

Gutierrez,⁵³ Segundo⁵⁴ and Bonino⁵⁵ all deny that the Hebrew scriptures reflect "two histories," or a twofold structure of reality in which God is revealed apart from the eventfulness of human history, in, say, some other plane or dimension conjured up by metaphysical thinking.

In this regard Bonino states most clearly what is at stake for liberation theology and shows much more sophistication on the metaphysical issue than Schubert Ogden's treatment of liberation theology would lead one to expect. Bonino saw that a theological perspective based on "the conviction that a universal order penetrates the world" would necessarily hold that "Heaven and earth, nature and society, moral and spiritual life seek the equilibrium that corresponds to their rational place, and the preservation of order is the supreme value."⁵⁶ He recognizes that at base this amounts to a rationale for defending the status quo.

Bonino rejects this assumption and with the affirmation of the Biblical dynamic view of history and revelation he clearly moves beyond the classical Protestant liberalism associated with the thought of Kant, Schleiermacher, Ritschl and Harnack. While he does not explicitly say what I am about to state here, this is an implication of his rejection of the twofold plane, that is, more precisely the finite/infinite paradigm for viewing reality in which God is affirmed to be infinite and the world finite. Bonino breaks with all theodicy as suggested by German idealism in both its philosophical and theological expression. This means that he breaks with the

kaleidoscopic view of history associated with the historicism of Leopold Ranke, Wilhelm Dilthey and Ernst Troeltsch and Adolf Harnack. In this view the state, culture and religion like pieces of glass in a kaleidoscope would strike ever new forms as history moves ad infinitum. In principle for 19th-century historicism, history had no end.

Liberation theology's appropriation of a single historical destiny for the world means a move to the finite world as the sphere of meaning and action. And although thinking in a Marxist frame of reference for the grasp of this destiny, it is not for all of that any less an appreciation of the finitude of the process of reality than that found in the works of Alfred Whitehead and Charles Hartshorne, so much appreciated by Schubert Ogden. Throughout the texts of these liberation theologians the inevitability of culture-conditionedness, of being bound to time and place, appears again and again. This turn to finitude as the sphere of reality and meaning is the reason why ideological conditioning is considered unavoidable, and so the issue is not whether or not to combine ideology with Christian faith, not even whether they are distinguishable--for all of these thinkers hold that they are distinguishable--but whether the combination of faith and ideology occurs critically or uncritically.⁵⁷

But, the rejection of a universal rational structure could have rather horrendous implications, if by way of this rejection, one would refuse to acknowledge common limitations that are givens of the biosphere, the realm that fosters organic

life in the interaction of air, earth and water that encompasses our planet. Rationalistic universalism is a metaphysical construct, whereas the recognition of the finite limitations of our planet produces a scientific construct that will inevitably play a role in the awareness of any society that seeks to govern or to control a significant portion of the planet's land area and mineral resources.

The ecological issues should not be dismissed or ignored as the luxury of affluent societies, but rather should enter into the goal-setting for any society seeking to reclaim a proper, mutually supportive relationship between the human enterprise and the natural environment of a given region or continent.

Mihajlo Mesarovic and Eduard Pestel have cogently argued in their book, Mankind at the Turning Point, that the survival of human beings under conditions that would foster basic health for humanity and the environment demands a conscious decision on the part of human societies in the collective to change the pattern of growth of the human enterprise in population expansion and industrial exploitation and production from what they call "undifferentiated growth" that refuses to recognize the built-in limitations of the earth's ecological system, to one of "organic growth" which lives within the physical parameters of nature.⁵⁸

The tragedy of the preoccupation with military and pure power solutions to political and economic problems is that in the struggle for political control and power, the abuse of the natural environment is exacerbated. The commitment to guns and

sophisticated weapons systems, both nuclear and bio-chemical, pose immediate threats to the carrying capacity of this planet to support a human population and all other forms of organic life. Thus humanity has become at once the endangering and the self-endangered species in the world's eco-system. The issue of a common destiny for all humanity must be faced by all societies, by all ideological persuasions, precisely in these terms or there will be no significant future to discuss for anyone.

