5 Ecumenical liberation theology

How I experienced its arrival in Germany and Europe after 1968

Ulrich Duchrow

It is a special pleasure to contribute to the project on contextual liberation theology (initiated in Lund). When I was working with the Lutheran World Federation in the early 1970s trying to take the first steps in doing contextual theology, it was Per Frostin from Lund who was one of my dearest colleagues in the international arena. As this type of theology was not easy to introduce, solidarity among committedly searching theologians was key to surviving the necessary struggles. Against this background it may also be interesting for contemporary readers to encounter biographical elements in the following reflections. First, I shall look at some roots of liberation theology, then at its beginnings in the 1960s, and finally at its development in relation to the changing contexts from the 1980s up to the present day.

Some roots of liberation theology

The roots of liberation theology, without any doubt, lie in the Hebrew Bible – read contextually. The Exodus story in Exodus 3ff. is the archetype of liberation theology. But there are other religions and philosophies of that classical period showing analogous liberating approaches, as we shall see. This ancient impulse came from the whole of Eurasia – from China to Greece. The Apostle Paul also passed the Jewish liberating heritage on to Europe. However, this heritage entered into a crisis, when Christianity was imperialised starting with the Roman Emperor Constantine in 312 CE and intensified by Theodosius from 380 CE. Yet periodically, persons and movements emerged to recover the liberating message of the Bible in their own contexts: Peter Waldo and Francis of Assisi in the beginnings of early capitalism, John Wycliffe and Jan Hus during its further developments, and at its climax, the Reformers Martin Luther, Thomas Müntzer, and some of the Anabaptists, to mention just a few. This heritage is also found in the British context, for example, Gerrard Winstanley in the 17th century. All of them drew their liberating message from a rediscovery of the Bible.¹ In the Catholic sphere, one should especially mention Bartolomé de las Casas, who was fighting slavery and the colonial abuse of indigenous peoples in

the 16th century, and documents of Vatican II, especially *Gaudium et Spes*, which was the inspiration for the important Medellín Conference in 1968.

The more direct predecessors of liberation theology emerged in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The first was Christoph Blumhardt (1842–1919), who developed his radical pietism into a radical social and political engagement. He discovered Jesus' message and practice of the kingdom of God, which is one of unlimited love, or more precisely love-powered healing and liberating all life and making the vulnerable human being the centre of concern. Against the massive critique of the conservative wing of the church, he joined the workers' movement and its political arm, the Social Democratic Party, which he served as a member of the Württemberg Parliament for six years. In this way, he became the father of religious socialism and influenced its representatives, the young Karl Barth, Hermann Kutter, Leonard Ragaz, and also Paul Tillich. Religious socialism was also one of the currents at the beginning of the ecumenical movement in the 20th century. Think of the World Conference on Church and Society in Stockholm in 1925 under the leadership of Swedish Archbishop Nathan Söderblom.²

Another source of liberation theology is the struggle against National Socialism (NS) and the "German Christians" in Germany, following Nazi ideology. It is the Barmen Theological Declaration of 1934, phrased by Karl Barth and adopted by a synod of the emerging Confessing Church, which articulated the fundamental break with traditional Constantinian imperial Christianity. Thesis II states:

As Jesus Christ is God's assurance of the forgiveness of all our sins, so, in the same way and with the same seriousness he is also God's mighty claim upon our whole life. Through him befalls us a joyful deliverance from the godless fetters of this world for a free, grateful service to his creatures.

We reject the false doctrine, as though there were areas of our life in which we would not belong to Jesus Christ, but to other lords – areas in which we would not need justification and sanctification through him.³

This means that the neo-Lutheran "doctrine" of two separate kingdoms,⁴ allowing economics and politics to move according to their "own autonomous laws" (*Eigengesetzlichkeit*, Max Weber), was overcome. This also happened later in Norway, where Bishop Eivind Berggrav upheld the original Luther against the neo-Lutheran assimilation to the Nazi occupiers of Norway.⁵

Probably the most influential theologian for later liberation theologies has been Dietrich Bonhoeffer. As early as 1927, in his doctoral dissertation, *Communio Sanctorum*,⁶ he states that the future of the church will not be bourgeois and that the proletariat has to be the starting point for new ventures of becoming the church. This was confirmed by his experience

of the Harlem black church he became part of while studying in Union Theological Seminary in the middle of New York near the Riverside Church in 1930–1931. But the most important aspect of his contribution to liberation theology is his rediscovery of the Reformation category of *status confessionis*. What does it mean? The answer may be found in his article “Die Kirche vor der Judenfrage” (“The Church Facing the Jewish Issue”) of April 1933, just three months after Hitler took power.⁷ Here he says that when the state is *too much* or *too little* of what it should be, namely too little devoted to order and justice or claiming too much power beyond its realm, then the church is *in statu confessionis*, i.e. has to intervene directly as a matter of faith. In his moment of history, this meant resisting the disenfranchisement of the Jews and not firing pastors of Jewish background as required by the Aryan section of the law (*Arierparagraph*). He put it into a parable ascribed to Luther: “If the coach driver is drunk, the church must not only bandage the wounds but put a spoke in the wheel”.⁸ Bonhoeffer did this by joining the resistance, paying with his life. This sealed his authenticity and credibility for good.

The origin of contemporary liberation theology in the 1960s and 1970s

The context for the recent rise of liberation theology was characterised by a complex mixture of international, national, and socio-economic factors. Starting from 1953 in Persia when democratic Prime Minister Mohammad Mosaddegh was deposed by the US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the British intelligence service, the United States – in conjunction with former European colonial powers – organised military coups in conjunction with local elites in many countries of the Global South in order to make, or to keep, these countries dependent on Western economic and geopolitical interests and structures (e.g. Brazil in 1964, Congo in 1965, Indonesia in 1965–1967, Chile in 1973, and Argentina in 1975). On the basis of the colonial past, this created what was identified and analysed academically in the form of the so-called *dependency theory*,⁹ showing the splits within and between societies into centre and periphery. So, liberation theology grew up in a context of a specific period of Western domination linked to the violence of elite military rule.

The youth uprisings in the 1960s were also coupled with resistance to US imperialism, which had taken over from France the dirty war against the people of Vietnam. Numerous demonstrations grew bigger and bigger in Germany; these were coupled with demonstrations against the Shah of Iran whom the United States had installed as military dictator after ousting Mosaddegh. However, the protest against the domination of the United States was linked to growing resistance against all forms of domination – against patriarchal power, capitalist exploitation, teachers’ and professors’ non-participatory methods of education, church hierarchy, etc.

