

A New Ideology: The Theology of Liberation

When informed that the theology of liberation would be discussed at the next national meeting of the Catholic Theological Society of America, the president of that society replied that it was not a good idea: the fad would have blown away by the time of the convention. Andrew Greeley, another trend-spotter, thought worse—that liberation theology was a fraud, nothing but justification for violence. European theologians saw some good in liberation theology but wanted to spiritualize it. John Paul II on his way to Santo Domingo was quoted as saying that liberation theology was no theology at all.

To those who watched the theological scene in the United States in the late 1960s and through the 1970s, such comments were not unusual. They were heard about a variety of trends and movements. Every eighteen months a wave of enthusiasm for a "new" idea swept through theological schools and journals. Depending on when one entered the scene, one encountered Teilhard de Chardin on evolutionary thought, or Dietrich Bonhoeffer on discipleship, Harvey Cox on the secular city, Van Buren and Altizer on the death of God, Moltmann on hope, Metz on violence, or a variety of experts on Eastern Christianity. Fads that were purported to be theories remained in the theological consciousness as partial insights or bad dreams. Five years after intense interest was shown in the death of God "movement," Thomas Hamilton was able to attract only a handful of persons to a session on the subject at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Religion.

The fact is that theology of liberation is not a fad. It was conceived in the mid-1960s and is now a full-fledged adolescent with adult intuitions and a strongly developing body. Despite gossip from the right that the theology of liberation was condemned at the Latin American bishops' meeting at Puebla in 1979, the ideology of liberation was reaffirmed by the bishops. John Paul II himself used much the same sort of language in later speeches in Mexico and Rome, and in his encyclical *Redemptor Hominis*.(1)

The creation of original religious thought in Latin America came as a surprise to most North American and European intellectuals.(2) They had grown accustomed to seeing little but derivative religious or philosophical thought in Latin America. Latin Americans either used translations of French or German, sometimes Dutch or Italian, works or they wrote their own manuals, closely copying European models of thought.

Importance

The number of books and magazines contributing to the development of liberation thought continues to grow.(3) Orbis Books, the major publisher of liberation thought in English, alone has produced seventy volumes, and this for an audience mostly in the U.S.A. and Canada. Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* has gone through seventeen printings in English alone and is

to be found in bookstores in most prominent North American universities.(4) Gustavo Gutiérrez's *A Theology of Liberation* has sold over 65,000 copies in the U.S. edition.(5) Further, many North American theological schools, Catholic and Protestant, routinely include materials from liberation theology in their courses.

Latin American theology also has an ever stronger influence in other Third World regions. There theologians have been encouraged to follow the lead of the Latin Americans and create religious thought drawn from their own socio-cultural context. Bonds, too, are being formed among theologians of the Third World.(6)

In Latin America the theology of liberation furnishes an intellectual system that has been influential at both the top and the bottom. It has served in a loose way as the major intellectual system behind many of the national and regional church statements. It took a more direct place center stage at the Puebla conference. There it supplied many of the core ideas, especially those expressed in part two, on the content and implications of evangelization. But liberation thought has been used as well by many (certainly not all) persons involved with grassroots Christian communities, a topic that will be discussed in the next chapter.

For many in the Latin American church the theology of liberation is more than an academic intellectual system: it is their ideology. This ideology provides a worldview and leads to pastoral and sometimes political consequences. It is an ideology in the technical sense of combining an intellectual system with values. The theology of liberation proposes goals for society, and in doing so becomes a distinct type of ideology.(7)

However, and this is important, for many, especially Latin American bishops, liberation thought is not ideology in the usual sense of the term. Yes, it is visionary thinking; its founders speak explicitly about utopia. But it is not integrated assertions, theories, and aims constituting a socio-political system.

Therein lies much of the difficulty outsiders experience about liberation thought. The theology of liberation has an ontology, a logic, a methodology, a psychology, and an ethic that serve as a foundation for an ideology. But for most the theology of liberation does not have a socio-cultural program beyond preference for a "third way" or for the "socialist" option. At Puebla many of the bishops were saying, "*Ni capitalismo, ni comunismo.*" What then? "That is for others to say; we do not have a program; we are not politicians or political scientists."

This aspect is important because, as we shall see, the match-up between the ideology of the church and that of the military is quite uneven. The military in many countries, because of its doctrine of national security, has an integrated system of assertions, theories, and aims that constitute a socio-cultural system. The church does not.

Apart from the question of ideology, the theology of liberation offers a vivid insight into the way that many Latin American church-related persons think about the church and the world, the way they reconstruct the world. That worldview may or may not be the "right" way to conceive reality but the thinking is a fact that others, especially political agents, have to deal with.

Thus, the shift in Latin American theology becomes a matter of importance to political elites, proponents of the status quo, the "marginalized" masses, and to transnational interests, especially multinational corporations and First World leaders, for the dominant ideology of the Latin American church is directed to macro-sociological concerns as well. Indeed, as currently taught, the theology of liberation is strongly opposed to what are perceived as the interests of North America, Europe, and Japan. The theology of liberation points an accusatory finger at the First World.

Anyone who wants to understand the theology of liberation should be aware of two cautions. First, liberation theology is not a monolithic Latin American theology. Given the vastness of the region, the difficulties in communication, and the rapid-breaking development of liberation thought, it is difficult for outsiders to know who among Latin American theologians are to be relied on as authentic representatives of liberation theology. Is José Comblin to be considered a theologian of liberation? Are the theologians of the liberation of the people (*pueblo*) to be numbered in the liberation camp? No, says historian of the theology of liberation, Mexican Jesuit Roberto Oliveros.⁽⁸⁾ Indeed theologians of liberation find it increasingly necessary to define their position against other Latin Americans who do not fully share their views.

There are other currents of thought in Latin American theology and some, notably Comblin's thinking about the national security state, have influenced bishops and indeed other theologians. But the theology of liberation is by far the most influential and representative movement in Latin American religious thought. That is true for the historical Latin American Protestant churches as well as the Catholic Church.

The other caution is that liberation thought should not be reified beyond its true measure. It is obvious on reflection but worth repeating that the theology of liberation has not been internalized fully by church leaders or pastoral ministers, clerical or lay. Like all incomplete ideologies, theology of liberation is at times strongly unified and dynamic, but at other times parts of the doctrine become inoperative or are forgotten. Thus, Latin American liberationists pay considerably more attention to "external domination" by other countries than to "internal colonialism" within Latin America, though both evils have been condemned and they are seen as intertwined.

Origins

In their efforts to show that their theology is truly and thoroughly Latin American, some of the active originators or champions of liberation thought have been careful to point out that their theology is not conciliar (Vatican II), meaning not European, or even postconciliar in the sense of being an application of Vatican II. Their writings, especially that of Roberto Oliveros, give at times the impression that liberation theology owes no debts. But however distinct liberation theology may be from traditional theology, both Catholic and Protestant liberation theologies develop from some clearly identifiable sources.⁽⁹⁾

On the Catholic side, liberation theology was influenced heavily by the social teaching of the church commencing with Leo XIII, modern European theology, Vatican II, and the CELAM conference at Medellín. These are influences that lead some if not all current liberationists to

where they are. The first three events or movements are closely related and at times appear to be seamless. The last, the Medellín conference, was as much influenced by liberation thought as that thought was influenced by it.

The phenomenon of modern Catholic social teaching is clearly identifiable but not always well understood. One source of misunderstanding is that readers, especially untrained theologians (including bishops), have tended to give the doctrine an absolute quality, much as they did to the arguments of medieval scholastic thought. But Catholic social teaching has evolved. Popes since Leo XIII have taken progressively wider or stronger stances on social and political issues. In fact, some of the later papal teaching contravenes or contradicts earlier teaching. Thus, Leo's statement that socialism must be "utterly rejected" was modified by later popes who saw values in the practice of socialism and in cooperation with socialists in the pursuit of social justice.

This misunderstanding of the evolutionary character of Catholic social thought leads astray those who rely on older positions. This is especially true of the military in Argentina, Brazil, and Chile. In those countries military ideologues incorporate a "Catholic integralism" into their military doctrines. These military doctrines not only cite positions taken from a European context of seventy or a hundred years ago but ignore the consistent and strong stands of the church against the excesses of capitalism.

What is called Catholic social teaching is found mainly in papal encyclicals and discourses. Much of the content of the teaching is not new: the fathers of the church and the great scholastics expounded most of the principles. It is generally agreed that "Catholic social doctrine" as a coherent modern enterprise begins with Leo XIII.(10)

Leo created a dramatic beginning for modern social teaching with the issuance of the first great social encyclical. Sensing the mood he was about to create, Leo entitled the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* ("of new things"). The encyclical created a sensation in 1891. Much of it reads as fairly tame now, although there still are some surprises, such as strong statements against the very rich.

Rerum Novarum pictured the socio-economic situation as one in which workers had been given over to the callousness of employers and the greed of competition. A few very rich have inordinate power over all the rest. Leo, though, rejects socialism as the solution. Of course, the socialism he had in mind does not embrace the myriad forms of socialism practiced in various countries today. Socialism is "utterly" rejected by Leo because private ownership accords with the law of nature.

Likewise, *Rerum Novarum* rejects class struggle: different classes are to live in harmony with one another. They who have money should give what they do not need to the poor. Leo sees this as a duty in charity rather than justice. This aspect of Catholic social teaching will grow much more pointed and forceful by the time of John XXIII and Paul VI. In contemporary social teaching one will find nothing like the statements of Leo about poverty and justice, such as: "In God's sight poverty is no disgrace. In fact, God calls the poor 'blessed.' Such reflections will keep the rich from pride and will cheer the afflicted, inclining the former to generosity and the latter to tranquil resignation."(11) Sentiments like that make contemporary theologians and activists wince. But

there is nothing better than such statements to point out the evolutionary and dialectical character of modern social teaching. Its changing character confuses the uninitiated and can be manipulated to bolster reactionary opportunists, but the evolutionary and dialectical method will foreshadow the method and the exploratory character of liberation theology.

Leo's greatest achievement was probably his concern for distributive justice. He demanded that workers share in the benefits they helped to create. For the Carnegies, Mellons, Pullmans, and Krupps of the industrial world, this was revolutionary and unacceptable thinking. For the working class it became a rallying call that stimulated the drive to unionization, better working conditions, and a greater share in benefits, including pensions.

Leo's stand had its greatest effect in the United States and parts of Europe. The church stood clearly on the side of the working class. As late as the early 1950s there were twenty-eight U.S. labor institutes with formal ties to Catholic universities. A few labor movements of Catholic inspiration or participation appeared in Latin America, notably in Venezuela, Colombia, and Costa Rica. But Catholic social teaching remained virtually unknown in Latin America until the stirrings of Vatican II.

Pius XI issued the second great social encyclical, *Quadragesimo Anno*, on the fortieth anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*. He reinforced themes of *Rerum Novarum*, but 1931 furnished a somewhat new situation. It was the second year of the great depression. The concentration of wealth had become an even graver problem.

One senses the threat of the Russian revolution and the "menace of socialism" in Pius's encyclical. But, following the lead of English and German Catholic intellectuals, he also questions capitalism as a system. For one thing, he is much more sensitive than Leo to the question of private property. Right is not the same thing as use. And the right of ownership is not absolute. Thus, "a man's superfluous income is not entirely left to his own discretion."(12)

Plus strongly criticizes capitalists who make excessive profits and pay bare subsistence wages to their workers. Again Leo's theme of distributive justice appears, only this time the teaching is stronger and more concrete. Pius calls for just distribution of profits and for humane working conditions. He discusses the criteria for a just wage, a theme that would be explored for years by Catholic intellectuals in the U.S.A. and Europe. He encourages social legislation. Workers must be allowed to be free to join unions, though at the same time Pius warns that workers have obligations in justice and have no right to demand all the profits.

Many tend to forget or overlook the strength of Pius's criticism of capitalism. He finds too much wealth and economic domination in the hands of a few, giving them excess power. One sentence alone will give a sense of the depth of his conviction: "The whole of economic life has become hard, cruel, and relentless in a ghastly manner."(13)

With Pius XI, the position of the church on socialism begins to shift. Pius perceives that socialism has changed in the forty years since *Rerum Novarum*. The communistic form must be rejected but there is a "mitigated socialism" that has some affinity with the principles of Christianity. Third

World theologians today carry the argument further and argue that some forms of socialism have greater affinity to the principles of Christianity than do any other known forms of political economy. But Pius was not ready for that. Instead, he says, "No one can be at the same time a sincere Catholic and a true socialist." (14) Nonetheless, the ecclesiastical perception of socialism is changing.

Pius anticipates liberation theology in another way. Probably for the first time the church sees sin as collectivized. In modern industrial life, injustice and fraud take place under "the common name of a corporate firm so that no one need take individual responsibility." (15) The Latin American bishops at Medellín and Puebla spoke forcefully about institutionalized injustices and collective sin. This represents a major shift in traditional Catholic (and Protestant Evangelical) thinking: Catholics almost uniformly refused to recognize anything more than individual injustice and sin.

