

READING JÜRGEN MOLTMANN FROM LATIN AMERICA

—♦♦♦—
JOSÉ MIGUEZ BONINO

For more than five centuries now, Europe has been constantly present in what she herself baptized as "Latin America." As the so-called "new world" tries to understand itself, some of its interpretations celebrate that presence while others bemoan it, but no serious interpretation can ignore it. What is true of the general history and culture of Latin America is perhaps even more significant for its religious and theological tradition. It should not, therefore, surprise us that the theological production of the last three decades that has come to be known as Latin American "Liberation Theology" would relate to the more significant trends in North Atlantic—and above all European—theology. In particular, the work of Catholic theologians like Juan Luis Segundo, Gustavo Gutiérrez, Hugo Assmann or Leonardo Boff or Protestants like Rubem Alves, Emilio Castro, Gonzalo Castillo, Julio de Santa Ana or myself can easily be shown to have watered at the sources of the Catholic theological renewal represented by Rahner, de Lubac or Congar and/or the Protestant post-First World War Barthian stream. Even as we tried to liberate ourselves from the burden of our Eurocentric inheritance and to root our theology more and more deeply in the native soil of our land and people, our work betrayed—as many critics have amply documented—the constant use of categories, presuppositions, and methods created and developed overseas. After all, for all their originality—which cannot be denied—Medellín is a Latin American interpretation of Vatican II and ISAL (the Latin American "Church and Society" movement) is a daughter of the World Council of Churches (more specifically, the developments of the Life and Work movement)!¹

I. MOLTMANN AND LATIN AMERICA

In this love-hate relationship between European and Latin American Liberation Theology, few people have played such a significant role as Jürgen Moltmann. To

José Miguez Bonino is professor of theology at Instituto Superior Evangélico Estudios Teológicos in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

THE ASBURY THEOLOGICAL JOURNAL

SPRING 2000 • VOL. 55 • NO. 1

explore that relationship during the last twenty-five years is to write a significant chapter in the history of this movement and, perhaps, to uncover something of its strength and shortcomings. This paper is no more than an initial attempt to explore that territory. A few dates and events will suffice to indicate the itinerary of this trip.

1. As Rubem Alves was preparing his doctoral dissertation at Princeton (New Jersey, USA) in 1965-68, his intended title ("Towards a Theology of Liberation") was transformed by advisers and editors into "A Theology of Human Hope"² to yoke it to the wagon of "The Theology of Hope" which Moltmann had launched in 1965. In fact, his thesis can be understood (or misunderstood)—as we shall comment below—as a counterpoint to Moltmann's book. And when Gustavo Gutiérrez published the epoch-making "Theology of Liberation" (and not "A" Theology of Liberation as the English translation put it) in 1971 (following several papers with the same title) Moltmann's thought is discussed, mostly in positive terms, in at least three sections of the book.³

2. 1973 marks an interesting turn in the discussion. In May of that year the World Council of Churches convened a four-day symposium on liberation theology in Geneva at the Ecumenical center in Bossey. Hugo Assmann and Paulo Freire from Latin America, and black theologians James Cone (from USA) and Bodipo Malumba (from Africa) and some sixty theologians from Europe sustained what was characterized as "heated debates that did not materialize into an open confrontation—but retrogressed into periods of awkward silence."⁴ In 1970, Hugo Assmann had already published an article in which he indicated the "suspicion" that, against the will and intention of their proponents, European "political theology" might be functional to the reactionary dogmatics and ethics, in which political theological discussion derived supposedly "pure" and "uncommitted" dogmatic formulations; second, by refusing to bring down their "political discussion" to the level of concrete political options, they left an indeterminate space in which all kind of reactionary "third positions" could find a refuge. In the polarized environment of 1973-76, when the internal dynamics of liberation movements drove them to believe that a "popular liberation breakthrough" was imminent and, on the other hand, when the aggressive policy of the United States was pushing the armies of Latin American countries to take over power and launch a "security state" with total repression of all dissent, Assmann radicalized his critique; there was no space for third positions: those who were not with the one and only socialist revolution were against it. Dialogue, in this context, can easily prove confusing or useless—or both.⁵ Moltmann, in his turn, interprets Assmann's position as "[t]he announcement ... that 'incommunication' was to take the place of dialogue with European theologians because they were Europeans. ..."⁶

3. More ironic—or perhaps more ambiguous—theologians like Gustavo Gutiérrez (*Theology of Liberation*, 1971), Leonardo Boff (*Jesus Cristo Liberador*, 1972), Jon Sobrino (*Christology at the Crossroads*, 1976), or myself (*Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation*, 1975), although sometimes sharing some of Assmann's questionings, found in Moltmann's writings (by that time *The Crucified God* was already published) some important insights which were worthy of careful consideration and discussion. It is in response to both the rejection and the invitation to dialogue that Moltmann writes his *Open Letter* to me in 1976.

