system, especially social injustices and corruption. After mingling with students from Arab countries, they have been imbued with the notion that Islam is the solution to their problems. „The meaning of religiosity to the majority of people is the quest for justice, for freedom and democracy“, according to a young Muslim intellectual in Malaysia. „Those who believe that the Islamic system is best are those who see Islam as a solution to social problems.“^{vii}

The spread of conservative or „fundamentalist Islam“ is also receiving help from US policy in the Middle East, its war on Iraq and its harsh treatment of Muslims in the US as security risks. We see it on our television screens every day – the brutalities of the Middle East conflict, especially the harsh treatment of Palestinians by Israel. Israeli tanks roll into Palestine and crush Palestinian homes before our eyes. Israeli bombs rain on hapless civilians. These scenes evoke anger, from people in faraway Hong Kong. How much greater is the intensity of the anger of those who are Muslims.

Rise in religious activism and religious fundamentalism

The spread of religious fundamentalism in Asia and the concurrent rise in religious activism has not been confined to Islam. Fundamentalist religious groups have become a political force in many countries, particularly in South and Southeast Asia and political violence has been increasingly perpetrated in the name of religion by militant groups.

Countries including India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Nepal, Myanmar and Indonesia have seen new waves of violent, religious activism in recent years. These involve Muslim-Christian conflicts in Indonesia, Pakistan and Bangladesh, Hindu-Christian conflicts in India and Nepal, Hindu-Muslim conflicts in India, Bangladesh and Pakistan, Buddhist-Christian conflicts in Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Cambodia. Apart from the tragic loss of lives, these conflicts have left deep psychological scars on communities that had previously been peaceful.

What are the factors that have eroded the ethos of religious tolerance and communal harmony that seemed so much more prevalent in Asia in the past? As suggested in the case of Islam, the same reasons may be true for the other religions – it has to do with the failure of secular states and secular ideologies.

In Europe, the backlash against the abusive use of religion in politics led eventually to the conception of the separation of church and state. According to Scott Appelby, „The core values of secularised Western societies, including freedom of

vii See „The Struggle for Islam“ in FEER, Dec. 11, 2003.

speech and freedom of religion, were elaborated in outraged response to inquisitions, crusades, pogroms and wars conducted in the name of God. Religion was the burning motivation, the one that inspired fanatical devotion and the most vicious hatred in the wars that plagued Europe from the 1560s to the 1650s^{vi}.

After the Second World War, in post-colonial Asia, newly emergent nations attempted to adopt the model of the modern, secular state, with a clear separation of church and state. Half a century later, we see a resurgence of religious activism and new challenges to the idea of the secular state. The trend is very visible in many parts of Asia where militant religious groups have become a powerful political force. In countries such as India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Nepal, Myanmar, the Philippines and Indonesia, violent conflicts have erupted in the name of religion. Religious militants, fundamentalist groups and communal political parties seem to be gaining political ground in many of these countries.

Given the multi-ethnic, multi-religious and multi-lingual landscape of most Asian states, communal hostility and outbreaks have much to do with the intense competition for access to the benefits of the modern state. It is unfortunate that, for historical, cultural and other reasons, the „nation-building project of the post-colonial era provided opportunities for some communal groups to monopolise the state apparatus and to dominate, incorporate or diminish other groups.“ In Malaysia, for instance, as a result of British colonial policies, the Chinese came to dominate in the economic sphere while the Malays (who by definition are also Muslims and *bumiputras*, or sons of the soil) controlled the political sphere. This sharp division of roles and the reinforcement of economic differences with ethnic differences have continued to be a source of communal tension.

Appleby observes that „Communalism attracts both majorities and minorities, elites and masses, who complain that the post-independence secular order has left them „victimised“ and grasping for their share of educational opportunities, capital assets, occupational training and jobs. Religious „fundamentalism“ provides an ideology for militant political movements.“ It becomes an answer to all problems.

Nowhere has the eruption of religious fundamentalism as a militant movement been more dramatic than in India, where Hinduism had traditionally been more closely associated with religious tolerance. Today, in India, Hindu fundamentalist militant organizations such as the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP), the Bajrang Dal, and other Hindu groups, collectively known as the Sangh Privar (Hindu fundamentalist family of organisations) are using religion to foment communal violence. They propagate a Hindu fundamentalist ideology that asserts a unifying Hindu culture for all Indians and advocates an ultra-

vi R. Scott Appleby, *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence and Reconciliation*, Rowman and Littlefield, 2000.

right, non-secular nationalism. This movement has historical roots that date back to 1915, when the Hindu Mahasabha (Hindu Great Council) was founded in reaction to the formation of the Muslim League. V. D. Savarkar, leader of the Hindu Mahasabha and author of the book *Hindutva*, formulated the doctrinal basis and ideological tenets of Hindu nationalism around the notion of Hindu racial, cultural and religious superiority. By the 1990s, the RSS, a highly organized brotherhood, had more than 2 million members supervised by 3,000 professional organisers, primarily celibate young men.^{ix}

Some characteristics of the movement:

- 1) reaction to secularism and pluralism (esp. against affirmative action measures for Muslims and lower-cast Hindus)
- 2) emphasises the positive aspects of Hinduism through its revivals and inclusive missionary activities among untouchables, Tribals, Sikhs, Buddhists and Jains, excluding only the Muslims and Christians.

The movement has generated incidents of mob violence, one of the most infamous of which has been the demolition of the Babri Mosque in December 1992 by over 200,000 Hindus who had descended on the city of Ayodhya (in the state of Uttar Pradesh). Thousands of people died in the subsequent rioting and Hindu-Muslim violence that erupted throughout the country. According to Hindu extremists, Muslims can remain in India only by accepting the hegemony of Hinduism. The hostility towards Muslims has a long history but over the last few years, their offensives against Christians have grown more intense as well. In four Indian states now, anti-conversion bills have been passed, in fact contravening the guarantee of freedom of religion in the Indian Constitution.

In Pakistan, the religious right has become increasingly assertive since the strong showing of a coalition of six radical Islamic Parties in national elections in October 2002. In the province bordering Afghanistan, the MMA-led government recently voted to enforce Islamic law in the province. They are considering establishing a morality police modelled on the Taliban's Ministry for Prevention of Vice and Promotion of Virtue. There is a ban on music in public places, male doctors have been forbidden from examining female patients and civil servants have been ordered to pray five times daily. There is serious concern that this trend could spread throughout Pakistan.

Of course, what makes religious militancy even more potent is when it reinforces ethnic divisions. Among the 180 territorial states in the contemporary world, more than 90 percent are multiethnic, containing two or more ethnic communities of significant size. In Asia, ethnic and religious diversity is common in most countries and this has, increasingly become the source of violence and political instability in the

ix Ibid.

region. Many of the inter-ethnic and inter-religious prejudices and hatreds have deep-seated historical roots. Somehow, they are mostly weather and time-resistant, transmitted over space and time.

The intense economic competition generated by globalisation has had the effect of sharpening inter-ethnic and inter-religious tensions.

What makes religious fundamentalism so potent as a political force today is that religious groups now have the means to become better and more effectively organized. One reason why Islamic fundamentalism is on the rise is because the financial and institutional capacity of Islamic countries has grown. There is no doubt that Osama Bin Laden's personal wealth was a factor in the organisational strength of Al Qaeda and its continued survival.

The means and opportunities for mass mobilisation based on religion have also grown appreciably with modern technology. Media, modern technology, such as the Internet and mobile phones have provided the means for groups to organise. Religion has become a potent force around which political mobilisation has happened and even religions that used to be considered „institutionally unorganised“ or were not visibly so, have become highly organised.

At the same time, secular ideologies, closely associated with the West have lost their appeal, whether it is capitalism, liberalism or Marxism. Socialist states are „transitioning“ towards market economies while those that still adhere closely to the traditional model of a „command economy“ are in dire economic straits. Even in countries where authoritarian regimes have been deposed, fledgling democracies are weighed down by mounting corruption, the widening rich-poor gap, political parties that advance the interest of a few in the name of the many and a restive army that wants to grab power.

In search of peace:

In a survey of the Asian scene, the picture I have painted appears rather dismal. The threats to peace are many. The inordinate use of force by the US in its reaction to „terror“ and against members of the „axis of evil“ served only to breed further religious militancy and violence.

But there have also been encouraging signs of hope, not least of which comes from Asian churches themselves. I would like to refer particularly to the efforts of the National Councils of Churches in the Philippines and in Sri Lanka in promoting peace negotiations in their respective countries between „rebel“ groups and their respective governments.

In 1986, when the Marcos dictatorship was deposed in the Philippines, there was great expectation that Corazon Aquino, installed as President through a „people

power“ revolution, would be able to bring the communist movement into the fold of mainstream politics and put an end to the violent „insurgency“ in the country. Unfortunately, the peace talks soon broke down between the Communist Party in the Philippines (CPP) and the Aquino regime, leading to a further polarisation in the position of both sides and an intensification of the civil war. When Fidel Ramos was elected to the Presidency, in 1992, he became the first Protestant to be elected to the highest office in what is predominantly a Catholic country. At this juncture, some members of the CPP approached the NCCP to convey the message to the President that they were prepared to engage in „unconditional talks“ with the government. It was through the direct intercession of the NCCP that the Philippine government eventually agreed to re-open peace talks with the CPP. These peace talks may not have put an end to the „insurgency“ but the engagement of the churches in the peace process was significant. In some regions, churches were involved in the establishment of „zones of peace“ so that farmers would not have to live in dread of being caught in the crossfire between the military and the rebels, or suffer from harassment from either side.

In Sri Lanka, I know that in recent years, the National Council of Churches has also been involved in pressing both the government and the Tamil Tigers to pursue peace talks. Churches have organised marches for peace. That pressure has to be continually put on both the government and the rebel forces.

In Asia, the search for peaceful solutions has to take place more intensively in the church. The church has to become more engaged as a medium for peaceful initiatives. And in areas where ethnic and religious conflicts exist or threaten to break out, it is crucial that these initiatives have to take on a multi-religious dimension.

As a first step, it is essential for churches to acknowledge our complicity, whether implicit or explicit, in generating communal anger and hostility. During the colonial era, Christian churches and institutions in many parts of Asia enjoyed special privileges and special ties with the colonial authorities. As a privileged minority, Christians had greater access to economic and cultural resources and even though their numbers were small, they became members of the elite and propertied classes. Today, Christians continue to be seen as belonging to a „well-endowed“ or „rich“ community in many Asian countries, especially in urban areas. It is not uncommon in some cities of Asia to see great, Gothic cathedrals standing in the midst of slums. How does this make people of other faiths feel?

Secondly, Christianity in Asia still has not completely shaken off the „stigma“ of being a „foreign religion“ or a religion closely identified with the West. Whether it is in India, Pakistan or in China, the new wave of Western missionaries, especially of the fundamentalist variety, has not helped to change this image. Perhaps we should not be surprised that anti-conversion laws have been passed in several Indian states as a reaction to aggressive proselytism. To make matters worse, the new wave

of missionaries include other Asians, especially those from the so called „more developed“ areas such as Singapore and Korea.

Even as we criticize the fundamentalist streak in other religions as leading to intolerance and religious violence, we need to recognize that Christianity itself has been used to legitimise intolerance and violence, both in the past and in the present. We need to criticise the new American „theology of empire“ which connects US foreign policy to a religiously inspired „mission“ that is promoted all over the world. As the Bush administration prepared to go to war in Iraq, there was no mistaking the powerful Christian images that appeared on our television screens. He was shown emerging from a worship service commemorating the death of victims of September 11. He spoke about praying over his decision to go to war. The association with Christianity was very clear and very visible. Immediately after September 11, as he spoke of the war on terror, he even used the word „crusade“.

More than anything else, Christianity and the church must be associated with peace rather than war. Christians must be seen as joining people of other faiths in building peace. Last year, even though it did not prevent the US from waging war in Iraq, what was heartening was that there were Asians of different faiths, ethnicity and from all walks of life who joined the global movement for peace by rallying around the call for a peaceful solution to the Iraqi crisis. Throughout the region, from Pakistan to Malaysia, Hong Kong, Philippines and Indonesia to Australia, opposition to the US-led effort to wage war on Iraq were manifested in mass rallies, involving more than a million people. That movement has to be sustained and expanded.

