

Explorations on a Feminist Intercultural Theology for a Just World

María Pilar Aquino

I have proposed to address today the topic of a feminist intercultural theology because I think that theological studies can be enhanced by adopting intercultural approaches to religion as these approaches help to find resources for overcoming oppressive discourses and practices, and for contributing to shape a just world. This topic allows us to enter into a space of respectful and critical dialogue as a means of forging new paths for continuing to develop pertinent theological responses to the concerns raised by the contemporary scenarios of a globalized world. I also believe that a theological education that is shaped by intercultural frameworks is better equipped to promote societies, cultures, and religions in which everyone has place. Fostering religious visions, processes, and activities that lead to actualize the human aspiration for a just world is the core aim of a feminist intercultural theology. Also, the practitioners of this theology are especially concerned about women who are poor because they and their children are the most affected by dehumanizing religious interpretations. Having this in mind, I thought of highlighting today the necessity of strengthening active communication between the theological activity and the emerging intercultural frameworks. The possible paths for this communication are explored in the book that I co-edited recently with the title *Feminist Intercultural Theology: Latina Explorations for a Just World*.¹ For my reflection today, I am drawing insights from the essay that I wrote for this book.

Arguments for Intercultural Frameworks

Intercultural philosophical approaches are proving to be a valuable resource for clarifying the social function of religious discourses and have already begun to bring about changes in the theological sciences, especially in the understanding of their ethical horizon. Among the many possible explanations for this, I consider relevant only three arguments that are important for the purposes of my reflection.

The first argument states that the multidimensional, inter-structured, and simultaneous processes being impelled by the present social model of imperial capitalist globalization are raising questions that the dominant Western European Christian tradition is unable to deal with in any significant fashion.² Due to its monocultural, eurocentric, and kyriarchal³ character, this tradition appears to be obsolete and incapable of offering visions that are compatible with the aspirations of many people who seek answers to the growing realities of social conflict which are taking place at the heart of divided societies. The bold characteristic of these societies is that of social injustice.

While more than two-thirds of the world's population experiences on a daily basis the heavy burdens of deep social inequalities, only a privileged minority of the world enjoys the benefits of the prevailing social model. But the most immediate experience of people around the world is shaped by the suffering and the anxieties that come from poverty, social violence, fatal illnesses, and increasing human insecurity. The present era is characterized by a worldwide crisis of human rights. It is precisely within the confines of such experience that people are interpreting their human and their religious existence. As I see it, the kyriarchal religions -including the Christian tradition- continue to fail in their mission to provide people reasons to assert their hope that another world is possible.

The second argument recognizes that in the context of Latin America and the Caribbean, even though the political panorama has changed significantly in the last few years, the cultural and religious environment not only continues to be adverse to women's dignity and human rights but has actually gotten worse. Recent studies point out that,

although there is some evident reform of political and social institutions, there has been no advance in terms of developing and consolidating a democratic culture.⁴ Marta Lagos, director of the prominent firm Latinobarómetro, states: "Unfortunately, after ten years, almost nothing in the region has happened as regards democracy . . . Everything changes so that everything stays the same."⁵ Among other causes, these studies point out that the attitudes and the values in favor of an antidemocratic political culture remain constant. From my viewpoint, another main cause, ignored by these studies, is the antidemocratic presence and activity in the region of Roman Catholicism and the fundamentalist Christian churches. Because of their hierarchical, authoritarian, and sexist character, these churches function in society as obstacles to the development of democratic cultures. In many countries conservative Roman Catholicism, with its absolutist dogmatism, has intervened in the public realm to prevent the approval of changes in legislation to protect the human rights of women.⁶

But in recent years the attacks against the human rights of women have increased similarly in other countries as well. Amnesty International points out that "this attack, especially regarding women's sexual rights and reproductive rights, was led by conservative U.S.-backed Christian groups and supported by the Holy See and some member states of the Organization of the Islamic Conference."⁷ For the Latin American and Caribbean region it would be naive to ignore the negative function that kyriarchal Roman Catholicism plays regarding the achievement of human rights for women. In most countries the Catholic Church has failed to offer alternative cultural models for transforming the mentality of privileges enjoyed by men in the present socio-cultural setting. The well-known "machismo" embedded in Latin American cultures and beyond continues to be cultivated and condoned by kyriarchal Roman Catholicism. This situation highlights for many of us the continuing relevance of feminist theories and theologies.

