

Article

Ham Sok Hon: Bridging Spirituality and Politics

Song-Chong Lee 

Department of Religious Studies, Seoul National University, Seoul 08826, Republic of Korea; songchonglee@snu.ac.kr

Abstract: This paper aims to offer an interpretation of Ham Sok Hon's views on the dynamic relationship between religion and politics. While considerable discussion has already taken place in the Korean academic community across various fields, including philosophy, theology, and political science, many of which propose *ssial* philosophy as the metaphysical foundation of his political thoughts, there still remains a need for a more systematic understanding of their relationship, which I argue is closely linked to his concept of *jeonilhwa gwajeong* (the process of unification/integration). By exploring Ham's unique analysis, particularly in relation to the notion of *ipcheseong* (stereoscopic/multi-dimensional), this paper will underscore their shared roots and objectives across different spheres of life: one pertaining to *salim* (human affairs) seeking the pursuit of fairness and equality, and the other dealing with spirituality, aspiring to grasp the sublime aspects of human existence. Both religion and politics, as these movements are termed, are mutually dependent, with their culmination promising peace and harmony in historical reality. Through highlighting Ham's integrated perspective on religion and politics, I will ultimately suggest a specific discourse—civil religion—as a theoretical framework to effectively unravel Ham's viewpoints.

Keywords: Ham Sok Hon; Korean religion; Korean philosophy; *ssial* philosophy; religion and politics; civil religion

1. Background

The politics of the 21st century is facing unprecedented challenges. The nation-state model, in particular, which has long been geographically stabilized and fixated, regardless of its creative origin based on constituents' shared ideas and identities, currently seems to exhibit a prelude to a dramatic denouement. While it still retains a formidable presence, especially in international relations, where it pursues self-interest and seeks to enhance its power through multi-dimensional competition, the nation-state is internally crumbling. What may seem robust externally are the governmental, institutional frameworks such as the United States, the G8, NATO, IMF, or WTO, and the multinational corporations, as well as other regressive states that Hardt and Negri symbolically label in their creative work, *Empire*, as Monarchy and Oligarchy, respectively (Hardt and Negri 2001). However, the inner unity and collective strength of the nation-state are eroding as historical challenges proliferate on multiple fronts. It contends with formidable counterforces that undermine its very foundations, such as globalization, which continually expands the sphere of human activity, transnational issues like migration and diaspora concerns, the broadening of notions of belonging, and identity politics that transcend national borders, fostering a new era of international political collaboration. The recent manifestations of the nation-state's struggle through various economic battles and military conflicts, including the wars in Ukraine and Israel–Palestine, signify more the desperate actions of a declining power than the exertions of a thriving Leviathan. Among various factors, politics stands out as a crucial factor in reaching resolutions for many. For example, a plethora of politically motivated liberals and progressives across the world have long acted as if they can sacrifice anything to secure individual rights and freedom, regardless of the complexity of their current social challenges, while communitarians and socialists have prioritized their rhetoric



Citation: Lee, Song-Chong. 2024. Ham Sok Hon: Bridging Spirituality and Politics. *Religions* 15: 601. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15050601>

Academic Editor: Enzo Pace

Received: 19 March 2024

Revised: 16 April 2024

Accepted: 8 May 2024

Published: 13 May 2024



Copyright: © 2024 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

on community values and collective ownership, sometimes even risking a slide into forms of fascism.

While their universal visions of the well-being of the people are generally meritorious, their means of achieving it often fall short. In many cases, major problems in politics and the political community are not merely issues of programs, policies, strategies, or institutions but rather stem from the mindset, political consciousness, and even the spirit of the people. This is dramatically illustrated by major historical events of humanity such as the French Revolution, the American Civil Rights Movement, and the Indian Independence Movement, whose driving forces extended beyond the material and institutional realms. Among the myriad forces that shape our minds, attitudes, perspectives, worldviews, and spirit, religion continues to prove itself relevant and powerful in the realm of politics, whether for beneficial or harmful ends. If the Delphic oracle for Athenian democracy and the Hebraic covenant for the Jewish Kingdom serve as ancient examples, the enforcement of Islamic law during the Iranian Revolution, the emergence of identity politics in the partition of India, and Christian nationalism in contemporary America are modern illustrations. Throughout the ages, a wealth of intellectual luminaries have recognized the profound intersection of religion and politics. From the timeless wisdom of Plato and Confucius to the modern insights of Reinhold Niebuhr, Leo Tolstoy, and Rabindranath Tagore, these thinkers have shed light on the complex and inevitable relationship between faith and governance.

2. Introduction

In the context of Korea, Ham Sok Hon's philosophy can be a compelling showcase of this dynamic interplay of religion and politics. Ham, twice nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize, is renowned in the Korean intellectual sphere as one of the most powerful and influential thinkers, celebrated for his dedication and leadership in the nation's independence, labor, and democratization movements, as well as for shaping the overall tone of Korean progressivism. Like Gandhi and Tagore, Ham found in religion a powerful insight that could enrich the understanding of politics and help better prepare for establishing a political community. According to Ham, religion rekindles and amplifies the fundamental core of Benedict Anderson's imagined community, enabling individuals to transcend conventional and natural constraints—such as biology, geography, and even culture—thus allowing them to reconfigure themselves within a new social environment and redefine their relationships with others (Anderson 2006).

Religion is not inherently at odds with politics. When properly defined, guided, and applied, religion can empower politics. Similarly, when politics is correctly understood, it provides religion with a practical framework and language to manifest, communicate, and realize its value. His personal engagement with the history of Korea vividly illustrates this reciprocity. For instance, the Christian narrative of emancipation and unconditional love played a pivotal role in shaping his unique historical perspective on the tragic reality of Korean politics. Drawing from the biblical narrative of the suffering bride and oppressed people, who ultimately rise again to unite with the divine groom, God, and attain freedom, Ham contextualized Korea's colonial fate within a salvation narrative. This perspective influenced his participation in various independence movements, including crucial moments such as the March First Movement, his tenure at Osan School, and his imprisonment by both colonial authorities and military regimes. Inspired by Mahatma Gandhi's Satyagraha Movement and the Hindu philosophy of Atman, Ham tried to translate religious ideals, values, and power into concrete political actions and programs aimed at national salvation and progress. Furthermore, drawing from the teachings of Daoist *wu-wei* and Buddhist non-attachment, he transcended institutional and ideological politics to better navigate the evolving political landscape and embrace diverse voices on national identity. In other words, Ham's historical sufferings, including numerous imprisonments and political persecutions, symbolize his deliberate efforts to foster a reciprocal dynamic between religion and politics.

Therefore, in this paper, I articulate Ham's understanding of the relationship between religion and politics. To offer a comprehensive portrayal of Ham's thought, I have selected materials ranging widely from the 1950s to the late 1980s.¹ This selection reflects my personal belief in the enduring consistency of his fundamental philosophy despite noticeable changes in tone within his theological and ecclesiastical perspectives over time. Through an examination of Ham's respective conceptualizations, my discussion will progress toward a nuanced exploration of their symbiotic interplay. Central to this exploration is Ham's concept of *ipchejeoseong*, which not only highlights the inherent interconnectedness of religion and politics but also underscores the distinctive role of authentic religiosity in bringing efficacy and righteousness to politics. As I examine Ham's definitions of religion and politics drawn from various sources of his writing, I will also elucidate his personal diagnosis of their problems. By emphasizing the necessity and significance of religiosity in all dimensions of human life, including history and politics, I ultimately aim to identify a specific conceptual dimension, in which I think religion can properly and beneficially function in political life, thus emphasizing its potential for playing a constructive role in shaping a so-called "good" political consciousness and community. While numerous connections can be drawn, this paper employs the discourse of civil religion (DCR), often seen as a theoretical framework primarily for American historical narratives, to illuminate Ham's religious reflection on the political community and his transcendent vision for a broader national understanding, including cosmopolitanism. Within this framework, "religious reflection" delineates Ham's scrutiny and efforts to address the moral quality and destiny of the nation, while "transcendence" signifies his movement beyond conventional boundaries toward cosmopolitanism, seeking to realize the metaphysical truths and aspirations of both individuals and his historical community, Korea. This application of civil religion specifically hinges on Ham's prophetic approach to political discourse, echoing the American discourse characterized by common soteriological rhetoric among prominent historical intellectuals and leaders envisioning morally and spiritually ideal communities. Examples include John Winthrop's iconic sermon on "the City upon a Hill", Jonathan Edwards's prophetic warning, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God", Lincoln's reference to the "Almost Chosen People" in his Gettysburg Address, Reagan's invocation of a "proud city built on rocks", and Rev. King's Dream Speech. Rather than categorizing Ham's views on religion and politics as a direct example of the DCR, this paper suggests that the DCR can serve as a useful interpretive framework to elucidate the dimension where his various religious ideas intersect with political thoughts and visions.