Christmas, of course, has always been regarded as a season of peace. Last Christmas, I received a card with an inspiring message from Germany which I would like to share with you. It revolves around Ephesians Ch. 3, V 3-6:

„God revealed his secret plan and made it known to me...that by means of the gospel the Gentiles have a part with the Jews in God's blessings; they are members of the same body and share in the promise that God made through Christ Jesus.“

According to the Christmas message, „Jesus throws a completely different perspective on religion.“ Religion has always been associated with insiders and outsiders, believers and unbelievers, sacred and the profane – opposites. As Christians, we tend to see ourselves as insiders, and when we use the word „heathen“, we mean „the others“. (In China, some new converts to Christianity feel they have to dissociate themselves from the „world“ with all of its sins and evil.) „We regard others with suspicion and sometimes even fear -- fear of contamination, fear of corruption. But in the Bible: the word „heathen“ has acquired another meaning: The heathens are all of us in our common human endeavours and aspirations, our lives set in the fascinating, luxurious beauty as well as the deep, inner disintegration of this world, all of us with our deep longing for life and with our suffering. In the midst of such a world

the secret is revealed that we, in whatever place and in whatever position we may be have a part in God's blessing, are members of his body and share in his plans. As members of the „nations“ we are invited to discover the miracle that God is not to be found in the closed sanctuary of a temple, but in the darker sides of our earthly life.^x

We cannot seek peace and reconciliation without the others. How will we do this? How long will it take?

Those who follow the lunar calendar recently ushered in the Year of the Monkey – in China, Vietnam, Korea and Japan. In the Chinese zodiac, the monkey is associated with intelligence, resourcefulness and agility. Our responses to these enormous challenges of our day and age need to bear these characteristics. We have to be intelligent, that is, well-informed; resourceful, that is, persistent in identifying ways and means to attain our objectives; and agile, that is, imaginative in our approach and in our solutions.

x Christmas letter sent by Bernhard Dinkelaker of EMS, 2003.

Conversion from violent religious and political fantasies

Dedication to Bishop and Moderator Dr Z. Kameeta in gratitude and respect

BERTOLD KLAPPERT

Text: Luke 9:51-56

- 51 And it came to pass, when the time was to be fulfilled that he (Jesus) should be received up (to heaven as Elijah), he set his face fast, to go to Jerusalem,
- 52 And sent messengers before his face: and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him.
- 53 And they did not receive him, because his face was to go to Jerusalem.
- 54 And when his disciples James and John saw this, they said, Lord, do you want us to command fire to come down from heaven and annihilate them, (even as Elijah did)?
- 55 But he turned and threatened them (and said, Do you not know what kind of children of spirit you are of?)
- 56 (For the Son of man has not come to annihilate men's lives, but to save them.) And they went to another village.
(Within the brackets, we have the first commentaries of the original New Testament text)
- I Zeal for the glory of God: the great passing
„He set his face fast to go to Jerusalem“ (9,51)
- II The long violent history of this zeal for the glory of God
„Lord, do you want us to command fire to come down from heaven and annihilate them?“ (9,54)
- III About conversion from religious and other fantasies of violence
„But Jesus turned and threatened them“ (9,55)
- IV About the Discipleship of the God of Israel and his Messiah Jesus, or: John the zealot became Jesus' beloved apostle
„And they went to another (Samaritan) village“ (9,56)

This short passage – Luke 9:51-56 – may be relatively short but it is nevertheless a powerful narrative: a narrative that gives an account of the great love, of the great passion of God and of His Messiah Jesus. The story is normally played down as a

travel report, the description of a trip or an account of a walk, as if it was some kind of nature ramble. As if Jesus was making his way through Galilee and Samaria towards Jerusalem, just as later Alexander von Humboldt walked through Latin America in the 19th to discover the land.

Our narrative, however, is the report of a journey, a *journey-narrative*: Jesus is making *his* journey to Jerusalem, beginning his journey towards his final Exodus, departure and Passover (Luke 9:31); he begins his journey that will ultimately lead to his suffering and consumption, his being received up to heaven. „And it came to pass, when the time was to be fulfilled that he (Jesus) should be received up (to heaven) as (it happened to) Elijah.

According to our *journey narrative* both apostles, James and John, sons of Zebedee, accompany Jesus on his journey to Jerusalem for the Passover. The language used in the passage is solemn, almost ceremonial:

„And it came to pass, when the time was to be fulfilled, that he should be received up (to heaven, as Elijah), he set his face fast to go to Jerusalem“ (Luke 9:51).

I „He set his face fast to go to Jerusalem“ (Lk 9:51) Zeal for the glory of God: the great passion

Three times the motif of Jesus „going“ appears in our passage, three times it speaks of his „face“ (in Hebrew *panim*). The Jesus-movement is not a standpoint or a fixed spot but „a WAY“ (Acts 22:4):

The way of Jesus is the resolute, ardently holy *going*, the beginning of the journey to Jerusalem: the great passion and zeal for the glory of God.

a. And Jesus' great passion for the Kingdom of God and His justice (*Mt 6:33*) is only a reflection of the great passion of the *God of Israel*:

„For thou shalt worship no other god: for the LORD, whose name is אלהים, is a jealous God“.

The early Greek translators (Septuagint) translated Exodus 34:14 thus:

„For God, whose name is Zealous, is a zealous God“.

b. And so, the whole of Israel is invited to go and to live for the passionate zeal, for the glory of God and the salvation of humankind.

And so, *Jesus* follows this way of great passion, which the God of Israel goes himself: „The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up,“ as Jesus said during the prophetic symbolic action (Zeichenhandlung) of cleansing the temple. (*John 2:17; Ps 69:10*) John Calvin, among all the reformers, was the great zealot for the glory of the God of Israel and for the humanisation of humankind.

c. And so also the apostles follow the way of Jesus and, with Jesus, the way of the God of Israel. Discipleship means: accompanying, „walking behind“ Jesus!

„And he (Jesus) sent messengers before his face: and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him“ (*Luke 9,52*).

„And they did not receive *him*, because his face was to go to Jerusalem“ (*Luke 9,53*).

And the Samaritans did not receive him! Imagine: as Jesus makes his way to being received up by the God of Israel (like Elijah) to heaven, the Samaritans, through whose territory the way from Galilee to Jerusalem must pass, *did not receive him!*

A scandal, a provocation; indeed an act of sacrilege against Jesus, the Messianic Son of Man! History is repeating itself:

- i) in Judea he was in a stable,
„because there was no room for them in the inn“ (*Luke 2:7*);
- ii) in Bethlehem he came to his own,
„and his own received him not“ (*John 1:11*);
- iii) so he passes, here, through the villages of the Samaritans, who for centuries had been quarrelling and fighting about religion with the Jews, because they had quarrelled in their religious zeal over the scope of the Canon, because they only accepted the five Books of Moses and not the Prophets and the third part of the Canon.

There are many stories in the Old and New Testaments, telling of the „*holy wrath*“ of those working for the glory of God.

Great figures demonstrating this zeal for the glory of God in the Old Testament were:

Moses, who liberated the people from slavery under the Pharaoh, so that they could serve the God of Israel and his commandments alone:

„Let my people go, that they may serve me (and not the Pharaoh and his gods)“ (*Exodus 9:1*). In 1933, at the beginning of the Nazi era, Karl Barth published his article: The first commandment as axiom of theology.

Then there was **Phinehas**, grandson of Aaron, who helped to overcome the apostasy to Baal-Peor and acted with great zeal for the first commandment. And the God of Israel responded,

„Behold, I give unto him my covenant of peace, because he was zealous for his God“ (*Numbers 25,12f*).

And Phinehas was the important role model for the later struggle for freedom of Judith against Holophernes (*Hebrews 11,34f*) and of the Hasmoneans and Maccabees (*1 Mac 2:26.54*) against Seleucid oppression and the Zeus cult they had estab-

lished in the Temple in Jerusalem, which the Book of Daniel describes as the „awful horror“ and sacrilege (*Mk 13:14*).

This tradition stretches right up to Paul, the zealot for God’s Law (*Phil 3,5ff*).

It is a shame that Christians do not believe or act with such great passion.

After Phinehas, the next great zealot for the glory of God is the prophet **Elijah**, (and Paul refers to Elijah in *Romans 11,2-4*), his struggle with Baalism in Israel and its calamitous social and political consequences. One only has to think of the dis-possession of Naboth with the introduction of a new absolute royal law in the course of the „*Baalisation*“ of Israel (*1 Kings 18.21*). The motto – still valid today – is: The King, as Emperor Wilhelm II in former South West Africa (Namibia today), is not subject to the Torah, but is above the law.

Bonhoeffer said that Christians should be rooted in such zeal and passion. And he added: it would be a shame, if they would never experience such passion. He had picked up on Nietzsche’s criticism that Christians were too often nothing better than tamed house pets.

Karl Barth, in his final lecture, Ethics of Reconciliation, towards the end of his life, also spoke of the „great passion“, which, in their zeal for the glory of God and humanity, led Christians to revolt against the absolutism of politics, economics and consumerism (*KD § 77*). Barth himself had actively practised this zeal for the glory of God and the compassion of humankind between 1933 and 1945 against the *Baalism* of the Hitler regime. He had warned about the excessive number of ‘*blind-worms*’, ‘*yes-men*’, ‘*flat-feet*’ that could be found within Christianity (*KD IV 5, 180f*).

And this is where the scandal lies: Jesus, the Messiah, the Son of Man, on his way to being received up into heaven by God like Elijah, is not received into a Samaritan village. Thus, Jesus, as we hear two verses later (*Luke 9,58*), has „nowhere to lay his head“ – in contrast to the foxes with their holes, and the birds with their nests. Is this scandal not enough to make anyone a zealot for the God of Israel and the Messiah of the God of Israel and his honour? What is the alternative?

II „Lord, do you want us to command fire to come down from heaven, and annihilate them.“ (Luke 9:54)

The long violent history of this zeal for the Glory of God

Were they not all justified – are they not all justified – in fighting against the dishonouring of God?:

Moses and Joshua-Jesus in the fight against Amalek, a desert tribe, which ambushed the tired and exhausted women and children who had just escaped sla-

very, and viciously sought to drive them to total destruction (*Exodus 17:8*) as the German colonial army did in Namibia in 1904 under the commander and manslaughterer von Trotha. Remember what Amalek did! (*Deuteronomy 25:17*). For the God of Israel, JHWH, fights against Amalek from generation to generation: from Moses and Joshua through Saul (*1 Sam 15:2; 28:18*), through Esther and Judith and Mordechai against human slaughterer Haman, the descendant of Amalekite, right up to Hitler. In the many books of remembrance commemorating those annihilated in Auschwitz, one can read: Do not forget Amalek! Do not forget von Trotha!

And wasn't Phinehas justified in fighting against the transgression of the first commandment, with his resolve:

„In the fear of the Lord, full of zeal“ (*Sir 45,28*)?

Weren't the Maccabees right in their struggle for liberation from their Seleucid oppressors, and up to Paul, who was righteous in his zeal for the Torah (*Phil 3:4-6*) and who referred to Phinehas (*Num 25*) in condemning those Christians who were involved in the worship of idols in the heathen world around him (*1 Corinthians 10,8*) – was he not right too?

„Lord, do you want us to command that fire comes down from heaven, and consumes them?“ (*9:54*)

And so there is a long history of uprising and of violence and violent fantasies that arise specifically out of the zeal for the glory of God and draw on this zeal:

Moses slays an Egyptian; Phinehas stabs the Israelite Zimri and the Midianite Cozbi, because they had sex with one another, when Israel was repenting for and weeping about its apostasy to Baal-Peor (*Num 25:1ff*).

