

CTC BULLETIN

Vol. XXII No.3 December 2006

God of Migrants and Migrants with God towards Peace-Making

Sungjae Kim¹

I. Crisis of Peace in the Time of Imperial Globalization and Mass-Migration

None of the countries in our world can avoid globalization of information and capital at the end of the twentieth century. However, we should not overlook the fact that humankind has experienced globalization of military forces or imperial cultures in every period of world history, even though in the past it was much more regional than it is today. All such globalization consequently caused marginalization of the socially vulnerable.

Humankind have realized that global terrorism could happen along with globalization since the incredible tragic attack on the World Trade Center in New York on September 11, 2001. It seems that while that horrible attack implies devastating response to the western countries' policy on the Middle East and the issue of conflict in Palestine since 1948, it might be related to a serious contradiction of the ongoing globalization. This has increasingly amplified the economic gap between the rich countries holding transnational corporations and the poor countries whose human and natural resources have been exploited by the former.

When we try to deal with the issue of peace in the time of globalization based on the IT-innovation and the spread of transnational corporations across the world, we must not fail to draw attention to those who have benefited in the trend of globalization, and those who have been marginalized or sacrificed in a social stratification amplified in such commercialized and mass-consuming cultures.

We should pay attention to the migration of marginalized people on an enormous scale in Asia in this century. In other words, enormous numbers of people have become landless because of social stratification caused either by political skirmish or migrants moving for subsistence to richer countries. This is the origin of globalizing economic power. Statistical information on Asian refugees or migrants shows their number to be twelve million in the 1990's. They were often placed at the bottom of the economic hierarchy of the richer countries as a source of cheap labor. Furthermore, they often face ethnic discrimination as a social minority in those countries. What is peace for them?

We also know of people who have been marginalized domestically as an oppressed minority by the majority or the dominant group in a nation. For example, people in

¹ The Rev. Dr. Sungjae Kim <sungjaek52@ybb.ne.jp or sungjaek@sa3.so-net.ne.jp> is a minister of the Korean Christian Church in Japan.

Okinawa were sacrificed for the battle of Tenuh (emperor) in World War II (WWII), a sacrifice of over one hundred fifty thousand people. Okinawa was placed under the control of the US military after the war. In spite of the fact that finally Okinawa was returned to Japan, Okinawa has been occupied by 30,000 US military, or about 75% of the entire US military presence (forty five thousand) in Japan. Another historical scar is that Koreans were forcibly mobilized by military government of Japan during the WWII. Over 242,000 Koreans² were conscripted by force and mobilized as Japanese imperial soldiers or civilian laborers to the battle-fields. Of these, 22,000 Koreans³ died during the war for Japan. As soon as Japan restored sovereignty, along with the enforcement of the San Francisco Peace Treaty on April 28, 1952, Japan enacted the Aid Law for Surviving Family of the War Dead and Injured (the Aid Law). After this act, Japan legislated pension for military personnel. Such proposals had been persistently blocked by the GHQ from 1945 to April of 1952. Consequently, between 1952 and 1988 Japan enacted 16 laws regarding compensation for the war-injured and war-victims' families, including laws for the A-bomb victims and the Taiwanese families of war-victims. However, Japan totally excluded Korean injured and families of victims from these aid laws. This practice has effect from the beginning until today. The reason for exclusion is nationality. Under the Aid Law, the only people eligible are those who are of Japanese nationality. Incidentally, it is quite curious that whereas the Aid Law which could provide compensation for the Korean injured has a clause of specifying the nationality, twelve of the other sixteen aid laws do not have such a clause. Over one hundred thousand of Korean women were conscripted as prostitutes, i.e., sex-slaves for the soldiers of Tenuh. However, Japanese government continued to conceal that historical fact so as to avoid taking historical responsibility. Even after the court was opened for these cases, namely the reparation of the Korean war-injured or the victims' families, Japan has stubbornly refused to acknowledge its own responsibility of reparation to these women. What is peace for them?

Ivan Illich describes the *pax economika* which has dominated in the world in modern time as peace based upon the success of economic accumulation of wealth (Illich, 1983: 4-46). The *pax economika* launched by Japan in the former part of this century has ultimately created an enormous number of Korean victims, as well as other Asian victims. In addition, the *pax economika* built up in post-war Japan totally excluded victims from appropriate reparation. Illich contrasts the *pax populi* with the *pax economika*. We find two socio-historical emergencies. One is the diasporadized ethnic minorities such as Koreans and Taiwanese in Japan who were migrants forcibly mobilized into Japan in the former part of the 20th century and their descendants. The other is the migrants who are new comers and who have increased in Japan particularly since the 1980s.

What do these two kinds of socio-historical beings mean? First, there is occurring an encounter and merging between new comers and old comers in Japan as receiving country. Second, we should acknowledge that continually increased migrants are gradually separated into each group of ethnic minorities, generationally alternating in host-country.

² 207,000 Taiwanese were conscripted by Japan.

³ 30,000 Taiwanese died.

Therefore, our theological perspective and missiological task should be based upon a profound insight into the dialectic relationship between migrant identity and diaspora identity. In order to innovate our Christian understanding of this issue and enlighten leaders and members of churches regarding missiological task for migrants in the time of globalization, we should refresh and deepen our biblical interpretation from the perspective of migrant theology.