Ecumenically, there were two decisive events in the early 1960s which prepared for new ecclesial and theological developments in this context:

- 1 The Second Vatican Council, 1962–1965.
- 2 The World Council of Churches' 3rd Assembly in New Delhi in 1961, which integrated into the WCC the Orthodox Churches and the International Missionary Council, including many churches from Asia and Africa.

The Second Vatican Council

The importance of *Vatican II* cannot be overestimated in terms of liberating effects in the Roman Catholic Church, particularly from below in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It was not by accident that, given the dependency context, the first big continental ecclesial expression of liberation theology happened within the Latin American Bishops' Conference in Medellín in 1968. This development did not originate in the hierarchies, but came from below, namely the ecclesial base communities (CEBs) at the local level. They were the most important subjects of change. Here, lay people, together with the priests, engaged in reading the Bible in the context of their daily problems and acted according to the famous triad *see, judge, act*. This formula had been developed by the Catholic Worker Movement and taken up in Pope John XXIII's Encyclical Letter *Mater et Magistra* of 1961. It recommends the triad as a way of reading and responding to the signs of the times:

There are three stages which should normally be followed in the reduction of social principles into practice. First, one reviews the concrete situation; secondly, one forms a judgment on it in the light of these same principles; thirdly, one decides what in the circumstances can and should be done to implement these principles. These are the three stages that are usually expressed in the three terms: look, judge, act.¹⁰

Implementing these principles meant, in the practice of the communities, reading the Bible contextually, in a way linked to clear analysis and common action.

The effects of the World Council of Churches' 3rd Assembly

The larger presence of Churches from Asia, Africa, and Latin America in the WCC after the New Delhi Assembly (1961) led to a watershed event of the ecumenical movement in 1966: the Geneva Conference of the Commission on "Church and Society" in 1966 entitled "Christians in the Technical and Social Revolutions of our Time".¹¹ Here we locate the decisive shift of the WCC in social ethics. Between the founding Assembly in 1948

and 1966, the formula of social ethics was “responsible society”. It was influenced by Reinhold Niebuhr’s “Christian Realism”. In short, this concept presupposed a capitalist democratic society of the Western type. Here, the task of the church and Christians was seen as intervention *within the system* to strive for more social justice. Geneva 1966 looked at reality from the perspective of the Global South, at that time called the “Third World” or “under-developed countries”. This meant that the *system as such* had to be questioned and transformed because it was discovered that through the structural dependency the under-development of the poor was the result of the development of the rich (a classic book, unfolding this, was later written by Walter Rodney under the title *How Europe Undeveloped Africa*).¹² Therefore, the whole concept of “development” was questioned because it was seen as embedded in the dominating system. The new theological formula became “God’s preferential option for the poor”, and in 1968 this was also crucial for the message of Medellín. Another term used at the 1966 Geneva conference was “theology of revolution”. In any case, here we have the perspectives of what later was termed “liberation theology” with its systemic critique replacing the Western reformist approach within the WCC. This was also the starting point of tensions between some Western churches, including German ones, and the more radical approach of the WCC.

The term “liberation theology” did not exist as a technical term before 1968. It was coined by the Brazilian Presbyterian theologian Rubem Alves in his doctoral dissertation called “Toward a Theology of Liberation”, presented at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1968.¹³ I personally was privileged to participate in a conference in Cartigny, Geneva, in 1969 where Rubem Alves and Gustavo Gutiérrez presented their thinking about this concept for the first time – three years before Gutiérrez’s seminal book was published under this title in 1972 (where, in the introduction, he mentions the conference in Cartigny as the first occasion on which he presented his thinking on this matter). This conference was organised by Charles Elliot, secretary of SODEPAX, the acronym for “Society, Development, and Peace”, a new unit created cooperatively by the Vatican and the WCC. The conference tried to design a new concept of development – overcoming the Western technocratic understanding using a liberating and participatory one. This shows how near to each other the Roman Catholic and Protestant/Orthodox communities had come at that time.

This also became clear in the 4th WCC Assembly in Uppsala, Sweden, in 1968, the birth year of the term “theology of liberation” and at the same time the climax of the worldwide student movement. At this Assembly, the Vatican representative, the Jesuit Cardinal Roberto Tucci, in his keynote address, even reflected on the possibility of membership of the Roman Catholic Church in a new form of WCC. Moreover, he offered full cooperation in the field of justice and peace – one of the fruits of this being SODEPAX.

South African apartheid creates a new *status confessionis*

With the Uppsala Assembly, another crisis moved into focus: the apartheid system in Southern Africa. It was characterised by a mixture of economic injustice, racist arrogance, geopolitical interests in the form of the West against the East, military violence and theological legitimisation – the capitalist world system in a nutshell. The Uppsala Assembly laid the foundation for the Program to Combat Racism (PCR). Here, the former General Secretary of the WCC, Willem Visser 't Hooft, pronounced the famous sentence:

It must become clear that church members who deny in fact their responsibility for the needy in any part of the world are just as much guilty of heresy as those who deny this or that article of the faith.¹⁴

This confessing, unambiguous approach was not really taken up in the PCR, but we used it in situations that arose as I shall explain shortly. The PCR's spearhead action was instead the "special fund", which provided racially discriminated groups with financial humanitarian aid in order to strengthen them in their resistance. This included the liberation movements the African National Congress (ANC) in South Africa and the South-West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO). This programme created an uproar in the West, including in German churches and particularly among Evangelicals. In my synod in the Evangelical Church of Baden, some people were calling Nelson Mandela a terrorist, even though the UN had recognised the liberation movements as legitimate South African and Namibian governments in exile. Before we continue to discuss the further development of this issue, let me turn to the Lutheran World Federation (LWF) during that time.

In 1970, the Lutheran World Federation was supposed to have its 5th Assembly in Porto Alegre, Brazil. As the local Lutheran Church wanted to invite the ruling dictator to the assembly, the Officers of the Federation decided to move the Assembly to Evian, in France. I was invited because I had been called to lead an integrated Department of Studies to be developed out of seven separate units after the Assembly. The events of 1968 had motivated the Executive Committee to also call a Youth Pre-Conference and have its delegates participate in the Assembly. After the Assembly, the Executive Committee elected the members of the Studies Commission which had the task of directing the work of the forthcoming Department of Studies. One of the members was Anna Marie Aagaard from Denmark, another the young Manas Buthelezi from South Africa, part of the Black Consciousness Movement, both very committed to the liberation perspective. He was later called by Dr. Beyers Naudé to join the staff of the Christian Institute, which was under attack by the apartheid government, including being banned for some time.