And after Phinehas, Mattathias, the Hasmonean priest, also killed: when, in his zeal for the glory of God, he rebelled against Hellenism, against the Greek cult practices and against the Zeus statue placed by Antiochus IV on the altar in the Holy of Holies in the Temple of Jerusalem,

„there came one of the Jews in the sight of all to sacrifice on the altar which was at Modin, according to the king's commandment. When Mattathias saw this, he was inflamed with zeal and slew him upon the altar. Also the king's commissioner, who compelled men to sacrifice, he killed at that time, and the altar he pulled down. Thus dealt he zealously for the law of God as Phinehas did unto Zimri“ (*1 Mac 2:23-26*).

And so the chain of violent religious zeal continues: from Moses and Phinehas up to Elijah!

Elijah slaughters the prophets of Baal (*1 Kings 18:40*):

„Then the fire of the LORD fell ... And when all the people saw it, they fell on their faces: and they said, The LORD, he is the God; the LORD, he is the

God. And Elijah said unto them: Take the prophets of Baal; let not one of them escape. And they took them: and Elijah brought them down to the brook Kishon, and *slew them there*. (1 Kings 18:38-40)

But the New Testament, too, reports openly about zealous attitudes within the group of apostles: Judas Iscariot, the *dagger-man – the Sicarius*, who acted, maybe not out of avarice but with the fervour of a zealot in betraying Jesus, to initiate the Kingdom of God along the lines of: let's start it violently, then the saviour will draw near (Hölderlin)!

And with this, we are back once more at our *journey narrative*: James and John, the „Men of Thunder“ – *Boanerges (Mk 3:17)*, also belong to this tradition of zealots: therefore, the reaction of John to the rejection by the Samaritan village is entirely revealing and unforgettable:

„Lord, do you want us to command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them“ (Luke 9:54).

And as an earlier commentator added „even as Elijah did“ when he sent down fire on King Ahaziah's messengers to Samaria and twice killed a captain and 50 soldiers, i.e. 102 men in total (2 Kings 1:10.12).

And they want to command this in the name of Jesus:

„Lord, do you want us to command“, the two apostles say. Look carefully at how they put this: the apostles aren't saying, we want that fire should fall from heaven and annihilate the Samaritan villagers. Instead they say: „Lord, do you want ...“. They are thereby projecting their violent fantasies onto Jesus, and through Jesus onto God Himself! In doing so, they reveal that they are unsure of themselves, that they are religious and political zealots and that, through the God of Israel, they are seeking to legitimise their fiery religious zeal. So up to today all fundamentalists of all religions! And formulated in such appalling terms!

Since then, fire has repeatedly fallen from heaven:

- from the German troops of the killer-commander von Trotha, to annihilate the Herero in the name of the God-given German Emperor Wilhelm II;
- from the kamikaze pilots in the service of their emperor God, Tenno, who in acts of suicidal terrorism crashed into the American fleet at Pearl Harbour (1942);
- fire fell from heaven onto the Spanish town of Guernica, horrifying Pablo Picasso and driving him to reproduce the scene in his extra-large painting, now exhibited in the Museum of Bilbao;
- there was also fire in Auschwitz, where the fire rose up to the heavens;
- there was fire in Warsaw and Gdansk, as described by Hans Grass;
- there was also fire over Coventry and Dresden;
 - right up to September 11th, with more than 3,000 murdered;

and the Afghanistan war with more than 10,000 murdered – the so-called *collateral damage*.

And in the context of the Bush crusade of „*infinite justice*“ and „*enduring freedom*“ – a biblical terminology – there is still no end in sight. For the „*Axis of Evil*“ is long and open to interpretation and can be changed at any time to fit any opponent or threat by those who determine what it means and take military action against the „*evil*“!

And remember the endless spiral of violence between Israel and the Palestinians, and between the Palestinians and Israel!

Have we no understanding then for those – coming from the enlightenment – who are now saying: Put a stop to all religions and the religious zealots with their „*burning rage*“? Remove religion from the agenda. It is the source of the violence; it is one of the major roots of the violence in world history:

„Lord, do you want us to command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them.“ (Luke 9:54).

Is religion, at heart, peaceful and is the perversion of religions merely an exception, as Ms Gnanadason from the World Council of Churches in Geneva recently said at a symposium on violence at the Seminary of the Kirchliche Hochschule (the Barmen school of theology) in Wuppertal? Is religion, at heart, peaceful? Really?

III „But Jesus turned, and threatened them“ (Luke 9:55) Conversion from religious and other fantasies of violence

In our narrative of the journey through Samaria towards Jerusalem, the statement is very clear and brief: „And Jesus threatened the disciples“, that is to say, James and John. An earlier commentator has, again, added to the original text: „Do you not know what manner of spirit you are of.“

Jesus is now outraged and burning with ardent zeal. The translation „*he rebuked them*“ is far too harmless. Jesus „*threatens*“ the disciples, as he had previously „*threatened*“ the fever during the healing of Peter’s mother-in-law (Luke 4:39), as in wind and sea during the calming of the storm he had „*threatened*“ the floods (Matthew 8:26). Jesus calls on James and John, who use the shibboleth „*Lord, do you want ...*“, to turn away from these hellish, deadly and destructive violent religious and political fantasies!“

And he threatens them! Reject your fantasies of violence, whether they are based in religion or politics, whether you are religious or irreligious, whether you are ideological or without any ideology! And do not start your search for this violence in others, but start your search for this within yourselves!

Here, Jesus is being zealous for the glory of God for the benefit of the salvation of humankind: and he threatened them.

Taking Jesus' threat as our starting point, we can find examples of turning away from the violence and the violent fantasies in the Old Testament, in Judaism, in the New Testament and in all the religions of humankind. Here are a few illustrations:

a) In Judaism: During the Exodus, through and with Moses, the Egyptian elite troops who are pursuing the fleeing slaves from Egypt are also killed. They are marked by the consequences of their oppression and their actions to prevent liberation, for they intended, to prevent Israel's liberation from slavery! But the Midrash, the Jewish Commentary of the Old Testament, states: as the Angels, together with Miriam and all Israel, began to sing their song of praise in gratitude for being saved, „Sing unto the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea“ (*Exodus 15:3*), the God of Israel was in mourning for the drowned Egyptian soldiers: „Those I have created, the Egyptians, have drowned, and you sing a song of praise!“ That's why the old Jewish translation, the Septuagint, decided that the song of Miriam would no longer be translated with „the LORD is a warrior“, but with: „The LORD destroys wars: the LORD is his NAME“. If the Lord of the war destroys the wars, then there will no longer be warlords! This translation of Exodus 15:3 is also cited twice in the Book of Judith! Judith killed Holophernes (as Bonhoeffer tried to kill Hitler) and this was the only way to annihilate war!

What is less commonly known is that during the Feast of the Passover – with the exception of the first great holy day – Judaism, right up to the present day has, for that reason only, sung the *partial Hallel*, i.e. part of this praise of God (Ps 114-118) omitting Ps 115f. And with explicit reference to the Proverbs: „Rejoice not when thine enemy falleth“ (Proverbs 24:17). This same sensitivity towards the drowned Egyptian soldiers is also demonstrated in the Passover liturgy, commemorating the Exodus from Egypt, by the fact that not all four cups of wine are drunk till they are empty, but that a few drops of the remaining red wine are sprinkled onto the plate, in memory of the Egyptian soldiers who died.

Regarding the zealous fervour demonstrated by Phinehas in killing Zimri and Cozbi in the tent, and his being granted eternal priesthood and the „Covenant of Peace“ as a consequence (Numbers 25:10), the transcribers dealt with this problematic text as follows: the peace that is achieved through Phinehas' excessive zeal (i.e. through the murder of two people), is not a genuine, stable peace. Hence, they have written the name of Phinehas with a small yod and the word Shalom – peace – in broken letters. Unfortunately, this tradition is not reproduced in our Biblia Hebraica. But we should certainly bear it in mind. „Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of!“

b) In the Old Testament: with **Elijah**, too, we find his religious zeal being rectified. The Old Testament twice tells of the conversion of Elijah from religious and political violence.

After the slaughter of the prophets of Baal (1 Kings 18) – in effect Elijah’s greatest triumph over the priests and policies of Jezebel –Elijah flees to Mount Horeb, sinks into a deep spiritual and suicidal depression, longing for his life to end. „He requested for himself that he might die; and said, ‘Now, O LORD, take away my life. *Why? For I am not better than my fathers?*’“ (1 Kings 19,4). This confession of guilt by Elijah, who, in his zeal for God, apparently wanted „to be better than his fathers and mothers“ is astonishing and revealing. And JHWH’s reply to Elijah, only one chapter later, is quite extraordinary in how it *questions Elijah’s ardent zeal*: In the remarkable scene on the Mount Horeb, the God of Israel answers Elijah, who has „been very jealous for the LORD ... and I, even I only, am left“ (1 Kings 19:10) as follows: And JHWH was not in the fire, that fell from heaven (1 Kings 18), but only in „the soft whisper of a voice“ (1 Kings 19:12).

And in yet another place the Old Testament tells of Elijah’s conversion from fundamentalist violence: after he had twice killed an officer and his fifty soldiers, and after the third occasion when the officer had come to Elijah and begged him: „O man of God, I pray you, let my life and that of my 50 men be precious in your sight“, the God of Israel spoke to Elijah: „Go down with him, [the messenger of King Ahaziah], *and do not be afraid of him*“. Thus, the Elijah’s religious zeal is confronted with the Elijah’s fear; indeed, it is a direct result of his fear. The God of Israel must liberate Elijah from the fear that drives his zeal: „Do not be afraid of him!“ (2 Kings 1:5). Were James and John afraid of the Samaritans when, in their ardent zeal, they wanted fire to come down from heaven onto the Samaritan village and its inhabitants? The allusion to the story of Elijah in Luke 9:51-56 makes this very probable. Here, the God of Israel must liberate Elijah not only so that he can *listen to the soft whisper of a voice*, but also so that he can discover his own fear, which combines his ardent zeal for the first commandment with a shadow of death and its murderous tang. Through this, the Old Testament is able to criticize Elijah, and not, as we normally do, turn him into a hero.

c) In the Talmud: Here is a final example of conversions from violence and violent fantasies: At the beginning of Psalm 104 we pray: „Bless the LORD, O my soul. O LORD, how manifold are thy works. In wisdom thou hast made them all; the earth is full of thy riches.“ (Ps 104:1.2.24). The whole psalm ends by expressing the following wish: „May sinners be destroyed from the earth; may the wicked be no more!“ (Ps 104:35).

The Talmud relates the following story about this: „In the district of Rabbi Meir, there lived a number of criminals, who afflicted him greatly. Rabbi Meir prayed that

they would die. His wife, Beruriah heard his prayer and said to him: ‘What makes you suppose that such a prayer to God is allowed? Because it says in Psalm 104:35: *May sinners be destroyed from the earth?* But the word you read as *sinners* can also be read as *sins*. That means if there are no more sins, there can also be no more sinners. You should pray for these people.’ Rabbi Meier did as his wife had said and the criminals repented.

Zeal for the removal and obliteration of sins and evildoing, and not for the removal and annihilation of sinners and evildoers is something that may be wished for: this is how the path towards conversion from violent fantasies and the violence of ardent religious zeal should be.

We return to our narrative of the journey of Jesus and his two zealot-apostles, James and John: John, the son of thunder, the zealot who with his brother James is threatened by Jesus. He is threatened and called on to convert from his religious and political fantasies of violence, because – as a third commentator has correctly added to the original text – *Jesus, as the Son of Man, did not come to destroy men’s lives (Luke 9,55, cf. 19,10)*.

The ardent zeal demonstrated by James and John is in stark contrast to the life-saving Son of Man’s going towards Jerusalem.

What does this conversion from violence, this liberation from violent fantasies, mean in positive terms?

IV „And they went to another [Samaritan] village“ (Luke 9:56) Discipleship of the God of Israel and his Messiah Jesus

We will now focus exclusively on the New Testament. Where, in the Old Testament, Elijah admitted his guilt „I am not better than my fathers and mothers“, the risen Christ repeats this question to Peter: „Do you still love me more than these other apostles love me?“ And Peter answers without religious superiority: „You know that I love you“ (John 21). And also Paul (in Romans 11 referring to Elijah in the desert) has been converted from religious zeal to kill people (such as Stephen!) to being a Pharisee of love in the discipleship of Jesus (*1 Corinthians 13*).

