

APPENDIX II

A HYPOTHESIS FOR A HISTORY OF
THEOLOGY IN LATIN AMERICA

I. INTRODUCTION

In this brief essay I want to propose a few hypotheses that can facilitate the writing—in the future and as a team in CEHILA—of a larger work on the history of theology in Latin America. We will never develop an understanding of our theological past until we have such a work. It is not absolutely essential for the constitution of a new theology, but it is essential for any definitive maturing of our theology. For this reason, each day that passes makes more necessary a theological reconstruction, but not one less interpretative.

On the other hand, it should be pointed out that one could write the history of theology *from theology itself*; namely, by allowing theology to be the point of departure, and by looking into the internal development of theology as an abstract *whole* subsisting in itself. One would follow this logical process to the epistemological limits of theological reflection. We could demonstrate, therefore, the evolution of the phenomenon in Latin America from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries. In this way, perhaps, the theology of Bartholomé de Las Casas or of José de Acosta would appear to be less technical or less “serious” in comparison to subsequent theology, the academic and university theology of the professors of Mexico or Lima.

But if we include dialectically the theological *whole* as a *part* of the totality of Christian existence, and even non-Christian existence, in the Christianity of the West Indies, and if we move from an abstract description of theology in itself toward the concrete level of theology conditioned by the nontheological (the real within which theology plays a practical role as theory), then our interpretation changes meaning, and the theology of Las Casas, though less academic, sophisticated, or articulated in his writings, is more authentic (because it denounces the fundamental contradictions and injustices of his day), while subsequent theology is imitative—hiding the injustices—ideological, and abstract.

Methodologically, then, it is necessary to place theology *within* the totality of existence in which it derives meaning, be it *within* the national or international geopolitical arena, or the life of the social classes, or the affected motivations to which it corresponds. An ideological-historical analysis could thereby produce some unexpected results. This analysis, however, is nothing more than a simple introduction to the problem, that is, it is merely a hypothesis for the task.

I hope that what I wrote in the *Encuentro del Escorial*, published in 1972 in Spanish by Sígueme Publishing House and in French by Cerf, will be kept in mind, since there I proposed a hypothesis for interpreting the *history of faith* in Latin America, while here I am dealing with a *history of theology*—a secondary and reflective level which has

to consider its point of departure: theology as a part of the everyday prophetic existential Christian faith.

II. IDEOLOGY AND THE HISTORY OF THEOLOGY

The context of the history of theology in Latin America is the history of theology of the new “center,” originally that of the Mediterranean and Europe, and subsequently that of the United States (since Russia contributes very little today to theological thought). The context of the biography of the son is the biography of the father. This does not mean that the son’s context is the same as the father’s, but on the contrary, that the son’s is only a reflection of the father’s context. Latin American theology is a product of European theology, but it is different. It is another theology. It sprouted from the same tradition, but in a different setting, namely, in a “peripheral” world within the modern mercantile era and later in a monopolistic empire. Theology in a colonial or neocolonial world can refract momentarily the theology of the “center,” but in its creative moments it will produce a new theology which will rise up against the more developed traditional theology. It is in this context of imitative ideological refraction or creativity that assents to a different reality in our Latin American world, that the history of theology in our dependent continent will be developed. Let us consider the question in parts.

1. *The Ideological Constitution of Theology*¹

The concept of ideology can be seen by its opposite: nonideological revelation. If there is an expression that allows the eruption of the exteriority of all the constituted ideological system, it is the proto-word, the exclamation or interjection of pain, that immediate consequence of perceived trauma. The “Ouch!” or painful scream resulting from a blow, a wound, or an accident indicates immediately not *something* but rather *somebody*. One who hears the cry of pain is astonished because the scream interrupts his commonplace and integrated world. The sound, the noise, produces a mental image of an absent-present somebody in pain. The hearer does not know as yet *what kind* of pain it is, nor the reason for the outcry. But the hearer will be disturbed until he knows who is crying out and why. *What* that cry says is secondary; the fundamental issue is the cry itself; one who is *somebody* is saying something. It is not what is said, but rather the saying itself, the person who cries out, who is important—that exteriority which calls out for help. Nevertheless, to cry “Help!” is already a word, a part of a language, of a culture. The scream or the cry for help is perhaps the most remote indicator of the ideological: “I...have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters” (Exodus 3:7). “And Jesus cried with a *loud voice*, and gave up the ghost” (Mark 15:37). It is the limit of human and divine revelation. It is putting oneself outside of the system, questioning it—when the pain is produced by sin, namely, by injustice and domination over the Other, it is the pain of Job, not merely physical pain, although this may also be involved.

The cry of pain such as “I am hungry!” requires an urgent answer, an answer that issues from a sense of responsibility: to be responsible for the one who is crying out in his or her pain. It is this responsibility that exemplifies authentic religion and worship,² and the trauma that one suffers for the Other who cries out is the *Glory of the Infinite* in the system. “I am hungry!” is the revelation that the gastric juices which are causing discomfort in the stomach, the acid that produces the pain, is the appetite, the “desire” to eat. This carnal, corporal, and material desire is the basis of the desire for the Kingdom of Heaven in its most fundamental meaning: it is the dissatisfaction

that demands to be satisfied. When the hunger of people is habitual, hunger stemming from poverty, it is from *this* that nonideological words arise. It is the carnality or basic materialism that Jesus places as the supreme criteria of the Judgment: "I was hungry, and you gave me meat" (Matthew 25:35).

The "Ouch!" of the first pain, the "I am hungry!" are already articulated in a language, a social class, a people, in a moment of history and refer to the *Reality* or exteriority of every constituted system. They cannot be ideological expressions. They are political or primary words, words that inaugurate a new totality of language and of conceptual formulations of meaning.

In effect, it is only the provoking of the constitution of a new system that satisfies the dissatisfaction of the poor of the old system, the starting point for the liberation of language. But just when the cry has been heard and is formulated, just when a new system is intended to be organized and a model is developed, just when the mediations for its realization are conceived, and much more when the system has been built, a new structured totality takes the place of the old one. Inside every system or totality of concepts, the words are structured by their role in the totality itself. But since the system is dominated by a few, by certain classes or groups, the projects of these groups are imposed on the whole system. From that very moment the conceptualization and the language of the dominating group is mingled with the "reality" of things and with the language itself. The concept and the word that expresses it establish on one hand the action of all members of the system, and at the same time it hides not only the internal contradictions of the system, but also and primarily the *exteriority of the poor*.³ It is in that moment that the formulation (the concept, the word: the *idea*) becomes an *ideology*: a representation that for all practical purposes hides the reality.⁴ There is, therefore, a dialectic between discovering and concealing, between theory and praxis.

When Jesus says that "they know not what they do" (Luke 23:34), he explicitly and clearly shows that twofold dialectic between discovering ("knowing" is seeing) and concealing (they know "not"), between theory ("knowing" is theory) and praxis ("doing" is praxis). On the one hand it is an authentic theological reflection on ideology, although in a single instance, since the torture of Jesus has unquestionable political significance, having been delivered by his government and national priesthood to the Roman authorities. Knowing not what they were doing is like saying that the interpretation of the praxis fails to discover its true meaning. Surely the soldiers knew what they are doing to a certain point: they were executing a political prisoner. The true meaning is, nevertheless, concealed, that is, the ultimate meaning of the praxis. This is precisely the practical function of ideology: it provides some knowledge for undergirding action, but at the same time it conceals the fundamental level of its ultimate or actual meaning. Thus, Jesus introduced us to the critique of ideology.

Ideology therefore serves a practical-interpretative function. This may be illustrated by a Latin American example first on the level of common interpretation, then on the level of the theological formulation.

The conquest of America, which began with its discovery in 1492, is not only a simple fact, it is also a historico-political fact. With Spain and Portugal, Europe began its dominating expansion over the peripheral world. Holland, England, and France followed. Spain since 1493 has theoretically "justified" the conquest. Pope Alexander VI issued the Bull *Inter coetera* in 1493 favoring the Roman Catholic kings of Spain by allowing them to evangelize these lands and bring them under their domain. Thus, in the *Recapitulation of Laws of the Indies Kingdoms* (1681), the first law of the

first section of the first book declares that the Lordship⁵ of the king of Spain over the new kingdoms is due to the obligation that the king has incurred with the Holy See to indoctrinate the Indians in the Roman Catholic faith. The conquering praxis is thereby “justified” by a theoretical basis —the papal bull. The whole juridical structure of the sixteenth century was obviously a type of *ideology*. Behind respectable principles was hidden the real *meaning* of the conquering praxis. The concealed meaning was the reality of the European domination of the Indian who was reduced to the most horrendous slavery. Death, theft, torture (that was the real fruit of the conquering praxis) was concealed by a false ideological interpretation, namely, evangelization. Papal bulls served the same ideological function in the quotidian conscience of the conqueror as the doctrine of *Manifest Destiny* in the mind of Sam Houston who occupied Texas and later separated it from Mexico in 1846. All the empires have reasons (void of reason) that permit them to establish their dominion over others. But their reasons are ideological-existentialist at the quotidian concrete level.

The quotidian ideological level is raised to the level of scientific ideology (as can be seen in some theological examples) in that science itself accepts certain judgments as principles (but with historico-cultural evidence), and experiences a moment of unavoidable ingenuity (science cannot by definition demonstrate its principles; that is to say, the principles of science are not scientific. It has been recognized since the time of Aristotle that they are the object of the dialectic).⁶ It is in this way that the ideology supporting the praxis of the conquest is raised by Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda (1490 - 1573) and by Francisco de Vitoria (1486 - 1546) to the level of theology. To Ginés the conquest of America and war against the Indians was justified. The “cause of the just war (*iusti belli causa*) by natural and divine right (*iure naturali et divino*) is the rebellion of the less gifted who were born to serve and their rejection of the dominion of their masters; if they cannot be subdued by other means, then war is justified” —according to the *Democrates alter*.⁷ It is evident that Ginés attributes this to Aristotle —in his ideological text on slavery in Greece in Book I of *Politica* —and also to the medieval authors, even to Thomas Aquinas in the *iustum dominativum* that the feudal lords had over the servants,⁸ and to other contemporary professors like Juan Mayor (1469 - 1550) in Paris who thought that in America “the people live like animals (*bestialiter*); therefore the first one that conquers them will rightly reign over them, because they are by nature servants (*quia natura sunt servi*).”⁹ For this reason even in the best of situations the Indian was considered “crude,” a “child” who must be civilized, a being with little intelligence and governed by instincts and “little inclined to celibacy” according to a missionary.

Even Vitoria himself, the eminent professor of Salamanca and author of *De Indis* (1537), pointed out in his *De iure belli* (1538) that the conquest of the Indians could not be justified on the basis of their having a different religion, nor because of the rights of the king, nor to preach the gospel, nor because of a pontifical concession, nor to oppose any sin *contra natura* that the indigenous American people committed. But Vitoria concluded that the conquest is justified when the missionary is hindered from proclaiming freely the gospel (“libere annuntient Evangelium” as Vitoria explains in his *Relectio de indis, quarta conclusio*). Thus the missionary can, “in order to avoid scandal preach to them even against their wills...and accept war or declare it.” By the *iniuria accepta* the eminent theologian justified the conquest. “From this conclusion it may also clearly be deduced that, for the same reason, if it is not possible to provide [the Indians] with religion any other way, then it is licit for the Spaniards to occupy their lands and territories and to establish for them new masters and to divest them

of their former gods, and do *whatever else* [sic.] that is permitted by the right of war as in every righteous war” (Ibid.). One can see therefore that even this progressive European theologian —without doubt the most advanced of his period, since on other levels he valiantly defended the Indian —could not avoid theological formulations.

Finally, we conclude that the ideology of the dominant classes or of the oppressor nations is concealing, whereas the formulations of the oppressed classes or of the prophets of such groups is critically revealing. It is the articulation of meaning that comes out from the cry of the poor.

2. *The Ideological Conditioning or the Theology of the “Center”*

Ideology justifies, then, the praxis, hiding at the same time the ultimate meaning of praxis itself, allowing the one who commits the injustice to continue with a “clear conscience.” Ideology is the formulation (existential or scientific) of the mediations of the project of the system without revealing itself to be a *system of domination*. What is concealed is the domination at certain levels. Because of this, it is possible to indicate the ideological sense of theology when one discovers the type of domination that it hides. This is to say that one can attempt to indicate the conditioning which inclines theological reflection in a certain concealing direction, in the direction that benefits or justifies the praxis of the group, class, nation, or culture that serves as the theoretical foundation. We can illustrate this by showing the conditioning that has constituted some of the theological levels ideologically of the history of the Mediterranean — European theology (which is the frame of reference of Latin American theology as it developed in the sixteenth century).¹⁰

During the New Testament era, Christians were oppressed as a group (Palestine was a distant Roman colony) and also as a social class (those first baptized were a despised class and without political and social influence, thus the ideological-concealing function of the first Christian formulations were minimal. One can observe in Paul some *machismo* (in regard to the problem of women) or the noncritical acceptance at the socio-political level of the institution of slavery (in his Letter to Philemon).¹¹ If at some point, nevertheless, the gospel is accepted, it is precisely because of its critical-de-ideological character, especially in those few formulations that can be attributed without doubt to Jesus of Nazareth. Later some inclinations toward “escapism” from the political reality can be seen in the texts of some of the primitive Judeo-Christian apocalyptic writers, such as the revelations of the Shepherd of Hermas. But even in these the reflections are hardly ideological.

The apologist Fathers, on the contrary, when they began to utilize Hellenistic categories, accepted certain ideological-concealing elements. Nevertheless, the politico-religious critique of those Christians who faced the dominating culture of the Empire was magnificent¹² (and for that reason de-ideologizing). There were also frontal attacks against all the ideologized values of imperialism by recently baptized thinkers who felt that they were Greeks and Christians at the same time.¹³ It is doubtful that we have ever had critics of the prevailing imperial culture as competent as those of the early Christian centuries.

Criticism of the empire continued either against paganism, against the Hellenistic or Roman culture, or against the vices in the cities. Even in the theologians deeply influenced by Greek philosophy such as Clement of Alexandria, Origen, or Irenaeus of Lyon, the developing theology allowed for the discovering of the contradictions in the *system*. One should note that by being Christian communities they were considered by Rome as dissident groups, “fifth columnists” who were sabotaging the ruling culture,

and for this reason they were frequently persecuted. Persecution in fact demonstrated that Christian theology was substantively critical or prophetic. Christians were persecuted because they challenged the “fundamentals” of the system, its values, and its gods. Theology had, then, a critical-prophetic function that was equally manifested at the political level. The Empire, in defending itself by political repression against Christians, actually revealed that Christianity was fulfilling its liberating mission, theologically de-ideologizing.