The third argument asserts that the function of theological knowledge can be clarified by answering these questions: What happens to the world's reality when God's presence and activity takes place there? And what happens to God's reality when it takes place in the world? According to Ignacio Ellacuría, the central concern of theology is making clear "which historical acts bring salvation and which bring condemnation, which acts make God more present, and how that presence is actualized and made effective in them."⁸ This concern leads one to recognize that the theological activity can and should understand that its function is in direct relation to those currents of thoughts and emancipatory social movements that foster processes leading to make possible in the world a new social paradigm of justice. It is in these processes that God's presence and activity become real in the world. God's reality becomes close and tangible in those women and men who promote transformative visions and practices for a new world of justice.

In light of these three arguments, I acknowledge the need that many of us have of intervening theologically in the efforts made worldwide to transform the present-day dominant kyriarchal cultures and religions. Insofar as a feminist intercultural theology cultivates our shared conviction that another world is possible, it becomes a concrete arena from which we contribute to make tangible God's presence and activity in the world. Intercultural approaches take into account that such shared conviction and contribution are shaped in interaction with the challenges raised by the different contexts in which we live. Interculturality, in this sense, is not so much a new theme for theology as it is a new rationality that comes to expand the ethical-political horizon of theology.

Key Understandings of Interculturality

From the outset, I must note the difficulties to offer a univocal understanding of interculturality. In fact, the mere attempt to offer such a univocal understanding would be

contrary to the very nature of intercultural frameworks, insofar as they are continually being elaborated and expanded in every process of cultural interaction.⁹ In general, the common tendency of the kyriarchal mode of knowing is toward seeking and establishing definitions that explain things in a clear and distinct fashion. The monocultural and Eurocentric character of kyriarchal knowledge functions as a key that locks off the possibilities for modifying such definitions by other modes of knowing, since the definitions are already unilaterally established. However, the meaning of interculturality cannot be encapsulated in locked-up definitions because people themselves are the actors and the subjects of the intercultural process. People, therefore, enter into the dynamics of transformation as interacting participants of diverse cultures and as bearers of aspirations for change.

But there is another difficulty in defining this concept. On the one hand, the meaning of interculturality is linked to the historical context of each people and each culture, so the meaning and implications depend on the realities, the resources, the priorities and the challenges of that context. On the other hand, in today's global contexts, the processes generated by capitalist globalization produce the simultaneous interaction -usually on unequal terms- of peoples and cultures all around the planet. In such contexts, according to the Korean feminist philosopher Choe Hyondok, intercultural praxis requires that we take into account the different constellations of power in order to analyze the implications and the consequences of intercultural processes.¹⁰

We must therefore ask questions about what interests are represented worldwide, what type of values underlie the cultural interaction promoted by the present globalization, and who is obtaining the benefits of such interaction. Even so, taking into account the difficulties mentioned here and being conscious of the complex dimensions of intercultural processes, I wish to emphasize the importance of fostering spaces of critical deliberation for the purpose of developing understandings of interculturality that express shared commitments. Having in mind a shared future of justice and well-being for all, we are encouraged to gather for a dialogue together about the theological strategies to reach that end. Next, I present briefly some of the understandings of interculturality that have oriented my own reflection.

