

Joerg Rieger¹

Occupy Heaven: Are God, Religion, and Politics beyond Rescue?

Religion as a Conservative Phenomenon

When Americans look toward Europe, it may seem to them as if religion on the continent has sunk into oblivion, particularly since religion continues to play such an important role in the United States. Statistics show that more than 80 percent of all Americans still believe in God and almost half of them state that they participate in religious services on a regular basis.² In the United States, religion shapes not only the private sphere but also politics and economics. Even in the board rooms of large corporations meetings are frequently begun with prayer.

Unfortunately, for progressives this religiosity provides little reason for hope, because religion manifests itself in public mostly as a conservative phenomenon. In the United States this is no accident, as religion has been intentionally and successfully utilized by conservative interest groups. This dynamic has been at work since the 1960s and has contributed to the conservative reputation of religion.

Even in Europe, the remainder of religious fervor appears to be located in the conservative camps. American religiosity has often contributed to this trend, for instance through its missionary zest and charitable support after World War II, especially in Germany. Ideological factors play a role here as well, for instance the theological sanctioning of patriarchy and the bourgeois nuclear family, which is promoted by conservative movements on both sides of the Atlantic.

Not surprisingly, it seems to progressives as if God, religion, and politics are beyond rescue. Too often in history religion puts itself on the side of the

¹ This text was first presented as a public lecture in occasion of the ESWTR conference 2013 in Dresden, together with Kwok Pui-lan, whose contribution is also published in this volume.

² See the latest report of the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life. (<http://religions.pewforum.org>, 25 February 2014).

status quo. Too often religion supported the side of the dominant powers: even today God is still envisioned in the role of monarchs, authoritarian father and leader figures, and captains of industry. Both literature and art are full of examples.³

In our presentation tonight we want to introduce counter models. However, our concern is not to develop yet another idealist model, which may sound attractive, but which has no foundation in reality. It is our concern not to lose sight of alternatives in a context where conservative religiosity dominates. We will do that by displaying and further developing progressive forms of religion. Alternative images of God, church, and politics are couched in active resistance and in progressive ways of life. Unlike in idealist ways of thinking, theory and praxis are not separated here but mutually determine each other.

Religion in Progressive Form

Though today religion in the United States presents itself mostly in conservative forms, historically, in the United States, there is also a common thread of progressive religion. Moreover, progressive forms of religion were part of the most significant transformations in U.S. history. The abolition of slavery in the nineteenth century, for instance, was supported by progressive religious traditions, which were fed from several sources: not only did the opponents of slavery refer to Christian values, the slaves also developed unique forms of Christianity. The latter are still vibrant today in Spirituals, Gospel Hymns, and witness to the spirit of liberation: “Go down, Moses, tell old Pharaoh to let my people go.”

Women’s suffrage,⁴ not even a hundred years old, had many religious opponents but there was also support from progressive religious figures. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, a representative of the American women’s movement in the nineteenth century, together with twenty-six other women wrote the so-called “Woman’s Bible”. Sojourner Truth, an emancipated slave who was actively involved in the liberation of slaves and advocacy of women in the nineteenth century, was closely related to Christian communities (Methodists and Adventists).

The religious overtones of the American Civil Rights movement are better known in Europe. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was an ordained Baptist minister, and Malcolm X practiced various forms of Islam. But only few people

³ One example is the book by Laurie Beth Jones, *Jesus, CEO: Using Ancient Wisdom for Visionary Leadership* (Hyperion Books: New York 1996).

⁴ In the United States women won the right to vote in 1920, in Germany in 1918.

know about the relationship between religion and the labor movement. Nevertheless, in contradistinction to Germany, in the United States the established churches have at times sided with workers. The so-called Social Creed, which was first adopted in 1908 by the Methodist Church, and later by other national church bodies, linked religion and the concerns of workers and called for shorter hours, the introduction of a day without work, more adequate salaries, pension plans, and health insurance.⁵ After several interruptions, the connection of religion and the labor movement is now once again gathering steam. My own academic work has received important impulses from these developments. We must not forget that the concerns of workers are not the special interests of a particular group but closely connected to the well-being of all.

The Occupy Wall Street movement (short: the Occupy movement) embodies this current trend, as it manifests many progressive ideals, particularly in the interrelating of progressive politics, economics, and religion. Its critique is not merely directed at dominant power forces, expressed today in politics and economics, but also at conservative religious voices. It is important to bear in mind, however, that the goal is not merely critique. The Occupy movement is concerned about lived alternatives in which power does not flow from the top down but from the bottom up. This changes everything, including our relation to the reality of God.