II. Review of the Bible from the Position of Migrants

A. Migrants (*gērîm*) in the Bible (Old Testament)

We find the being of migrants in many stories of the Bible. In the Old Testament we find the term *gēr* in singular form and *gērîm* in plural form. *Gēr* and *gērîm* occur 92 times in the form of a noun and *gûr* (to sojourn, immigrate) 81 times in verbal form. In sociological sense, these concepts refer to people who lost their inherited land in their home country or village, or immigrated as agricultural workers for temporary job (short or long term) or as refugees seeking protection from famine or conflicts in another community or country where they did not have their kinship. In Genesis, these words are often used to refer to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob sojourning in Canaan, Philistine, and Egypt. In Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, these are mainly used to point to outsiders included in the Israelite community for treatment or protection equal with the Israelites.

Why were most of the *gēr/gērîm* texts edited in these books of the Old Testament? Its background is intimately related to socio-political situation in Judah (southern part of Palestine including Jerusalem) in mid- and late 8th century B.C. Although the population in Jerusalem was approximately 8 thousand in mid-8th century that increased 3 times, reaching 25 thousand at the end of the 8th century. The middle of the 8th century was definitely a significant turning-point in the history of Israel and Judah along with other east Mediterranean petty states. Assyria succeeded in placing the eastern Mediterranean under siege in the time of Assyrian kings, i.e., Tiglath-pileser III (744-727 BC) and Sargon II (722-705 BC). The petty states on the eastern coast and the northern Arabian tribes and Judah were subdued by Assyria, and became vassals or Assyrian provinces. This included Samaria, i.e., the Assyrian province of Samerina⁴ after the downfall of the northern kingdom in 721 BC. Assyria used basically two ways to conquer those states, viz. vassal states and provinces. It seems to have been the policy of mass deportation⁵ by Assyria that profoundly

⁴ Hayim Tadmor notes that "at the time of Shalmaneser's death in the winter of 722 the deportation of the people of Samaria had hardly been started. ... Upon his accession to the throne or his usurpation, Sargon experienced a major domestic crisis, in connection with which he moved to pacify the citizens of Assur, granting them, or returning to them, certain privileges. ... Only sometime late in 720 Sargon returned to Samaria, to deport its people and to rebuild it as the center of a new province of Samerina" (Tadmor, 1958: 37-38).

⁵ Bustenary Oded profiled Assyria's policy of mass deportation in his study as follows: "(a) Sennacherib deported the largest number of inhabitants (469,150 + x souls in 20 acts of deportation), and after him Tiglath-pileser III with 393,598 + x deportees, and Sargon II with 239,285 + x deportees. (b) It is clear from the data we possess that, with regard to both the number of *instances* of deportation and the *number* of deportees, the system of mass deportation was carried out intensively and on a very large scale during the reigns of Tiglath-pileser III, Sargon II and Sennacherib. (c) From the figures

influenced the king of Judah, Hezekiah's diplomatic and defense policy and furthermore his court's understanding of national identity. We can categorize the people of Judah who encountered the great shock by Sennacherib's campaign, siege, and deportation as follows: (1) refugees to Jerusalem; (2) refugees to other safer areas in Judah; (3) deportees to Assyria or Babylonia; (4) inhabitants living in territories which were taken over by other vassal states or provinces; (5) inhabitants of Jerusalem who survived the Assyrian siege and absorbed a huge number of the refugees from outside.

The urban settlements of Judah in the 8th century B.C. led to "a high degree of economic specialization by various towns and groups within towns" which were "integrated into a regional network in which their surpluses were redistributed" (McClellan, 1978: 281). However, the population in Judah experienced a considerable decline during the seventh century, which seems to have been related to "the transition from a network of towns that characterized the kingdom of Judah in the 8th century B.C. to one of much smaller settlements and fortresses in the 7th century" (McClellan, 1978: 281).

On the other hand, the population in Jerusalem rapidly expanded at the end of the 8th century B.C. Surprisingly, however, its population, which totaled 7,500 in the mid-8th century B.C., reached 24,000 in the seventh century (Broshi, 1974: 23; 1978: 12; Broshi and Barkay, 1985: 111-119).⁶ Broshi explains the shift as follows:

This expansion cannot be explained by mere demographic or economic growth; or was it a gradual process. During the quarter millennium after King Solomon's reign, the city changed very little, but around 700 B.C. it increased to three or four times its former size. No economic factor could have necessitated a concentration of 24,000 people in Jerusalem, when the city of the eighth century must have numbered only 6000-8000 (Broshi, 1974: 23-24).

The extraordinarily increased population⁷ can be attributed to refugees not only from the north after the fall of Samaria but also from the countryside of Judah which had been destroyed before and at the time of the Assyrian invasion of 701 BC. We can assume the two waves of mass immigration caused by the Assyrian campaigns and its deportation

provided by the royal inscriptions the largest number of people in any *one* deportation is the 208,000 that Sennacherib deported from Babylonia to Assyria. Of the 43 complete enumerations which we possess, in each of *thirteen* cases 30,000 and more persons were deported, in *eight* cases between 10,000 and 30,000, and in *twenty-two* cases less than 10,000 persons. (d) The estimated number, based on the figures given by the royal inscriptions, of four and a half million deportees in the neo-Assyrian period, of whom about 80% were deported from the time of Tigrath-pileser III to the destruction of the Assyrian empire, attests to mass but not total deportations. Not all the residents of a certain city or area were deported, but only a proportion of them. Sargon II, for example, did not deport all the residents of the city of Musasir. A provincial governor was appointed over those who remained, and they paid taxes" (Oded, 1979: 21).