- In its most existential dimension, interculturality is understood as taking a position before life or as a "conscious way of life in which an ethical position in favor of living together (*convivencia*) with differences takes form."¹¹ In this sense, interculturality is an experience that emerges from daily life because that is where human interaction occurs and that is what people use to explain their existence.¹² Such an experience goes beyond mere tolerance or simple recognition of cultural diversity, for it understands that diversity is an opportunity for improved human development cultivated by dialogue. Interculturality, in the words of Raúl Fornet-Betancourt, is a form of "consciously knowing the finality for which we work . . . in order to know what we should take care of today and how we should do it."¹³
- As a social force for change,¹⁴ interculturality is an international social movement composed of practitioners who are present at different levels of existing social institutions and who work in diverse fields of human activity, including churches and universities. For S. Wesley Ariarajah, "intercultural hermeneutics has been used to denote a number of movements within the theological scene that relates to interpretation and explication that involves two or more cultures."¹⁵ This social movement seeks to strengthen the relations among different cultures so that they can develop jointly, as equal subjects, "a model for living together"¹⁶ in solidarity and peace. By affirming an ethical horizon of emancipation, interculturality can also be understood as a current of thought and action that is committed to the "emergent and insurgent moral forces of our epoch,"¹⁷ those that have as their project the construction of a just world.
- In its development as a framework for thought and action, interculturality is understood

fundamentally as an *alternative political-cultural project* that seeks, according to Fernet-Betancourt, "the reorganization of current international relations . . . [and] the correction of the asymmetry of power that exists today in the world of international politics."¹⁸ As such, interculturality aims at transforming the relations of domination and subordination that are rooted in today's cultures and societies. The goal of this transformation is the creation of just conditions that affirm the rights and the human dignity of marginalized social groups.¹⁹ In order for theologies and religions to participate in this goal, it is imperative to strive for their intercultural transformation in such a way that "they become what they should be: ways of participating in God's truth."²⁰

- As a new scientific paradigm or disciplinary model, interculturality is understood as a "methodology that allow us to study, describe and analyze the dynamics of interaction among different cultures and that views interculturality as a new discipline."²¹ In this understanding, interculturality "is the theory and method of interpreting and understanding across cultural boundaries."²² This is not, however, a narrow methodology, but rather "an interaction of diverse methods"²³ that intersect and enrich one another so as to participate more effectively in the work of building a more just world.

By joining together these understandings of interculturality, I can discern their distinct orientation toward the transformation of existent realities, with the aim of shaping a world where there is a place for everyone and where human dignity and human rights become possible for all. In this new world, the subordination of women will no longer exist because the kyriarchal cultures and religions will have ceased to exist. In order for such a world to be possible, however, it is necessary to participate actively in the fashioning of spaces for intercultural dialogue. This participation entails that one has taken seriously a hermeneutical challenge, namely that of evaluating critically the presuppositions of our own knowledge practices and theories of understanding.²⁴ Intercultural thought refuses to continue participating in the creation of theories based on purely abstracting thought; that is, theories disconnected from the social contexts in which marginalized cultures have developed plural forms of knowledge that cultivate visions and practices of social change. From a feminist intercultural perspective, the dominant models of knowing have been and continue to be kyriarchal-monocultural and Eurocentric. Since these models continue to declare themselves to be universal, it is not surprising that they ignore or subordinate the emergent models of rationality that propose emancipation and justice as the primary objectives of knowledge. Hermeneutical historicization, therefore, requires that we transcend any theories that ignore the knowledge practices developed by marginalized social groups for the purpose of emancipation and justice.

In this sense, intercultural dialogue does not promote retrieval or reconstruction of the kyriarchal-monocultural patterns of thought, but rather supports the radical transformation of the current models of thought. From a feminist intercultural feminist perspective, the renunciation of conceptual absolutisms and doctrinal dogmatisms is essential for making egalitarian communication and open deliberation possible. In this way, the feminist practice of interculturality seeks to transform the supposedly universal character of kyriarchal-monocultural knowledge and to offer emancipatory modes of knowing so that justice, being the primary objective of knowledge, comes to be truly universal from within each culture and society. For this reason, not only do intercultural theological frameworks accept and value cultural diversity, but they also recognize and affirm that it is precisely in the ethical-political space of justice where cultures and religions should join together.