As bad as present pollution of the environment now is, the difference between it and the world after a nuclear holocaust can best be expressed in the images conjured up by the religious consciousness as between paradise and hell. Our common human commitment should be to stave off nuclear hell, while we with the time bought from that activity, spend it to transform the social and economic hell of Latin America and the third world into viable "organic growth" societies, hopefully along with the so-called first and second world societies. This means that the exploitative activities of the latter must be checked within and without. North Americans must be confronted with the truth that they do not have an inherent right to be the stomach of the world.

Ironically, it may very well be that the Latin American society will adjust much more smoothly to the situation of organic growth under conditions of scarcity than will the United States, conditioned as it has been to a high-consumption life style with its inherent incapacity for adaptation. In terms of

resource consumption there is only one society with a per capita consumption pattern that is throwing the eco-system out of balance, only one dinosaur society in the current forest--the U.S.A. Whatever the meaning of the struggles that lie ahead in the next few decades, in the course of them a trade-off will occur in consumption pattern between North and South America. The U.S.A. will decrease, and they will increase.

The question is, whether this will occur under conditions of war with the inherent possibility of nuclear destruction, or of another sort of struggle in which alternative forms of resistance and coercion are brought to play? Perhaps present-day Poland points to a new kind of confrontation: military vs. organized non-military segments of the population. In such a confrontation can the military really win any long term struggle? It remains to be seen.

(c) Of Praxis

All liberation theologians affirm praxis as the content of theology, with praxis understood as Christian obedience to the commandment to love thy neighbor, or, in St. Paul's terms, "faith works through charity." As Gutierrez puts it, "...love is the nourishment and the fullness of faith, the gift of one's self to the other, and invariably to others: this is the foundation of the praxis of the Christian, of his active presence in history."⁵⁹

Here is liberation theology's version of what Dietrich

Bonhoeffer called "costly grace." It is faith taking the commandment to love seriously as the Christian way in the world. What is striking to the outsider seeking to appreciate this praxis from the standpoint of a dialogue with Judaism is the immediate parallel one can find in Judaism as a religion of mitzvoth and deeds of hesed. Here one could hope for a meaningful dialogue between liberation theology and Judaism--especially since there is expressed appreciation by Rubem Alves and Bonino for the Hebrew concept of truth emeth "not as an abstract realm of ideas, but as 'efficacious truth' as 'action,' as 'the name given by a historical community to its historical deeds, which were, are, and will be efficacious in the liberation of man.'"60

But even this opening for dialogue threatens to be quickly closed by Bonino's supersessionist teaching. According to him the Christian recovers work in order to go beyond it immediately. As Bonino put the reason from the standpoint of the Marxist view of alienation from work:

There is a striking similarity between this view and the Pauline rejection of the 'works of the law' in which man's actions are also objectified as something valuable in themselves apart from the doer and the neighbor, as a 'work' which can be merchandised in order to buy justification.⁶¹

Such insensitivity to the meaning of mitzvoth and deeds of hesed is a pity to behold, for from the Jewish standpoint mitzvoth represent commandments, the keeping of which amount to acts of solidarity as a community of faith. They are not done in order to be saved any more than a Christian works to be saved.

They are not done in order to be justified in one's own individual piety, but rather to express one's solidarity with the community of faith through obedience to God. As such, to keep any and all of the commandments of scripture is an act of acknowledgment, not simply of the past glory of God, but of the presence of God to the present, and to the future, community of faith. Such solidarity becomes the basis for a consensus in communal self-understanding that is always ready to serve as the agent of collective action and concern.

Christianity, on its part, usually turns to the great commandment of Mt. 22:37-40 for the basic imperative of faith:

↓ You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind.

This is the great and first commandment.

And a second is like it, You shall love your neighbor as yourself.

On these two commandments depend all the law and the prophets.

