In reflecting on the question, “what parallels Gutierrez’s writing and where do they diverge”, in reflecting on where they parallel- it appears that both Cone and Gutiérrez argue that Christian theology should, and I think both would argue, MUST begin with the oppressed. They would argue that Christian theology is required to understand God as actively opposed to oppression and reinterpret salvation as liberation within history. I think where they diverge the most is primarily in their contexts and central categories. For Cone, his work centers around Black experience and racial liberation, whereas Gutiérrez's experience of poverty and socioeconomic liberation are his focuses. I think what is perhaps one of the most interesting and even fascinating bridges between these two prolific works is this: both are essentially asking the same theological question from different "undersides of history": What does the gospel mean when you read it from the place of the person who is suffering rather than from the place of the person who holds power?

I believe that there is a temptation by many to say that both Cone and Gutiérrez "believe the same thing”; however, I would argue that they don't. While there are similarities, I think they are better understood more as convergent liberation theologies emerging from different communities of oppression than “believing the same thing.” Cone's starting point is the Black experience in the United States; Gutiérrez's is the experience of the poor in Latin America. I think that their theological methods overlap, but their particular histories shape what each sees most clearly.