Intercultural approaches to religion and theology, therefore, deliberately avoid any romanticization or uncritical understanding of one's own cultural tradition. Such approaches also recognize that cultures, in their diversity, offer emancipatory visions of the world and of

human relations that are helpful in the search for new ways of living that eradicate the subordination of women. An intercultural understanding of religions and theological activity, then, involves a commitment to eliminating the pervasive inequalities between men and women because, theologically, it is contrary to God's purpose for humankind and the world. Fornet-Betancourt points out that cooperation or interaction among cultures can be deceitful if there is no clear affirmation of a *politics of transformation* "that combats effectively and unequivocally the asymmetry of power that characterizes the current world 'order' and that becomes more acute as globalization progresses. Only by creating conditions of equality and social justice at a global level will it be possible to guarantee a free interaction in which all cultures can . . . promote, from within, mutual transformations in their ways of life."²⁵ Thus, an intercultural theological activity supports the shift from a politics of inequality to a politics of transformation.

With the aim of facing the challenges that the present contexts of capitalist globalization present for the theological activity, feminist intercultural theology seeks to strengthen the development of a *critical ethical-political paradigm of biblical and theological interpretation*.²⁶ Since the dominant interpretative paradigms continue to be kyriarchal-monocultural and Eurocentric, their transformation must be a common task shared by the theological community in its diverse cultural settings.

Feminist Intercultural Theology: For a New World of Justice

"Another World Is Possible" is the declaration or slogan that each year brings together hundreds of social movements, human rights organizations, religious leaders, government representatives, public-policy leaders, scholars, researchers, intellectuals, and activists from all parts of the world. Organized by the World Social Forum,²⁷ this encounter joins together all these organizations and individuals who "are committed to building a planetary society directed toward fruitful relationships among Humankind and between it and the Earth."²⁸ Those of us who hold that another world is indeed possible are guided by a new vision, one that illuminates the search for alternatives that open the way to a world free of divisions, poverty, and violence. This vision speaks of a new kind of globalization in solidarity, one which is at the service of social justice.

From the stand point of the Christian tradition, a feminist intercultural theology asserts that the redeeming and creative presence of God in the world is truly expressed only by the historical realities of justice, solidarity, peaceful *convivencia* (living together), and human fulfillment. The very content of these realities, therefore, is understood to be the expression of God's glory on earth. According to Elizabeth Johnson, "In biblical terms, yearning for salvation, for victory in the struggle with evil, for deliverance of the poor from want and of the war-torn from violence is consistently expressed in the hope that God's glory will dwell in the land or will fill the earth or will shine throughout heaven and earth."²⁹ The central role that this vision has for every struggle for social change means that, in the present context of kyriarchal globalization, feminist intercultural theologies have committed themselves to developing and promoting the kinds of knowledge and practice that transform those conditions that are contrary to God's purpose. Their function is to foment and sustain, in religious-political terms, visions of justice that give impulse to every effort to change the present situation.

If I could name one aspiration that people of all cultures value and share in common, it would be the aspiration to experience the wellbeing and happiness of their everyday life. Experiencing a peaceful existence and the satisfaction of one's basic emotional and material needs is something that all persons treasure for themselves and for those around them. I believe that this aspiration is universal and that it exists in all the cultures of the world. In the current model of society, however, its fulfillment is literally impossible for more than

two-thirds of the world's population. What is more, the present kyriarchal cultures and religions not only have been useless in preventing this situation, but they have also contributed to exacerbating the politics of inequalities, with its exclusionary institutions and its monocultural and sexist discourses. Nevertheless, as Tapio Kanninen points out, "in the light of the unfortunate but increasing prominence of religion as a divisive force in our world, the time has come for religion also to play its role in uniting people and creating conditions for peace."³⁰ The proposal to develop a feminist intercultural theology is due to the fact that intercultural frameworks, according to Hyondok, have "the intention to transform reality, and not simply describe and explain the reality."³¹ We want to contribute to change the oppressive conditions in which people live.

