

**I N T R O D U C I N G**

**REDEMPTION  
IN CHRISTIAN  
FEMINISM**

Rosemary R. Ruether



**I N T R O D U C T I O N S I N  
F E M I N I S T T H E O L O G Y**

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Mary Grey • Lisa Isherwood

Catherine Norris • Janet Wootton

The Pilgrim Press

Cleveland, Ohio

This book is dedicated to my colleagues in  
feminist theology around the world,  
especially to Ivone Gebara,  
who has risked much to speak the truth

NOTICE: This material may be protected  
by Copyright Law (Title 17 U.S.C.)

The Pilgrim Press, Cleveland, Ohio 44115

© 1998 by Sheffield Academic Press

Originally published by Sheffield Academic Press, Ltd., Sheffield, England

The Pilgrim Press edition published 2000. All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper

05 04 03 02 01 00      5 4 3 2 1

ISBN 0-8298-1382-9

If we are clear that the redemption signified by Christ is both carried on and communicated through redemptive community, this means that Christ can take on the face of every person and group and their diverse liberation struggles. We must be able to encounter Christ as black, as Asian, as Aboriginal, as woman. This also means that the coming Christ, the incompleting future of redemption, is not the historical Jesus returned, but rather the fullness of all this human diversity gathered together in redemptive community. This is the 'Human One' who is to come, who bears the face of all suffering creatures longing for liberation.

Finally, this way of Christ need not and should not be seen as excluding other ways. The creating, inspiring and liberating presence of God is present to all humans in all times and places. It has been expressed in many religious cultures, some of which parallel the Christ way, and some of which complement it with other spiritualities, spiritualities of contemplation, for example, or of renewal of nature. The challenge of Christology today may be not to try to extend the Christ symbol to every possible spirituality and culture, but rather to accept its limits. Then we can allow other ways and peoples to flourish in dialogues that can reveal God's many words to us.

NOTICE: This material may be protected  
by Copyright Law (Title 17 U.S.C.)

## Chapter Seven

### Suffering and Redemption: The Cross and Atonement in Feminist Theology

Suffering challenges the human understanding of reality. The tendency of many cultures is to look for someone or something to blame. To think that suffering is random and meaningless is frightening. By finding a 'cause' one gives meaning to suffering. Human cultures have come up with various 'causes' of suffering. One explanation found in African cultures, among others, is to assume that evil spirits cause illnesses, accidents and misfortunes. Particular people in the village are designated as the agents of these evil spirits and are isolated or punished accordingly.

Women are the favored victims of this explanation for suffering, including accidents that befall their husband and children. Even a woman who miscarries is presumed to have done something amiss to have caused this misfortune and is pressured to confess even on her recovery bed.<sup>1</sup> In Western Europe in the late medieval and Reformation eras this folk tradition of woman-blaming for misfortunes, as the likely vehicles of demonic spirits, was transformed into a campaign of witch persecution by both Catholics and Protestants. Christian teachers used the idea that women are innately weaker and prone to evil, having caused evil to enter the world in the first place, to scapegoat women as witches, often those that were poor, marginal or nonconformist.<sup>2</sup>

1. See, for example, Oduyoye 1992: 14; also Oduyoye 1995: 40-42, 120-23; and Amoah 1990: 129-53.

2. Catholic theological misogyny as a rationale for why most witches are female is found in the fifteenth century Dominican handbook for witch-hunting, *Malleus Maleficarum* (trans. Montague Summers; New York: Dover, 1971). The sixteenth-century Calvinist theologian William Perkins gave a similar if less extensive rationale from a Reform perspective: see his 'The Damned Art of Witchcraft', in Perkins (1970: 596). For a discussion of the relation of women, religion and witchcraft

The classic explanation for misfortunes developed in ancient Judaism was that it was caused by human sin. This was particularly applied to collective misfortunes that befell the nation. Both natural disasters, such as droughts and floods, and also devastating incursions by foreign armies that trampled over fields, looted and killed and carried the survivors into exile, were explained as divine punishment by Israel's God. Israel has failed to obey God's commandments and so has suffered. The experiences of disasters thus became the occasion for prophets and teachers to call for repentance, return to strict observance of God's commandments, in order to restore God's favor, Israel's return to its promised land and a time of peace and prosperity.<sup>3</sup>

The writer of the book of Job challenged this explanation for suffering, insisting on the innocence of the righteous Job, who had done nothing to deserve such suffering. The answer God gives Job from the whirlwind does not give an alternative explanation, but simply an awesome demonstration of God's sovereign power over all that transpires in creation, before whose might puny humans should fall silent.<sup>4</sup> 'Who are you to question God's ways?' is God's answer to the problem of suffering, but an answer which begs the question.