Here again ↓ faith and community solidarity are one and the same. For the Christian as well as the Jew it is understood that all one's deeds, i.e. the whole praxis of one's life, both in its liturgical and non-liturgical expression, are deeds of love for God and for fellow humanity. To do one is to do the other. Christianity specifically teaches that "If any one says, 'I love God,' and hates his brother, he is a liar, for he who does not love his brother whom he has seen, cannot love God whom he has not seen." (I John 4:20).

It seems clear that even liberation theology acknowledges

this as the thematic content of Christian faith. This is no piece of time-bound, early second-century ideology, but an expression in human language of the faith that understands itself as the recipient of God's love, and so as obliged to love the world that God has created and is redeeming.

What Christian theology needs to do is to apply this as praxis not only to intra-Christian relations, but also to Christian relations with other communities of faith, especially Judaism, and yes, (one can hear the question in the minds of liberation theologians) with other ideologies such as Marxism as well. But since liberation theology has made so much of the Exodus as paradigm, it seems to me that a serious consideration of a meaningful and fruitful dialogue with Jewish theologians should be both fitting and desirable for Latin American liberation theologians. At stake for them would be an appreciation of the Hebrew roots of their faith which they openly acknowledge. For Jewish theologians what would be at stake is the possibility of gaining some appreciation on the part of influential Latin American theologians for the presence of Jewish communities in Latin America. Will it be possible for liberation theologians to learn a basic lesson of the holocaust: namely, that anti-Semitism is covert anti-Christianity, so that for a Christian to be co-opted into anti-Judaic praxis means co-optation to self-destruction?

Further, is it inconceivable that Latin American Jewish communities and Latin American "new organic" Christian communities

could very well produce a common agenda for human life in that continent? This question entails consideration of the following theme:

(d) The New Humanity

Christians and Christian heresies are quick to speak in terms of the "new humanity" because of their apocalyptic background with its vision of a new heaven and a new earth and the new people of God, the children of light, in the new age.

Gutierrez once more set the theme for liberation theology. It derives in his view more directly from the deep sense of alienation that comes with the awareness of living in a society characterized by oppression and injustice, than from "other worldly" sources. The new humanity will appear not beyond history, but in this history as the structures of oppression and injustice yield to the forces of liberation. The "new humanity" is not conceived in terms of the new heaven and the new earth beyond history, but rather in terms of the liberated humanity who come to 'own' their own lives and to participate in shaping their own destiny through faith and "conscientization," Paulo Freire's term for the process of becoming aware of being oppressed by a consciousness dwelling within oneself, and breaking out with one's own language into a new sense of social responsibility with self-determination.⁶² In Gutierrez's words:

It is important to keep in mind that beyond--or rather, through the struggle against misery, injustice and exploitation the goal is the creation of a new man.⁶³

It is interesting that Mesarovic and Pestel at the outset of their discussion of the global ecological crisis, which in their view spells a disaster as grave as a nuclear holocaust, decry the religious temptation to simply do nothing and have faith. Yet they also come to speak in terms of a "new mankind" in the following passage:

The transition from the present undifferentiated world growth to organic growth will lead to the creation of a new mankind. Such a transition would represent a dawn, not a doom, a beginning, not the end. Will mankind have the wisdom and will power to evolve a sound strategy to achieve that transition?⁶⁴

The fundamental challenge to humanity is whether it can find in the energies and forces that have fostered egotism within individuals and groups, and is perhaps most rampant as nationalism in politics and as triumphalism in religion, a basis for a kind of collective egotism as humanity understood as a planetary family. If the new humanity, the new responsible collectivity, is to emerge from the material of the old, as it is transformed by conscientization, by a new-world self-awareness and self-identification, then one must examine closely the elements of the old humanity to find there the seeds of the new.

Heretofore, the peoples, the cultures, the nations, the empires, the religions and ideologies of humanity have functioned as centrifugal forces, dividing asunder the peoples, the nations, the religions and the empires. The question now is whether there cannot be found in all those manifestations a capacity for centripetal force, a pulling together in identification across the differences of ideology, of religion, of nationality, of

racial and cultural background. Is this not the ultimate goal of authentic conscientization? One affirms one's own self, one's people, one's community in their own destiny, but then in that process one discovers a basis for identifying across differences to the awareness of one common destiny for all humanity. This does not mean eliminating all differences or reducing meaning to a common-denominator-type language. It means utilizing one's differentness, one's uniqueness as a human being for the sake of the human family and a healthy relation with non-human species and the non-human environment, now so heavily charged with human waste and pollution.