For feminist intercultural theology, a new world of justice is the only world that we can call our home. In this regard, Mercy Amba Oduyoye states that "our future as women is in living our true humanity in a world that we have helped to shape, and in which even now we have begun to live and enjoy, conscious of our situation and seeking consciously to change structures and attitudes. Even the prospect of being a part of this calls for celebrating."³² For many of us Latin American women, the reason for our hope lies in the fact that, by our feminist theological practices in diverse cultural environments, we are intervening together in bringing about what María Cristina Ventura calls "the new possibilities to exist with human dignity."³³ In terms of intercultural thought, these possibilities of living in a humane and dignified manner are broadened at the world level because, from within each culture and from the global interaction of cultures, an *alternative politico-cultural project* is already under way, and a *critical ethical-political paradigm of biblical and theological interpretation* is booming.

The proposal for a feminist intercultural theology is not a prescription or a finished product. I propose that it can be understood as a process of critical deliberation, which, in interaction with other liberating theological languages, seeks to contribute to the construction of different realities. I have no hesitation in recognizing that this theology affirms an option for hope. Fornet-Betancourt holds that intercultural thought affirms such an option because it enters into the scenario of present-day reality "as an alternative for articulating the concrete hopes of every person who dares today to imagine and to rehearse still other possible worlds."³⁴ In our present circumstances of deeply divided world, nation, religions, and churches, the option for hope and the affirmation that another world is possible are ethical and religious imperatives for the theological community in every part of the world. Theological education, therefore, continues to face the challenge of understanding itself as a powerful space for vision and imagination so that theology truly contributes to bring about a renewed creation and a reconciled humanity.

Accordingly, a feminist intercultural theology affirms that theological knowledge should function as a principle of liberation in the church and society.³⁵ That is why, both in its aims and in its contents, this theology is articulated according to the simple criterion of what harms or what helps "the very fact of living"³⁶ of the people. In the same way, for its epistemological coherence, this theology assumes the *feminist option for the poor and the oppressed* as its fundamental principle of biblical and theological interpretation.³⁷ This option has a twofold consequence for our work: theological contents are developed in response to the aspirations and struggles of wo/men for an existence free of human degradation, and primacy is given to those emancipating traditions for a just world that are born in our own cultural environments.

Finally, I would suggest that intercultural theological education needs to be undertaken as a collective task and as an activity rooted in the concrete, lived contexts of our communities. As I mentioned at the beginning of this presentation, the most common experiences of people everywhere have to do with poverty and the lack of basic human rights. The immediate consequence for our theological work is our need to continue raising

questions about how religious languages operate in social life, what ethical-political consequences they have, what type of relation they establish with social and religious movements involved in social transformation, what impact they have in the local struggles to promote justice, what types of answers they offer to the struggles for the human and reproductive rights of women, what religious resources they provide for affirming the human rights of the homosexual community, what incidence they have in "the very fact of living" of the people, and what type of common future we can envision on the basis of the cultural and religious frameworks of interpretation advocated by intercultural thought. Addressing these questions is necessary precisely because intercultural frameworks are aimed at fostering interaction among cultures for the sake of reaching justice for all. Our own work is dedicated to strengthen the imagination of the theological community so that we may contribute better to the shaping of viable routes toward a common future for humankind and for the whole creation around us. With our religious languages and resources, our work is called upon to show that another world of justice is possible in this world.