The question of innocent suffering, particularly innocent suffering of the nation as a whole, has plagued Jewish thought through the centuries, as its people have been victimized by successive powerful empires. This question has returned with new urgency after the Nazi Holocaust, causing thoughtful Jewish thinkers to question the very idea of a just God who is in charge of history.<sup>5</sup> The dilemma of theodicy: that God is either unable to stop suffering and hence not omnipotent, or else wills unjust suffering and hence not good, haunts post-Holocaust Jewish thought.

For Christians, however, the question of the Holocaust is not directed at God's goodness or power, but at their own complicity. Since the

persecution, see Ruether 1995b: 89-114. Also the chapter on witchcraft in Weisner 1993: 218-38.

3. This announcement that divine punishment is about to befall Israel due to its sin and disobedience is typical of the prophetic writings; see for example the book of Amos.

4. Job 38.1-40.2.

5. The major Jewish Holocaust theologians are Richard Rubenstein, Emil Fackenheim and Irving Greenberg; see Ruether and Ruether (1989: 191-203); for a Jewish critique of the abuse of Holocaust theology to justify injustice to Palestinians by the state of Israel, see Ellis (1990, 1994).

Holocaust in Nazi Germany drew on a heritage of more than a millennium of Christian religious hatred and persecution of Jews, Christians must ask themselves what in their own teaching fueled such hatred and how are these Christian teachings on Jews and Judaism to be changed to purge them of anti-Semitism.<sup>6</sup>

Traditionally the Christian response to suffering has been a complex synthesis of human self-blaming and a view of God who is both omnipotent and yet a compassionate savior who intervenes in history, sending his 'own son' to suffer and die to rescue humans from their sinful condition. Both God's power and goodness are vindicated in the face of suffering by teaching that God voluntarily takes on human suffering and pays for the primal sin that is its cause. This combination of beliefs makes for a powerful construction both to answer the question of suffering and silence the question, but when the threads of its fabric are examined, it threatens to unravel.

The Christian answer combines the following set of claims. First, it is said that God created a wholly good creation and intended the human condition to be painless. There was neither moral nor physical evil in God's original plan. Originally humans would neither have sinned nor died. Human disobedience, initiated by women, who bear the primary guilt for it, ruined this original plan and corrupted human nature and the natural world itself. As a result humans sank into a condition where they are both prone to physical evils, culminating in death, and are locked in a tendency to moral evil from which they are unable to rescue themselves, having lost their original free will. God is saved from any responsibility for evil, moral or 'natural', which is placed totally on human, especially female, shoulders.

Secondly, humans are said to have incurred an infinite guilt for this situation of evil that they are incapable of paying. They have offended God infinitely and are thereby irreparably alienated from God, without any means at their disposal to make amends. But God in his graciousness has intervened to overcome this alienation and pay for this guilt. This gulf between humans and God can only be bridged through a blood sacrifice of one who is both 'man', but one innocent of sin, and God. Through voluntarily suffering and dying on the cross as one himself lacking in sin and hence guilt for it, Jesus pays for human sin as a human

6. For Christian Holocaust theology, see Ruether and Ruether (1989: 203-15); also Ruether (1974b).

and also acts as God to bridge the gulf created by human guilt that only God, not humans, can overcome.

The good news of redemption through the cross is that we are reconciled with God, and God now loves and accepts us in spite of our sin. We now have the possibility of growing in moral goodness through divine grace, gifted by a new capacity to obey God that we are incapable of in our present human condition, but receive through a power that comes to us from God. By accepting this good news that we are accepted, even while still sinners (and continuing to be sinners), we are assured of ultimately overcoming the mortality into which we were plunged through sin and living happily with God after death.

But what of continuing suffering here and now on earth? What of injustices that bring terrible suffering to the innocent; what about natural disasters that destroy human efforts to build secure lives? Although some Christians have held out the hope that either apocalyptic intervention from God or human progress would bring about a new paradise on earth,<sup>7</sup> mainline Christianity has offered no promise that anything will get better on earth, either morally or physically, as a result of the redemption won by the cross of Christ. The action of the god-man is vertical, changing alienation from God to acceptance by God, not horizontal, changing evils that plague human history.

