

# THEOLOGICAL TRENDS

## Political and liberation theology, I

ALTHOUGH only a few years ago it would have seemed questionable at the least to discuss political and liberation theology side by side, today it would make no sense at all to do otherwise. Part of their respective maturation processes has been to learn from one another; to learn about their essentially similar intentions and the differences in their respective approaches to that common purpose, namely, to demonstrate the closeness of the link between political action and christian life.

In recent years, the theology of liberation has definitely been the better-known phenomenon, no doubt as exaggerated media coverage about Marxism and the theology of revolution has found it more newsworthy. However, the term 'political theology' has much the longer pedigree. 'Liberation theology' as a term, if not as a reality, dates back only as far as the mid-sixties, and first became current with Gustavo Gutierrez's *A theology of liberation*.<sup>1</sup> 'Political theology', on the other hand, is as old as the threefold stoic division of theology into natural, mythical and political.<sup>2</sup> To delineate the precise contemporary relationship between political and liberation theology is the first of our tasks in these pages.

In 1977 and 1978 in the pages of *The Way*, Joseph Laishley wrote a three-part article on liberation theology. The present two-part article is not to be thought to duplicate or replace that valuable work, but to bring it up to date. Seven or eight years later, it is possible to see far more clearly the relationship of political and liberation theologies, and, of course, a lot has happened in these years to both theological schools. Here, then, we shall concentrate on the recent development of political theology, and the progress of liberation theology since 1978.

Since much of the first part of the article will be devoted to distinguishing between the two, it is important at the outset to emphasize their basic affinity. Both are theologies of social involvement. Both consider that social and political concern must go beyond mere participation to a radical transformation of the process. Both believe that the gospel at its heart is a call to the transformation of the social order, and consequently both assert that the claim to faith, to love God or follow Jesus Christ, is an empty claim if it does not emanate from a people deeply committed to justice. They are not merely varieties of moral or practical theology however, and certainly not simply appeals for a social ethic. Although important to both, ethics is subordinated to a deeper self-understanding in which they are new ways of conceiving the enterprise of theology or religious reflection. The primacy of praxis in both theologies, though

some may question it, definitely constitutes more than cosmetic alterations in the fabric of theological method.

### *Contrasting characteristics*

A number of relatively superficial distinctions can be made, which at least help to sketch out contrasting characteristics within the general family resemblance of political and liberation theologies. These include the relative age of the two; their origins in different geographical and cultural contexts; their reputed respective orientations towards the theoretical (political) and practical (liberation); their self-conception as universally or only locally valid; and their respective *raison d'être*, the dialogue with a secularized and atheistic world on the one hand, the struggle against oppression on the other. Each of these pairs of distinctions contains some truth: each is an oversimplification.

It is certainly true that political theology is older than liberation theology, at least as a term current in christian tradition. However, the contemporary reality of political theology has almost nothing in common with anything that bore that name in the past. Today's political theology, for one thing, could not have existed before the writings of Marx or the combined impact of the masters of suspicion, Freud, Nietzsche, Feuerbach, and the sociologists of religion such as Weber and Durkheim. On the other hand, the emergence of liberation theology as recently as twenty years ago should not lead anyone to think that it is something totally new. Its links with popular religion and traditional devotions on the one hand, and its strong adherence to an often simplistically interpreted scripture on the other, give it a surprisingly conservative and even evangelical mien from some vantage points.

Geographically, culturally and even religiously, political and liberation theologies emerged from different worlds. The latter is indubitably in its origins a latin american phenomenon, while political theology can be traced almost exclusively to germanic roots. Today, however, this neat demarcation must be qualified, since both forms of theology have spread far beyond their places of origin. Liberation theology is to be found throughout the so-called Third World, and among oppressed minorities in the most affluent countries (for example, among blacks, Hispanics and women in the United States). The wider impact of political theology is harder to discern, but present nevertheless wherever christian-marxist dialogue or radical social ethics are under discussion. We also ought not to forget that political theology exercised an influence, albeit as a force to be reacted against, in the thinking of many of the early theologians of liberation who had been trained in german schools of theology. They recognized the aims of the outlook, while forming their own approach largely in reaction to its methods.