The Assembly passed very progressive resolutions. It was really a fascinating time of awakening and initiative. We were able to design an exciting

studies programme for the next seven years leading up to the next assembly. Our method was a decentralised participatory action-reflection research project (later called a contextual theology approach) involving the grassroots of the churches. We had project areas like Justice and Peace, concentrating on the root causes of economic injustice and human rights; Encounter of the Churches with Marxism in Different Cultural Contexts; Christian and Theological Education; and, for the first time in the ecumenical movement, a “women’s desk” working with groups around the world on “Women as Innovative Groups”. Gretchen Dutschke from Aarhus was part of this project. All of these project areas were related to an overarching ecclesiology study process under the title “The Identity of the Church and its Service to the Whole Human Being”.¹⁵ We did not call it liberation theology at that time, but it was in fact exactly this because of the method by which we worked. We had an exciting team of mostly young people.

It was in solidarity with our oppressed brothers and sisters in Southern Africa and in the framework of the ecclesiology study that one of the key resolutions of the forthcoming 6th Assembly in 1977 was developed: the resolution declaring apartheid a confessional issue constituting a *status confessionis*, as Bonhoeffer did in the case of disenfranchisement of the Jews.¹⁶ It explains what a *status confessionis* means:

Under normal circumstances Christians may have different opinions in political questions. However, political and social systems may become so perverted and oppressive that it is consistent with the confession to reject them and to work for changes. We especially appeal to our white member Churches in southern Africa to recognize that the situation in southern Africa constitutes a *status confessionis*. This means that, on the basis of faith and in order to manifest the unity of the Church, Churches would publicly and unequivocally reject the existing apartheid system.¹⁷

As the white Lutheran Churches in southern Africa did not comply with this resolution, their membership in the LWF was suspended by the next Assembly in 1984. In 1982, the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (WARC) made a decision along the same lines, declaring apartheid a heresy.¹⁸ Thus, both organisations implemented what Visser ’t Hooft had already suggested in Uppsala in 1968 in the tradition of Dietrich Bonhoeffer. But how are insights like these to be implemented?

In traditional understanding, theology used to be linked to great names of (usually male) academic individuals. Liberation theology by definition is linked to real life in communities and therefore necessarily connected with praxis.¹⁹ This is why we, in our ecclesiology study, also looked into the *social forms of being church*. In the messianic scriptures of the New Testament, we discern four or five social forms of the church. There are *local communities* like the one in Corinth (cf. I Corinthians 1:2). There are

groups on the road between the local communities (migrant preachers), and later there are special resident groups like intentional communities including monastic communities. Both I call *discipleship groups*. All these keep in contact within the *worldwide oikumene* as a third social form. Fourth, there are *regional entities*, e.g. Paul addresses the local communities in the Roman province of Galatia. But according to Matthew 25:31–40, there are *people who receive Christ*, the Human One, although they do not know this. They are feeding the hungry, giving water to the thirsty, visiting the sick and the prisoners and receiving foreigners, in short, *the most needy ones*, in whom Christ is hidden. These people and groups do not call themselves Christians, but they receive Christ in the needy. So this is the hidden form of the church which is at the same time the yardstick, the criterion for all the other forms of the church to test whether they really are the Church of Christ. This is also the reason why the church, in reading the signs of the times, must build alliances with these groups and movements who are responding to the needs of the people.

It is with this understanding that I used my connections in Germany to experiment along these lines. In 1967, I had been appointed to the Presidium (governing board) of the German Kirchentag. In 1969, we had the Kirchentag in Stuttgart, where students of the 1968 generation created a very revolutionary atmosphere, organising sit-ins, passing resolutions, commandeering microphones, etc. The governing board, not acquainted with these methods in the universities at that time, was becoming very concerned. I, coming from the context of the university, responded to this fear by suggesting we reshape the Kirchentag to become a “Kirchentag from below”, because the key request was for participation. So we developed rules to make participation possible, which led to huge success of the Kirchentag in the 1970s and 1980s. One crucial element of this was developing a Shalom Forum together with the peace groups. When in 1979–1983 the military buildup with medium-range missiles created a heated debate, the Shalom Forum served as the infrastructure for the first big demonstration in Europe, with 90,000 people at the Kirchentag in Hamburg in 1981. The Reformed Church in Germany even proposed regarding the question of weapons of mass destruction as a *status confessionis*. It was in this context that I proposed – according to Bonhoeffer’s understanding – that we speak of *processus confessionis* leading to the corporate ecclesial decision of *status confessionis*, which turned out to be helpful in the discussions that started in the 1980s.

Global economy: a confessional issue for the churches in the context of neoliberalism

The context of the 1980s was the introduction of *neoliberalism* into national and international politics. The first experiment had started in Chile after the CIA induced the military coup of General Augusto Pinochet, ousting the

democratically elected president, Salvador Allende, and inviting the “Chicago Boy” Milton Friedman to implement that ideology. Margaret Thatcher followed in Great Britain in 1980, Ronald Reagan in the United States, Helmut Kohl in Germany, and others a little later. These names merely symbolise the process; in reality, this counter-revolution was well prepared on a broad level by think tanks, particularly by the Mont Pèlerin Society under the leadership of the economist Friedrich August Hayek, and also of Milton Friedman.²⁰

In response to the negative developments linked to the emerging neo-liberal hegemony, in my region we started to gather the grassroots groups working for justice, peace, and creation in the years from 1981–1983, because we felt that the problems in all these fields were linked to the neo-liberal global economy. At Pentecost 1983 we founded the “Ecumenical Network for Justice, Peace and the Preservation of Creation (to translate the German literally) in Baden”. It happened that in the same period I was elected delegate of my church in Baden for the upcoming 6th Assembly of the WCC in Vancouver, Canada, in July–August 1983. By chance, I was asked there to give the introduction to one of the eight issue groups on the issue of justice. In addition, my friend Heino Falcke, Dean of Erfurt in East Germany, was asked to present the introductory paper for the issue group on peace and creation. So we agreed to put the focus on the triad of justice, peace, and creation from both sides. As we also knew the plenary speakers, we were able to convince them to concur in this perspective. We had also worked along these lines in our respective East and West German delegations. As the Commission on Faith and Order also presented what it called the Eucharistic Vision to the Assembly, linking ecclesiology with socio-economic, political, and ecological responsibility, we were able to achieve the Assembly decision calling the churches to embark on a “Conciliar Process of Mutual Commitment (Covenant) for Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation” (JPIC). This was a real *kairos*.²¹