Sufferings, both those caused by unjust evils and by inexplicable 'natural' disasters and mortality, continue unchanged by the cross of Christ. The Christian response to this continued reign of suffering on earth is a peculiar double bind. On the one hand, one should regard oneself as guilty for such continued suffering, and redouble one's repentance for guilt, and gratitude to Christ for having overcome a guilt we cannot overcome by ourselves. Indeed all other sufferings are said to pale before the sufferings endured by Christ on the cross for our sins, and it is we who caused Christ to suffer. If we had not caused sin in the first place, Christ would not have had to suffer to rescue us. Our contemplation of Christ's cross therefore should mingle gratitude for overcoming our offense with renewed guilt at having caused the terrible offense that made this infinite suffering necessary.

Secondly, even if we are innocent of having caused some particular evil that befalls us, we should endure it, accepting its blows, because thereby we imitate the cross of Christ. We become Christlike by enduring suffering like Christ, who, though innocent, suffered for our sins.

7. For Christian traditions of future hope, see Chapter 8 below.

Significantly this double-bind message of the cross is first developed in the New Testament as a way of counselling slaves to passively accept not only the condition of slavery itself, but also the arbitrary beatings often inflicted on them by their masters.

Slaves, accept the authority of your masters with all deference, not only those who are kind and gentle, but also those who are harsh. For it is a credit to you if, being aware of God, you endure pain while suffering unjustly. If you endure when you are beaten for doing wrong, what credit is that? But if you endure when you do right and suffer for it, you have God's approval. For to this you have been called, because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, so that you could follow in his steps.<sup>8</sup>

From medieval times to the present this double-bind message of the cross has been particularly preached to Christian women to accept not only their condition of subjugation, but also arbitrary violence visited upon them by husbands.<sup>9</sup> On the one hand, women are doubly guilty for the primal guilt of humanity (if it is possible to be doubly guilty of an infinite guilt). In any case women were created to be subjected to men in God's original plan for creation, but their disobedience caused them to be punished by a redoubled servitude justly enforced coercively. So women should regard the general conditions of their harsh subjugation as both their 'natural' condition and as just punishment for their sin.

Women should endure even harsh enforcement of their subjugation as their due both by nature and a punishment for their sin. But if in some particular situation this harshness becomes excessive, and they are blameless of any particular offense that might have occasioned it, then this too they should endure without complaint, since by sweetly accepting unjust suffering they become Christlike. The hope is held out that their cruel husbands may eventually be converted by this sweet acceptance of cruelty, reminded of Christ's suffering for them.<sup>10</sup> Thus the

8. 1 Pet. 2.18-21 (NRSV).

9. In Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales*, the story of the patient Griselda who endures without complaint the extreme suffering and arbitrary trials imposed on her by her husband is told as a model of wifely decorum; see 'The Clerk's Tale', in Chaucer (1932: 197-218).

10. For a critique of the way the cross is used to perpetuate wife battering, see the DMin thesis by Carole Findon (1995).

cross of Christ has become an exquisite tool for justifying domestic violence and advising women to endure it without complaint.

This double bind of deserved suffering for guilt and the promise of becoming a Christlike agent of redemption for one's victimizers through innocent suffering has been such a powerful message that Christian women have found it very difficult to challenge. Even feminist theology has only gradually linked the Eve myth with the theology of the cross. Feminist theology early began to unpack the myth of Eve, with its views of female innate subordination and guilt for evil. But they have been slow to question the theology of Christ's sufferings as a model for women's sufferings. Dare we ask: are we saved by the innocent suffering of Christ on the cross? This means asking, not only is Christ's innocent suffering on the cross a model of us, but is it redemptive in itself?

Joanne Carlson Brown and Rebecca Parker's article 'For God so Loved the World' was the major piece that opened up this question of redemptive suffering.<sup>11</sup> In this article Brown and Parker critique the 'satisfaction' theory of atonement through the blood of Christ on the cross. They show how this theory of atonement reproduces a sado-masochistic theology and practice based on the idea of an 'offended' God who can only be mollified through the payment of innocent blood by one who is both human and divine. This theology has been used to make women both the guilty ones deserving of suffering and the suffering servants called to imitate the innocent Christ.