⁶ M. Broshi surmises that the grand total of the population in Judah amounted to 403,000 people (Broshi and Finkelstein, 1992: 54).

⁷ B. Halpern believes that the people in the countryside escaped not only to Jerusalem, but also to the fortress-cities close to their villages, which Halpern explains with a model of "Hedgehog Defense" (Halpern, 1991: 18ff).

policy as an enormously significant sociological impact on society and polity in Judah especially in Jerusalem. One wave came from the north after 721 BC, and the other fled to Jerusalem or to the fortress-cities from the countryside besieged by the Assyrian troops in the last decades of the 8th century or from the Judean provinces ceded by Sennacherib to the Philistines after 701 BC (Broshi, 1974: 25; Eisman, 1978: 52; Avigad, 1983: 55).

Recent biblical studies assume that drastic, but not yet final, edition of biblical texts containing terms of *gēr/gērîm* are attributed to the time of King Hezekiah in Judah and onward. The abrupt retreat of Sennacherib's troops gave Hezekiah's court an opportunity for theological legitimation of the Davidic dynasty. However, it seems that Hezekiah could not successfully launch a campaign restoring the lost land as well as annexing the north, particularly after the failure of the widespread revolt in 705 B.C. in which Hezekiah was involved. Hezekiah was continually bound to heavy tribute to Assyria even after Sennacherib's army returned to Assyria in 701 B.C. It seems likely that Hezekiah's court was bound to nationalism without the fruit of territorial restoration under the siege and the lingering political bondage by Assyria, whether before or after 701 BC. In that political condition Hezekiah's court was forced to struggle with the following emergent tasks: (1) the expansion-plan of Jerusalem caused by the rapid increase of population; (2) the refitting of local forts and the re-supply of rations for defense of the border of Judah, especially to control the Philistines, ensuring a route to Egypt and a route for the Mediterranean sea-trade, at least until the siege of 701 BC; (3) the necessity of royal apology and policy to alleviate the friction or conflict between the indigenous populace and the refugees, especially to soothe the complaints of the poor suffering from rapid inflation.

The problem of the explosive increase of population in Jerusalem especially would have caused social unrest or friction between the indigenous people and the refugees as new comers in Jerusalem. In such a socio-political crisis, who acted as an advocate for the refugees? It seems plausible that their concern and situation confronted Hezekiah's court through the prophetic circles and the Levites rather than directly. Hezekian nationalism had to be articulated not only for legitimating the politico-economic interest of the Davidic court and the ruling class in Judah, but also for responding to political demands by those critical social groups as well as to the population crisis.

The *gēr/gērîm* texts, which had been rooted in social tradition of providing sojourners, migrants or refugees with hospitality, played an important role in the biblical edition legitimating the Hezekian regime in the late 8th century B.C. in the above socio-political situation. After the *gēr/gērîm* texts came to take significant position in editing process of the biblical documents in Judah of the 8th century B.C., these concepts were continually used in editing works even in the post-exilic period because these became hidden key-words for deconstructing and reconstructing the identity of Israel whenever ancient Israel faced socio-political crises and limitation of conventional understanding of Israel. The concepts of *gēr/gērîm* are deeply associated with migration which means being uprooted from the original land and re-rooted or grafted in an unfamiliar land. It means making society on that land hybrid by including those alien beings. God in the Bible intentionally chose migrants such as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph and Moses as agents of God.

We can consider the concept of *gēr/gērîm* in the Bible in two ways: *gēr/gērîm* in Israel and Israel as *gēr/gērîm*.

1. gēr/gērîm in Israel

The texts of gēr/gērîm in Israel are classified into two categories: (a) gērîm as those to be protected⁸ and (b) gēr/gērîm as those included in the community of Israel for sharing good things in the feasts.⁹

It is remarkable that King Hezekiah's (proto-Deuteronomistic) scribes could comprehensively be involved in editing the biblical documents by adopting sources which were brought to Jerusalem together with refugees from the north. Biblical scholars view that Hezekiah's scribes contributed to forming the framework of the Book of Covenant (Exodus 20:22-23:33) which seems to have had significance like constitution for legitimating Hezekiah's regime in the late 8th century. N. Lohfink (1991: 41) succinctly depicts the entire literary structure of the Book of the Covenant¹⁰ as follows:

Exodus: The Covenant Code in Its Final Shape

1. A	20:22-26	Cult: idols and altar
2. B	21:1-11	6 + 1: liberation of slaves
3. C	21:12-22:19	Civil law collection, mostly He-style
4. C'	22:20-23:9	Collection "ger", mostly I-Thou-style
5. B'	23:10-12	6 + 1: fallow year and sabbath
6. A'	23:13-19	Cult: feasts and sacrifices
7.	23:20-33	"Epilogue"

Focusing on the literary significance of these texts for framing the entire structure of the Book of the Covenant, Lohfink explains the composition of the structure as follows:

There is one important element which does not seem to come from outside: the stranger. The laws on the poor start in Exod 22:20 and conclude in Exod 23:12 with the stranger. The stranger, in a certain sense, frames the laws on the poor (section C' B' in the above table). ... There are the laws framed by the repeated ger law (C'). Then there are two laws where the number seven is important, the laws on fallow year and sabbath (B'). Then come the rest of the laws, which are mainly cultic (A'). This arrangement of laws is chiasmatically symmetrical with that in the first half of the Code (ABC). The Code starts with some cultic laws; the law on the liberation of slaves depends on the seventh year; the collection of laws which then

⁸ Exodus 22:20, 23:9, 12; Leviticus 19: 10, 33; Deuteronomy 5:14, 14:29; 16: 11, 14; 23:8; 24:14, 17, 19, 20, 21; 26:11, 12, 13; 27:19; Jeremiah 7:6; 22:3; Ezekiel 22:7, 29.