To want to be better than one’s fathers and mothers! The majority of our dialogue concepts are characterised by, or come from, exclusivism or superiority, according to the slogan: „Christianity is the absolute religion“ This is the title of a very influential book by E. Troeltsch, a well known religious thinker in Germany, published in 1902, two years before the extermination of the Hereros, Damaras and Namas in 1904!

But to conclude, we will stick with John the zealot and „son of thunder“, who wanted fire to come down from heaven onto the Samaritan village and its inhabi-

tants: John, who had advanced the zealot's principle of, „He that is not with us, is against us“ (*Luke 9,49*) – which today, being repeated by George W. Bush, is still highly effective and laden with political and religious implications – and who, in his ardent zeal, wanted to put it into effect against the Samaritans, then through encountering the ardent spiritual zeal of Jesus' love on his journey through Samaria to Jerusalem and his cross, underwent a conversion away from these zealous fundamentalist fantasies of violence.

To put this in positive terms: He became „Jesus' beloved apostle“ (according to the Gospel of John), or more precisely, „the apostle, loved by Jesus“. The beloved apostle was overcome by Jesus unconditional love for him. Luther, in the aftermath of his reformation discovery, formulated this fundamental experience memorably in his Heidelberg Disputation from 1518: „*The love of God does not find, but creates, what God loves; therefore sinners are accepted by God because they are loved by God; they are not loved because they are attractive within themselves.*“ (Thesis 28).

Loved so unconditionally by Jesus, John, „the beloved apostle“, remains by Jesus side: he follows Jesus into the palace of the High Priest; he is the only apostle to remain with the women at the foot of the cross; and, finally, he is the only apostle, of whom it is written that after going to Jesus tomb: „He saw, and believed“ (John 20:8). And so, John the fierce religious zealot let himself be converted to the Gospel of love, which at its heart proclaims God's love for the sinners and evildoers: „For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life“ (John 3:16).

So, John, as second century church history reported, became the apostle, who in Ephesus in Asia Minor, tried to reconcile the Jewish synagogue with the Jewish and Gentile Christian community: with his frequently repeated maxim: „Children, love one another!“

And not only that: As the apostle – unconditionally loved by Jesus – he became the *lover of the soft whisper of the voice of God, the voice of God's wisdom*, the voice, which teaches one to listen and which arises from listening: „In the beginning was the word“ (John 1:1), in the beginning was the listening, in the beginning was the word of God! In the beginning was the one *logos*, which was incarnated and became a Jewish human being, „that enlightens all humankind“ (*John 1:9*). From which follows a dialogue-model, not of fundamentalist superiority, but of neighbourhood and neighbourliness.

Our journey narrative concludes in a short yet incredibly deep way: „And they went to another (Samaritan) village“ (Luke 9:56). Nothing more! Was that the end of the story? Was this an anti-Samaritan conclusion to the story?

One last thing must be mentioned: John, who in his fierce religious zeal wanted fire to come down on the Samaritan village, was, according to the mission report on the development of the Christian church in Samaria (Acts 8), one of those who were

actively involved in the foundation and development of the Christian Church in Samaria: „Now when the apostles who were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter *and John*. Who, when they were come down, prayed for them (the Samaritans), that they might receive the Holy Ghost“ (Acts 8:14).

And they went to another Samaritan village!

That is not an anti-Samaritan conclusion. No allusion to the threat of Elijah's fire from heaven, which is only deferred, but not withdrawn. It is not a sentence of resignation, but, within the framework of Luke's double work and St John's Gospel (John 4), it is a sentence full of prospect and hope: full of the unwavering great passion of love.

And they went to another Samaritan village!

If we follow in the footsteps of Jesus the Messiah on the way of reconciliation and love, then something specific will happen within each of us: conversion away from the zealous and violent religious and political fantasies – which we suddenly discover and reveal in ourselves – to being new-created as the beloved, whom Jesus loves unconditionally, and who, therefore, respond in love to this ardently holy and irresistible love of Jesus. That is the great passion for the glory of God and for the benefit of humankind. And that is why, in following the way of Jesus' love, they have no alternative but to turn away from the path of the fierce religious zealot and the fundamentalist's fantasies of violence. The Letter of St John states: „He who says he is in the light, and hates his brother and sister, is in darkness even until now. He that loves his brother and sister abides in the light ... But he that hates his brother and sister is in darkness, and walks in darkness, and knows not where he goes, because that darkness has blinded his eyes.“ (1 John 2:9f.) „If a man says, 'I love God', and hates his brother and sister, he is a liar: for he that loves not his brother and sister whom he has seen, how can he love God whom he has not seen? And this commandment we have from him, 'That he who loves God loves his brother and sister also'.“ (1 John 4:20f.)

And they went to another Samaritan village!

Why did they do so? Because the Son of Man did not come to destroy men's lives (all men's lives!) but to seek and to save what has been lost! (Ezekiel 34). This is how the great passion of love should be: the sacred and determined zeal for the glory of God and the salvation of humankind. This is the way of the ardently zealous and determined love of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ's love is the really great love, the really great passion for God and humankind, the very great passion and zeal for Justice, Peace and the Integrity and Integration of Creation.

Literature

- O. Betz: Art. Johannesevangelium, in: Calwer Bibellexikon Band 1, Stuttgart 2003, 676-680.
- O. Betz: „To worship God in Spirit and Truth. Reflections on John 4,20-26“, in: Der Messias Israels, Tübingen 1987, 420-438.
- O. Betz: Das Gnadenamt des Apostels Paulus und des Jüngers Johannes, in: Jesus. Der Herr der Kirche, Tübingen 1990, 447-466; Die Vision des Paulus im Tempel von Jerusalem, 91-102; Paulus als Pharisäer nach dem Gesetz, 103-113.
- K. Hoffmann: Die große ökumenische Wegweisung. Die Bedeutung der Versöhnungsethik K. Barths für die ökumenische Bewegung im konziliaren Prozess für Gerechtigkeit, Frieden und Bewahrung der Schöpfung heute, Frankfurt 2004.
- J. Jeremias: Jesu Verheißung für die Völker, Stuttgart 1956m 31f., 55f.
- B. Klappert: Abraham eint und unterscheidet, in: Rheinreden, Melanchthon Akademie, Köln 1996, 21-64.

Overcoming Violence from a biblical Perspective

SUNG-HEE LEE-LINKE

“But he turned and rebuked them. And he said: You do not know what kind of a Spirit you belong to; for the Son of Man did not come to destroy men’s lives, but to save them. And they went on to another village” (Luke 9,55-56).

In reference to the bible study of Professor Klappert, I will concentrate my exegesis on the question of Jesus: *What kind of a Spirit do you belong to?* I do so because this question is also a constant and critical challenge for us today in the struggle to overcome violence **in our lives** and in our world. I emphasize “in our lives” intentionally, for we usually dwell on the role of the other person when speaking about violence and seldom on our own role.

Before finding an answer to the above question, it is essential that we discover the origin of violence from a biblical perspective.

An evil spirit as the origin of violence

Where does violence originate? This question is dealt with in many Old Testament stories. One of these is the account of the decline of Saul’s kingdom. Saul was unable to find peace and joy in his life. The reason is given in 1 Samuel 16,14: *“Now the Spirit of the LORD departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the LORD tormented him.”* This signifies that the relationship between God and Saul has broken down. Saul then felt himself being overwhelmed by an evil spirit emanating from a powerful but unknown source. He became restless. He was driven by jealousy, rage and a murderous drive to kill David. *“And on the morrow an evil spirit from God rushed upon Saul, and he raved within his house... Saul had his spear in his hand; and Saul cast the spear, for he thought, ‘I will pin David to the wall.’ But David evaded him twice” (1 Samuel 18,10ff.).* This act of violence by Saul caused the end of his kingdom.

The origin of violence and the power of an evil spirit within us

The notion that the origin of violence is located within us is also found in the New

Testament, but the message has a different focus. The Pharisees confronted Jesus, criticising his disciples for not living in accordance with the tradition of the elders by eating with defiled hands. Jesus responded to this criticism: *“What comes out of a man is what defiles a man. For from within, out of the heart of man, come evil thoughts, fornication, theft, murder, adultery, coveting, wickedness, deceit, licentiousness, envy, slander, pride, foolishness. All these evil things come from within, and they defile a man. (Thus he declared all foods clean.) (Mark 7,18-23).*

All these evil things come from within, and they defile a man – with this declaration, Jesus is making it clear that we have to seek the origin of violence within ourselves. He is making us aware of our responsibility to overcome the power of the evil spirit within us. He is inviting us to liberate ourselves from the chains of this power.

Refreshing images in overcoming violence in our life

After receiving this invitation from Jesus, we are asked to find the path towards liberation from the evil spirit’s binding power. Where, and how, can we refresh ourselves with the power of life to combat the power of death? As we know, we can do this by reading and by praying in and through the Holy Spirit of God. And furthermore, we also know from our experiences of life that we need symbols or ideas or images to strengthen us in our struggle for justice, peace and the integrity of creation.

Throughout my own life, three images have been very supportive and important in helping me to live as a Christian woman. This morning, I would like to share these images with you in the hope that they may also give you strength in your struggle to overcome violence.

- The first is the image of God upholding me with his victorious right hand: *“But you, Israel, my servant, Jacob, whom I have chosen, the offspring of Abraham, my friend; you whom I took from the ends of the earth, and called from its farthest corners, saying to you, ‘You are my servant, I have chosen you and not cast you off’; fear not, for I am with you, be not dismayed, for I am your God; I will strengthen you, I will help you, I will uphold you with my victorious right hand (Isaiah 41, 8-10).* If we really believe in our loving God who accompanies us hand in hand, how can we possibly be afraid? If we feel the powerful energy of the loving God in our hands, how can we possibly commit violence against others? If we seriously believe that we are the chosen servants of God, how can we then ignore the violence in our world?
- The second image is that of the human body as a temple of the Holy Spirit: *“Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you*

have from God? You are not your own” (1 Corinthians 6,19). Our body as a temple of the Holy Spirit – this image reminds us of the story of the creation of humankind in the image of God: “*So created God man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them*” (Genesis 1,27). This story should prevent us using our psychological or physical powers to advance our own self-interests, because our bodies are not given for our own use, but for the glory of God, for the reconciliation between God and humankind, between us and others.

- The third is the image of the human being as a living letter from God which brings the Good News to the oppressed people: “*You yourselves are our letter of recommendation, written on your hearts, to be known and read by all men; and you show that you are a letter from Christ delivered by us, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of human hearts*” (2 Corinthians 3,2ff.). What a wonderful image of us this is. We as people bringing the healing message to those who are sick, blind, discriminated against – physically and, in a broader sense, socially! It was the work of Jesus: “*And Jesus went on from there and passed along the Sea of Galilee. And he went up on the mountain, and sat down there. And great crowds came to him, bringing with them the lame, the maimed, the blind, the dumb, and many others, and they put them at his feet, and he healed them, so that the throng wondered, when they saw the dumb speaking, the maimed whole, the lame walking, and the blind seeing; and they glorified the God of Israel*” (Matthew 15, 29-31). Now we are engaged by God to do the same things as the disciples of Jesus. What a privilege this is!

Reconciliation as a means of overcoming violence in our world

A widely held opinion in my Asian culture – according to the teaching of Confucius – is that no one can bring justice to others unless he or she is in harmony with him or herself. Jesus says the same in the example of the blind guide: “*And if a blind man leads a blind man, both will fall into a pit*” (Matthew 15,14). The significance for us is that we are capable of overcoming violence in our world, once we have overcome the violence in our own lives.

The journey from inner harmony to overcoming violence in our world is possible by reconciliation in the biblical sense. Reconciliation means not just repairing the broken relationship between two parties. It also means establishing mutual respect and trust. When the ministry of reconciliation does not have respect and trust as its foundation, the struggle for justice, peace and the integrity of creation will very often merely remain an ideological or political activity.

An other interesting aspect of reconciliation in the New Testament is that reconciliation with your brothers or sisters is the precondition for reconciliation with God (2 Corinthians 5,18ff; Matthew 5,24; 1 John 2,2). Why? Because overcoming violence as a ministry of reconciliation must have the Kingdom of God as a perceptible goal in which the rights for human life and the cosmos / nature commune with each other in harmony.