Brown and Parker also question the 'moral influence' theory of atonement, shaped by Abelard in the twelfth century as an alternative to Anselm's 'satisfaction' theory. Abelard questioned the view of God as one whose anger needs to be assuaged through the blood of an innocent victim. In his view it is our, not God's, attitudes that need to be changed. God continues to love us and to want our repentance, but our hearts are hardened through sin. By seeing the proof of God's love for us even unto death through the suffering victim, Christ, we are converted.<sup>12</sup>

Brown and Parker also question Abelard's theory as one that condones suffering and death. A version of this theory has also been proposed to women who, through patient suffering at the hands of battering husbands, are supposed to change their hearts. Likewise modern spiritualities of non-violent struggle, as proposed by martyrs, such as

11. In Brown and Bohn 1980: 1-30.

12. Brown and Bohn 1980a: 11-13.

Martin Luther King, Gandhi and Archbishop Romero, have counselled those who want to transform the hard hearts of their oppressors to endure unjust suffering.

It may be right to struggle without recourse to violence for other reasons. But there is little evidence that oppressors' hearts are changed by seeing the sufferings of their victims. Rather they intend this suffering and death in order to silence those they wish to eliminate. Their own followers may be inspired by the memory of their leaders' unjust torture and death to continue the struggle, but is this a reason to propose an embrace of torture and assassination?

For Brown and Parker a feminist liberation theology of redemption must start with the proposition that unjust suffering and death are never justified as a means of redemption. We are not redeemed through or because of anyone's unjust torture and death, including that of Jesus. Rather redemption means a transformation that brings abundant life in loving mutuality. Redemption comes about through processes or practices that actually create and promote mutual flourishing.

Unjust suffering and death is the opposite of redemption and does not substantially promote it. Prophetic figures who confront oppressive powers and call for a transformation of hearts and social systems toward just and loving life are killed by those who benefit from unjust power in order to stop them from promoting such alternatives. They wish to silence them and to terrorize their followers into silence. The desired effect of the public torture of prophets to death is to scatter their followers in dismay.

This is exactly what happened with Jesus' followers, but they then became convinced that he was not dead but risen, and they reassembled to continue his proclamation of 'good news'. This did not come about through or because of the cross, but as a refusal to accept the message of the cross, an insistence that life will win over death in the end. For Brown and Parker we need to distinguish Jesus' proclamation of justice and abundance of life in the face of oppressors, and his disciples' renewed courage to continue his proclamation, from the cross as a crime intended to silence him and to destroy his movement.

Womanist theologian Delores Williams has made a similar critique of the doctrine of atonement through the blood of the cross. For Williams, the figure of the Egyptian slave woman, Hagar, who was forced to become a surrogate mother to bear a child for her childless master and mistress, Sarai and Abraham, and then cast into the wilderness, only to



find there an encounter with God and hope for the future, is a paradigm of African-American women's experiences. Like Hagar, African-American women in slavery times were made surrogate sex objects and child-bearers, as well as oppressed workers, for their masters. They fled into the wilderness to find freedom.<sup>13</sup>

For Williams, redemption must be judged in terms of black women's oppression and their struggle for survival and 'quality of life' for themselves and their children. Black women encounter a redeeming God, not through Christ's sufferings on the cross, but in wilderness experiences where they encounter a God that gives them the power and hope to 'find a way where there is no way'. For Williams, the theology of atonement that makes the innocent sufferings of Jesus on the cross a surrogate for sinful humanity re-enforces unjust suffering, particularly the surrogate suffering that black women have had to endure. The cross needs to be recognized as a symbol of evil, not a means of redemption. It expresses the efforts of those who rejected Jesus' ministry to destroy his movement by killing him.

The cross can be seen as an extreme example of the risk that anyone struggling against oppression takes at the hands of those who want to keep the systems of domination intact, but it is not itself redeeming. What is redeeming is not Jesus' sufferings and death, but his life, his vision of justice and right relation restored in communities of celebration and abundant life. Jesus is a model and helper for black women as one who resisted the temptations toward unjust power in the wilderness and spoke the word of life against the systems of death. It is this ministry of healing and prophetic proclamation on behalf of life that black women need to imitate as followers of Jesus. Although we may fall prey to the powers of oppression in so doing, this is not to be sought, nor is it a way of promoting redemptive life.<sup>14</sup>

European feminist theologian Dorothee Soelle has also struggled with the theology of atonement through the cross, but from a different perspective from Brown and Parker and Delores Williams. Soelle focuses on the problem of rich complacent white Christians who benefit from the violence of an oppressive world. Soelle sees the traditional Christian message that we are powerless sinners who can only passively receive our redemption from above as re-enforcing a spirituality and ethic of passive collaboration with the powers of violence and oppression. We

need to break through this collaboration by rejecting the notion of a patriarchal God who created systems of domination and who calls us to obedient service to them.