3. Review of Literature

To contextualize my discourse, let me briefly outline the current academic discourse on Ham's views regarding the intersection of religion and politics and discuss the potential contribution that my analysis can offer. Research, along with various academic discussions and debates on Ham's thoughts, has continued since the late 1980s. Starting with Kim Kyoungjae's meaningful theological analysis of Ham's *ssial* philosophy and his view of history in 1989, a variety of scholarly subjects have been explored since then, including his biography, literary uniqueness, pacifism, and religious thoughts during the 1990s and the early 2000s (Jung 2006; K. Kim 1989a, 1989b; J. Kim 1993; Samwoong Kim 2000; Sunsoo Kim 2001; Y. Kim 2006; Park 2001; Roh 2000; Yi 2005). Interest in Ham Sok Hon has remained relatively consistent across various academic fields in Korea, including religious studies, theology, philosophy, education, history, and political science. However, the mainstream discussion has yet to significantly advance toward presenting a new direction of discourse with fresh materials. Moreover, English-language research on this subject is exceedingly rare. Recent studies on religion and politics within Ham's thoughts predominantly focus on three central themes: (1) the active involvement of *minjung* (the people) in political affairs; (2) the necessity for mental or spiritual (*jeongsin*) transformation for societal progress, including the role of Christian faith and church; and (3) Ham's understanding of and critical approach to the nation-state and democracy. In all these seemingly

practical discussions of political life, there always lies a discussion of Ham's philosophy of *ssial* and *saengmyeong*, not only as a theoretical foundation of any formulation of political vision but also as a fundamental force to empower people to act collectively. In his 2022 work titled "Hamseokeonui Sahoechamyeorongwa Jonggyogwane Daehan Gochal (A Study of Ham, Seok-heon's Social Participation Theory and Religious View)", Kim Bongkeun sheds light on Ham's intentional efforts to place people at the forefront of political life. Through an analysis of Ham's poems from the 1950s, like *Huinson* (White Hands) and *Dae Seoneon* (Declaration), Kim explores how Ham articulates his dynamic Christian theology and activism, drawing inspiration from both Western and Eastern philosophies (Kim 2022b). Lee Sangrok discusses how, according to Ham, *minjung* can contribute to the fulfillment of the will of God in political and historical reality, emphasizing a soteriological task. Historical salvation is the realization of democracy (S. Lee 2010). Similarly, Kang Sootaek expands on the notion of *ssial* to broaden Ham's perspective on *minjung*, particularly within the realm of civil society (S. Kang 2014). On the relationship or interaction between religion and politics, numerous productive discussions have been undertaken as well. For instance, in his 2020 work, Kang Mungu illuminates the multifaceted nature of politics, suggesting that biblical narratives offer valuable insights into this realm. Ham's unwavering advocacy for political engagement reflects his deep-seated religious calling and his aspiration for a cohesive and inclusive community (M. Kang 2022). Likewise, Kim Bonggeun's recent comparative analyses of Ham with Augustine and Hauerwas aim to underscore Ham's soteriological perspective on political action across history, particularly evident in his views on the interplay between church and state and the role of religion in societal responsibility (Kim 2022a, 2021).

The active and meaningful role of religion in politics is further illuminated by Ham's characterization of it with the notion of *jeongsin gaehyeok* and *jeongsin hyeokmyeong*. Comparing Ham's perspective with that of Kim Suyoung, Choi Ho-young highlights Ham's deliberate efforts to empower the Korean intellectual community, urging them toward creative initiatives for social progress and liberation from injustice and oppression. He emphasizes that the true revolution lies in intellect and spirit, with institutional reforms being mere reflections of this deeper change (Choi 2022; Kim 2021; Han 2014). Han Kyumoo echoes similar sentiments, suggesting that Ham's political ideas are rooted in *uminron* (愚民論), yet lamenting the failure of Korean intellectuals, including educators, to effectively catalyze *minjung* growth (Han 2014). In a similar vein, Lee Dongsoo recognizes the unique role of Ham as a social critic or political commentator who effectively functions to translate highly professional concepts into a public language to deliver political messages and inspire action accordingly (D. Lee 2002). Lee Unsun's examination of Wang Yangmyeong's notion of *simjeungni*, which is paralleled with Ham's *ssial* awakening as vividly portrayed in his experience of *sinobijeu mot ga* (不忍池畔) in Japan, serves as another compelling showcase indirectly illustrating the fundamental role of religious enlightenment in reshaping human mentality and consciousness, thereby influencing our physical and political environment (U. Lee 2013). There are several notable discussions exploring Ham's perspective on democracy. In her works from 2007 and 2013, Moon Jiyoung tries to clarify terms such as *minjok* (nation), *minju* (democracy), and *gukka* (state), which featured frequently and significantly in Ham's political discourse. She underscores his persistent advocacy for empowering *minjung* over career politicians to achieve genuine democracy (Moon 2013). In her 2006 work particularly, Moon illuminates how Ham's discourse of resistance profoundly impacted the democratization movement of the 1970s (Moon 2006).

Although recent discussions have consistently highlighted the profound role of Ham's philosophy of *ssial* in explaining a variety of his pluralistic political expressions and formulating a system of thought, there remains a noticeable lack of serious exploration concerning the fundamental relationship between religion and politics. While many draw upon individual ideas from Ham's public statements to support their arguments, they often neglect to establish a strong logical connection between them. Even when one can deduce theoretical insights from Ham's scattered statements across his various works attempting to

integrate religiosity into political life, synthesizing an overarching idea proves challenging, particularly due to Ham's heavy use of metaphorical language. Therefore, this paper will pay special attention to instances where Ham explicitly discusses politics and will carefully trace where these discussions conceptually and logically lead. For instance, when Ham states, "In times when politics decays, it is religion that saves; and when religion withers, it is politics that rescues", he unequivocally expresses their inseparability.² This paper will explore how this seemingly archaic idea—the unity of religion and politics—can navigate predicted fallout and be effectively repositioned to appeal to modern sensibilities. Central to this exploration is Ham's notion of *ipcheseong*, which he himself depicts through diagrams, emphasizing the reciprocal and organic interaction between religion and politics. This logical framework will be further elucidated by Ham's articulation of the historical development of this relationship. According to him, the primal state of this relationship involves religiosity playing a critical role in inspiring, guiding, and empowering politics, ultimately leading to an expanded political consciousness such as cosmopolitanism. At the end of the analysis, I will propose a conceptual framework of civil religion through which I believe Ham's discourse on religion and politics can be adequately understood and communicated.