Let us pray together.

God of creation, our God of life, we thank you for our gathering this morning.

You have called us from the different parts of the earth.

Jesus Christ, our God of reconciliation, we thank you for our ministry.

You have trusted us to do the same work as you

by struggling for the kingdom of God on this earth.

Holy Spirit, our God of sanctification, we thank you for the joy and confidence in our hearts. You have taken our bodies as your temple.

Our God of love, we confess we will praise your mercy all our lives.

Strengthen us in our struggle to overcome violence.

Uphold us with your victorious right hand. Help us to be a living letter bringing a healing message.

Amen.

Economic Globalisation and Economic Violence

SEONG-WON PARK

I am grateful to the United Evangelical Mission for inviting me to this conference. The theme, Globalisation and Violence is extremely important in this time of totalitarian rule of the empire. One of the root causes of violence at all levels, from a human relationship to an international relationship level, is economic injustice and its close association with militarism and geo-political hegemonic domination. Therefore, it is important to analyse the structural economic injustices.

I will briefly explore three points: firstly, the convergence of geo-political strategy and militarism for market domination; secondly, neo-liberal economic globalisation and its consequences; and thirdly, ecumenical communities' responses to economic globalisation.

Convergence of Political Hegemony, Militarism and Globalisation

There are all kinds of violence in every society, but in international terms, there is severe structural violence on a global scale. Today's global violence and war on terror stand at the root of a convergence of the geo-political hegemonic domination, militarism and economic globalisation of the empire. We would be restricted in our access to an important root cause of today's global violence if this convergence was not properly addressed.

The convergence of the geo-political hegemonic domination, militarism and economic globalisation has its historical connection. Soon after World War II, George Kennan, who was entrusted to articulate the post war vision of America, enunciated „Safeguarding and expanding its growing economic influence through military presence.“ This American vision for governing the world and this hegemonic march continues everywhere in the world even today. In today's geo-political situation of the world, we clearly see the implementation process of this vision wherever the US military forces are present in such countries as Iraq, Afghanistan, the Philippines, Korea, and the Middle East, to mention just a few.

Richard Labévière, the author of *Dollars for Terror; The United States and Islam*, carried out interesting research on the relationship between the dollar and terror which might be one of the related historical root causes for current global terrorism. A few weeks before the Yalta conference (February 1945), US president Roosevelt

carefully read the report which Senator Landis wrote on American interests in the Middle East. This text eventually became the White House textbook on Arabic Affairs. Part of the prediction of the report was the suggestion to establish direct relations between Washington and the Arab countries.

The implementation of the suggestion was carried out by Roosevelt after the Yalta conference. On 14 February 1945, on the way back from Yalta, Roosevelt held a historical meeting with the Saudi King Iban Sa'ud, on board the *Quincy*, a cruiser anchored in the great lake Amer between Port-Said and the mouth of the Suez Canal.¹

The main interest of the US was to get a monopoly on the exploitation of all the oil-bearing layers discovered in Saudi Arabia, and the interest of the House of Saud was to get full support from the United States for the kingdom's hegemonic domination in the region. These two hegemonic interests were strategically met and an historical agreement was made on board the *Quincy*. This later became the so called „*Quincy Pact*“.

On the basis of this pact, Saudi Arabia guaranteed that the bulk of America's fuel needs will be met at moderate prices and in return, the United States ensured unconditional protection against any possible external threat to the kingdom. The American support of the kingdom was based not only on its capacity as oil supplier to deliver at moderate prices, but also on its hegemonic power over the Arabian Peninsula. Thus the US has jointly been controlling the priority task of the House of Saud's „Arab diplomacy“. Since the adoption of the „*Quincy Pact*“, an almost exclusive economic, commercial and financial partnership continues to link the two countries. The US increases its oil purchases in exchange for more and more substantial deliveries of American weapons to Saudi Arabia.

In the 80s, the US administration intentionally tried to break down socialism and nation-led- capitalism in order to promote neo-liberal economic globalisation. On the occasion of Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan, according to Richard Labévière, the Central Intelligence Agency supported the major Islamic Nationalist Movements in order to crack down on socialism. After the demise of the socialist bloc, those militias were abandoned or betrayed. Therefore the US was set as their target, and at the same time they promoted political Islam by attempting to overthrow Islamic secular governments. Richard Labévière says that the Saudi royal government and the US have been playing a significant role in this development.

i One could see not only this story, but also all other stories in the following reference: Richard Labévière, *Dollars for Terror, The United States and Islam*, Translated by Martin DeMers, (New York, Algora Publishing 2000, pp. 37-41 (Originally published as *Les Dollars de la Terreur, Les Etats-Unis et les Islamistes* (Editions Bernard Grasset, 1999)

In the Guardian dated 6 October 2003, Michael Moore, the famous film director who is critical of George W. Bush's invasion of Iraq, put forward seven questions to Mr Bush about the Bush family's relationship with Saudi Arabia. His questions are also at the root of the historical relationship. That is why Michel Moore asked George W. Bush seven questions on the US relationship with Saudi Arabia around the issue of September 11. As I learned this historical background, I was reminded of the words in the Bible, „You reap whatever you sow.“ (Galatians 6:7)

In my view, the convergence of the geo-political hegemonic domination, militarism and economic globalisation is one of the significant causes of not only global violence, but also communal violence which occurs in every society today.

Since economic domination is one of the clear goals of the empire, it would be important to analyse current economic globalisation in order to find ways to overcome violence. Therefore, let me now share with you more about neo-liberal economic globalisation and its social, economic, political and cultural consequences.

Tide of Neo-Liberal Economic Globalisation

The world today is being swept by the irresistible tide of globalisation. Globalisation, in its broad sense, refers to the rapid growth of linkages and interconnectedness between nations and social communities which make up the present world system.ⁱⁱ However, the project which facilitates this tide is the Neo-liberal model of economic globalisation which promotes the rapid growth of international trade, the vast expansion of speculative movements of financial capital internationally, and the astounding spread of consumerism through mass communication around the world.

Economic globalisation promises to bring millions of people into active participation in global economic life. Yet the majority of the global population and countries and situations that are unwilling or ill-equipped to adapt to the torrid pace of globalisation are marginalised and excluded in this game. Indeed, it has long been known that many people and many communities lose more than they gain from exposure to globalising trends. In spite of this phenomenon, the Bretton Woods institutions keep saying that „There Is No Alternative“ (TINA) and the human situation can be improved by unlimited economic growth.

Global civil society has been resisting this discourse. From Seattle to Evian last year, the global civil movements have been raising their voice at every international occasion where the WTO, IMF and 'World Bank' have their meetings. The argument

ii Anthony McGrew and P.G. Lewis (eds), *Global Politics: Globalization and the Nation States* (Cambridge, The Policy Press, 1992), p. 303.

of global civil movements is that the Bretton Woods institutions betray their mandate and are incapable of carrying out their work. They argue that these institutions should be dismantled, because they are only serving the rich industrialised countries and there is no possibility of reform. An alternative solution would be to incorporate or integrate them into the UN System so that global economic development could be managed more democratically. UNDP is actually suggesting establishing, for instance, a ‘UN Development Security Council’ similar to the UN Security Council. At last, the global civil movements, under the slogan, „Another world is possible!“, are setting up a counter World Social Forum in Porto Allegre and in Mumbai this year against the World Economic Forum in Davos.

Economic Globalisation and Its Consequences

Many people say that economic globalisation has both positive and negative aspects. For instance, access to knowledge and information through Internet, communication through cell phones, access to information through foreign TV stations, increased opportunities for travel and, in general, lower prices for consumer goods are the positive consequences of economic globalisation.

However, according to the analysis on economic globalisation, there are serious negative consequences and the list of negative consequences is far greater and serious. Contrary to the Neo-liberalist’s temptation that many people will benefit from the globalisation of the economy, more people are experiencing an unprecedented level of suffering and exclusion. Here are some key negative consequences.

1) A Social Problem – Systematic Exclusion and the Growing Gap between the Rich and Poor.

The exclusionary nature of economic globalisation is the first negative aspect. The report of the Kitwe consultation held in 1995 said, „What we in the Southern African region see, is the systematic exclusion of Africa from the world economy. Large parts of Africa have already been declared dead as far as the global economic map and the global economic plans of the G7 group of countries are concerned.“ The phenomenon of exclusion is seen not only in Africa, but also in the desperation people feel everywhere as a result of economic globalisation.

According to the UNDP report of 2002, while the capital flows from the North to the South in 2000 amounted to 3.1% of their Gross Domestic Product, (namely 2.5% in the form of foreign direct investments and 0.6% in the form of net grants and development aid), the capital flows from the South to the North (interests and amortisation payments, so their so called debt-service) amounted to no less than 6.3% of their joint GDP. So even today, a yearly net transfer of capital takes place from the

poor countries to the rich amounting to no less than 3% of their whole annual income. This is one example of the evidence showing that the poor are becoming poorer, while the rich are becoming richer.

The exclusion of people from the global economy is taking place at a time when accumulated global wealth is larger than it ever has been in the history of humankind. Exclusion is a double-edged sword: it impacts on humanity as well as nature. Capital growth for a few owners of property and finances has become more important than life.

2) An Economic Problem – Speculation Economy and Idolisation of Money.

The present economy is based on speculation that moves money to markets where it can grow rapidly, neglecting the humanitarian and ecological cost. Daily, at the stock exchange, over 1.5 trillion US dollars are sent around the globe. Only 2% of this gigantic sum goes to the real economy (for production, trade and service) and 98% is speculation. Many people have warned that unscrupulous professionals have turned the market into a casino. All elements of life have been turned into commodities for speculation. A few get extremely rich while the majority suffers hunger, poverty related illness, despair, violence, death and destruction. This leads to a widening gap between the rich and the poor. Violence today largely stands at the root of the economic disparity between the haves and the have-nots.

In Korea recently, the number of people committing suicide is starting to outstrip that of those who are killed in traffic accidents. During the first three months of 1998, just after the economic crisis, 25 people were committing suicide every day – sometimes entire families. From 1999 to 2001, the number of suicides decreased. But from 2002 the number increased again to an even greater number than in 1998. According to a survey, the main reason for the increase in suicide is poverty. If people in the cities lose their livelihood by becoming unemployed, they sometimes see no way out but to commit suicide. Today, two persons commit suicide every day because of poverty. The Korean government is being praised by the IMF as one of the ideal examples of overcoming the economic crisis, but more people are pushed into a corner where they see no way out but to end their lives.

Money no longer serves people, but people are forced to serve money. The love of money in 1 Timothy 6.10 is becoming a credo for many people. In this way, money takes the form of mammon today and claims the sovereignty that belongs to God.

3) A Political Problem – Political Erosion.

In order to ensure that money moves freely, politics are played by the rich countries, for example the USA. They use undemocratic or near totalitarian international institutions like the G8 summits, IMF, World Bank and the WTO to weaken the political control of the nation-states over national economies. These instruments of the

money market demand the extension of deregulation, the liberalisation of markets, the reduction of taxes and the reduction in public, social security and health spending by governments. The democratic sovereignty of people is eroded as the global market forces weaken the nation-state politically.

4) A Security Problem – Militarism and its convergence with economic globalisation
Theology teaches us that – if military power may be used at all – the power of the sword is meant to preserve justice and peace. Even according to the ideology and constitutions of all countries, the purpose of the military is self-defence in the case of a country being attacked. As we have seen in the empire's vision that George Kennan developed, militarism and economic domination cooperate closely. In the „new world order“ since the '90s the rationale has changed. The military of the USA and its allies organised into NATO are openly designed to protect the economic interests of the West. The new NATO strategy even renounces the disguise of international law and openly states that the alliance can mandate itself as it already did in the war against former Yugoslavia. The USA has even re-opened a new arms and missiles race, promising new profits to the arms industry. The US National Security Strategy that came out in September 2002 could be understood as a US intention to rule the world with its omnipotent military forces.

5) An Ecological Problem – Erosion of Creation.

