

The Holy Spirit and Liberation Movements:

The Response of the Church

Richard Tholin

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the Christian experience of the Holy Spirit in the context of contemporary liberation movements. This is not what I anticipated would become the focus when I began preparation for writing. At that time, my perception of the Spirit was influenced by the revival of Pentecostalism and I tended to view the work of the Spirit as subjective, charismatic, and often ecstatic. As a result, I expected to examine the ways in which the Holy Spirit might be seen as the dynamic element that enables creative change in established, static institutions (in a version of the church-sect tension). But the more I explored the biblical experience of the Spirit the more my purpose had to change. The perception of the Spirit as a source of radical social change persisted, but it became both broader and more precise—broader by moving beyond the church as a self-contained institution to the church as a part of world history, and more precise by focusing on the specific issue of oppression.

As a result, we will examine the biblical experience of the Spirit and its relationship to liberation movements among blacks fighting systems of white racism in the United States and southern Africa, among women resisting the cultural and economic oppression of male-dominated societies and, particularly, among the peoples of the Third World struggling against economic and political exploitation by the developed nations and their agents.

When I reached the decision to deal with liberation, I became acutely aware of my own identity. I am a white, male, affluent American Christian. I have had just enough experience with liberation movements to know that for me to assume the role of interpreter of these movements would be foolhardy. They rightly insist on speaking for themselves. What one in my position can do, however, is to listen and respond out of who one is and to assume responsibility in the light of that which comes from the Spirit and the liberation movements.

I cite this personal position not simply as a catharsis or a predelivery defense mechanism but because, for a long time, this is where the dominant leadership of the churches has been. Despite the beginnings of change, quota systems and all, the church, including Methodist segments of it around the world, has been led predominantly by white, male, middle-aged, relatively affluent Americans or Europeans. We will attempt a response to the Spirit and to movements for liberation from within the church, a church too often part of the systems of oppression that dehumanize blacks, women, the poor, and many others.

Let us begin with a biblical exploration of the work of the Spirit. The biblical word provides the norm for all Christian analysis. But it is particularly important for any analysis of the Holy Spirit. Not all spirits are the Holy Spirit, nor is all enthusiasm the work of the Spirit, as Wesley was quick to point out to his followers. Only those experiences which are in continuity with the biblical record as it comes to focus in the person and work of Jesus Christ are of the Holy Spirit. Further, if the church is to be freed from participation in established systems of oppression, then its resolve must be steered by the most fundamental sources of its faith. For those in the Wesleyan tradition, the test of

the Spirit and the primary source of the radically converting word is the Bible, as it centers in Jesus Christ.*

* In the delivery of this material as a lecture, adaptations were made which copyright rules make very difficult in the published version. One form of oppression is found in language, in this case, the use of the masculine for all generic terms. Much of the quoted material in this paper uses male generic language. In the lecture form that language was changed to more inclusive terms. Readers might well attempt the same discipline.

In addition, where the pronoun is used for the Holy Spirit the spoken version used "she." While not making an extended defense here, there are some hotly debated linguistic arguments for this usage. In any event, use of the female pronoun for the Spirit can be a constructive way to move beyond exclusively male designations for the triune God.

I. The Spirit in the Biblical Witness

A. In the Old Testament

In the Old Testament, the Spirit is *ruach*, the breath of God. That breath filled inanimate matter and created human life (Genesis 2:7). But contrary to domesticated images of the Spirit, as the gentle breeze comforting the weary or inspiring the poet, *ruach* is that wind of God, out of the desert like Israel itself, that dried up Noah's flood, held back the waters of the Red Sea,¹ and devours and withers sinful people like grass. (Isaiah 40:7, 59:19)

In the early history of Israel, the powerful wind of God raised up charismatic leaders in the early judges and kings. (cf. Judges 3:10, 6:34; 1 Samuel 11:6, 16:13) The Spirit was restless and unpredictable, often creating ecstatic experiences, not unlike similar ecstasies in other Semitic religions. But in the encounter of Israel with Jahweh the power of the Spirit began to take a particular form, one that set it completely apart from interpretations of Spirit-possession in other religions.

The major prophets took the spirit-concept out of these surroundings, and transformed the divine spirit from something religiously and ethically neutral into the concept of the purposeful and deliberate operation of God's personal power . . . in history and creation.²

This historicized, Hebraic view of the Spirit is in sharp contrast to all concepts of the Spirit as *mana*, the divine power existing in various forms of nature.³

As a result, in the mainstream of Old Testament literature, the Spirit is the source of the prophetic Word, the power of God entering human history through the judgments and actions of God's chosen spokesmen. That Word of the Spirit was not simply words. It was power, the power of God working through both *theoria* and *praxia*. Spirit-filled prophecy included both insight into underlying reality and action based on that insight.⁴ As a result, the prophetic word of the Spirit became event. The inspired prophetic insight into God's ultimate purposes and immediate demands created encounters and happenings that shaped the flow of history—as the fear of prophetic proclamation by political leaders made abundantly clear.

But not every claim of prophetic inspiration comes from the Spirit of God. Ecstasy and visions can be claimed by anyone, including the false prophets. (cf. Jeremiah 5:12-13, 14:14, 23:16-22) The true mark of the Spirit is a particular content and concern, a content and concern that flow out of the compassion and commitment of God. Here the prophetic oracles must be allowed to speak for themselves, beginning with one of the most familiar messianic passages of the Old Testament. (Isaiah 11:1-9)

There shall come forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse and a branch shall grow out of his roots.

And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord.

(verses 1-2, RSV)

And what does the king who has the Spirit do?

He will not judge by appearances,
nor decide by hearsay,
but act with justice to the helpless,
and decide fairly for the humble.

He will strike down the ruthless with his verdicts,
and slay the unjust with his sentences.
Justice shall gird him for action,
he shall be belted with trustworthiness.
(verses 3b-5, Moffatt)

Only after such judgments is the vision of peace possible where the "wolf shall dwell with the lamb" (verse 6), and "they shall not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain" (verse 9).

It is crucial to recognize the basic concerns that are linked inseparably to the gift of the Spirit. The Spirit brings justice, not the legalities of clever courtroom argument and external appearances, but the justice of one who loves the poor and helpless, who is consistently biased toward the humble and oppressed. And Spirit-inspired justice includes striking down the power of the ruthless oppressor, a justice that is enacted, not just proclaimed. Then comes the possibility of a land full of peace. (For similar passages in Isaiah, see 2:4, 9:7, and 32:15-18, all of which deal with the Spirit in the context of justice, concern for the oppressed, and the messianic vision of peace.)

The same dynamics can be seen in Micah. In the third chapter, the prophet speaks out against the rulers of Israel, "who hate the good and love the evil . . . who eat the flesh of my people." (verses 1-3) He then attacks the false prophets—" . . . the seers shall be disgraced, and the diviners put to shame . . . for there is no answer from God." (verse 7) Then comes the true word of the Spirit.