NOTES

-
1. María Pilar Aquino and Maria José Rosado-Nunes, ed., Feminist Intercultural Theology: Latina Explorations for a Just World (Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis Books, 2007).
 2. On this, see S. Wesley Ariarajah, "Intercultural Hermeneutics: A Promise for the Future?" Voices from the Third World 29, no. 1 (2006): 91.
 3. The term kyriarchy is a feminist analytical category. This is "a neologism coined by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza and derived from the Greek words for 'lord' or 'master' (kyrios) and 'to rule or dominate' (archein) which seeks to redefine the analytic category of patriarchy in terms of multiplicative intersecting structures of domination. Kyriarchy is a socio-political system of domination in which elite educated propertied men hold power over wo/women and other men. Kyriarchy is best theorized as a complex pyramidal system of intersecting multiplicative social structures of superordination and subordination, of ruling and oppression," Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Wisdom Ways: Introducing Feminist Biblical Interpretation (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2001), 211. Also, as explained by Schüssler Fiorenza, "the neologism kyriarchy-kyriocentrism (from Greek kyrios meaning lord, master, father, husband) seeks to express this interstructuring of domination and to replace the commonly used term 'patriarchy,' which is often understood in terms of binary gender dualism. I have introduced this neologism as an analytic category in order to be able to articulate a more comprehensive systemic analysis, to underscore the complex interstructuring of domination, and to locate sexism and misogyny in the political matrix or, better, matrix of a broader range of oppressions," Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Rhetoric and Ethic: The Politics of Biblical Studies (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 5.
 4. Daniel Zovatto, "Cultura Democrática: Poco Cambia Pese a los Cambios," Latinobarómetro, Observatorio Electoral Latinoamericano, Noviembre de 2005, available from <http://www.observatorioelectoral.org/informes/tendencias/>; Internet (accessed December 11, 2006).
 5. Cited by Zovatto, "Cultura Democrática."
 6. See, for example, a typical case from Nicaragua in Roland Membreño Segura, "Deshumanización y Fundamentalismo Cristiano: A Propósito del Aborto Terapéutico," El Nuevo Diario (Managua, Nicaragua), edición 9425, Miércoles 8 de Noviembre de 2006,

available from <http://www.elnuevodiario.com.ni/2006/11/08/opinion/33345>; Internet (accessed December 13, 2006); Violeta Otero Rosales, "La Iglesia Católica y el Aborto: Por Abortos Clandestinos Mueren Mujeres," El Nuevo Diario (Managua, Nicaragua), edición 9392, Viernes 6 de Octubre de 2006, available from <http://www.elnuevodiario.com.ni/2006/10/06/opinion/30665>; Internet (accessed December 13, 2006); Tania Sirias and Edgard Barberena, "Más Voces Internacionales en Defensa del Aborto Terapéutico," El Nuevo Diario (Managua, Nicaragua), edición 9435, Sábado 18 de Noviembre de 2006, available from <http://www.elnuevodiario.com.ni/2006/11/18/nacionales/34263>; Internet (accessed December 13, 2006).

7. Amnesty International, "Key Issues: Stop Violence against Women: Women's Right to Freedom from Violence," in Amnesty International Report 2006: The State of the World's Human Rights, available from <http://www.amnesty.org/ailib/aireport/index.html>; Internet (accessed December 12, 2006).

8. Ignacio Ellacuría, "The Historicity of Christian Salvation," in Mysterium Liberationis. Fundamental Concepts of Liberation Theology, ed. Ignacio Ellacuría, S.J., and Jon Sobrino, S.J. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1993), 251.

9. Concerning this, see Raúl Fonet-Betancourt, Filosofar Para Nuestro Tiempo en Clave Intercultural (Aachen, Germany: Verlag Mainz, 2004), 12-14.

10. Choe Hyondok, "Introduction to Intercultural Philosophy: Its Concept and History," in In Quest of Intercultural Philosophy: Communication and Solidarity in the Era of Globalization, ed. Department of Philosophy (Gwangju, Korea: Department of Philosophy, Chonnam National University, 2006), 8.