⁹ Exodus 12:48-49; Leviticus 16:29; 17:8, 10, 13, 15; 28:26; 20:2; 22:18; 23:22, 24:16, 22; Numbers 9:14; 15:14, 15, 16, 26, 29, 30; 19:10; 26:57; 35:15; Deuteronomy 1:16; 29:10; Joshua 8:33, 35; 1 Chronicle 22:2, 2 Chronicle 2:16; 15:9; 30:25; Isaiah 14:1; Ezekiel 14:7; 47:22, 23.

¹⁰ We find similar analyses of the entire literary structure of the Book of the Covenant in other scholars' studies; cf. E. Otto (1988: 9-11), L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger (1990: 23), Y. Osumi (1991: 25). However, Lohfink's analysis is the most significant for my study since he notes the literary function of the gēr-texts in shaping the entire literary structure of the Book of the Covenant.

follows clearly comes to an end with the law on the ger in 22:20. Add the epilogue in 23:20-33, and what results is a kind of hebdomadarian structure of the whole (Lohfink, 1991: 40-41).

Lohfink's consideration of the entire literary structure of the Book of the Covenant in relation to the *gēr/gērîm*-texts does not only describe the literary function of the *gēr/gērîm*-texts in the final stage of edition, but also lays the groundwork to consider the socio-rhetorical significance of the *gēr/gērîm*-texts in Exodus 22:20 and 23:9 in relation to the Book of the Covenant as a constitutional document for articulating the national identity of Israel in late 8th century Judah during the Assyrian crisis.¹¹

We find how the issue of *gēr/gērîm* was greatly remarked in the period of the late 8th century Judah in terms of influx of refugee in Jerusalem from outside. The Hezekian regime faced great question whether or not Jerusalem should include those people escaping from deportation policy by Assyria. Hezekiah decided to include them by advocating "You shall not wrong or oppress a resident alien, for you were aliens in the land of Egypt" (Exodus 22:20, NRSV). It is remarkable that the Hezekian regime aimed to articulate a comprehensive identity of Israel including native people in Jerusalem and those from the north by identifying all the people with *gērîm* in the land of Egypt. Put differently, this passage significantly leads the readers/audience to compassionately include the current migrants/refugee as *gēr/gērîm* seeking shelter and protection by encouraging the readers/audience to remember the memory of their own past history as *gēr/gērîm*.

2. Israel as *gēr/gērîm*

We can also find texts in the Old Testament where the terms *gēr/gērîm* occur to depict the identity of Israelite charismatic characters such as patriarchs¹², Moses¹³, prophet¹⁴ and poets¹⁵, or Israel¹⁶ *perse*. We know that the covenantal relationship between Yahweh as God of Israel and Israel as people of Yahweh is consistently described in the Old Testament. Furthermore, Israel is promised the land of Canaan. The paradigm of relationship between Yahweh, Israel and land of Canaan is a theological foundation in the Old Testament even

¹¹ Lohfink is inclined to abstain from definitely explaining the socio-historical background for the significant use of the *gēr*-texts in shaping the entire structure of the Book of the Covenant: "One of the questions to which I have no answer is: What may have been the historical and sociological reasons which brought about this striking introduction of the stranger into the formulaic language about the poor? The fashionable guess among scholars at the moment is that the stranger became recognized among the *personae miserae* in connection with the massive migration from the north to the south after the destruction of Samaria" (Lohfink, 1991: 41).

¹² For patriarchs, Deuteronomy 26:5; 1Chronicle 16:19; Psalm 105:12; for Abraham, Genesis 12:10; 15:13; 17:8; 20:1; 21:23, 34; 23:4; for Lot, Genesis 19:9; for Isaac, Genesis 26:3; for Jacob, Genesis 28:4; 32:5; 37:1; 47:4, 9; Exodus 6:4; Psalm 105:12, 23.

¹³ Exodus 2:22.

¹⁴ For Elijah, 1Kings 17:20.

¹⁵ Psalm 39:13; 61:5.

¹⁶ For the people of Israel, Leviticus 25:23; 1Chronicles 29:15; Psalm 15:1; Ezekiel 20:38; for Levites, Deuteronomy 18:6; Judges 17:7, 8, 9; 19:1, 16.

though it has variation in each of books. At the same time, however, we can acknowledge that memory of *gēr/gērīm* is profoundly etched in the identity of Israel. It seems to be intimately associated with historical experience of Israel most of which is attributed to long history without independent nation-state. Israel has long history of migration and new settlement since emergence of Israel in Palestine 12th century B.C. until birth of the Davidic monarchy in 10th century. Its history is reflected in depiction of patriarchs' sojourning and liberated Israelites' wandering in the wilderness of Sinai in the biblical literature. Experience of exile in Babylonia is another great experience as *gēr/gērīm* in foreign land, which reached around fifty years.