4. Slowly, in the years that follow, the occasions of encounter, discussion, and interface increased. In September 1977, invited by ISEDET (Instituto Superior Evangélico de

Estudios Teológicos) Moltmann offered lectures in Buenos Aires that are published in Spanish under the title, *Temas para una teología de la esperanza*, with comments which Armando J. Levoratti and José Míguez Bonino offered in the occasion of the lectures.⁷ In the following month, October 1977, the "Comunidad Teológica de México" organized a symposium with Moltmann's participation together with James Cone (Black theology) of the USA, Sergio Martínez Arce of Cuba and several theologians from Central and South America. In a sense, this last meeting had something of the hardness of the Geneva symposium. "Moltmann," comments Jean Pierre Bastian in his preface to the publication of the Latin American contributions to the debate, "has been an important teacher for many of us in Latin America, and the difficulty of communication and understanding with this spokesperson for the most progressive European church invited to a reflection on the theological production related to different Christian praxis."⁸

II. COINCIDENCES AND DISAGREEMENTS

As I was looking back and re-read all this material, I had a strange feeling: it all looked so distant, so old-fashioned. We speak now a different language, pose different questions, have other expectations, struggle at different fronts. And yet, at another level, we move in the same history, face the same theological and social dilemmas, and carry some of the same burdens. Was there something fundamental at stake in the coincidences and the disagreements of Latin American and European theologians? Is there something to be learned in view of Christian thinking and praxis as we move into a new millennium? Can we trace some parallel, converging or divergent lines in the movement of Latin American Liberation Theology and the theological production of Professor Moltmann in the two decades between the 1970s and the 1990s? What I offer from here onwards are my own reflections, which certainly do not intend to represent "the theology of liberation"—even if that were possible for any one person or group—and probably Moltmann may not recognize himself in my interpretation. It is meant, rather, as a sign of my gratitude for all we have received from him and as an expression of friendship for a person I have learned to esteem and respect. If, besides that, it can provide an opportunity for further conversation, I will feel amply rewarded.

I would need to begin the story with the Karl Barth that, after World War I and provoked by a different ideological and social understanding in search of a political praxis, challenged the kind of subjective or ethical "continuities" between faith and human life which had characterized "liberal bourgeois theology" for more than a century. His way of "clearing the ground" was to pose a total, qualitative distance between the Word of God and all human creations—theology included. As his own example (though not always that of his "followers") showed, this did not mean renouncing political commitments or activity. But it did mean that none could claim "divine legitimation." In relation to all ideological, social, or political undertakings (as well as to all religious experiences and cultural manifestations) God's Word was "The Great Disturbance."⁹

In our own Latin American experience—particularly of young Protestants—in the 1940s and 1950s, this message had a liberating power. It reflected our own rebellion against both the conservative traditional Christendom mentality and order, sometimes allied to the Catholic Church and the landed aristocracies, and to the "savage capitalism"

represented by the liberal elites' alliance with foreign interests (Great Britain and the United States particularly). But, on the other hand, it also liberated us for social and political active commitments—for instance in social movements, student reform and socialist parties—over against the religiously justified “political abstinence” of fundamentalist or pietist Christians.

2. But Barth did not tell us much about the “positive possibilities” or the concrete meaning of “the great positive possibility” that also appeared in the contents of his commentary! Some among these young theologians turned briefly to Brunner’s “point of contact,” or to Reinhold Niebuhr’s realism. But, as the social and political crises became more and more acute in the late fifties and sixties, those alternatives were not clear or meaningful enough. Barth’s theology and example were significant only when it was clearly visible that political decisions involved a matter of faith—like in the question of “German Christians.” This is the strength and the weakness of Barmen. But in the quest for a faithful Christian praxis in the common “affairs of the world” most decisions are not so clear. Are we left without any clue? Does God retreat into God’s **otherness** and leave us without any direction? Are there no signs at all—certainly not absolute but at least as “pointers” of God’s action in this world? Barth himself was aware of the problem and in his *Community, Church and State*⁹ tried to suggest “correspondences” which could give some orientation¹¹ But it is not until the 1960s that some European theologians began to articulate a theological paradigm which, without returning to the liberal idea of natural continuities, could establish the right continuity/discontinuity, or disturbance/affirmation between God’s judgment and God’s grace and justice in the affairs of the world. Undoubtedly, the biblical studies of Old and New Testament prepared the way. But it is the “political theology” of the sixties that was able to offer a new alternative. In this breakthrough Moltmann played a decisive role.