A crucially important step in comprehending Christian theology as ideology occurred when Constantine was crowned emperor (324), and also in the Council of Nicea (325). The most glorious century of patristic theology (A.D. 325- 425) also constitutes the beginning of the formation of theology as ideology. (We are not saying that theology thereby lost its value. Rather, we are simply indicating that the ideological aspect of theology increased; it became more determinative). The Greek Patristics (Athanasius, Basil, and from Gregory to John of Damascus) and the Latin Fathers (from Ambrose and Augustine to Isidore of Seville), some of them under the authority of the Emperor and others under the Papacy, accepted the existence of the Empire not only as “natural,” but also —especially in the Latin world —the Empire was virtually equated with the *civitas Dei* (by replacing the content of Augustine's *civitas Dei*). The *Christianitas* came to be identified with Christianity. Theology accepted too many imperial, social, cultural, linguistic, and sexual structures as essential ingredients of Christianity. Thus theology, with the platonic or neoplatonic method, came to justify the political and social domination of the early centuries of Byzantine and Latin Christianity. The displacement of the method (from the historico-existential in the biblical thought to the epistemical or apodictical, to which were added anthropological and ontological dualism) pushed theology into many ideological blind alleys. A detailed study is therefore necessary. It is evident that an aristocratic and imperialistic Christianity, constituted in its various levels of ecclesiastical decision making by the most powerful and influential classes, more and more instrumentalized Christianity to solidify its power. We want to point out again —and this applies to all of this appendix —that instrumentalization does not invalidate the theological effort; it simply limits it. (It is commonly recognized that every theology is only a remote analogy of the “science of God” in which God himself will participate as *visio* only in the fulfilled Kingdom). Ideological moments in every theology indicate that it is unavoidably an *historical*, conditioned, and limited reflection.

The theology of the Greek Patristics pressed on until the end (1453) without changing fundamentally during the centuries (although it grew continually, as was clearly demonstrated by the exiles in Italy during the fourth century). Latins, on the other hand, thanks to the Franks, generated a new theological process. The Venerable Bede (672 - 735) originated a process that developed in the Holy Roman Empire (whose *sacredness* justified Christianity: the political ideological moment of essential importance concealed the imperialistic and social domination of the oppressed kingdoms and of the feudal serfs). The classical era of the *Primera Escolástica* (early Scholasticism) followed the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215. The golden age of Latin Christianity and of Scholasticism (1215- 1315) was that of Abelard, Bonaventure, Thomas, and Duns Scotus. The Platonic or Augustinian method was modified by the discovery of Aristotle's *Organon*, which was derived from the Arabs via Spain (Toledo). Behind this apparatus —indeed much more precise with its substantialistic categories and employed with remarkable cleverness and with very well developed logic —a theology fundamentally a-historical, ideologically concealed innumerable contradictions from an

overbearing *machismo* —domination of women¹⁴ —to the class struggle, to the opposition between classes (the citizen was the *simpliciter politicum iustum*, that is, only the feudal lord)¹⁵ or the clash of kingdoms —since no theologian questioned the right of the emperor over the other kings, or, in other situations, of the Pope over the emperor and other kings. An ideological analysis of this theology, so valuable and important on the one hand, done socio-psychoanalytically or economico-politically, *avoiding extreme ingenuities*, will produce great results in the future. It will show us in a better way the genius of those theologians and the unavoidable limitations of their conditioning. They were men and not gods.

The same can be said of later Scholasticism —the classical age during the time of the Council of Trent (1545 - 1563), that is, from 1530 to 1630, under the influence of Vitoria, Bañez, Soto, Suárez, Molina, and Juan de Santo Tomás —publicized by Silvestre de la Ferrara y Cayetano —first in Salamanca and then through the whole Hispanic Empire, resplendent in its Aristotelian-Thomistic commentaries, and already moving in the *via moderna*, which subsequently provided the basis of the Cartesian ontology as well as that of Wolff— followed by the Franciscan Schools in England from which proceeded philosophical empiricism. We see then that Patristic theology flourished in the Byzantine Empire and the Papacy together with its dependent kingdoms in Africa, Gaul, and Spain. And if early Scholasticism needed the power of the Franks, later Scholasticism was dependent on Charles V, Emperor of Spain, the Low Countries, and Germany. Its ideological moment is evident. Yet one sees little or nothing of this theology in the newly discovered and exploited colonies. There is no reference to the serious problem of poverty in Spain —counterpart of conquered America. Trent was concerned only with the Germanic problem and ignored the enormous possibilities that Africa, Asia, and America portended for Europe. Modern Christianity, Catholic Christianity, turned in upon itself in Europe and developed a unique blindness to the exteriority of other cultures, countries, and peoples. It is for this reason that the *Third Scholastic*, which flourished after the First Vatican Council (1869 - 1870) in Latino-Catholic Europe —although one must recognize the many German theologians such as Kleugten (d. 1893) —was wedded to the Encyclical on the necessity of beginning an studies with Thomas Aquinas. Catholicism, which reluctantly abandoned imperial and later monarchical and feudal theses, slowly accepted and subsequently justified passionately liberal democracy and, surreptitiously, bourgeois capitalism —which is always being *reformed*. When one reads today the writings of Mercier, Garrigou Lagrange, or Maritain, leaving aside the fact that they have contributed greatly to the reformulation of Catholicism, it is evident that an important ideological moment is concealed at the socio-political level. Reyes Mate has demonstrated this fact in several ways.¹⁶

On the other hand, the tradition that we may refer to as German theology —which opened the way for Protestant theology was its French, Swiss, Dutch, and English components —which has developed since the sixteenth century, that is, since the Reformation, does not avoid concealing the contradictions of its epoch. Luther himself faced the withering criticism of Thomas Münzer who spoke out in defense of the impoverished peasants of the feudal world in crisis. This tradition with Augustinian origins and with Franciscan and even Thomastic influences (e.g., Melanchthon), subsequently felt the full impact of Wolffian rationalism, of Kant, of the *Aufklärung*, and of idealism (especially that of the Hegelian right), although it was not the only tradition affected (one need only remember the example of the fervently anti-Hegelian Schleiermacher). The Catholic world of Moehler (d. 1838), which was formed in Tübingen,

continued in this direction. Together with a mediating neo-Kantianism, phenomenology, and Heideggerian ontology, we have a Bultmann or a Rahner (completely different theological positions which, nevertheless, develop from Heidegger), together with the socio-political critique of the Frankfurt School to Metz, from the position of Ernst Bloch to Jürgen Moltmann. Earlier, what was called the “nouvelle theologie” of prewar France, with the discovery of the history of theology, such as the kerygmatic theologies, the demythologizing, existentialist, political, and utopian theologies, all of them —and even their prolongations in the United States with the “death of God” movement, etc. —stem from the center of Europe, particularly during and following World War II. Like the Second Vatican Council (1962 - 1965), and the highest levels of the World Council of Churches, all of this theology thrives in an optimum of a reconstructed Europe, the Europe of the “German miracle,” during the time when the North American Empire displaced the British Empire overseas (the “Empire” later had to come “hat in hand” to the door of the European Common Market in order to be accepted as one of its members). The method of this theology is now existentialist, ontological, and even dialectical. Hegelian influence has continually increased since the bicentennial commemoration of his birth (1770 - 1970).

At any rate, all this theology manifests significant ideological moments: one of them being the ingenious idea that they represent the “center” of the world (from a cultural, political, and economical point of view. Even though Europe depends on the United States, it enjoys over the latter a recognized humanistic-cultural, though not a scientific-technical, “superiority.”) At the same time, this theology has not yet taken seriously its class conditioning: the theologian is not only the product of an aristocratic class (the university), he also represents a dominating nation (which in various ways oppresses its colonies with its capitalistic and monopolistic industrialism). Furthermore, the “point of departure” of its theological reflection has never been questioned. If its point of departure were a praxis of liberating the oppressed (which is the origin of the non-ideological word and the criticism of all ideology), then its theology would have to explain its organic compromise with the economic and political system it represents. These issues are, however, not even recognized by this theology of the “center” (not only for social, but also for geopolitical reasons. Liberation theology is conversely a theology of the economically poor classes and of the politically dependent, neocolonial, and “peripheral” nations). The proposals of this theology remain within the confines of the “center,” and for this reason are “ideologized,” that is, they conceal the principal contradiction of our time, namely, the “center-periphery” system —and with it falsify the relations between the classes of the “center.” It becomes, therefore, a theology that conceals and thereby justifies the domination of the poor peoples of the world.

From this we can conclude that theology, when denoting the reflection of a non-theological faith of the oppressed, that is, when it is the methodical expression of those who do not control the system, possesses all its anti-ideological and critico-prophetic faculties. To the degree that theology expresses a nontheological faith of the dominating groups or nations, and living lost in part its prophetic dimension (at least to the degree that it represents a system of domination), theology ideologizes itself. It is for this reason that in the United States and Europe (the latter is the “center” while being relatively dependent on the former) even the radical or democratic socialist movements can only be reformist, but without ever dialoguing seriously with those of the “periphery” who actually questioned the system itself.¹⁷ It is easy to speak of freedom for one who in some way exercises power. An example can be seen in the imposition of an economic “liberalism” on its new colonies by England during the latter decades of the eighteenth century. England demanded “freedom” to sell its products to the

nonindustrialized countries, ignoring the fact that in London during the early years of that same century they publicly hanged those who purchased any French product. The “protectionism” of the emerging English industry was exercised over the “peripheral” countries. Freedom means not only the possibility of choosing among several options; it means possessing the power or at least the possibility to make a choice. Before having the freedom to choose (between this or that possibility) between the liberalism or socialism of the “center,” it is necessary to establish a justice that will permit having something to choose—justice will allow the oppressed to eat, to clothe themselves, to read, to make decisions). The fundamental human liberty is *the right to live*, rather than the freedom to decide to live *in this* or *in that way*. Justice or socio-political liberation is that which makes possible the freedom to choose: “Tempore necessitatis omnia sunt comunia,” declared Huguccio. It is evident that there are times when it is necessary for everyone to cooperate in a disciplined way, even in spite of the aristocratic egoism of the old dominant classes (which are the only ones that “have” and that “choose” this or that), to produce or manufacture goods that will permit everyone to live as humans.

During the construction of the *new order*, “freedom” as the supreme value, which is itself an example of a reactionary ideology since it destroys the unity of discipline, creates divisions and in the name of pluralism makes impossible any real change. There will come times of diversity and freedom of choice, but the child cannot be killed until he is born.

III. THE PERIODIFICATION OF THE HISTORY OF THEOLOGY IN LATIN AMERICA

In previous writings we have proposed a periodification of the history of the Church in Latin America. It would be a history of a nontheological faith becoming praxis. We now propose as a hypothesis a given periodification which can open the way in an area in which—as far as I know—there is no writing. *The History of Catholic Theology* by Grabmann¹⁸ makes some suggestions regarding theology in Hispanoamerica. But as usual—and we Latin Americans are accustomed to this—we are really *left out of history*. How can we describe the development of our theology? What are the most important periods? What is the meaning of each one of them?

1. The First Epoch: Prophetic Theology Confronting the Conquest and Evangelization (since 1511)

The discovery of America by the Spaniards and Portuguese initiated a geopolitical revolution without precedent in world history. The eastern Mediterranean, which was the “center” of history from the time the Cretans lost their primacy, was replaced by the North Atlantic (beginning in the sixteenth century until today). On the other hand, ten times more silver and five times more gold than there was previously in existence were taken back to the Mediterranean and Europe in the sixteenth century alone—all of it from the mines exploited with the blood of the Indians. This is the origin of the colonial *plus valia* (surplus in value), the accumulated capital that was essential for the developing industrial revolution. A world was collapsing; Europe, surrounded by the Turks and Arabs, became open to the whole world. It was a time of utopias, of novelties, and of discoveries. In Spain, Cisneros began the first reformation and edited the first critical commentaries on the Old and New Testaments—all toward the end of the fifteenth century, more than a generation before Erasmus.

In 1492 the Catholic kings sponsored the last medieval crusade against the remaining Arab kingdom in Europe, in the process recapturing Granada.

Papal bulls since 1493, as we have already noted, justified religiously the conquest of America. But the discovery of America had no apparent influence on the Council of Trent. The proposal by Cardinal Jiménez de Cisneros to occupy the Indies without guns was ignored, and the Spanish conquest was therefore violent, even as were the subsequent conquests by the Dutch, English, French, and Germans (the latter in twentieth-century Africa). The Spanish conquest, however, produced a small handful of prophets, outstanding Christian missionaries who valiantly—and often at great risk to themselves—defended the Indians.¹⁹ We will mention just one of them.

Other than a Franciscan layman, it was Antonio de Montesinos, OP (d. 1545) who in 1511, by order of his superior, Pedro de Córdoba, OP (1460 - 1525), uttered the first critico-prophetic cry in America. On that 30th of November, the cleric Bartolomé de Las Casas (1474 - 1566) listened intently to Montesinos' sermon defending the Indians against the Spanish "encomenderos." It was not until 1514, however, that Las Casas took up the cause of justice. Prior to that time

clergyman Bartolomé was extremely busy and very diligent in making money like everyone else. He sent Indians from his parcel of land to extract gold from the mines and to sow his fields, taking advantage of them as much as he could. But on the day of the Feast of Pentecost he began to consider Ecclesiasticus 34: 18 - 20: "The sacrifice of an offering unjustly acquired is a mockery; the gifts of impious men are unacceptable. The Most High takes no pleasure in offerings from the godless, multiplying sacrifices will not gain his pardon for sin. Offering sacrifice from the property of the poor is as bad as slaughtering a son before his father's very eyes." Thus began, I would say, Las Casas' misery.²⁰

This prophetic conversion of a thinker who later would be as prolific in writings as he was profound and practical in his conclusions, could be considered the birth of the Latin American *theology of liberation*. Bartolomé himself wrote in his Testament (1564)—fifty years later—that "God in His mercy chose me as his minister not because of any merit of mine, to try to return to the people whom we call Indians, the true owners and possessors, those kingdoms and lands, because of the grievances, wrongdoings and damage never before equaled, seen, or heard which they suffered from us Spaniards against all reason and justice, and to return them to their *pristine liberty* from whence they have been unjustly despoiled, and *to liberate them* from the violent death that they are still suffering."²¹

Bartolomé de Las Casas, like José de Acosta, SJ (1539 - 1600) in Peru, Bernardino de Sahagún, OFM (d. 1510) in Mexico, as well as others, were—or at least were among—the theologians of the first generation after the conquest who faced the reality of their time with less ideological bias than their companions of conquest and evangelization. Consider the following text and the clarity with which Las Casas exposed the principal contradiction of his era and the ideological blindness of his contemporaries:

God will unleash against Spain his anger and wrath because *all of us* have communicated and participated more than a little in the bloody and stolen riches [of the Americas] so usurped and wrongly acquired, and with so much waste and death of those people, that even the greatest penitence cannot undo, a penitence which I fear will never come because of *the blindness* [here is the fruit of ideology!] that God because of our greater and lesser sins and especially in those who presume to be and who are regarded as wise and who rule the world, because of their sins, even this *obscurity of understanding* [here is another indication of ideological concealing!] so recently, that since sixty years ago they began scandalously to steal, kill, and exterminate these peoples: and *until now no one has noticed* these scandals and

injustices of our holy faith, these robberies, ravages, deaths, enslavements, usurpations of states and other's properties, and finally the widespread devastations and depopulations *resulting from the enormous sin and injustice.*²²

For our “theologian of liberation” the socio-political sin was the moment of conquest. The praxis was the “sin and enormous injustice,” but “until now no one has noticed it” (seen it) because of the “blindness” and the “dullness of understanding.” That is to say, the real *meaning* of the praxis is not recognized: and we are dealing therefore with an ideology that conceals from everyone the real nature of things, from adults and children as well as from the wise and powerful.