Similar qualifications have to be made about the remaining distinctions.

It has certainly been true that political theology has been less aware of or less willing to admit the radicality of its departure from traditional theological thinking. There is much to be said for the view that at least in the writings of J. B. Metz, perhaps its best-known exponent, political theology is in fact a modification of and self-conscious complement of transcendental theology (such as that of Metz's mentor, Karl Rahner).<sup>3</sup> To this extent the theoretical/practical contrasts made between political and liberation theologies have some justification. More recently, however, political theology has come to learn from liberation theology,<sup>4</sup> while the theology of liberation itself has freed itself from its own axiomatic claim to be a theology without theory.<sup>5</sup> Similarly, the openness of political theology to 'the power of the poor in history' (Gutierrez's phrase) will perhaps help to free political theology from conceiving of theology as the abstract (if praxis-oriented) search for truth, while liberation theology's methodological innovations must lead to qualifying its own determination to be 'local theology'.<sup>6</sup>

As the orbits of political and liberation theologies expand, they come to overlap. In the fusion of horizons that occurs in the minds of theologians in both traditions, the distinctions come to seem less and less obvious. A good example of this is in the blurring of the originally clear contrast between the self-understanding of the two schools of thought. Political theology in our sense of the term emerged out of Germany in the late fifties and early sixties. Europe in the mid-twentieth century and since has been characterized by a prevailing culture of secularism, even of atheism, and by the kind of all-pervasive spiritual apathy whose dominant emotion is mild depression. Such an ethos could not but affect the Churches of Europe, which have in any case never been notable for standing against the currently established order. Following Ernst Bloch, Dorothee Soelle has suggested that the malaise of institutional religion in Western Europe can be attributed to its 'necrophilia', that is, its attachment to what is without life, be that the acquisition of wealth or the ecclesial structures that belong to another time.<sup>7</sup> In the face of a culture which is not so much hostile as apathetic, 'dead by bread alone', political theology came to conceive of itself as an essentially prophetic response, adopting a critical stance towards every power-structure, including Churches and governments of whatever kind. Invoking the eschatological outlook of much earlier and supposedly purer Christianity, political theology relativized all secular utopias and the religious claim 'to be involved in the coming of the kingdom, to an awaiting of the unforeseeable and uncontrollable 'advent' of God. In place of utopia, apocalyptic was enshrined. Curiously for a *political* theology, its critical standpoint rendered it deeply suspicious of established political processes.

Liberation theology exists within a cultural context almost totally different from the old world of Western Europe. In Latin America the

counter-ideology is not a secularized culture, not even the cold war, but the mechanics of colonialism and the economics of the periphery, 'the oppressed periphery of the great economic empires'.<sup>8</sup> The opponent is not a decadent or world-weary society, but a system which actively victimizes and seeks to maintain the status quo by any means that are necessary, including the actual violent repression of opposition. In this situation, says Juan-Luis Segundo, the whole Church must choose; it may not merely stand back from all political options and platforms. Its role is not to criticize, but to become engaged in the struggle for life. The choice, he says, is not between the shape of society in the United States, and the Soviet Union, but about 'what sociopolitical scheme can be chosen now from our own undeveloped condition, which will at the same time be effective and coherent with the kind of society which we desire for Latin Americans as we know them'.<sup>9</sup> Liberation theology is unafraid to take sides, both because it faces not so much unbelief as violence, and also because it recognizes a sense in which human beings can truly be involved in building the kingdom of God. Unlike political theology, it admits a utopian dimension, while it retains the conviction that heaven cannot be built here on earth. To this extent, as Segundo among others has pointed out, political theology reveals its dependence on the pauline/lutheran doctrine of justification by grace alone, while liberation theology, true to its more catholic roots, has been happy to make space for the idea of human cooperation in the divine plan.