Israel's inclusive stance on people regarded as *gēr/gērīm* is deeply related to the identity of Israel in which the nature of *gēr/gērīm* is inscribed through historical experience and memory. Put differently, when God, Yahweh, calls on and gathers Israel as people of Yahweh, the divine reason for calling is profoundly linked with social situation of *gēr/gērīm* as marginal being in the world and existential condition of *gēr/gērīm* as hybrid being. Yahweh's compassionate voice of liberation of the oppressed from slavery or oppression resonates in spiritual space which people regarded as *gēr/gērīm* held in their social existence and memory. Biblical expression like "O Yahweh, who may sojourn (*gūr*) in Your tent?" (Psalm 15:1) implies that Yahweh is identified as God of Tent who searches, guides and uses sojourners who lost safe place for residence and emigrated seeking safer places. This is an aspect of identity of God in the Bible.

3. "You shall not wrong or oppress a *gēr*, for you were *gērīm* in the land of Egypt."

Theologies of ancient Israel in the Old Testament were shaped and revised in the paradigm of Yahweh, Israel and the land. However, whenever "Israel" persisted in faith in Yahweh and the divinely promised land as its territorial arena, it had to struggle with the issue of diverse peoples as non-Israelites and search for a way to reintegrate or re-establish the identity of Israel in socio-historical crises. In that sense, I note that the concept of *gēr/gērīm* functioned as a shadow-concept which impacted on the identity of Israel in its Yahweh-religion and land-theology. I draw attention to Homi K. Bhabha's definition of "boundary" or his term "in-between" in the nation-building, which "marks the nation's selfhood" but at the same time "interrupts the self-generating time of national production" and "disrupts the signification of the people as homogeneous" (Bhabha, 1994: 148). Advocating the horizon of post-colonialism vs. post-modernism, Bhabha, furthermore, describes the meaning of minorities as marginal beings or inner others in nation-building as follows:

The problem is not simply the "selfhood" of the nation as opposed to the otherness of other nations. We are confronted with the nation split within itself, articulating the heterogeneity of its population. The barred Nation It/Self, alienated from its eternal self-generation, becomes a liminal signifying space that is internally marked by the discourses of minorities, the heterogeneous histories of contending peoples, antagonistic authorities and tense locations of cultural difference. ... So long as a firm boundary is maintained between the territories, and the narcissistic wound is contained, the aggressivity will be projected on to the Other or the Outside (Bhabha, 1994: 148,149).

Bhabha's insight into the characteristic of national boundary leads me to remember the aggressivity to others in "Canaan" in the theology of the exodus and land that became the basis on which the scribes/writers of the JEP (Yahwist, Elohist, Priestly) literature and the Deuteronomistic History attempted to articulate the national identity of Israel. However, we should not overlook that the *gēr/gērîm*-texts in the Old Testament do not only shed light dimly on an inner otherness of "Israel" itself, but also function as the counter-narrative to the aggressiveness etched in the exclusive narrations of "Israel" in Canaan, the land promised by Yahweh. The concept of *gēr/gērîm* in the Old Testament reflects heterogeneous reality in the social history of "Israel" and at the same time reveals a way toward co-existence or co-habitation regardless of, in dissonance with, or beyond the logocentric intentionality stamped in the hierarchical structure of Israel and which was articulated by each of the historical authors of the Old Testament. I believe the theology of the Old Testament has to be re-formed from this perspective in our situation of a deeply torn society on the same globe.

The concern for the *gēr/gērîm* in the Old Testament leads us to discern the following: Biblical scribes/writers along with political or religio-political rulers continually and persistently pursued the identity of Israel through restless struggles for the land of "Israel" promised by Yahweh in the history of domestic and international crises, or in a marginal spot between imperial powers. However, Yahweh continued to lead them to address the issue of co-habitation with others. The biblical concept of *gēr/gērîm* was, is and continues to be at the crossroad of these two vectors, i.e., the divine and the human.

"You shall not wrong or oppress a *gēr*, for you were *gērîm* in the land of Egypt." This is one theological message with the concept of *gēr/gērîm*. It is remarkable that while the first "you" is singular along with *gēr* in singular form, the second "you" is plural along with *gērîm* in plural. Viewing it in historical context of Judah in the 8th century BC, singular "you" in ethical command on the former part seems to be designated to native inhabitants inside the wall of Jerusalem, while plural "you" in theological reason for its command on the latter part comprehends both of native inhabitants and refugees seeking protection. Put differently, the text means to construct a comprehensive identity of Israel by means of the concept *gēr/gērîm*. At the same time, this text articulates theological paradigm to encouraging ethic of co-habitation between natives and aliens on the same space through prompting remembrance of historical and existential memory as *gēr/gērîm* inscribed in self/selves. Remembrance of self/selves as *gēr/gērîm* leads to ethic of loving aliens like self/selves. In other words, it is the concept of *gēr/gērîm* that transforms land into cohabitant space for people within and without border.

B. God Choosing Migrants

Standing on the hermeneutic position of *gēr/gērîm*, we are led to vital interpretation of the biblical stories, which possibly contributes to construction of "theology of migrants." For example, it is significant for us to get access to the stories of patriarchs in Genesis from the viewpoint of *gēr/gērîm*. Let us focus upon the story of Abraham's start of sojourning. Actually its story begins from Genesis 11:37. We find the genealogy of Sem, one of Noah's three sons (Genesis 11:10-36), which is attributed to the priestly documents in the mid-6th century B.C. and onward. In other words, we can consecutively read two stories of the

Babel tower in Genesis 11:1-9 and Abraham's start of sojourning from Genesis 11:37 and onward, both of which literary-historically belong to JE (Yahwist and Elohist) literature that seems to have merged in the Hezekian court of Jerusalem in the late 8th century B.C.