One of the most vigorous advocates of the social teaching of the church was Pius XII, whose pontificate bridged the era from mid-depression to 1958. Yet one is hard pressed to isolate major statements. Only two of his encyclicals deal with social justice -- *Summi Pontificatus* and *Mystici Corporis* -- and they treat only selected aspects of it. Instead of the grand statement, Pius XII was the master of frequent statements on important occasions. He made superlative use of modern communications within the papal framework. As one indication of the contributions that he made to modern social teaching, Guerry's *Social Doctrine of the Catholic Church* has some sixty references to Pius's teaching. (16)

Perhaps Pope Pius XII's major contribution was to delineate more clearly many aspects of the social teaching of the church and to lay the groundwork for John XXIII's and Paul VI's great social encyclicals. One of the areas that Pius XII elucidated more clearly was that of the social role of private property. Property is seen as playing a vital function for family and social life, as well as the more commonly emphasized personal role. The force of his teaching is shown by such statements as: "Whether serfdom comes from the power of private capital or from the state, the effect is the same." (17)

John XXIII brought new vigor to the scene with two major encyclicals and the convocation of Vatican II. All three events expressed a new self-understanding of the church and opened much wider horizons for the church-world thematic. John opened floodgates in the Latin American church. His teaching and that of Vatican II foreshadow the theology of liberation. Not only will the themes introduced by John and Vatican II be resumed by Latin American theologians, but a new methodology emerges, one that will become crucial for the efforts of liberation theologians.

John's encyclicals *Mater et Magistra* and *Pacem in Terris* (which was introduced at the United Nations) repeat familiar teaching about workers and unions. But John spoke also about the international order that was changing drastically. New nations were springing into being at the rate of practically three a year.

John spoke about just wages and strikes as did previous popes. But he also discussed economic aid, the use of farm surpluses at the international level, and in a forceful statement asked the well

fed to look after the undernourished "without imperialistic aggrandizement." He called for the state to take a more active role, and even talked about state ownership. Many of the things he said sounded like favorable comments on distinctive features in some socialist countries. In *Pacem in Terris* there is no condemnation of communism or socialism. Indeed John distinguishes between philosophies and movements. Catholics and socialists, both striving for social justice, could meet and cooperate.

Persons in the Third World and in non-Catholic churches noted the change of tone in *Pacem in Terris*. The encyclical goes beyond the Catholic world; it addresses all Christians and all persons of good will. In so doing, John won the hearts of many-and raised the hackles of some conservatives and industrialists.

John also opened a new topic: he warned against colonialism and new forms of imperialism. Whatever implications there are for the developed countries remain to be discussed by the churches of the U.S.A. and Europe. By contrast, the church in Latin America has made colonialism and imperialism (dependency) central to its analysis.

Vatican II was the great event of the Catholic Church in the last four centuries. One may not agree with it, but one cannot ignore it. It has been seen by many theologians, Catholic and Protestant, as the church in the process of reforming itself. Social scientists would refer to the process as modernization, revitalization, adaptation, or organizational reform.

The process of reform was begun by describing carefully the situation of the church and that of the world. Then the council searched sacred scripture for the primitive or developed images it needed for itself and for its role in the world. Thus, the church no longer simply emphasized the hierarchical aspects of authority but returned to thinking of itself as "the people of God," "the common priesthood," a "royal nation" -- all images of shared authority.

In the longest and most influential document of the council, *Gaudium et Spes* (The Church in the Modern World), a "new" methodology is introduced. Many theologians now believe that the methodology of *Gaudium et Spes* is every bit as important as its content. The methodology used in the document turns traditional theology on its head. Instead of proceeding in the timehonored fashion, discussing theological or biblical principles and then applying them to a present-day situation, *Gaudium et Spes* reverses the process: it begins with a careful analysis of the de facto situation, then turns to sacred scripture and theology for reflection on that situation, and finally, as a third step, makes pastoral applications. Theological reflection thus becomes the second, not the first, step.

Tradition, established theology, and the magisterium of the church had been used as the starting point in previous papal teaching, other Vatican II documents, and in traditional theology. *Gaudium et Spes* plunges right into the current world situation. It was almost the last of the schemata to be developed by the council. It proved to be the bridge into the future.

In the description of the church in the world, *Gaudium et Spes* makes use of social and behavioral sciences. Previously philosophy, the preferred "handmaiden," guided the theological enterprise.

The church now searches the given socio-cultural situation for the "signs of the times," to hear the voice of God in them.

In *Gaudium et Spes* the church also returns to sacred scripture more directly than it was accustomed to doing. It thereby employs a more thorough hermeneutic -- that is, a contemporary search for the meaning of the world and of world events in the light of the scriptures.

As far as content goes, in *Gaudium et Spes* the church again condemns strongly the concentration of wealth and power for the benefit of a few. The church also expands its teaching on private ownership. For North Americans, no point of the social teaching of the church is harder to grasp - or perhaps better said, no segment of that teaching is less known than that on private property.

The conciliar fathers at Vatican II said that the traditional right of private ownership needs to be balanced by the right inherent in various forms of public ownership. Moreover, a person's lawful possessions should be seen as common property "in the sense that they should accrue to the benefit not only of themselves but of others." The clarity and force of the teaching can be seen in two further statements: "The right to have a share of earthly goods sufficient for oneself and one's family belongs to everyone If someone is in extreme necessity, such a one has the right to take from the riches of others what he or she needs."(18)

The momentum of Vatican II was not lost on Paul VI, at least at the beginning of his pontificate, which coincided with the last two years of Vatican II. He issued two highly important documents, *Populorum Progressio* and *Octogesima Adveniens*.

In 1967, a year before the Medellín conference, *Populorum Progressio* rejected many of the basic precepts of capitalism, including unrestricted private property, the unbridled profit motive, and reliance on free trade in the international economy. Paul VI emphasizes very strongly the right, in justice, of poorer nations to aid by wealthier nations. There is at least a suggestion that, in extreme situations, the poor are justified in a violent solution to their problems. That statement or interpretation was modified by Paul on his arrival at Medellín.

He describes the modern world: the rich are getting richer, and the poor, poorer -- an analysis even more valid in the 1980s than it was in 1967. It was also the type of analysis that would be echoed at Medellín. Paul looks beyond poverty to its causes: systems of modern economics are widening the gap between rich and poor. And this gap is perceived by the poor. Why? Because the spread of modern communications has brought with it a revolution of rising expectations. "One cannot condemn such abuses [of liberal capitalism] too strongly because the economy should be at the service of humankind."(19)

Octogesima Adveniens, an apostolic letter issued in 1971 on the eightieth anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*, covers a number of topics. Among the more important themes treated is socialism. Paul again distinguishes between movements (or regimes) and the original ideology of socialism. Socialism is no longer rejected. Instead careful judgment is called for. And socialism must safeguard such values as freedom, responsibility, and openness to the spiritual dimension of the human person.

A review of the social teachings of the church shows a number of changes and advances. The church begins to employ a new methodology. The perspective has changed: no longer is it church and world, or the church in the world, but rather the church for the world. This is a major shift. Advances in social teaching place the church at the side of the poor, helping them claim what is theirs. The church also shifts its focus from alleviation of the results of poverty to elimination of the causes of poverty. The church increases its questioning of liberal capitalism and makes a cautious opening to socialism. It is important to keep these changes in mind when attempting to understand the venture undertaken by Latin American liberation theologians.

Methodology

Liberation theology offers Latin America religious leadership groups a new way to do theology. Indeed, some critics have said that the theology of liberation is nothing but methodology and lacks ascertainable content. That criticism is heard less and less as Latin American theologians add more and more flesh to the skeletal beginning made by Gutiérrez and other pioneers.

Liberation theologians have made strong claims that their methodology is new, distinct from traditional theology. This claim is made, in part, to give character, weight, and distinctness to their thought. Whether, in fact, their theological method is new can be debated.

The lines of influence in the creation of the methodology of liberation theology have yet to be untangled by historians. At this time it is enough to say that the conciliar fathers in *Gaudium et Spes*, the architects of Medellín and Puebla, and the liberation theologians themselves consistently follow the same three-step methodology.

The first step is a description of the church in the world. This step involves the use of sociology and economics. And in the case of the Latin Americans at least (in contrast to some originators of feminist or black theology in the U.S.A.), their analysis is structural analysis, deriving in part from class and dependency analysis, a point that will be developed more fully later in this chapter.

Then as a second step comes biblical and doctrinal reflection on the situation described. Thus in the case of Latin America, the teaching of the Bible and of the church led the bishops at Medellín and Puebla and the theologians of liberation to reflect on a society in which justice would prevail. This they describe as a society in which human dignity is respected, the legitimate aspirations of the people are satisfied, personal freedom and access to truth are guaranteed. This type of society, which would correspond to Christian principles, conflicts with what the bishops and theologians perceive in Latin America: they find oppression by power groups, elites. "[These] groups may give the impression of maintaining peace and order, but in truth it is nothing but the continuous and inevitable seed of rebellion and war." (20)

As a third stage, pastoral conclusions follow the biblical and doctrinal reflections. Some conclusions that have consistently appeared in CELAM documents and in the writings of theologians of liberation include defense of the rights of the oppressed, a healthy critical sense of the social situation, promotion of grassroots organizations, a halt to the arms race in Latin

America and in the world, just prices for raw materials, and a denunciation of the machinations of world powers that work against the selfdetermination of weaker powers.

Gutiérrez and other liberation theologians contrast their theology with traditional (largely deductive) theology. They emphasize that their theology is a second act or step, not a first act, as is traditional theology. Liberation theology is elaborated in making reflections on reality; it develops out of praxis (21) This praxis is the core of understanding how liberation theologians conceive their methodology.

Praxis for them is a somewhat vague term with unfixed parameters. At times it refers to the activity of hierarchy, clergy, and other church professionals. At other times it has been made to designate actions of the entire ecclesial community in conformity with the message of the gospel; this is usually referred to as "orthopraxis." Sometimes praxis refers to the conduct of the individual believer within an essentially social dimension.

Praxis is used in a larger sense than it has had from the days of the Greek philosophers, and especially larger than its Marxian usage. Praxis is a way of knowing. It means learning by reflecting on experience. This is exactly how Gutiérrez defines theology: critical reflection on the activity of the church.

It is important to note that this is not a detached reflection by an analyst pouring over facts gathered by academics. The first moment or act for Gutiérrez is charity-doing justice in action; then theology can be practiced as a second act. Juan Luis Segundo is even stronger in drawing out the practical inferences for the doing of this new theology: it cannot be learned, as traditional theology was, behind seminary walls by teachers and students isolated from the day-by-day struggles of the church in the world, meaning especially the poor in the world.

Hence not only does theology have a new meaning; "church" does also. Traditional theology, until Vatican II, had emphasized the church as believers organized in a hierarchical, institutional body. Liberation theology uses both class analysis and biblical analysis. Thus it sees the church and the world in terms of class; within the social classes the poor are the most favored by God. This option for the poor is for liberation theologians a biblical imperative.

The first act or moment of the liberation theologian is action on the part of the poor, on the side of the poor, in the senses of identification, geography, and advocacy. This understanding of theology seems very far from its usual meaning in North America and Europe. In practice liberation theology may not be that distinct, but liberation theologians have found it helpful to define themselves clearly and often in contrast to traditional theology.

The understanding of praxis thus is more specific in liberation theology than a John Dewey philosophy of learning from experience. Liberation theology means learning from the experience of the poor.

Theology of Liberation and Traditional Theology

Until the Vatican II era traditional theology formed the basis for the education of the Latin American clergy and laity. Neoscholasticism ruled the Catholic theological world ever since the sixteenth century. It had its supremacy reinforced by Leo XIII at the end of the nineteenth century, when he issued his letter *Aeterni Patris* reestablishing Scholasticism as the philosophical and theological system for the church and mandating Thomistic Scholasticism for seminary education.

Theologians and philosophers outside and inside the Catholic Church acknowledge the greatness of Thomas Aquinas's intellectual system. For years followers of the Great Book Program read major sections of Thomas's *Summa Theologiae*. That work is regarded as the greatest of medieval theology. Without a knowledge of the *Summa* or a similar monument of Scholastic thought, one would be hard put to understand either medieval or Reformation thought. However, enshrining one school of thought as *the* intellectual system of the church was a profound mistake.

Liberation thought was not the first to point out the deficiencies of Scholasticism, but liberation theology has become one of the most effective theological expressions done in conscious contrast to traditional theology. How far the apple fell from the tree is a valid question: despite the protestations of Oliveros and others that the theology of liberation is new and distinct, liberation theology deeply roots itself in neo-scholasticism.

Traditional theology and liberation theology mirror many of the cleavages in the old and new Latin American church. Several characteristics mark Scholasticism as distinct from liberation (and many other types of modern) theology: Scholasticism is "eternal," ahistorical, essentialist (as opposed to existentialist), theocentric, hierarchical, and feudal. By contrast liberation theologians characterize their thought as evolutionary, historical, existentialist, christocentric, communitarian, participatory, and egalitarian.

Many divergences of thought in the Latin American church center around the person of French philosopher Jacques Maritain. A neo-scholastic, he influenced several generations of Latin American intellectuals and Catholic Actionists. Latin Americans read him in French or in translations of his numerous works. And he indirectly affected Latin Americans through teachers and writers such as Fernando Martínez Paz of Argentina and Tristão de Athayde (Alceu Amoroso Lima) of Brazil.