After the Assembly, the WCC called me to work with the different departments and the representatives of the Vatican to design a framework for the process, which we did from 1985 until June 1986, before Preman Niles took over the newly created staff position. This meant that all the previous and present work of the WCC departments could flow into this overarching process. All social forms of the church could also be engaged. The ecumenical grassroots networks were already multiplying, congregations developed special programmes including international partnerships, national churches organised ecumenical assemblies, and continental convocations were even called. The Conference of European Churches (CEC) under the leadership of Jean Fischer was able to convince the European Roman Catholic Bishops’ Conference to organise the common Ecumenical Assembly in Basel, Switzerland, in 1989. In 1990, the world convocation on JPIC in Seoul, South Korea, tried to bring together the insights of the different continents, issuing ten affirmations.²²

Many things could be said about the effects of this process in the different regions. I will mention only one. The people in the former German Democratic Republic claim that it was this process that helped them in their “peaceful revolution”, as they call it. The Dresden Ecumenical Assembly in particular had a great public effect by raising questions of human rights. But also the non-violent methods in which – thanks to the process – they were trained helped to avoid a violent clash with the state. In West Germany, we used each Kirchentag not only for the issue of peace, but also for the anti-apartheid struggle and JPIC. It was in 1985 at the Kirchentag in Düsseldorf that we persuaded the physicist and philosopher Carl Friedrich von Weizsäcker to get involved in the JPIC process, which led to a lot of publicity.

Content-wise, the *global economy* started to become the focus in the process because it became clearer and clearer that injustice, war and armament, and ecological destruction were systemically caused by the imperial capitalist economy becoming more and more brutal in its neo-liberal form. The debt crisis of the 1980s emerged as the clear indicator. So in connection with the 50th anniversary of the Barmen Theological Declaration in 1984, the Latin American liberation theologian and economist Franz Hinkelammert and I – independently from each other – raised the question of whether, after the cases of Nazism and apartheid, the global economy created a new *status confessionis* for the churches. At that time in Europe, only the Dutch economist Harry de Lange agreed to some extent. But when I visited Brazil in 1985, theologians such as Julio de Santa Ana (the former director of the WCC Commission of the Churches’ Participation in Development), Leonardo Boff, and others were very open to this analysis and theological conclusion. In the JPIC process, we also discovered that the confessional approach, traditionally familiar to the Reformation Churches, was not the only way to express the unequivocal YES and NO in critical contexts. In other church traditions, other terms express the same seriousness, such as covenant, discipleship, conciliar decisions, eucharistic fellowship, catholicity, etc. This diversification also helped in this case of ecumenical consensus building on global economy. The results of these deliberations, with reference to Luther and Bonhoeffer, I summarised in my book *Global Economy: A Confessional Issue for the Churches?*²³

The ecclesiology question had also led us to intensify our *biblical scholarship*. As early as in the 1960s, new ways of reading the Bible contextually had emerged, e.g. materialistic Bible reading, or Jewish forms of biblical interpretation, called the “house of learning”, and especially socio-historic Bible research. This approach made it abundantly clear that the central starting point and perspective of the Bible is the Exodus, the liberation from the exploitation of human labour as expressed in the preamble of the Decalogue and – if you look at the tenth commandment, “you shall not covet” – the prohibition against accumulating greedily. Jesus, in the context of the Roman Empire, declares the key theological issue the decision between God

and mammon, which in his presence becomes good news to the poor (Luke 4:16ff.) because it is they who have been impoverished by the mechanisms of debt, taxes, etc. in the service of accumulating treasures.²⁴ Paul sees the empire as totally governed by injustice and idolatry (Romans 1:18) and the liberation through God's spirit as leading to solidarity (*agape*) by overcoming the divisions between the ethnic groups, master and slave, patriarch and woman (Galatians 3:28). So liberation towards justice and peace is the fundamental perspective of the Bible, not just the name of a particular theology. A theology which is not liberating towards these ends is no biblical theology. Gerhard Liedke and I tried to nurture the grassroots process in this perspective by publishing the book *Shalom: Biblical Perspectives on Creation, Justice and Peace*.²⁵

This liberation perspective has to be interpreted in each situation, reading the signs of the times – therefore, it is a key example of contextual theology. The ecumenical movement has been working with this principle since 1983, the Vancouver Assembly, i.e. for more than 35 years now. The issue at stake had been identified as the imperial global economy – the life and death issue (the theme of the Vancouver Assembly was *Jesus Christ, the Life of the World*). The results of the subsequent ecumenical processes are astonishing. Let me quickly summarise this period. It was the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (WARC), after Milan Opocenský from Prague had taken office as General Secretary in 1989, which started a process of regional consultations in the 1990s to probe this issue. In 1995, the African Consultation called for a *status confessionis* in the case of global economic injustice. This was taken up in 1997 by the WARC General Council in Debrecen, Hungary, which called for a seven-year “committed process of progressive recognition, education and confession (*processus confessionis*) within all WARC member churches at all levels regarding economic injustice and ecological destruction”.²⁶ In 1998, Milan Opocenský and the responsible staff person, Park Seong-Won from Korea, invited the WCC Assembly in Harare, Zimbabwe, to join this process, which was decided positively. The economist Rogate Mshana from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Tanzania was called to lead this process. In 2000, Karen Bloomquist became director of the LWF Study Department and also joined the emerging team. After further regional consultative processes, the three following Assemblies of the three organisations came to clear conclusions. The LWF started with the Declaration on Globalization in Winnipeg, Canada, in 2003, stating:

Through our diverse experiences, we are facing the same negative consequences of neoliberal economic policies (i.e., the Washington Consensus) that are leading to increased hardship, suffering and injustice in our communities. As a communion, we must engage the false ideology of neoliberal economic globalization by confronting, converting and changing this reality and its effects. This false ideology is grounded on

the assumption that the market, built on private property, unrestrained competition and the centrality of contracts, is the absolute law governing human life, society and the natural environment. This is idolatry and leads to the systematic exclusion of those who own no property, the destruction of cultural diversity, the dismantling of fragile democracies and the destruction of the earth.²⁷

WARC followed with the General Council in Accra, Ghana, in 2004 issuing the Accra Confession, which was intentionally drafted in the form of the Barmen Declaration. Here are just a few sentences:

11. . . . the current world (dis)order is rooted in an extremely complex and immoral economic system defended by empire. In using the term “empire” we mean the coming together of economic, cultural, political and military power that constitutes a system of domination led by powerful nations to protect and defend their own interests . . .