Comparing two stories, we acknowledge a remarkable contrast between two as follows:

Babel Tower in Genesis 11:1-9	Abraham's Sojourn in Genesis 11:37ff
Tower was constructed in the land of Shinar which is identical to Ur.	Abraham's family left Ur for sojourning.
People attempted to make their name famous ('âšâ) by themselves.	God, Yahweh, promised to Abraham to heighten (giddēl) his name.
People were punished, lost common language for communication and dispersed meaninglessly from the land of Shinar, Ur.	Abraham started his sojourn from Ur and decided to go further towards Canaan with a promise of blessing by Yahweh in Haran. He was sent among peoples in Canaan with a divine mission.

Reading the story of Yahweh's call of Abraham for sojourning in comparison with the story of Babel tower, we find that Yahweh's election of Abraham as gēr from Ur and in Haran implicitly opposes imperialistic state-power building up Babel tower on the basis of invasion against small countries and sacrifice of people by deportation or forcible mobilization, on the one hand. On the other, Yahweh's call of Abraham from Ur implicitly means the start of the divine plan to construct the world of co-habitation as an alternative way different from the world of Babel tower. For its purpose, while Abraham was called out and guided to the way to live as sojourner of God, Yahweh decided to be God with the sojourner.

Put differently, Yahweh started to create a space of co-habitation in the world by choosing Abraham out of his sojourning land, Haran, as the gēr who emigrated from the land where human arrogant and violent plans were shattered with the Babel tower. Although Abraham seems to symbolize a migrant as victim of trouble on the Babel tower, Yahweh decided to be God with migrants by choosing Abraham.

III. Space of Full Life and Human Beings as gērîm

A. Task of Migrants or Resident Aliens as the Divine Sojourners (gērîm in Hebrew)

Trekking the ways of patriarchs as sojourners in Genesis, we find that they worked on two tasks in the land of Canaan and Philistine. One was to build altars as contact zone to spiritually communicate with God. Another was to dig wells to get water from the underground. Even though we cannot directly find the scenes of Abraham digging wells in his stories, Genesis 26 makes us imagine that Abraham also worked on digging wells during his sojourn in the land of Canaan and Philistine. In Genesis 26, after Abraham died, his son Isaac tried to go to Egypt because of famine in Canaan, just as his father did before. However, God stopped Isaac and commanded him to sojourn (gûr) in the land of Philistine. Isaac obeyed the divine command and succeeded to build a materially affluent life. But he

started to be envied by the local people in Gerar of Philistine. Finally he could not help but move out towards a peaceful place. Then he decided to head for the valley of Gerar where his father Abraham had dug a well or wells before. He found the well broken by the local people. He dug it again for recovery and survival. However, the local herders quarreled with Isaac's herders. Then after naming its well, Esek (meaning quarrel), Isaac moved further to another place and dug another well. But again trouble happened between Isaac and the local people. This time, he named the well Sitnah (meaning hostility). However, he never gave up. He dug more wells until there was no more trouble. Therefore, he called its well, Rehoboth (broad). The concept of Hebrew *rāhab* has deep meaning beyond territorial. It implies enlarging the heart, i.e., releasing the shrunk heart from tension, or making the heart peaceful.¹⁷ When Isaac finally reached peaceful well without any more trouble with local people, Isaac heard a voice of Yahweh's promise of blessing, and built altar there. Later on, Abimelech, a local king, came to Isaac to make a peace treaty, confessing that God truly worked behind Isaac.

Isaac's migration in the land of Philistine from one well to another was caused by discriminatory pressures by local people in the light of sociological perspective. From a cultural viewpoint of identity of sojourner, Isaac's recovering works on the old wells dug by Abraham implies reconfirmation of his root or identity as son of Abraham. The image of digging wells makes us imagine vertical motion just as digging into the depth of his memory for bridging between his socio-cultural existence as sojourner, i.e., landless, or rootless (*déraciné*) and the root of identity as son of Abraham and believer of Yahweh. However, the well which Isaac finally reached means simultaneous recovery of his identity and peace of co-habitation. Put differently, the broad well dug by Isaac as well as altar for worship to Yahweh symbolizes Yahweh's true purpose of choosing *gērīm* (sojourners) and sending them to new lands for revealing the glory of God. That was true reason of God for promising to bless Abraham in Genesis 12:1-3.

This story signifies tasks of migrants on the globe in our time. Migrants as resident aliens are beings to bear significant task-mission to dig wells of peaceful co-habitation in migratory lands, not just socially vulnerable beings whose human rights need to be protected. There are many high and rigid borders to separate peoples as nations from each other. However, there is no border in the underground containing water and the heaven. We are asked to dig out the well of peace to pump up borderless water-source for co-habitation, i.e., life in fullness.