The problematic interconnection of globalisation and ecology comes primarily from the repercussions of „economic globalisation“, the accelerated march of corporate-driven economic forces and their global outreach. The unlimited growth of money in the industrial economy depletes natural resources and threatens the environment. The engineering of genes and food serves the maximisation of profits. The Pharmaceutical scandal in South Africa clearly demonstrates this case.

Industrial capitalism dominates the life of nature at both the macro level and the micro level, as it conquers nature to obtain resources for profit making.

- The unlimited growth of the capitalist industrial economy depletes natural resources and develops environmentally hazardous energy production through dams and nuclear fission.
- The natural environment is destroyed unlimitedly through pollution of water, air and life forms, through global warming and so on.
- The genes of living beings are arbitrarily engineered for profit in the name of the increase of food production and in the name of improving human health.
- The so-called scientific and technological developments ultimately are encroaching on the mystery of life.
- The capitalist economy is protected by weapons systems including nuclear and bio-chemical weapons, which can destroy life totally.

6) *An Ethical Problem – Upside down Values.*

Competition is a credo in the free market economy. Competition is a key ideology of economic globalisation. Without competition, the growth incentive is not motivated and the market cannot grow. Therefore, competition is injected into the hearts and minds of people. Competition, however, destroys community and solidarity. Economic globalisation facilitates strong individualism. Today, there is only shareholder value in economic life. People are no longer paying any royalty to companies. There is no longer a sense of family in corporate business life, which was the case, at least, in Asian societies. Monetisation of all aspect of life is taking place. People no longer regulate the economy; rather the economy rules the people. This kind of distorted value contradicts God's sovereignty, which enhances life, calls for solidarity, and measures life by love and fullness rather than accumulation.

We may differ about many things regarding details, analysis or concepts, but on this we find agreement: We are facing unprecedented suffering caused by an economic system that excludes many people, destroys creation and threatens life. This is true not only in the South but also in the North.

Ecumenical Communities' Responses to Economic Globalisation

After the demise of the socialist bloc when neo-liberal economic globalisation began its acceleration, WARC sensed that the global conflict was going to shift from an ideological frame to an economic one. In fact, the cold war was simply replaced with another form of hegemonic power domination over the world in an economic framework.

Having read the signs of the times, the Alliance launched a process of reflection on „Faith and Economy“. The Alliance had organised a series of regional consultations in places such as Manila (1995), Kitwe (1995), San José (1995) and Geneva (1996). Among those regional consultations, the Kitwe consultation's participants urged the WARC to take up economic injustice as a confessional matter challenging whether the WARC could declare *status confessionis*. This Consultation had recognised that Africa and the African people are systematically excluded from the world economy. It perceived that not only the powers in the global market subjugate and enslave the people as workers, peasants and consumers to production process and to the market forces, but also today's global economy has been sacralised, and elevated to an imperial throne which is directly contradictory to our Christian Faith.

In August 1997, just a couple of months before the Asian economic crisis occurred, the Debrecen General Council of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches reflected on the issue of economic injustice and ecological destruction. The Alliance have made the historic decision to call upon all member churches at all

levels to a committed process of recognition, education and confession (*processus confessionis*) regarding economic injustice and ecological destruction.

This journey has its historical references in the Barmen Declaration of the Confessing Church in Germany (1934), in the Ottawa declaration on the Apartheid system by the General Council of the WARC (1982), in the Confession of Belhar (1986) and the confessing stances of Asian churches against the colonial powers. It is also accompanied by similar movements such as the WCC Conciliar Process for Mutual Commitment (Covenant) for Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation.

In its 8th General Assembly (Harare, 1998), one of the main questions raised was how we live our faith in the context of globalisation. The World Council of Churches recommended that the challenge of globalisation should become a central emphasis of the work of the World Council of Churches. The Assembly encouraged its member churches to join the *processus confessionis* movement initiated by WARC.

On the basis of this resolution, the WCC and WARC organised a consultation in Bangkok and Seoul in 1999 2 years after those two countries faced a severe economic crisis. Later the LWF joined the ecumenical journey and the three organisations as well as other regional bodies such as the CCA, CEC, CLAI, and PCC organised a series of regional consultations in Budapest in 2001, Fiji in 2001, Soesterberg in 2002 and Buenos Aires in 2003. Just last month, a North American consultation was held in New York under the theme of „Just and Fair Trade Agreements? Churches in North America Addressing Globalisation“.

At its recent General Assembly in Winnipeg in 2003, the Lutheran World Federation heavily criticised the neo-liberal economic globalisation in the light of its ecclesiological notion as a communion. The Assembly emphasised that economic practices that undermine the wellbeing of the neighbour (especially the most vulnerable) must be rejected and replaced. The Assembly went on to say, „This false ideology is grounded on the assumption that the market, built on private property, unrestrained competition and the centrality of contracts, is the absolute law governing human life, society, and the natural environment. This is idolatry and it leads to the systematic exclusion of those who own no property, the destruction of cultural diversity, the dismantling of fragile democracies and the destruction of the earth.“ WARC and the LWF have come to the same conclusion on the negative consequences of neo-liberal economic globalisation and the necessity to respond to it as Christians.

What have we learned from the Bible and Theology on Economy?

How should the Church respond to this situation? What are the theological imperatives for doing that? Each communion has its own unique ecclesial entry point in

responding to economic globalisation. For instance, the Lutheran World Federation has recently reflecting on the concept of „communion“ in the face of globalisation. The Eucharist and the Trinitarian presence of God in communal form among people and in history is an important Orthodox notion. Covenant and confession are the important concept for Reformed theology. The expressions for mystical realities such as the *family of God* and the *body of Christ* challenge Christians and the Church to reflect on what it means to be the church in the face of economic globalisation.

Since I come from the Reformed tradition, let me share with you what Reformed theology teaches on economy. As we know, Reformed theology has made a remarkable contribution to developing a theology of economy, particularly by Calvin. In the 16th century, the Western society was in full effervescence. Bloody military struggles of many monarchs had broken society into pieces. The so-called „discovery of the New World“ had given floods of gold to Europe, which facilitated a lot of industries and multiplied commercial exchanges. The ancient corporate structures and frames could no longer accommodate this superabundant activity.

Uncontrolled capitalism was born and this capitalistic development brought about a terrible increase in the cost of living as well as a cheapening of labour. It caused a rapid proletarianisation of the workers and large fortunes piled up and multiplied while the miserable masses became ever more prolific. Calvin saw a possible breakdown of the community, the Body of Christ, in theological term, and the victimisation of the poor by the rich. In order to keep the community, the Body of Christ, in good shape, to protect the vulnerable from the economic violence of the rich, to protect the rich from being led into temptation of exploiting the poor, to build up economic ethics on the basis of love and grace, and to guide people not to serve mammon but to serve God who is life giver, Calvin developed a theology of economy. Calvin's economic thought can be summarised in the following affirmations:

1) Material goods and money are instruments of God's grace.

Reformed theology does not separate faith and world into two domains. Money is the means that God uses in granting to human beings what is necessary for existence. Material goods and money are signs of the grace of God who makes people of God live.

2) Money could become mammon unless it is controlled by God.

Money is a sign with a twofold meaning. It is a sign of grace for those who acknowledge that all their possessions come to them from God. But it is also a sign of condemnation of those who acquire the things they need to live without recognising that those gifts are from God. If they think that it is money and not God that assures their daily bread and guarantees their future, money then becomes mammon and takes the place of God.

3) *Human economic activity needs regulation, because of the sinfulness of human nature.*

The victory of mammon over the human being does not only make the individual sinful but also brings about the perversion of society. Immense perturbations follow in economic life, engendering social disorder. The Reformed notion of the sinfulness of human beings justifies that money and human economic activity need control and regulation. As long as human beings remain sinful, an external order must regulate economic operations so that people are not led into temptation.

4) *The Economy should be a life-enhancing and life-centred economy.*

The immediate goal of commerce is to allow human beings to procure what they need in order to live. Commerce must relieve the pain of human beings and render their existence pleasant. God's economic vision is life-enhancing economy. In order to respond to the life-giving purpose of God, commerce must always attend to this goal.

5) *Reformed theology promotes a 'Solidarity Economy' between the haves and the have-nots.*

According to God, social life is an uninterrupted circulation of goods, concretely expressing human beings' complementary life and obligatory solidarity. This circulation is assured by economic exchanges through the market. The market, therefore, is a social form of solidarity. According to the Gospel, theft is not only the act of grabbing something belonging to another person. Theft is first of all refusing to give one's neighbours what rightly belongs to them.

6) *Reformed theology advocates 'The Poor Friendly Economy'.*

According to the vision of life found in the Gospel, the rich person is the one who, with regard to his or her neighbour, finds himself/herself in a privileged position. Therefore, redistribution should go from the richer towards the poorer. The rich have a providential economic mission. They are assigned to share a part of their wealth with people poorer than themselves so that the poor will no longer be poor and the rich will no longer be rich.

7) *Grace and Love should be spiritual basis of economic activities.*

God's grace is a free gift; it is not for sale in the market place (Isaiah 55.1-3). God has given that which, if shared, will provide abundant life for all (John 10.10). Economic life should be lived based on love and grace, not on competition and greed.

Theological conflict with neo-liberal economic globalisation

We have recognised that the current global economic power does not aim at the preservation of life, the restoration of human dignity, the building of the common good or stewardship of creation. There are theological conflicts with neo-liberal economic globalisation.

God's economy is an inclusive economy trying to ensure the full and just participation of all members of the Body of Christ, particularly the poor. God's economy is an economy of solidarity between the rich and the poor. God's economy is a protective economy for the poor. In God's economy, the flow of the wealth should be from the rich to the poor. The economic index of God's economy is the poor. This is shared even today by the UNDP's argument that the economic index should not be the GNP, but criteria such as literacy, health, life expectancy, maturation, etc. God's economy should be based on love and grace.

If we evaluate the current neo-liberal economy, its idea is exactly opposite to God's economy as understood by Calvin.

- Whereas today's neo-liberal economy is exclusive, God's economy is inclusive.
- Whereas the neo-liberal economy is an exploitative economy of the poor, God's economy is a protective economy in favour of the poor.
- Whereas in the neo-liberal economy the flow of wealth is from the poor to the rich, in God's economy it goes from the rich to the poor.
- Whereas in the neo-liberal economy the poor are invisible, in God's economy the vulnerable are before everyone's eyes.
- Whereas the neo-liberal economy is based on greed and profit-making, God's economy is based on community and mutual support.
- Whereas the neo-liberal economy is based on limitless competition, God's economy is an economy of cooperation.
- The vision of the economy of a caring God, prophetic critique, social and legal regulation of the economy, and resistance are various forms of the basic biblical view: the economy's mandate is life in fullness for all people and communities.

Where this is not followed we can expect suffering, dehumanisation and death. The Chinese concept of Economy (*Kyung Sei Jei Min*) is almost identical with the biblical vision of economy. „*Kyung Sei Jei Min*“, from where „*Kyung Jei*“ (economy) came, means „To save people by regulating the world.“ Enabling life of people is the main purpose of the Asian concept of economy.

Today's neo-liberal economic globalisation moves in the opposite direction to what we have been taught by the Bible and Reformed Theology.

The Church is challenged to confess

Economic globalisation kills the lives of the people and destroys nature because it subjects all life to the global market which is aimed at capital growth for the few owners of property and financial capital, rather than at satisfying the needs of all people and caring for life. In the global market, which is ideologically self-justifying, rationally and scientifically truth-claiming, morally pretentious, and religiously self-sanctifying, God's sovereignty over life is replaced. In view of this situation, which is unacceptable to our Christian faith, we are challenged to take a faith stance against structural injustices.