Maritain captures well the spirit of traditional Catholic thought. Writing about Aristotle's thought, the basis of Scholasticism, Maritain stated:

To extract the truth latent in Platonism was the mighty reform effected by Aristotle. Aristotle successfully took to pieces Plato's system, adapted to the exigencies of reality the formal principles he had discovered and misapplied, reducing his sweeping perspectives within limits imposed by a sublime common sense, and thus saved everything vital in his master's thought. He did more: he founded for all time the true philosophy. If he saved whatever was true and valuable, not only in Plato, but in all the ancient thinkers of Greece, and brought to successful conclusion the great work of synthesis which Plato had attempted, it was because he definitively secured the attainment of reality by the human

intellect. His work was not only the natural fruit of Greek wisdom purified from Plato's mistakes and the alien elements included in Platonism; it contained, completely formed and potentially capable of unlimited growth, the body of the universal human philosophy.

Then [Thomas Aquinas] welded Aristotelian thought into a powerful and harmonious system; he explored its principles, cleared its conclusions, enlarged its horizons; and, if he rejected nothing, he added much, enriching it with the immense wealth of Latin Christian tradition, restoring in their proper places many of Plato's doctrines, on certain fundamental points opening up entirely new perspectives, and thus giving proof of a philosophic genius as mighty as Aristotle himself. Finally, and this was his supreme achievement, when by his genius as a theologian he made use of Aristotle's philosophy as the instrument of the sacred science, he raised philosophy above itself by submitting it to the illumination of a higher light, which invested its truth with a radiance more divine than human.(22)

In brief, Maritain and neo-scholastics in general believed that Aristotle and Aquinas gave the church an intellectual system that was established in its essentials and needed only to be understood and expanded, mostly in nonessential aspects.

Maritain represents a frame of mind that has disappeared from most Catholic seminaries and universities in Latin America. But that traditional caste of mind continues a vestigial existence in right-wing Catholics of Brazil, Argentina, Chile and Central America who joined *Tradición, Familia, y Patria* (Tradition, Family, and Fatherland). And it continues among military men who formed or passed on the doctrine of national security. Brazilian and Argentinian presidents and military commanders regularly make appeals for order and stability on the basis of Catholic integralism (Western Christian civilization vaguely undergirded by Scholasticism).

Changes in Latin American theology and practice are profoundly rooted in advances that were taking place in European Catholic thought. These changes multiplied and created new expressions of Catholic theology especially during the 1950s and '60s. The theology behind Vatican II was taking shape in Catholic universities and departments of theology at state universities in France, Germany, Holland, and Belgium. At precisely this period Latin American bishops and religious superiors sent off some of their brightest talent to European schools for theological training. A significant convergence was taking place of the Latin American church and new European thought.

Gustavo Gutiérrez, who would become a central figure in liberation theology, enrolled as a student in philosophy at Louvain and then in the school of theology at Lyons. Both institutions helped lead the church toward new (or revived) forms of philosophical and theological expression. Gutiérrez experienced at first hand what leading intellectuals of the Catholic Church were going through: the shift from neo-scholasticism to contemporary European theology with a variety of approaches.

What Gutiérrez heard or read at Louvain and Lyons was the fruit of many years of effort on the part of Catholic and Protestant intellectuals in Europe. For a long time their efforts had been marked by a return to sources: Catholics and Protestants alike searched the scriptures and the

writings of the fathers of the church. These biblical and patristic endeavors developed into full-scale movements. The Ecole Biblique was founded in Jerusalem before World War I; the Institutum Biblicum opened in Rome. Numerous archeological explorations began. Interest in biblical languages revived and journals devoted to biblical and patristic studies multiplied.

A parallel exploration into modern philosophy began. A number of Catholic and Protestant intellectuals searched for philosophical approaches that could be Christian without being Scholastic. They favored an approach that was historical, acknowledging Aristotle and Aquinas as important figures in the history of Western thought but not putting them dead center as did Maritain.

At Louvain Gutiérrez encountered a school of neo-Thomism cautiously exploring contemporary philosophy. Students heard moderate and historically-minded neo-scholastics. And they were introduced to phenomenology and other forms of modern philosophy. It was an era of exploration. Creativity and search were even more evident at the Louvain theological center. A number of thinkers who influenced the progress of contemporary theology taught at Louvain: Bede Rigaux, O.F.M., in biblical exegesis, Roger Aubert in church history, Philippe Delhaye in ecclesiology, and above all Gustave Thils in theological methodology.

The faculty at Lyons matched the intellectual stimulation of Louvain and presented Gutiérrez with additional perspectives from modern theology. Theologians there suffered some of the frustrations following in the wake of *Humanae Generis*, an attempt by Rome to dampen efforts at nonscholastic theologizing. But Roman efforts did not weaken for long the vitality of such journals as *Nouvelle Théologie*, emanating from the Jesuit faculty at Lyons. Pioneers of modern Catholic theology at Lyons, such as Henri de Lubac, continued their search for new biblical knowledge and their study of modern philosophy.

That liberation theology is profoundly rooted in European theological experience can be seen in Gutiérrez's *A Theology of Liberation*. Several hundred references are made to works of Yves Congar, Gustave Thils, Karl Rahner, and a whole panoply of European intellectuals-theologians and philosophers alike. It would be a cruel joke for Latin American theologians of liberation not to acknowledge their European heritage.

Besides differences in the perspectives already described, liberation and traditional theology differ in their starting points. Traditional theologians begin by examining scriptural or traditional Christian teaching. For liberation theologians the starting point is the poor-more concretely stated, the experience of the poor in a history that is at the same time religious and secular, individual and collective, embracing the worlds of consciousness and external forces. This theme will be elaborated in a later section.

The tools that liberation theologians use to examine and understand experience-the experience of the poor and the efforts of the church in their behalf-do not come primarily from philosophy but from the social sciences. Here then is another difference between traditional theology and liberation theology. There is a good deal less emphasis on philosophy in liberation thought. Instead social science becomes its chief auxiliary in theological analysis.

One would be misled to understand "social science" here to mean primarily social and economic statistics or sociological and economic theories as they typically are taught in the classrooms of American universities.(23) Beyond the facts of the Latin American situation are sociological constructs that liberation theologians feel are crucial in explaining how Latin America is currently evolving. In the main, there are two such constructs: class analysis and dependency theory. The theologians began by stating facts of Latin American underdevelopment: there are great numbers of poor persons and "nonpersons" (persons who do not participate fully or at all in the benefits of the system) and, relatively speaking, the poor are becoming poorer. Then the theologians (often pressed by other Latin American intellectuals) needed to explain why the situation is what it is.

For this explanation they engaged in discussion with their colleagues in the social sciences. Of course, there is more than one explanation taught in Latin America. (One may hear Ricardo Ffrench-Davis explain the Latin American economic picture in terms similar to those of Milton Friedman, from whom FfrenchDavis learned his economics.) But the prevailing view in sociology and economics in Latin America leans toward class analysis and dependencytheory.

Class analysis and dependency theory go hand in hand. As already mentioned, the failure of development models to benefit the Latin American masses brought dependency theory to the forefront in Latin American intellectual circles. Dependency theory sees development and underdevelopment as necessarily connected: they are complementary parts of the unity of the capitalist system. Underdeveloped countries -- countries on the periphery of the global economic system -- are deluded if they think they have the possibility of development within the existing capitalist system. These countries will always remain dependent on the developed countries. Besides the iron laws of the international marketplace, which tip the balance in favor of the developed countries, especially the U.S.A., other mechanisms of control are the multinational corporations and the international banking community. The latter includes both public entities, such as the International Monetary Fund, and private interests, such as Chase Manhattan, Citibank, and the Bank America.

Class analysis explains that this dominance is made possible through the cooperation of small groups of local citizens-elitist oligarchies. Both new (industrial) and old (farming and ranching) oligarchies are intimately tied in with the world capitalist system and help it run. An oligarchy holds national political power or controls it sufficiently to conform to its interests. Often the interests of the military and the national oligarchy coincide. (The one exception was Peru where dependency analysis led the military to believe that the existence of the landholding oligarchy created an incendiary situation that threatened national security from within the country.)

In the view of class analysis the oligarchies form an almost seamless international upper and upper-middle social class. They adopt cultural characteristics of the developed nations and disdain their own indigenous cultures. Whether seen on Lexington or Collins avenues or in Miraflores, Las Lomas de San Isidro, or Chapinero, they all have the same look about them.

The fact that this analysis derives from Karl Marx and his followers does not deter liberation theologians. They accept these explanations as factual or at least as better explanations of reality than those provided by structural functionalism in American sociology or Keynesian economics.

For many Latin Americans, such theories are bankrupt.

Nonetheless for many North Americans the fact that liberation analysis is neo-Marxist is a serious matter.(24) In response Latin American moderates have pointed out several factors that caution against overhasty condemnation. First, one may borrow parts of Marxist analysis without being a Marxist, much less a communist. Secondly, Marx is recognized by even non-Marxist sociologists as a great sociologist. He called attention to social class as a factor in social life in a way that no other sociologist had done. In this and other regards, Marx is one of the pioneers of theoretical and empirical sociology. Thirdly, American sociologists and social journalists have done innumerable studies based on class. In fact, class analysis of a particular kind is regarded as a kind of illness many American sociologists suffer from, a kind of adolescent fixation that inhibits consideration of other factors, such as ethnicity. Fourthly, one is invited by Latin Americans to see whether class analysis and dependency theory do not in fact explain a great deal.

By the same token dependency explanations of the Latin American situation and *dependencia* as a general theory have serious limitations and weaknesses.(25) As a theory, *dependencia* does not explain many of the social and economic processes in the history of Latin America, as many social scientists and historians have pointed out.(26) Moreover -- and for some this is the most important critique -- *dependencia* analysts have failed to formulate alternative strategies for social change.(27) In sum, as John Browett remarks, the dependency perspective "provides some understanding of the basic causes of the contradictions within capitalism but does little to generate proposals for their elimination."(28)

Meanwhile many liberation theologians continue to use -- uncritically -- dependency perspectives in reflecting on the Latin American situation. Although many of their social science colleagues have attempted to move beyond *dependencia* as an all-encompassing theory, liberation theologians prefer to moralize about *dependencia* as the central "reality" of Latin America.(29)

A final difference between liberation theology and traditional theology is the choice of audience to which it is addressed. Traditional theology addresses itself to other theologians or to students of theology. This is nowhere more evident than in Thomas Aquinas. His *Summa Theologiae* begins with questions from other notable theologians or his own students; his main argumentations and responses to questions are addressed to the same audience. Most academic theology is done in the same manner. When Norman Pittinger, who has published fifty theological works, was asked who was the interlocutor he had in mind when he wrote his books, he replied it was other theologians. Did he have the poor in mind? "No."(30)

Liberation theologians have the poor in mind when they do their theology. More precisely they have the nonperson in mind. By this they mean what they call the "marginalized," those pushed to the margins of society by culturally embedded discrimination. These are the "invisible" persons who have been treated until recently as if they did not exist: women, blacks, the urban and rural poor.

To its credit, modern European theology has attempted to shift its focus from other theologians to nonbelievers. Historians of contemporary theology point out that European theologians, such as

Rahner and Congar, who dominated the thinking of Vatican II, attempted to modernize church thinking. But for them treating the church in the modern world meant addressing the questions of science and the difficulties of belief in the post-Enlightenment world.

To Latin American theologians such questions are perhaps interesting, but they are not primarily their questions. It is not the nonbeliever but rather the nonperson who is the subject to be addressed. Such is the extent of this difference that Latin American theologians were shocked by the "callousness" of Harvey Cox's speculation in *The Secular City* about life in an ultratechnical society, as Oliveros reports.(31)

Latin American theologians believe that theology should be a response to the questions of the people. As Robert McAfee Brown comments, today it is the poor, the "nonpersons," who are asking the questions.(32) Basic questions in theology are approached very differently as a result of differing perspectives. Classic theologians ask about proofs for the existence of God in an age of science. Liberation theologians ask, Does that God interest us?

As Juan Luis Segundo mentions, there is a long tradition of spending a great deal of time on the "first questions" (the existence and nature of God).(33) It was not unknown in schools of theology for professors to spend a whole semester on the first two questions of the *Summa*. Such a preoccupation is deplored by many Latin Americans, one of whom is quoted by Segundo as saying that he wishes he could punch around St. Irenaeus and others who wasted so much time debating questions about the "substantial nature" of God.

In contrast to traditional theology, Segundo points out that there is a fact of life that appears more decisive: "among Christians [in Latin America] we find a real lack of interest in the problem of God. If Vatican II had said that there were three Gods, who would care?" He asks, What does God say about himself in the New Testament? God's "statements for the most part deal with us human beings, our lives, and how to transform them. A much smaller set of statements deal with God. But even these passages show [God] operating in our lives and transforming our history." Thus Segundo hints that "God appears on the human horizon in the process of transforming [human] existence from within." He goes on to argue the radical proposition that "our God is fashioned partly in the image of the social reality of Christian Western society."(34)

This is not the place to develop further such ideas. It is more important to note the difference in approach and style that arises from the difference in audiences that traditional and liberation theologians have in mind. Traditional theology, addressing the educated Christian on the verge of unbelief or the upper middleclass unbeliever, begins with questions about the existence of God. Liberation theology, having in mind the questions of the poor and marginalized, asks about idolatry: do Christians by their lives present false images of God to others?(35) In this analysis, liberation theologians are developing their thought along the lines of *Gaudium et Spes*, which states: "To the extent that they are deficient in their religious, moral, or social life, Christians must be said to conceal rather than reveal the authentic face of God and religion."(36)

Theologians of Liberation

History will record few single names as giants in liberation theology as one might point to Thomas Aquinas in Scholasticism or Martin Luther in Reformation thought. A number of intellectuals have taken up the work of liberation thought; they have contributed but a part to the larger enterprise. Although theology of liberation was not invented by a committee, it has been the result of cooperative endeavor to an extent previously unknown in Western philosophy or theology.