But as for me, I am filled with power,
with the Spirit of the Lord,
and with justice and might,
to declare to Jacob his transgression
and to Israel his sin.
Hear this, you heads of the house of Jacob
and rulers of the house of Israel,
who abhor justice
and pervert all equity,
who build Zion with blood
and Jerusalem with wrong . . .

Therefore because of you
Zion shall be plowed as a field
(verses 8-10, 12, RSV)

As these and similar passages demonstrate, the Spirit was given to the prophets to speak the word of the Lord with a power far beyond their own. And why did the Lord give this power? Was it to give the Spirit-possessed the glow of mystical experience, the excitement of ecstasy, the calm assurance of the redeemed? Hardly. For the prophet, the Spirit was a burning fire in the bones, a living word that could not be held in, yet, when spoken, led to pain and alienation from his own people. (cf. Jeremiah 20:7-18) Why did the Spirit give prophetic power? Only because the Lord's commitment to justice and the humanity of the oppressed demanded it. Paul Tillich summarized the identifying mark of the Spirit in Old Testament literature.

In all its parts the Old Testament follows this line. There is no Spiritual Presence where there is no humanity and justice. Without them—and this is the judgment of the prophets against their own religion—there is demonized or profanized Spiritual Presence.⁵

B. The Spirit in the Gospels

Of all the Gospel writers, Luke is most aware of the activity of the Spirit and its primary role in providing the power and authority of Jesus' ministry. It is only consistent with the Old Testament then that Luke, more than the other Gospel accounts, also presents Jesus as the fulfillment of the prophetic stream of Israel. G.W.H. Lampe describes Luke's basic perspective.

Yet, although he excels the ancient prophets (by his steady, rather than intermittent, union with the Spirit), Jesus is nevertheless himself a prophet for whom they had prepared the way; his person and office, as described by St. Luke, recall many features of the character and work of the most outstanding figures among them; and he is presented to the readers of this Gospel and Acts as the fulfillment of the prophecy of Deuteronomy 18:15:

"The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet . . . like unto me (Moses): unto him shall ye hearken."
(cf. Acts 3:22-23, 7:37)⁹

The Spirit-inspired, prophetic view of Jesus is set firmly in a messianic context. In inter-Testamental times, it was believed that the prophetic gift had ended at the close of the Old Testament period. Since "the Holy Spirit was primarily the spirit of prophecy," this meant that the Holy Spirit was also absent. When prophecy by the Spirit broke out again it would signal the start of the messianic era.⁷ Luke describes the annunciation and birth of John and Jesus as just such a new and powerful pouring out of the Spirit, seen primarily in the oracles of the primary figures, including, Mary, Zechariah, and Simeon. But most of all, it was the prophetic figure of John, striding out of the wilderness, preaching the judgments of God upon his generation, who was seen as the forerunner of the one who would fulfill the messianic visions of the prophets. Whatever else Jesus' baptism meant, it certainly identified him with the prophetic purpose and preaching of John. It is hardly accidental that it was in the midst of a prophetic movement, not in the official precincts of the Temple or the neighborly circle of the synagogue, that the Spirit descended on Jesus.

Thus, in Luke, the renewed activity of the Spirit is linked with prophetic proclamation and the messianic role of Jesus. But it is not just a proof-texting use of the prophetic predictions without any concern for the content of prophetic preaching. Mixed through these events was the continuing concern of God for justice and the cause of the oppressed. The core of the oracle of Mary echoes with the words of Amos and Micah, a fact not missed by the socialist Anglo-Catholic rector of Thaxted, Conrad Noel, when the statue of the Virgin and child in his church carried the words:

He has shown strength with his arm,
he has scattered the proud in the imaginations
of their hearts,
he has put down the mighty from their thrones,
and exalted those of low degree;
he has filled the hungry with good things,
and the rich he has sent empty away.
(Luke 1:51-53, RSV)

The basic concern for justice and the poor also broke through John's preaching of repentance. When his hearers were stricken and asked what they should do, John translated the basic prophetic concerns into specific instructions that fit the situations of the penitents. This contrasts to so much of our generalized, spiritualized, and sanitized preaching. The multitude was to give priority to the needs of the poor: "He who has two coats, let him share with him who has none; and he who has food, let him do likewise." Tax-collectors were to behave justly: "Collect no more than is appointed you." And most importantly, soldiers, who enforced the power of the state, were not only to be just but were to get off the backs of the oppressed: "Rob no one by violence or by false accusation, and be content with your wages." (Luke 3:10-14) While on first reading these would seem mild enough, to carry through such acts of repentance would have been revolutionary for the social order of the time, just as they would be in legislative budget committees, offices of multi-national corporations, the White House, and urban police headquarters today.

When Jesus returned from his baptism he "was led by the Spirit" into the wilderness, very much in keeping with the biographies of earlier prophets. There he went through the struggle that prepared him for the messianic crisis he was to initiate. The relevance of this struggle for Jesus' later ministry has been interpreted many ways. But James H. Cone, writing from within a black community sensitized by struggle against white oppression, presents an understanding of this passage

that fits the prophetic nature of Jesus' mission more closely than other interpretations.

The Tempter's concern is to divert Jesus from the reality of his mission with the poor. Jesus' refusal to turn the stone into bread, or to worship the Tempter, or to throw himself from the pinnacle of the Temple (Luke 4:3-12) may be interpreted as his refusal to identify himself with any of the available modes of oppressive or self-glorifying power. His being in the world is as one of the humiliated, suffering poor.⁸

All of this comes to sharpest focus in Jesus' announcement of his mission in Nazareth. Here the work of the Spirit, the commitment of the Old Testament prophets to justice and the poor, and the dawn of the messianic era, are all fused in one powerful purpose expressed in the classic messianic passage from Isaiah 61.

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who are oppressed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.
(Luke 4:18-19, RSV)

With this passage the basic relationship of the Spirit to the ministry of Jesus is set. Subsequently, Luke does not deal so explicitly with the Spirit. Instead, he describes the results of the Spirit's prophetic work in Jesus' preaching of the Kingdom of God with authority and power⁹ and in his continual identification of God's redemptive activity with the poor and the oppressed.

Jesus' bias toward the poor comes as a shock to affluent Christians. But it pervades his teaching and action so completely that it can be denied only by evasion. The Sermon on the Plain in Luke is explicit.

Blessed are you poor, for yours is the kingdom of God.
Blessed are you that hunger now, for you shall be satisfied.
Blessed are you that weep now, for you shall laugh.
Blessed are you when men hate you, and when they exclude you and revile you, and cast out your name as evil, on account of the Son of Man! Rejoice in that day, and leap for joy, for behold, your reward is great in heaven; for so their fathers did to the prophets.