Bartolomé opposed not only Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda (the theologian who justified as natural the slavery of the Indian), but also Las Casas went far beyond the progressive Vitoria. Bartolomé recognized that war against the Indians could be justified if they were a barbarian, absolutely uncivilized people given to irrational and vicious actions. But the fact is that the Indians were not guilty of any of these deficiencies. For “of the universal and infinite number of people of *every gender* created by God [the Indians] were the most simple, without malice and duplicity, very obedient and faithful in every way to their natural lords and to the Christians whom they served. [They were the] most humble, patient, peaceful and quiet—devoid of quarrelsomeness and boistrousness—of all the people in the world.”²³ Bartolomé had an incalculable appreciation for the Indians, the poor, and the oppressed. For him the war of conquest was absolutely unjustified. There was *no reason* to attempt to use force against the Indians, and all that had been stolen from them through the conquest, and apportionments of the land and the *encomiendas* should be restored to them, or those who participated in “it would not be saved.”²⁴ Moreover, Bartolomé declared that “all persons from every place in the Indies where we have entered *have an acquired right* of making a *just war* and exterminating us from the face of the earth, and this right will be theirs until the day of judgement.”²⁵ Bartolomé then defended the war of liberation by the Indians against the Europeans not only in his time, but also until the present. Thus he endorsed theologically the rebellion of valiant Tupac Amaru (1746 - 1782) in Peru or of Fidel Castro in 1959 in Cuba—in the same Cuba of Bartolomé’s prophetic conversion.

Las Casas’ theological treatises, e.g., *De único modo (The Only Way)*; his *Historia de las Indias (History of the Indies)*, an apocalyptic-prophetic, not historic, treatise; the *Apologética historia sumaria (Summary of Apologetic History)*, a treatise on the pre-Christian religiosity; a large quantity of pamphlets, articles, memorials, defenses, his *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias (A Brief Report on the Destruction of the Indies)*; the *Dieciséis remedios para la reformación de las Indias (Sixteen Remedies for the Reformation of the Indies)*; the *Argumentum Apologiae (An Apologetic Argument)*; *Los tesoros del Perú (The Treasure of Peru)*; etc. —all of these are a part of the praxis of a great Christian. Conqueror, priest, patron, litigator before kings and courts and councils, organizer of agriculture experiments, missions, and communities, a novice, student, writer, polemicist, defender, and attorney before tribunals: in the sixteenth century he sailed the Atlantic more than ten times. From his praxis of defending and attempting to liberate the Indian he developed and published his militant theology, a *totally political theology*, as Juan Friede demonstrates.²⁶ But it is also an *historical*,²⁷ *concrete*²⁸ theology with *anthropological meaning*,²⁹ and is *intentionally practical*.³⁰

This was *nonacademic* or preuniversity theology—not because it was against learning, but as a matter of fact it was developed before there were such places of study in Latin America, and also because it was born in the heat of the battle and not as the product of the more or less artificial exigences of life in a professor’s cloister.

This *critico-prophetic theology* was missionary, formed men of action, clarified the rules, and uncovered structural and personal sins. All of this anticipated by four hundred years the present experience of creative theology in Latin America. Of necessity, the first theological effort on our continent should be well studied in order to discover the first model developed on this side of the Atlantic from the exercise of authentic reflection on Christian praxis in a colonial, “peripheral” situation. Las Casas foresaw to some extent the beginnings of European imperialistic domination. He passed judgment on the beginning of the oppressive worldwide expansion of the “center,” condemned in its totality the system that was being organized, regarding as “unjust and tyrannical *all* that was being done against these Indians in the West Indies.”³¹

This was the theology elaborated and supported by the action of hundreds of missionaries during the first period of our Latin American Church, before the organization of a Christendom of the Indies.

2. *Second Epoch: The Theology of Colonial Christianity (1533-1808)*

On June 3, 1533, university courses in theology were begun by Professor Francisco Cervantes de Salazar, Professor of Rhetoric and Elocution in Mexico City. This academic beginning in theology, in an institution which granted degrees like those of the universities of Alcalá and Salamanca, was the formal initiation of a tradition which lasted two and a half centuries. In 1538 the Dominicans opened their cloister in Santo Domingo and began to offer the first classes in theology for their students. Then on July 1, 1548, the Dominicans organized the same classes in Lima. Somewhat earlier, in Tiripetío (Mechoacán), Mexico, the renowned Augustinian Alonso de la Veracruz began teaching theology. Then on September 21, 1551, Phillip II issued a royal decree supported by a papal bull, and the universities of Lima and Mexico were founded. On January 25, 1553, the Rector and Dean *del Cabildo*, Juan Negrete, led a procession through the streets of El Reloj and of La Moneda in Mexico City, beginning in this way university life in America. Among the first professors were Pedro de la Peña, OP in *Prima*, Alonso de la Veracruz, OSA in scripture, Pedro Morenos in Canon Law, Juan de García in Arts, Bartolomé Frias in Law, and Blas de Bustamante in Grammar and Rhetoric.³² The course of study was for four years. On September 19, 1580, there began an obligatory class in the Nahua language in Mexico City and in Quechua and Aymara languages in Lima. By 1630 there were 500 pupils enrolled in Mexico, the majority studying theology, while there were only ten students in civil law and fourteen in medicine. By 1755, 1,162 students had been granted doctoral degrees by the university in Mexico.

By the royal decree of Phillip IV on May 26, 1622, and the papal bull of Gregory XV on July 9 of the following year, the secondary schools were founded —each with the authority to grant degrees —as far away as Manila in the Philippines, Cuba, and also in Mérida, Puebla, and San Luís de Potosí in Mexico, in Guatemala, Panama, Caracas, Santa Fé de Bogotá and Popayán in New Granada (Colombia), in Cuzco, Huamanga, and Quito, in Charcas (which in 1798 was elevated to the level of a university, as were Lima and Mexico), in Córdoba, Argentina, and Santiago, Chile. To these should be added many tridentine seminaries where theology was taught, schools such as the famous Palafoxiano School in Puebla, which was founded in 1641, together with those in Guadalajara and Oaxaca. Also, beginning in 1578 the Jesuit schools were authorized to grant degrees.

The young student in seventeenth-century Lima began his year of study on or about October 19 and concluded it approximately on July 31. His first course was

from 8:15 until 9:15 a.m., followed by fifteen minutes of recitation. The second course was from 9:30 to 10:30 a.m., followed by recitation. From 2:00 until 2:30 p.m., he studied Quechua, followed by an hour of class on moral theology or Scripture. On Saturdays there were “sabatinas” (exercises) or the defense of theses. There were monthly debating sessions to prepare the students for the annual debates. The *Segunda Escolástica* (Second Scholastic) prevailed without question: Aristotle's *Logic*, in theology the *Summa* of Aquinas together with the various Dominican, Jesuit, and Franciscan interpretations.

Mexico shined in this “golden century” (the sixteenth); Lima in the seventeenth-century baroque culture, and Chuquisaca or Charcas in the eighteenth century of Jesuit humanism (at least until 1767 when they were expelled from Latin America). The following represent some sixteenth-century examples. One should not forget that Antonio Rubio (1548-1615) was the author of *Lógica Mexicana* (Mexican Logic) (a German edition was published in Cologne in 1605, and there were other translations as well), which was used as a textbook in Alcalá. Rubio, professor in Mexico and in Córdoba del Tucumán,³³ provided a logical formation from which a student moved on to theology with the possibility of hearing, for example, Alonso de la Veracruz (1504-1584), a prolific author in his own right. Among his writings were a Commentary on the Book of Sentences, another on the Epistles of Paul, a *Relectio de libris canonicis*, and even a *Relectio de dominio in infideles et iusto bello*.³⁴ Veracruz, like many others, was one of the first missionaries. He ministered in the indigenous town of Tripetí and eventually became the Prior of Tacámbaro in 1545. He later went to the Convent of “The Great Atotonilco” among the Otomi Indians and was elected Mexican Provincial in 1548, at a time when he was carrying tremendous academic responsibility.

If we consider the content of this theology in relation to the events of the time, we can quickly discover its ideological conditioning. This last theologian denied that the king had the right to dominate the Indians, but Veracruz believed that the Pope had *indirect power* over the Indians in order to evangelize them, and this right could be granted to kings. Therefore it was perfectly just, reasoned Veracruz, to deprive the Aztec king Montezuma of his power in order to civilize and Christianize his barbarian people. Against Bishop Montufar, Veracruz insisted that the Indians should not be forced to pay high taxes, but he did allow for the system of *encomienda*. One can see, therefore, that all the theology of Christendom in the West Indies was at best *reformist*, that is, it obscured the contradictions and injustices that the “Las Casian” group had condemned.

There was also the colleague of Veracruz, Pedro de la Peña, OP (d. 1583), admired as professor of the *Prima*, but who later abandoned his professorship to become a missionary in Verapaz (1563-1565), and even later the renowned Bishop of Quito (1565 - 1583) and author of commentaries on the *Summa*. We must also mention Bartolomé de Ledesma, OP (d. 1604), author of the well-known treatise *De iure et iustitia* and of the *Sumario de los siete sacramentos*, both works commissioned by the Bishop of Mexico, Pedro de Ortigosa, SJ (1537-1626), who wrote *De natura theologiae, De essentia Dei*, as well as commentaries on the *Segunda Secundae*; Andrés de Valencia, SJ (1582 - 1645), who edited the *Tractatus de Incarnatione*; the prolific author Juan de Ledesma (1576 - 1636) who wrote some sixteen volumes, only one of which is extant, *De Deo uno*; and Pedro de Pavia, OP (d.1589), author of *De sacrosanto sacramento eucharistiae*. The list would be even longer if we included from this same century the names and works of Estéban de Salazar, OSA, Andrés de Tordehumos, OSA, Juan

de Gaona, OFM, Bernandor de Bazan, OP, Francisco de Osuna, OFM, Pedro de la Concepción, Carmelite, and Juan López Agurto de la Mata, as well as many others.

If we take now as an example the university of Chuquisaca in the eighteenth century, we could read what a Jesuit provincial recommended to his religious: “Study, therefore, metaphysics, but immerse yourselves immediately into general physics which will teach all of you the harmonious composition of the universe and will provide you the basis to refute effectively Rousseau’s *Emilio*, Voltaire’s philosophical *Dictionary*, Holbach’s *System of Nature*, Marechal’s *Examination of Religion*; and Montesquieu’s *Persian Letters*, as well as works of other monsters of impiety, aborted by unbelievers during this century.”³⁵ Thomas Falkner, once a student of Newton, taught classes in Córdoba del Tucumán in 1763 and began his mathematics classes teaching Leibniz, Wolff, Newton, Locke, Cassandi, and Descartes. From mathematics his students passed to theology. In Chile, for example, the Jesuits had libraries with up to twenty thousand volumes, “the majority of scientific and literary works circulating in Europe until the middle of the eighteenth century.”³⁶ Domingo Muriel (1734 - 1795) was well versed in the Scriptures, the decisions of Church councils, ecclesiastical history, as well as civil, ecclesiastical, and municipal law of Spain and the Indies. He was likewise proficient in Spanish, French, Italian, Greek, Latin, and Hebrew.³⁷

This theology, nonetheless, imitated that of the Second Scholastic, and for that reason was doubly ideological because it was already widespread in Europe and simply repeated itself in America, thereby concealing not only the injustices of the old continent but also those of the new. Nevertheless, a documented history of our theology would show many critical and de-ideologized aspects, such as the theoretical treatment of the types of Guaraní property written by Father Muriel while he was teaching in the University of Córdoba del Tucumán. Muriel’s was an outstanding work distinct from anything known thus far, one that promoted the organization of the famous Jesuit *reducciones* (reductions) of Paraguay,³⁸ a socialist type of experiment wherein property was held in common by the producers of work—an experiment that had repercussions in eighteenth-century France as a kind of protohistory that would later be called “utopian socialism” because of the influence that it had on people such as Meslier, Mably, or Morelli. Common property was not denied by Muriel or any colonial theologian, but his study contained an anticipated critique of bourgeoisie property in the name of an agricultural or archaic society.

Portugal, through its famous University of Coimbra, had enormous influence on Brazil; but in contrast to Spain, the Portuguese had no interest in founding either universities or many secondary schools. Theological life in Brazil was nevertheless vigorous, although equally imitative. In the Lusitanian colony, the Jesuit presence was much greater than in Hispanic America; and even before the time of Antonio de Vieira (1608-1698), Jesuits were a part of the conscience of the Church in colonial Brazil.³⁹ On the other hand, because Brazil had no war for national emancipation, and Pedro I, King of Portugal, broke away from the mother country and inaugurated the Brazilian Empire and ruled until 1831, the crisis that devastated and isolated Spanish America was not so evident in Brazil. Furthermore, the new waves of foreign influence that so affected most of the other Latin American nations were not felt in Brazil.