B. Space of Cohabitation as the Divine Gift to *gērīm*

What is the land and who is true land owner? In Leviticus 25 we find remarkable words regarding the biblical idea of landownership. Leviticus 25:23 refers to right and obligation of the sold land-restitution for the Israelites as people of Yahweh. There we remarkably find theological reason for restitution: "The land shall not be sold in perpetuity, for the land is mine, for with me you are sojourners (*gērīm*) and tenants (*tōšābīm*)" [Leviticus 25:23]. Here Yahweh is identified as true landowner, and all the people are just sojourners living temporarily in a specific area and tenants borrowing the land from the true landowner in

¹⁷ Cf. Psalm 4:1; 18:36; 25:17; 119:32, 45.

this world. Land is lent to us as tenants from God. In other words, land is a gift to us, but for a task given by God as true landowner. In German terminology, land is Gabe (gift) but Aufgabe <upon-gift> (task) to accomplish the divine purpose of granting land as co-habitant space or heterogeneous space ("heterotopia", M. Foucault) for life in fullness to all the people, not only citizens of host countries but also migrants or resident aliens as guests.

We still definitely live in the system of nation-states since modern time across the world. Each nation-state is demarcated by precise boundaries from other countries. Freedom of our travel in and out is limited by immigration acts and custom in each country. At the same time, however, we have been facing the time of cross-bordering globalization. So far only powerful ones can benefit from globalization. We should not overlook the fact that global capitals originating from richest countries need the gap between economic levels of various countries in order to expand the market and get more profits by using cheaper labor. In other words, there is a relation of complicity between globalization and nationalism.

IV. Conclusion

A. Peace-Making from the Margins

Now let us focus on Jesus' words of peace on the mount in Matthew 5¹⁸. It seems that Matthew attempted to compare the mount¹⁹ as the place of Jesus' sermon to the holy cosmic mountain of pilgrimage by whole nations depicted in Isaiah 2:1-5. In this text Isaiah proclaimed peace, i.e., denying war, even without using the term *shalôm*. In Matthew 5:9 Jesus obviously proclaims that peace-makers will be blessed as sons of God. We cannot find a parallel text in Jesus' sermon in Luke 6. While Matthew's concern is directed at the holiness of Jesus' sermon, Luke puts his emphasis on Jesus' critical stance to the poor and the rich by adding the part of woe to Jesus' sermon of blessing. Let us focus on the common points between Matthew and Luke.

First, Jesus' position is on the margin of the world which is centered on the Jerusalem temple, ruled and supported by the priests, scribes, Pharisees, and Sadducean aristocrats. Put differently, the locus of Jesus' sermon of blessing is a counter-point to both Jerusalem as center of Jewish rule and to Rome as center of the Roman Empire. It follows that Jesus' sermon of blessing from the mount to the marginalized people around him has the potential in the minds of hearers and readers for a paradoxical reversal in the relation of center and margin. Jesus' description of peacemaking as works of the children of God and as blessing ought to be interpreted in that context. That is, peacemaking which Jesus blesses begins among the marginal people in an oppressive world and is finally transformed into the center, the gate of the Kingdom of God. Moreover, we should pay attention to the fact that peacemaking is not separated from justice or righteousness²⁰ and compassion for the marginalized²¹ in Jesus' sermon on the mount. This is certainly rooted in the prophetic

¹⁸ Luke locates Jesus on the plain in His sermon of blessing and woe which is parallel to this text in Matthew 5.

¹⁹ Many scholars also believe Jesus is the new Moses with a new law on a new Sinai.

²⁰ Cf. Matthew 5:6, 10.

²¹ Cf. Matthew 5:3-5, 7-8.

traditions in the Hebrew Bible. Put differently, Jesus followed the position of considering peace as an issue of social justice or righteousness from the locus of compassion for people marginalized by the secular rulers and the wealthy class.

Secondly, Jesus' sermon on the mount envisions the recipients of divine blessings as coming from diverse aspects of the marginalized, i.e., the poor in spirit, those who mourn, the meek, those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, the merciful, the pure in heart, the peacemakers, and those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake. From this point we can realize that, while peacemaking is necessarily related in diverse ways to a complex interaction of human sufferings and the practice of justice or righteousness, Jesus' sermon on the mount opens the way to construct a counter-network of solidarity for peacemaking by gathering those who are marginalized in diverse ways in the world.

B. Church as Network of Hospitality

We have to reconsider legitimacy of nation-state in our time of globalization. We have to go back to the biblical viewpoint regarding land and people. We should clarify the meaning of land as co-habitant space for all the peoples on the globe, but not as market-place for global capitals. Without migrants, how can we form such a world? Let us rediscover the significance of Christian church as altar and well for sharing life with God and with each other in fullness on the globe in our time. Let us recover the function of church as shelter, or "the city of refuge"²² Let us listen to Jacques Derrida's description of "the city of refuge" as follows:

Whether it be the foreigner in general, the immigrant, the exiled, the deported, the stateless or the displaced person (the task being as much to distinguish prudently between these categories as is possible), we would ask these new cities of refuge to reorient the politics of the state. We would ask them to transform and reform the modalities of membership by which the city (cité) belongs to the state, as in a developing Europe or in international juridical structures still dominated by the inviolable rule of state sovereignty – an intangible rule, or one at least supposed such, which is becoming increasingly precarious and problematic nonetheless.²³

As Derrida views, finding the way of sharing life with sojourners within any nation-state means creating a new space for co-habitation or life in fullness on the territory of any country beyond the limited conception of nation-state. It is our churches that bear the divine mission task to create a new space for co-habitation or life in fullness with sojourners, i.e., beings living with diaspora identity such as migrants, refugees and ethnic minorities by constructing and expanding the global network of shelter and hospitality. This is one of the best ways not only to resist xenophobic nationalism but also to overcome it towards peaceful co-habitation in fullness of life.