(Luke 6:20b-23, RSV)

It is important to note how Luke differs from Matthew. Matthew uses the phrases "poor in spirit" and "hunger and thirst after righteousness;" Luke uses only the words "the poor" and "hunger." And in case the point is missed, the Lucan version describes the other half of the great reversal of the Kingdom.

But woe to you that are rich, for you have received your consolation.

Woe to you that are full now, for you shall hunger.

Woe to you that laugh now, for you shall mourn and weep.

Woe to you, when all men speak well of you, for so their fathers did to the false prophets.

(Luke 6:24-26, RSV)

And this pervades Jesus' teaching. Two of his most powerful parables—the rich fool (Luke 12:13-21) and Dives and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31)—dramatize the judgment of God on the uncaring rich. The pointed reply to the rich man, when he pleads to send a messenger to warn his family, is, "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." (Luke 16:29)

Like the prophets, Jesus did not limit his pedagogy to words. The prophetic praxis was at work in his actions, including probably the most dramatic of his public confrontations. Jesus' cleansing of the Temple, following hard on the symbolic actions of his entry into Jerusalem, is now widely interpreted as a demonstration of messianic authority, not simply a puritan campaign against selling in sacred precincts or cheating on ecclesiastical exchange rates. But the prophetic content, i.e., God's concern for justice and the oppressed, is not so commonly seen in the midst of the messianic symbolism. And yet the Synoptic accounts of Jesus' brief words of explanation point in precisely that direction. Through the short-hand of referring to well-known Old Testament passages by citing a very familiar phrase from them, Jesus evokes—with "my house shall be a house of prayer for all nations"—a high point of prophetic universalism in Isaiah 56:1-8; and—with

"you have made it a den of robbers"—the great Temple address of Jeremiah 7. The Isaiah passage speaks some of the strongest yet most tender words of inclusion for the rejected and despised found in biblical literature—in this case for eunuchs and foreigners. The Jeremiah passage derides all attempts to buy God's protection from the beseiging Babylonians with Temple litanies and demands; instead, it proclaims that they will be saved only if they "truly execute justice one with another . . . do not oppress the alien, the fatherless or the widow, or shed innocent blood . . ." (Jeremiah 7:5) The Gospel accounts do not make clear the specific abuses Jesus was protesting. He could well have been taking action against the oppression of alien converts and women who may have been virtually excluded from Temple worship by relegation to areas not only on the margins of the Temple but also preempted for Temple profit-making. But whatever the specific abuses in the Temple or social order, the prophetic roots of Jesus' pedagogical action were clear. True worship demands participation in God's commitment to justice and inclusiveness, with special concern for the oppressed and excluded.

Finally, Jesus' active identification with the poor meant his life took the form of the Suffering Servant. This, too, continues the prophetic purpose. Lampe points out the connections.

The Servant is pre-eminently a prophet, one in whom God had put his Spirit. (Isaiah 42:1) He is in some respects a new Moses . . . His office, like that of Moses, is to release men from bondage and darkness by the power of the Lord . . . (Isaiah 42:7)¹⁹

The whole series of events leading to Jesus' death—trials before the powerful authorities of Temple religion and Roman imperialism, torture by the soldiers, and execution among thieves—dramatized that the redemption brought by Jesus came not through participation in the forces of oppression but through identifi-

cation with those condemned by established and quite legal authority. Like the Servant, "he was numbered with the lawless." (Luke 22:37; Isaiah 53:12) When God authored the triumph of the Resurrection, he set an ultimate contradiction in human history. His saving action came through self-sacrifice and suffering, through identification with the powerless and the out-cast. The power of the oppressors, even when allied with death itself, is not final. The Servant becomes the judge, the Lord of history. The small community of Christians soon began to sing, "at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord . . ." (Philippians 2:10-11)

C. The Spirit in the New Testament Church

The work of the Spirit in the mission of the church is in continuity with the work of the Spirit in the life of Jesus, a continuity made clear by the unity of Luke-Acts. But the context changed in the early church. First, the scope of its work broadened. This can be seen in the new understanding of the kingdom of God that dawned on the disciples. "What the nature of that kingdom was to be they began to discover after the Resurrection. It turned out to be, not a restoration of the kingdom to Israel, but a mission to the world.²¹ And God's Spirit was to fuel that mission.

But you shall receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth. (Acts 1:8)

Both the continuity and the changing context of the work of the Spirit can be seen in the account of Pentecost. In the Lucan account, prophesying, i.e., preaching, is still "the central and decisive activity of the Spirit,"²² as it was in the Old Testament and with Jesus. But the context has become the world, not Israel. The crucial result of the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost is not

ecstatic experience for its own sake but as a missional gift, i.e., the power to preach to all nations. As a result, it is possible to interpret the account of speaking in tongues as "a proleptic summary of the missionary story which is to be unfolded in the whole of the subsequent record in Acts."¹⁴ The basic interpretation of what is happening comes from Joel, in which Luke underlines the way the Spirit means prophecy. Finally, the climactic event of the coming of the Spirit is Peter's kerygmatic preaching and the great ingathering of converts.

Second, the time span of the mission is seen as very short. The Gospel must be spread throughout the world before the return of the Lord. Therefore, the gift of the Spirit "inaugurates an intermediate period in the history of God's redemptive purposes," one which fulfills the prophetic expectation of the outpouring of the Spirit envisioned in Joel and "the ground of a new hope that Jesus will come again."¹⁴ The strategy of the Spirit flows out of this shortened time span, a strategy that soon focused on missionary preaching to all peoples. Eduard Schweitzer points out how this basic perspective on the work of the Spirit permeates all the major New Testament letters, not just Luke's account in Acts.

In this way, in John as in Paul, the Jewish answer is given a new twist: the Spirit is the Spirit of prophecy; but this is not a phenomenon of remote ages, but is the power of God now present in the preaching of the church, moulding the life of the Last-Age people of God and so challenging and judging the world.¹⁵

The continuities in method and content with Jesus' preaching of the kingdom of God and with the Israelite prophets need to be seen. The preaching of both Old Testament prophets and the New Testament church is a radical confrontation with human sin, a crisis that demands decision. Both insist on the necessity of conversion, that is, a turning away from sin in repentance

and a turning toward God and divine love. And in both, the preached word is not just words, but the action of God that creates a new history for those it confronts.

The experience of the Spirit in the New Testament church also has some connections to the priority given by Jesus and the prophets to the poor. The gift of the Spirit created a new kind of corporate life, what Paul called "the fellowship of the Holy Spirit." The most obvious result at the time of Pentecost was a combination of intimate fellowship in worship and a radical communal sharing of goods. Dodd points out that each of the two accounts (in Acts 2 and 4) of such radical sharing, "which are thought to emanate from separate sources, is given as the immediate sequel to an account of the descent of the Holy Spirit."¹⁶

The most important connection, however, is the eschatological faith of the early church that saw Jesus as Lord over all principalities and powers. (cf. Colossians 1:16) That faith enabled Christians to stand against political and religious authorities, when necessary, in order to proclaim the Word, a power of contradiction that the Spirit gave both the Old Testament prophets and the followers of Jesus.

