

Dario Barolin

I would like to begin this very brief presentation by expressing my gratitude for the various contributions we have received both here and from the floor.

I would like to highlight a few points that I believe could help us, on the one hand, to deepen our understanding of how we are interpreting the signs of the time and, on the other, to raise some issues that could contribute to theological dialogue.

1. Hermeneutics

Starting with the latter, I would like to point out two things:

- a) We need to be aware of how we talk and listen to each other, especially on issues that are sensitive for us. I think it is important to note that in our process of dialogue and reception of what we hear, there is a serious risk of "over-interpretation." We need to try to discern between what our sister or brother is saying to us and what we are hearing. It is certainly a phantasmagoric task, but one that is essential if we are to truly seeking to listen to each other.
- b) In these days, we have seen both in the presentations and in the assembly a rich and diverse way of understanding and living out "Reformed theology." I understand that it is not enough to speak in the plural and recognize the existence of "Reformed theologies." We need to be able to communicate our theological grammar and, above all, make an effort to understand the path that has led to the formulation of this diversity of "Reformed theologies." In order to have an edifying Christian conversation that leads to agreement, we need to speak the same language or at least have interpreters to make the dialogue possible.

2) Reading the signs of the times.

a) Jesus, in his ministry, embracing the prophetic tradition, showed us where God's gaze is directed and, above all, from where he challenges us to look at reality.

- The call is therefore to read the signs of the times from the perspective and with the victims, the crucified of our time.

- This task requires us to move beyond compassion and solidarity. It is necessary, as the prophets did and as Jesus did, to name the responsibilities behind it.
 - If we speak of the suffering of creation, it is essential that we name, preferably by name and surname, what causes its suffering.
 - It is not the same to speak of poverty and inequality as it is to speak of injustice and sin. Furthermore, we must necessarily speak of what causes it.
 - It is not enough to talk about the suffering of the Gazans, Ukrainians, Sudanese, etc. It is necessary to name who is on the other side of the drone or the shrapnel, what the causes are, and who is responsible. Let me emphasize that those who are responsible are not forgotten by God but are called to conversion.

b) Linked to the previous point, the different situations we have mentioned here, which are just a few examples, need to be seen not in isolation but in terms of how they relate to and reinforce each other. The Accra Confession taught us precisely the power of having undergone a process of study and deepening to unravel the connections between different levels of injustice and give us a global vision, especially why it was a challenge to the Christian faith.

c) Finally, I would like to make a contribution along these lines. Today, violence, power, extortion, and weapons are openly affirmed and tolerated, as the way to organize the world. Although they have always existed, today they represent a change of era in relation to the process that began after World War II. Rita Segato, an Argentine anthropologist, refers to the genocide in Gaza as "expressive violence." By displaying this violence and death, a new law is being proclaimed. It is not only the end of the "Universal Declaration of Human Rights", it is a new declaration, a declaration that charter that affirms that the power of death is the new law.