In more recent years, there seem to be signs of the ideological and theological purity of these positions becoming more nuanced. Latin american theology of liberation is perhaps less politically jejune than it was in the heady days of *Christians for socialism*. No doubt it has recalled Gutierrez's insistence that if *metanoia* does not precede revolution, we only exchange one tyranny for another. It is this fact, that textbook Marxism has largely given way to the notion of the empowerment of the poor, that made the recent Vatican *Declaration on some aspects of liberation theology* so anachronistic and inappropriate.<sup>10</sup> Its attacks on marxist ideology in liberation theology were very wide of the mark.

The problem for political theology was for it to learn to take sides. It has to an extent adjusted to that need, perhaps in response to the changing economic fortunes of Europe, perhaps through the realization that standing in prophetic posture before any and every form of government might come to seem a luxury in face of the possibility of nuclear holocaust pre-empting the advent of the reign of God. For whatever reason, political theology seems more ready for political commitment than it once did. Perhaps it parallels the step from Baader-Meinhof anarchism to the radical political alternative of the 'Green' party. Metz, in his recent *Faith in history and society*, recognized the tendency of his own work to hold back from concrete choices. In his terminology, the moral

*praxis* that he advocated had to be matched by a 'social *praxis*' that accepts the marxist analyst's discovery of structural oppression.<sup>11</sup> One cannot simply appeal to the better side of human nature: one must work to change the structures which entrench the worse side. To this extent, political theology grows more like the theology of liberation. From this comparison, we now need to turn to a more thorough look at recent developments within each of the two schools of thought considered separately.

### *Political theology*

Most discussions of political theology understandably begin by explaining what it is not. A term with a history has to face the possibility of initial misconceptions. It is therefore important to explain that political theology is not a theology of politics, subjecting the discipline or career of politics to critical reflection inspired by the christian *kerygma*. On the other hand, political theologians must sometimes engage in just such a reflection. Similarly, although political theology is not explicable as social ethics, issues in social ethics are likely, as we shall see, to figure quite largely in the calculations of political theologians. There has also been in the not so distant past a form of political theology that has seemed to be little more than a theological justification of a political status quo. We might associate with that the name of Emmanuel Hirsch in Nazi Germany,<sup>12</sup> or the more jingoistic variants on the otherwise healthy theological phenomenon of civil religion in the United States.<sup>13</sup> Political theology in its contemporary realization, on the contrary, cannot be identified with the justification of any variety of the status quo, at least not without surrendering its cherished exercise of ideology critique. Even when it leans to the commitment of a liberation theology, it cannot sell out to any political ideology.

It is far more difficult to face the question of what in the end political theology actually is. One of the reasons for this is that just as the term has had a long and varied history, so at the present time there is no consistency in its usage, or in the self-understanding of those who would accept the designation of political theologian. A second consideration which makes for difficulty in definition is that, unlike liberation theology, political theology is not 'church theology'. It does not belong anywhere, and has no national or transnational ecclesial community structured according to its insights. It remains a largely academic, extra-ecclesial gnat, stinging the institution into action as and when it can. Certainly, the three principal exponents of the approach are all german (J. B. Metz, Jürgen Moltmann and Dorothee Soelle), but they do not form a school of thought, do not share a confessional background, and do not always address the same issues.

Despite the problems, however, an attempt to delineate the reality of

political theology can be made. There seems some justification for the claim that political theology begins with the recognition that the world is not so much *cosmos* as *polis*, that it is a human, social, economic and political organism that is rightly referred to as a community. Correct as this statement is, however, there is a danger inherent in such an expression. The insistence that it is a human world, a world in which human beings will 'have dominion', can lead to the legitimization of the exploitation of the non-human and inorganic unless such a formulation is accompanied by an insistence on responsibility. This realization constitutes a significant recent enrichment of the idea of political theology which we shall comment on further below.