And when they bring you before the synagogues and the rulers and the authorities, do not be anxious how or what you are to answer or what you are to say, for the Holy Spirit will teach you in that very hour what you ought to say. (Luke 12:11-12, RSV)

The record of Acts is that neither Temple authorities (Acts 4) nor Roman governors (Acts 24-26) could silence that powerful word. This Spirit-filled power of contradiction made the early church suspect in centers of established power and gave even simple Christians the confidence that they would triumph while the massive power of Rome would fall. An apocryphal story recounts the answer of a second century martyr to the

taunt, "And what is your carpenter of Nazareth doing now?" as, "He is building coffins for Rome."

But the difference also must be recognized. As the church moved out of the people of Israel into the more diverse and individualistic Greco-Roman world, the concern for justice in political and economic structures found in the Hebrew prophets faded into the shadows of the consciousness of the church. And the commitment to the poor and oppressed was translated into communal sharing within the church, a sharing that in the early period of charismatic enthusiasm was radical but as the church grew soon became charity for the poor rather than socialization of all resources. In this sense, the prophetic Spirit of the Old Testament and Jesus was narrowed by the early church to the personal confrontation of individuals with the kerygmatic message and to the internal life of the church.

In another sense, the social consequences of the Spirit, working through prophetic proclamation, were broadened as the church broke out of the confines of Israel and undertook a worldwide mission. The potential power for radical political and economic change was submerged under individual and church consciousness which hardened over the centuries into heavy layers of institutional structure and political establishment. At the same time, the prophetic message of God's commitment to justice remained alive in segments of the church's life, waiting to be activated by the Spirit when historical situations sensitized Christians to hear the Word again. The Old Testament remained part of the canon and the Jesus of the Gospels, speaking through his dramatic parables and actions, led some Christians of all eras to stand with the poor and oppressed as an act of discipleship. The contradiction of human power made possible by the eschatological faith in Jesus as Lord and empowered by the Spirit steeled disciples to stand against the powers of

this world. The evangelical preaching of the church called for radical repentance and conversion that, even when it was individualized and privatized in its concepts of sin, still challenged the values and orders of the world. When human history did not end in one generation, when Christians began to assume responsibility for government and the use of economic power, then these submerged forces again became appropriate for those who took seriously the Lordship of Jesus Christ, just as they had for the prophets and for Jesus in bringing the prophetic word to the nation of Israel.

II. The Church, the Spirit and Contemporary Liberation Movements

If at the heart of the work of the Spirit in the biblical record is action "to proclaim release to the captives . . . , to set at liberty those who are oppressed," (Isaiah 61:1-2, Luke 4:18) it should come as no surprise that Christians are confronted with the possibility that the Spirit is at work in the midst of movements for human liberation. In our time, many Christians, speaking from within oppressed communities which seek liberation, are insisting that such is precisely the case—James Cone, for instance.

The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Father and the Son at work in the forces of human liberation in our society today. In America, the Holy Spirit is black people making decisions about their togetherness, which means making preparation for an encounter with white people.¹⁷

What follows is an attempt to see how the biblical view of the Spirit, the contemporary mission of the church, and a particular liberation movement interact in our moment of history. It will focus on only one liberation movement—that found in South America—and two spokesmen: Paulo Freire as the primary one, whose *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* "is rooted in concrete situations" and 'grows out of his identification

with the peasants of northeastern Brazil through a liberation movement combining literacy training and political action;¹⁸ and Rubem Alves, as the secondary source, who, in *A Theology of Human Hope*,¹⁹ does theology in the context of the political humanism of revolutionary movements in South America. Given the limits of time, choosing one movement is the only way to make it possible for a liberation movement to speak even minimally for itself.

Freire has written his book for "radicals" (which I presume can be a legitimate description of a prophetic people possessed by the Spirit). As a result, he is "certain that Christians and Marxists, though they may disagree with me . . . will continue reading to the end."²⁰ Out of his reflection on his experience, he draws a sharp distinction between radicalization and sectarianism. "Sectarianism makes myths and thereby alienates; radicalization is critical and thereby liberates." Sectarianism can be of the Right, which treats the past as "something given and immutable;" or of the Left, in which "tomorrow" is decreed beforehand, is inexorably preordained." Both types of sectarianism are reactionary. Both types, "treating history in an equally proprietary fashion, end up without the people—which is another way of being against them."²¹

The radical, committed to human liberation, does not become the prisoner of a "circle of certainty" within which he also imprisons reality. On the contrary, the more radical he is, the more fully he enters into reality so that, knowing it better, he can better transform it. He is not afraid to confront, to listen, to see the world unveiled. He is not afraid to meet the people or to enter into dialogue with them. He does not consider himself the proprietor of history or of men, or the liberator of the oppressed; but he does commit himself, within history, to fight at their side."²²

For Freire and Alves, the core of liberation movements is not programs of economic welfare or even of political power, essential as these may be. The heart of the liberation movement is a vision of what it means

to be human and a commitment to a process of humanization. According to Alves,

Humanization, therefore, is not created by economic panaceas. It exists to the extent to which man, as free subject, creates his future, the future which liberates him from the passivity under which the master keeps him. "Man is only truly man," observes Paul VI in *Populorum Progressio*, "in as far as master of his own acts and judge of their worth, he is author of his own advancement."²³

Oppression is everything that dehumanizes persons by dominating and controlling them, by treating them as powerless Objects. Liberation is setting the oppressed free to be Subjects, to find power to create their own unique history. Oppressive dehumanization and liberating humanization exist in contradiction.

But while both humanization and dehumanization are real alternatives, only the first is man's vocation. This vocation is constantly negated, yet it is affirmed by that very negation. It is thwarted by injustice, exploitation, oppression, and the violence of the oppressors; it is affirmed by the yearning of the oppressed for freedom and justice and by their struggle to recover their lost humanity."²⁴

The tool that the oppressed use for their liberation, in Freire's analysis, is conscientization (more familiar to some as "consciousness-raising"²⁵). Conscientization includes four elements, integrated into one process. First, there is the growing awareness of basic contradictions between what the oppressed can be and what the oppressive system allows them to be, an awareness of their special human gifts and calling and of the forces of oppression that block the full realization of their humanity. Second, such a new consciousness is not a result of abstract analysis but of a combination of reflection and action. It is praxis, i.e., "action and reflection of men upon their world in order to reform it."²⁶ In an oppressive system praxis includes resistance, the negating of the oppressors' negation of their humanity. Third, a new consciousness brought alive in praxis is always corporate; it is impossible apart from

solidarity among the oppressed as they develop power to break out of the grip of the oppressor. Finally, the basic dynamic is liberation, one that stands both at the end of the process and inside it, one that finally frees the oppressor as well as the oppressed. "This, then, is the great humanistic and historical task of the oppressed: to liberate themselves and their oppressors, as well."²⁷ For those on top in an unjust society, who see the latter element as "humane" use of their power to "help" the oppressed, a further word must be heard.