3. The Third Epoch: Practical-political Theology of the Creole Oligarchies during the Neocolonial Emancipation (since 1808)

In approximately 1760 there began in Hispanic America the dissemination of information about and the study of the new interpretations of traditional. theology and of

the growing influences of the Enlightenment, especially of the French school. The occupation of Spain by Napoleon (1808) threw the colonies—guided by their creole oligarchies—against the Hispanic bureaucracy with its viceroys, judges, and the great majority of bishops, into the struggle for liberation from the metropolis. As a part of the liberation praxis, the oligarchical class—composed of priests and other clergymen, professors, religious, and university laypersons—began to formulate a theological “justification” for the revolution against Spain. Their theology was born, therefore, amidst the ruins of the theology of Christendom, a reflection formulated outside the universities; in fact, it became nonacademic, as during the early days of the Conquest. It was a theology articulated in the pulpits,⁴⁰ in the call to arms,⁴¹ in the constituting assemblies—as in Tucumán where sixteen priests formed the absolute majority of the twenty-four representatives elected by the provinces in 1816—in the texts of the new constitutions—such as the one of Quito written by the director of the theological seminary there, a constitution which, when it was proclaimed in 1809, was accompanied by the singing of the *Salve Regina*—in the multiple proclamations, and in hundreds of articles written in the revolutionary newspapers. The noise of war together with the socio-political, administrative, and economic changes produced a chaotic disorganization that included the closing of universities, secondary school, and seminaries; professors enlisting in the armies; and libraries being burned or otherwise left to ruin. No new books were imported from Europe; no more missionaries or teachers arrived. Seminarians and students abandoned their studies. The system of Royal Patronage disappeared, and theology was no longer supported by the state. The Holy Office of the Inquisition ceased attempting to stop the flow of every new kind of ideological influence. It is no wonder, then, that in this pandemonium and anarchy the Second Scholastic receded, and there appeared an apocalyptical enlightenment and eclectic currents of thought.

If the theology of Christendom was imitative, the theology of this era recovered some of the initial creativity of the theology in America. The learned principles (in Thomism and Saurecianism) were utilized to justify the liberation praxis of the creole oligarchy. This stage should be studied carefully in the writing of a history of Latin American theology. It represented a new nonacademic, practical, and *political* moment of theological reflection beginning with a faith committed to a process of liberation, and for this reason it was de-ideologized. The dominating class in the colonies (the Hispanic bureaucracies) were subjected to analysis and criticism by a practical theology developed by the creole oligarchies (not yet by the oppressed classes as has happened in the twentieth century). It is not surprising, then, that Manuel Belgrano (1770 - 1820), a graduate in law from Salamanca and native of the Río de la Plata region, himself a General in the army of liberation, published in London in 1812 a commentary of four volumes by Father Lagunze, a Chilean Jesuit, on the Revelation of John: *El Reino del Mesías en gloria y majestad (The Kingdom of the Messiah in Glory and Majesty)*, a work that emphasized in its messianism the meaning of the future in a politico-eschatological movement. Nor is it strange that in the same year Las Casas' *La destrucción de las Indias* was republished in Bogotá to support the same liberating process.⁴²

The superficiality of this theology, when compared with “serious” academic works, does not diminish its importance, even though it was aborted in part primarily because it lacked the time and conditions for its consolidation. Moreover, it quickly deteriorated into a reflection that justified the new order of things and, therefore, lost its critical revolutionary direction. But this was not the reason it failed to fulfill its historical function, because in fact it mobilized the people against Spain—since the creole

oligarchy without the theological support of the Church could never have completed the liberating process.

4. *The Fourth Epoch: The Neocolonial Conservative Theology on the Defense (1831-1930)*

The dates of this period come from Rome's acceptance of the neocolonial liberation, as evidenced by Pope Gregory XVI's encyclical *Sollicitudo Ecclesiarum* (1831) and the political crisis of the neocolonial oligarchy or the somewhat later economic crisis of dependent liberalism of the "center" in 1929. During this long century theology moved from being a mere reflection of the theology of a colonial Christendom and of the euphoria of the two decades following 1809, to *confine itself* to a conservative, provincial, traditional position, always behind in regard to what was happening, at least until the middle of the nineteenth century. Positivism—which became known in Brazil through the book by M. Lemos entitled *Compte, Philosophie positive* (1874), in Mexico through the writings of Gabino Barreda, and in Argentina due to P. Scalabrini—was criticized by conservative theologians. But these studies of positivism are not without merit—works such as those by Mamerto Esquiú (1826 - 1883) in Argentina, and slightly later those by Jacinto Ríos (1842- 1892). The situation changed somewhat with the "romanization" that began slowly with the foundation in 1859 of *the Colegio Pio Latinoamericano* (Latin American Pius College) in Rome, an event which coincided with the emergence of the elites of anticlerical neocolonial liberalism. They appeared in Colombia in 1849, in Mexico with Juárez in 1857, and in Brazil with the Republic in 1889. A larger group of thinkers, theologians, and bishops⁴³ began to espouse this liberal position toward the end of the century. The group later became known in political circles as "Christian Democracy." It is interesting to observe how Mariano Soler (1846-1908), the first Archbishop of Montevideo and one of the first students of the Latin American Pius College in Rome and who presided the opening session of the Latin American Plenary Council (1899), criticized Darwinism, Protestantism, rationalism, irreligious propaganda, etc., in his book *El catolicismo, la civilización y el progreso* (1878)⁴⁴ (*Catholicism, Civilization, and Progress*). He employed progressive, liberal terminology and categories (with a bibliography of the era in French, English, and Italian) but couched in a fundamentally conservative and traditional agrarian posture. There was manifested a distrust (if the bourgeois and of the nascent technological Anglo-North American culture that was beginning to emerge as a monopolistic empire. But the basis for the suspicion stemmed from the Latin Continental European and Latin American conservative agricultural tradition. Nevertheless, during the early part of the nineteenth century, beginning first with a small number of "liberal Catholics," there began a move away from this European-Latin American conservatism to a more progressive theological position adopted by members of the middle class who were allied with the upper echelons of the oligarchy.

Rome's influence grew, especially in Italy, and the theologians of Vatican Council I began to exert direct influence on Latin America, primarily because of the increased number of theology students who went to Rome. Since the end of the nineteenth century only Chile has sent a few seminarians to countries other than Italy. The Third Scholastic became present in all centers of theological teaching. The Catholic University of Chile was founded in 1869 and became the most important theological center of Latin America until well into the twentieth century.

Since 1850 the Protestant presence in Latin America has grown, whereas before it was sporadic and insignificant. Presbyterians began their work in Colombia in 1856,

in Brazil in 1859, and in Mexico in 1872. Methodists began in Brazil and Uruguay in 1835. Their work in Uruguay produced little results and therefore ceased. It was begun anew in 1876. Baptists arrived in Argentina in 1881. Protestants did not begin to unite their forces until the Congress of Panama in 1916, and they failed to produce anything significant theologically until recently with the work of theologians such as Rubem Alves and José Míguez Bonino.

5. *The Fifth Epoch: The Theology of the "New Christendom" (1930-1962)*

During this period there occurred the transition away from *traditional theology* reflecting the thinking of the proprietary classes, the *integrists*, (whose enemies were bourgeoisie liberalism, communism, Protestantism, and the "modern times" in general) who were committed to the *theology of development* that was reformist in nature. They accepted a bourgeoisie *ethos*, but unfortunately one of a dependent capitalism, for in the majority of our nations the economy does not reach the level of capitalism. Most Latin American countries are nothing more than neocolonies exporting the raw materials, but without a truly national bourgeoisie.

The crisis of 1929, resulting from the collapse of North American capitalism, profoundly affected the "periphery," especially Latin America. In some of the countries, such as Argentina, Uruguay, and Chile, together with the southern section of Brazil between Río de Janeiro and São Paulo, and in Mexico, the crisis incited a reaction of increased industrialization in order to limit imports, a movement that grew significantly during World War II. At the same time, however, there appeared a number of popular social movements (the first of which was the Mexican Revolution of 1910, which subsequently was cleverly orchestrated by the bourgeoisie of that country) that made it impossible for the neocolonial bourgeoisie to continue their domination. There followed the rise of the military classes in practically every country, first functioning in the name of the land owners and later on behalf of an ambiguous unity between the national bourgeoisie and the working classes. This brought about the end of the militant, lay (following the French inspiration of Littré), Positivist (since the time of Compté), anticlerical (although morally Christian) liberalism. On the other hand, there was an openness to and even a seeking of support from the traditional, conservative Catholic Church. This allowed for the celebration of gigantic Eucharistic Congresses, but principally it set the stage for the beginning of the movement known as *Catholic Action* and other similar institutions that were products of the theological theorizing of the "New Christendom"

In 1928 two priests —Caggiano, who would later become the Cardinal of Buenos Aires, and Miranda, who would be named the Cardinal of Mexico —went to Rome to study the organization of *Catholic Action*. Then, beginning in 1929, the movement slowly became institutionalized in all of Latin America. The theology of Catholic Action clearly distinguished between the "temporal" and the "spiritual." Laymen were said to be responsible for the temporal, the worldly, the material, and the political, while the priests were the "spiritual overseers," the vicars of the Kingdom of Christ. The function of Christians, of the militant, was to fulfill their "apostleship." This "sending" or mission was defined as "participation in the hierarchical apostleship of the Church," understanding that the hierarchy meant the priests and the bishops. In this way the ministries and the sacrament of orders virtually suppressed the significance of the charisms and the sacrament of baptism. Laymen could participate in political parties of "Christian inspiration," and thus there arose in Chile in 1936 the group

known as the “Falange” (the Phalanx), which separated from the youth movement of the Conservative Party. Following World War II, and because of the Italian association, the “Falange” was called “Christian Democracy,” prospering mainly between 1950 and 1970. Laymen could also participate in labor unions of “Christian inspiration,” and thus was organized CLASC, the Latin American Confederation of Christian Unions, which for the most part were nothing more than movements for reform. Catholic laypersons were also encouraged to teach in “Christian schools.” The task was seen, therefore, to be that of reconverting Latin America into a coalition of Catholic nations because the Kingdom of Christ required the recognition of the Catholic religion as the predominant and official faith of all the nations. The Church dreamed, therefore, of recovering through the work of militant laypersons the measure of power it had lost during the nineteenth century with the crisis of Christendom.

The *theology of the “New Christendom”* was not academic but militant, not directly political but rather dualistic in the sense of being temporal-spiritual. The State and the Church should, it was thought, be perfect societies each acting in its own sphere in a nonconflictual way. It was not until 1950 that the *theology of development* emerged, which represented the stage in which Christians—or at least some of them—began to participate in the bourgeoisie project of expansion and development. Nevertheless, it is quite evident that no one was aware of the class problem or of the dependence of the Latin American continent on the economic, political, and military power of the United States. The Third Scholastic received the help of theologians such as Jacques Maritain and Emmanuel Mounier, and with them a particular interpretation of reality was rejuvenated.

Theologians began to organize other than in Italy, and the most progressive of them began studying in France, the country of the Pastoral, of catechetical, liturgical, and spiritual experiences, and of the “working priests.” The “social doctrine” of the Church permitted many of these priests to work with laboring classes and with marginal groups.

During this period theological faculties or centers were initiated in many universities such as the Javeriana in Bogotá (founded in 1937), the Catholic University in Lima (1942), the Bolivarian in Medellín (1945), the Catholic Universities of São Paulo and Río de Janeiro (1947), of Porto Alegre (1950), of Campinas and Quito (1956), of Buenos Aires (1961), and many others later. Theology “a la Europe” thereby had an academic environment in which it could continue to grow while waiting for a creative moment.

Ecclesial praxis was also growing. Catholic Action, founded in Argentina and Chile in 1931, in Uruguay in 1934, in Costa Rica and Peru in 1935, in Bolivia in 1938, and eventually in all of Latin America, increased the *intensity* of the “social struggle.” Groups such as *Human Economy*, inspired by Lebreton, or the *Centro Belarmino* in Santiago, Chile, continued to make people aware of the prevailing social conditions. The same can be said of the Centers of Social and Religious Investigations which were begun in Buenos Aires, Bogotá, and Mexico City, centers that maintained a certain sociographic perspective (I am not saying sociological, much less economic-political) of the Latin American reality.

No less important was the foundation of CELAM (the Latin American Conference of Bishops) in Río in 1955, through the inspiration of Monseñor Larrain, a move that permitted the coordination of all of the apostolic movements and that played a significant role in the formation of the militant theologians of the following era. The same can be said of the organization of CLAR (the Latin American Confederation of

Religious) in 1958, as well as other movements of various types in the universities, theological seminaries, Catholic Action, and Catholic labor unions.

Furthermore, the bases of the biblical movement were established. Protestants with the *Bible Societies* and Catholics through their seminars, magazines, and new editions of the Bible began to pave the way for a spiritual renewal.

Nevertheless, one can say that even after World War II theological thought in Latin America was essentially a reproduction and application of European theology and was virtually devoid of any historical or contemporary knowledge of the Latin American reality.

6. *The Sixth Epoch: The Latin American Theology of Liberation (since 1962)*

This last period has three clearly discernible stages: the first from the beginning of the Second Vatican Council to Medellín (1962 - 1968), a time of preparation and of development theology; the second (from 1968 to 1972), a time for the formulation of the *theology of liberation*, characterized by an attitude of euphoria despite the fact that there were clear indications that the road to freedom was fraught with difficulties; the third (which was initiated in Sucre in 1972 among Catholics with the restructuring of CELAM and among Protestants with their UNELAM), a time of maturing, of persecution, of becoming aware of the *long* process of liberation, of the awareness that we are now exiles in captivity. From the deepening of the Exodus we can restudy and rethink Second Isaiah and other books composed by and about the prisoners in Babylon. This era is a time of passing from the *theology of development* to the *theology of liberation*.

Nevertheless, we should not deceive ourselves. As Luís Alberto Gómez de Sousa declared during the First Latin American Theological Encounter (Mexico City, August 1975), within the process of a dependent capitalism there presently coexists as unequals a reflection of the classes tied to agriculture, the theology of development (a reflection of the bourgeoisie classes and of the small bourgeoisie), and the theology of liberation (which expresses the faith of emergent classes: the workers and peasants, marginalized and somewhat radicalized sectors of our society). It is for this reason that the theological confrontation in Latin America is not between traditional theology and the theology of liberation, but between a “progressive theology of development (inspired by the best of contemporary European thinking) and the theology of liberation.” The criticism that the theology of liberation frequently voices against the best of European theology (either political theology or the theology of hope) is in reality addressed to those among us who use these European theologies to discredit a *valid and critical* theology in Latin America (which cannot be adapted by reformist European theology, which serves the world of the “center,” but which is very ambiguous and ideological for the “periphery”). The theology of liberation demands that European theologians consider the repercussions of their proposals for the “periphery,” because there are in Latin America reformists who can be reactionary, antirevolutionary, or at least allied with the openly traditionalist theologies (such as *Opus Dei*).