The recognition of the world as more *polis* than *cosmos* implies the other fundamental principle of political theology, that the human subject is to be thought of first and last as involved in and even constituted by a nexus of relationships, a 'world'; only in this context does the individual make sense. This more communal, less privatistic notion of the individual is that aspect of political theology which brings it close to the catholic tradition, while its tendency to emphasize the prophetic rather than priestly dimension of christian witness shifts it back towards the protestant 'camp'.

Perhaps the best way to explicate the particularity of political theology is through its insistence on *praxis*, a phenomenon which it shares equally with liberation theology. *Praxis*, however, is a strange word and used loosely at times, so that it is not easy to say exactly what it means in this context. Perhaps the closest one can get is to say that it refers to transformative action in society, action (in other words) which is consistent with its own theory. Moreover, the theory is undergoing a constant purification in the light of the *praxis*. *Praxis*, then, is committed and consistent involvement in action directed to the transformation of society. It is, in the best sense of the word, revolutionary.

Closely related to the notion of *praxis* is the principle of *orthopraxis*, an idea consciously intended as a contrast to orthodoxy. It would be an oversimplification to suggest that political theology replaces orthodoxy with *orthopraxis*, at least if that was interpreted to mean that the role of teaching is simply dissolved in favour of activity. Obviously, both beliefs and actions are needed, if beliefs are to be more than opinions, and if actions are to have any consistent direction. Rather, the question is one of what shall be the test of a claim to faith. Too often, political theology will argue, the test of faith has been the willingness to subscribe to a series of propositions. We might call it the credal notion of faith. The test of faith, argues political theology, must in fact be the quality of the individual's involvement in the transformation of the community and society. As Dorothee Soelle expressed it:

Political theology is a hermeneutic, which . . . holds open an horizon of interpretation in which politics is understood as the comprehensive and decisive sphere in which christian truth should become *praxis*.<sup>14</sup>

That is to say, it is in the political dimension of human life that truth of the believer's claim will be demonstrated, that he or she has undergone a genuine *metanoia*. In the insistence on a real and not merely a notional assent to the conversion experience, there is a curious closeness between political theology and more evangelical forms of Christianity.

Regardless of the shifts in political theology over the twenty years in which it has existed in its present form, this attention to the primacy of *praxis* has remained the same. From its initial 'prophetic' and therefore curiously non-partisan approach to society, and its preference for moral over social *praxis*, to its more recent attention to the need for concrete commitment and awareness of structural or systemic oppression, the priority of *praxis* over theory has in fact only been strengthened. However, the attitude of political commitment has to lead to a shift in the kind of *praxis*, from what we can call apocalyptic to utopian *praxis*. This should not be overstated; nevertheless, where confrontation is replaced by commitment to structural change there is clearly an implicit attention to building a *futurus*, even if still living in hope of the definitive *adventus*.

The orientation of political theology to *praxis*, whether or not we approve of it, constitutes without doubt a significant shift in theological methodology. Both biblical and ecclesial fundamentalism on the one hand, and scholastic and liberal theologies on the other, have tended to the primacy of theory over *praxis*. The good Christian's life would be expected to conform to some measure of correctness, whether the rightness of philosophical reason or that of what Edward Farley calls 'the house of authority'.<sup>15</sup> To make 'right action' out to be the only basis upon which genuine theoretical thinking can be done is revolutionary, even if in political theology as a whole the reciprocity between the two is admitted, rather than (as in liberation theology) a stress upon the clear primacy of *praxis* over theory.

Political theology is also primarily a 'foundational' theology, in the sense expressed in Francis Schüssler Fiorenza's new *Foundational theology*. Unlike fundamental theology, which has a basically apologetic function, true to its origins as a defensive reaction to enlightenment thinking, foundational theology is a 'reconstructive hermeneutic'.