The oppressors, who oppress, exploit, and rape by virtue of their power, cannot find in this power the strength to liberate either the oppressed or themselves. Only power that springs from the weakness of the oppressed will be sufficiently strong to free both.²⁸

How does the church, sometimes a direct supporter of oppression and often integrated into the established order that benefits from exploitation of the powerless, respond to such movements of liberation? Particularly, is there any affinity between the biblical experience of the Spirit and the process by which a church dominated by white, male, middle-aged, affluent American and European leadership responds to movements of liberation among blacks, women, the young, the poor and the Third World? The process of conscientization can provide a useful framework for such an exploration.

A. Developing an Awareness of the Contradictions Between Liberation and Oppression

The first requirement of Christians who hold power in our society is to listen. This has always been the first task of any Spirit-inspired, prophetic community, as John Taylor insists.

What turned a man into a prophet was not eloquence but vision, not getting the message across but getting the message. Prophecy is essentially an act of recognition by which one sees the significance of an event as a revelation that must be passed on.²⁹

That moment of vision always comes as a gift, not a product of our skill and effort. But we can be sensi-

tized to the possibility of new vision by recollection of the way the Spirit has worked in the biblical community and by listening with anticipation to the oppressed themselves.

Confronting the biblical experience has been the aim of the first half of this chapter. Some of that analysis has direct connections to the process of a new awareness of the contradictions of oppression. First, in the Old Testament and in Jesus, the Spirit is the source of passionate commitment to justice, of clear bias toward the poor, the excluded, and the oppressed, and of judgment upon the oppressors. But the identification with the oppressed goes deeper than words. In the Incarnation, Jesus becomes one with the poor and powerless, finally taking the form of the Servant who is crucified as a criminal. And he says we continue to meet him in the hungry and imprisoned. (Matthew 25:31-46) In the light of this, when the church is inescapably involved in the historical issues of its world, it will share the prophetic commitment to the powerless and expect the vision of the Spirit to come from the poor and oppressed more than from the oppressors.

Second, the Spirit inspired the eschatological vision of the people of God, both in the Old and New Testaments, a vision that always provided a vivid contrast between the way things are and the way God intends them to be. John Taylor again puts it well.

This unique and authentic opening of the eyes by the Spirit of creativity within the heart of all things produces that double exposure by which what is and what might be are seen in a single vision. The fire with which he burns is the fire of judgment precisely because it is the fire of creation. Possessed by such a Spirit, the prophet is bound to criticize and protest.³⁰

Third, the Spirit has been the power that breaks through the thick barriers of prejudice and exclusion so that dialogue can take place. Peter's experience, as the Spirit dragged him out of the confines of superiority into an encounter with Cornelius, was such an event.

His radical new insight, "Truly, I perceive that God shows no partiality, but in every nation any one who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him," (Acts 10:34-35) helped to enable Jews and Gentiles to meet each other as equals in genuine dialogue, not as superiors and inferiors. That same Spirit freed the church to recognize that there is "neither slave nor free, neither male nor female for you are all one in Christ Jesus." (Galatians 3:28) As a result, it should surprise no one if the Spirit calls those with power to listen to the oppressed, including fellow Christians, as equals. In many situations of oppression, it is precisely the ability to enter into such dialogue that can be the beginning of liberation for both the oppressed and the oppressors.⁸¹

All this leads to the conviction that the Spirit does not speak *about* the oppressed so much as the Spirit speaks *through* the oppressed. I would judge that most of us have had experiences that bear this out. Those of us for whom a social system works well find it almost impossible to break through the network of myths that every system develops, not only to explain but to justify, the vast inequities between rich nations and poor nations, between black and white.⁸² And even when uncomfortable perceptions slip through the grid, they are too weak to overcome the inertia of familiar and comfortable patterns of life. Those among the oppressed who have to deal with leaders of established churches are quite clear about this. James Cone says it for blacks.

White theologians, not having felt the sting of oppression, will find it most difficult to criticize this nation, for the condemnation of America means a condemnation of self.

The true black thinker is in a different position. He cannot be *black* and be identified with the powers that be. To be black is to be committed to destroying everything this country loves and adores. Creativity and passion are possible when one stands where the black man stands, a

creature who has visions of the future because the present is unbearable.⁸³

The oppressed are the only ones who can make clear, without either hardhearted evasion or sentimentality, what an oppressive system is doing to their humanity. Even more, once those on top begin to listen, the oppressed are the ones who can communicate contradictions and protective myths of the whole system. Often this must come through painful confrontation and acts of resistance that force the attention of the powerful, even practicing Christians among them. At other times, the demythologizing comes through humor, which requires a double vision of what is and what is pretended to be and recognizes that what society considers ultimate is not so profoundly serious as it pretends—a double vision with marked similarities to Christian eschatology.⁸⁴ As a result, the shafts of humor that suddenly reveal the truth of a system usually come from those who know oppression first hand. A personal experience can illustrate this. In the mid-1960's, we saw James Baldwin's play, *Blues for Mister Charlie*, in a predominantly black audience in New York. At one point in the play, the hero, a black musician, after ten years in the North, returns to his home town in the deep South and reports to his family.

Edna . . . she said it wasn't as tight for a black man up there as it was down here. Well, that's a crock, Grand-mama, believe me when I tell you. At first I thought it was true, hell, I was just a green country boy and they ain't got no signs up, dig, saying you can't go here—or you can't go there. No, you got to find that out all by your lonesome.

We smiled, but the rest of the audience exploded. And the experience became a sharp knife that punctured the pretense that hid the depths of oppression in our "liberal" world.

B. Conversion and Praxis

Freire describes a basic dynamic of conscientization that forms a second link to the experience of the Spirit.

Liberation is thus a childbirth, and a painful one. The man who emerges is a new man, viable only as the oppressor-oppressed contradiction is superseded by the humanization of all men. Or to put it another way, the solution of this contradiction is born in the labor which brings this new man into the world: no longer oppressor or oppressed, but man in the process of achieving freedom.⁸⁵

For the oppressed, according to Freire, part of the pain in the birth of freedom is the risk of making choices, of challenging overwhelming power, of becoming a threat to oppressed comrades who are fearful of still greater oppression if they stand up to the powers that control them.