4. Defining Religion and Politics

4.1. Religion

In Ham Sok Hon's broader philosophical project, religion may be one of the most challenging subjects to study, not because his thought is overly complex but because it evolves through different stages over time. Without considering the particular historical context of his life, one may easily misunderstand his points. Although his thinking was relatively more open-minded than that of others with similar religious affiliations, even from a young age, due to the profound influence of his significant mentor, Yu Yougmo, renowned for his creative and syncretic philosophy, Ham's mature understanding of religion remained largely aligned with the typical Christian theological thought available at the time. Having experienced numerous dramatic life situations, both personally and communally, including his extensive intellectual journey across multiple places such as Japan and the U.S., as well as his unwavering struggle for justice and democracy, Ham's conception of religion ultimately diverged from conventional notions.³ For Ham, religion epitomizes the pinnacle of human potential. Metaphysically, it embodies the divine impulse or force that compels individuals to introspect and self-criticize. This process not only helps them effectively navigate life's challenges, such as physical survival and sustenance, but also taps into their boundless creativity, constantly reshaping or enriching their identities and destinies. Functionally, and more specifically, sociologically, religion serves as a tool for individuals to awaken to their true identity and actively manifest this awakening, particularly within historical reality. It redirects their ontological concerns inwardly, inspiring and empowering them to align their practical life efforts, such as pursuing ease of living and nurturing an inclusive power dynamic with what Ham terms the natural law or the law of *saengmyeong* (life). For this comprehensive and practical function, Ham's religion is not something that humans choose but something that comes to them as a living force, "the lived religion: religion is fundamentally inherent to life—an attitude or essence. Belief or disbelief does not define religion."⁴

Taking a closer look, for the metaphysical dimension, Ham believes that religion is an expression and instrument that deals with the grand evolutionary process of human existence, in which we, "born as materialistic and carnal entity, come to transcend the material plane to what we commonly term as the spiritual realm."⁵ It helps us seek unity and transparency within the existence between the binary opposites that we often take for granted, such as the mind vs. the body, the inner vs. the outer, the worldly vs. the otherworldly, and the self vs. the other, so that we can move beyond our uncritical inclination to frequently label as "other" that which is not part of ourselves, whether it be things or ideas. The idea of *ssial*, which is Ham's most famous philosophical concept, contains this no-

tion of deep ontological and epistemological integration. Differing from the conventional understanding revolving around institutional and organizational expressions of humans' sacred experiences, which can be represented as a static noun, Ham's notion of religion is more of an adjective and a verb, implying process and movement toward an ultimate direction. As articulated in his myriad uses, specifically in socio-political contexts, the idea of *ssial*, as the revolution of the mind (*jeongsinhyeongmyeong*), represents both the inner awakening and the outer expansion or fulfillment of our existence. Encountering the ultimate divine, reciting sacred syllables, chanting holy names, dancing to celestial melodies, and immersing oneself in the sacred symphony of ancient words are all different expressions of awakening to *ssial*. Ham believes that if one discovers their true self or the essence of their existence, united organically and meaningfully, engaging with other lives and surroundings, it can be called *ssial*-awakening or religion in the more conventional sense. Due to their shared functions, phenomena, and resulting moral outcomes, *ssial* and religion can be interchangeable. It is not that Ham's notion of *ssial* closely aligns with our general understanding of religion, but rather that his creative articulation of religion, which draws on a heightened state of mind in both intelligence and spirituality, bears similarity to the notion of *ssial*. Thus, religion, like *ssial*, serves not as a noun but as an adjective or verb denoting a kinetic journey toward the primordial, ultimate, and ideal state or direction.

Integral to or synonymous with *ssial*, religion inspires and empowers individuals to embrace a boundary-breaking disposition conventionally called transcendence. For Ham, this entails the function of breaking various realms spanning ontology, epistemology, theology, and ethics. Ontologically, the purpose of religion is to rediscover one's divine, "true identity (*chamna*)",⁶ "opening up the spirit (*honeul yeolgo*, openin up hon)"⁷ and essentially stimulating dormant minds to shake off their intellectual and spiritual lethargy. The encounter and communication with God, the epitome of existence, unveil the depths of our being, elevating our significance throughout history and empowering our influence in politics as we come to embrace our inherent humility, reminiscent of the greatness of Jesus on Mount Golgotha rather than of Prometheus on Mount Olympus. Religion, the articulated form of our desires, experiences, and expressions of transcendence, enables us to sense the universally and cosmically shared identity of all lives, referred to as *ssial* in Ham's vocabulary. *ssial*, awakened through religious insights, inspirations, and practices,⁸ according to his idiosyncratic usage, denotes our innate, natural, affective connection to each other, synonymous with Confucian *jen*, Jesus's *agape*, Hindu unity of Brahman-Atman, and Buddhist *metta*.⁹ Through true religion, we become ontologically primordial or, more literally, "pure (*maen*)" —stripping away all the artificial constructs and labels—to harmonize with others, thinking as "the whole within the individual (*jeonchejuui uisigeul gajin gaein*)."¹⁰ Since religion is the sublime pursuit of truth both internally and externally within beings, there is no distinction between individuals, societies, and nations. Just as faith coincides with one's genuine desire to learn, as shown in Jesus' teaching on his intention of parables, religion emerges when one strives to ontologically reconfigure their entire life, aiming to truly understand and appreciate the divine melody played by the various instruments of nature and human affairs.

Epistemologically, religion intends to expand knowledge not only in terms of the quality of its content but also in how we acquire it. True knowledge, particularly about life, cannot be confined within a conceptual box. It is dynamic and organic, constantly reshaped by the vicissitudes of time, place, and human interaction. According to Ham, the awakening-to-*ssial* or religion signifies a cognitive and spiritual boundary-breaking and expansion, not solely due to human intention but also because of the fundamental nature of the divine, which is constantly expanding, connecting, and unifying. Thus, Ham warns against religion, specifically against absolutizing religious claims and communities. He stated, "Believing that all other religions are falsehoods except for one's own reflects a deficiency in one's own faith."¹¹ He even compared our epistemology of religion with various artistic expressions, saying, "Absolute truths need not manifest in a singular form. Just as there is no rule stating that inspiration in art must be expressed in one way, I believe

the same applies to religion.¹² It makes sense because for Ham, religion or religious faith should entail something about plausibility, “*seolmyeongdoeneun sinang*”, which implies or presupposes reasonableness—a larger epistemological outcome than merely within the individual.¹³ Furthermore, since religion, unlike science seeking factuality, is an act of finding and creating meaning, it should remain open to various interpretations and practices that suit evolving social contexts.¹⁴ Although not expressed with sophistication due to the distinct literary genre of his writing, his religious epistemology resonates with numerous intellectual predecessors, including Aristotle and Aquinas, who emphasized the contextual and interactive nature of meaning and knowledge—a perspective echoed by various modern thinkers such as Foucault and Rorty.¹⁵ He even parallels his concept of religion with the Buddhist notion of *upaya* (*bangpyeon*, skillful means), wherein cognitive fluidity and adaptability blend heavenly truth with earthly reality.¹⁶ Ultimately, it serves the fundamental purpose of life: expressing and realizing universal love. Ham thus envisions the integration of all dimensions of life, including politics, economy, culture, and arts, particularly in our thinking, which he calls “the integration of thoughts (*tonghabui sago*)”, beyond “specialization from technological society (*gisulsahoeui teuksuhwa*).”

This epistemological openness naturally leads to challenging the doctrinal and ethical rigidity of religion. Inspired by his intellectual journey, drawing from a diverse array of religious and philosophical thinkers spanning the East and West, including H. G. Wells, Romain Rolland, Tolstoy, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, Tagore, Confucius, Laozi, and many others, and confronted by ceaseless life crises—both personal and communal—Ham gradually, yet resolutely, embraced a universalist stance. He articulated, “No one in this world can claim to possess an entirely perfect truth. Instead, truth is singular; at least, in moral religions—though I’m uncertain about minor cultic religions—there must be a singular truth and the same. Shouldn’t it be otherwise? Thus, the essence of religion is unity.” In the realm of true religion, encapsulated by the transcendent dimension termed *yōnggye* (spiritual realm) by Ham, doctrinal formulations such as the deity of Jesus and the facticity and historicity of the Immaculate Conception of Mary and their debates hold no significance. In essence, everything should harmonize if it embodies truth, just as in mathematical and logical truths. Ham perceived diverse theological experiences, understandings, and interpretations as varied expressions of the Ultimate Truth, encapsulated in his phrase, “Many yet one, one yet many.”¹⁷ He even pondered, “If Laozi or Zhuangzi were to describe the concept known as God in Christianity, wouldn’t they refer to it as the Dao?”¹⁸

For his elaboration of ethics, Ham harbored strong disdain for the traditional religious system, particularly its doctrinal and institutional components, which often became glaringly problematic through political entanglements. This sentiment is vividly portrayed in his contentious essay on the powerful, including religion, that he wrote in *Sasanggye* in 1957 and the ensuing exchange of debate with Catholic priest Yun Hyeongjung, who believed that his criticism was nothing more than a low, obscene disparagement. He vehemently condemned, “Religious institutions erect walls higher than those of prisons atop governmental offices, luring in vulnerable souls with honeyed words. Once inside, these souls are confined day and night, stripped of their outer and inner coverings, rendered unable to leave. Meanwhile, outside, there’s a tempting facade of soul-salvation, all in a glorious display.”¹⁹ Although the establishment of organized religion is inevitable to create a space to respond to our desire to continue our transcendent experiences, its descent into a mere social and political institution seeking and wielding power is unacceptable to Ham. Religion is an act of elevating our mental or spiritual realm into a higher dimension where one can exercise the sublime power to connect and co-thrive with all living beings.