18. We believe that God is sovereign over all creation. “The earth is the Lord’s and the fullness thereof” (Ps 24:1).

19. Therefore, we reject the current world economic order imposed by global neoliberal capitalism . . . which def[ies] God’s covenant by excluding the poor, the vulnerable and the whole of creation from the fullness of life. We reject any claim of economic, political and military empire which subverts God’s sovereignty over life and acts contrary to God’s just rule.²⁸

After these clear decisions of the LWF and WARC, some Western churches, including the German ones, did everything to hinder the WCC from joining in with such clarity. So the next Assembly in 2006 in Porto Alegre, Brazil, only issued a call for AGAPE, an acronym for “Alternative Globalization Addressing People and Earth”.²⁹ But the WCC continued the work in different programmes and adopted several documents in the following Assembly in Busan, South Korea, in October–November 2013. Let me first mention the second WCC Declaration on Mission “Together Towards Life”:

31. Jesus has told us “You cannot serve God and mammon” (Matt. 6:24, KJV). The policy of unlimited growth through the domination of the global free market is an ideology that claims to be without alternative, demanding an endless flow of sacrifices from the poor and from nature. “It makes the false promise that it can save the world through creation of wealth and prosperity, claiming sovereignty over life and demanding total allegiance, which amounts to idolatry”. This is a global system of mammon that protects the unlimited growth of wealth of only the rich and powerful through endless exploitation. This tower of greed is threatening the whole household of God. The reign of God is in direct opposition to the empire of mammon.

88: the Spirit rejects the idea that Jesus' good news for all can be consumed under capitalist terms, and the Spirit calls us to conversion and transformation at a personal level, which leads us to the proclamation of the fullness of life for all.³⁰

This declaration also warns not to fall into the trap of the pseudo-charismatic "prosperity Gospel" looking for growth like capitalism.

There is also a conference document, called "The São Paulo Statement: International Financial Transformation for the Economy of Life", which led to a programme under the title New International Financial and Economic Architecture (NIFEA), sponsored by the WCC, WARC, LWF and Council for World Mission (CWM), also accepted in Busan. It says:

There is thus a requirement for an active radicalizing of our theological discourse that will no longer allow too much power being placed into capitalist ideologies that have resulted in an inability to think beyond existing financial and economic structures . . .

We reject an economy of over-consumption and greed, recognizing how neoliberal capitalism conditions us psychologically to desire more and more, and affirm instead Christian and Buddhist concepts of an economy of sufficiency that promotes restraint (Luke 12:13–21), highlighting, for example, the Sabbath economy of rest for people and creation, and the Jubilee economy of redistribution of wealth . . .

We seek to overcome capitalism, its nature and its logic and to establish a system of global solidarity. We search for alternatives, for just, caring, participatory and sustainable economies such as a solidarity economy and gift economy.³¹

These four organisations continue the process of NIFEA for an Economy in the Service of Life up to this day, preparing a significant input for the 11th WCC Assembly, to be held in Karlsruhe, Germany, in 2022.³²

It was a special gift that two weeks after the Busan Assembly Pope Francis published his Apostolic Exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium* (*The Joy of the Gospel*). It is in many ways the climax of 30 years of ecumenical work and struggle on the issue of global imperial capitalism, fundamental for the life or death of humanity and the earth. He plainly states:

53. Just as the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" sets a clear limit in order to safeguard the value of human life, today we also have to say "thou shalt not" to an economy of exclusion and inequality. Such an economy kills . . .

Therefore,

No to an economy of exclusion [53–54] . . .

No to the new idolatry of money [55–56] . . .

No to a financial system which rules rather than serves [57–58] . . .
 No to the inequality which spawns violence [59–60].³³

I regard it as a unique and historic event for the church that all historical churches have within 30 years come to an agreement to reject the imperial capitalism that is threatening human life on earth. Why is it threatening all human and even animal life on earth?

Death-dealing capitalism as climax of a money-driven civilisation: what are the alternatives?

It is the essence of capitalism that capital must grow. Therefore, it creates limitless *compulsory economic growth*. Limitless growth on a planet with limits is impossible. This is why capitalism is not sustainable. This can best be understood against the background of the whole history of money. It starts in the 8th century BCE in the whole of Eurasia from Greece to China. I and others have written extensively about this, for example in a book I co-authored with Franz Hinkelammert: *Transcending Greedy Money: Interreligious Solidarity for Just Relations*.³⁴ The thesis is that money, besides being a useful instrument for exchange and credit, develops a tendency to make money out of money, coupled with greed to accumulate without limit. This has to do with the insecurity that emerges when people do their economic work no longer in communities, but as individuals in a market.³⁵ In Jesus' time, the time of the Roman Empire, this accumulation of money ended in treasure building, which Jesus called mammon – creating the decisive theological choice between accumulation of money and the God of justice.

Starting in the 11th century in Upper Italy, money was transformed into capital in the sense that profit had to be immediately reinvested to create more accumulation of money, first in the form of *commercial and usury capital*. So, more and more, the economy became a money-accumulating machine penetrating all spheres of life including religion. Luther rejected this throughout his life. In modern times, capital conquered the sphere of production, creating *industrial capitalism*. Here, the ecological question comes into play because the issue is not only the exploitation of workers and splitting of societies – the material throughput creates the exhaustion and pollution of the earth. In the present stage of *financial capitalism*, the compulsory economic growth is even enhanced by financial speculation. This means that we are not just living in a new phase of money-driven civilisation, but in the final phase. It has become not only death-producing, but suicidal. For example, concerning the climate catastrophe, Richard Heinberg speaks of the time of the “Great Burning” and concludes: “Climate change is contributing to a mass extinction of species, extreme weather, and rising sea levels – which, taken together, could undermine the viability of civilization itself”.³⁶ Some scholars even talk about the *self-burning of humanity*.³⁷ These are facts in spite of a certain president's narcissistic ignorance. To avoid this catastrophe, humanity in the medium

and long term is bound to develop a trans-capitalist, life-enabling, and life-enhancing culture and economy.