When we turn to the oppressors, the required transformation is even more radical. "Conversion to the people requires a profound rebirth. Those who undergo it must take on a new form of existence; they can no longer remain as they were."⁸⁶ Nor is this a matter of rhetoric or feeling. It requires radical action that links one's future to the oppressed.

Discovering himself to be an oppressor may cause considerable anguish, but it does not necessarily lead to solidarity with the oppressed. Rationalizing his guilt through paternalistic treatment of the oppressed, all the while holding them fast in a position of dependence, will not do. Solidarity requires that one enter into the situation of those with whom one is identifying; it is a radical posture.⁸⁷

The biblical experience of the Spirit introduced a similar crisis of decision that could lead to a radical change, to a turning around, to conversion. To the prophets, use of power to exploit the helpless came under God's judgment. Only if one repented and then acted with justice could God's salvation come. Otherwise, one could repeat the magic words, "The Temple of the Lord," all day and offer sacrifices of ritual penitence forever and God's righteous anger would not be assuaged. (Jeremiah 7) Jesus' preaching of the Kingdom and his authoritative actions required a similar kind of radical decision. Nor did Jesus settle

for token repentance or easy charity while keeping one's basic source of power intact. The rich young ruler was confronted with a decision, not about charitable tithes, but about his capital and identification with the powerlessness of Jesus' disciples.

Conversion has, over the centuries, often been so privatized or sacramentalized by the churches that it loses much of its impact. Yet, it retains in its Gospel form a power that has sometimes reached those who exercise or share in the benefits of exploitive power. Roman Catholic leaders in the Third World, sensitized by liberation movements and their faith, have recognized the power of conversion, as expressed in "Gospel and Revolution: Pastoral Letter from the Third World," written under the direction of Dom Helder Camera, Archbishop of Recife, August 15, 1967.

From the doctrinal point of view, the church knows that the gospel demands the first and the most radical revolution—conversion, total transformation from sin to grace, from selfishness to love, from pride to humble service. And this conversion not only is inner and spiritual but is addressed to the whole man, the physical and social creature as well as the unique spiritual person.⁸⁸

For many of us in the Wesleyan tradition the last ten years of confrontation by movements for liberation have brought the beginnings of a similar realization, cast in terms of our particular historical experience. A personal experience, one similar to what many of you have experienced, can illustrate the process. In 1963 some of us were confronted with a call for support from a group of black students who, with a few whites, had been arrested when attempting quietly to worship in a prestigious white Methodist church (ironically on Worldwide Communion Sunday). So early one Saturday evening three of us white pastors from a distant state found ourselves sitting on the floor of a crowded room with black students, singing, sharing experiences, laughing. But overarching everything was a sense of tension, the tension that grips you when you know that

hard decisions must soon be made. Those decisions would lead to action, action that meant standing together publicly in a society dominated by whites and heavy with violence. And if we were to take that stand it meant taking orders from blacks, following their strategy completely, not knowing what to expect, not able to control the results. And suddenly I was back in a small Evangelical United Brethren church during evangelistic services, where there was lively singing, shared testimonies, laughter and, at the same time, the steady tension of knowing that an altar call was coming, that one must face a decision that could lead to action, first by taking a public stand at the altar and then by open Christian witnessing among one's friends. The future it would lead to was uncertain. In both situations, the dynamics were remarkably alike. And the response, the taking of a stand and the joy that swept around us afterwards in the living fellowship of those who shared a common commitment, was the same. The difference was that in one the Spirit confronted me with a decision about personal salvation and in the other, with a decision about standing with those seeking liberation. Such a short-term involvement is only a taste of the long-term commitments involved in genuine conversion or solidarity. In both there was an authentic biblical content and the dynamics of the Spirit. Together they provide some awareness of the radical range of conversion to which the Spirit calls, in experience consistent with our Wesleyan heritage.

C. Solidarity with the Oppressed

If those who benefit from oppression repent, if they turn around and act differently, they will not overcome the dichotomy between oppressor and oppressed by just any actions. The action that is required is solidarity with the oppressed. Freire makes clear the way action and solidarity are intertwined.

... true solidarity with the oppressed means fighting at their side to transform the objective reality which has made them these "beings for another." The oppressor shows solidarity with the oppressed only . . . when he stops making pious, sentimental, and individualistic gestures and risks an act of love. True solidarity is found only in the plenitude of this act of love, in its existentiality, in its praxis. It is farce to affirm that men are people and thus should be free, yet to do nothing tangible to make this affirmation a reality.⁴⁰

But even when those who have been part of the controlling strata align themselves with the oppressed, there remains a distinct possibility that the spirit of their identification can destroy its value. The danger is to assume that they are to lead the oppressed or to speak for them rather than to join them. Something of this can be seen in the response of one Christian thinker.

We must demand entrance to the powerful because, in virtue of representing the poor, we are ambassadors of Christ. I hold that in every situation of injustice and oppression, the Christian—who cannot deal with it by violence—must make himself completely a part of it *as representatives of the victims* (stress in original)⁴⁰

In contrast, Freire warns of the dangers of a conversion that retains the paternalistic position of the convert.

... certain members of the oppressor class join the oppressed in their struggle for liberation, thus moving from one pole of the contradiction to the other. Theirs is a fundamental role and has been throughout the history of the struggle. It happens, however, that as they cease to be exploiters or indifferent spectators or simply the heirs of exploitation and move to the side of the exploited, they almost always bring with them the marks of their origin: their prejudices and their deformations, which include a lack of confidence in the people's ability to think, to want, and to know. Accordingly, these adherents to the people's cause constantly run the risk of falling into a type of generosity as harmful as that of the oppressors . . . because of their background they believe that they must be the executors of the transformation. They talk about the people, but they do not trust them; and trusting the people is the indispensable precondition for revolutionary change. A real humanist can be identified more by his trust in the people, which engages him

in their struggle, than by a thousand actions in their favour without that trust.⁴¹

The perspective of this extended quotation is crucial for the leadership of the church if it is to work for authentic liberation. The objective of liberation is not simply political and economic programs but humanization. It aims to enable all persons to become Subjects, to create their own unique history. Control by the sympathetic and benevolent is still control.

One of the major functions of the Spirit has been to create solidarity among those who are converted. In Tillich's terms:

The divine Spirit's invasion of the human spirit does not occur in isolated individuals but in social groups, since all the functions of the human spirit—moral self-integration, cultural self-creation, and religious self-transcendence—are conditioned by the social context of the ego-thou encounter.⁴²

The experience of the early church is a good bit more graphic. As we have seen, the coming of the Spirit created a radical new community, one in which each person gave up the security of individual possessions and became solidly a part of the new community, a solidarity so powerful that to betray it—to "lie to the Holy Spirit"—was a life and death matter. (Acts 5:1-11)

The commitment to solidarity is particularly important for those of us in Methodist churches. With the discipline and group support of the class meeting far in the past, we often are surfeited with individualism and private pietism. As a result, the work of the Spirit is seen almost entirely as a source of inner, personal experience and seldom as the creator of a powerful new community. If we are to appropriate the meaning of the Spirit in our age, we need to open ourselves to a converting power that drives us into solidarity with all those who do God's work among the peoples of the world.