3. As I see it, Moltmann developed, during these thirty years, three interrelated theological ways to build in the field that Barth had cleared. The first is his *Theology of Hope*. In a dialogue between Christian eschatology and Ernst Bloch’s *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*, Moltmann transposes Barth’s “otherness” from a metaphysical to a historical plane and thus to a place from which this otherness, rather than paralyzing human praxis, calls for it and gives it a future:

For the element of otherness that encounters us in the hope of the Old and New Testaments—the thing we cannot already think out and picture for ourselves on the basis of the given world and the experiences we already have of that world—is one that confronts us with a promise of something new and with the hope of a future given by God. The God spoken of here is no intra-worldly or extra-worldly God, but the “God of hope” (Rom. 15:13), a God with “future as his essential nature” (as E. Bloch puts it).¹²

In Latin America this orientation soon appears in three directions. Rubem Alves publishes his *Toward a Theology of Human Hope*, to which we have already referred. His debate with Moltmann—to which the latter refers in his *Open Letter*—has to do with the twofold source of hope: on the one hand, with Moltmann, in the anticipation of God’s

promise; on the other, in the protest of human suffering, the “negation of the negative.” This note was not absent from Moltmann’s argument but, from the painful experience of a Third World situation, demanded a more central place in any consideration of Christian theology and praxis. On a different plane, Moltmann’s theology of hope evokes in Latin America a reflection on the positive meaning of “utopia.” Gustavo Gutiérrez tries to relate what he would call “the redemptive level” of eschatology to the human capacity of developing, from a critical analysis of existing reality, by projecting the positive and negating the negative in human experience, a “human utopia” which becomes a direction for the more concrete “historical projects” and the specific strategies and tactics of the human historical praxis of liberation.¹³ In still a third direction, Franz Hinkelammert distinguishes the alienating and the mobilizing possibilities of utopian thinking.¹⁴

It is not my intention in these references to discuss the directions in which Moltmann’s eschatological provocation was interpreted, but rather to point out, on the one hand, its positive impact on Latin American liberation theology and, on the other, the immediate need and effort to re-interpret it from the concrete experiences of suffering and struggle of the poor as the specific area where liberation theology finds its origin and its structuring principle.

The second direction in Moltmann’s effort to relate God’s Word to human reality takes place in the sphere of Christology—now in dialogue with the critical theory of Max Horkheimer—in *The Crucified God* (1972). Here he takes up the question raised by Alves. The Cross cannot be merely explained as a “step” in God’s redemptive plan but as “a mode of being of God.” Here, the crucial question is: Is God’s power over death—his struggle against the “vicious circles of death” in human life and experience—carried from outside or from the inside of history? If we take seriously the biblical witness of Christ’s relation to God, the unavoidable question is: How is God’s kingdom (his sovereignty) present in the cross of Jesus? Now we are forced to reformulate God’s transcendence, not as “distance” but in a new relation of power and love which is not visible except in faith. Power is generated from within the circle of death: “the possible overcoming of the negative is effective by entering the mechanisms of negation,” interprets Jon Sobrino in his Christology.¹⁵

This last quotation already introduces us into the “Latin American reception” of *The Crucified God*. In fact Sobrino’s *Cristología desde América Latina* is a long dialogue with Moltmann. This, again, points to the particular “slant” in Latin American interpretation. No doubt Moltmann’s argument—both in this and the previous book—raises a number of complex philosophical and theological questions, which have been amply (and sometimes hotly) debated in European theology. In Latin America, the crucial question had to do with Moltmann’s proposal of “theodicy” which is not a theodicy of “rationality” but of “participation,” an invitation to discipleship, a space created for a praxis of love within the sufferings of the world.¹⁶ In a somewhat similar vein, I tried to re-read *The Crucified God* as an invitation to a praxis, while at the same time requesting a more specific and analytical consideration of the structural reality of the “vicious circles of death” which would deepen and critique the initial, and in my view insufficient, comments in the final chapter of the book.¹⁷