In the journey, we have found many negative aspects of the economic globalisation. Among them the following three are crucial challenges:

1. *Life is at stake.* Economy is an access to livelihood. Under the current system many people are denied access to their livelihood. Life of both human beings and the earth is seriously at stake. If the current economic trend continues, the life of the human community and the planet itself will fall into a serious crisis. That is why the WARC Buenos Aires forum issued a „Faith Stance on Global Crisis of Life“.
2. *The Community is at stake.* The modern market and globalisation undermines community. The vision of neo-liberal globalisation, which is based on the absolutisation of individual freedom and private property, is different from the vision of oikoumene. The WCC Assembly in Harare discerned that the vision behind globalisation competes with the vision of the Christian commitment to oikoumene, and stated that the logic of globalisation should be challenged by an alternative way of life of the community in diversity. The World Alliance of Reformed Churches noted that the neo-liberal economic globalisation has an 'exclusionary nature' and this cannot be accepted by Christian faith. Calvin himself developed a lot of economic regulations in order to keep the community in good shape.
3. *The Integrity of our Faith is at stake.* The participants of the Kitwe consultation said „Today, the global economy has been sacralised, and elevated to an imperial throne. It has become the creator of human beings. In so doing it usurps the sovereignty of God, claiming a freedom that belongs to God. Luther promoted the freedom to serve one's neighbours in love, not freedom to seek one's self interest. Whatever you have but do not need for your life already belongs to the poor. A Church where the poor is excluded is not a Church.

As the ecumenical journey continues, the global economy has given rise to a truly grave situation that is causing unprecedented suffering of the people, their socio-economic exclusion, and cataclysmic destruction of life on earth; and this calls churches and faith communities to an intensification of the process of confession

and resistance with utter seriousness and great urgency. The Church whose economic thought is entirely incompatible with that of the neo-liberal model of the economy cannot remain silent on this structural economic violence. Moreover, as the Exodus people and early Christian community did (as illustrated in the Manna economy and solidarity economy in Acts 2.), the Christian Church should promote an alternative people's economy over against the empire economy.

Confessions arise out of a certain condition that requires a clear rejection of false doctrine and practices. The confession should include the following concrete resistance action:

1) Rejecting Economic Exclusion.

We believe and affirm that God's love embraces all living creatures, and the whole creation. God's promise of life is indeed cosmic (Genesis 9.). There can be no exclusion of any living creature from God's grace and love. In Christ there can be no barriers of separation and exclusion by wealth, by power, by gender, by nationality, by culture and ethnic identity, by race, by ideology and religion or by any demarcation (Galatians 3.). The dispensation of the Holy Spirit permeates all people (the whole humanity), the whole of life, and the whole of creation (Romans 8).

2) Rejecting Ecological Destruction.

We believe and affirm that „the God who creates, sustains, judges, reconciles and redeems is also the God who rests. Land, air, forests and water need their renewal, regeneration and replenishment that come from the biblical vision of the Sabbath day, the Sabbatical year and the Year of Jubilee. Sabbath celebrates God's intention that all creation be set free from exploitation. It is a vision of sufficiency, denying the right of a privileged few to exhaust the earth's finite resources. All are called to such a style of life in the spirit of Sabbath“ (Debrecen).

3) Rejecting Mammonism.

When we are told that we cannot serve two masters, God and Mammon, it does not mean that we have to choose one of them. It does not mean that gold and silver have nothing to do with God. It rather means that gold and silver also belong to God. Therefore, money is an instrument of God's grace when it is under God's control. If not, it is in danger of becoming Mammon. The love of money then becomes a root of all kinds of evil (1 Timothy 6.10).

4) Responding to the cries of victims and keeping the Community in good shape.

Calvin proclaimed: „God wills that there be proportion and equality among us, that is, each one is to provide for the needy according to the extent of one's means, so that no one has too much and no one has too little“. Calvin affirmed the vocation of

Christians to struggle so that the „crying difference between rich and poor“ ceases and the Body of Christ (the Community) remains in good shape. Christians from the Reformed tradition have seen this vocation expressed in the biblical claim that God is the „helper of the helpless“, the „father of the orphaned“ and the „God of the widow“. The Church has to follow God in this. This calls us to stand up against the power of Mammon as we seek to affirm the sovereignty of God.

5) *Affirming Life.*

We believe and affirm God's gift of abundant life remembering that Christ said: „I have come that they may have life in fullness“ (John 10.10). We see a vision of the economy of the household of God in all the kinds of action God takes to feed the people of God. Economy (*oikonomia*) is related to the management of the household (*oikos*). The household is where life is born and sustained through mutual and self-giving love. How the community cares for its members at times of crisis, life and death, reflects the way in which life may be transformed and the household of God becomes a reality. The household may be families, local communities, or the global village.

Two Conflicting Worldviews

We are now living in a world where two worldviews are clearly conflicting with each other. One is the worldview of the empire and the other, the worldview of the community. The struggle between the Davos World Economic Forum and the Porto Allegre (this year in Mumbai) World Social Forum could be described as a tension between these two different world views. It is the contemporary face of an epic struggle between a community and an empire that extends back to the earliest human experience. Its contemporary resolution may determine the fate of creation and humanity for many generations to come.

In the worldview of the empire, the world is inherently a hostile and competitive place. The only choice life offers is to be a winner or a loser, to rule or be ruled. Trust, compassion, neighbourliness, and cooperation are for fools and cowards. The society which is ruled by the worldview of the empire is likely to exhibit persistent patterns of exploitation, injustice, and scarcity, a climate of fear and insecurity, perceptions of real or imagined threats, political demagogues who play to these fears, violence against suspect groups, and the embrace of coercive institutions that specialise in the use of force to impose order. Such societies easily become trapped in a self-reinforcing cycle of violence and competition for power that provides fertile ground for demagogues who build their power base on fear and violence by appealing to those who long for vengeance, and to those who seek the protection of a powerful leader. This is exactly what is happening today.

In the worldview of community, the world is a place of creative opportunity, best realised through cooperation and the equitable sharing of power and control of resources. The society, which is served by the worldview of community, can generate love, hope, community, generosity, mutual recognition, cooperation, solidarity and spiritual vitality.

The question before us as a Church is whether we opt for the worldview of empire or should choose the worldview of community.

Biblical Epilogue

In conclusion, let me invite you to a reflection on a biblical text, Matthew 28.19-20, which is widely known as a great missionary mandate. Traditionally, we have read this text as an aggressive or conquering type of mission mandate: *Make all the people, all nations on earth Christian!* Many churches and Christians still have this understanding and try to implement this missiological imperative by trying to approach the so-called ‘unreached people’ in all corners of the world.

But if one reads this text more carefully, it says something else. I would like to draw your attention to three key words.

Firstly, „all nations“ in verse 19; secondly, „Baptise them“ in the same verse; and thirdly, „Teach them“ in verse 20. What do these three key concepts tell us? With regard to the language „all nations“, we realise that the objective of mission is not only the individual person, but nations or peoples, all nations, all people. The mission mandate here, at least, is targeting not the individual but peoples and nations. What does this notion tell us?

The second key word is „Baptise them“: „Baptise them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit!“ What does this mandate mean? Is it a mandate to make all nations, all people Christian and make them members of Christian churches? Maybe so! But when I read this text in the socio-political context when Jesus was challenging his disciples, it says more about the grand-scale mission task. As we all know, the context in which Jesus shared this divine mission with his disciples was the context of the Roman Empire. All nations and peoples have been colonised by the Roman Empire, and their dignity and sovereignty have been deprived by the imperialistic power. The Roman Empire had driven that time’s geographical and geopolitical globalisation under the discourse of the „*Pax Romana*“. The Roman Empire will bring you peace, and peace can be possible only when all nations and all people are under the military umbrella of the Roman Empire.

In this context, Jesus was sounding out another discourse. „Peace I leave with you; my peace I give to you. I do not give you as the world gives. Do not let your hearts be troubled, and do not let them be afraid.“ (John. 14:27) „*Pax Christi*“ would

be the conceptualisation of this text. „*Pax Christi*“ should not be understood as depoliticised or apoliticised spiritual opium. It confronts „*Pax Romana*“, the empire’s discourse.

„Teach them“ and „Baptise them“. Teach all nations to obey everything that the real Lord of history has commanded us. The challenge or mission that the disciples were given by Jesus was to TEACH the discourse, „*Pax Christi*“, against the Roman Empire’s discourse, „*Pax Romana*“. Bringing the gift of *Pax Christi* to all nations that were colonised by the Roman Empire with its *Pax Romana* discourse was the very mission that was given to the disciples.

„Baptise them!“ What would this mandate mean in this context? Would this simply be a liturgical celebration of Christianising all nations or all individuals? It would mean, „Bringing the citizenship of those colonised nations and peoples back to God!“ All nations and all people are people of God who governs heaven and earth. No earthly empire can deprive the right and dignity God has given to all peoples and all nations.

That is why Jesus gave this mandate by making an opening remark in verse 18: „All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me“. This is a very similar situation to the context in which the creation story in Genesis 1 was formulated. The Babylonian Empire was the context from where the Creation story was written by exiled priests. In the face of the tyrannical rule of the Babylonian Empire, the proclamation that God is the creator of heaven and earth and he made all inhabitants in it. By saying, „All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me“, Jesus recalls this authority once again and gave this mandate of proclaiming God’s life-giving discourse, against the mundane death-giving discourse. We are now living in a similar context.

Globalisation and Violence

JÖRG HÜBNER

Thesis 1:

The reduction of everyday and omnipresent violence by education and the dominance of right is the urgent task of presence.

Violence is a phenomenon of everyday life. Violence is everywhere. No one can choose by the time of his or her birth or in the middle of life if he or she wants to start with violence. Nor can he or she choose that for him or her the omnipresence of violence does not exist. Every human being throughout his or her lifetime is confronted with the omnipresence of violence and has to deal with it – that is a sad fact, which I have to state at the start of my thesis. It is also an expression of Christian faith if we say, with the Theological Declaration of Barmen, that we do live „in the as yet unredeemed world“. And another thing follows: The ethical question how we can react to the omnipresence of violence. How can I resist the existing violence? Is it useful or even inevitable to limit existing violence with violence? Is it appropriate to resist violence actively or do I just have to let it go its ways? A Christian ethic has to face this dilemma – always facing the foundation of our faith. And that is towards the way that Jesus Christ gave by his death on the cross and the overcoming of the power of death on Easter: to minimise violence. All his life and work is ruled by this option. Through this option of minimising everyday omnipresent violence, he did not want to create a better world but guide humankind more closely to the very heart of his humanness. This impulse of faith is still valid today. The minimisation of violence, in an all-embracing sense, is one of the most urgent tasks of the present day. The minimisation and reduction of violence, through education, leads to peaceful action and the dominance of right. The minimisation and reduction of violence – this demand and inner obligation follows from the realisation that we live „in the as yet unredeemed world“ but are moving towards salvation as we live in that world.

Thesis 2:

For an ethical discussion, it's very important to know what we mean by violence. In my opinion, violence is the physical threatening of life.

For an ethical judgement, what we mean when we talk of violence is of enormous

significance. In German, the word „Gewalt“ means violence as well as power. But in Latin the German word can be separated into potestas and violentia. Here, I am going to talk about violence, which means direct physical interference – so in Latin terms, I’m going to talk about violentia. Nevertheless, violence can also include psychological interference and can take collective forms. By talking about the omnipresence and everyday occurrence of violence we mean physical harm and the threatening of life.

Thesis 3:

The term ‘structural violence’ leads to more problems than it solves. The reduction of violence as an aim recedes into the distance and it becomes increasingly impossible to recognise the responsibility for its realisation.

The suggested definition of violence is not undisputable. As a contrast, here is the definition of Johan Galtung, the well-known Doctor of Peace studies. He says, „let us say that violence is present when human beings are being so influenced so that their actual physical and mental realisations are below their potential realisations.“ This definition is very broad, with no selectivity or precision. It will likely lead to more problems than it solves. How could violent actions be discerned from non-violent actions? Who defines what potential realisation is? How can the extent of the external and internal potential realisation be discerned? Along with the definition by Johan Galtung comes a reference to the phenomenon of structural violence. This means that people are oppressed less by direct force than restricted by structural force. People do not have access to the possibilities of life, which they should have according to the historic conditions of their time. Here it becomes clear to me that the dividing lines are fluid. Who causes this structural violence? Who says from which point on force is exercised? What are the potential realisations that people fail to gain? A lot of questions concerning the dividing lines and the aim of the minimisation and reduction of violence are becoming increasingly blurred because they are becoming less concrete. Or even better: One demand follows another. Actually, all these phenomena of structural violence are about the creation of just structures. Unjust structures, or even the lack of structures at all, support the uprising of physical violence. Existing unjust circumstances need to find an outlet in order to let the aggressions caused restriction and oppression run free. That is the very heart of the term „structural violence“ – and this has to be taken very seriously. But the widening of the term violence does more harm than good. Most of all, it pushes the aim of minimisation and reduction of violence further away, and it is impossible to ascertain who should be responsible for its realisation.