The *theology of liberation* was not the result of spontaneous generation. It has a recent history, a history that goes back to Bartolomé de Las Casas in the sixteenth century. Among the youth movements (young people are still free to challenge the system!) were the *specialized* Catholic Action groups (JUC, JEC, JOC) of the last period of the “New Christendom.” They began to discover the responsibility of being a lay Christian and the demands of political commitment. Within the middle classes

composed of the smaller and somewhat larger bourgeoisie, the workers, and peasant leaders, many were radicalized—in Brazil for example in the 1950s—because they refused any alliance with the industrial bourgeoisie and the land-owning oligarchy. Many were students who were unwilling to accept the fact that they did not naturally belong to the oppressed classes. For this reason the students rejected their class, passed from reformism to revolution, frequently adopting not the anticommunism of the right but the communism of the extreme left (the Communist parties were for the most part reactionary), and at times fell into a naive romanticism because of their lack of political realism. Their attitude was basically zealot, and theirs was a kind of zealotry characterized by a utopianism and heroism that was neither practical nor operative—as can be seen in the case of Camilo Torres in Colombia (d. February 16, 1966), or the “Teoponte” guerrillas in Bolivia.⁴⁵ Confronting a general pessimism, Torres and the “Teopontes” voluntarily attempted to do everything simultaneously. It is not strange that the armed groups of the Peronist left in Argentina (the *Montoneros*) were founded by former leaders of the JUC, or that the MIR in Chile attracted the majority of the so-called Group of Eighty priests. Nevertheless, the *theology of liberation* is not the product of these single-issue groups, guerrillas, nor of *extreme* leftists. On the contrary, it is theological reflection based on a much more profound analysis of reality, a reflection that stems from the persecution and martyrdom of the Latin American christians, hundreds of whom have given their lives for their faith in concrete political situations, murdered by parapolitical forces, by the police, by the army, or by groups linked to the CIA or its henchmen (the soldiers of Pilate!).

A. Time of preparation (1962 -1968)

The theology of development was based on the mythical process of the “development” of the underdeveloped peoples by means of the technical help and the capital of the powers of the “center” (principally the United States and Europe). This development reached its maximum expression with Kennedy's “Alliance for Progress.” The *theology of development*⁴⁶ reflected the faith that partial social, political, and economic reforms would suffice. It had a “functionalist” spirituality: the “state’s grace” would help it to fulfill its duty and provide a “good example.” It was a spirituality that was updated with the latest thought from Europe. It attempted to be “incarnate” in the world (without having discovered the conflict existing in such a “world”—a world considered *a priori* to be good). What happened, however, was that the world was that of the bourgeoisie, and the inherent conflict was not seen because the Christian had been educated inside the ecclesial bourgeoisie culture.

The Second Vatican Council was held within the cultural process of central Europe and the peaceful coexistence between the United States, Europe, and Russia (which climaxed with the Helsinki Accords). Within this process the participation of Latin Americans can be considered theologically nonexistent. This is understandable, given the immaturity of theological reflection in Latin America since the beginning of the century.

The Bishop of Talca, Manuel Larraín, was elected President of CELAM in 1963—a position that he held until his accidental death in 1966. This movement culminated with the Second General Conference of the Latin American Episcopacy held in Medellín in August 1968. Medellín represented the climax of the period of preparation. Its vocabulary was, however, developmentalist. It spoke of “human promotion,” “development,” “liberation,” “international tensions and external neocolonialism,” the “growing distortion of international commerce,” “the flight of capital,” and of the

“international monopolies and imperialism of money.” Medellín was the result of a long process.

Since the end of World War II, groups of young seminarians studied in France and later in Austria and Germany. Some of them studied in the United States. At the beginning they simply “repeated” what they had learned. But little by little as a result of certain organisms such as FERES,⁴⁷ founded by Houtart, or DESAL⁴⁸ by Veke-mans in 1961 —although both were from Belgium, they would subsequently follow very different ways — the Latin American reality began to be described. In 1961, ILADES⁴⁹ was founded in Santiago, Chile. Religious sociology gave way to general sociology and then to the pastoral. ICLA⁵⁰ was founded in 1961 in the South and in the North in 1966. There followed the Latin American Institute of Pastoral Liturgy (1965), then OSLAM,⁵¹ which offered courses for seminary professors, and IPLA⁵² — which opened its doors in Quito in 1968 and trained more than 500 pastoralists — began its itinerant activities in January 1964 under the inspiration of Monseñor Proaño and of a group of activist theologians. This period of the theology of development culminated in a congress held in Mexico City, September 24-28, 1969, under the theme “Faith and Development.”

Their Latin American contacts, the need to present a theology to the participants from all the Latin American countries (from Mexico and the Caribbean to Brazil and the Andean Zone and the Southern Cone) prevented the theologians from “repeating” merely what they had learned in Europe. They had to adapt their discourses to the Latin American reality and deal with the agonizing problems of poverty and injustice that the continent was confronting.

The Latin American theologians of this period were, among others, Juan Luis Segundo⁵³ and José Comblín —who, although Belgian, lived and worked in Latin America for more than twenty years.⁵⁴ Comblín’s *L’échec de l’Action catholique* (1959) was written from his experience in Brazil. It was the first and only authorized critique of the theology of the “New Christendom.” At the same time, and in another sector — and as a passage to the later stage — a *theology of revolution*⁵⁵ was promulgated in ecumenical circles in which some Latin American theologians participated.⁵⁶

B. The Formulation of the Theology of Liberation (1968-1972)

A long process had been incubating in Latin America. In 1959 a group of guerrillas defeated the dictator Fulgencio Batista in Cuba. Fidel Castro and “Che” Guevara became world and Latin American symbols. Liberation movements began to be organized everywhere. In Chile, with Allende’s Popular Unity, the process manifested a new vitality (1970). The return of Perón to Argentina and the proposals for liberation by the popular movement there (1972-1973) engendered new hope. The organization of a movement for the liberation of the whole continent seemed possible. CELAM in turn promoted its Institutes. There followed seminars for bishops, priests, and laypersons. The “Christian Base Community” movement grew in number and influence. Priests for liberation multiplied —the most important were “Priests for the Third World” in Argentina, the “Group of Eighty” in Chile, and the ONIS in Peru. University students became politically committed to the socialist cause.

It was in the midst of these events, in approximately 1964, that an epistemological division occurred at the level of human sciences: the socio-economy of development was transformed into a theory of liberation, the result of a diagnosis that proposed the “theory of dependence.”⁵⁷ The theory may be summarized as follows: it is impossible to develop the undeveloped countries because their undevelopment is due to the

systematic exploitation by the countries of the “center.” The “periphery” —as Raul Presbisch, UNESCO economist, had declared in 1964 in the first meeting of UNC-TAD —must consistently sell its raw materials for less while the manufactured products of the “center” are sold for consistently higher prices. The disequilibrium is structural, and it is growing. There followed the sociology of liberation and with it a new economy.⁵⁸

It is not strange, then, that in 1968 Latin American theology began to reflect these socio-economic insights; thus there was born the “theology of liberation.” Gustavo Gutiérrez, adviser to the student movements in Peru, raised the question: “Will it be a theology of development or a theology of liberation?”⁵⁹ Richard Shaull asked the same question at an ecumenical level,⁶⁰ as did the Brazilian Protestant leader Rubem Alves,⁶¹ and the Argentine populist Lucio Gera in his opposition to the theology of secularization.⁶² From the praxis of liberation there followed critiques of the theologies of revolution, of the “death of God,” and of secularization. Hugo Assmann set forth the differences between the theology of liberation and European political theology and the theology of hope.⁶³ Since approximately 1970 - 1971, the theology of liberation has tended to coalesce as it received historical and philosophical support.⁶⁴ The meeting in Escorial, Spain, in July 1972,⁶⁵ was the first occasion when those participating in the movement could engage in face-to-face theological dialogue. Among those attending were José Míguez Bonino⁶⁶ who had for years been a leading Latin American participant in the World Council of Churches, Juan C. Scannone of Argentina,⁶⁷ the editors of *Vispera* (published in Montevideo), Héctor Borrat and Methol Ferre,⁶⁸ and representatives of the “Service of Documentation” of MIEC in Lima. Various theological journals such as *Stromata* (Bueno Aires), *Teología y Vida* (Santiago), *Christus* (Mexico), *Pastoral Popular*, *Revista brasileira de Teología* (Petrópolis), *Sic* (Caracas), *Diálogo* (Panama), etc., began publishing essays and editorials committed to liberation. This was the stage of euphoria initiated by Dom Hélder Camara, Archbishop of Olinda-Recife, who with sixteen other bishops of the “periphery” declared in a document published in *Témoignage Chrétien* (Paris, July 31, 1966) that the “people of the Third World constitute the proletariat of the present world.” This perspective was ratified by Monseñor Eduardo Pironio, then Secretary of CELAM, when in a meeting in New York he stated that “our mission, like Christ’s, consists of bringing the good news to the poor, of proclaiming liberation to the oppressed” (Maryknoll, 1971).⁶⁹

These events represented the theological reflection of those who were thinking of the *concrete* political commitment of Christians in their geopolitical situation of being the “periphery,” and of the social responsibility of the “organic intellectual” of the oppressed classes (in this case the theologian), and of the participants in whole or in part who were risking involvement in the liberation of those classes. They were not looking for a fight. The “fight” is the fruit of sin. It is begun by the oppressor (the sinner) and is endured by the oppressed.

C. The “Captivity” and the “Exile” as Stages of Liberation (1972-)

The theology of liberation, which was preponderantly inspired by the positive efforts for liberation (such as Moses coming out of Egypt), soon discovered the hard reality from the praxis of “captivity” and of “exile.” The present writer was obliged to flee his country and is writing now as one in actual, concrete exile. It is not difficult to understand why such a subject was proposed by Brazilian theologian Leonardo Boff.⁷⁰ The liberator Christ is the “suffering servant.”⁷¹

The shadow of repression and imperial domination covered virtually the whole

continent (with the exception of an island in the Caribbean). Liberation groups have meanwhile redefined themselves facing persecution from the outside (the police state) and from the inside (that of the Church itself), and the *theology of liberation* is beginning its maturation in the cross.

In view of the failure of the “Alliance for Progress,” the United States changed its policies with respect to Latin America. For this reason the CIA, for example, opposed Allende’s Popular Unity Party in Chile in 1963, the year that William Rogers was named U.S. Secretary of Latin American Affairs and delivered ten million dollars to a Belgian priest to help further the cause of Christian Democracy.⁷² In 1964 there was a military overthrow of the government in Brazil under the theoretical and practical guidance of Golbery, establishing in effect a model that would be followed by military officers in carrying out coups in Uruguay (1971), Bolivia (1972), and Chile (1973). Many of these officers had been trained in the United States or in the Panama Canal Zone. The “Rockefeller Report” (1969)⁷³ reiterated the hard line by stating that the “security of the Western Hemisphere” (of the United States) makes it necessary to aid the military governments of Latin America—even though they are dictatorial (which they were never called)—because they functioned as defenders of the order and values of our “western Christian civilization.” Among these defenders of Christian civilization are the presidents of Brazil, the Uruguayan military dictators, Banzer, and Pinochet. The North American Empire no longer speaks of liberty or of democracy in its neocolonies. It now speaks of “order” and “security,” trusting in its “god” (“In God We Trust”), which more and more appears to be Mars, the god of war, the one founded on the victory of the oppressors. It is evident that the political imprudence of the single issue or guerrilla groups allowed the armies to be transformed into occupation forces favoring the Empire. Certain segments of the Church supported this action and sacralized this line of the “extreme right.” It is important to note that these efforts were also assisted by the “progressives,” reformists, and postconciliar theologians of development who were inspired by the best of European theology. All of these have been critical of the theology of liberation, and they continually formulate new projects, some of them supported by German Catholic entities, for their criticism. The argument is simple: the theology of liberation is allied with the “extreme left” (which is untrue) and with the guerrilla groups. Later, liberation theology was criticized as being the strategical Marxist-Christian support for such violent groups.⁷⁴

The meetings in Bogotá in November 1973,⁷⁵ and in Toledo in 1974,⁷⁶ for example, were designed to counteract the theology of liberation, but were only partially successful. On the other hand, after the meeting in Sucre (November 1972), it was decided to close the Institutes of the Pastoral in Quito, of Liturgy in Medellín, and of Catechesis in Manizales in order to reorganize them into a single institution—from which Comblín, this writer, and others were excluded—with a new orientation. In Belgium the old Institute *Lumen Vitae*, where several Latin Americans were participating, was closed, and slowly everywhere institutes, seminars, and groups committed to the theology of liberation were canceled or suppressed.

Between the left and the right—in the “center”—some theological movements that we may call “populist” were functioning—especially in Argentina due to the euphoria accompanying the return of Perón—movements that since 1974 were understandably ambiguous in their position. Developments, however, prompted them to define more precisely their idea of “the people” and to understand better the distinction between reformist and revolutionary positions. A confrontation ensued, as we have said, between the progressives “a la Europe” and the proponents of the theology of liberation—a

confrontation that was clearly visible in the meetings sponsored by CELAM in Bogotá in November 1973 and in Lima in September 1975.⁷⁷

Meanwhile, the theology of liberation continued to mature amid persecution, and the number of its adherents increased. Expelled from their positions (e.g., Comblín in Brazil and Assmann in Chile), persecuted sometimes by those of their own Church, they grew in number and quality. Then there emerged spokesmen such as Ignacio Ellacuría and Jon Sobrino in El Salvador,⁷⁸ Luís del Valle in Mexico,⁷⁹ Virgilio Elizondo among the Chicanos in the United States,⁸⁰ Raul Vidales in Lima,⁸¹ Rafael Avila in Colombia,⁸² Ronaldo Muñoz in Chile,⁸³ and Alejandro Cussiánovich in Peru.⁸⁴

The theology of liberation began to take more seriously its role in the popular movements of liberation and has been unable to avoid solidarity with these movements in their struggles, particularly with the martyrs of the Latin American Church: Antonio Pereira Neto, murdered in Brazil (1969); Héctor Gallego, disappeared in Panama (1971); Carlos Mugica, shot to death in Argentina (1974); and Ivan Betancourt, murdered in Honduras (1975).⁸⁵

“Christians for Socialism,” who held their organizational meeting in Chile in 1972, now represent a world movement. In their second meeting in Quebec they evidenced a real maturation, more precision in their interpretative categories, and a respectable distancing from their Chilean position. Latin American theology is, therefore, making a significant contribution to Christian theology.⁸⁶

The *I Encuentro Latinoamericano de teología* (First Latin American Theological Encounter) held in Mexico in August 1975⁸⁷ brought a halt to liberation theology's moving to a new stage of development by producing a clear confrontation between positions that were preponderantly North American and “functionalist,” and which were virtually ignoring our concrete Latin American reality. One week later, however, the *Theology in the Americas* meeting held in Detroit made possible the first contact between several Latin and North American theologians—the latter group composed of representatives of Black, feminine, and Chicano theology, together with other critics of the system. In addition to these developments there was the added possibility of future dialogues with African and Asian theologians. The theology of liberation thus opened the debate to the whole world.⁸⁸

We can, therefore, assert that the theology of liberation discovered the *political time* of captivity, of prudence, and of patience. But if it is to avoid being transformed into reformism, it will be necessary to move toward the single strategic goal of liberation.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have been able to see that in the history of Latin American theology there have been three creative periods. *The initial one* dealt with the conquest and the evangelization of the continent. It produced a prophetic, political, and extrauniversity theology. *The second one* dealt with the process of the neocolonial national liberation movements at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It produced a practical, political, and non-academic theology. *The third stage* dealt with the process of popular, national liberation against monopolistic, capitalistic imperialism. It produced the theology of liberation, likewise prophetic, political, and nonacademic. These theologies unite the people—the Indian, the creole or the proletariat, the peasant, the marginalized emerging groups, and revolutionaries—who think of *militancy* when they link their faith and the praxis of liberation. For this reason the theology of liberation could begin by using European theologians and categories. But it is in fact another theology because of its point of

departure, its theological production of militancy, and its final goal. That is to say, it is a different theology because of its method.