Because of the cooperation needed and the ad hoc nature of the liberation theology undertaking, communication among the system-builders assumes central importance. Theologians and their colleagues in the biblical and social sciences exchange information, analyses, and definitions through letters, conferences, and publications. One finds contributions to liberation thought in mimeographed position papers as well as published books.

Paulo Freire and Gustavo Gutiérrez have been preeminent in the creation of liberation thought. Their contributions have allowed liberation theology to move along paths it might not have taken without them. Whatever may be the ultimate judgment on the worth of their efforts, they are to date the most representative of liberation thinkers and will be treated at greater length below. If someone is looking for "classics" to read in liberation thought, Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and Gutiérrez's *A Theology of Liberation* cannot be ignored.

Paulo Freire: Conscientization

Not only is the method of creating theology or ideology different in Latin American theology; the method of communicating this ideology is also different. At the core of what many Latin Americans mean when they talk about education as a liberating force is not so much the thought of Gustavo Gutiérrez as that of Paulo Freire.

Freire is better known worldwide than is Gutiérrez. This is due in part to the position Freire occupied at the World Council of Churches, headquartered in Geneva. This position offered him an international platform from which to radiate his influence. Freire's work is widely perceived as a philosophy of education, so his thought appeals to wider audiences—audiences that are less churchy, if not altogether secular. He has been invited on two occasions to lecture for a quarter at the Harvard School of Education. His best-known book, *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, was available at most university bookstores in the United States. It is a book that is used both as text and reference, despite the heavy-going character of its prose and style."⁽³⁷⁾

Unlike Gutiérrez and many of the liberation theologians, Freire did not study in European universities. Nonetheless he was influenced strongly by European and North American writers such as Husserl, Buber, Mounier, Schaff, and Fromm. He also immersed himself in the lives of the poverty-stricken masses of northeast Brazil. Out of both sources, Freire developed a coherent intellectual system and a practical methodology.

As a professor at the University of Recife, his area of interest was history and philosophy of education. What he was searching for was a philosophy and a practical program for training adults to read and write. Together with a number of other young Catholic intellectuals, he joined Catholic Action, thereby becoming involved in adult education.

Freire, though, was interested in far more than functional literacy. He wanted to empower illiterates, to raise their consciousness of their own fatalism -- to conscientize them -- and to motivate them to take charge of their lives to a greater extent. It was no wonder then that the literacy movement was considered revolutionary or that the Brazilian military, when it came to power in 1964, dismantled the movement.

Freire suffered an experience that was to become increasingly common for Catholic intellectuals. He was jailed for two months. He then left for Chile rather than face a series of "preventive" arrests. There he continued his work, this time under U.N. auspices as educational consultant for INRA, an agrarian reform program.

The force of Freire's ideas and methods can be felt in reading his *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Some North Americans feel that his ideas challenge the status quo so strongly and so inevitably that it is better not to conscientize the poor and illiterate. Of forty education majors interviewed at a large state university in the U.S.A., all admired Freire's method but the majority thought the method should not be employed, because of possible social consequences.(38) In effect, better not to tell the poor the truth about themselves.

Freire, of course, would disagree. So would the theologians of liberation. It is only a slight exaggeration to say that their whole effort has been to tell the poor (and the nonpoor) the truth about poverty and disenfranchisement. Freire and the other liberation thinkers also argue against *not* educating oppressors and oppressed. The liberation argument is that education is never neutral. Left to itself, conventional education socializes students into the values and worldview of oppressors.

Like other Brazilians in the early 1960s, Freire worked out for himself an intellectual position about underdevelopment and backwardness. He saw a new era dawning for Brazil, one in which economically there would be greater national development and autonomy, and socio-politically there would be more openness and participation. The process of modernization would tend to divide society into one group that would resist change through paternalism and "massification" and another group that would welcome necessary changes. Freire felt that he and other educators must fit into the second category: they must help to prepare themselves and others for modernization.

Freire viewed traditional literacy training as a mechanism for adjusting the illiterate to a given society. Its methods treated disadvantaged human beings as objects into which superior beings poured knowledge. For Freire this is debasing and dehumanizing. The human person, for him, is not an object but a "subject," one who works upon and changes the world.

Freire proposed a critical, active method that would overcome fatalism and resignation. The critical capacity of the illiterate grows out of discussions about situations that "mean something" to them, and to which they themselves have something to contribute. The teacher serves as facilitator and catalyst for this dialogue.

Freire and his associates developed a core vocabulary out of the de facto life situations of the

rural poor. This varied from region to region so that words and concepts used in programs in Brazil differed from some of those used in Chile. There are stages in the Freire method, but we cannot describe them here in detail. What is important and what has been seized upon in other parts of the world -- and by pioneers in other types of liberation theology, such as black or feminist liberation theology -- is that it is necessary for repressed groupings of persons to reflect on their own cultural, economic, and social situation and to begin to become masters of their own lives. *Conscientization* won a place for itself at the heart of liberation thought.

Gustavo Gutiérrez: Theology of Liberation

Roger Vekemans, in his three-part study of the history of the theology of liberation, examines a number of "antecedents."⁽³⁹⁾ His discussion is probably more confusing than helpful. Vekemans' study makes it appear that the theology of liberation developed out of other currents of thought in some straightline fashion. But Gustavo Gutiérrez and other major architects of the theology of liberation are at pains to point out that they did not pertain to this or that antecedent school of thought.

Nonetheless, theology of liberation has its intellectual debts, some of which are traceable to currents of thought of the 1960s and '70s. Mention of the antecedents of liberation thought helps to picture the color and texture of the intellectual landscape in which the theology of liberation was created. The major currents and themes of those times as they affected Latin America included the theology of revolution, the theology of development, dialogue with Marxists, the theology of hope, and political theology. Most of these themes were more European or North American in terms of major participants, interlocutors, and methodologies. The theology of revolution seemed almost to be a direct funneling of ideas of Richard Shaull of Princeton Theological Seminary and the National Council of Churches to Montevideo and thereafter to other parts of Latin America through ISAL. Most of the intellectual development of the theology of revolution took place in Europe.

In part, it was the extraterritorial nature of these discussions that sparked the beginning of the theology of liberation. Under the urgency of preparation for the forthcoming Medellín conference, Latin American theologians turned to the theme of latinamericanization. The uniqueness of Latin American theology is the burden of this chapter.

The breakthrough occurred when Gustavo Gutiérrez presented a major statement of Latin American thought at the Chimbote conference in July 1968, immediately preceding the Medellín conference. The nucleus of his presentation (published under the title *Hacia una teología de la liberación* the following year) was that it was not development that Latin America needed but liberation.⁽⁴⁰⁾ He saw development as an idea that was promoted by non-Latin Americans, was clearly bankrupt in Latin America, and was not the response called for after meditating on the Latin American situation in the light of sacred scripture and tradition, especially the social justice tradition of the church.

It is sometimes believed that the theology of liberation developed out of the Medellín conference.⁽⁴¹⁾ A first rough sketch of the theology of liberation was presented at the Chimbote

conference, before Medellín, but the formulation of liberation theology began in 1964, when Ivan Illich, then a major catalyst of Latin American thought, organized the meeting in Petrópolis mentioned above. By all accounts Gutiérrez's contribution to that meeting was the most significant theologically. In a paper on the pastoral ministry of the church, Gutiérrez developed the theme of theology as critical reflection on praxis.⁽⁴²⁾ He further reworked and presented that theme for a group of Catholic university movement leaders in Montevideo in February 1967.⁽⁴³⁾ These were the first stages in the elaboration of Gutiérrez's thought.

Another stage came in the mid-1960s when political activists, including a number of convinced Christians, began to take up arms against corrupt governments. The new political awareness, already described, and the "new" definition of the Latin American situation posed by these activists troubled Gutiérrez. They forced him to come to terms with problems that his theology, largely learned in many years of study in Europe, was incapable of even addressing, much less solving.

A further stage in the development of Gutiérrez's formulations can be dated to July 1967. At that time he gave a course on poverty in Montreal. He viewed the poor from a new perspective: they were both a social class and the bearers of God's word.

After presentation of the rough sketch of liberation thought at Chimbote, he continued the elaboration of his thought at an international conference in Cartigny, Switzerland, sponsored by Sodepax. By now Gutiérrez was gaining international attention. His paper for the conference was published in several languages;⁽⁴⁴⁾ an English resumé was issued as *Notes on a Theology of Liberation*.⁽⁴⁵⁾

During the ensuing months Gutiérrez worked diligently on a more elaborate and polished version of his thought. The result was *A Theology of Liberation*. It appeared in 1971 in Spanish and thereafter was translated into many other languages. It is acknowledged as a classic presentation of the theology of liberation. There are many theologies of liberation and many variations within mainline liberation thought, but Gutiérrez's work remains the most representative and the best known.

When lecturing in the United States, which he has done with some frequency, including a semester at Union Theological Seminary, he apologizes that the language he will be speaking is neither English nor Spanish but his own special blend. When speaking of the death of the theologian, a possibility that must be faced by those who take a stand against a violent, entrenched status quo, his fingers play nervously over his face.

By South American standards, Gutiérrez is a "late vocation." Instead of entering the seminary after six years of primary school or even after high school, he entered the school of medicine at the Universidad Nacional San Marcos in Lima. Like many of his classmates, he was active in political groups. Always interested in issues beyond medicine, after five years of medicine he shifted to philosophical and theological studies to prepare for the priesthood. He studied for a semester in Santiago, which offered the best in theological education in Latin America at the time. That best was none too strong, though, and Gutiérrez moved to Europe. First, beginning in 1951,

he studied philosophy and psychology at the Catholic University of Louvain. Then, in 1955, he went to Lyons to study theology. He was ordained in Lima in 1959, and returned to Europe for one semester at the Jesuit Gregorian University in Rome.

Aside from lecture tours to various parts of the world, Gutiérrez has remained in Lima since 1960. There he has been professor of theology at the Catholic University and national advisor for the National Union of Catholic Students. Currently he prefers not to be known as a *profesor universitario*; instead, in responding to the question about what he is doing in Lima, he answers that "I work with the people," and he does theology out of that context.(46)

Other Theologians of Liberation

Many of the other creators of the theology of liberation have had educational experiences similar to those of Gutiérrez. Leonardo Boff, who is best known for his development of liberation christology, pursued higher studies in Europe after doing his basic philosophical and theological studies in Brazil. Boff concentrated his graduate studies in Munich, where he studied with leading contemporary theologians -- Rahner, Scheffczyk, and Fries -- but he also sat in on courses at Louvain, Würzburg, and Oxford.

Hugo Assmann also went to Europe after basic philosophical and theological studies in Brazil. He went to Rome for graduate theology but then studied the social sciences and mass communications at various Latin American universities. The multidisciplinary training of Assmann and many other theologians of liberation is nowhere better exemplified than in the training of Enrique Dussel, one of the few lay liberation theologians (married, the father of three children). He received a licentiate in philosophy from the Universidad de Cuyó in Mendoza, Argentina, and a doctorate in philosophy from the Universidad Nacional de Madrid. Then he studied for two degrees in Paris: a doctorate in history from the Sorbonne and a licentiate in theology from the Institut Catholique.

Dussel also exemplifies two other characteristics found in a number of other proponents of the theology of liberation: he is in exile and he has been brushed by death. His home in Argentina was bombed. Perhaps this helps to explain Gutiérrez's anxious fingers.

Another pioneer of liberation theology, especially at the level of popularization, is Juan Luis Segundo. He studied philosophy in Argentina, then attended Louvain for a licentiate in theology and moved to the University of Paris for a doctorate in letters. Interestingly, for the latter degree he wrote works on the thought of Nicolas Berdyaev and on ecclesiology.

Some Protestant proponents of liberation theology received their higher theological education in the United States. José Miguez Bonino attended Emory University and Union Theological Seminary; Rubem Alves went to Princeton University and Union Theological Seminary. Both have also been visiting professors in the United States.

Several common characteristics can be noted about some of the leading liberation theologians. They are serious students who have been exposed at length to ideas outside Latin America. Their

intellectual training usually involved more than one discipline. They are committed to the liberation struggle and, in many instances, have suffered personally and deeply. Finally they have attempted to construct an indigenous Latin American theology. How well they have done so we shall have reason to judge as we move to a direct consideration of their thought.

Fundamental Themes

Liberation theology is nothing like a finished system of thought. It was continually criticized, especially in the early and mid-1970s, for having little or no content. Where was a christology or an ecclesiology in liberation theology? Where was the trinitarian doctrine? How about spirituality? Much of this criticism was correct but undeserved. Liberation theologians were well aware of their paucity of thought in major areas of traditional theological concerns. The most palatable and promising response they could give was: it is coming. Liberation theologians knew this in their bones and did not always bother to explain other reasons.