Religion and Power

The Occupy movement has reminded us once again of the role of power. Talking about the 1 percent and the 99 percent draws our attention to the question of social class. In the United States, the contrast is obvious and growing, especially in regard to the 0.1 percent: the top 10 percent earn \$100,000 or more a year, the top 1 percent earn \$368,000, the top 0.1 percent earn about \$1 million or more, and this group holds 7.7 percent of the national income.⁶ The point, however, is not primarily money: money symbolizes power.

While this insight might go without saying, it is new in the thinking of many Americans, who have tended to assume for the most part that class is not particularly significant in the United States. For many, the Occupy movement has helped them understand for the first time, at least to some degree,

⁵ See <http://www.nccusa.org/pdfs/1908-Social-Creed.pdf>, 13 February 2014.

⁶ See Timothy Noah, "The United States of Inequality," *slate.com*, 13 September 2010. (http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/the_great_divergence/features/2010/the_united_states_of_inequality/introducing_the_great_divergence.html, 25 February 2014).

the importance of the question of class, although much is yet to be examined and deepened. In the meantime, more and more Americans sense that the “rags-to-riches” American Dream remains merely a dream. After all, class boundaries in the United States are less permeable than in almost all other industrialized countries. Class mobility in the United States is only one third of class mobility in Denmark and only one half of class mobility in Canada, Finland, and Norway.⁷

Obviously, power plays a crucial role in the realms of politics and economics. Unfortunately, it is too often overlooked that power also calls the shots in religion. Religious groups and churches embody the power of the status quo in different ways, and our images of God often reflect dominant visions of power as well. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the past God was envisioned as a feudal ruler and a monarch.

One consequence of this hidden power is that it is commonly assumed that church and God can only exist in specific hierarchical configurations of power. Those who reject these configurations of power seem to have no choice but to reject church, God, and ultimately religion.

In the Roman Empire, the elites came to this exact conclusion regarding the early Christians: Christians were denounced as atheists, because they did not believe in a God aligned with the hierarchical power of the gods of Antiquity. Jesus Christ, the manifestation of the Christian God, had rebelled publicly against the hierarchical power of the Roman occupiers and their Jewish vassals, and he identified with the oppressed against the oppressors. His mother, Mary, expressed this forcefully when she noted that God pushes the powerful from their thrones and lifts up the lowly (Luke 1:52). At the same time, the Romans could be tolerant of other religions: they incorporated other Gods in their religion, like the Egyptian Gods Isis and Osiris, as long as their adherents conformed to the power of the empire. In addition, the Romans had little difficulty exalting humans to the role of god, and revered their emperors as divine rulers. The difficulty was, therefore, not with the divinity of Jesus as such, but with the form that this divinity took. This particular God did not fit in with the theism of the powerful.

As a result, Christians often find themselves in closer proximity to atheists than to those kinds of theists who believe in the hierarchical power of God.

⁷ See Isabel V. Sawhill and John E. Morgen, “Economic Mobility: Is the American Dream Alive and Well?”. (http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/papers/2007/5/useconomics%20morton/05useconomics_morton, 25 February 2014).

The rejection of hierarchical power brings together Christians and atheists, especially in situations where religion shores up the hierarchical dominance of the status quo. This is not only true for the Roman Empire, it is also true for situations in the contemporary United States and even in Europe, where shrinking churches tend to cling to the status quo.

Religion and Alternative Power

Based on these observations, some conclude that alternative approaches must reject power as a matter of principle. If the dominant status quo claims power, it is often assumed, all others should choose powerlessness. Nevertheless, the Jewish and the Christian traditions demonstrate early on that there are alternatives, which embody power in a totally different way. Powerlessness is not the only alternative to dominant power. Not only could the Jewish and Christian traditions never be controlled completely by the prevailing empires, they also produced alternative dynamics of power, connected to alternative images of God.⁸

The Occupy movement has once again brought to the fore some of these alternative dynamics of power. “Dangerous memories” (Johann Baptist Metz) of the life and work of Jesus reemerged in new forms. People remembered once more that Jesus did not align himself with the elites of his time, but practiced solidarity with the common people – the so-called multitude. He sided with those who experienced oppression and marginalization, like the sick, the socially despised, women, children, and the working population like fishermen and peasants. It is also not unimportant that Jesus himself was raised as a construction worker with little formal education, which also means that he must have been in close touch with many of the unemployed of his time.⁹ It is likely that he experienced unemployment himself, since construction work at that time was strongly determined by the fluctuating demand of the Roman Empire and its vassals.