11. Fonet-Betancourt, Filosofar Para Nuestro Tiempo, 12-13.

12. Raúl Fonet-Betancourt, Interculturalidad y Globalización: Ejercicios de Crítica Filosófica Intercultural en el Contexto de la Globalización Neoliberal (Frankfurt/IKO; San José, Costa Rica: Departamento Ecueménico de Investigaciones, 2000), 68.

13. Raúl Fonet-Betancourt, La Interculturalidad a Prueba (Aachen, Germany: Verlagsgruppe Mainz in Aachen, 2006), 22.

14. On the understanding of the social forces that orient history, see Ignacio Ellacuría, Filosofía de la Realidad Histórica (Madrid: Trotta, 1991), 449-57.

15. Ariarajah, "Intercultural Hermeneutics," 93.

16. Hyondok, "Introduction to Intercultural Philosophy," 7.

17. Fonet-Betancourt, La Interculturalidad a Prueba, 18.

18. Fonet-Betancourt, Filosofar Para Nuestro Tiempo, 13.

19. Fonet-Betancourt, Interculturalidad y Globalización, 85.

20. Fonet-Betancourt, La Interculturalidad a Prueba, 113.

21. Fonet-Betancourt, Filosofar Para Nuestro Tiempo, 13.

22. Ariarajah, "Intercultural Hermeneutics," 92.

23. Fonet-Betancourt, La Interculturalidad a Prueba, 116.

24. Raúl Fonet-Betancourt, Trasformación Intercultural de la Filosofía: Ejercicios Teóricos y Prácticos de la Filosofía Intercultural Desde Latinoamérica en el Contexto de la Globalización (Bilbao: Desclée de Brouwer, 2001), 39.

25. Raúl Fonet-Betancourt, "Interacción y Asimetría entre las Culturas en el Contexto de la Globalización: Una Introducción," in Culturas y Poder: Interacción y Asimetría Entre las Culturas en el Contexto de la Globalización, ed. Raúl Fonet-Betancourt (Bilbao: Desclée de Brouwer, 2003), 25.

26. On this paradigm, see Schüssler Fiorenza, Rhetoric and Ethic, 32-33.

27. World Social Forum, "Another World Is Possible," English version available from

-
- <http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/>; Internet (accessed November 14, 2006).
28. World Social Forum, "Charter of Principles," English version available from <http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/>; Internet (accessed November 14, 2006).
29. Elizabeth A. Johnson, Friends of God and Prophets: A Feminist Theological Reading of the Communion of Saints (New York: Continuum, 1999), 53–54.
30. Tapio Kanninen, "Prevention and Reconciliation in a World of Conflicts: The United Nations Perspective," in Reconciliation in a World of Conflicts, ed. Luiz Carlos Susin and María Pilar Aquino (London: SCM Press, 2003), 99.
31. Hyondok, "Introduction to Intercultural Philosophy," 17.
32. Mercy Amba Oduyoye, Daughters of Anowa: African Women and Patriarchy (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), 207.
33. María Cristina Ventura, "Prácticas e desafíos de la teología Afro-dominicana en un mundo globalizado," in Teología Afroamericana II: Avances, Desafíos e Perspectivas: III Consulta Ecumênica de Teología Afroamericana e Caribenha, ed. Antônio Aparecido da Silva and Sônia Querino dos Santos (São Paulo: Centro Atabaque de Cultura Negra e Teologia, 2004), 139.
34. Fornet-Betancourt, Transformación Intercultural, 209.
35. Ignacio Ellacuría, Conversión de la Iglesia al Reino de Dios: Para Anunciarlo y Realizarlo en la Historia (Santander: Sal Terrae, 1984), 211.
36. *Ibid.*, 86.
37. Concerning this, see María Pilar Aquino, "The Feminist Option for the Poor and Oppressed in the Context of Globalization," in The Option for the Poor in Christian Theology, ed. Daniel Groody (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), 191–215.