The method of the theology of liberation is not merely functionalistic, taking “science” as a prototype, accepting as givens the components of the *contemporary* system without questioning radically the system as such. This would be the method of Lonergan who has his followers in Latin America, especially in the North. This would not be a radically critical theology.

Nevertheless, a mere dialectical method following the tradition begun by Hegel and carried on by the Frankfurt School and by Bloch himself moves from the given system and opens itself to future possibilities for the same system. But in reality this method is really reformist—at best it is the democratic socialism of the “center,” composed of people who are as afraid of an oil embargo as are their compatriots in the Christian Democratic parties—because an oil crisis could bring an end to the domination by the “center”.

What they fail to see is that the dialectical theology of the “center,” that is, the meaning of theology *in* Europe, changes dialectically when applied to the “periphery.” The theology which in Europe is radically critical of its own structures is nothing more than reformist and even counterrevolutionary in the “periphery,” for it proposes to change things only in Europe. It strives only for an intranational, not an international revolution. It absolutizes its nation as a whole and in turn abstracts the rest of the world. This theology, therefore, is valid only for the European *partial*-whole, but not the *total*-whole of the present world.

The method employed by the theology of liberation has as its point of departure the conduct of the people of the “periphery,” of the laborers and peasants who still suffer because social and economic achievements of the “center” (a strike of Ford, Volkswagen, or Citroen workers means a rise in the price of the manufactured product that will be purchased by the worker in the “periphery”). On the other hand, the method of theological production itself is not essentially academic but takes on meaning at the “basic-base” as reflection on the experiences of Christians committed to the real process of liberation. It is reflection on the *militancy* of a movement that is ecclesial and political. For the theologian it means the risk of *orthopraxis*. Its method is more than dialectical (I prefer to call it *analectical*) or universally dialectical in that it knows how to pose the question of the *externalization of the culture* of the “periphery” and of the popular groups. It proposes not only a *technical* revolution, but also a *cultural* revolution by affirming the values of the people and of the oppressed classes.

Furthermore, the theology of liberation uses primarily the measurements of the social *critical* sciences, or as Fals Borda puts it, those tools of the social sciences of liberation.⁸⁹ Economics and sociology (from its “theory of dependency” situated at the proper level), geopolitics, political science, and Latin American history are aware of the “theoretical rupture” that proposes to use as a point of departure an individual from the oppressed and nonimperialistic culture, and they discover the “ideological scientificism” of the sciences of the “center.” Furthermore, since 1970, the philosophical relation between the social sciences and theology has become increasingly clear. Thus a *philosophy of liberation* becomes a hermeneutical necessity.⁹⁰

At any rate, the *written works* of the theology of liberation as works *in themselves*, as an “abstract whole,” can—because of their language—use authors and ideas of European inspiration. As parts of a Latin American whole they make sense. If I take, for example, Gutiérrez’ *Theology of Liberation* and do not understand that it is a book written in Gutiérrez’ spare time, when he is free from his responsibilities as prophet

and inspirer of a large number of priestly works, of various Christian base movements, as professor in the university, and participant in politics, actions that absorb all his time—if I do not understand that it is a tactical book, where he says what is possible to say and where everything cannot be said, where he includes a bibliography for the scholar's benefit—but is unnecessary for the “base” if the work is not seen as the fruit of *political* language itself, then the real Latin American meaning of the book is missed. One should not forget that political language, as that of the Councils, is not valued for what is said as much as for against whom it is said, why, and to whom it is written. The theology of liberation is essentially Latin American for the simple reason that only a Latin American or one who makes the effort to live together with others in the world can *fully* understand its meaning. For this reason theologians in Latin America are persecuted by the police, the security services, and even by ecclesiastical leaders. If the *real* evidence of its newness were not evident, Latin Americans could continue producing academic theological treatises and “the Prince of this World” would not disturb them.

For this reason, the criticism of theology can follow one of two alternatives:

ALTERNATIVE 1 Abstract Criticism

Theology *a* criticizes → theology *b*

In this case “theology *a*” criticizes “theology *b*” as one part criticizes another *part* of the same system, or as a *whole* criticizes another *whole*, both of which are independent of the total system. In both examples, if the parts or the *wholes* are homogeneous and not in conflict, then the criticism is abstract because it does not take into account the conditions or factors that could produce conflict and heterogeneity in these two examples.

ALTERNATIVE 2 Concrete or Historical Criticism

Theology *a* → is part of the “European” *whole* or of the “center”

Theology *b* → is part of the “peripheral” *whole* which is worldwide because it embraces the “center”

Only in this case can “theology *a*,” aware of its European presuppositions, now analyze itself and “theology *b*,” being aware also of the presuppositions of this different theology (“theology *b*”). Otherwise, the criticism is not concrete and historical but rather ideological because it confines “theology *a*” to the narrow horizons of its own world, and from the “center” it pretends to be able to interpret all of what is happening in the world. Thus it becomes doubly ideological, first because it ignores or forgets its own presuppositions, and in the second place because it assumes that the presuppositions of the rest of the world are the same as its own. If these two demands are fulfilled, then the criticism will be constructive and can help to advance the worldwide study of theology. (Note, I did not say “universally.”)

The *point* of departure for European theology—even the most progressive theology—is the university or the pastoral praxis of the churches. The *point* of departure of the theology of liberation is the “militancy” of the theologians who are as parts of the Christian *movements* involved (even unto death) in the real, political, economic, cultural process of Latin America. The language of the theology of liberation is unintelligible without a knowledge of the hermeneutic of those Latin American movements.⁹¹

We know that Marx was born in Trier, Germany, but we also know that Theotonio dos Santos, Faletto, Cardoso, Fals Borda, Darcy Ribeiro, and many others were born in Latin America, thus redefining the part of the “center” from the theoretical rupture

that implanted all that had been said before as a part of a new *totality* where the language acquired an essential, qualitative newness. This is the way the theology of liberation applies an ideological interpretation to the same theology, to the praxis situated within the respective classes, and to the nations within the “center” and the “periphery.” Thus theology is freed from the Mediterranean patristics, from European medieval thought, and from the confines of the European-North American community to be open to the whole world for the first time in the history of Christianity. The point of departure for liberation theology is Africa, Asia, and Latin America, the oppressed classes, the discriminated races, the abused women, the dominated children, the despised aged. It is de-ideologized theology because it hears the cries of the oppressed, but with an awareness that only *in the Kingdom* will we know clearly what we have done.

V. AN ABBREVIATED CHRONOLOGY FOR A HISTORY OF THEOLOGY IN LATIN AMERICA

1. Prophetic theology versus the conquest and evangelization (1511-1577)
 - 1511 Preaching of Antonio de Montesino in Santo Domingo.
 - 1514 Conversion of Bartolomé de Las Casas in Cuba.
 - 1527 Bartolomé begins his *Historia de las Indias*.
 - 1541 Bartolomé publishes his *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias*.
 - 1577 José de Acosta writes his *De procuranda indorum salute*.
2. The theology of Colonial Christendom (1533- 1808)
 - 1553 The University of Mexico opens, as well as San Marcos University in Lima.
 - 1553-1563 Pedro de la Peña serves as Professor of the *Prima*.
 - 1605 Antonio Rubio writes his *Lógica Mexicana*.
 - 1622-1625 A large number of secondary schools of theology are founded.
 - 1776 Domingo Muriel writes his *Fasti novi orbis*.
3. Practical-political theology versus the neocolonial emancipation (1808)
 - 1808 Lagunza's *El Reino del Mesías en gloria y majestad* is published.
 - 1809-1812 Preaching by Hidalgo, Morelos, and many others in favor of national liberation.
 - 1813 The *Destrucción de las Indias* is reprinted in Bogotá.
4. Conservative neocolonial theology on the defensive (1831- 1931)
 - 1859 Colegio Pío Latinoamericano is founded in Rome.
 - 1867 The school of theology in the University of Mexico is suppressed.
 - 1869 The Catholic University of Santiago, Chile, opens.
 - 1878 Mariano Soler writes *El catolicismo, la civilización y el progreso* in Montevideo.
 - 1899 Latin American Plenary Council meets in Rome and issues what may be called a “Romanized” theology.
 - 1916 Meeting of American Protestant churches in Panama.
5. Theology of the “New Christendom” (1930-1962)
 - 1931 Catholic Action founded in Argentina.
 - 1937 Founding of the Javeriana University in Bogotá.
 - 1947 Catholic Universities of Río and São Paulo founded.
 - 1955 CELAM organized in Río de Janeiro.
 - 1960 Catholic Universities in Buenos Aires and Córdoba are founded.
6. Latin American theology of liberation (1962-)

- 1962-1965 Participation of Latin American theologians in the Second Vatican Council.
- 1968 Second General Conference of CELAM in Medellín.
- 1969 Congress on "Faith and Development" in Mexico.
- 1970 Various meetings on the "theology of liberation" in Bogotá, Buenos Aires, Mexico City, Oruro, Bolivia, etc.
- 1971 Gustavo Gutiérrez publishes his *Teología de la liberación*.
- 1972 Meeting in Escorial on "Faith and Social Change in Latin America."
- 1973 Persecution of Christians involved in the process of liberation in Chile.
- 1975 First Latin American Encounter of Theology in Mexico, and the Theology in the Americas meeting in Detroit.
- 1976 *I Encuentro de los teólogos del Tercer Mundo* in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
- 1977 *II Encuentro de los teólogos del Tercer Mundo* in Accra, Ghana.
- 1977 Meeting in Mexico of various theologians of liberation with European and North American theologians (Assmann, Vidales, Dussel, Concha, *et al.*, with Moltmann, Cox, Cone, *et al.*).
- 1978 Meeting in San José, Costa Rica, of social scientists and theologians of liberation.

NOTES FOR APPENDIX II

1. Cf. the brief bibliography in Kurt Lenk, *Ideologie, Ideologiekritik und Wissenssoziologie* (Berlin: H. Luchterhand, 1971), pp. 429-450.

2. Cf. Chapter X, "La arqueológica," of my work *Para una ética de la liberación latinoamericana* (Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno, 1975).

3. Cf. E. Dussel, "Domination-Liberation," *The Mystical and Political Dimension of the Christian Faith*, ed. Claude Geffré and Gustavo Gutiérrez in *Concilium* 96 (New York: Herder and Herder, 1974): 34-56.

4. In this work I will use the term "ideology" in a very limited sense, not as the total expression of a human class or group, but only *when it conceals* reality with its contradictions and basic conflicts.

5. "God our Lord, by his infinite mercy and goodness has given to us without merits a great part in *the Lordship* of this world," declared the King of Spain in the *Recopilación* I, I, 1.

6. Cf. Aristotle, *Topica* I, 2, 101a, 26b; and Dussel, *Método para una Filosofía de la Liberación* (Salamanca: Ediciones Sígueme, 1974), pp. 17ff.

7. Cited by Venancio Carro, *La teología y los Teólogos juristas españoles ante la conquista de América* (Madrid: Talleres Gráficos Marsiega, 1944), p. 593. Cf. Juan Ginés Sepúlveda, *Opera* (Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia, 1780), I-IV, and especially *his Tratado sobre las justas causas de la guerra contra los indios* (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1941). See also Juan Solórzano Pereira, *De indiarum iure* (Iugduni, 1672), I-II, and Silvio A. Zavala, *La filosofía política de la conquista de América* (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1947). Lewis Hanke, Giménez Fernández, and Hoffner have written extensively on the theological-political controversies regarding the conquest. Sepúlveda insisted that to hunt the Indians like animals was suitable and justified, for hunting as an art "is practiced not only against beasts, but also against those who have been born to obey but refuse to serve. Such a war is by nature just." *Democrates alter*, cited by Carro, *La teología y los teólogos juristas españoles ante la conquista de América*, p. 595.

8. *Summa theologiae*, II-II, q. 57, art. 4.

9. J. Major, In *secundam sententiarum*, dist. XLIV, q. 3 (Paris, 1510).

10. What I have said in regard to the development of European theological thought is only indicative, the purpose being to provide the participants in the *Encuentro* (Meeting) with a ready frame of reference for the development of Latin American theology. For this reason no specific bibliographical references are included. Furthermore, it would be helpful for Europeans to write a history of theology as a phenomenon that contains ideological stages.

11. The ideological-historical stage or period in no way invalidates the nature of revelation, for revelation consists of critical-eschatological eventualities that develop their potential in their own times. It was revelation that inspired the antislavery activity of the Jesuit teacher Ramírez and his disciple Pedro Claver, SJ in Cartagena during the early years of the seventeenth century. It is also revelation that inspires the *antimachismo* of the Christian feminist movements of our day. The question of revelation and ideology, however, remains.

12. Christianity originally was composed of the oppressed peoples and groups of the Roman Empire, as can be seen in the text of Tatian in his "Address to the Greeks": "But

with us there is no desire of vainglory nor do we indulge in a variety of opinions... Not only do the rich among us pursue our philosophy, but the poor enjoy instruction gratuitously; for the things which come from God surpass the requital of worldly gifts" (chap. 32). *The Anti-Nicene Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, n.d.), Vol. II.

13. Artistides in his *Apology* attacked the very fundamentals of the Empire and Greek culture. His attitude was subversive when he declared: "Those who believe that the sky is God are wrong... Those who believe that the earth is Goddess are wrong... Those who believe that water is God are in error" (pp. 119- 21).

14. *Summa theologiae*, I-II, q. 81, art. 5: "...quod principium activum in generatione est a patre, materiam autem mater ministrat... si, Adam non pecante, Eva pecasset, filii originale peccatum non contraherent." Woman gives only *matter*; it is the male who gives *being* to the son.