For one thing, they were not necessarily concerned with the same questions as were followers of traditional theology. (It would take wild broncos to pull them into a traditional consideration of the Trinity. They are, however, vitally concerned with the life of God.) Secondly, they believed it impertinent at best and haughty and insensitive at worst for European and North American critics to expect a fully developed theological system "overnight." Outsiders tend to forget that liberation theology is not the work of a Paul Tillich who could produce a fully developed system within ten to twenty years. Rather, liberation theology is the product of a number of theologians working in different locations and without a principal figure directing them. Thirdly, liberation theology is developing out of immersion with the people, "at the base," and this takes time. But it also allows for development, revision, and honing of thought. It is clearly an evolutionary process.

At first certain central themes emerged in the work of Latin American theologians living in far-distant locations. Latin Americans sometimes took this communality and centrality of themes chosen by diverse individuals and groups working separately to be evidence of "the working of the Spirit." But the fact of this common emergence should not be surprising: many persons were reflecting on similar situations throughout Latin America (and the Third World) and they were using a process modeled for all at Vatican II. Moreover, countless meetings, seminars, courses, and conferences on liberation themes were taking place in Latin America as early as 1962. Many meetings took place because of the intrinsic dynamism of liberation thought and the necessity of further enriching partially developed insights.

Another, more regular channel of communication was developed in these two decades beyond occasional meetings. Theological and pastoral thought was communicated in numerous publications: newsletters, pamphlets, and magazines. Their number was immense. Every group seemed to have its own internal bulletin, many of them developing or diffusing liberation thought. Some liberation theology is still being developed in mimeographed bulletins with a circulation of a hundred or less but most major advances now appear as articles in *Christus*, the *Revista Eclesiástica Brasileira*, or a number of other journals.(47)

Out of this interaction has grown a network of theologians and another network of readers. The

theologians of liberation know one another personally, despite the distances between their home bases of activity, and they are aware of one another's latest thoughts. Thus about one hundred liberation theologians communicate with one another informally but regularly through conferences, letters, and published works. Another group of consumers (many of them out of Latin America) tries to keep up with liberation thought through personal contact or through major theological journals from Latin America.

Discussing the theology of liberation is like hearing the report on a friend's teenage son or daughter: the report tends to confuse outsiders because of growth in some areas and not in others, because of extremes in stances and moods, and because of enthusiasms for some areas of thought and unexplained dislike for other areas. In liberation theology all this takes place with a resolute distancing from previous schools of theology, especially those of the First World, while at the same time implicitly depending on the insights of modern European and North American theology.

Description of Reality

Although the three methodological divisions -- description of the Latin American situation, theological reflection, and pastoral applications -- seldom appear neatly in the writings of the theologians of liberation, the divisions are clearly agreed to as the major steps in doing liberation theology. This became abundantly clear in the large-scale theological conference on theological method that took place in Mexico City in 1975.(48)

For most theologians of liberation the task of describing Latin American society was sufficiently well accomplished by the Medellín and Puebla conferences. They might prefer a stronger touch here or there but by and large they take such analysis for granted and are now developing other "parts" (they prefer "moments" or "movements") of liberation theology.

The description of Latin American society was done largely by using dependency and class analysis. Theologians who contributed to this analysis include Gutiérrez, Dussel, Assmann, Rubem Alves, Sergio Méndez Arceo, and Raúl Vidales. They concentrate on themes such as the prevalence and condition of nonpersons in Latin America, the existence of social sin (structural or institutionalized injustice), the spiral of violence (Hélder Câmara's phrase), and the injustices of world capitalism. These themes have been discussed in the previous chapter.

Unity of History

The major debt of liberation theologians to modern European theology is the acceptance of the unity of history. To non-Catholics and especially to non-Christians this may not appear as a major achievement but for Latin Americans it is a crucial shift in thinking, in fact a quantum leap. Instead of thinking of religious history and world history as separate, instead of believing that outside the church there is no salvation, instead of talking about religious or secular activity, liberation theologians routinely and strongly emphasize the unity of history.

Medieval and Reformation theology emphasized the distinction of natural and supernatural

worlds, separate worlds of secular and divine activity, worlds that did not always have much to do with one another. In the extreme, in the theology of Martin Luther, there were two kingdoms; activity in the secular kingdom could not affect life in the other kingdom, the world of grace and God's activity.

This distinction was denied by the Second Vatican Council and the consequent affirmation of the unity of history has become the major rationale for the involvement of the Latin American church in the social and political world. The shift in perspective from an other-worldly to a this-worldly ideology is extreme.

The question of the unity of history has been worked out in terms of nature and grace. This has been a major task of modern Catholic theology, especially as developed in the works of Rahner and de Lubac and expressed in *Gaudium et Spes* at Vatican II. Nature and grace are no longer seen as separable areas of human existence but rather two dimensions of one "graced nature." As Míguez Bonino has said in *Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation*: "Jesus Christ does not come to superimpose a different, transcendent, or celestial reality on top of the realm of nature and history, but to reopen for man the will and the power to fulfill his historical vocation. He has not come to make man into superhuman beings, or a religious creature, but to open to him to the will and power to be man."(49)

Gutiérrez, and a number of other theologians of liberation who had worked with Catholic Action or similar activist groups before Vatican II, struggled with previous rationales for Christians to work at making the world a better place. Most of the largely French-inspired Catholic intellectuals and activists followed the distinction of Jacques Maritain that emphasized the autonomy of the temporal sphere from the church. In his view there were two worlds, each with its own autonomy. The church (thinking in terms of its clergy) had the task of inspiring lay persons to work in the world and seek the fulfillment of their vocations there. But the church itself was not to become directly involved. Throughout the 1950s and early 1960s the official church in places such as Brazil, Peru, Venezuela, and Bolivia became increasingly skittish about officially sanctioned Catholic Action groups' taking explicit political stands. This resulted in a break with the hierarchy, disillusionment (for a while) of clerical and lay leaders, and the eventual adoption of a new perspective on nature and grace, church and world.

Applying the insights of the unity of history meant that (Catholic) theologians of liberation and activists had no need to wait for a mandate from a bishop for activity in the political or social sphere. It was the "vocation" of all men and women to work for the construction of a just society. Gutiérrez cites Edward Schillebeeckx, the noted Dutch theologian: "The hermeneutics [meaning] of the kingdom of God consists especially in making the world a better place."(50) Liberation thinkers have consistently emphasized the importance of the history of liberation, of the historical perspective of theology. No one has mined this area more fervently than Enrique Dussel. He has produced a number of works on the history of Latin America.(51) Dussel's writings do not center on generals and presidents; they focus on the poor and the oppressed—the way they lived and the reasons they became or remained poor and oppressed. He describes their struggles and the work of leaders such as Las Casas and the early bishops who struggled with them. And he tells of those who fought against them or did nothing. This is history from the reverse side, the

underside -- the side of the poor.

Dussel and other liberation theologians also emphasize that history should be used as a primary source for theology.(52) Theologians are urged to search history for facts and interpretations, no longer relying on philosophy as their paramount auxiliary.

Political Activity

The differences between Latin American and North Atlantic theologians are very evident on a third important theme of liberation theology: the call to become involved in political activity.(53) The disagreement is not about the political (public) nature of Christian presence or activity: political theology is not unknown in European circles. Rather the disagreement has to do with the level of commitment maintained by North Atlantic theologians in their discussion. Miguez Bonino argues forcefully against them:

They want to remain at some neutral or intermediate level in which there is no need to opt for this or that concrete political praxis. We have already seen that such an attempt is self-deceptive. The opposite position which we adopt brings with it a particular risk. Nobody will claim, in fact, that his analysis of social, political, and economic reality is more than a rational exercise, open to revision, correction, or rejection.(54)

The theologians of liberation argue that to remain at the level of generality is to endorse the status quo -- that is, to accept without criticism the economic and political system within which one lives.

In contrast, too, to the notion that political activity is a part-time affair, to be done alongside family life, professional life, or leisure activities, Gutiérrez argues:

But today those who have chosen a liberating commitment find politics to be a dimension that includes and conditions all human activity. It is a global environment and collective arena of human fulfillment. Only by starting from this perception of the universality of politics in a revolutionary perspective can a more restricted sense of the term be understood, one which accurately defines politics as the orientation to political power. Every human situation has then a political dimension.(55)

This new stance carries Christians unapologetically into politics in Latin America. A number of dedicated Catholics, lay and clerical, formed part of the Nicaraguan government after the fall of Somoza. Four priests have held cabinet or high-level posts in that government.

Such a worldview also carries Latin American Christians into trouble. It brings them into conflict with governments and the military (as will be discussed in a later chapter). It also leads to misunderstanding by North Atlantic theologians and conservative church leaders in Latin America and Rome. European and North American theologians often disdain Latin American activism as another proof of the superficial and unprofessional quality of Latin American thought. Conservative, even moderate, church officials tend not to understand social and political activism,

largely because they adhere to traditional models wherein church and world are separate entities with distinct histories. Implicit in their mentality is separateness of nature and grace, the natural and supernatural, what is divine and what is human.

Conflict and Change

Another difference between liberation and traditional theologians is their attitude toward conflict. Most traditional theologians assume that stability, tranquility, status quo, consensus, are the norms. This is not true for liberation theologians, for whom instability, institutionalized violence, and change are the valid concepts for interpreting what is taking place in much of Latin America. Joseph Laishley rightly cautions: "Since we are dealing with a framework of interpretation, we are not asking whether this is true or false, but whether it is more or less an adequate tool for interpreting, for making predictions and guiding action. Only constant observation and testing can prove whether it is so or not."(56)

Option for the Poor

In the original cluster of ideas developed in discussions among liberation theologians and articulated by one or another participant, one idea does not follow from another by deduction; one theme leads intuitively and easily to another. Gutiérrez's *A Theology of Liberation* exhibits a forceful unity, each theme interrelated with other themes, a network after the manner of a symmetrical spider's web. It is in this way that a fifth major theme, the option for the poor and oppressed, appears throughout the network of ideas in liberation theology. Option for the poor is the driving force in the dynamics of liberation theology.

In their reading of the struggles of Latin American peoples, liberation theologians ask, On which side of the struggle is God's preference and the presence of the church to be found? If that does not immediately sound like a theological question, at least consider it a biblical question, say liberation theologians. The unfolding of the theme of the option for the poor offers an excellent example of the workings of liberation theology. Latin America is seen as a continent suffering from external domination and internal colonialism. This is the first step, that of describing *hechos* -- facts, reality. In the situation of dependence and colonialism, the majority of Latin Americans are the poor, the nonpersons -- those systematically discriminated against and excluded from full participation in government services or national life.

The second step, *reflexión* -- searching through sacred scripture and church teaching -- reveals that God has come to the people as a liberator, championing human (material and spiritual) development. This theme is developed out of the Old and New Testaments. Theologians using scripture have a twofold task: to attempt to understand the text in its historical situation, and then to reflect on what the text says to them in their historical situation. They thereby set up a back-and-forth tension, an interplay between the text and the person reflecting. It is a hermeneutical circle, circulation "between the text in its historicity and our own historical reading of it in obedience," as Míguez Bonino explains.(57)

Robert McAfee Brown comments that this reading of the text in our own situation is no easy task,

for the reading also means listening to what others have to say about our situation. We may think simply that we are living in a situation of prosperity, but others may say that our prosperity is in part due to our exploitation of them.(58)

Liberation theologians believe strongly that God takes sides -- in favor of the poor, the nonpersons. Such texts as Exodus 1:8-14, 2:23-25, and 3:7-10 show that God takes the side of the poor and oppressed. The entire Old Testament can be read as a vigorous repudiation of poverty.(59) Gutiérrez offers three reasons for the repudiation of poverty. First, poverty contradicts the very meaning of Mosaic religion, the mission of liberation. Secondly, slavery and exploitation go against the mandate of Genesis: to become the subject of creative freedom that is achieved through work; to demand just treatment for the poor, slaves, and aliens. Thirdly, the human person, beyond being the image and likeness of God, is the very sacrament of God-that is, "we meet God in our encounter with men; what is done for others is done for the Lord. In a word, the existence of poverty represents a sundering both of solidarity among men and also of communion with God. Poverty is an expression of sin-that is, of a negation of love. It is therefore incompatible with the coming of the kingdom of God, a kingdom of love and justice."(60)

Others have concentrated on the New Testament. Segundo Galilea says that "the basic intuition is that in Christianity it is essential to have a sense of the poor, to opt for the poor, to serve and liberate the poor."(61) A key text is Luke 4:16-30: Jesus announces his mission to the poor and the oppressed and promises release from captivity and freedom for the oppressed. He also declares a jubilee year involving radical economic reordering.