The power which is lived out in Jesus’s relationships is not hierarchical and elitist. It is not oligarchic, aristocratic, or plutocratic, that is, it is not the rule of the few, the elites, or the wealthy. It is not even democratic in the strict sense of the word, because in the Greek world democracy signified the rule of

⁸ The considerable list of studies of religion and empire continues to grow and includes authors such as John Dominic Crossan, Neil Elliott, Richard Horsley, Brigitte Kahl, and many others.

⁹ The Greek term *tektoon* does not connote the well-structured world of a German carpenter and his guild, although the term is often misunderstood in this way.

a privileged strata of citizens, which excluded the lower classes. Jesus – this should be noted especially in Germany – does not represent the power of the well-heeled bourgeoisie, not even the educated middle-class.

Inspired by the New Testament terms of *laos* and *ochlos*, translated as “people” and “crowd” or “multitude”, we are therefore talking about “laocracy” and “ochlocracy”. The notion of laocracy, shaped in collaboration with Euro American and Latin American liberation theologians, connotes the alternative power of the common people, as it finds expression in the Jesus movement.¹⁰ What is at stake here is solidarity and cooperation rather than competition and one-upmanship.¹¹

Likewise, the term ochlocracy, which was initially conceptualized in Korean Minjung theology, connotes the power of the so-called multitude, which must not be misunderstood as a rabble or mob. In an ochlocracy,¹² the multitude becomes the acting subject that, in opposition to the elites, does not usurp the place of a hierarchical God, and does not exercise power from the top down. If communal life is not understood in terms of hierarchy and competition, the various members of society tend to give each other strength in a positive fashion.¹³

It is important to note that these alternatives to the hierarchical paradigm of power provide not only an alternative political model but also an alternative theology. Instead of assuming the place of God, the multitude does the will of God and embodies therefore not only alternative images and imaginations of God but also an alternative reality of God. The masses are fed not necessarily because of a one-time supernatural spectacle, which is not relevant for anyone else, but because the distribution of the loaves of bread and fish encourages the crowd to do the same (Mark 6:30-44).

These alternative images and imaginations of God bring us closer to the reality of the natural world and of the cosmos than any of the more traditional images of God. This implies a fundamental shift in perception in other areas

¹⁰ See Néstor Míguez / Joerg Rieger / Jung Mo Sung, *Beyond the Spirit of Empire: Theology and Politics in a New Key* (SCM Press: London 2009).

¹¹ The often overlooked theme of solidarity is reflected in Jesus’s parable of the unforgiving servant in Matthew 18:21-35.

¹² See Ahn Byung Mu, “Jesus and the Minjung in the Gospel of Mark,” in: Kim Yong Bock (ed.), *Minjung Theology: People as the Subjects of History* (Commission of Theological Concerns, Christian Conference of Asia: Singapore 1981), 138-152.

¹³ Kwok Pui-lan and I, in our book *Occupy Religion: Theology of the Multitude* (Rowman and Littlefield: Lanham 2012), deal with the work of Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt. See, for instance, their book *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (Penguin: New York 2004).

as well, as the focus is still on the achievements of the elites rather than on the achievements of the multitude. This is true not only for achievements in the social sphere, but also for technical, economic, and intellectual ones. Re-examining the power and success of the multitude unlocks the potential of the future.

This alternative power is, therefore, not only at work on the political stage. All levels of society are constantly more or less connected, and in the classical context distinctions between politics and religion, in the sense of the distinguishing between the public and private, did not yet exist. Feminist thinkers have reminded us for many years that the personal is the political.

Consequently, laocracy and ochlocracy can be enacted in all realms of life including the life of community and in families. Jesus opposed narrow and conservative visions of families, which are still supported by conservative representatives of religion and politics. True relationships are not rooted in biology but in collaboration: “Whoever does the will of God,” says Jesus, “is my brother and sister and mother” (Mark 3:35). Furthermore, Jesus decisively rejects the subordination of women and children. Children have a special place in the eyes of God, which reflects the principles of laocracy and ochlocracy: “It is to such as these that the kingdom of God belongs” (Mark 10:14b). The only regulation concerning the relation of the genders, which Jesus denounces and toughens, is divorce,¹⁴ because in patriarchal society it placed an enormous economic and social burden on the backs of women and children. It is interesting that conservative politics and religion have long made peace with divorce and denounce other problems, which were of no concern to Jesus, such as committed homosexual relationships.