What should not be overlooked in Ham’s articulation of religion, however, is the fact that his seemingly highly pluralistic position did not lead him to abandon his theocentric Christian religious framework. Since *jeonilhwa gwajeong* (Unifying Process) constitutes Ham’s larger philosophical proposition encompassing most of his thoughts, including history, politics, and mass movements for social progress (K. Kim 2010), there should be a focal point or a singular axis from which all constituents of life can find order, a sense of

direction, and a moral goal. Great wisdom traditions from Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, and Daoism are all inspiring in helping humans discover the profound ontological depth manifested in a variety of forms. However, they fall short in translating their potential into a sociological and historical force. While Ham never explicitly pointed it out, given his emphasis in his overall literature, the absence of the soteriological narrative inherent in the Christian faith was a central concern. For effective human progress, singularity or centrality is imperative. Humans, as assumed in most of Ham's literature, are vulnerable to selfishness and power-mongering due to the paradoxical nature of free will. They need a singular focus from which to collectively make sense of the world and find a better relatable plausibility in explaining the origin and destiny of life. Moreover, to imbue this framework with significance, the ultimate singularity needs to be personified or anthropomorphized so that humans can engage with it personally and communally, thereby creating stories and meanings. Even though Ham recognized the possibility of alternatives in other religions, he believed that the soteriological narrative of Christianity is the best not only to reveal the inherent problem of human nature but also to properly respond to the feeling of transcendence in various sectors of life, such as history, society, and politics, particularly with the salvific focus on both personal and communal life through various effective narrative devices such as enslavement, the advent of a messianic aid, exodus, liberation, and the promised land.

4.2. Politics

In Ham's view, religion and politics exhibit homology not in their divergent manifestations in life but in their shared origins. Both stem from life's fundamental movement, which unfolds in two different directions: horizontal and vertical. Politics, as defined by Ham, embodies the horizontal expansion of life, aiming "to level things (*jeong*, 政 or *jeongya*, 正也)", metaphorically put, "not to have bumps and lumps" to achieve and "govern (*chi*, 治) justice", while religion represents the vertical pursuit of spiritual alignment, "aiming to ascend to heaven (*haneullo ollagajaneun undong*)." The former addresses social and moral aspects, while the latter pertains to the spiritual realm. They both represent "the structure of life (*saengmyeongui gujo*)", a concept Ham characterizes specifically as *ipchejeok* (stereoscopic) rather than *pyeongmyeonjeok* (planar).²⁰ What Ham tries to emphasize with *ipcheseong* is the shared goal of religion and politics. Though their functions diverge within different spheres, they ultimately converge in their shared endeavor: the realization of unification/integration. In the realm of this stereoscopic dimension, religion and politics are closely interrelated. For instance, as religion deepens, politics becomes useful and beneficial. Conversely, when politics falters, it reflects a weakening of religion. Both, in their respective spheres, contribute to the integration of life, as defined by Ham as "living like a true human"²¹: politics addresses life matters and related interactions, while religion attends to spiritual concerns. In a sense, they all grapple with the inner enemy: politics wrestles with the tendency to devise schemes "to unload suffering onto others",²² while religion seeks to diminish self-identity to mere biological existence. The inner enemy interferes with their common goal of leveling and deepening to realize the largest possible unity of life. Ham believes that religion and politics are both the movement of *jeongsin* (精神). While *jeongsin* is commonly translated as spirit or mind, contrasting with the physical and material realm, its nuance transcends mere religiosity or spirituality. It encompasses our cognitive capacity and state of consciousness and often extends to the *zeitgeist*. For that reason, Ham frequently calls for *jeongsin undong* (movement of *jeongsin*) and *jeongsin hyeongmyeong* (revolution of *jeongsin*) whenever talking about political matters.

Therefore, the problem of politics, as diagnosed by Ham, needs careful clarification. Although Ham was persistently disapproving and critical of politics, much of his severe criticism and disparagement of politics are not aimed at the goal and activity of politics, but rather against politicians and their entrenched corrupt strategies, programs, policies, and systems. He harshly denounces politicians, labelling them as "sly fox politician", "conniving rat politician", "divisive agitator politician", "manipulative butcher politician", "de-

ceitful schemer politician”, and “fossilized statesmen.”²³ However, he never relinquishes the original purpose of politics, which, in its sublime state, would ultimately intersect with that of religion, aiming to recover the sacred nature of human life. Ham says, “In striving to live in a manner that is spiritually and morally upright, in striving to live as true and authentic individuals, the language of a nation emerges, along with its customs, morals, and institutions. This is referred to as culture. Working consciously and systematically to advance this culture is what constitutes a country and politics.”²⁴ Much like religion, politics is an active life movement, manifesting horizontally to seek truth through non-violent means. While religion aims to reconfigure the relationship with the divine, politics focuses on arranging human relationships for the improvement and distribution of various material and social resources. It is a *jeongsin undong* within the historical and sociological context.

Thus, the enduring political problems that we have been experiencing are caused by our misunderstanding of politics, resulting in an unbridgeable divide with religion. Not only have we, at various points of history, fortified a formidable barrier against the intrusion of religion into politics, but we have also begun to exalt politics with an almost reverential fervor. He asserts, “The false deity of salvation is politics. Throughout human history, it has been the faith in the omnipotence of politics that has guided us.”²⁵ This lofty status of politics derives particularly from its control over power. As Harold Lasswell famously defined politics as being about “who gets what, when, and how”, people believe that politics is primarily concerned with facilitating access to and utilization of power and material resources within our social environment (Lasswell 2011). They perceive this task as distinct from that of religion. What is known as secularization, including the division of labor, professionalism, and bureaucratization, has solidified this false belief. Specific skill sets were mechanistically and unfairly relegated to particular professions, fostering professional communities imbued with a positivist ethos that overlooks spirituality. Consequently, our essential consideration of human emotions and volition has been dehumanized and reduced to mere quantitative and objective facets. Ham suggests that what we currently perceive as politics is, in fact, politics stripped of its essence, leaving only its superficial aspects. Programs, policies, and institutional strategies, essentially, are mere surface elements. True politics resides in the realm of consciousness, mentality, disposition, and attitudes, serving as the authentic aims of political engagement. It involves a conscious effort, utilizing various methods, to construct a new way of thinking and engaging with people to thrive together.

To better grasp Ham’s reasoning on how religion and politics interact, both striving for the common goal of *jeonilhwa gwajeong* (the process of unification and integration), it is important to discuss his concept of the evolving relationship between these two spheres. Ham presents a distinct interpretation of 物有本末 事有終始 知所先后 則近道矣 (*muryubonmal sayujongsi jisoseonhu jeukgeundoui*, 물유본말 사유종시 지소선후 즉근도의) a renowned passage from the Great Learning. It underscores that everything has its origins and outcomes; events have their conclusions and beginnings. Understanding the significance of the end is crucial here. “What comes last was the first”, suggesting that what appears insignificant or humble is actually fundamental and significant.²⁶ This interpretation symbolically shows Ham’s focus on the people/minjung as the driving force shaping and guiding history and politics. It implies that the end marks a new beginning, empowering previously ignored or oppressed individuals to become active and authentic participants. Ham contends that political history has evolved to reflect this dynamic.²⁷ For instance, in ancient hunting and gathering societies characterized by a nomadic lifestyle, simple tools, and limited possessions, individuals with exceptional environmental knowledge, communication skills, and charisma often rose to power. Later, the development of agricultural technology and lifestyle led to the centralization of power and the establishment of city-states and kingdoms, in which a powerful king or monarch dominated politics. As social stratification, along with the expansion of wealth and territories, became stronger and more sophisticated, a primitive exercise of collective political power, particularly by the elite aristocrats, emerged along with the formation of a new system