But liberation theologians argue that the whole tenor of the New Testament is enough to emphasize the privileged position of the poor in the saving encounter with God. The poor are blessed; it is especially to them that the good news is brought. And it is among the poor, the suffering, the oppressed that the Lord is present in a very special way. Galilea continues: "In the parable of the last judgment, the liberating service of the poor (even if it is no more than material aid) is the path of salvation, and the absence of this sense of the poor, as my brothers in need, is the road to destruction."(62)

Liberation theologians make pastoral applications as their third step. A number of implications for pastoral practice (praxis) have been made in regard to the option for the poor. The most notable of them was emphasized at Puebla; indeed, some consider it to be the major achievement of that conference: the church should exercise preferential treatment for the poor and the oppressed. Secondly, the church and Christians should live a simple lifestyle. This is a theme introduced by John XXIII at Vatican II, where it was partially developed but then dropped. It was then taken up by Gutiérrez and numerous others, notably Hélder Câmara and Leonidas Proaño, bishops who practiced what they preached, and expressed as a central issue at Medellín. Thirdly, the poor and the oppressed should have the gospel preached to them in their own voice, in small communities, the grassroots Christian communities. Other implications include struggle against the excesses of capitalism and against the repressive tactics of governments that are especially hard on the poor and marginalized.

Because of its methodology, liberation theology developed a different starting point from that of

traditional theology. Theoretically theology could have many starting points. Like St. Thomas and the Scholastics, one could start with nature and conclude from reasoning based on causality or order that there must be a God. This gets one as far as the God of the philosophers, but not to the God of belief. Secondly, one could follow St. Thomas further and apply teachings derived from an inerrant book or an infallible church. One thus moves from revelation to the world, on which revelation sheds its light. Thirdly, modern theologians have sometimes started with the inherently rational nature of the human mind and then concluded that a universe out of which such rationality could evolve must itself be the creation of a Supreme Mind.

Although not denying the validity of such approaches, liberation theology has its own. It takes a view from below, where the vast majority of the human family lives, "where pain is." God is to be found in the life of the poor. The God of the Jewish Testament is the God of the poor and the oppressed. God sides with them, taking their part and identifying with them. The God of the New Testament is the same God. Even more, God becomes man, not one possessed of wealth or influence but one who belonged to the poor of the land, a lower-class Jew who cast his lot with the poor.

Assmann was one of the first to talk about the epistemological privilege of the poor. He believes that the way they view the world is closer to reality than is the way the rich view it. The way the poor view the world is accurate to a degree that is impossible for those who see the world only from a vantage point of privileges they want to retain. Assmann did not have in mind the indolent poor; he was thinking of the struggling poor, those who do not accept their lot as a whim of fate or a divine decree conveniently sanctioning the status of those who hold power. This concept of the epistemological privilege of the poor gives a fuller idea of the richness of feeling and attachment that liberation theologians have for the poor.

Liberation

A sixth theme, which follows closely the idea of the option for the poor, is the explicit elaboration of the central idea of liberation. It is a very extensive theme and is approached from varying perspectives by diverse liberation theologians. Five elements can be singled out as forming the core of what liberation has come to mean in their theology: 1) sin and redemption; 2) salvation as a social event; 3) temporal liberation; 4) biblical promise; and 5) exile or captivity as the starting point.

Sin is seen not only as personal and individual: the effects of original sin are seen in social structures; they include political and economic oppression. Persons are born and live in these structures not by the direct will of God, but as a result of humankind's moral failure to construct a world of justice. Sin is not just individual deliberate irresponsibility; it is systemic evil -- institutionalized injustice or systematic discrimination.

Total human redemption, then, involves not only a cleansing from individual sin but liberation from oppressive structures of the world of today. Liberation means movement toward a new age where all persons will be free, autonomous, living responsibly and with dignity in their own culture.

For many Christians (including theologians) salvation has been thought of as an individual event, usually understood as personal salvation in the afterlife, passage into full life with God. Following the insights of Vatican II and of modern theology, salvation is seen by liberation theologians as a social event, as wholeness and total social well-being in community with others.

Moreover, salvation or liberation begins to take place here and now. It is not thought of as deliverance from a fated nature. Rather, as Letty Russell describes it, it is the power and possibility of transforming the world, restoring creation, and seeking to overcome suffering.(63) Galilea adds:

Genuinely liberating events happen in society, in history, in the lives of men: for example, a happening that brings justice to the oppressed; a political change that really creates more freedom; the power to overcome vices, chronic diseases, and so on.(64)

At Medellín the idea was characterized as "the passing of each and every one of us from less human to more human living conditions."(65)

At the heart of liberation theology is the acceptance of the idea of liberation as biblical promise. Pironio, Gutiérrez, and others substituted the term liberation for human development, in part because as they read and attempted to find meaning in sacred scripture for Latin America they believed that liberation was a much truer biblical term than development.

Some of the first formulations of liberation theology were developed out of exodus themes and Jesus's miracles. Galilea summarizes the position:

The exodus is the people of Israel leaving the bondage of Egypt. Guided by Moses, it is led toward Palestine, the promised land, so that it may establish itself there as an independent people. The exodus is, literally, a political fact: Israel's liberation from Egyptian oppression . . . for the Israelites, it is a liberating political experience. But beyond its political significance, it has a religious meaning: the experience of God who saves, who tears his people away from the enslavement of sin, who fulfills his promise to constitute it as the chosen people.(66)

The bishops at Medellín made their own the same interpretation and application: "Just as in bygone days Israel, the first people, experienced the saving presence of God when he freed them from the bondage of Egypt, so too are we, the new people of God, bound to feel his presence."(67)

Galilea, and others, find a liberation motif in miracles:

[They] concerned earthly liberation: loaves were multiplied to feed the hungry crowd, the sick were healed, the possessed recovered their peace of soul. But in their purpose, these miracles had a deeper and more religious significance: they were attempting to lead the Jews to the belief that the salvation promised by God was already among them. That is why in order to confirm to John that he was the Messiah and Savior, Jesus replied to

John's messengers: "Go and tell John what you hear and see: the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have the good news preached to them."(68)

Much fuller developments of the biblical basis of liberation have been made since the first sketchy but well-argued beginnings made by Gutiérrez, Galilea, and others. One of the first areas to be developed after Gutiérrez's ground-breaking *A Theology of Liberation* was precisely the theme of Jesus as liberator.

In summary, liberation theologians have found much of the scriptures opening up to them new insights on liberation. Justo and Catherine González point out that many of the passages assigned for Sunday reading in Catholic and mainline Protestant churches lend themselves to liberation themes.(69) Space will not allow further development here of how liberation theologians are building a fuller biblical base for their interpretations but one should point out what are probably the five great liberation texts. They are called by Brown: 1) the God who takes sides (Exod. 1:8-14, 2:2-25, 3:7-10); 2) to know God is to do justice (Jer. 22:13-16); 3) true worship (Isa. 58:6-7; Amos 5:21, 2-24); 4) liberty to the oppressed (Luke 4:16-30); and 5) judgment on the nations (Matt. 25:1-46).(70)

Praxis

The discussion of the seventh of the early themes of liberation theology examined the richness of the concept of praxis. Gutiérrez and others developed the idea of orthopraxis. They enlarged the theme along several lines, two of which are particularly important. One is the idea of fidelity or integrity: that practice should match vision or beliefs. Thus the church should be more concerned about orthopraxis, instead of concentrating, as in the past, on orthodoxy, correct intellectual tenets. The second perspective was that of orthopraxis as efficacious love. Liberation theology bases itself on praxis, on a commitment to liberation. This means in practice a theology rooted in service to others, especially the neediest.

This theological theme was not meant only as a corrective to academic theology, which may hold itself apart from the real world; it was also addressed to large numbers of Latin Americans symbolized by the *beatas* of the lower classes or the *buenos católicos* of the upper class who turn their backs on the needy. The theologians felt that the Latin American church had been especially guilty in sheltering church-goers instead of challenging them. A confession of guilt was made by the church at Medellín when it described itself as "a sinful church in a sinful society." The church also made a giant step toward the poor and toward simplifying itself at Medellín, a step that turned into a leap at Puebla when the church opted for preferential (though not exclusive) treatment for the poor.

Hope and the Kingdom

The eighth theme of the first formulations of liberation theology was similar to a theme being developed simultaneously in many other parts of the world, that of hope and the coming of the kingdom (eschatology). As a central theme it appears in Gutiérrez's *A Theology of Liberation*

(1971), James Cone's *Theology of Black Liberation* (1973), and Letty Russell's *Human Liberation in a Feminist Perspective* (1974). In Russell the theme is a conscious elaboration of the European theology of hope of Jürgen Moltmann and the political theology of Johannes Metz. Although considerable debt is owed by Gutiérrez and others to this European influence, Latin Americans have tried to distance themselves from Metz and Moltmann. The debate became especially strong between two Protestant theologians, Moltmann and Miguez Bonino, both highly influential in international circles. The debate is too lengthy to be discussed here.(71) It will suffice to recount some of the main outlines of the concept of hope and the coming of the kingdom as developed by Latin American liberation theologians.

Here another fount of influence on Latin American liberation thought must be mentioned: North American liberal Protestantism. As yet this history has not been written or even fully documented. Influence, moreover, has been mutual and it is difficult at times to judge which partner, North or South America, gained more in the interchange of ideas. It will be enough here to say that financial and intellectual support for Latin America from the National Council of Churches has been substantial and steady over a period of fifteen years. Two U.S. schools of theology, Union (New York) and Princeton, have been especially active in the interchange of ideas with Latin American theologians. One of the most notable Latin American Protestant theologians involved in this interchange is Rubem Alves, a Brazilian who has been active as a pioneer of liberation thought. His is the first major formulation of a theology of hope in Latin America.(72)

For Alves the underlying question of his life and work has been, What is necessary for forming and conserving human life in the world? For him the answer is "our vocation to freedom." His position is similar to that of John Courtney Murray, perhaps the greatest U.S. Catholic theologian in this century, who said in 1965, "The first truth about man is that he is free, so that the first truth about Christ is that he is liberator, the one through whom man is set free."(73)

Alves and others evolved a theology of hope as a second step ("moment") after reflecting on the Latin American, especially the Brazilian, situation of the late 1960s. (Recall that torture and repression were systematically applied to dissidents in Brazil after 1968.) In reflecting on this situation, Alves and others searched the scriptures. Increasingly the central thought of the kingdom of God lost its far-away, after-life character for them. They began to realize that the kingdom as presented in the synoptic gospel writers (Matthew, Mark, and Luke) was to be realized *now*, building toward the future. Thus the present and future tasks of the Christian became much more emphasized by liberation theologians than a retelling of the past. Gutiérrez especially felt that Latin American Christianity had given far too much emphasis to its past.

In shorthand terms, one may say that liberation theologians emphasized such ideas as realizing the future, making the kingdom present now. In this they were clearly opting for a theology that includes utopia as a central part of its vision. "Utopia" was meant in the sense of working for a better future society, one that would not be fully realized before the end of time. Nonetheless there was an "inner" mandate, one of the laws of the gospel and of life, that human beings should work actively for a society in which more just relationships would prevail.

Thus liberation theology in its first formulations came full circle to the first and second themes

(unity of history and the political dimension of religion): religiously motivated men and women work actively in human/religious history to construct a more equitable society, a work that necessarily involves politics because all human activity has a political dimension. Other themes enter naturally to complete the movement: concretely, the building of the kingdom (just society) means preferential (but not exclusive) treatment of the poor and oppressed, working for their liberation (freedom from unjust restraints in order for them to achieve their full human/Christian potential). Fidelity to a Christian vocation will be measured by orthopraxis (efficacious love) more than by orthodoxy. Although the theological "movements," or themes, of the original formulations appear in a circular pattern, the theologians themselves prefer to think in terms of a spiral; a circle is static and fixed, a poor symbol for life.

Later Themes

Christology

In his central work, *A Theology of Liberation*, Gutiérrez outlines a number of unfinished tasks for liberation theologians. Chief among them, in terms of immediate needs, were more elaborated works on christology and spirituality. As to the first area, liberation theologians were acutely aware of the necessity of showing the specifically Christian character of their work. This they needed to head off their many critics, some of whom superficially wrote them off as half-baptized Marxists playing in the intellectual garden of Ernst Bloch (humanistic Marxism). Further, given the personalistic character of Latin American culture, the liberation theologians would gain few adherents without appeal to the life and personality of Christ. However, one has only to read the works on Jesus the liberator that followed Gutiérrez's work to realize the deep personal conviction of the authors as to the centrality of Christ in the liberation process.

Jon Sobrino and Leonardo Boff produced the two first major works in liberation christology.⁽⁷⁴⁾ Both have fared better in the high seas of North Atlantic theological criticism than a number of other liberation works. Their writings have depth of scholarship and forceful argumentation that reflect the extensive European training of their authors. Their influence and that of other liberation theologians working in christology was evident at Puebla where christology suffuses the final document (unlike the Medellín document).

The most important christological work in liberation theology (understood in the larger sense of any theology developing the liberation theme regardless of geographical region) has been produced by a European, Edward Schillebeeckx. His *Jesus: An Experiment in Christology* (75) and *Christ: The Experience of Jesus as Lord* (76) display a breadth of scholarship, especially biblical scholarship, unmatched by most modern theologians. They also exhibit the same methodological steps as Latin American liberation theology. Schillebeeckx is one of the leading theologians of the world; the close similarity between his work and that of the Latin American liberation theologians offers major reinforcement for their work.