What is reversed here, as the Occupy movement emphasizes, is the relation of the 99 percent and the 1 percent: “So the last will be first, and the first will be last” (Matthew 20:16). While the normative flow in politics and religion is from the top down, in this new paradigm the direction is from the bottom up. This does not mean that the 1 percent is automatically excluded: it is free to take the side of the 99 percent, which actually happens every now and then.¹⁵

Deep Solidarity

One of the most important insights, which follows from what has been said so far, has to do with a new understanding of solidarity. In the past, even progressives understood solidarity often in terms of *noblesse oblige*. Solidarity tended

¹⁴ Matthew 19:7-9 is a better example of the patriarchal context than Mark 10:1-11.

¹⁵ See <http://westandwiththe99percent.tumblr.com/>, 25 February 2014.

to be a well-meaning declaration of solidarity by the privileged for the underprivileged, rooted in the willpower of the privileged.

The principle that we are calling *deep* solidarity, by contrast, is based on the assumption that most of us are in the same boat, without being aware of it. The global economic crisis, which began in 2007 and which is not over yet for many people, has served as a wake-up call for many, especially in the United States. The American Dream has turned into a nightmare, not only for the mass of the underprivileged, but also for the so-called middle-class. Half of the jobs that have been lost are never going to return. More and more full-time jobs are being replaced by part-time jobs, casual jobs, or temporary jobs without social benefits, as well as those which require only the most minimal of commitments from employers. Whereas the older generation is concerned about its future and retirement – decline of one's social status in retirement is the sad norm in the United States – the younger generation has little hope for socio-economic advancement. In the United States, youth unemployment was at 13 percent in 2007, by 2010 it rose to 21 percent. The duration of unemployment has risen as well.¹⁶

Deep solidarity implies that more than 99 percent of the population are no longer benefiting from the capitalist system, if they ever did. As a result, new relations emerge between different sectors of societies and groups which have so far never really understood themselves to be in solidarity. This means that those ethnic and racial majorities who belong to the 99 percent are more closely related to those ethnic and racial minorities who also belong to the 99 percent rather than to representatives of the 1 percent. For example, men who belong to the 99 percent are more closely related to the women of the 99 percent than to other men who belong to the 1 percent.

This does not mean, however, that differences no longer play a role and should be erased. On the contrary: differences are as real as ever and need to be reflected upon. The new idea is that these differences need no longer be used against the 99 percent, as was historically the case. In the United States, for instance, black and white workers were often pitted against one another, so that white workers identified with white bosses even without benefiting a whole lot in the end. In Europe, too, we need to ask ourselves who really benefited when working men, for instance, were played off against working women. Whenever working men identify with men who are employers, as is

¹⁶ See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Youth_unemployment, 25 February 2014.

customary in a patriarchy, the latter have the advantage. Working men and women could achieve considerably greater improvements if they would work with, instead of against, one another. This is what we mean by deep solidarity. When working men become conscious of their deep solidarity with women, they can use their institutionally derived advantages for the benefit of all while severing the false ties on which a patriarchal society is based.

Deep solidarity enables us to employ our differences in a constructive fashion. Now relative advantages – like for instance certain remaining economic and political advantages of the middle class – can be used for the benefit of all. This kind of deep solidarity presupposes that we clarify for ourselves the boundary between the 99 percent and the 1 percent. This boundary is so commonly overlooked that the middle class often considers itself to be aligned with the 1 percent, even though that is not the case.

The bigger goal that we envision is the interrelation of the streams of various liberation movements. Even though there are tensions between these movements that must be addressed, it is now more apparent than ever that we have a lot more in common than previously understood.