What is hospitality? According to Émile Benveniste's analysis, *hospes*, Latin origin of hospitality, is composed of *hosti-* (guest, other or counterpart) and *pet* (host or self) [Ukai, 2001:30]. Therefore, the concept of hospitality implicitly contains meanings of guest, other,

²² Numbers 35:9-34; Deuteronomy 19:1-13; Joshua 20:1-9 cf. Exodus 21:12-13.

²³ Jacques Derrida, *Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness* (London: Routledge, 2002), 4.

host and self, simultaneously. What does it mean? When one is visited by a guest seeking shelter and help, one is requested to be a host taking care of the visitor as needy. However, at that moment, one who became the host receiving the guest comes to remember that he/she him/herself originally came into existence as guest in the world essentially. Then the positions of host and guest become reversed in his/her identity. While he/she as host provides the guest with help, shelter and support, he/she serves the visitor as the guest obeying to and serving the host. Living such double and transpositional identities simultaneously implies recovery of his/her own true identity. We find that the term of hosti- finally generated such terms as hostility or hostile in the history of language. It is amazing that hospitality hides a meaning of hostility in its depth. However, this encourages us to realize that only the spirit and acts of unconditional giving of hospitality to guests or other can dramatically transform hostility into reconciliation and peace.

Remember the story of Mary and Martha whom Jesus visited as guest in Luke 10:38-42. While Martha remains in a position of host receiving guest, Mary changed her position from the receiver of guest to guest receiving hospitality of living words from Jesus who is the Lord and the true inviter to the reign of God. Martha failed to keep her own identity as hostess, but Mary's transpositional identity between hostess and guest, or from hostess to guest, and furthermore, the dialectics of host and guest, was protected and blessed by Jesus. Our church is expected by the Lord to be host providing hospitality, like the city of refuge. However, we can bear that task as the divine mission only when we as servants serve Jesus Christ, the Lord, or we identify ourselves as guests receiving the Words of Life from Jesus Christ as true Host. Our church should recover the right of hospitality to guests in our missiology in the time of globalization and mass-migration. Locating himself in beings of migrants suffering from devastating impact of globalization, and accordingly standing outside our demarcated space of self-preservation, Jesus Christ asks our church for unconditional hospitality as challenge to the conception of nation-state and charity. For Jesus Christ is exactly the Lord of unconditional hospitality in the reign of God.

We are facing a storm of devastative globalization along with militarism and nationalism in early 21st century. However, we are called out by the Lord as divine sojourners with a mission of counter-globality of peace and life in fullness towards the world which is eroded by the storm of neo-imperialistic globalization and neo-nationalism.

References

- Avigad, Nahman. *Discovering Jerusalem*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1983.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Broshi, Magen and G. Barkay. "Excavations in the Chapel of St. Vartan in the Holy Sepulchre," in *IEJ* 35 (1985): 108-128.
- Broshi, Magen and Israel Finkelstein. "The Population of Palestine in Iron Age II," in *BASOR* 287 (1992): 47-60.
- Broshi, Magen. "The Expansion of Jerusalem in the Reigns of Hezekiah and Manasseh," in *IEJ* 24 (1974): 21-26.
- "Estimating the Population of Ancient Jerusalem," in *BAR* (June 1978): 10-15.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Eisman, Michael M. "A Tale of Three Cities," in *BA* 41 (1978): 47-60.

- Halpern, Baruch. "Jerusalem and the Lineages in the seventh Century BCE: Kinship and the Rise of Individual Moral Liability," in *Law and Ideology in Monarchic Israel*, eds. Baruch Halpern and Deborah W. Hobson, (JSOT Sup 124). Sheffield: Academic Press, 1991, 11-107.
- Illich, Ivan. "What is Peace: Development as Violence," in *Violence and Peace*, (Japanese) ed. Yoshikazu Sakamoto. Tokyo: Asahi News Paper, 1983, 4-26.
- Lohfink, Norbert. "Poverty in the Laws of the Ancient Near East and of the Bible," in *TS* 52 (1991): 34-50.
- McClellan, T.L. "Towns to Fortress: The Transformation of Urban Life in Judah from 8th to 7th Century B.C.," in *SBL Seminar Papers* (1978), 277-286.
- Oded, Bustenary. *Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, Wiesbaden: L. Reichert, 1979.
- Osumi, Yuichi. *Die Kompositionsgeschichte des Bundesbuchs Exodus 20,22b-23,33*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Otto, Eckart. *Wandel der Rechtsbegründungen in der Gesellschaftsgeschichte des antiken Israel: Eine Rechtsgeschichte des „Bundesbuchs“ Ex XX 22-XXIII 13*, Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1988.
- Schwienhorst-Schönberger, Ludger. *Das Bundesbuch (Ex 20:22-23:33): Studien zu seiner Entstehung Theologie*, (BZAW 188), Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990.
- Tadmor, Hayim. "The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological-Historical Study," in *JCS* 12 (1958): 22-40, 77-100.
- Ukai, Satoshi. "Thinking of Hospitality," in *Minorities Create* (Japanese), ed. Kuniichi Uno and Humiaki Notani, Tokyo: Serika, 2001, 23-36.