Jesus reveals the true God as one who unmasks the systems of evil and shows them to be demonic. Jesus announces the true God who is on the side of the poor and the victimized of oppressive society. In so doing he runs the risk of retaliation by those in power. The cross is the ultimate expression of this retaliation by the mighty of religion and state that rejected his call for repentance and solidarity with the poor and sought to shore up their own system of power and its ideological justifications by silencing the prophet.

The resurrection means that they did not succeed in silencing him. He rose and continues to rise wherever prophets arise, breaking through the system of lies, and offering a glimpse of the true God of life who stands against the evil systems of worldly power. The cross is not a payment for sin, or a required sacrifice for our well-being, but the risk that Jesus and all people take when they unmask the idols and announce the good news that God is on the side of the poor and those who struggle for justice.<sup>15</sup>

For Soelle the resurrection is a victory over the cross, but this does not mean that the cross itself was necessary nor is it in itself redemptive. Rather redemption happens whenever we resist and reject collaboration with injustice and begin to taste the joys of true well-being in mutual service and shared life. When life is lived in solidarity with others in mutual well-being, every act of sustaining life becomes a sacrament of God's presence, whether this is bread broken and shared, sexual pleasure between lovers, tilling the ground, making a useful product or giving birth to a baby. God calls us into abundance of life here on earth. This is the promise of God's Kingdom when 'God's will is done on earth, as it is in heaven.'<sup>16</sup>

Another aspect of this critique of the traditional theology of sin and atonement through the cross has come from Korean Minjung theology. For Minjung theologians, such as Andrew Park and Chung Hyun Kyung, Christian theology has focused too much on the idea of sin as pride and not enough on the experiences of oppression by those victimized by the pride of others. Sin as prideful disobedience to God and violence to others is the evil done by those in power. It is important to

13. Williams 1993b.

14. Williams 1991: 1-14.

15. Soelle 1995a: 99-108.

16. Soelle 1995b: 41-48; Soelle 1990: 12-22.

critique this kind of sinful evil, but it should not be universalized as the situation of all humans. Rather the majority of humans have been shaped, not by overweening pride in dominating power, but by the sorrows and sufferings of victimized suffering. This is what Minjung theology calls 'Han'.<sup>17</sup>

Han is the frustrated sorrow and anger at unjust suffering accumulated in the masses of people (the Minjung) due to the repression of any outlet for this anger or resolution to their experiences of injustice. Han is not simply an experience of individuals, but it is collective and transmitted from generation to generation. It can find dangerous expression in explosions of mass anger. It can also find creative expression in the masked dances and folk dramas of Korean villagers, who thereby mock the authorities and demystify their claims of obedient respect. Han also is the tenacity for life that continually arises in the people in the midst of situations of crushing defeat.

Minjung theologians recognize Han in the individual and collective expression of the people's sorrow and anger, but also in their resistance to unjust suffering. They seek to convert this resistance into constructive power to protest injustice and to engage in struggle to change it.<sup>18</sup> From this Minjung perspective, the cross of Jesus is an expression of sin, that is, the evil of the dominant powers who seek to perpetuate their power by silencing the one who calls for conversion.

But the cross does not atone for sin. Rather those who remember the cross as a crime against humanity experience the Han of accumulated anger and sorrow at this act of unjust violence, but they also revolt against it by carrying on Jesus' message of good news to the poor.<sup>19</sup> The resurrection manifests the tenacity for life that rises in the victimized who refuse to accept the power of the rulers to silence the prophets. Redemption takes place in the continual resurgence of power and hope for abundant life that sustains the struggle against the system of death.

These feminist liberation critiques of the classical theology of the cross should force Christian theologians and liturgists to tell the Jesus story in a different way, a way that I believe is more authentic to its historical reality. Jesus did not 'come to suffer and die'. Rather Jesus conceived of his mission as one of 'good news to the poor, the liberation of the cap-

17. Park 1993.

18. Kyung 1990b: 134-46.

19. This is my own application of the theology of Han to the cross, not one developed explicitly by Park or Chung.

tive', that is, experiences of liberation and abundance of life shared between those who had been on the underside of the dominant systems of religion and state of his time.