Foundational theology entails a reconstructive interpretation of the intertwining of christian vision and social *praxis*. The Church's *praxis* that flows from its christian faith and vision not only expresses its religious identity but is a foundational and validating warrant of that identity.<sup>16</sup>

In other words, the social *praxis* of the christian Church not only testifies to its faith, but validates it.<sup>17</sup>

A particularly good example of how this methodological axiom works is to be found in Metz's treatment of 'the dangerous memory of the freedom of Jesus Christ'.<sup>18</sup> Political theology finds in Jesus a paradigm of absolute freedom, above all freedom to challenge and question the present moment, freedom from its presuppositions and ideology. Jesus Christ in his proclamation of the kingdom is also the one who announces the liberating power of God's unconditional love. The memory of this Jesus liberates the Church today from the presuppositions and ideology of the present moment. It follows Jesus's proclamation not just of *any* future, but of a future for those who are now oppressed and without hope. Precisely because it subordinates our present to the future of those who are powerless now, it is both freeing (from the cautious possession of the present moment) and dangerous. Moreover, in the Church's current *praxis*, that arises out of its dangerous memory of the liberating power of Jesus Christ, it finds its validation as the Church of Jesus Christ. Its mission confirms and somehow constitutes its nature. Without its mission it has no nature. 'The Church', says Metz, 'must understand and justify itself as the public witness and bearer of the tradition of a dangerous memory of freedom in the "systems" of our emancipative society'.<sup>19</sup>

To comprehend this, it is necessary to appreciate, as Fiorenza has expressed it so well,<sup>20</sup> that in some respects political theology is best understood as a retrieval of classical political understanding. Politics in that sense has more to do with the construction and maintenance of a particular ethos than with manipulating the machinery of government. *Praxis*, as action to maintain the ethos, was crucial to that earlier understanding of politics. *Techne*, as the proficient means of manipulation is more important today. Almost all political theologians unite in a deep suspicion of the rationalistic and technological society of today and the 'purpose-oriented mentality' to which it drives its citizens. The best example in brief compass of this critique of contemporary society from within the ranks of political theologians is to be found in Dorothee Soelle's *The inward road*<sup>21</sup>. Soelle, following Ernst Bloch's analysis of society as fundamentally bored (and Bloch following Schopenhauer), characterizes the disease as 'death by bread alone'. Society is like a vast supermarket in which, 'absentmindedly yet intent on what we are doing, we push our shopping carts up one aisle and down the other, while death and alienation have the fun of the place'.<sup>22</sup>

If Metz's focus in political theology has tended to be upon its fundamental or foundational character, that of the two leading protestant exponents, Jürgen Moltmann and Dorothee Soelle, has been upon its practical and ecclesiological consequences. Soelle's two early books, *Christ the representative*



and *Political theology*<sup>23</sup> were both recognizable as traditionally organized works of theology. Her more recent and more frequent books tend to be relatively slight essays on a variety of topical political and social subjects. This shift has been disappointing to some, who saw in the earlier Soelle an exciting theological imagination, but it is understandable as an act of commitment to the orientation to *praxis* of political theology. Moltmann has remained more faithful to the image of the theologian, but in his own way he too has grown more explicitly political in recent years.

Soelle's work is a useful place to face one of the challenges put to political theology by more traditional schools of thought, namely, that it does not believe in or at least has no particular use for God. There are certainly places in Soelle's writings where she places herself in the ranks of 'post-theistic' Christianity, and these have been well-analyzed by John Cobb in his recent book, *Process theology as political theology*.<sup>24</sup> There are other places where she is much less clear; the fullest and clearest statement of this ambivalence about theism is to be found in the previously mentioned *The inward road*.

Belief in God is certainly not an easy option for the political theologian. The mind-numbing consumerism of modern society has had its impact not only on many millions of the citizens of affluent western nations, but also on the Church which exists within those countries, leading to an institution which has often taken on too much of the colour and too many values of the world in which it should be striving to be prophetic. Soelle believes that such a Church is 'necrophiliac', involved with formalisms and structures and regulations, all of which are dead compared with experience of the living God. Mystics point the way for Soelle to genuine experience of God. To the mystic, she says, the use of language and images is suspect, since while such things provide human beings with the only means they have to talk about God, they replace the meeting with the reality of God which must take place in darkness and silence within. The mystic denies the world, denies the self, and 'denies God for the sake of God', that is, denies the inherited notion of God for the search for the experience of the living God. The mystic is then the paradigmatic prophet, demanding that the world, people and the Churches relativize their own historically conditioned presuppositions, the ideology of their own times, and engage in a painful search for God within.