called feudalism and manorialism. However, the politics of modern and contemporary society, marked by the explosive production of endless new professional fields and knowledge, a new mode of economy, and a new way of controlling systems with elaborated laws, regulations, and policies, is being dominated by technocrats, capitalists, and bureaucrats. Thus, people who were the fundamental root of life and society have long been placated at best, marginalized at the least, or oppressed at their worst. Ham argues that the end of politics marks the onset of a new era, wherein people emerge as the primary architects of their own destiny. The essence of their power lies not in charisma, specialized skills, wealth, or territorial control but rather in their unique experiences of the lowest points in life, particularly what he calls suffering, whether economic, political, or even philosophical. Since politics is something internal, dealing with the character, culture, disposition, consciousness, and values of the people, programs, policies, and institutional efforts are simply instruments to express it. The mode of politics has been, however, misled by focusing excessively on the external. Ham believes that without a revolution in people's consciousness, there can be no good politics. Given that conventional politics and its various agents think and act from their privileged position, accessing and expanding the sources of power, their institutional efforts inevitably fail, as history has repeatedly demonstrated. Ideas such as Reinhold Niebuhr's prophetic warning of an "immoral society", when viewed through Ham's perspective, should be reframed. Instead of solely emphasizing group egoism, which inadvertently accentuates the inherent limitations of collective human consciousness, we should redirect our focus toward our moral or even spiritual negligence resulting from excessive trust in established structures.

Therefore, the final stage of political mode is the *ssial*-driven politics, which is the movement of people's political consciousness, called in various phrases such as the revolution of *jeongsin*, non-violent struggle, and *ddeut*-seeking life (meaning/will-seeking life). Varieties of Ham's humanistic expressions deepen this notion. Politics is "to prescribe medicine, which is to hear the voice of people."²⁸ And "a true politician should resemble a diligent farmer, nurturing and cultivating, rather than a carpenter or blacksmith, shaping and molding through force and coercion."²⁹ "The people are the spirit of the tiger, and the governance of the nation is the tiger's fat. When the nation is in disarray, it is because the spirit of the tiger has perished; when the spirit is lost, it is because the belly is hungry and confined."³⁰ "The true politics is to meet the tiger in nature."³¹ These metaphoric expressions, such as prescribing medicine, cultivating land, and nurturing the soul of the tiger, are all intended to deliver Ham's core philosophical message on awakening the political consciousness of the people.

Examining further, according to Ham, mature politics or the ultimate mode of politics would manifest three major markers: *seuseuroham*, serenactivism (*jeongjeokpyeongan*), and cosmopolitanism. They all demand the spiritual maturity of the people. *Seuseuroham* is the concept that Ham frequently highlights in his writing. It literally means self-doing and self-acting. This concept emerges in his metaphysical discussions when he talks generally about the divine nature of life and history. Inspired by biblical narratives, Ham explains the origin and movement of life by emphasizing the self-initiating act of the logos of God. God descended upon this earth of His own volition, willingly embraced suffering, faced death by His own choice, triumphantly rose again, and thus single-handedly redeemed humankind. What is more important is the paradox. He ascended to glory by embracing humility, attained liberation through enduring suffering, attained sanctity by shouldering sin's consequences, and triumphed over death by embracing mortality.³² In grappling with the numerous political challenges facing the Korean people, Ham draws inspiration from the biblical grand narrative, advocating for a concept he terms *seuseuroham* (Moon 2006). He passionately encourages the people to emerge as the architects of history and politics, citing historical triumphs like the Imjin War, the Donghak Movement, the March First Independence Movement, the April Revolution, and the Gwangju Uprising. Even amidst historical setbacks such as the Rebellion of Myocheong, Ham emphasizes that if the people had joined and taken the lead, it might have turned successful, implying the importance of *seuseuroham*. As mentioned earlier, if the country is the tiger, the people are its soul, and politics is the fat. Without their spiritual and intellectual agility and cleverness, the country-subject to political dynamics—cannot thrive.

The reason why people can thrive *seuseuro* is because they are the most emphatic agents in this highly conflicting political reality, labeled as, according to Ham, *maensaram* (bare person), *nandaero inneun saram* (person true to their innate self), *sunjeonhan saram* (pure-hearted individual), *amugeotdo butyeogajigo itji aneun saram* (person without anything attached), and *ge-unboni chakage doen saram* (person with a fundamentally good nature).³³ We are all “born from the love of our mothers.”³⁴ “Politics does not solely govern the country; instead, life generates skills and institutions. Similarly, it is not philosophers or moralists who guide the people, but rather the people themselves who impart wisdom and empower others. The nation belongs to the *ssial*, and the world belongs to the *ssial*. Nor are the politicians who lead the people, but the ignorant people who lead the country”³⁵. Ham states, “We (the People) established the ancient king Dangun, selected Dongmyeong, birthed Hyeokgeose and Wangeon, and raised Sayuksin and Saengyuksin.”³⁶

The ultimate mode of politics should also present serenactivism. Inspired by H. G. Wells’s *The Open Conspiracy: Blue Prints for a World Revolution*, Ham highlights the awakened or enlightened intellect and dynamic activism of the people. Echoing Wells’s idea of people voluntarily and openly engaging in a world revolution, he emphasizes *deureonae noeun moban* (open conspiracy). This concept underscores the notion that individuals, realizing themselves as the original and pure source of power and change, must openly act to influence and shape society and politics. Unlike the clandestine plotting characteristic of communist revolutions, serenactivism should operate transparently, with the objectives of the people’s movement and its strategic efforts being open to all stakeholders because they are confidently reasonable and justifiable. To engage in serenactivism in politics, individuals must break free from the habit of everydayism, characterized as “a revolutionary way of life, (*hyeongmyeongui saenghwalhwa*) (Choi 2022).” Everydayism here refers to a secularized state, a life of inertia, a passive existence, a life taken for granted, a life without action, and a life without spontaneous creativity; in other words, a life that the masses should avoid at all costs.³⁷ In a state where people speak freely, express their opinions without restraint, and engage in activities of freedom as they please, peace naturally arises. This state is serenactivism.³⁸

Ham believes that people’s *seuseuroham* and serenactivism would lead to a non-violent cosmopolitan mode of politics. When *ssial*-awakened people think, act, and collaborate with each other, boundary politics would eventually collapse. As mentioned earlier in the discussion of the evolutionary process of the modes of politics in history, the only alternative that has not been seriously and systematically tried is the option where people themselves take the lead in politics, not dictators, ideological cadres, or unenlightened mobs. The political community that people or *minjung* themselves would ultimately establish must be cosmopolitan. Ham himself said, “I have become a cosmopolitan because of Wells.” Many countries, particularly those emerging after World War II, have uncritically embraced the nation-state model as the default for their systems. Regrettably, the essence of the nation-state has transformed into a system primarily serving corporate leviathans, driven solely by profit and power. All constituents, especially those lacking status, privilege, and power, are relegated to serving morally and spiritually insensitive political machinery. People have been indoctrinated to believe that it is impossible and unjust to transcend the nation-state paradigm, as statism has become a revered theology, worshipped and sacrificed for. Ham vehemently criticizes this confinement of people’s political consciousness within the boundaries of a nation, state, or territory.