Thesis 4:

One sign of globalisation is the massive growth in financial transactions. This fundamental change creates new responsibilities.

One sign of globalisation at the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century is not only the worldwide trade of goods and services. This trade existed even before World War I. The extent of the international division of labour, which was present in 1914, returned in the 1980s. One sign of present day globalisation is the massive growth in financial transactions and the expansion of trade by new financial instruments. This trade greatly exceeds the economic achievements of many countries. The main protagonists of the global market are no longer the transnational concerns but the institutional investors, i.e. the pension funds, the insurance companies and the hedge funds. If we want to talk about structural influences, we have to look at the protagonists. They create new opportunities to shape the global market, influence politics and mould society throughout the world. Structures, in the age of globalisation, are ruled by the institutional investors.

Thesis 5:

The new institutional investors are not the source of structural violence in the age of globalisation. What's more: Globalisation itself does not produce violence but the existing or non-existing structures of the global financial market provoke violence as a reaction.

From these observations a number of questions emerge: Do the protagonists on the global financial markets exert structural violence? Through their decisions, do they limit the life chances of people living in the countries of the South and the North? Are institutional investors the source of the structural violence in world society in the 21st century? Are they the hidden warlords in the age of globalisation? My thesis is: No, they are not. The expansion of financial trade is, in principle, neither good nor bad. Because financial resources, money and capital are the modern form of communication in a pluralist society. It is not morals or ethical attitudes that decide on the exchange of goods or services but the neutral resource – money. So the decisive question will be if everybody can have access to this financial market. Or are there structures that are opposed to that? These are ethical tasks, which follow from the changing society of the world. The expansion of global financial markets requires well-developed structures that give every human being the possibility of using the advantages of the world society. As shown above, structures can provoke violence. Even more, an outbreak of violence is likely when any structure is missing. My thesis is: It is not globalisation itself that produces violence but the existing

or non-existing structures of the global financial market that provoke violence as a reaction.

Thesis 6:

To realise the reduction of violence it is necessary to create alternative regulations for the global finance market.

If globalisation only means extending trade, it does not lead to the sufficient integration of the countries of the South into the global markets. Trade is focused on short-term aims; trade only produces superficial integration. Capital flows, which reach the countries of the South and trigger investments in the branches of industry, do help integration. One advantage of globalisation is the increase in the absolute amount of capital invested in the countries of the South. But one must not forget that the powerful financial protagonists, through their decisions, determine the course of direct investment and its financial foundation. If they withdraw their capital for comprehensible reasons from a region, it can have considerable consequences for all of the other protagonists. The Asia crisis in 1997/1999 has demonstrated how much the financial markets are about psychology. Economic literature calls it the „herd instinct“: When one investor withdraws his capital, the rating agencies soon follow in calling the whole region no longer profitable and the whole market changes. The Southeast Asia region has not been able to recover from the enormous social effects of the Asia crisis until today. The various financial crises of the 1990s proved that the capital market in this respect is extremely vulnerable and in urgent need of regulation. Within the schools of economics, this necessity is recognised; even international institutions such as the IMF are thinking about possible forms of international insolvency law. A careful, but strict and clear regulation of the financial markets is necessary for economic and ethical reasons.

Thesis 7:

Economic ethics in a global perspective will refer to the undivided and universal validity of human rights.

This leads to the question, how it is possible to order the global financial markets in a way that they are orientated towards a minimisation and reduction of violence. The answer must be: By taking into consideration basic human rights. Human rights – they are a kind of condensation, a spiritual summary of humankind. Shaped by numerous negative experiences, one can find here the fundamental rights, which must not be violated if man is to live a contented life. What is necessary for humans

is specified here in the form of rights. Political rights are part of human rights, for example the right to free elections and the freedom of speech. But this freedom can only be realised if the freedom of others, as well as its economic, social and cultural foundation are incorporated. Therefore, the political rights are to be considered as fundamental as the social, economical and cultural rights, that is to say the right to work, the right to social security and sufficient food, the right to be protected from malnourishment and the right to education. Economic ethics in a global perspective will refer to the undivided and universally valid human rights and find their orientation in these. This, though, is valid for an international order of trade that is dependent on the realisation of the mutual recognition of the economic subjects. This finds its ethical equivalent in the guarantee of human right: the economic side can only lead to satisfactory results if the protection of human rights is improved and enhanced. The protection of human freedom is a fundamental prerequisite for an efficient and successful economy, because creativity, fantasy and commitment to work grow under the conditions of freedom. Therefore, the universal protection of human rights has never been as well developed as it is today. Only a few countries or individuals deny that the protection of human rights is a global duty. At a regional level, however, the protection of human rights has become more of a priority than it ever was before.

Thesis 8:

There are many ways of regulating the global financial market. To reduce violence, the introduction of a form of Tobin Tax would be useful.

How can we transfer this ethical orientation to the financial markets? There are many proposals for the regulation of the global financial markets. For example, the bailing-in of private investors if the national financial market breaks down or, as an alternative, the control of foreign exchange dealing. The mechanisms for the regulation of the global financial markets have to be measured against the economical needs and the ethical criteria. The foreign exchange tax is most interesting from this point of view because it has to be paid by many people and hence causes additional income and thereby economic expectations. In a pure form, the foreign exchange tax means a taxation of foreign exchange sales in order to stop the fast and short-term trade of foreign exchange in favour of long-term investment of the Tobin-tax. This way, such a tax, today, is neither effective nor useful. But there are reformed models which, on one hand, include options and derivatives and, on the other, are based on a very low level of taxation to help correct both serious disadvantages of the Tobin-tax. In order to help prevent a global crisis in case of a breakdown of the capital markets some economists proposed combining low taxation of financial trans-

actions with fixed foreign exchange rates, which only come to fruition if the divergences have reached a certain level. This suggested reform of the classic Tobin-tax as an element in agreement with the market, matches economic needs by making the speculations on short-time investments unprofitable and counteracting any possible financial crisis. Similarly, it enhances long-term investments and thereby leads to stable economic development in the countries of the South. Last but not least, a transaction-tax secures income that can be invested in projects for sustainable investment.

Thesis 9:

The important task of the churches in the age of globalisation is to strengthen universal human rights by preaching the Trinitarian understanding of God and by translating human rights into an ethical programme.

It will be crucial for the Churches and Christian social ethics to be able to call the undividable and universal human rights to mind. Theologically, human rights can be founded on the Trinitarian understanding of God: Christian preaching and social ethics know about the Imago Dei, which the Creator bestowed on all human beings. In Jesus Christ, humanity received the gift „that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor rulers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God“ (NRS Rom 8:38.39) and thereby the Imago Dei. Finally, man sees himself as being moved by the Holy Ghost, who gives his thirst for life and his longing for freedom a direction and sets him in relation to all humankind and the surrounding creation. Even if we cannot translate human rights into an ethical program they can still be used for orientation. The model of a „responsible society“ from the first assembly of the World Church Council (1948) is something of a connecting link between the right/law and ethics, between the guarantee of inalienable human rights and the search for options to push it through. By a revivification of this model under the conditions of globalisation, the orienting function of human rights could be turned into the following criteria:

- the right to equality of women and men
- the protection against exploitation
- the enhancement of the freedom to participate, the freedom to realise ones abilities
- the right to nutrition and an appropriate standard of living
- and responsibility for the foundations of living for future generations.

Thesis 10:

Accept the task of shaping the globalisation process and, especially, the financial market, is the best way to reduce violence in a new world.

The Church, through its many employees and financial resources, is, however, an economic power. In different ways from firms competing against each other, the Church can use its financial resources for similar means. A church, which, under the above-mentioned conditions of the globalisation process, does not invest its capital by this criteria but for the greatest profitability and seeks to tell „other“ economic subjects about an alternative strategy will lose credibility. To propose ethical investment, to stimulate it and realise it with its capital is possible, as some national churches, particularly European and US-American churches, have demonstrated. Ethical investment does not have to be opposed to economical demands. On the contrary, these models created by the criteria of sustainable investment should decide the financial investments of all churches as far as possible. Through this, the Church also accepts responsibility for the task of shaping the globalisation process.

Contributors

Theresa Cariño is the co-ordinator of the Hong Kong Office of the Amity Foundation, a Chinese development foundation with strong church links. A native Singaporean who graduated in political science and Asian studies, she spent 20 years in the Philippines teaching political science at the De La Salle Catholic University in Manila. In 1990, she set up non-governmental organisation, the Philippine-China Development Resource Centre, which promotes the exchange of NGO and church workers between these two countries to work on peace and development issues.

Reiner Groth is the General Secretary of the United Evangelical Mission (UEM). Before becoming General Secretary in 1991 in Wuppertal, Germany, he worked as a co-worker of the UEM in the Democratic Republic of Congo and as a pastor for mission and ecumenism in the Evangelical Church in the Rhineland, Germany.

Jörg Hübner is a theologian and pastor in Neuss, Germany. He is chairperson of the committee on social ethics of the Evangelical Church in the Rhineland and author of a range of studies on globalisation and justice.

Zephania Kameeta is Bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the Republic of Namibia and has been moderator Moderator of the United Evangelical Mission since 2000. He is also Vice-President of the Lutheran World Federation.

Zephania Kameeta is a well-known representative of liberation theology who remained true to his convictions in the long struggle against Apartheid in Namibia. For many years he was a teacher at the Paulinum Theological College in Windhoek and a member of the SWAPO-leadership. From 1990 to 2000 he was the deputy speaker of the House of Parliament in the Republic of Namibia.

Bertold Klappert is professor for systematic theology at the Protestant School of Theology („Kirchliche Hochschule“) in Wuppertal, Germany. One special focus of his academic work is Christian-Jewish relations. He is a member of various church committees on this issue and has been a guest lecturer in Boston, Jakarta, Jerusalem, Pematang-Siantar, Prague and Seattle.

Sung-Hee Lee-Linke is professor for systematic theology at Marburg University, Germany. Born in South Korea, she came to Germany as a student. From 1987 to 1990, she was a member of the standing committee on faith and order of the World

Council of Churches. Since 1994 she has been responsible for inter-religious and intercultural dialogue and for feminist theology at the Protestant Academy in the Rhineland.

Ulrich Möller is a member of the church board of the Evangelical Church of Westphalia, Germany and vice-moderator of the United Evangelical Mission. He is head of the department for ecumenism, mission and world responsibility in the Westphalian church. As such he is responsible for the church's justice, peace and integrity of creation process in his church and very much involved in questions of globalisation.

Jochen Motte, originally a pastor from the Evangelical Church in the Rhineland, Germany, is, since 1993, the Executive Secretary for Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation of the United Evangelical Mission. In this position he is also responsible for the UEM's participation in the Decade to Overcome Violence..

Fidon R. Mwombeki is General Secretary of the Northwestern Diocese of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Tanzania. He is chairperson of the Tanzania Coalition on Debt and Development and is the church's representative on economic justice issues. He is also an alternate board member of the global fund to fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

Rüdiger Noll is Director of the Church and Society Commission of the Conference of European Churches (CEC) in Brussels as well as being the CEC's Associate General Secretary. Originally a pastor from the Evangelical Church of Westphalia, Germany, he has been working for the CEC on JPIC related issues since 1991. He is also Moderator of the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) Advisory Panel of Experts on Freedom of Religion or Belief and President of the Committee of Freedom of Religion or Belief of the Geneva based NGOs in consultative status with the United Nations.

Seong-Won Park is Executive Secretary of the department of co-operation and witness at the World Alliance of Reformed Churches in Geneva. The former theology professor from Seoul, South Korea, is also Coordinator of the „Processus Confessionis“, WARC's major programme response to neo-liberal economic globalisation.