Soelle is not opposed to the role and reality of institutional religion, so long as it does not bow to the local and particular gods of the contemporary moment, but one can well see how institutional religion might be opposed to Soelle. Indeed, this example perhaps illustrates something of the suspicion of the Churches in general, and of the Catholic Church in particular, shown towards political and liberation theologies. Ever since the institutional Church achieved that stranglehold upon the gifts of the

Spirit which subordinated the charismatic to the institutional element in the Church, a clerical monopoly on power has kept laypeople in general and women in particular in a subordinate role. Mystics (and many of the great ones have been women) are independent of the power structure; their experience is private and self-validating, their posture is anti-institutional and even counter-cultural. To the extent to which the institutional Church of the moment is concerned with power and control, (and when has it ever been entirely free from these matters?) mysticism presents a threat. In similar fashion, a political theology which looks to *praxis* as the test of christian authenticity possesses criteria for proclamation and denunciation which lie outside the control of an institutional Church itself open to challenge for its failures in *praxis*. Political theology has not gained much of a foothold in the european and north american Churches, perhaps because it has failed to touch anyone much beyond academic circles. Liberation theology is of course in quite a different position. It has come close to claiming the Church of a whole continent, and it is in consequence against that rather than against its more theoretical parallel that the current suspicion of the institutional Church is directed.

In the second half of this article we shall turn to more recent events in the theology of liberation. To conclude this first part, I should like to draw attention to one or two interesting new variants upon political theology which do have something to offer to current theological consciousness, and perhaps even to liberation theology. John Cobb's *Process theology as political theology*, which I mentioned earlier, is a good place to look for a clear if critical survey of these new directions, namely, a theology of environmental and ecological issues, a theology in the face of the nuclear threat, and even a 'vegetarian' theology.

Cobb sets out to argue against political theology that it has failed to step beyond a narrowly anthropocentric concern to recognize the essential interdependence of the human and non-human world, and indeed the rights of non-human subjectivities over against those of human beings. Cobb is of course correct in the main line of his critique, but even he sees that in recent years political theology has begun to make ground on its earlier blinkeredness to wider concerns. For example, Metz in *Faith in history and society* recognizes the need for a 'reconciliation between nature and history'. 'Nature', Metz says, 'must be safeguarded by a reflection about our historical responsibility for nature, so that it is not exploited without restraint'.<sup>25</sup> His earlier attention to apocalyptic has also made him sensitive to the theoretical implications of a possible nuclear holocaust. However, it is with the writings of Moltmann that political theology truly reaches out to these quintessentially modern problems.

In one of Jürgen Moltmann's most recent books, *The power of the powerless*<sup>26</sup> the first chapter is devoted to what can only be called a

theological meditation on vegetarianism, born out of a political theologian's analysis of power. God gave the earth to humankind to subdue it and rule it, and gave them the right to kill animals for food. However, our situation today parallels not so much the Garden of Eden, where all things were done in moderation, as the world before the Flood, where catastrophe impended on all sides, where wickedness knew no bounds. Repentance today to stave off the catastrophe, whether of nuclear war or of world starvation, means structural change, that is, social and not merely moral *praxis*. Among the many ecological structural changes that can and should be made at the present time, argues Moltmann, is a reversal of the prehistoric predicament. Then they ate animals to survive: today we should switch back to vegetarian food, since it can feed so many more people. Moreover, 'could this transition not also be a way of mitigating and resolving the bitterness of killing in order to eat and survive?'<sup>27</sup> It is the attention to structural social change that makes this a political theology and not merely a pious devotional sermon.