15. *Summa theologiae*, II-II, q. 57. art. 4.

16. Reyes Mate, *El ateísmo, un problema político* (Salamanca: Ediciones Sígueme, 1973).

17. We observed in a recent meeting of "Theology in the Americas" in Detroit, August 1975, that this was true of Black theology, e.g., James Cone, *Black Theology and Black Power* (New York: Seabury Press, 1969); *God of the Oppressed* (New York: Seabury Press, 1975); Benjamin A. Reist, *Theology in Red, White, and Black* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975); and feminist theology, e.g., Rosemary Ruether, *Liberation Theology* (New York: Paulist Press, 1972). No distinction is made between the center and the periphery on an international level. The liberation movement is promoted among these groups, but within the borders of their individual nations, which are in themselves as the center oppressors of other nations on the periphery. These groups may even include the oppressed countries in their project, but they fail to be aware of or criticize imperialism. This center-periphery contradiction distinguishes therefore *Black theology* in the United States from *Black theology* in Africa — in that the former struggles against oppressive racism but ignores economic-political oppression on an international level. The same can be said of the feminist movements of the "center" in relation to those of the periphery —as was evident in the World Congress of Women which met in Mexico City, July 1975, where the feminist movements of Viet Nam, Cuba, and Latin America openly criticized the apolitical and exclusively sexist feminism of the North American women specifically. If the theological movements of the "center" do not take into account the reality of imperialism, they will inevitably evolve into a dangerous revisionist reformism.

18. Martin Grabmann, *Die geschichte der katholischen theologie* (Frieburg: Herder & Co., 1933). Dussel cites the Spanish edition, *Historia de la teología católica*, trans. David Gutiérrez (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1940), pp.350ff.

19. Cf. my work, *El episcopado hispanoamericano, Institución defensora del indio 3* (1504-1620): 6-147 (Cuernavaca: CIDOC, 1969).

20. *Historia de las Indias*, libro III, cap. 79 (Madrid: BAE, tomo II, 1961, p. 356). Cf. the synopsis of the life and bibliography of Las Casas in my article in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1974 edition.

21. *Obras escogidas*, V, 539.

22. *Ibid.*

23. *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias*, V, 136. The text continues stressing the qualities of the Indians: "Also they are extremely poor and powerless or want little of this world's goods... They are clean and unpreoccupied, quick to understand, very capable and ready to accept every good doctrine; they are very apt to receive our holy faith. ... These [are] tame sheep endowed with the aforementioned qualities by their Creator and Maker" (p. 136 a-b). Such descriptions are frequent in Bartolomé: the Indians are "so docile, patient, and humble" (*Apologética historia*, Argumento, III, 3). Remember that this immense work, the *Apologética*, is a respectful tribute by Las Casas to the Indian, a tribute in which he describes with sympathy their world, their culture, their beliefs. The same idealization appears also in the *Historia de las Indias*, I, cap. 40: "We Christians stopped to

observe the Indians ...how evident their meekness, simplicity, and trust in a people they had *never known*. ...They are by nature kind, simple, humble, meek, passive, and virtuous in inclination, talented, prompt, yes very inclined to receive our holy faith” (I, 142 a-b); “...they are a *toto genere* by nature very meek people, very humble, extremely poor, defenseless or without arms, very simple” *Historia de las Indias*, Prólogo, I, 13b).

24. Cf. the full text in the *Memorial al Consejo de Indias* (1565), presented with commentary in the edition of J. B. Lassege, *La larga marcha de Las Casas* (Lima: CEP [Centro de Estudios y Publicaciones], 1974), p.387.

25. Lassege, *ibid*.

26. *Bartolomé de Las Casas: precursor del anticolonialismo* (Mexico: Siglo Veintiuno, 1974).

27. It is important to note that as Las Casas wrote his enormous *Historia de las Indias*, José de Acosta published his *Historia natural y moral de las Indias* (Cf. the edition published in Madrid, 1894, 2 vols.). See also the work of León Lopetequi, *El padre José de Acosta* (Madrid, 1942).

28. This theology is explicit in letters, discussions, controversies, “memorials,” apologies, and sermons. Though the literary style is impressive, the works were not written for university audiences.

29. Las Casas’ *Apologética historia sumaria* is as significant as his *Historia*. José de Acosta’s *De procuranda indorum salute* (Salamanca, 1589) is, as the previous work, an anthropological study. The great Bernardino de Sahagún collected materials for what would be his *Historia de las cosas de Nueva España* (Mexico: Ed. Pedro Robredo, 1938), I-V, which was the first study of world anthropology in a contemporary sense.

30. This theology influenced the thinking of laypersons, missionaries, and bishops, and helped shape laws, e.g., the “Leyes Nuevas” of 1542 which eliminated the system of *encomienda*, as well as inspiring other reforms.

31. *Historia de las Indias*, III, 79, p.357.

32. For the theology of colonial Christianity, see the histories of the churches by nations (e.g., *Cuevas* for Mexico, *Groot* for Colombia, *Vargas* for Ecuador, *Vargas Ugarte* for Peru, *Cotapos* for Chile, *Bruno* for Argentina, etc.) See my *Historia de la Iglesia en América latina* (Barcelona: Editorial Nova Terra, 1974), pp. 433- 459; *Para una historia de la Iglesia en América latina* (Barcelona: CEHILA, 1975); for Mexico only: José Gallegos Rocafull, *El pensamiento mexicano en los siglos XVII y XVIII* (Mexico: Centro de Estudios Filosóficos, 1951, Bibl. pp. 397- 414); *Bibliotheca Missionum* (Münster, 1916-1938), I-XI; J. García Icazbalceta, *Bibliografía mexicana del siglo XVI* (Mexico: Andrade y Morales, 1886); Julio Jiménez Rueda, *Herejías y supersticiones en la Nueva España (los heterodoxos en México)* (Mexico: Imprenta Universitaria, 1946); Cristóbal B. Plaza y Jaen, *Crónica de la real pontificia universidad de México* (Mexico: Talleres gráficos del Museo Nacional, 1931); Oswaldo Robles, *Filósofos mexicanos del siglo XVI* (México: Librería de M. Porrúa, 1950) (where there is found material for our subject); and the work of Julio Jiménez Rueda, *Historia jurídica de la universidad de México* (Mexico: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, 1955). See also Félix Osoreo, *Historia de todos los colegios de la ciudad de México desde la conquista hasta 1760* (Mexico: Talleres Gráficos, 1929). Among the colonial theologians one should not forget Juan Palafox y Mendoza, *Obras* (Madrid: Imprenta de G. Ramírez, 1762), I-XVII. The works of Guillermo Furlong Cárdiff, e.g., *Nacimiento y desarrollo de la filosofía en el Río de la Plata, 1536-1810* (Bueno Aires: G. Kraft, 1952). His works on the thought in Río de la Plata, for example, help to fill a vacuum in that area of Latin America. Works like those of Pedro Henríquez Ureña, *Historia de la cultura de América hispánica* (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1947) serve as contextual reference. Nevertheless, we must admit that there is no work on the history of theology in Latin America, although the materials are minimally sufficient to provide an idea of the whole.

33. Cf. the work of Walter Redmond, *Bibliography of the Philosophy in the Iberian Colonies of America* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1972), on the existent bibliography in Latin American colonial philosophy, which indicates the importance of these writings.

34. Cf. Ernest Burrus, "Alonso de la Veracruz. Defense of the American Indians," *The Haythrop Journal* 4 (July 1963):225-53; and Redmon, *Bibliography of the Philosophy in the Iberian Colonies of America*, notes 781-83. See also Bienvenido Junquera, "El maestro Alonso de la Veracruz," *Archivo agustiniano* 18 (1935).

35. Cited by Cárdiff, *op cit.*, p. 617.

36. F. A. Encina, *Historia de Chile* (Santiago: Editorial Nacimiento, 1930), V, 550-95.

37. Cf. Javier Miranda, *Vida del venerable sacerdote Don Domingo Muriel* (Córdoba, 1916). Muriel's best-known works are *Fasti novi orbis* (Venice, 1776), *Rudimenta juris naturae et gentium* (Venice, 1791), and *Collectanea dogmatica de seculo XVIII* (Venice, 1792).

38. Guillermo Furlong Cárdiff's is the most complete work on the Paraguayan *reducciones*.

39. Cf. my work on Vieira, *América latina, dependencia y liberación* (Buenos Aires: F. García, 1973), pp. 52ff. This kind of messianism is traditional in Brazil even until today. Cf.

M. I. Pereira de Queiroz, *Historia y etnología de los movimientos mesiánicos* (Mexico: Siglo Veintiuno, 1969).

40. Cf. Agustín Churruca, "El pensamiento de Morelos. Una ideología liberadora," *Christus* 477 (1975):13ff.; and 478 (1975):10ff, in which he illustrates the difference between creative, oppressive, and decadent Spain. "The aggressive affirmations of the Mexican liberator do not refer to Spain, which we Mexicans love and which was personified in Las Casas, Vasco de Quiroga, and many others. They are directed against that entity incarnated by the limited personality of Godoy, and haughtily and arrogantly trampled upon by Napoleon and Botella" (p. 15).

41. It should not be forgotten that without the intervention of the "lower clergy," emancipation from Spain would have been impossible. It was the priest Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla (1753-1811), former director of the seminary in Morelia, who sounded the call to arms on September 15, 1810. He led the liberation forces until he was condemned for heresy by the University of Mexico and shot in 1811.

42. The historian Roberto Tisnés describes this edition in his work. For a description of the apocalyptic movement, cf. Horacio Cerutti, "América en las utopías del renacimiento," *Hacia una filosofía de la liberación*, ed. Osvaldo Ardiles, et al. (Buenos Aires: Editorial Bonum, 1973), pp.53ff.

43. The crisis was real. Julio Jiménez Rueda in his *Historia jurídica de la universidad de México* says that Mora indicated in 1830 that it was necessary "to suppress an exorbitant number of professorships of theology which had gone year after year without a single student" (pp. 152- 53). In 1834 the whole program for teaching theology was changed: "the *prima* in theology became theological authorities, Scripture continued by its name, and vespers became ecclesiastical history" (p. 160). Little by little theology was abandoned in the national university forever. In 1857 the Theological Library became a part of the National Library, and in 1867 the School of Theology was definitively eliminated. "Catholic liberalism" was born in this kind of environment. Cf. Néstor T. Auza, *Católicos y liberales en la generación del ochenta* (Cuernavaca: Centro Intercultural de Documentación, 1966), 2 vols.

44. Cf. José María Vidal, *El primer arzobispo de Montevideo, Dr. Mariano Soler*, which contains a list of more than one hundred writings of this theologian. For information on the Plenary Council of 1899, cf. Pablo Correa León, *El concilio plenario latinoamericano* (Bogotá, n.d.) and Felipe Cejudo Vega, *El primer concilio plenario de América Latina* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa, 1948).

45. Cf. Hugo Assmann, *Teoponte: una experiencia guerrillera* (Oruro, Bolivia: Centro "Desarrollo Integral," 1971). The leader of this group was Néstor Paz, poet, physician, and Catholic seminarian who was killed October 8, 1970, at the age of 25.

46. Cf. François Houtart and Vincente Vertrano, *Hacia una teología del desarrollo* (Buenos Aires: Latinoamérica Libros, 1967); Victor Cosmao, *Signification et théologie du développement* (Paris, 1967); Hugo Assmann, "Die situation der unterentwickelt gehaltenen Länder als Ort einer Theologie der Revolution," *Diskussion zur "Theologie der Revolution,"* Ernst Feil and Rudolf Weth, eds. (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1969). The "theology of revolution" had already broken with the "theology of development" and represents a transition to the "theology of

liberation.” Cf. Rubem Alves, “Apuntes para una teología del desarrollo,” *Cristianismo y Sociedad* 21 (1969).

47. *Federación Internacional de Estudios de Sociología Religiosa* (International Federation of Religious Sociological Studies).

48. *Centro para el Desarrollo Económico y Social de América Latina*. This Center for Economic and Social Development of Latin America was inspired in part by the Christian Democracy movement in Chile. It moved in 1970 to Caracas and from there to Bogotá, where it now publishes the journal *Tierra Nueva*. In the first edition, April 1972, the first article was written by Alfonso López Trujillo, “La liberación y las liberaciones” (pp. 5 - 26), in which he says, “Everything which is not revolution (presumably violent) is catalogued as developmentalism, a useless and deceitful attempt.” The theology of liberation is identified with extreme and even guerrilla positions and is distinguished from liberation despite the human and political contradictions. In the issue of July 1975, p. 27, n. 16, we are accused of using an ideological hermeneutical method with respect to theology (A. López Trujillo, “El compromiso político del sacerdote”) without acknowledging the fact that the subject is proposed by Christ himself (Luke 23 :34). Thus begins the criticism of the theology of liberation.

49. *Instituto latinoamericano de doctrinas y estudios sociales* (Latin American Institute of Doctrines and Social Studies), founded by Jesuits proceeding from *Action populaire* (Paris), such as the French Father Bigo, now in Bogotá, but does not support the theology of liberation.

50. *Instituto de Catequesis de latinoamérica* (Catechetical Institute of Latin America).

51. Organization of Seminaries in Latin America.

52. *Instituto Pastoral de América Latina*, which has done a commendable work of conscientization, publication, and seminars. It has been severely criticized by the more conservative groups.

53. Segundo was born in 1925 and is the author of *Berdiaeff. Une réflexion chrétienne sur la personne* (Paris: Aubier, 1963), *La Cristiandad; ¿una utopia?* (Montevideo: Cursos de Complementación Cristiana, 1964), 2 vols.; “L’avenir du christianisme en Amérique latine,” *Lettre* (Paris) 54 (1963): 7 - 12; and earlier *Función de la Iglesia en la realidad rioplatense* (Montevideo: Barreiro y Ramos, 1962) ; and later his five volumes: *A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1973 - 1974). Two of his recent works are *De la sociedad ala teología* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Carlos Lohlé, 1970), and *The Liberation of Theology* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1976).

54. Comblín was born in Belgium in 1923 but has lived and worked in Latin America since 1957. Among his writings are *Théologie de la Paix* (Paris: Editions universitaires, 1960- 1963), 2 vols.; *Théologie de la ville* (Paris: Editions universitaires, 1968); *Le Christ dans l'Apocalypse* (Paris: Desclée, 1965); *Teología do desenvolvimento* (Belo Horizonte, 1968); *Théologie de la revolution* (Paris: Editions universitaires, 1970 - 1974), 2 vols. Only in volume 2 does Comblín adopt some of the theses of the theology of liberation.