Spirituality

Another criticism fired at the early liberation theologians was their lack of concern for spirituality. The neo-Marxist character of some of their formulations, the secular emphasis of their thought,

and especially the lack of extended discussion on the spiritual nature of Christianity left liberation theologians vulnerable to criticism -- especially from fellow Latin Americans whose religion was nothing if not other-worldly. Gutiérrez recognized this lack. In *A Theology of Liberation* he states that one of the reasons for it was not an absence of desire or practice but of intellectual development of the theme: "If they [activist Christians] are not always able to express in appropriate terms the profound reasons for their commitment, it is because the theology in which they were formed -- and which they share with other Christians -- has not produced the categories necessary to produce this option"; this foreshadows Gutiérrez's full-length statement of a spirituality of liberation in: *We Drink from Our Own Wells*.(77)

No one has thus far responded more deeply and thoroughly to this lack than Segundo Galilea. In three works, *El sentido del pobre*, *Apostolado y contemplación*, and *Vivir el cristianismo*, Galilea planted the seeds of a spirituality of liberation.(78) This spirituality was then developed more systematically in his *Espiritualidad de la liberación*.(79) He enlarges upon five ideas as basic to a new spirituality, one in contrast to monastic or traditional spirituality. First, change of heart, conversion, is realized through a commitment, a conversion to other human beings. Secondly, the so-called history of salvation is intimately related to the history of the liberation of the poor. Thirdly, tasks and commitments involved in the liberation process anticipate the kingdom of God. Fourthly, charity (love) takes its historical form in liberation praxis. Fifthly, Latin Americans should attempt a reading of the beatitudes specifically for Latin America. This would be a reading done by the poor on a continent of the poor.

Another liberation theologian who has devoted his attention to spirituality from a liberation point of view is Jon Sobrino. His writing on prayer has found an appreciative audience. Sobrino also took part with other liberation theologians in a groundbreaking attempt of seven Latin American journals of religious thought that culminated in a publishing enterprise devoted to the theme of spirituality of liberation. This cooperative effort on the part of liberation theologians and their publishers characterizes much of what has been taking place in Latin America: a sense of urgency, dialogue (stemming from eagerness to learn from others), evolutionary development, dialectical growth, and flexible, wellplanned, efficient cooperation.

Ecclesiology

Another major area of theology opened up by Gutiérrez is ecclesiology.(80) He pointed out the central place of the church in the salvation/liberation process but he did not systematically develop the theme. Others, such as Segundo and Boff, have produced fuller theological treatments of the church.(81) Liberation theologians are in the field "doing church" and have settled in their own minds what "church" should be: *comunidades eclesiales de base*, grassroots Christian communities. This is the reality, the praxis, out of which they do their theology. It is also the reality out of which the future of the Latin American church will dawn. It is appropriate, then, that when Boff elaborates the rationale for grassroots communities he entitles the book *Ecclesiogénesis* ("the church coming to life").

Biblical Basis

A final point about the content of liberation theology should be made, especially for the benefit of those for whom the Bible is the centerpiece for faith and for doing theology. Liberation theologians are of the same opinion. But there are few direct treatments of the Bible by scripture scholars from a liberation perspective. In a sense the theologians are outrunning the exegetes. Liberation theology is a major step in the interaction of biblical and theological scholars, an interaction that has been taking place since the birth of modern biblical studies, beginning at the time of World War I.

Catholic and Protestant biblical scholarship currently enjoys a reputation for high academic standards and achievements. However, liberation theologians fault many modern exegetes for their hermeneutics, or interpretations, saying that they know the literal meaning of the text but that they do not know what the text means in our times.(82) This flaw derives from two sources: biblical scholars until rather recently did not pay much attention to the sociology of the bible, the socio-economic context of biblical happenings, and they did not ask the right questions of the text.

Thus one has only to look up modern interpretations of what the poor mean in the New Testament, taking "blessed are the poor" or similar texts. New Testament commentators almost unanimously denied that Jesus had the literally poor in mind; they held out for the poor in spirit. There have been a few exceptions among older biblical scholars and now a major shift to a liberation perspective is taking place among younger biblical commentators, in large part due to the challenge offered by liberation theologians.

Achievements

The crowning achievement of liberation theology is methodological. Liberation theologians have perfected and put into active practice the methodology used by Vatican II in *Gaudium et Spes*. This methodology has brought them and the church into the daily lives and problems of the peoples of Latin America in a way that traditional theology had not accomplished in four hundred years. As a result, the Latin American church will never be the same again.

The second major achievement is emphasis on and elaboration of the relationship between Christian faith and the struggle for justice in the world. During the 1960s official documents of both Catholic and Protestant church bodies made it very clear that the struggle to achieve a decent existence for the suffering majority of humankind was the embodiment of Christian love in the world. The official teaching has been taken up with great enthusiasm in the so-called Third World. From now on it is expected that the churches of the Third World will offer strong leadership within larger church bodies. Walbert Bühlmann remarks that we may even have a Lima I instead of a Vatican III.(83)

A third major achievement has occurred in the area of ecumenism. In various parts of the world there has been progress in mutual understanding and movement toward unification. But in the Third World there is a parallel path toward unity on the level of orthopraxis -- that is, de facto commitment by Christians. Their common struggle has united them very deeply. Alfred Hennelly remarks that the last great division among the Christian churches may involve a gulf separating

those who read the gospel as a summons to the struggle for justice and those who are indifferent or even hostile to such an interpretation.(84)

A fourth achievement is the intimate relationship that has been established between theology and Christian praxis throughout parts of the Third World. All the writings mentioned above have arisen out of praxis and are intended to enhance praxis. The result is liberation evangelization for millions on the grassroots level.

A fifth achievement is that we have been shown that theology can be a communal effort. Theology of liberation is not the system of a single person, a Rahner or Tillich, a de Chardin or Barth; it is rather a cooperative effort of many. At least as a symbol, liberation theology represents Christianity well, for it is the joint effort of men and women of all skin colors working throughout the world on a common project which is aimed at building up a society of justice and love. Rather than competition, there is sharing of ideas. Liberation theologians know one another, respect one another, and promote their ideas. This is unusual at least in some parts of Latin America, where misanthropy is known to run high. Theology, thus seen, is a communal effort, confronting a common catastrophe.(85)

The fad that will not go away, Latin American theology of liberation, has influenced theologians and activists in other countries and has helped to spawn other theologies of liberation. The first areas of the world where that influence was noted were Africa and Asia. African and Asian theologians have not copied liberation theology directly but rather have adopted a similarity of style or approach to Christian reflection on what is taking place in Africa and Asia. Kosuke Koyama's *No Handle on the Cross* or Allan Boesak's *Farewell to Innocence* read like Asian and African inventions rather than Latin American imitations.(86)

The network of liberation theologians widened to include theologians from Africa and Asia in the Ecumenical Association of Third World Theologians (EATWOT). Their first meeting at Dar es Salaam in 1976 demonstrated the influence of the Latin Americans and also showed areas of basic agreement, such as in method and theological objectives.(87) The Africans took the initiative of forming their own regional group, so that a Pan-African conference was held in Ghana in 1977. It was evident that Third World theology was beginning to thrive in other parts of the world.

As liberation theology was developing in Latin America out of theologians' social experience, so too was black and feminist liberation theology in the United States. Gutiérrez's *Notas para una teología de la liberación* was presented at a conference in 1968. James Cone's *A Black Theology of Liberation* (1970) was followed by J. Deotis Roberts's *Liberation and Reconciliation: A Black Theology* (1971), Frederick Herzog's *Liberation Theology* (1972), Letty M. Russell's *Ferment of Freedom* (1972) and *Human Liberation in a Feminist Perspective* (1974), and Rosemary Radford Ruether's *Liberation Theology* (1973). A number of other works including many by North American theologians who are neither black nor female have followed this initial outburst, indicating the long-lasting appeal that liberation theology has exercised.

Informal contacts between North and Latin American theologians have been maintained for a long time. Some of these contacts were stimulated through yearly meetings of CICOP sponsored by

the Latin American Office of the U.S. Catholic Conference. The 1971 meeting was the last and perhaps the most important: it had as its theme the theology of liberation. It thereby introduced many in the U.S.A. to the ideas that were in ferment in Latin America(88) and that would be focused in Gutiérrez's central work, which appeared in English translation two years later.

Following a massive conference in Mexico City in 1975, attended by almost every Latin American theologian of note, some of the leading Latin Americans went north to Detroit for the first formal meeting of Theology in the Americas.(89) A frank interchange took place and sparks flew over differences in perspectives between the Latin Americans and some of their counterparts in black, feminist, or Chicano liberation theology. Nonetheless, interaction continues.

Detroit II was held in the summer of 1980.(90) It was preceded by the fourth international of EATWOT in São Paulo, to which representatives from the U.S.A. and Europe were invited for the first time.(91) The fifth EATWOT conference, centered on dialogue between Third World and First World theologians, was held in Geneva, Switzerland, in January 1983.(92)

Theology in the Americas itself represents an interesting case in ecumenism. It is an office housed at the headquarters of the National Council of Churches (historical Protestant churches) and was run until August 1980 by Sergio Torres, a Chilean priest, and continues through the coordinating activities of two Catholic sisters, Caridad Guidote and Margaret Coakley.

It would be too lengthy to trace here the influence and interaction of Latin American theologians with those of Western Europe except to say that interaction varies widely from country to country.(93) Differences of opinion are most intense on the part of some German theologians, whereas many Spanish theologians appear much more open to liberation theology. Meetings of Latin American theologians with their Spanish colleagues took place at El Escorial in 1972 and at Toledo in 1974. The interchange of ideas has continued, Ignacio González Faus, editor of the review *Selecciones de Teología*, being one of its key figures.

In summary, with such international influence, liberation theology is not a trend that will fade away before the next meeting of the Catholic Theology Society of America. Liberation theology is entrenched in official church documents; it lives and breathes in the lives of numerous small communities.

Notes

1. Puebla, *Final Document*, §§ 26, 41, 189, 261, 321, 329, 351-55, 452, 475, 479-506, 696, 895, 979, 1026; John Paul II, Opening Address of the Puebla Conference, section 3; General Audience in Rome, Feb. 14, 1979, and esp. General Audience in Rome, Feb. 21, 1979 (published in the English edition of *Osservatore Romano* for Feb. 19 and 26, 1979, respectively); *Redemptor Hominis*, passim. See also José A. Linares, "Liberación según Juan Pablo Segundo," *Ciencia Tomista*, vol. 106, no. 347, pp. 161-91.

2. Reactions, positive and negative, to liberation theology are numerous. They range from Kenneth Hamilton's judgment in "Liberation Theology: Lessons Positive and Negative," in Carl E.

Armering, ed., *Evangelicals and Liberation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977), p. 124: "That liberation theology is a heresy I believe to be beyond question," to more favorable reactions in the same volume. Robert McAfee Brown has catalogued critiques of liberation theology in his *Theology in a New Key: Responding to Liberation Theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), pp. 102-31. Dennis P. McCann has written a full-length critique of the theology of liberation from the perspective of social ethics: *Christian Realism and Liberation Theology: Practical Theologies in Creative Conflict* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1981).

3. A comprehensive bibliographic guide to Latin American theology has begun appearing yearly, *Bibliografía teológica comentada*, from the Instituto Superior Evangélico de Estudios Teológicos, Buenos Aires. A bibliographical resource from Spain is *Actualidad bibliográfica de filosofía teológica*. A valuable guide to works before 1975 is *Sociología de la religión y teología* (Madrid: Cuadernos para el Diálogo, 1975). For works in Portuguese, the Brazilian review *Atualização* publishes annually its *Bibliografia teológica brasileira*. Three other bibliographies of high quality but more limited scope are Therrin C. Dahlin, Gary Gillum, and Mark L. Glover, *The Catholic Left in Latin America: A Comprehensive Bibliography* (Boston: Hall, 1981); Hans-Jurgan Prién, *Die Geschichte des Christentums in Lateinamerika* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970); and Lambros Comitas, *The Complete Caribbeana, 1900-1975* (Millwood, N.Y.: KTO Press, 1977). J. Andrew Kirk has compiled a useful select bibliography that emphasizes Protestant contributions to liberation theology in his *Liberation Theology: An Evangelical View from the Third World* (Atlanta: Knox, 1979), pp. 228-37. To his list should be added Kirk's own work and recent books by Protestants of varying traditions: Daniel L. Migliore, *Called to Freedom: Liberation Theology and the Future of Christian Doctrine* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980) and Theodore Runyon, ed., *Sanctification and Liberation: Liberation Theology in the Light of Wesleyan Tradition* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1981). See also John H. Sinclair, ed., *Protestantism in Latin America: A Bibliographical Guide* (S. Pasadena, Cal.: William E. Carey Library, 1976).

4. New York, Continuum, 1968.

5. Maryknoll, N.Y., Orbis, 1973.

6. See chap. 1, note 15, above, and Basil Moore, ed., *Black Theology: The South African Voice* (London: Hurst, 1973).

7. For a discussion of what constitutes ideology, see James M. Malloy and W. R. Campbell, "Ideology in an Action Framework: An Approach to Communist Political Behavior," *Occasional Papers in Political Science*, no. 3 (University of Rhode Island Press, 1968).

8. Roberto Oliveros Maqueo, *Liberación y teología: Génesis y crecimiento de una reflexión* (1966-1976) (Mexico City: Centro de Reflexión Teológica, 1977), pp. 344-72.