The third direction is—as it corresponds to the subject—more elusive, but extraordinarily important: the several comments and discussions, particularly in some of Moltmann’s

more recent writings, to the person and the work of the Holy Spirit. It appears in relation to Christology in his *Der Weg Jesu Christi: Christologie in messianischen Dimensionen*,¹⁸ to ecclesiology in his *Kirche in der Kraft des Geistes*,¹⁹ to Creation in the Gifford Lectures of 1984-85,²⁰ in relation to eschatology in his *The Coming of God*²¹ and more systematically in *The Spirit of Life*.²² It has frequently been noted that Pneumatology, particularly in the Western tradition, is the least developed doctrine. Sometimes, the Holy Spirit is absorbed by ecclesiology, other times it becomes simply a rubber stamp to certify the authority of Scripture or is totally subjectivized in "religious experience." Some years ago, Hendrikus Berkhof opened the way to a more comprehensive understanding of the work of the Spirit in his Warfield Lectures at Princeton of 1964,²³ where he emphasized both the unity and the specificity of the work of the Spirit in its different dimensions: mission, church, individual, creation, and eschatology. These are precisely the areas in which Moltmann has developed a Trinitarian doctrine of the Spirit.

The importance of this theme for Latin American theology in general and for Liberation Theology in particular can hardly be exaggerated. Jose Comblin's *O Espírito Santo e a Libertacao*²⁴ has explored the doctrine in relation to the Latin American experience in the life of the communities, of the "spirituality" of liberation and in a renewal of ecclesiology (here with a specific reference to Moltmann's book on the Church). But still two important issues which have become more and more significant for Latin American theology were not discussed in Comblin's book. One is the work of the Spirit in the preservation, renewal, and consummation of creation, to which Moltmann has given a significant place in his pneumatology. Boff's recent works on "ecology" and on the doctrine of the Trinity have underlined the importance of this question for Latin America.²⁵ The other area has to do with the experience of the Spirit in the growing Pentecostal movement in the whole of Latin America (and many other areas of the world, including the industrial countries). While Moltmann refers to this fact in his book on *the Spirit of Life*, and deals briefly with specific Pentecostal doctrines like "the gift of tongues" and "healing" (present also in other of his writings), it seems to me that he still owes us deeper dialogue with the emerging Pentecostal theologians in Latin America, in Africa, and in the North Atlantic world.²⁶

III. DEALING WITH THE DIFFERENCES?

As we review these different lines which converge—in a Trinitarian framework—to root the understanding of the triune God's presence and operation in the world in a way which respects both God's transcendence in relation to any human action and the theological significance of human historical praxis and experience, we have found a certain tension between Moltmann—and other European progressive theologians—and the reception and interpretation of their approach in Latin America. Although somewhat in caricature, it would be possible to say that the first concern is preeminent in European theologians while the second dominates the Latin American view. In his *Open Letter*, Moltmann reviews the work of his critics and shows that those who reproach him for not giving a greater theological significance to human action in social and political projects, nevertheless speak of the "fragmentary," "proleptic," or "penultimate" status of these actions and achievements. In strict terms, his observation is correct. But there is little doubt that, in terms of emphasis, of intention, the differences are real, at least, in two ways.

1. On the one hand, Latin American authors try to specify Christian liberating praxis in terms of very concrete decisions related to specific issues—economic, political, social. To illustrate with one instance: while a particular form of class analysis can be debatable, a general discourse about poverty which does not relate to any specific understanding of the “anatomy” and “physiology” of poverty remains undecided and admits all kinds of responses—some of them definitely reactionary! It is true that Liberation theologians have learned—from experience and dialogue with colleagues from other Third World areas—that class analysis is not enough to define “poverty”—and therefore is insufficient for a strategy of liberation. In this sense, the discussion of race and gender, for instance, has become constitutive of our understanding of the condition of oppression and of the strategies of liberation. The examples can be multiplied. But in any case, the need to move from general definitions of oppression and liberation to specific structural, anthropological, cultural, and even religious analysis and the discussion of definite—however imperfect or conjectural—projects continues to be central to our theological work and, in our view, a dangerous shortcoming in the work of many of our European friends.