While acknowledging the significance of *minjok* (nation) in shaping the narrative for the Korean people, Ham emphasizes its universality beyond mere national confines. According to Ham, *minjung* (people) are the true owners and authors of their narrative, not subservient to any particular nation. Ham advocates for embracing diverse narratives of *minjok*, particularly those highlighting shared suffering, to foster a deeper global unity. Consequently, Ham rejects the concept of “nationalist democracy (*minjok minjujuui*)” as inherently unjust.³⁹ Politics, for Ham, serves as a means to level the playing field and promote fairness and equality horizontally. It is an earthly tool reflecting our innate desire and duty to connect with others. Ham views the current nation-state system as a transitional phase in our institutional devel-

opment, urging it to serve as a stepping stone rather than a final destination. Reflecting on human history's successes and failures—from ancient empires to the United Nations—Ham emphasizes the need for continual evolution and adaptation. At the heart of this vision lies humanity's awakened belief in its unification, metaphysically described as the unification of *ira* (一我) and *daea* (大我), driven by a shared moral imperative derived from humanity's shared historical experiences. Ham poetically echoes Rev. King's universal moral imperative on justice, stating, "I cannot become a sinner without implicating the entire human race in sin, nor can I disregard the whole while striving to do good." Like Pierre Teilhard de Chardin predicts in his *Phenomenon of Man* (Teilhard de Chardin 2008), Ham envisions an Omega Point where human endeavors across various domains converge toward a common direction, culminating in the highest ideal—the thriving of all humanity.⁴⁰ People or *minjung* can and must work on envisioning and establishing living together peacefully and harmoniously. The nation of Korea finds itself in a favorable position within this lofty cosmopolitan endeavor, not due to its grandeur, but because it has been an insignificant pawn, like many others, lost in history's dim alleyways—a mere echo of failure.⁴¹

5. Ham's Imagination of Korean Civil Religion

As articulated in the stereoscopic relationship with politics, Ham's vision of religion in the practical dimension is very exquisite to conceptualize. Like religion, in its larger goal, politics serves the overarching goal of fostering harmonious coexistence among people to the fullest extent possible. Although not directly intertwined, the vigor of religiosity within a society, true spirituality, is believed to contribute to the *jeonilhwa gwajeong* (the grand unifying process), of which politics is a significant part. Religion deeply resonates with individuals, inspiring them to mold their political consciousness, culture, and institutions toward a moral character, which entails constant self-reflection and self-criticism to better accommodate all who cross our path, be they residents or sojourners seeking solace. To elucidate Ham's nuanced perspective on the complex relationship between religion and politics, I think that it could be beneficial to employ a conceptual framework anchored in the notion of civil religion.

Civil religion, a term initially coined by Rousseau and later revisited and popularized by Bellah and his adherents, embodies a symbolic system of beliefs and rituals centered on the sacred identity of the political community. Drawing from Durkheimian principles, civil religion conceptualizes the political community and society themselves as objects of veneration, mirroring the reverence typically reserved for religious deities. Much like traditional religions, civil religion encompasses divine cosmogony, covenantal agreements, and redemptive narratives featuring elements such as transgression, liberation, and prophetic figures or events. For instance, Bellah contends that the American nation occupies a sanctified position in the collective psyche of its citizens. This sacredness derives from pivotal historical junctures, symbolic acts, and soteriological narratives. Events like the American Revolution, the Civil War, and the Civil Rights Movement are revered as hallowed moments in the nation's narrative. Similarly, symbols such as the American flag, the Statue of Liberty, and the Great Seal of the United States, along with rituals like the national anthem, presidential inaugurations, Memorial Day, and Thanksgiving, are imbued with sacred significance. However, the true essence of this civil religion lies not merely in the reverence for these symbols and rituals but in the collective consciousness that transcends individual perspectives and fosters a sense of unity and cohesion among the populace. It is in this communal consciousness, where individuals perceive themselves as part of a greater whole that the quintessence of civil religion truly resides. With civil religion, in principle, individuals have the ability to think as a whole. America holds greater value than the individual. This fundamentally means individuals internalize the nation's identity, enabling them to make profound decisions and act when demanded, even at the cost of personal interests or life.

Similarly, Ham emphasizes the self as a whole. The whole does not refer to Korea as an institutional entity but a personified collective self. Speaking on religion and politics at the Gyeongseong-Jungang-Gidok-Cheongnyeon-Hoegwan auditorium in 1948, during the nation's nascent quest for institutional identity, Ham delivered a striking phrase to the au-

dience: “*Joseoneuro malhage hara* (Let Joseon speak for itself).”⁴² He suggests a metaspheric viewpoint, in which the broader contour and landscape of the whole’s varying voices fade out individual noises. He visualizes the following:

“When you climb up a high mountain and look down at the valleys, each valley has its own streams and villages, forming towns and cities. They compete with each other, boasting of their prosperity and reveling in their pleasures. Houses become like crab shells, where people crawl in and out, resembling ants bustling about, with no tears or laughter, no praises or curses to be heard. Instead, invisible lights and inaudible whispers reveal the true essence of life.”

The community, according to Ham, is not merely an institutional apparatus but an organic entity with a personality formed from the accumulated memories of specific historical experiences. Similar to the concept of civil religion, where the American people perceive the nation of America as a sacred entity with feelings and agency in history, Ham suggests that Korean people should likewise be able to sense the personality of Korea that both exults and mourns amidst the ever-shifting tides of fate. To be precise, in Ham’s case, this personality has been shaped by the history of *han*, which presents the endless struggle of the Korean people to reclaim human dignity from myriads of collective challenges and adversities, including numerous foreign invasions, turbulent internal strife, and brutal civil war, oppressive colonial occupation, bitter ideological divide, and countless other trials. Ham discovers within these tragic memories a collective sacred narrative: the tale of peace-loving Korean people persistently striving to overcome oppression and injustice, courageously journeying toward a promised land. To achieve this, Koreans must uncover or awaken to the *ddeut* (meaning/will) of their history, which Ham believes involves feeling and becoming unified (*hanaga doejaneeun or irujaneeun geot*). This task of unity transcends language, policies, heroes, hierarchy, and even the will of the people.⁴³ Ham states, “*Joseoniran jeonche geujasini malhayeoyahanda. Jonjaehaneun geoseun joseoniraneun saengmyeongiji musangyegeupdo aniyo, jabongado aniyo jeongdangina gyohoeodo anida* (Joseon must speak for itself. Its existence is not merely a social class, nor is it capitalist, nor is it a political party or a church).” It is, again, Joseon, the nation, that undergoes self-awakening, self-reflection, and self-redemption rather than individuals thinking independently.⁴⁴ He envisions a civilization’s maturity in which individuals are highly and ceaselessly attuned to the voice of the whole, interpreting its message to guide and uplift the moral growth of the community.

According to Ham’s perspective on religion and politics, the term “whole” does not denote an institutional entity like government, nation, or ideology. Instead, it embodies a sense of community rooted in individual consciousness—an awakening to true self-understanding and impelled by a moral imperative: the quest for harmonious coexistence with fellow travelers in life. Thus, for Ham, religion—what I term civil religion—signifies an individual’s capacity to transcend biological and social constraints in pursuit of discovering and embodying life’s profound meaning. Being civil represents the milieu where this transcendence is translated, applied, and tested socially. Both aspects should not be taken literally, as Ham evolved beyond the literal dimensions of his circumstances over time. For instance, he formally distanced himself from institutional Christianity in the *Declaration*, aligning his actions with his faith’s truths. Furthermore, he transitioned from nationalism to cosmopolitanism, embracing a broader citizenship concept. Ham envisages a driving force to unite people and move society forward—a civically mature consciousness. This consciousness fosters a higher, more sacred conception of the political community, where established systems undergo profound moral reflection and imaginative evolution.

6. Conclusions

According to Ham, religion and politics are reciprocal. “There is no religion without politics, and there is no politics without religion.”⁴⁵ They serve distinct purposes on varying horizons, yet they converge on the common aspiration of *hanaro mandeuljaneun isang* (the ideal of unification). The unification in the political horizon aims for fairness and equality in practical affairs and governance, while religious unification seeks to harmonize the cosmos with

life and reconcile time with eternity.⁴⁶ They are various expressions of life. “Life is physical strength, instinctual power, survival competition, belief, and love. When it comes to the act of living, it’s called economics; in the realm of interactions, it’s called politics. When spoken of in the context of complex spiritual relationships, it’s called religion.”⁴⁷ Given their reciprocal nature, when one falters, the other follows suit. True religiosity or spirituality serves as the backbone of societal well-being. For Ham, genuine religiosity is the moment of *ssial*-awakening: the realization that life entails creative growth, peaceful connections, and thriving alongside others. Politics serves as an instrument to actualize this life vision in historical reality, continuously influenced by the *ssial* notion, which is evolved spirituality, and perpetually challenging and expanding our potential for coexistence with all forms of life.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