55. Cf. the bibliography on the subject in *Desarrollo y revolución* in the bibliography published by CEDIAL (Bogotá, 1974), pp. 73- 95, and Hugo Assmann, “Caracterização de una teología de revolução,” *Ponto Homen* 4 (1968):6- 58. The question arose in part because of the meeting of “Church and Society” sponsored by the World Council of Churches in Geneva in 1966. Richard Shaull was a major contributor, together with several Latin American participants.

56. It should be noted that the “theology of liberation” will show that the “theology of revolution” is merely the application of certain themes from moral theology to the revolutionary situation; it is like giving it the “green light.” It is not a complete reexposition of the theory, but rather more a manifestation of “opportunism.”

57. The most creative group in regard to this doctrine was Brazilian, first Alberto G. Ramos, *La reducción sociológica* (Río de Janeiro: Instituto Superior de Estudios Brasileiras, 1958), followed by Helio Jaguaribe, Cândido Mendes, Alvaro Vieira Pintos, and others who

worked with the ISEB (The Brazilian Institute of Social Studies). To this group one should add Celso Furtado, Teotonio dos Santos, and others. The theory of dependency was formulated between 1968 and 1970, the period when most of the writing on the subject was published. Cf. the bibliography prepared by CEDIAI as well as the final bibliography in *Fe y cambio social en América Latina* (Salamanca, 1973).

58. Cf. the writings of the African economist Samir Amin, e.g., *L'accumulation a l'échelle mondiale* (Dakar: IFAN, 1970), which, following the "Latin American theory of dependence," suggests it as a hypothesis applicable worldwide.

59. Gutiérrez was born in 1928. Among his works are: *Lineas pastorales de la iglesia en América latina* (Lima: Editorial Universitaria, 1970); *A Theology of Liberation*, trans. Caridad Inda and John Eagleson (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1973), as well as a great number of articles in various journals.

60. In his brief work, "Consideraciones teológicas sobre la liberación del hombre," in *IDOC* (Bogotá) 43 (1968); and in "La liberación humana desde una perspectiva teológica," *Mensaje* 168 (1968):175 - 79.

61. Alves was born in 1933. Cf. his "El protestantismo como una forma de colonialismo," *Perspectivas de Diálogo* 38 (1968):242- 48; *A Theology of Human Hope* (Washington, D.C.: Corpus Books, 1969); and *Tomorrow's Child* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972).

62. Among his other works are *La iglesia debe comprometerse en lo político* (Montevideo: JECI, 1970); "La misión de la Iglesia y del presbítero a la luz de la teología de la liberación," *Pasos* 8 (1972):21. He was the chief editor for *Sacerdotes para el Tercer Mundo: historia, documentos, reflexión* (Buenos Aires: Editorial del Movimiento, 1970), and coauthored with Rodríguez Melgarejo, "Apuntes para una interpretación de la iglesia en Argentina," *Vispera* 4 (1970): 59 - 88. See also Aldo Büntig (b. 1931), *El Catolicismo popular en Argentina* (Buenos Aires, 1973).

63. Assmann was born in 1933. Cf. a bibliography in *Fe y cambio social en América Latina* (Salamanca: Ediciones Sígueme, 1973), p. 403. Assmann's most important work is *Teología desde la praxis de la liberación* (Salamanca: Ediciones Sígueme, 1973), in a revised English edition *Theology for a Nomad Church*, trans. Paul Burns (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1975). Together with Gutiérrez, Assmann is the most original thinker of the movement.

64. I was born in 1934. The first edition of my *Historia de la Iglesia en América Latina* was published in 1969, now in its third Spanish edition. See also my *Para una ética de la liberación latinoamericana* (Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno, 1973), 2 vols. (Volumes 3 and 4 will be published shortly); *History and the Theology of Liberation* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books); and *Ethics and the Theology of Liberation* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books).

65. The papers of the meeting were published as *Fe y cambio social en América Latina* (1973). There were other meetings following the theme of liberation (once the break with development began). The meeting "Fe y desarrollo" in Mexico City, November 24 - 28, 1969, Sociedad Teológica Mexicana, *Memoria del primer congreso nacional de teología: Fe y Desarrollo* (Mexico, 1970), 2 vols., was one of the last under the theme of the "theology of development." On March 6 - 7, 1970, there was an international symposium which produced *Liberación: opción de la iglesia en la década del 70* (Bogotá: Editorial Presencia, 1970). ISAL brought together some twenty theologians in Buenos Aires, August 3 - 6, 1970. The papers were published in *Fichas de ISAL* 26 (1970) and in *Cristianismo y Sociedad* 23 - 24 (1970). The Second Meeting of the "theology of liberation" papers were published in the bulletin "Teología de la liberación" (Bogotá, 1970); another meeting was held in Juárez, México, October 16- 18, 1970, "Seminario de la teología liberación," the papers of which were mimeographed and are available from IDOC, Via S. Maria dell' Anima 20, 00186, Rome. There was a course of study on "the theology of liberation" in Oruro, Bolivia, December 2 - 19, 1970. We still remember the academic week of August 1971 on the "Dialéctica de la liberación latinoamericana," published in *Stromata* (Buenos Aires) 1 and 2 (1971), emphasizing the "philosophy of liberation." Cf. *Hacia una filosofía de la liberación latinoamericana* (1971) with contributions from authors such as Osvaldo Ardiles, Horacio Cerutti, Julio de Zan,

Enrique Dussel, Anibal Fornari, Daniel Guillot, and Juan C. Scannone. Since 1971, there have been an increasing number of meetings on “the theology of liberation.” In Europe it is still not understood that liberation theology is not the fruit of university dialogue, but is the result of an ecclesial and politically-based movement that is supported by thousands of religious, priests, and laypersons in multiple situations. In the “dialogue” the theology of liberation is not intratheological, but emerges from historical praxis. As Rosino Gibellini de Brescia states, “There is no ecclesial movement of the theology of hope nor of political theology. ... The European may read a book on the theology of liberation and conceptually understand the examples... *but he does not understand that it is a movement of the Church*” (*Christus* [Mexico] 479 [1975]:9).

66. Míguez was born in 1924. Cf. “La theologie protestante latinoamericaine aujourd'hui,” *IDOC International* 9 (1969):77- 94; “Nuevas perspectivas teológicas,” *Pueblo oprimido* (Montevideo, 1972); and *Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974).

67. Scannone was born in 1931. Cf. his “Hacia una dialéctica de la liberación,” *Stromata* 17 (1971):23 - 60; “El actual desafío planteado al lenguaje teológico latinoamericano de liberación,” *CIAS* (Buenos Aires) 211 (1972) : 5 - 20; and “Ontología del proceso auténticamente liberador,” *Panorama de la teología latinoamericana* (Salamanca: SELADOC, 1975).

68. The outstanding articles of Ferre are: “Iglesia y sociedad opulenta. Una crítica a Suenens desde América latina,” *Vispera* 12 (1969): 1ff.; and the defense, for political reasons in the Third World, of the encyclical *Humanae vitae* in *Vispera* 17 (1970): 26 - 31; and “Hacia una teología de la liberación,” *Marcha* (Montevideo) 1527(1971): 1 - 15.

69. Cf Eduardo Pironio, “Teología de la liberación,” in *Criterio* (Buenos Aires) 1607 – 1608 (1970).

70. Boff was born in 1938. Among his works are *Jesús Cristo libertador*, 4th ed. (Petropolis: Vozes, 1974); *Vida para Além de Morte*, 3rd ed. (Petropolis: Editoria Vozes, 1974); *O destino do homem e do mundo*, 3rd ed. (Petropolis: Editoria Vozes, 1974); and *A vida religiosa e a Igreja no processo de liberação* (Petropolis: Editoria Vozes, 1975). Also he was one of the collaborators in the *Concilium* series, “Salvation in Jesus Christ and the Process of Liberation,” *The Mystical and Political Dimension of the Christian Faith*, ed. Claude Geffré and Gustavo Gutiérrez 96 (New York: Herder & Herder): 78 - 91.

71. This subject, nevertheless, has long been an object of contemporary Latin American reflection. Cf. my work, *El humanismo semita* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Universitaria, 1969), appendix “La misión en los poemas del Siervo de Yahweh.” That Christ, the Servant of Jehovah, suffered, was crucified, and persecuted *politically*, has a very concrete significance in Latin America. The oppressed people—oppressed socially, politically, and economically for five centuries by the European or North American empires, and by the national oligarchies—for centuries have identified with the bleeding Christs of our baroque and colonial churches. He is the people’s Christ, despised by the theologians of secularization and by our oppressive oligarchies.

72. It appears that Father Roger Vekemans received ten million dollars from the CIA in order to campaign against Allende’s Popular Unity Party. Cf. the declarations of Father James Vizzard in *The Washington Star* (July 23, 1975), p. 1.

73. Cf. the text in *Mensaje* 185 (1969):396ff., and *The Rockefeller Report on the Americas* (Chicago, 1969).

74. This kind of argument has been used against the theology of liberation. Cf. Assmann, *Teología desde la praxis de liberación* (1973), pp. 238ff.

75. The papers of this meeting were published under the title *Liberación: diálogos en el CELAM* (Bogotá: CELAM, 1974) in which the article by Buenaventura Kloppenburg, “Las tentaciones de la teología de la liberación,” pp. 401- 15, is significant because it discusses all of the attacks against liberation theology. Jorge Mejía in his “La liberación, aspectos bíblicos,” criticizes liberation theology on the basis of exegesis (pp. 271- 307), and Monseñor

López Trujillo, "Las teologías de la liberación en América Latina," (pp. 27 - 67), distinguishes between the "good" and the "bad" (Marxist) theologies of liberation.

76. Published under the title *Teología de la liberación. Conversaciones de Toledo* (Burgos, 1974), with contributions from Jiménez Urresti, Yves Congar, López Trujillo, et al., and they declared that there are "as many theologies as there are authors," and speak of "the integral and universal liberation of all of humanity" (pp. 295ff.). There appears to be no awareness of the existent confliction in a sinful situation, e.g., the domination of one nation by another nation (imperialism), of the class by another class, etc. Their "universalism" hides the contradictions of sin.

77. The theme of the meeting was "Social Conflict in Latin America and Christian Commitment," September 6 - 13, 1975, in Lima. There was not a single theologian of liberation among the speakers. On the new direction taken by CELAM since 1972, see F. Houtart, "Le Conseil episcopal d'Amérique Latine accentue son changement," *ICI* (Paris) 481 (1975): 10 - 24.

78. Among the works of Ellacuría is "Posibilidad, necesidad y sentido de una teología latinoamericana," *Christus* (Mexico) 471 (1975): 12 -16, and 472 (1975):17- 23. Ellacuría is an out standing philosopher, and we can rightly expect a major contribution from him as from Sobrino, who has just published an important work, "La muerte de Cristo," following the liberation theme.

79. Valle is the author of various articles in *Christus* and is a leader in the "Sacerdotes para el pueblo" ("Priests for the People"), now referred to as the "Iglesia solidaria" ("Solidarity Church") in Mexico.

80. Elizondo's first theological-pastoral book will be published in the editorial section of *The Sunday Visitor*. He is founder and director of the Mexican-American Cultural Center in San Antonio, Texas, and the first "Chicano" theologian.

81. Cf. *La Iglesia latinoamericana y la política después de Medellín* (Bogotá: Departamento de Pastoral, CELAM, 1972). Vidales has written numerous articles in *Servir*, *Christus*, and *Contacto* (Mexico). He has just published an analysis on the theology of language of Gilberto Giménez, "El golpe militar y la condenación de Cristianos para el socialismo," *Contacto* 1 and 2 (1975): 12 - 115.

82. Avila is a Colombian lay theologian and author of various works.

83. Muñoz was born in 1933. His most well-known book is *Nueva conciencia de la Iglesia en América latina* (Santiago: Ediciones Nueva Universidad, 1973).

84. Cussiánovich, *Nos ha liberado* (Lima: Centro de Estudios y Publicaciones, 1972), was written for the "bases" to teach them to think in terms of liberation.

85. In regard to the recent Latin American martyrs, cf. Scarboro Missions (Ontario, June 1975). Among them are Carlos Mugica (Argentine priest, age 44), Maurice Lefebvre (priest, assassinated in Bolivia, age 49), Henrique Pereira (Brazilian priest, age 28), Tito de Alencar (priest who was tortured in Brazil and died "tormented" in France, age 29), Juan Alsina (died in Chile in September 1973, age 31), Héctor Gallego (Colombian priest who disappeared in Panama, age 28), and Ivan Betancourt (doctor in letters from the Buenaventura University in Bogotá). Betancourt was born July 28, 1940, and was martyred near Jutigalpa in the diocese of Olancho, June 23, 1975. All were aware that they were giving their lives for Christ the Liberator, and they are as much saints of our Church as were the martyrs of the Mediterranean during the first three centuries.

86. The meeting was held April 23 -30, 1972. The document was published in *Signos de liberación* (Lima: CEP, 1973), "I Encuentro latinoamericano de cristianos por el socialismo," ("The First Latin American Meeting of Christians for Socialism"), pp. 238- 43; more widely with all of the documents by Editorial Siglo XXI (Buenos Aires, 1974). Cf. Gonzalo Arroyo, "Católicos de izquierda en América latina," *Mensaje* 191 (1970): 369 - 72.

87. Materials from the meeting will be published in Mexico. The impact in Mexico is evaluated in articles by Vicente Leñero, "Teología de la liberación," *Excelsior* (Mexico), and reproduced in *Christus* 479 (1975):62- 70.

88. This meeting, August 18 - 25, began to rectify the disencounter with Black theology —as seen in Freire, Assmann, Bodipo, and Cone, *A Symposium on Black Theology and the Latin American Theology of Liberation* (Salamanca: Ediciones Sígueme, 1974), the result of a meeting sponsored by the World Council of Churches, “A Symposium on Black Theology and Latin American Theology of Liberation” —since there was a productive dialogue between the Latin American, Black, feminists, and Chicano theologians. The discussion centered on the main contradictions: “center-periphery,” and “United States (Empire) and Latin America (Neocolony).”

89. Orlando Fals Borda, *Ciencia propia y colonialismo intelectual* (Mexico: Editorial Nuestro Tiempo, 1970), especially “¿Es posible una sociología de la liberación?” pp. 22 - 32.

90. *Revista de filosofía latinoamericana. Liberación y cultura* (Bueno Aires), in which liberation philosophers are collaborating. Editorial Bonum (Buenos Aires) has published various works by these philosophers. Of special importance is the work by Ricaurte Soler, *Clase y Nación en Hispanoamérica, Siglo XIX* (Panama: Ediciones de la Revista Tareas, 1975).

91. Some of these aspects were indicated by Hugo Assmann, “Iglesia y proyecto histórico,” *Teología, Iglesia, y Política* (Madrid, 1973), pp. 137 - 58.