In saying this, however, I am quite conscious of the changes that have taken place during the last decades in the conditions of our analysis and strategies and which have moved us to a much more flexible and open definition of “diagnoses” and “concrete options,” and therefore to be much more careful in defining “allies” and “enemies.” We would also expect our European friends to have learned from their own experience that some of their own implicit choices—like their confidence in the progressive movement of their societies in the direction of increasingly “social democracies” or “democratic socialisms” cannot be taken for granted anymore, and that our denunciation of the intrinsic polarizing and “excluding” tendencies of modern capitalism have begun to appear more clearly in their own societies. In other words, we may still have much to talk about and discuss in relation to the specific face of oppression and struggles for liberation in our respective conditions, but it seems that we can share an increasing awareness of the “global” nature of our problematics and of the challenge of a theology concerned with liberation.²⁷ This is a particularly acute problem because it is precisely in this area where we miss in our European friends—Moltmann included—a more direct engagement with the global economic processes which are shaping—although in different forms and with diverse intensity—the nature and future of all our societies. While we have felt that theology cannot avoid, without betraying our responsibility, examining the economic and social nature and consequences of the so called “new international economic order” and to discuss its quasi-religious language and its theological legitimation, it seems that our North Atlantic colleagues (with some exceptions, to be sure) have concentrated too exclusively in the psychological, cultural, or ecological side-effects.

2. The other question is more specifically theological. It has to do with the unity and distinction between God’s acts of liberation and human praxis. To be sure, the “causal” relation which Segundo seemed to claim in some of his expressions—human liberation praxis has a “causative” relation to the establishing of God’s kingdom—is at least questionable. Moltmann’s answer, however, that “the kingdom, rather attains a causal character for the experienced event of liberation”²⁸ does not help much in solving the dilemma. We need a different way of posing and discussing the old debate about “synergism.” In recent

years, several Latin American theologians have begun to try to articulate some of our theological concerns in the framework of a Trinitarian paradigm. In this direction, a doctoral dissertation of a young Argentine Lutheran theologian has advanced an interpretation of the question of synergism in what seems to me an original and promising way. The issue, as he sees it, is the theological status of what could be called "the human mediation" in God's acts of liberation, which he characterizes—going back to a language strongly present in early patristic and orthodox theology—as the "assuming" or the "incorporation" of the creature in God's saving—in our case liberating—acts of justice for the sake of the poor. In this direction, Guillermo Hansen recovers and reinterprets the traditional Christological concept of "enhypostasis" to address this issue. I cannot attempt here to summarize his carefully developed argument, which of course should be discussed in detail. But, while we might want to look more carefully into this analogy to the Christological use of the concept of enhypostasis, the central point relevant to our theme seems to me well expressed in a brief paragraph of his thesis:

It is in this manner ... that we reach the final point, namely, that precisely in the enhypostatic nature of Christian praxis, the event of the divine-human "cooperation" coheres, not as a reality pertaining to two causal, agential entities involved in a reciprocal-conditional exchange, but as the relationship existing between the hypostatic termino posited by God's decision to be God not without the creaturel—i.e. to be triune.²⁹

If "enhypostatic" means "to find one's identity in the other" then the divine initiative gets its historical "identity" as it becomes incorporated ("incarnate") in human praxis, and human praxis gets its transcendent meaning and reality as it is assumed by the Holy Spirit. Certainly, we are aware of the protections needed by such a formulation. Hansen points out that we are not yet at the point where "God is all in all" but in the intermediate time where the human actor still maintains "the characteristics and constraints of any human witness and praxis (thus always subjected to the judgment of God."³⁰ I would myself wish this caveat to be further developed in terms of Luther's "simul justus et peccator." But the central theological insight—which is not so distant from the Orthodox understanding of "theosis"—seems to me a necessary overcoming of the dualistic presuppositions which have plagued the discussion of synergism and human-divine so called "cooperation."

Certainly, the concrete shape of Christian praxis will not be "deducted" from some theological premise. It is always an act of discernment in which the effort to rationally understand the historical conditions, the ideological and ethical convictions and the availability, in personal and community prayer and meditation, to the guidance of the Spirit are finally synthesized in an action which is offered in faith and trust to God and to our neighbor. But it is not insignificant both to recognize the precarious and limited nature of that praxis and to trust that, even in its limitation, it is taken up and assumed in God's action.

Notes

1. J. Míguez Bonino, "Visión del campo social y sus tareas desde las iglesias cristianas no-católicas" in *Fe Cristiana y Cambio Social en América Latina*: Salamanca, Ediciones Sígueme, 1973, pp. 179-202.