Jesus shared these experiences of liberating life for the poor and revealed a liberating God by exorcisms and healings and by celebratory meals in which marginalized people shared food at table together. He did not seek to be killed by the powers that be, but rather to convert them into solidarity with those they had formerly despised and victimized. He offered to them also an entry into the Kingdom of God, but only by following after 'the prostitute and the tax collectors', that is, those they formerly regarded as unclean and unworthy.<sup>20</sup>

The poor heard him gladly, but those in power refused his invitation of conversion. They sought to silence him and destroy his community of followers by subjecting him to a terrorizing public execution. The notions that he 'willingly' accepted this death, and even that he sought it as the necessary means of redemption, are later Christian rationalizations in the face of the terrible reality of the crucifixion. This is belied by the cry of Jesus from the cross, 'My God, my God, why has thou forsaken me', suggesting one who hoped that God would bring about transforming new life, not the handing him over to the power of the oppressors.<sup>21</sup>

Like other prophets who see that the power of those who want to silence them is mounting, he may have recognized shortly before his death that it was likely that they would 'get him'. But this is quite different from conceiving of crucifixion as something to be sought and accepted as a means of redemption. **Rather we should say that redemption happens through resistance to the sway of evil, and in the experiences of conversion and healing by which communities of well-being are created.** Jesus practiced such healing and community gathering and called for the conversion of the dominant into repentant solidarity. We follow him by continuing this same struggle for life against unjust suffering and death.

If Jesus came to give us a glimpse of abundant life liberated from the oppressive powers and the prophetic courage to confront and call for

20. Mt. 21.31. Matthew uses this saying of Jesus to suggest that the Pharisees are unbelievers who will never be converted and go into the Kingdom; but the saying suggests an earlier context in which the Pharisees are called to be converted, but the condition of their conversion is a solidarity with those they despise in which they go into the Kingdom of God 'behind' them (my own interpretation).

21. Mk 15.34; also Mt. 27.46.

the conversion of those who profit from unjust power, what of the finitude of life itself? Will not these tastes of abundant life themselves pass away in death as the fragility of finite life catches up even with communities of joyful celebration? In the history of the interpretation of the cross we see a prophetic spirituality that sought to confront one problem, namely unjust suffering caused by sinful human systems, pressed into the service of solving another problem, namely, mortality. This was not Jesus' issue, but the issue of Greek spirituality. The Greeks were concerned with death as a problem of finitude, rather than unjust death visited upon the advocates of the poor by the powerful.

We should not call people who experience life's tragic vicissitudes to 'carry their cross'. Even in the face of 'natural' ills, we should not passively acquiesce (itself a sure means of hastening death), but cultivate the resiliency of life that allows us to live abundantly even in the midst of the fragilities and limits of life. The contemplative spiritualities of the world's religious traditions have been about cultivating this spirit of resiliency in the midst of finitude, letting go of ego-clinging and cultivating compassion for all 'sentient beings', to use Buddhist language.

Perhaps we need a complementarity of spiritualities appropriate in different situations. There is a place for the contemplative spirituality that learns to be in communion with God in the midst of finitude, and there is a time for the prophetic spirituality that gives us the courage to resist unjust evils, call for the overthrow of oppression, the conversion of oppressors and the gathering of counter-cultural communities of life. We need to cultivate both but not confuse these two spiritualities, just as we should not confuse the death from unjust violence we need to protest with the finitude that will bring natural death at the end, hopefully, of a full life.

Where is God in all this? If Jesus unmasks the God who justifies systems of violence, and reveals the true God on the side of the poor, what God reigns in the crucifixion of Jesus and in continued unjust suffering and the killing of the prophets? The God of omnipotent control over history and the God of good news to the poor are incompatible. If God wills Jesus' death, if God wills the unjust violence of poverty, sexism, racism and anti-Semitism, then God is a sadist and a criminal.

The God who is on the side of the poor is not in power in the history in which crime continues to win. Divine goodness and divine omnipotence cannot be reconciled, as Christianity has sought to do in the theology of atonement. Rather, in so far as God represents just and loving

life in mutual sharing, God is for us the insurgent tenacity of life that is not in the seats of power, but yet is still undefeated.

This good and holy power for life continually arises, despite the victories of unjust death, to empower new struggles for well-being, sustaining the moment glimpses where this well-being is lived here and now. The God of the resurrection did not cause the cross, but was momentarily crushed by the cross, only to rise again, overcoming it with a rebirth of protest and new hope. In the resurrection we say No to unjust death and Yes to life abundant for all of us together.