Of course, there is the question of what alternatives would look like. This has to be demonstrated against the framework of what can be called the *three pillars of capitalism*: 1) money, b) property, and c) labour. Here are just some basic aspects:

The key feature of a *new monetary order* is that money must turn from a commodity for accumulation into a public good, democratically managed.³⁸ It has to be an instrument for exchange and credit (without interest), not an end in itself.

A *new property order* will be built on the commons, on the world as a gift to be used for life, not as a privatised commodity.³⁹ This starts with land, water, air, and seeds, but also includes common cultural goods produced by collectives such as the internet. Consequently, all basic goods and services – including, for example, transport, education, and health – which satisfy people's basic needs must be public. This does not mean that they all should be transformed into state property. Public property must and can be organised as near to the people concerned as possible. Indeed, there are many legal forms through which this can be done.⁴⁰ The struggles against privatisation, together with the struggles against capital-serving imperial structures, are the main allies of liberation theology and churches, besides initiatives building up such new orders from below.

The *new labour order* has to start with full participation in decision-making and move towards ownership of the means of production by the workers, e.g. in the form of cooperatives. One key element is the reduction of working hours. In the recent past all productivity gains have been siphoned off into capital accumulation. This has to be changed in order to justly distribute the remaining work in the digital era – and distribute it in a family-friendly way. Here faith communities and the labour movement must build alliances.⁴¹

The role of liberation theologies for transformation

The necessary change does not only concern structures. It was probably the mistake of parts of the movements after 1968 to isolate the structural issues, to ideologise them, and even mirror the dominating system by using violence, as did the RAF (Red Army Faction; Rote Armee Fraktion) in Germany, for example – thus giving the reactionary forces a pretext to push back and start a counter-revolution. The original impulse of 1968 was holistic, including the question of improving human relations in all aspects, because the whole of capitalist civilisation is penetrated by calculating, egocentric thinking and spirituality. It is here that specifically *liberation theologies* come into play. In our book *Transcending Greedy Money – Interreligious Solidarity for Just Relations*,⁴² mentioned earlier, Franz Hinkelammert and I have shown that all world religions and philosophies in the first phase of the money-driven

civilisation (called the *Axial Age*) reacted critically to these developments. Thus not only the Hebrew Bible, the messianic scriptures of the New Testament, and the Qur'an – i.e. the Abrahamic religions – but also the Buddha in India, the Greek Socratic philosophy, and Daoism and Confucianism in China each in their particular cultural language resist the tendency to accumulate money with all its social and psychological consequences.

So my interpretation of *liberation theology* is that in our times, in all religions and wisdom traditions, movements have emerged in view of the present crisis.⁴³ They tie their own critique and actions to the power of resistance within their original sources, which protest against the negative consequences of the then-emerging money-driven civilisation.⁴⁴ They do so to counteract the assimilation of their own religious communities to the imperial capitalist economy and the imperial way of life linked to it.

Religion has power over people. This is why the powers-that-be are interested in religion, and aim to co-opt it for their own purposes. The *South African Kairos Document* of 1985 developed categories to analyse the assimilation of churches to apartheid which are still relevant today: state theology, church theology, and prophetic theology.⁴⁵

- *State theology* actively adapts itself to the dominating political and economic power. This is why we also call it *capital theology*. In Christendom, the great transformation into state theology happened under Emperor Constantine in 312 CE. The transformation of Protestantism into a protagonist of capital theology for the first time occurred with Puritanism.
- *Church theology* looks for reconciliation and harmony without establishing justice as a basis for sustainable reconciliation. At that time, churches criticised apartheid with words without raising the systemic question. Their main interest was that people were nice to each other.
- *Prophetic theology* is the theology faithful to the original sources and, therefore, critical of the systems and powerful actors, and promoting justice and peace. This theology also aims at building solidarity alliances with people of other faiths and all humanist forces, and can also be called liberation theology.

Thus, liberation theology always has to go through the critique of religion, deconstructing state/capital and church theologies, before it can unfold its prophetic life-enhancing mission.

Today, prophetic and liberation theologies are emerging not only in all world religions, but also in the *indigenous cultures* of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In Korea, the indigenous worldview is called *Sangsaeng*; in Africa, *Ubuntu*; in Latin America, “good life” (e.g. *sumak kawsay* in Quechua). They are characterised by the search for a new culture of life overcoming the Western civilisation that counts success only in terms of money (Gross National Product). Here, life for all in harmony with

nature replaces maximum profit for the few, as a way of thinking and the objective of the economy.

Certainly, you find dissidents of modernity turning against the trends of the dominant civilisation across the centuries. In terms of our theme, it is interesting to see that it is in the 1960s when the rethinking started, not only in the *Christian Oikumene* but in wider alternative movements including those within faith communities, and those processes of rethinking are linked to the rediscovery of the original sources of the world religions critical of the emerging first phase of the money-oriented civilisation. Thus, liberation theology can be interreligious today. Alliance-building between faith communities and social movements is the key to building up countervailing force from below. As Antonio Gramsci has argued, this work from below is linked to the support of what he calls “organic intellectuals”, i.e. people of the social and natural sciences, theology, environmental humanities, etc., committed to the popular struggles.⁴⁶

In Germany, churches and theology are not living up to these enormous challenges. They mainly preach an individualised, i.e. capitalist, Gospel. The worldwide ecumenical consensus looking for alternatives to imperial capitalism has not been communicated to the congregations, and so did not create a critical discussion and practice throughout the church. There is *one exception*: the church is quite clearly positioning herself against the frightening right-wing extremist developments in our society, especially the hate speech and actions being directed towards refugees. But the church tends to be more committed at the humanitarian level. It is not challenging the root causes of the situation. As mentioned previously in relation to the Jewish question, Bonhoeffer correctly said: “If the coach driver is drunk, the church must not only bandage the wounds but put a spoke in the wheel”. Here the wheel is imperial capitalism creating the crises driving people from their homes to Europe. This is why Kairos Europa is developing a network of congregations called “Interreligious Solidarity against the Root Causes of Forced Migration” (“Interreligiöse Solidarität gegen Fluchtursachen”).⁴⁷

Here is the project in summarised form. The congregations publicly challenge the talk about a “refugee crisis” because this term is turning victims into perpetrators creating a crisis. Instead they ask, with the refugees, “who is creating the crises” driving you and other people away from home? With this question they invite refugees to help the congregation to learn about the causes of their being in Germany. Half of the refugees have fled the wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and Libya. Who has waged or fuelled these wars through breaking international law? The United States, together with its European allies. So how can it be that the far right – be they movements, parties, or governments in Europe – are aggressively handing the responsibility over to the victims instead of changing their imperial and neo-colonial policies? This is how congregations learn about the geopolitical structural issues – by joining with the peace movement to challenge government policies and right-wing spiritualities.