But the solidarity Freire calls for is solidarity with

the oppressed. And it must be a solidarity that trusts the people and supports their liberated potential. At this point, we must turn again to the prophetic identification with the poor, made visible in Jesus, who took upon himself the life of the poor and mixed with society's outcasts, not in condescension but in joy. He did not talk so much about lifting up the poor as joining them—"for every one who exalts himself will be humbled, but he who humbles himself will be exalted." He did not organize programs of charitable good works but dignified and accepted thankfully the gifts of those whom society ignored or despised (cf. the woman who anointed his feet or the widow dropping her coins in the Temple chest).

Where solidarity with the oppressed will lead varies with the situation and the range of options open. In some cases, where all options for peaceful protest and change are closed, some Christians, like Camillo Torres, may join the guerillas.⁴³ Others, like Archbishop Camera, may stay in high office in the church, live a simple life and use their position to challenge the violent injustice of the established order and to amplify the voice of the powerless. In other situations, those with power in the church, including the power of position and budget, will give up that power when powerless groups raise their voice, not as an act of paternalistic charity but as the result of honest dialogue and negotiation among equals. Churches with political and economic influence in developed countries will press for policies that enable equity and self-determination for the Third World. At a minimum, Christians will not oppose forces which make them their wealth and power. The pastoral letter from the Third World pleads for at least that much sensitivity to the Spirit.

Even if we have not been able to (share all that we have) voluntarily through love, let us know at least how

to recognize the hand of God, correcting us like children through the events that compel us to make this sacrifice.⁴⁴

In all of these ways, and many others, the key question will be solidarity. If the church's commitments are clear, if it stays in direct and constant communication with the oppressed, if it is willing to be a servant, not a master, then ways will be found to support genuine liberations.

The same must be said for the issue of violence. Some Christians argue that they cannot support, much less commit themselves to, movements of liberation because they entail violence. But the prior question is, "Which side are you on?" If one is a pacifist and is in solidarity with the oppressed, then he or she will be keenly aware of the official and legal violence that maintains systems of exploitation and suppression. For such persons, there is much useful work to be done in calling attention to and acting against, through non-violent means, the violence of the oppressors, as Christians with some status are doing in South Africa or Mozambique. But, of course, when Christians in dominant strata publicly side with the oppressed they must be ready to take the consequences. They become highly suspect, even traitorous, because they break through the moral pretensions and seeming unanimity that unjust systems use to legitimate their oppression. As a result, solidarity with the oppressed through non-violent action usually leads to the deeper solidarity with the oppressed through shared suffering.

But other Christians are not opposed to the use of force against unjust powers, such as Nazism. Such Christians must accept a wider range of options in support of liberation movements, including violent revolution when all other effective avenues for justice are closed in situations of great oppression. Such Christians cannot easily require non-violent methods only of liberation movements. As Helmut Gollwitzer puts it,

"anyone who uses pacifist arguments on the question of revolution but not on questions of the army, reveals his argument as the ideology of the ruling class."⁴⁵ But whether one is committed to pacifism or to the just use of force, the first question is the question of solidarity with the oppressed.

Other Christians hold back from commitment to the oppressed because they see the oppressed sometimes turning into oppressors when they gain power. Freire is well aware of the danger.

However, the moment the new regime hardens into a dominating "bureaucracy" the humanist dimension of the struggle is lost and it is no longer possible to speak of liberation.⁴⁶

But this realization is hardly an excuse for evasion of the biblical commitment of the Spirit to the poor and powerless. Rather, it keeps us aware that the church's work is never done, that if a revolution by the oppressed leads to new forms of oppression, then the church is on the side of the newly oppressed. One must be clear, that when former oppressors say they are now "oppressed" because they no longer have the power to exploit and the way of life exploitation makes possible, this is not true oppression.⁴⁷

D. Liberation as a Process

The changing face of some revolutionary movements and the continual need for new forms of liberation, easy to document in the twentieth century, make it clear that liberation is both a goal and a process and that the reality of our lives is shaped more by the process than by the final fulfillment of liberation. Freire's pedagogy is built on such a reality. The struggle for humanization, for the ability to make one's own history, is not established forever in one quick contest. Rather, those involved in liberation "perceive through their relations with reality that reality is really a process, undergoing constant transformation."⁴⁸ This

means that even when revolutions liberate oppressed groups, the struggle to maintain genuine human freedom must continue. This calls for varying forms of revolutionary change. Richard Shaull proposes a concept of permanent revolution in the light of the virtual impossibility, in many situations, of revolutions that completely overturn the existing order in "one moment of total victory."

Instead of *total* revolution in the sense of a headon assault on the total structure of the established order, we can work for *permanent* revolution, by which the entire structure is confronted with an increasing number of challenges at those points where changes are most imperative.⁴⁹

These views of liberation as a process have an affinity for particular ways of thinking about God and our response to God's action in history. First, our understanding of God as a God of liberation must be shaped by dynamic, not static, images.

God's grace, instead of making human creativity superfluous or impossible, is therefore the politics that makes it possible and necessary. This is so because in the context of the politics of human liberation man encounters a God who remains open, who has not yet arrived, who is determined and helped by human activity.⁵⁰

The dynamic power of God working with persons in the midst of human history has always been at the heart of the definition of the Spirit. The more we understand God in terms of process, particularly historical processes of liberation, the more the doctrine and experience of the Spirit moves toward the center of our theological reflection.

Second, our understanding of God's relationship to the People of God and their relationship to history is shaped by understanding liberation as a process. In this view, the church must always be a people on the move through history, a people who are pioneers more than settlers. When the church has been actively expansionist, pushing through existing boundaries, the work of the Spirit has been an essential source of

leading and power. This was certainly true in the Acts accounts of how the Spirit lured and prodded the early church to new missionary ventures. (cf. Acts 8:29, ch. 10, 13:1-4)⁵¹ One should not expect it to be different when the boundaries through which the church breaks are not geographic, but political and economic, not boundaries but bondage.

Liberation as a process also can be seen in the way the oppressed begin to set free their oppressors, both from the slavery of dependence upon exploiting others and from their own exploitation by oppressive systems. One of the forces that enslaves oppressors in our society is the bondage to impersonal and materialistic structures. Freire analyzes that enslavement and its source.