Notes

- 1 Two distinct compilations of primary sources by Ham Sok Hon have been released in Korea: (1) *Ham Sok Hon Jeonjip* (함석헌전집), (Seoul: Hangilsa, 1987), and (2) *Ham Sok Hon Jeojakjip* (함석헌저작집), (Seoul: Hangilsa, 2009). Additionally, there exists another online collection titled Babosae Ham Sok Hon (바보새 함석헌: 동서를 아우른 생명평화사상, hereafter referred to as Babosae), available at <http://ssialsori.net/>, which was curated and maintained by Chung Hyeonpil, former executive director of the Ham Sok Hon Memorial Foundation (함석헌기념사업회). All references to Ham Sok Hon in this paper are sourced from *The Collected Works of Ham Sok Hon* of Babosae (hereafter referred to as *Collection*). Notably, each in-text citation from the *Collection* is presented in this paper with specific volume titles and page numbers.
- 2 “Sae Sidaeu Jeonmang 새시대의 전망 (Prospect for a New Era)”, *Collection*, p. 81.
- 3 Since the 1950s, Ham has been recognized for embracing a more pluralistic stance on matters of faith. For further discussion, refer to Bongkeun Kim (2022b, p. 20).
- 4 “Ssiarui Uimiwa Minjungundong 씨알의 의미와 민중운동 (The Meaning of Ssial and Minjung Movement)”, *Collection*, p. 305.
- 5 “Ssauneun Pyeonghwajuuija 싸우는 평화주의자 (A Fighting Pacifist)”, *Collection*, p. 55.
- 6 “Minjok Tongirui Gusang 민족 통일의 구상 (Envisioning National Unification)”, *Collection*, pp. 142–143.
- 7 “Minjok Tongirui Gusang”, p. 60. Moon interprets Ham’s notion of hon as the spiritual whole or the collective consciousness of the people. See (Moon 2006).
- 8 Ham said that *ssial* is of the religious. See “Kkeunnaji Aneun Gangyeon 끝나지 않은 강연 (Unended Lecture)”, *Collection*, pp. 406–410.
- 9 “Ssiarui Uimiwa Minjungundong” pp. 135–136.
- 10 “Ssiarui Uimiwa Minjungundong”, pp. 310–311.
- 11 “Nae jonggyo bakkeneun dareun jonggyoneun da geojinmarirago haneun geoseun geu saramui mideum jachega bujokan pyosirago saenggakaeyo 내 종교 밖에는 다른 종교는 다 거짓말이라고 하는 것은 그 사람의 믿음 자체가 부족한 표시라고 생각해요.” See “Minjok Tongirui Gusang 민족 통일의 구상 (Envisioning National Unification)”, *Collection*, p. 196.
- 12 “Yesure isseoseo yesulgaeye eotteon inseupireiseyeoni japyeotda hadeorado geugeosi hangajiro pyohyeondoeeya handaneun beobeun eopjiyo. jonggyodo machangajirago saenggakaeyo 예술에 있어서 예술가에게 어떤 인스피레이션(靈感)이 잡혔다 하더라도 그것이 한가지로 표현되어야 한다는 법은 없지요. 종교도 마찬가지로 생각해요.” See “Minjok Tongirui Gusang”, p. 197.
- 13 “Ssiarui Uimiwa Minjungundong”, p. 22.
- 14 “Ssauneun Pyeonghwajuuija 싸우는 평화주의자 (A Fighting Pacifist)”, p. 55.
- 15 See Aristotle’s attention to situational context in *Rhetoric*, Aquinas’s exegetical approach in *Summa Theologica*, Foucault’s interactive process of the production of knowledge in *The Archeology of Knowledge*, and Rorty’s pragmatic approach to understanding truth and meaning in *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*.
- 16 “Ssauneun Pyeonghwajuuija”, p. 372.
- 17 “Ssauneun Pyeonghwajuuija”, p. 74.
- 18 See note 17 above.
- 19 “Saenggakaneun Baekseongiraya Sanda 생각하는 백성이라야 산다 (Only Those Who Think Must Live)”, *Collection*, p. 109.
- 20 “Sae Sidaeu Jeonmang”, p. 82.

- 21 “Kkumteulgeorineun Baekseongiraya Sanda 꿈틀거리는 백성이라야 산다 (Those Who Are Resilient Must Live)”, *Collection*, p. 318.
- 22 Ham said, “*gonaneun dareun saramhantero tteobonaaja, geuge jeongchiimnida* (Politics is attempting to pass on suffering to others).” “Kkeunnaji Aneun Gangyeon 끝나지 않은 강연 1 (Unended Lecture)”, *Collection*, p. 38.
- 23 “Saenggakaneun Baekseongiraya Sanda”, “여우처럼 생글거리는 정치가 (p. 64)” “밀구멍, 똥구멍으로 숨쉬는 정치가 (390)” “선동 정치가 (p. 427)”; 꿈틀거리는 백성, “떡잎을 자르고 오리 배를 찢는 정치가 (p. 75)” “교활한 정치가 (p. 215)” “늑아빠진 정치가 (p. 439)”.
- 24 “Kkumteulgeorineun Baekseongiraya Sanda” *Collection*, p. 318.
- 25 “Sae Sidaeu Jeonmang”, p. 78.
- 26 “Sauneun Pyeonghwajuuija”, *Collection*, pp. 352–254.
- 27 For Ham’s thought of the evolution or progression of history, see “Kkumteulgeorineun Baekseongiraya Sanda” *Collection*, 8. Additionally, see (Kim 2022a).
- 28 “Kkumteulgeorineun Baekseongiraya Sanda”, p. 16.
- 29 See note 28 above.
- 30 “Kkumteulgeorineun Baekseongiraya Sanda”, p. 17.
- 31 “Kkumteulgeorineun Baekseongiraya Sanda”, p. 18.
- 32 “Teuseuro bon segyeyeoksa 뜻으로 본 세계역사 (World History Viewed Through Meaning)”, *Collection*, 56.
- 33 “Ssauneun Pyeonghwajuuija”, p. 5.
- 34 “Ssauneun Pyeonghwajuuija”, p. 231.
- 35 “Kkumteulgeorineun Baekseongiraya Sanda”, pp. 5–7.
- 36 “Kkumteulgeorineun Baekseongiraya Sanda”, p. 248.
- 37 “Kkumteulgeorineun Baekseongiraya Sanda”, p. 21.
- 38 “Kkumteulgeorineun Baekseongiraya Sanda”, p. 284.
- 39 “Ssauneun Pyeonghwajuuija”, p. 106.
- 40 “Ssauneun Pyeonghwajuuija”, p. 38.
- 41 “Kkumteulgeorineun Baekseongiraya Sanda”, pp. 123–126.
- 42 “Mueosi Cham Munjeinga 무엇이 참 문제인가 (What is the True Problem?)”, *Collection*, p. 120.
- 43 “Mueosi Cham Munjeinga?” p. 125.
- 44 “Mueosi Cham Munjeinga?” pp. 123–124.
- 45 “Kkeunnaji Aneun Gangyeon 1”, p. 10.
- 46 “Saesidaeu Jeonmang”, p. 84.
- 47 See note 46.

Primary Sources

- Ham, Sok Hon. The Collected Works of Ham Sok Hon (Hereafter Referred to as *Collection*). *Babosae*. Available online: <http://ssialsori.net/> (accessed on 2 May 2024).
- Kkeunnaji Aneun Gangyeon 끝나지 않은 강연 (Unended Lecture). *Collection*.
- Kkumteulgeorineun Baekseongiraya Sanda 꿈틀거리는 백성이라야 산다 (Those Who Are Resilient Must Live). *Collection*.
- Minjoktongirui Gusang 민족통일의 구상 (Envisioning a National Reunification). *Collection*.
- Mueosi Cham Munjeinga 무엇이 참 문제인가? (What is the True Problem?). *Collection*.
- Saenggakaneun Baekseongiraya Sanda 생각하는 백성이라야 산다 (Only Those Who Think Must Live). *Collection*.
- Saesidaeu Jeonmang 새시대의 전망 (Prospect for a New Era). *Collection*.
- Ssauneun Pyeonghwajuuija 싸우는 평화주의자 (A Fighting Pacifist). *Collection*.
- Ssiarui Uimiwa Minjungundong 씨알의 의미와 민중운동 (The Meaning of Ssial and Minjung Movement). *Collection*.
- Teuseuro bon segyeyeoksa 뜻으로 본 세계역사 (World History Viewed Through Meaning). *Collection*.