Is not the awareness of this possibility as much a call to action as the presence of injustice? Are they really different? Isn't the call to justice the call to identify across differences through a mutually created, mutually shared world structure? Here again, it seems to me that this awareness is a call to dialogue and again it seems to me that a dialogue between Christian liberation theologians and Jewish theologians and religious leaders could prove genuinely fruitful, if carried on with a sense of mutual responsibility to each other and to one's own community for the life-time and the life-space shared by these communities in Latin America.

Latin American theologians are seeking and experimenting with new ecclesial expressions for orthopraxis. It seems appropriate therefore that Judaism with a great deal of experience in new-community formation as kibbutzim would have a great deal to offer in a dialogue about the various possible communal ex-

pressions of orthopraxis. What Paulo Freire learned from Buber could conceivably be revived in a fresh dialogue between Christians and Jews in Latin America.

Conclusion: The Hermeneutic of Liberation as a Basis for
Making and Doing Shalom

A full discussion of such a hermeneutic cannot be presented here. The proper context would be in a meeting with liberation theologians and Jewish scholars. What follows is a suggestion that presupposes Segundo's first and second steps: (1) of awareness of the present experience of oppression, misery as a basis for (2) the suspicion that questions the whole ideological superstructure of human society and culture and theology's role within it. (See p. 14 above.) The suggestion is for the steps of questioning prevailing Biblical interpretation (step 3) for the purpose of a new interpretation of Scripture that may lay a proper foundation for orthopraxis (step 4). If liberation through orthopraxis is the fides qua, the faith by which one seeks to deal with demonic, oppressive structures, shalom understood in terms of the Hebrew root sh.l.m., as totality, entirety, or better yet, wholeness, is the fides quo, the goal for the process of restructuring life and thought as human beings before God.

The range of meaning of shalom (no longer to be italicised in this paper in order to make it part of English vocabulary) is as extensive as the uses of it throughout the history of Israel, but especially from nomadic times through the conquest and set-

tlement in the land of Israel, and through the great disruptions, such as the Assyrian invasion and the Babylonian captivity to the restoration to the land and the rebuilding of the temple under Persian rule. I wish to suggest that the oldest use of shalom as a greeting of blessing in the nomadic phase of Israel's history is very appropriate for the current situation of Latin American peoples who have yet to claim their own land.⁶⁵

Then shalom meant "well being" or being well in all that was necessary for a blessed life--enough food, clothing, shelter, good family relations, finding good grazing and water for the flocks on the sojourn, hence being well with nature. All this as a whole was understood as a blessing and gift from God, and so was the subject of inquiry when in the nomadic age one asked another, "How is your shalom?" For example in Genesis 29:6 where Jacob asks about the shalom of Laban the Son of Nahor, and receives as an answer, "He has shalom and see, Rachel his daughter is coming with the sheep." Rachel coming with the sheep represented the shalom, the total well-being of the family, and perhaps of the whole tribe of Laban.

The story of Jacob's dream at the place he named Beth-el, house of God, where he received the covenant of promise, is fully illustrative of the human and the divine import of shalom, and might well be taken as the Biblical paradigm for it. In the dream God spoke from the top of the ladder on which angels were ascending and descending, and God promised the land on which he lay as a gift to Jacob and his descendents (Gen. 28:13),

but the purpose of the gift was to generate descendents^{a/} who "like the dust of the earth shall spread to the west and east, and to the north and the south; and by you and your descendents shall all families of the earth bless themselves" (v. 14).