Second, the refugees can teach our congregations who is destroying the local economies in Africa by selling subsidised, overproduced goods at dumping prices there. Who is stealing the fish with big fishing boats off Africa's west and east coasts – all this on top of the colonial and neo-colonial past? Who is mainly responsible for the climate catastrophe? It is Europe and the West in the first place with their unsustainable way of life, their free trade agreements, etc. Here the main political problem seems to be that the social democracy in Europe became neo-liberal in the 1990s, robbing the people of the opportunity to develop, elect, and implement an alternative to the forces making capital accumulation and therefore economic growth the absolute priority over the wellbeing of people and sustainability of the earth.

Refugees from Africa can also tell us about the results of the climate change produced mainly by the industrialised countries. It is predicted that in some areas of Africa the temperature will increase by 10 degrees Celsius. Droughts and climate wars are the consequence and a growing cause of people being driven from their homes.

So we ourselves produce the refugees as a boomerang of our own actions and/or of our silence about the real issues to be resolved. And it is the political right who profit from the failure of progressive parties, but even more, who push neo-liberal policies, thus aggravating the problems they pretend to solve. Thus they gravely disorient people about the real situation to be addressed. This is what the participating congregations are learning with the refugees. And they are building alliances with social movements working for alternatives to global capitalism as their way of doing liberation theology.

Conclusion

Summing up what we have considered, we face a decision between life and death. But we do have strong helpers.

- We have the original sources of our religions and philosophies, calling for a decision between God and mammon – and in the case of Jesus' followers, they have the inspiring and strengthening Spirit of God.
- We have the Reformers' rejection of early capitalism.
- We have today's ecumenical, interreligious and humanist movements' trans-capitalist orientation.

So we should be able step by step to leave the dominant 3,000-year-old death-bound civilisation, driven by greedy money and greedy persons. We can build alliances for a new culture of life. This would include not only structural but also mental, epistemological, and spiritual alternatives. Not only is another world possible, but renewed human beings are as well.

This is how I hope for a New Reformation as a fundamental cultural revolution, driven by compassion and justice for life in the midst of the

struggles of the people to avoid the forthcoming disasters. These are some aspects of how I understand liberation theology today, more than 50 years after the youth rebellion in 1968.

Notes

- 1 An international group of researchers showed this in a research and action project called “Radicalizing Reformation – Provoked by the Bible and Today’s Crises” between 2010 and 2017. It culminated in the publication of seven volumes of interdisciplinary studies (www.radicalizing-reformation.com/index.php/en/publications.html, accessed February 13, 2020) and an International Conference in Wittenberg, in January 2017, issuing the “Wittenberg Declaration” (www.radicalizing-reformation.com/index.php/en/3rd-and-final-international-conference-2017/165-declaration.html, accessed February 13, 2020). One key element of this project for coping with “today’s crises” was the rediscovery of Luther’s complete rejection of early capitalism, mostly forgotten now by Lutheran churches in Europe but inspiring in many ways. For Karl Marx, for example, Luther was the “first German National Economist”, and he quoted him extensively (Elaborated in Ulrich Duchrow, *Mit Luther, Marx und Papst den Kapitalismus überwinden* [Hamburg and Frankfurt/Main: VSA and Publik-Forum, 2017], summarised in <http://ulrich-duchrow.de/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Peoples-Reporter-Overcoming-Capitalism-with-Luther-Marx-Pope.pdf>).
- 2 A short summary may be found at <http://oikoumene.net/hostudies/gerecht.book/one.book/index.html?entry=page.book.1.2.2>, accessed February 13, 2020.
- 3 www.sacred-texts.com/chr/barmen.htm, accessed February 13, 2020.
- 4 Refuted by Ulrich Duchrow, *Christenheit und Weltverantwortung: Traditionsgeschichte und systematische Struktur der Zweireichelehre*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1983 [1970]); and Per Frostin, *Luther’s Two Kingdoms Doctrine: A Critical Study* (Lund: Lund University Press, 1994).
- 5 Cf. Ulrich Duchrow, ed., *Lutheran Churches – Salt or Mirror of Society? Case Studies on the Theory and Practice of the Two Kingdoms Doctrine* (Geneva: Lutheran World Federation, Dep. of Studies, 1977), 84–94. Here, Torleiv Austad shows Berggrav’s reasoning for resistance as one of the few cases where the Two Kingdoms concept was not misused for assimilating to powers.
- 6 Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Sanctorum Communio: Eine dogmatische Untersuchung zur Soziologie der Kirche*, ed. Joachim von Soosten, DBW 1 (München: Kaiser, 1986 [1930]; Engl. ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2009).
- 7 Dietrich Bonhoeffer, “Die Kirche vor der Judenfrage (1933),” in *Berlin 1932–1933*, eds. Carsten Nicolaisen and Ernst-Albert Scharffenorth, DBW 12 (München: Kaiser, 1997), 349–58.
- 8 Cf. Ulrich Duchrow, *Global Economy: A Confessional Issue for the Churches?* (Geneva: WCC, 1987), 34ff.
- 9 Cf. one of the classic books on this topic, Andre Gunder Frank, *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical Studies of Chile and Brazil* (New York: Monthly Review Press Classics, 1967).
- 10 Pope John XXIII, “Mater et Magistra: Encyclical of Pope John XXIII on Christianity and Social Progress,” May 15, 1961, accessed February 13, 2020, http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-xxiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_15051961_mater.html.
- 11 M. M. Thomas and Paul Abrecht, intr. and eds., *Christians in the Technical and Social Revolutions of Our Time: World Conference on Church and Society, Geneva, July 12–26, 1966: The Official Report* (Geneva: WCC, 1967). A summary may be found at <http://oikoumene.net/hostudies/gerecht.book/one.book/index.html?entry=page.book.1.2.7.1>, accessed February 13, 2020.