2. Rubem Alves, *A Theology of Human Hope* (Washington, D.C.: Corpus Books, 1969).
3. Gustavo Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1973). References to Moltmann in pp. 13-15, 160-68, 215-25.
4. Archie LeMone, "When Traditional Theology meets Black and Liberation Theology," in *Christianity and Crisis*, vol. 33, no. 15, September 17, 1973, p. 177.
5. Hugo Assmann, *Opresión-Liberación: Desafío a los Cristianos* (Montevideo: Tierra Nueva, 1971), pp. 12-14, 106-22. E.T., *Theology for a Nomad Church* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1976), pp. 30-32, 92-96.
6. In his "Open Letter to José Míguez Bonino" published in *Christianity and Crisis*, 29th March, 1976, p. 56. Henceforth quoted as "Open Letter."
7. *Temas para una teología de la esperanza*: (Buenos Aires, Editorial La Aurora, 1978). The book reproduces, with some modifications, the lectures published in German as *Neuer Lebensstil* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1977).
8. Jean Pierre Bastian, "Praxis Christiana y Producción Teológica en América Latina," in *Taller de Teología* (Mexico, 1978). The entire work and the reactions to it can be found in Jorge V. Pixley and Jean-Pierre Bastian, eds., *Praxis Christiana y Producción Teológica*. (Salamanca: Sigueme [Colección Agoral, 1979).
9. Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans* (New York: Oxford, 1933).
10. In the original *Christengemeinde und Bürgergemeinde* in "Theologische Studien," Heft 20, Evangelische Verlag, Zollikon, Zurich 20, 1946.
11. Still in a Barthian line, Paul Lehmann developed a theology of "God's action in history" with the slogan, "What God is doing in the world is what it takes to make and keep human life human." His writings and visits to Latin America and his book *Ethics in a Christian Context* (Harper and Row, N.Y., 1963), and above all the work of Richard Shaull, a disciple of Lehmann who spent long years in Colombia and Brazil, had a significant influence, particularly on Protestant youth and was central to the early development of the ecumenical movement.
12. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Theology of Hope* (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), p. 16.
13. Gutiérrez, op. cit., pp. 232-39.
14. Franz Hinkelammert, *Crítica de la razón utópica*. San José, Costa Rica: DEI, 1984. See also, *Teología alemana y teología latinoamericana: un esfuerzo de diálogo*. San José: Costa Rica: DEI, 1990.
15. *Cristología desde América Latina*, p. 172. ET, *Christology at the Crossroads* (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1978).
16. In an analogous way, Leonardo Boff has developed this theme in his *Passion of Christ: Passion of the World*. Maryknoll, N.Y. (Orbis Books, 1988).
17. José Miguez Bonino, *Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), pp. 145-49.
18. Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1989.
19. *Gott in der Schoöpfung: Oekologische Schoepfungslehre* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag 1985). English translation, *God in Creation: An Ecological Doctrine of Creation* (London: SCM Press, 1985).

20. *God in Creation*, trans. Margaret Kohl (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991).
21. *The Coming of God, Christian Eschatology*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997).
22. *Der Geist des Lebens: Eine ganzheitliche Pneumatologie* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1992). ET: *The Spirit of Life* (London: SCM Press, 1992).
23. Hendrikus Berkhof, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1964).
24. In the collection *Teologia e Libertacao* (Petropolis: Editora Vozes, 1987).
25. Leonardo Boff, *Teologia e ecologia* (Sao Paulo: Paulinas).
26. I have tried to call attention to some aspects of this in *Faces of Latin American Protestantism* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1996), chap. 3.
27. As an act of honesty I must confess our dissatisfaction with the way in which the work of Third World theologians is received and discussed in most European theology. Aside from the fact—that is not unimportant—that their readings are usually limited to those writings which are available in translation—thus reflecting more the “tastes” that editors presuppose in their North Atlantic market—the discussion itself is most frequently just a comment on a hasty summary of a book or article rather than engaging a substantial discussion. This results in European theologians and philosophers (the footnotes and references are evidence for it) with side comments (which can even be laudatory!) on Third World related issues. It is quite clear that we have no right to ask for anything different—a theologian defines his or her task according to how they perceive it. But this methodology does not seem conducive to the best.
28. *Open Letter*, p. 58.
29. Guillermo Hansen, *The Doctrine of the Trinity and Liberation Theology: A Study of Trinitarian Doctrine and its Place in Latin American Liberation Theology* (Ann Arbor, Mich.).
30. *Ibid.*, p. 869.