In all, it is perhaps Moltmann who has brought political theology furthest in recent years, and who has simultaneously been prepared to defend its relative sluggishness in revolutionary language or commitment. Challenged for just that lack, Moltmann wrote in 1976 (in an article in *Christianity and crisis* of 29 March) to defend the idea, in fact cherished by liberation theology itself, that political theology is local theology, *of* the people and not for them, and that this could easily mean a revolutionary socialism in one part of the world, and a democratic socialism in another part (Europe), in which the challenge to Christians is not to achieve political freedom but to take the political freedoms they have won and translate them into economic freedoms. At the same time, in his most recent collection of essays he describes 'political hermeneutic' in ways which suggest that he too is indebted to third world theology:

There can be no economic justice without political freedom, no improvement of socio-economic conditions without overcoming cultural alienation and without personal conversion from apathy to hope. Whoever does not understand salvation in the most comprehensive literal sense and does not strive for a network of saving anticipations over the various fields of devastation does not understand salvation holistically.<sup>28</sup>

In the second half of this two-part article we shall investigate the recent history of political theology's younger and more vigorous sister, the theology of liberation.

*Paul Lakeland*

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> London, 1973.

<sup>2</sup> The best brief survey of the historical development of political theology is to be found in Francis Schüssler Fiorenza, 'Political theology as foundational theology', in *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America*, 32 (1972), pp 142-177.

<sup>3</sup> Metz's most valuable works are *Theology of the world* (London, 1969), *Faith in history and society* (London, 1980), and *Followers of Christ* (London, 1978). For an account of Metz's relationship to the transcendental thought of Karl Rahner, see Lamb, Matthew: *Solidarity with victims* (New York, 1982), pp 117-122.

<sup>4</sup> See Metz, *The emergent Church* (London, 1981), pp 48-66.

<sup>5</sup> The methodology of liberation theology is best presented in Juan-Luis Segundo *The liberation of theology* (Dublin, 1977).

<sup>6</sup> On the notion of local theology, see Robert J. Schreiter, *Constructing local theologies* (New York, 1985).

<sup>7</sup> *The inward road* (London, 1978).

<sup>8</sup> 'Capitalism and socialism: a theological crux', in *Liberation north: liberation south*, edited by Michael Novak (Washington, D.C., 1980), p 8.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> *Instruction on certain aspects of the theology of liberation*. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Origins* 14 (13 September, 1984), pp 193-204.

<sup>11</sup> Metz, *Faith in history and society*, particularly chapter four.

<sup>12</sup> Emmanuel Hirsch's 'Political theology' was a kind of canonization of the current political status quo, which happened to be that of the German Third Reich.

<sup>13</sup> Civil religion was identified as a specific type of religion by Robert Bellah in *Beyond belief* (New York, 1970), pp 168-193.

<sup>14</sup> *Political theology* (Philadelphia, 1974), p 59.

<sup>15</sup> Farley's 'archaeology and critique' of the house of authority can be found in *Ecclesial reflection: an anatomy of theological method* (Philadelphia, 1982), pp 3-168.

<sup>16</sup> Schüssler Fiorenza, Francis: *Foundational theology* (New York, 1984), p xvi.

<sup>17</sup> On this, see my own *Free in Christ: the challenge of political theology* (Leigh-on-Sea, U.K. 1984).

<sup>18</sup> Metz, *Faith in history and society*, pp 88-99.

<sup>19</sup> *Ut supra*, p 90.

<sup>20</sup> See note 2.

<sup>21</sup> Soelle, *The inward road*, chapters 1-3.

<sup>22</sup> *The inward road*, p 8.

<sup>23</sup> Soelle, Dorothee: *Christ the representative* (London, 1967), and *Political theology* (Philadelphia, 1974).

<sup>24</sup> Cobb, John: *Process theology as political theology* (Manchester 1982).

<sup>25</sup> pp 107, 106.

<sup>26</sup> Moltmann, Jürgen: *On human dignity* (Philadelphia, 1984).

<sup>27</sup> *Ut supra*, p 7.

<sup>28</sup> Moltmann, Jürgen: *On human dignity* (Philadelphia, 1984), p 110.