Secondary Sources

- Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Choi, Ho-young 최호영. 2022. Gimsueonggwa Hamseokeon-Hamseokeonui Saengmyeong Sasanggwa Gimsueongui Hyeongmyeongnon 김수영과 함석헌(2): 함석헌의 생명 사상과 김수영의 혁명론 (Kim Su-Young and Ham Seok-heon(2): Ham Seok-heon’s Idea of Ssial and Kim Su-young’s People Theory). *Talgyeonggyeinmunhak 탈경계인문학 (Trans-Humanities)* 15: 107–39. [CrossRef]
- Han, Kyumoo 한규무. 2014. Teuseuro Bon Hangugyeoksawa 1960nyeondae Hamseokeonui Minjuhwaundong 『뜻으로 본 한국역사』와 1960년대 함석헌의 민주화운동 [A Study on Korean History from a Spiritual Perspective and the Pro-Democracy Movement of HamSeok-heon in the 1960s]. *Hangugeosahaksahakbo 韓國史學史學報 The Korean Journal of History of Historiography* 29: 259–84.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2001. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Jung, Ji-seok 정지석. 2006. Hamseokeonui Minjungsasangwa Minjungsinhak 함석헌의 민중사상과 민중신학 [Minjung Theology and Ham Sokhon's Idea of Minjung]. *Sinhaksasang 신학사상 Theological Thought* 134: 101–33.
- Kang, Mungu 강문구. 2022. Hamseokeon jeongchisasangwa jonggyosasangui yunghwae gwanhan yeongu 함석헌 정치사상과 종교사상의 융화에 관한 연구 [A Study on the Integration of Ham Sek Hon's Political and Religious Ideas]. *Immunnongchong 인문논총* 59: 329–51. [CrossRef]
- Kang, Sootaek 강수택. 2014. Ssialgwa Siminsahoe: Hamseokeonui Sahoesasange Daehan Simin Sahoeronjeong Jeopgeun 씨알과 시민사회: 함석헌의 사회사상에 대한 시민 사회론적 접근 [People and Civil Society: A Sociological Approach to Ham Seok-Heon's Social Thoughts]. *Sahoewa Iron 사회와 이론 Society and Theory* 24: 245–86.
- Kim, Bongkeun 김봉근. 2021. Gyohoeui Gonggongseonge Daehan Hamseokeongwa Haueowoseuui Ipjang Bigyo Yeongu Jongmallonjeong Jeongchisinhagui Gwanjeomeseo 교회의 공공성에 대한 함석헌과 하우어워스의 입장 비교 연구—종말론적 정치신학의 관점에서 [A Comparative Study on the Positions of Seok-Hun Ham and Hauerwas on the Publicity of the Church—Focusing on Eschatological Politics Theology]. *Sinhaksasang 신학사상 Theological Thought* 195: 185–225.
- Kim, Bongkeun 김봉근. 2022a. Gukgawa Gyohoeui Gwangyee Gwanhan Jeongchisinhakjeok Gochal-Auguseutinuseuwa Hamseokeoneul Jungsimeuro 국가와 교회의 관계에 관한 정치신학적 고찰—아우구스티누스와 함석헌을 중심으로 [A political and theological study on the relationship between the state and the church: Focusing on Augustine and Ham Seok-heon]. *Hangukjojiksinhangnonchong 한국조직신학논총 Korean Journal of Systematic Theology* 68: 59–119.
- Kim, Bongkeun 김봉근. 2022b. Hamseokeonui Sahoecamyeongongwa Jonggyogwane Daehan Gochal Si: Huinsongwa Daeseoneoneul Jungsimeuro 함석헌의 사회참여론과 종교관에 대한 고찰: 시[詩] 「흰 손」과 「대선언」을 중심으로 [A Study of Ham, Seok-heon's Social Participation Theory and Religious View: Focusing on Poems “White Hands” and “The Grand Declaration”]. *Sinhakgwa hangmun 신학과 학문 Theology and Other Disciplines* 24: 10–33.
- Kim, Jin 김진. 1993. Hamseokeonui Jonggyo Sasang Yeongu [함석헌의 종교사상 연구]. *기독교사상* 37: 207–24.
- Kim, Kyoungjae 김경재. 1989a. Hamsekhenyui Ssialsasang Yen-gu 함석헌의 씨알사상 연구 [A Study of Ham Sok Hon's Ssial Thoughts]. *신학연구 Theological Research* 30: 77–104.
- Kim, Kyoungjae 김경재. 1989b. Hamseokeon Sagwanui Gidokgyojeok Yoso [함석헌 사관의 기독교적 요소]. *Sinhaksasang 신학사상 Theological Thought* 66: 526–40.
- Kim, Kyoungjae 김경재. 2010. Hamseokeonui Jonggyo Ihae 함석헌의 종교이해 [Ham Seok-Heon's Understanding on Religion]. *Jonggyomunhwabipyong 宗教 문화비평 The Critical Review of Religion and Culture* 17: 17–45.
- Kim, Samwoong 김삼웅. 2000. Hamseokeoneun Nuguinga 함석헌은 누구인가 [Who is Ham Sok Hon?]. *Wolgan Inmulgwa sasang 월간사상 Monthly Philosophy*, 73–81.
- Kim, Sunsoo 김성수. 2001. 함석헌 평전: 신의 도시와 세속 도시 사이에서 [Biography of Ham Sok Hon: Between the City of God and the City of Man]. Seoul: Samin.
- Kim, Yongjun 김용준. 2006. *Naega Bon Hamseokeon* [내가 본 함석헌 [Ham Sok Hon that I saw]]. Seoul: Akanet.
- Lasswell, Harold D. 2011. *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How*. Whitefish: Literary Licensing, LLC.
- Lee, Dongsoo 이동수. 2002. Hamseokeongwa jeongchipyongnon 함석헌과 정치평론 [Ham Sok Hon and His Political Criticism]. *Hanguk-jeongchihakoebon 한국정치학회보 Korean Political Science Review* 35: 87–105.
- Lee, Sangrok 이상록. 2010. Hamseokeonui minjung insikgwa minjujuuiron 함석헌의 민중 인식과 민주주의론 [Ham Seok-hon's perspective on the people and the discourse of democracy]. *Sahagyeongu 사학연구 Review of Korean History* 97: 147–90.
- Lee, Unsun 이은선. 2013. Wangyangmyeongui Yangjiwa Hamseokeonui Ssial, Saengmulgwonjeongchihang Sidaereul Wihan Jonjaesageon Wangyangmyeongui '良知'와 함석헌의 '씨알', 생물권정치학 시대를 위한 존재사건 [Yang-ming's liang-chih [良知] and Ham Seok-heon's ssial [씨알], political meanings of Being-advents of them for our era of biosphere's politics]. *Yangmyeonghak 양명학 Yang-Ming Studies* 35: 5–48.
- Moon, Jiyoung 문지영. 2006. 1970nyeondae Minjuhwaundong Inyeom Yeongu Hamseokeonui Jeohangdamnoneul Jungsimeuro 1970년대 민주화운동 이념 연구: 함석헌의 저항담론을 중심으로 [A Study of the Ideology of the Democratization Movement in 1970s]. *Sahoegwahangnonjip 사회과학논집* 37: 1–27.
- Moon, Jiyoung 문지영. 2013. Hamseokeonui Jeongchisasang Jeontonggwa Geundae, Dongyanggwa Seoyangui Ibunbeopjeong Daeribeul Neomeoseo 함석헌의 정치사상: 전통과 근대, 동양과 서양의 이분법적 대립을 넘어서 [Political Thought of Ham Seok-Heon: Towards the National, Popular and Democratic State in South Korea]. *Minjujuutwa Ingwon 민주주의와 인권 Journal of Democracy and Human Rights* 13: 49–80.
- Park, Jaeson 박재순. 2001. Hamseokeonui Munhwagwan 함석헌의 문화관 [Cultural Thoughts of Ham Sok Hon]. *Hangungmunhwasin-hakoe 한국문화신학회 The Society for Korean Cultural* 5: 289–310.
- Roh, Myeongsik 노명식. 2000. 함석헌 Ham Seokheon. *Hanguksasimjanggwa 한국사시민강좌 Public Lecture on Korean History* 26: 111–46.
- Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre. 2008. *The Phenomenon of Man*. New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics.
- Yi, Chiseok 이치석. 2005. *Ssial Hamseokeon Pyeongjeon* 씨알 함석헌 평전 [Ssial: Biography of Ham Sok Hon]. Seoul: Sidaeu Chang.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.