9. McAfee Brown has a helpful discussion of the antecedents of Protestant and Orthodox liberation thought in his *Theology in a New Key*, pp. 35-49. See also Edward Duff, *The Social Thought of the World Council of Churches* (New York: Association, 1956) and Paul Bock, *In*

Search of Responsible World Society: The Social Teaching of the World Council of Churches (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974).

10. Fremantle, Gremillion, and O'Brien and Shannon present overviews of Catholic social teaching with selection of documents. Guerry, Calvez and Perrin, Calvez, and Charles provide systematic presentation of Catholic social teaching. Aubert analyzes much of the evolution of the social teaching of the church and offers useful bibliographical references. Anne Fremantle, *The Social Teaching of the Church* (New York: Mentor-Omega, 1963); Joseph Gremillion, *The Gospel of Peace and Justice: Catholic Social Teaching since Pope John* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis 1976); David O'Brien and Thomas A. Shannon, *Renewing the Earth: Catholic Documents on Peace, Justice, and Liberation* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Image, 1977); Emile Guerry, *The Social Doctrine of the Catholic Church* (New York: Alba, 1961); Jean-Ives Calvez and Jacques Perrin, *The Church and Social Justice: The Social Teaching of the Popes From Leo XIII to Pius XII* (London: Burns and Oates, 1961); Jean-Ives Calvez, *The Social Thought of John XXIII* (Chicago: Regnery, 1965); Rodger Charles, *The Christian Social Conscience* (Hales Corners, Wis.: Clergy Book Service, 1970); and Jean-Marie Aubert, *Pour une théologie de l'âge industriel* (Paris: Cerf, 1971). On the evolutionary character of Catholic school teaching John Coleman, S.J., "Development of Church Social Teaching," *Origins* 11, 3 (June 4, 1981) 34-41.

11. *Rerum Novarum*, § 20.

12. *Quadragesimo Anno*, § 50.

13. *Ibid.*, § 109.

14. *Ibid.*, § 120.

15. *Ibid.*, § 132.

16. *Social Doctrine*, p. 286.

17. Letter, *Sertum Laetitia*, Nov. 1, 1939.

18. *Gaudium et Spes*, § 69.

19. *Populorum Progressio*, part 1, § 26.

20. Medellín, "Peace," § 14.

21. For a discussion of the concept of praxis as used by Latin American social scientists, see Edward L. Cleary and Germán Garrido-Pinto, "Applied Social Science, Teaching, and Political Action," *Human Organization*, 36, 3 (Fall 1977) 270. For orthopraxis, see Robert L. Kinast, "Orthopraxis: Starting Point for Theology," *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* (1983) 29-44.

22. *An Introduction to Philosophy* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1930), pp. 82-83 and 98-99.

23. For a discussion of some key differences in social science in Latin America and the U.S.A., see Cleary and Garrido-Pinto, "Applied Social Science," pp. 269-71. For an excellent overview, see Alejandro Portes and William Canak, "Latin America: Social Structures and Sociology," in Ralph H. Turner and James F. Short, Jr., eds., *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 7 (Palo Alto, Cal., 1981), pp. 225-48.

24. For a helpful discussion of Marxian analysis in liberation theology, see Joseph Laishley, "Theological Trends: The Theology of Liberation I and II," *The Way*, 17, 3 (July 1977) 217-28 and 17, 4 (Oct. 1977) 301-11. See also the statement of a major proponent of liberation theology: Segundo Galilea, "The Theology of Liberation," *Lumen Vitae*, 33, 3 (1978) 342.

25. Since the original work of Caio Prado, Jr., Sergio Bagú, Florestán Fernandes, André Gunder Frank, Raúl Prebisch, and Celso Furtado, a large body of literature on dependency has grown up. Peter Evans offers a useful bibliography in *Dependent Development: The Alliance of Multinational, State, and Local Capital in Brazil* (Princeton University Press, 1979), pp. 331-51. The debate continues especially in the pages of the *Latin American Research Review*. For research on multinational corporations, see Peter B. Evans, "Recent Research on Multinational Corporations," in Ralph H. Turner and James F. Short, Jr., eds., *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 7 (Palo Alto, Cal., 1981), pp. 199-223. Reviews of early literature on dependency are provided by Joseph Kahl, *Modernization, Exploitation, and Dependency* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction, 1976); Fernando Henrique Cardoso, "The Consumption of Dependency Theory in the United States," *Latin American Research Review* 12, 3 (1977) 7-24; and Cardoso, "Current Theories of Latin American Development and Dependency: A Critique," *Boletín de Estudios Latino-americanos y del Caribe*, 22 (June 1977) 5-64. Among other critiques, see Philip O'Brien, in Ivar Oxaal et al., eds., *Beyond the Sociology of Development: Economy and Society in Latin America and Africa* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975) and Harold Blakemore, "Limitations of Dependency: An Historian's View and Case Study," *Boletín de Estudios Latino-americanos y del Caribe*, 18 (June 1975) 74-87. For a discussion of the weaknesses of liberation theologians' use of dependency theory, see Michael Dodson, "Liberation Theology and Christian Radicalism in Contemporary Latin America," *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 11, 1 (1979) 203-33, esp. 208-14. Specific suggestions for the improvement of dependency analysis are offered by Steven Jackson et al., "An Assessment on Empirical Research on *Dependencia*," *Latin American Research Review*, 14, 3 (1979) 7-28, esp. 22; and C. Richard Bath and Dilmus Jones, "Dependency Analysis of Latin America," *Latin American Research Review*, 11, 3 (1976) 3-54, esp. 33-36.-The *Latin American Research Review* has provided a forum for dependency theory, especially as *dependendistas* attempted to criticize one another's formulations and to recast dependency theory. For reviews of later formulations of dependency perspectives, see a series of articles forming a symposium on dependency, *Latin American Research Review*, 17, 1 (1982) 115-72.

26. See, for example, the Introduction in J. J. Villamil, ed., *Transnational Capitalism and National Development: New Perspectives on Development* (Hassocks, Sussex: Harvester, 1979); David G. Becker, *The New Bourgeoisie and the Limits of Dependency: Mining, Class, and*

Power in "Revolutionary" Peru (Princeton University Press, 1983); and Sidney W. Mintz, "The So-Called World System: Local Initiative and Local Response," *Dialectical Anthropology*, 2, 4 (Nov. 1977) 253-70.

27. For an attempt to supply strategies to overcome dependency, see Heraldo Munoz, ed., *From Dependency to Development: Strategies to Overcome Development and Inequality* (Boulder: Westview, 1982).

28. John Browett, "Out of Dependency Perspectives," *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 12, 2 (1982) 146.

29. See, for example, Leonardo Boff, *Liberating Grace* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1979), pp. 67-72.

30. Faculty Seminar, Aquinas Institute of Theology, March 14, 1979.

31. *Liberación*, pp. 158-59.

32. *Theology in a New Key*, pp. 62-63.

33. *Our Idea of God* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1974).

34. *Our Idea*, pp. 3-19.

35. In addition to Segundo, see Antonio Pérez-Esclarín, *Atheism and Liberation* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1978).

36. *Gaudium et Spes*, § 19.

37. Thomas G. Sanders gives an excellent introduction to Freire's methods: "The Paulo Freire Method: Literacy Training and Conscientización," *American Universities Field Service Reports*, West Coast South America Series, 15, 1 (1968).

38. Interviews at Florida International University, Miami, Nov. 1031, 1979.

39. "Antecedentes para el estudio de la teología de la liberación (comentario bibliográfico)," *Tierra Nueva* (Bogotá) 1, 2; 1, 3; 2, 5 (1972-73).

40. Montevideo, MIEC-JECI, 1969.

41. Hugo Assmann in *Theology for a Nomad Church* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1976), p. 8, says: "A theology of liberation began to take shape only after the Medellín conference in a series of occasional articles and more explicitly in proceedings of other conferences." In a footnote he refers to conferences held in 1970 and later years.

42. The mimeographed paper is in the archives of the Centro de Estudios Bartolomé de Las Casas, Lima.
43. *Lineaspastorales de la Iglesia en América Latina* (Lima: CEP, 2nd ed., 1976).
44. Included in *In Search of the Theology of Development* (Lausanne: SODEPAX, 1969).
45. *Theological Studies*, 31, 2 (1970) 243-61.
46. Interview, June 1978.
47. Mensaje (Chile), *Páginas* (Peru), *Diálogo Social* (Panama), SIC (Venezuela), *Diálogo* (Guatemala), ECA (El Salvador), and *Servir* (Mexico).
48. *Liberación y cautiverio* (Mexico City: Encuentro Latinoamericano de Teología, 1975).
49. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975, p. 166.
50. "La teología," *Los católicos holandeses* (Bilbao: Desclée de Brouwer, 1970), p. 29.
51. See, for example, *Historia de la Iglesia en América Latina* (Barcelona: Nova Terra, 3rd ed., 1974); *Disintegración de la cristiandad colonial y liberación* (Salamanca: Sígueme, 1978); and *El episcopado latinoamericano y la liberación de los pobres, 1504-1620* (Mexico City: Centro de Reflexión Teológica, 1979).
52. See, for example, Enrique Dussel, *History and Theology of Liberation* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1976).
53. Philip Scharper discusses the political aspects of theology in "Toward a Politicized Christianity," *Commonweal* (June 16, 1978), pp. 392-99.
54. *Doing Theology*, p. 93.
55. *Praxis of Liberation and Christian Faith* (San Antonio: Mexican-American Cultural Center, 1976), p. 19. See also *A Theology of Liberation*, pp. 45-50.
56. "Trends II," p. 304.
57. *Doing Theology*, p. 102.
58. *Theology in a New Key*, pp. 84-85.
59. Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation*, pp. 294-96.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 295.

61. "Theology of Liberation," p. 349.
62. Ibid., p. 349.
63. See chap. 4, "Salvation and Conscientization," in Letty Russell, *Human Liberation in a Feminist Perspective* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974), pp. 104-31.
64. "Theology of Liberation," p. 346.
65. Final Document, Introduction to *Conclusions*, §6.
66. "Theology of Liberation," p. 346.
67. Introduction to *Conclusions*, §6.
68. "Theology of Liberation," pp. 346-47.
69. Justo L. González and Catherine G. González, *Liberation Preaching: The Pulpit and the Oppressed* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1980), pp. 38-48.
70. *Theology in a New Key*, pp. 88-89. See also José Severino Croatto, *Liberación y libertad: Pautas hermeneúicas* (Buenos Aires: Mundo Nuevo, 1973).
71. See Míguez Bonino, *Doing Theology*, and Moltmann, "An Open Letter to José Míguez Bonino," *Christianity and Crisis* (March 29, 1975), pp. 57-63.
72. *A Theology of Human Hope* (New York: Corpus, 1969).
73. Quoted by Alfred Hennelly, "Apprentices in Freedom: Theology since Medellín," *America* (May 29, 1978): 418.
74. Sobrino, *Christology at the Crossroads: A Latin American Approach* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1978); Boff, *Jesus Christ Liberator* (Orbis, 1978).
75. New York, Seabury, 1979.
76. New York, Seabury, 1980; see esp. part 4.
77. *A Theology of Liberation*, p. 203; *We Drink From Our Own Wells* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1984).
78. Bogotá, CELAM Departamento de Pastoral.
79. Madrid, Editorial Cristiandad, 1979 (first published in 1974); see also his *Seguimiento de Cristo* (Bogotá: Paulinas, 1978) and *El rostro de Dios* (Petrópolis: Vozes, 1979).

80. For a discussion of early formulations of liberation ecclesiology, see T. Howland Sanks and Brian H. Smith, "Liberation Ecclesiology: Praxis," *Theological Studies*, 38, 1 (March 1977) 3-38.
81. Segundo, *The Community Called Church* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1973); Boff, *Ecclesiogenesis: Las comunidades de base reinventan la Iglesia* (Santander: Sal Terrae, 2nd. ed., 1980).
82. See, for example, Brown, *Theology in a New Key*, pp. 80-85.
83. *The Coming of the Third Church* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1977).
84. "Apprentices," p. 421.
85. Ibid.
86. Maryknoll, N.Y., Orbis, 1977 (both works).
87. See The Final Statement of the Ecumenical Dialogue of Third World Theologians. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, August 5-12, 1976 in Sergio Torres and Virginia Fabella, M.M., eds., *The Emergent Gospel: Theology from the Underside of History* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1978), pp. 259-71.
88. See Thomas E. Quigley, ed., *Freedom and Unfreedom in the Americas: Toward a Theology of Liberation* (New York: IDOC, 1971).
89. See Sergio Torres and John Eagleson, eds., *Theology in the Americas* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1976).
90. See Cornel West, Caridad Guidote, and Margaret Coakley, eds. *Theology in the Americas: Detroit II Conference Papers* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Probe, 1981).
91. Proceedings of the conference have been published in Sergio Torres and John Eagleson, eds., *The Challenge of Basic Christian Communities* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1981).
92. Conference papers are published in Sergio Torres and Virginia Fabella, eds., *Doing Theology in a Divided World* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1985).
93. See, for example, J. M. Aubert et al., *Théologies de la libération en Amérique Latine* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1974).