This climate (of a process of violence) creates in the oppressor a strongly possessive consciousness—possessive of the world of men The earth, property, production, the creations of man, men themselves, time—everything is reduced to the status of objects at its disposal For them *to be is to have* and to be of the "having" class They cannot see that, in the egoistic pursuit of *having* as a possessing class, they suffocate in their own possessions and no longer *are*; they merely *have*. (Stress in the original)⁵²

There is the liberation of heightened consciousness in Freire's words. But many of us have found similar awareness sharpened even more directly in the praxis of shared experience with liberation movements. It has been from oppressed groups that many of us successful in the institutional church, often closely tied in lifestyle to the dominating strata of society, have found the power of commitment, human solidarity, and joyous celebration that has begun to crack open the impersonal and bureaucratic systems that have impoverished our lives. It has been those on the margins of society, oppressed or rejected, who have helped us recover some of the vitality of risk-taking and personal encounter in the midst of direct action against systems of oppres-

sion. They have begun to open our eyes to the contradictions of a materialistic culture, of a culture that can imprison us in comfortable cells full of entertaining gadgets, but cells nonetheless—cells which wall us off from the direct encounter that can create a history of human, not mechanical, richness. In this sense, the oppressed, once they have entered into a process of their own liberation, have done the work of the Spirit for the oppressors, a work that helps us come alive again to Jesus' vision.

... do not be anxious about your life, what you shall eat or what you shall drink, nor about your body, what you shall put on Look at the birds of the air! . . . Consider the lilies of the field, . . . do not be anxious, . . . But seek first his kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things shall be yours as well. (Matthew 6:25-33, RSV)

Finally, liberation as a process is not a hard and joyless building of perfect societies in the political sense, or the rigid pursuit of heaven when happiness can finally be allowed in the religious sense. Rather, it is living the future now, made possible because the power of the Spirit is at work in and beyond us. Alves catches that joyous reality of fulfillment in the midst of the process of liberation.

The community of faith, however, does not find the erotic sense of life at the end of the praxis of liberation, but rather in the midst of it On the way toward the promised land man learned that there is a time to stop, to abdicate all attempts to build the future, to remain in pure receptivity and in a total abandonment of calculation. His today was God's gift. He could rest because the politics of liberation was not carried on by the power of man alone, but rather by the passion and activity of God.⁵⁸

That "passion and activity of God" is the Holy Spirit, working to liberate both the oppressed and the oppressor from those principalities and powers, those systems of oppression, that destroy the basic humanity of both, and to enable both to "obtain the glorious liberty of the children of God." (Romans 8:21)

Notes

1. Cf. John V. Taylor, *The Go-Between God: The Holy Spirit and the Christian Mission* (London: SCM Press, 1972), p. 49.
2. Eduard Schweitzer and others, *Spirit of God* (from Gerhard Kittel, *Theologisches Worterbuch Zum Neuen Testament*) trans. by A. E. Harvey (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1960), p. 5.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
4. Cf. Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, Vol. III (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1963), pp. 148-49.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 153. See also Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, p. 2: ". . . the Spirit of God is power, power with a moral emphasis. It is active power, that is to say, it is the personal activity of God's will, achieving a moral and religious object. It impinges on Israel as the power of history . . ."
6. G. W. H. Lampe, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of Luke," in D. E. Nineham, edit., *Studies in the Gospels* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 172-173, and pp. 172-177, for a detailed exposition. See also A. Hastings, *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem* (London, 1958), pp. 50-75.
7. Cf. E. Earle Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke*, New Century Bible Series (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1966), pp. 28-29, 69.
8. James H. Cone, *A Black Theology of Liberation* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1970), p. 206.
9. Lampe, *op. cit.*, p. 184. "The connection between the Kingdom and the Spirit appears in the fact that the risen Lord's command to his disciples to await the promise of the Spirit-baptism seems to form part of a discourse about 'the things concerning the Kingdom of God,' and that the apostle's reception of the power of the Spirit constitutes the answer to their question concerning the restoration of the kingdom of Israel." Lampe also cites the Lucan interpretation of the phrase, "Thy Kingdom come" in the Lord's Prayer and the way Luke speaks of the Kingdom as "coming upon" persons.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 177.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 192.
12. Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, p. 43.
13. Lampe, *op. cit.*, p. 193.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 193.
15. Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, p. 97.
16. C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1936), p. 137.
17. Cone, *op. cit.*, p. 122.
18. Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Middlesex, England and Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1972), p. 16.

19. Rubem Alves, *A Theology of Human Hope* (New York: Corpus Books, 1969).
20. Freire, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 15. The quotation is from *Populorum Progressio* (Boston: St. Paul edition, 1967), no. 34.
24. Freire, *op. cit.*, p. 20.
25. Cf. Letty M. Russell, "Human Liberation in a Feminine Perspective," *Study Encounter* (World Council of Churches), Vol. VIII, No. 1, 1972, pp. 7-10.
26. Freire, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
29. Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 69.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
31. Cf. Freire, *op. cit.*, p. 82, for a description of the need for full participation of the oppressed in conscientization, and Russell, *op. cit.*, p. 11, on the need for honest dialogue between women and men. In places of political and economic oppression, e.g., among blacks in Mississippi or Chicago or among farm laborers in California and Texas, the basic struggle has been over the possibility of genuine negotiation between those in power and representatives chosen *from and by* the oppressed.
32. Cf. Freire, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-10, for an analysis of many such myths used by those in power and often internalized by the oppressed, to perpetuate an exploitative system.
33. Cone, *op. cit.*, p. 49.
34. For a sociological and theological analysis—and demonstration—of the central role of the comic in Christian faith, see Peter Berger, *The Precarious Vision* (New York: Doubleday, 1961).
35. Freire, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 37.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
38. (on p. 14) "Gospel and Revolution: Pastoral Letter from the Third World." in John Gerassi, edit., *Camillo Torres: Revolutionary Priest* (Middlesex, England: Pelican Books, 1973), p. 430.
39. Freire, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
40. Jacques Ellul, *Violence* (London: SCM Press, 1970), pp. 151-52, quoted in Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 55.
41. Freire, *op. cit.*, p. 36.
42. Tillich, *op. cit.*, p. 148.
43. Cf. Gerassi, *op. cit.*, for a biography and complete edition of the works of Camillo Torres and pp. 40-44, for an account of the response of other South American priests.
44. "Pastoral Letter from the Third World," in *Ibid.*, p. 432.
45. Quoted in Jürgen Moltmann, "Racism and the Right to

- Resist," *Study Encounter* (World Council of Churches), Vol. VIII, No. 1, 1972, p. 4.
46. Freire, *op. cit.*, p. 33.
47. Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 48.
49. Richard Shaull, "Revolution: Heritage and Contemporary Option" in Carl Oglesby and Richard Shaull, *Containment and Change* (New York: Macmillan, 1967), p. 238.
50. Alves, *op. cit.*, p. 136.
51. Cf. Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, p. 42.
52. Freire, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-35.
53. Alves, *op. cit.*, p. 156.