It is clear that without land and a meaningful relation to the land, no people can survive. This is a fact of life for Israel and all peoples of the world. But God's promise of blessing is not restricted to Jacob's descendents but rather is extended to "all families of the earth." The particularity, the uniqueness of people and land are there, not as ends in themselves, but as a means of blessing for all. This is a highly significant Biblical meaning of national particularity. It is recognized, received as a blessing and utilized to bless all humanity. Thus the shalom vision of Jacob was universal according to which God blesses the whole by way of the part. The Jewish table prayer that asks "Make us a blessing to every person that we meet" is fully commensurate with this shalom vision given to Jacob.

For his part Jacob made a vow, after awaking and setting up the stone upon which his head had rested as a pillar, and then after pouring oil on it, he said:

If God will be with me, and will keep me in the way that I go and will give me bread to eat and clothing to wear, so that I come again to my father's house in shalom, then the Lord shall be my God, and this stone which I have set up for a pillar shall be God's house; and of all that thou givest me, I will give the tenth to thee.

Gen. 28:20-22

Again, there is no shalom without the basic necessities of food and clothing and shelter, and there is no shalom without family and without a land to sustain the family. For Jacob, the sojourner, for his descendents in and out of the land of Israel, the basic conditions of shalom remain the same: a right relation with nature, with the family and with other families and nations, and all this means a right relation with God the Lord and giver of life, the gift of gifts, the charism of all charisms.

In this new age of scarcity and starvation, we need to be guided by the Biblical image of shalom given in Jacob's dream. Healthy people in a healthy environment will inevitably be blessings to peoples beyond themselves and their borders. The God of the Bible, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, is a God of shalom who wants well-being & blessing for all of the families of the earth. Thus to work and struggle for the conditions of basic well being for the oppressed is to work and act in faith, in hope and in love.

The Christian Scriptures identify Jesus Christ with the shalom of God. In Ephesians, chapter 2, it says of Christ Jesus "he is our shalom" who "has broken down the dividing wall of hostility" between Israel and gentiles. Of course, what follows next will be found offensive to Jews--namely, "by abolishing in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new human being in place of the two, so making shalom," (v. 16). But, in view of the fact that Jews do not expect gentiles to be observant of more

than the laws of Noah, they recognize that the observant life is both a response and a search for shalom which in principle is available to all humanity. Therefore, in the matter of Jewish-Christian relations the non-observance of Christians is not an issue for Jews. From the standpoint of Christians who appreciate the Hebrew roots of Christian faith the observance of Jews is not only not a problem, but a source of joy and blessing as Christians witness the joy of Israel in the gift of life and in the shalom of sabbath keeping, which is the well-being of the human spirit that comes with the celebration of creation. As Elie Wiesel once put it, "Judaism is the celebration of life."

In the messianic midrash of the Gospel of Luke, Christ is identified, not simply with shalom, but ^{with} "shalom on earth to persons of good will" (Luke 2:14) in the angels song at the birth of Jesus. Jesus as proclaimer of the kingdom of heaven, the reign of God, promises food, clothing, drink to all those who "Seek first his kingdom and his righteousness" (Mt. 6:33) because they who do so, will know that life and the body are the primary gifts and that food and clothing are clearly relative to that gift (Mt. 6:25-32). (Here the Hebrew root of Christian faith is clearly exposed in Jesus' preaching, just as it was in the stories of his activity as a healer and as a miracle-worker who fed the multitudes.)

The Hebrew understanding of shalom derived from a conscious identification of Israel with all creation. Israel was, and is, conscious of itself as the witness to creation and to God's

mighty acts in the liberation of Israel from bondage in Egypt and for the proper service of God and humanity as a people among other peoples, both in the land of Israel and in diaspora. For Israel to have been called out of Egypt did not mean that the Egyptians could not, and did not, remain Egyptians; but rather that Egypt could not remain the oppressors of Israel. Thus the Exodus is the appropriate paradigm for all liberation; that is liberation understood as a new relation and a new becoming in relation between oppressed and oppressor.