Let us not forget that the status quo has always benefited from playing these various movements against each other, and from cleverly using the tension for its own purposes. For instance, when some talk about the question of class or put themselves in solidarity with workers, others who work on issues of gender or race quickly suspect that they are about to be excluded. But the issues of gender or of race are often closely tied to the question of class. After all, we are not just concerned about abstract prejudices but about the question of power, which in our societies is most clearly expressed in economic terms: women earn less than men and are less often to be found at the top of the corporate ladder; racial minorities are more likely to be unemployed and are often discriminated against at work, and so on. When we talk about class, we also need to consider questions of gender, race, as well as the questions of ethnic and sexual minorities. Vice versa, when we talk about questions of gender, race, ethnicity, and sexuality, we need to keep in mind the question of class and the distinction between the 99 percent and the 1 percent. Of course, the question of class will need to be examined at greater depth, but we cannot deal with this question here.¹⁷

¹⁷ On the topic of class and religion see Joerg Rieger (ed.), *Religion, Theology, and Class: Fresh Engagements after Long Silence* (Palgrave Macmillan: New York 2013).

Immanence and Transcendence

In conclusion I want to return to the theological implications. For many years we understood theology and religion in terms of the tension between immanence and transcendence. Unfortunately, however, a misunderstanding becomes apparent as immanence is defined as natural reality and transcendence as supernatural reality. Things get worse when the task of theology and religion is mainly understood as dealing with this kind of transcendence.

An alternative understanding of immanence and transcendence reaches back all the way to the roots of the Jewish and Christian traditions. In the Old Testament the work of God and salvation are not at all oriented towards supernatural things but towards life in the world. Here we are not dealing with a kind of immanence that is in opposition to transcendence but with a completely different understanding of transcendence: transcendence is the work of God in the world.

In the New Testament the incarnation of Jesus illuminates this understanding of transcendence. God is at work in the world and for the world through the life and work of Jesus. The realm of God is not only in heaven but also on earth; the will of God is supposed to be done on earth as it is in heaven, as Jesus taught. Transcendence refers here not first of all to the supernatural but to an alternative reality in the world, i.e., an alternative immanence, where we receive our daily bread, where real debts are forgiven, and where the liberation from evil is experienced. It is also noteworthy that there is a shorter version of the Lord's Prayer in the Gospel of Luke, which does not even mention heaven.¹⁸

The transcendence that characterizes this kind of religious outlook is, therefore, essentially related to this world. Even Karl Barth has understood this, although few Barthians followed him in this direction. The contrast possibly has to do with the fact that Barth was aware of the question of class.¹⁹ Transcendence is, speaking in terms of early Christian symbols, the Christ child in the manger, in poverty, at the margins of society. Transcendence is found not above the world but in the midst of the world, in an alternative immanence in which the multitude can live truly free lives. Alternative immanence and transcendence take sides: they stand on the side of the lowly. They are not to be found on the side of the powerful. According to Barth, "God always takes

¹⁸ See Matthew 6:9-13; Luke 11:2-4.

¹⁹ See Joerg Rieger, "Klassenkampf und Religion: Karl Barth, Sabine Plonz und aktuelle Alternativen zur bürgerlichen Theologie," in: *Das Argument* 299.5 (2012), 699-707.

His stand unconditionally and passionately on this side and on this side alone: against the lofty and on behalf of the lowly; against those who already enjoy right and privilege and on behalf of those who are denied it and deprived of it.”²⁰ The Abrahamic religions support each other in this case. In the Quran (4.75) the following question is raised: “And what is [the matter] with you that you fight not in the cause of Allah and [for] the oppressed among men, women, and children?”

Whether God, religion, and politics are not beyond rescue depends on this matter. Here, religion has to lay its cards on the table. Is it on the side of the oppressed and does it find God there, or is it on the side of the status quo? There is no third option. In a situation shaped by dramatic differentials of power, there is no middle road. Even the so-called middle class needs to choose a side.

La religión actualmente se presenta frecuentemente como un fenómeno conservador. Con demasiada frecuencia en la historia de la religión, ésta se ha posicionado del lado del statu quo. Por consiguiente, puede parecer que Dios, la religión y la política están más allá de la Salvación. Este ensayo tiene por objeto introducir modelos alternativos, comenzando con la constatación de que las formas progresistas de la religión son parte de las transformaciones importantes en la historia. Las experiencias recientes con el movimiento Occupy Wall Street reflejan muchas de estas características progresistas, sobre todo la relación de la política progresista, la economía y la religión. Las críticas que surgen de estas experiencias no son sólo críticas dirigidas a la potencia dominante, expresadas, hoy, en la política y la economía, sino también críticas al poder dominante que se materializa en la religión. Tales críticas apuntan a las alternativas vividas en las que el poder no fluye de arriba hacia abajo, sino de abajo hacia arriba.