- 12 Walter Rodney, *How Europe Undeveloped Africa* (London/Dar es Salaam: Bogle-L'Ouverture/Tanzania Publishing House, 1972).
- 13 Rubem Alves, "Toward a Theology of Liberation" (Doctoral diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1968). A summary can be found in Bruno J. Linhares, "Princeton Theological Seminary and the Birth of Liberation Theology," *REFLEXUS – Revista Semestral de Teologia e Ciências das Religiões* 8, no. 12 (2015): 19–43, doi:10.20890/reflexus.v8i12.234.
- 14 Willem Visser 't Hooft, "The Mandate of the Ecumenical Movement," *Ecumenical Review* 70, no. 1 (2018): 105–17, 114.
- 15 Cf. Ulrich Duchrow, ed., *The Identity of the Church and its Service to the Whole Human Being, International Consultations, 3 volumes* (Geneva: LWF, 1973–1975); Ulrich Duchrow, *Conflict over the Ecumenical Movement: Confessing Christ today in the Universal Church* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1981).
- 16 Bonhoeffer, "Die Kirche vor der Judenfrage (1933)," 349–58.
- 17 Arne Sovik, ed., and the Lutheran World Federation, *In Christ – A New Community: Proceedings of the Sixth Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation, Dar-es Salaam, Tanzania, June 13–25 1977* (Geneva: Lutheran World Federation, 1977), 179f.
- 18 Lennart Henriksson, *A Journey with a Status Confessionis. Analysis of an Apartheid Related Conflict between the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa and the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, 1982–1998*, Studia Missionalia Suecana CIX (Uppsala: Swedish Institute of Missionary Research, 2010).
- 19 See Elina Vuola's Chapter 4 in this volume.
- 20 Cf. Bernhard Walpen, *Die offenen Feinde und ihre Gesellschaft: Eine hegemonietheoretische Studie zur Mont Pèlerin Society* (Hamburg: VSA, 2004).
- 21 Cf. Stylianos Tsompanidis, *Orthodoxie und Ökumene – Gemeinsam auf dem Weg zu Gerechtigkeit, Frieden und Bewahrung der Schöpfung* (Münster: LIT, 1999).
- 22 www.oikoumene.net/home/global/seoul90/seoul.grund0/index.html, accessed February 13, 2020.
- 23 Duchrow, *Global Economy*.
- 24 Cf. Douglas E. Oakman, *The Political Aims of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012); Douglas E. Oakman, *Jesus, Debt, and the Lord's Prayer: First-Century Debt and Jesus' Intentions* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014).
- 25 Ulrich Duchrow and Gerhard Liedke, *Shalom: Biblical Perspectives on Creation, Justice and Peace* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1989). Here we also elaborate the concept of the social forms of being church.
- 26 www.oikoumene.net/eng.home/eng.global/eng.reportdebrecen97/index.html.
- 27 See Lutheran World Federation Assembly, Winnipeg, June 2003. IX. TRANSFORMING ECONOMIC GLOBALIZATION. A summary can be found at <http://oikoumene.net/eng.home/eng.global/eng.winnipeg2003/index.html>, accessed February 8, 2020.
- 28 <http://wrcr.ch/accra/the-accra-confession>, accessed February 13, 2020.
- 29 www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents/assembly/2006-porto-alegre/3-preparatory-and-background-documents/alternative-globalization-addressing-people-and-earth-agape, accessed February 13, 2020.
- 30 www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents/commissions/mission-and-evangelism/together-towards-life-mission-and-evangelism-in-changing-landscapes, accessed February 13, 2020.
- 31 www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents/wcc-programmes/public-witness-addressing-power-affirming-peace/poverty-wealth-and-ecology/finance-speculation-debt/sao-paulo-statement-international-financial-transformation-for-the-economy-of-life, accessed February 13, 2020.
- 32 Cf. <http://wrcr.ch/justice/economic-and-financial> and <http://kairoseuropa.de/>.

- 33 Pope Francis, “*Evangelii Gaudium*,” apostolic exhortation, November 24, 2013, https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium.pdf.
- 34 Ulrich Duchrow and Franz Hinkelammert, *Transcending Greedy Money: Inter-religious Solidarity for Just Relations* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).
- 35 On the power of greed in relation to economy and liberation theology cf. Atola Longkumer’s Chapter 6 in this volume.
- 36 Richard Heinberg, *Afterburn: Society Beyond Fossil Fuel* (Gabriola Island, BC, Canada: New Society Publishers, 2015), 2.
- 37 Hans Joachim Schellnhuber, *Selbstverbrennung: Die fatale Dreiecksbeziehung zwischen Klima, Mensch und Kohlenstoff* (München: C. Bertelsmann, 2015).
- 38 Cf. Harald Bender, Norbert Bernholt, Klaus Simon, and Akademie Solidarische Ökonomie, eds., *Das dienende Geld: Die Befreiung der Wirtschaft vom Wachstumszwang* (München: oekom, 2014).
- 39 Cf. Sigurd Bergmann, “Die Welt als Ware oder Haushalt? Die Wegwahl der trinitarischen Kosmologie bei Gregor von Nazianz,” *Evangelische Theologie* 53, no. 5 (1993): 460–70; and Sigurd Bergmann, “Life-Giving Breath: Ecological Pneumatology in the Context of Fetishization,” *Ecumenical Review* 65, no. 1 (2013): 114–28.
- 40 Ulrich Duchrow and Franz J. Hinkelammert, *Property for People, Not for Profit: Alternatives to the Global Tyranny of Capital* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004). In Chapter 7, we propose an alternative “property order from below”.
- 41 Jörg Rieger and Rosemarie Henkel-Rieger, *Unified We Are a Force: How Faith and Labor Can Overcome America’s Inequalities* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2016).
- 42 Duchrow and Hinkelammert, *Transcending Greedy Money*.
- 43 See also Miguel A. De La Torre, ed., *The Hope of Liberation in World Religions* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008).
- 44 On both Christian and Islamic theology’s potential for critique of and resistance to oppression in global capitalism, cf. Teresa Callewaert’s Chapter 8 in this volume.
- 45 Cf. <https://kairossouthernafrica.wordpress.com/2011/05/08/the-south-africa-kairos-document-1985/>, accessed February 13, 2020.
- 46 Cf. Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Books* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1982), 9.
- 47 Kairos Europa, eds., *Interreligiöse Solidarität gegen Fluchtursachen* (Heidelberg: Kairos Europa, 2016).