The Christian understanding of shalom identifies it with Jesus. Jesus is the messiah because he was anointed with the shalom of God in such a way that the sense of well-being, being well before God is spread with the good news of God's coming reign. So "Blessed indeed are the shalom makers" and "they shall be called the children of God" because they work for the basic wholeness of all persons; i.e., for meaningful physical, social, and spiritual conditions for human living before God. Thus St. Paul extended this typical greeting in his epistles: "Grace to you and shalom from God our Father and from our Lord Jesus Christ" (Romans 1:2). Of course, the Greek word eirene has some connotations that vary from the Hebrew shalom, but it is clear that the early Christian custom of passing the peace was deeply rooted in the Hebrew meaning of shalom, so that a Christian received and gave shalom in community.

The alienation, exploitation and oppression of the present world have made the shalom vision once more a dream, or at best

a faint hope. Still it is the mandate of Biblical faith to make shalom, to do deeds that will enhance the total well-being of the families of the earth. One begins with the oppressed and the poor--Why? Because that is the way of God to "put down the mighty from their thrones," and to exalt "those of low degree," as the song of Mary put it in Luke 1:52.

Without the shalom vision liberation would be simply another one of the human centrifugal forces, tearing the human world asunder. With the shalom vision it becomes a positive force for dynamic, organic unity, calling humanity to self-realization in a creativity that seeks alternatives to all forms of oppression. Perhaps no one in recent times was more moved by the shalom vision than was E.F. Schumacher. He found expression for it in a little book published shortly before his death, one with a title that was his own echo of the Hebrew tradition: A Guide for the Perplexed.

Schumacher was aware that he wrote for people whose perplexity ran deep, who could, and can, no longer believe in the possibility of shalom. How striking it is that Schumacher addressed them from precisely the premise of Freire, Gutierrez, Segundo and Bonino. In order to believe in shalom, in the new humanity, they must come to believe in themselves precisely because they believe in God who gave them the gift of themselves and a world in which to realize the gifts of love and care for others. As he put it:

The art of living is always to make a good thing out of a bad thing. Only if we know that we have

actually descended into infernal regions where nothing awaits us but "the cold death of society and the extinguishing of all civilized relations," can we summon the courage and imagination needed for a "turning around," a metanoia. This then leads to seeing the world in a new light, namely, as a place where the things modern man continuously talks about and always fails to accomplish can actually be done. The generosity of the Earth allows us to feed all mankind; we know enough about ecology to keep the Earth a healthy place; there is enough room on the Earth, and there are enough materials, so that everybody can have adequate shelter; we are quite competent enough to produce sufficient supplies of necessities so that no one need live in misery. Above all, we shall then see that the economic problem is a convergent problem which has been solved already: we know how to provide enough and do not require any violent, inhuman, aggressive technologies to do so. There is no economic problem and, in a sense, there never has been. But there is a moral problem, and moral problems are not convergent, capable of being solved so that future generations can live without effort. No, they are divergent problems, which have to be understood and transcended.

Can we rely on it that a "turning around" will be accomplished by enough people quickly enough to save the modern world? This question is often asked, but no matter what the answer, it will mislead. The answer "Yes" would lead to complacency, the answer "No" to despair. It is desirable to leave these perplexities behind us and get down to work.⁶⁶

I have cited Schumacher at length in the hope that the last words of his book and this paper might become a first word to a new and significant dialogue both between Christians and Jews of Latin America, and between Latin Americans and North Americans in a common quest for shalom.

Notes:

1. Rosemary Ruether, Liberation Theology (New York: Paulist Press, 1972), p. 181.
2. Schubert Ogden, Faith & Freedom (Nashville: Abingdon, 1979), pp. 30-39.
3. Ibid., p. 123.
4. Jose M. Bonino, Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), pp. 22-23.
5. Ibid., pp. 71-72; and 106-131.
6. Juan L. Segundo, The Liberation of Theology, (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1976), p. 9, p. 133, and pp. 216-228.
7. Gustavo Gutierrez, A Theology of Liberation (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1973), p. 9f.
8. Bonino, p. 97.
9. Segundo, pp. 16-19.
10. Gutierrez, p. 35.
11. Ibid., p. 36.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid., p. 37.
14. Ibid., p. 178.
15. Ed., Walter M. Abbott, S.J. "The Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, " The Documents of Vatican II (New York: America Press, 1966), p. 25.
16. Gutierrez, p. 159. Cf. Bonino, p. 77.
17. Segundo, p. 108.
18. Ibid., p. 110f.
19. Ibid., p. 111.
20. Ibid., "Theology as the Second Step," pp. 75-81, esp. pp. 77-79.
21. Ibid., p. 78.
22. Ibid., p. 81
23. Ibid., p. 77.