Estas experiencias alternativas de la religión y el poder arrojan nueva luz sobre muchas de las tradiciones judía y cristiana, que encarnan el poder de una manera diferente. No sólo pueden estas tradiciones controlar completamente por los imperios dominantes, sino que también pueden generar alternativas de poder, ligados a las imágenes alternativas de Dios. El resultado es una nueva comprensión de la solidaridad, que tiene el potencial para reunir a las corrientes de los diversos movimientos de liberación sin dejar de lado las diferencias y tensiones. Basándose en esta nueva solidaridad, imágenes arraigadas de inmanencia y trascendencia se pueden reconstruir, produciendo nuevas visiones de Dios, de la religión y de la política.

²⁰ Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, trans. T.H.L. Parker et al. (Charles Scribner's Sons: New York 1957), vol. II.1: *The Doctrine of God*, 386.

Religion today presents itself mostly as a conservative phenomenon. Too often in history religion put itself on the side of the status quo. As a result, it may seem as if God, religion, and politics are indeed beyond rescue. This essay seeks to introduce alternative models, beginning with the realization that progressive forms of religion were part of significant transformations in history. Recent experiences with the Occupy Wall Street movement reflect many of these progressive characteristics, particularly the relation of progressive politics, economics, and religion. The critique that emerges from these experiences is not merely directed at dominant power, expressed today in politics and economics, but also at dominant power as it is embodied by religion. Such critique points to lived alternatives in which power does not flow from the top down but from the bottom up.

These alternative experiences of religion and power throw new light on many Jewish and Christian traditions, which embody power in a different way. Not only could these traditions never be controlled completely by the prevailing empires, they also produced alternative embodiments of power, linked to alternative images of God. The result is a new understanding of solidarity, which has the potential to bring together the streams of the various liberation movements without neglecting differences and tensions. Based on this new solidarity, entrenched images of immanence and transcendence can be reconstructed, producing new visions of God, religion, and politics.

Religion zeigt sich heute meist als ein konservatives Phänomen. Allzu oft hat sich Religion in der Geschichte auf die Seite des Status quo geschlagen. Und so scheint es, als ob Gott, Religion und Politik tatsächlich rettungslos verloren wären. Dieser Artikel will alternative Modelle einführen, angefangen mit der Wahrnehmung, dass progressive religiöse Formen an wichtigen Veränderungen in der Geschichte beteiligt waren. Die Erfahrungen mit der Occupy Wall Street Bewegung reflektieren viele dieser progressiven Merkmale, vor allem die Beziehung zwischen progressiver Politik, Wirtschaft und Religion. Die Kritik, die aus diesen Erfahrungen hervorgeht, richtet sich nicht nur gegen die herrschende Macht, wie sie heute in Politik und Wirtschaft realisiert wird, sondern auch gegen die herrschende Macht, wie sie die Religion verkörpert. Diese Kritik verweist auf gelebte Alternativen, in denen Macht nicht von oben nach unten fließt, sondern von unten nach oben.

Diese alternative Erfahrungen von Religion und Macht werfen ein neues Licht auf viele jüdische und christliche Traditionen, die Macht anders verkörpern. Diese Traditionen konnten nie völlig von den herrschenden Mächten kontrolliert werden und mehr noch, sie produzierten alternative Verkörperungen von Macht, verknüpft mit alternativen Gottesbildern. Das Ergebnis ist ein neues Verständnis von Solidarität mit dem Potential, die Ströme der verschiedenen Befreiungsbewegungen zusammenzuführen, ohne Unterschiede und Spannungen zu vernachlässigen. Auf der Basis dieser neuen Solidarität können fest verwurzelte Bilder von Immanenz und Transzendenz rekonstruiert werden und neue Visionen von Gott, Religion und Politik entstehen.

Joerg Rieger, Prof. Dr., is Wendland-Cook Professor of Constructive Theology at Perkins School of Theology, SMU. Among his most recent books are his edited volume *Religion, Theology, and Class: Fresh Engagements after Long Silence* (2013), *Occupy Religion: Theology of the Multitude* (with Kwok Pui-lan 2012), *No Rising Tide: Theology, Economics, and the Future* (2009), and *Christ and Empire: From Paul to Postcolonial Times* (2007, German and Portuguese translations).