Notes:

24. Martin Luther, Lectures on Galatians, Vol. 26, Luther's Works, (St. Louis: Concordia, 1963), p. 124, where Luther attacked the Roman Catholic doctrine of merits as among the "monstrosities and horrible blasphemies" that "ought to be propounded to Turks and Jews, not to the church of Christ."
25. Segundo, p. 9.
26. See pp. 8-9 above, notes 11-13 above.
27. Segundo, p. 77.
28. Ibid., p. 82.
29. Ibid., p. 79.
30. Ibid., p. 106.
31. Ibid., p. 109.
32. Ibid., p. 106.
33. Ibid., p. 110.
34. Ibid., p. 105.
35. Ibid., pp. 106-107.
36. Ibid., p. 85.
37. Ibid., p. 86.
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid., p. 116.
40. Ibid., p. 166.
41. Ibid., p. 164.
42. Ibid., p. 165.
43. Ibid., p. 162, re: "the law of the economy of energy"
44. Ibid., p. 171.
45. Ibid., p. 174.
46. E. F. Schumacher, Small Is Beautiful (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), Part II The Third World, pp. 163-297.

Notes:

47. Segundo, p. 95. Note 5 where he writes:
"This is evident from the fact that the concern to get rid of Jesus physically--because he threatened the status quo--was primarily displayed by the supposedly 'religious' authorities rather than by the representatives of the Roman Empire."
48. Jeffrey G. Sobosan, "The Trial of Jesus," The Journal of Ecumenical Studies (Vol. 10, Winter, 1973), p. 83.
49. Samuel Sandmel, Anti-Semitism in the New Testament (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), p. 28.
50. Hans Kung, On Being a Christian, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976), p. 320.
51. See Howard Clark Kee, Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977), p. 45 on the "Early Christian use of Scripture" where in a most cursory treatment, not even a page long, he says in regard to the topic: "Attention to that question is essential in the study of Mark because of the hundreds of allusions to and quotations from scripture that this little book contains." Later on in his summary remarks Kee refers to the Septuagint as the Bible for the Markan Community.
- A more careful study of the early Christian use of scripture is offered by John Drury, Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel A Study in Early Christian Historiography, (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1976), especially ch. 4 on "Using Scripture." Here we are shown that more and more of the allegedly historical facts must be attributed to the imaginative weaving of Septuagintal allusions into the stories of Jesus, so that the conclusion is compelled that without the use of the Septuagint the stories as we find them in the gospel could not have been written.
52. Bernard Lonergan, Method in Theology, (New York: Herder & Herder, 1972), pp. 20-21.
53. Gutierrez, p. 153.
54. Segundo, p. 39.
55. Bonino, p. 134.
56. Ibid., p. 114.
57. Segundo, ch 4 "Ideologies & Faith," pp. 97-124.

Notes:

58. Mihajlo Mesarovic & Eduard Pestel, Mankind at the Turning Point, (New York: New American Library, 1974), pp. 1-9.
59. Gutierrez, p. 7.
60. Bonino, p. 74.
61. Ibid., p. 110.
62. Gutierrez, pp. 145-147 on "Faith and the New Man" and pp. 91-92 where he discusses Paulo Freire's "Conscientization" as presented in his Pedagogy of the Oppressed, (New York: Seabury Press, 1968), pp. 100-103.
63. Gutierrez, p. 146.
64. Mesarovic and Pestel, p. 9.
65. See Hugh C. White, Shalom in the Old Testament (Philadelphia: United Church Press, a Shalom Resource of the Joint Education Development program of some ten denominations of North America, for a summary of recent scholarship on shalom.
66. E.F. Schumacher, A Guide for the Perplexed, (New York: Harper & Row, 1977), pp. 139-140.