

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

WHORM Subject File Code: CO073

(Countries: Ireland)

Case file Number(s): 130294 (2 of 2)

Box Number: 94

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: **reagan.library@nara.gov**

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

Last Updated: 11/16/2023

CELAM III interpreted liberation as "integral liberation" which means: "freedom from all forms of servitude, from personal and social sin, from all that divides man and society, and which has its source in egoism, in the mystery of sin." It also involves freedom "for progressive growth in one's self, in community with God and with other persons which culminates in the perfect communion of heaven where God is all in all and where there are no more tears." ⁵⁵ This definition stands in sharp contrast to the definition of liberation advanced by the more radical liberationist proponents. ⁵⁶ However, there is sufficient flexibility in this more restrictive definition and in other segments of the Puebla documents to provide the radicals room for their programs. The maldistribution of wealth and power was labelled by CELAM III as a "social sin" which could be alleviated through fundamental structural change, including new approaches to landholding, industry and commerce. ⁵⁷

Puebla makes clear that the Church, especially the priesthood, is to stay out of partisan politics to avoid becoming identified with secular political groups or ideologies. Lay persons, however, are encouraged to participate in politics; and furthermore, the Church will "train individuals to choose options consistent

with the common good to enhance the well-being of the weaker members of society." 58 The CEB's are endorsed as the "pastoral vehicle to promote evangelization as liberation" and included in the pastoral activities of the Church's leadership is the duty to promote awareness among individuals of problems and forms of oppression plus initiatives to act upon them. At the same time, the Puebla Conference took a more conservative position on who should ultimately control the CEB's. Originally viewed as lay groups to be led by and composed of lay members under the general auspices of the Church, the CEB's following Puebla are now placed squarely under the control of the bishop in whose diocese they operate. 59

In a final statement issued at the end of the Conference, the bishops assumed a position very similar to that voiced by Third World leaders regarding the developed world and the superpowers:

We do not accept the role of satellite to any country, nor subjugation to foreign ideologies. We want to live fraternally with all...but now is the time to warn the developed countries; do not manipulate us, do not block our progress, do not exploit us, but on the contrary, aid us in the spirit of high motivation to conquer barriers to our underdevelopment while respecting our culture, our principles, our sovereignty, our identity, and our national potentialities. 60

The Puebla Conference conclusions, though ambiguous and somewhat contradictory, seemed to place the Church

on the side of participatory democratic systems, mixed economies, and reformist social policies. While condemnatory of internal and external ideologies that support "oppressive structures," the overall thrust of CELAM III appears to favor gradualness, moderation, conciliation, pluralism, and consensus. 61

Chapter V

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE U.S.

The vibrant message and activism of the liberationists in Latin America possess important implications for the U.S. and its policies in the Hemisphere. The liberationist portrays the U.S. as the grand archvillain. In writings and conferences the liberationist maintains that the U.S. is the primary source of the poverty and oppression in Latin America. Through its aid and trade policies as well as its diplomatic and political positions, the U.S. has, says the liberationist, created the structures which "exploit and oppress" the people. The U.S. is blamed for inventing and propagating the "national security doctrine" which in turn is said to have created the political underpinnings for the military dictatorships south of the border. 62

Gustavo Gutierrez charges that:

...there can be authentic development for Latin America only if there is liberation from the domination exercised by the great capitalist countries, and especially by the most powerful, the U.S.A. It is becoming apparent that the Latin American people will not emerge from their present state except by means of a profound transformation, a social revolution. 63

Jose Miguez-Bonino and others insist that the CIA, the State Department and the Pentagon bring their influence to bear on Latin countries in behalf of U.S. companies to support their "exploitive" economic interests. Almost every unfortunate occurrence in Latin America can be traced to the sinister hand of the U.S. 64

That the U.S. is evil forms an essential part of the liberationist view. At an international ecumenical congress in February-March 1980 held in Sao Paulo, Brazil, an American hispanic was invited to speak. Her portrayal of the U.S., later published and given wide circulation, epitomizes the liberationist view:

The example of politicization and conscientization in the basic communities, often through the blood of martyrs, causes us both shame and profound pain: shame because we are from the country (U.S.) that has often provided arms and support for slaughter; pain because we are brothers and sisters of those who died.

This politicization leads us to work much along class lines. Individualism has appeared more clearly as one of the tools of the oppressors.

Pluralism in the U.S. creates great divisions and prevents our raising a voice united in support, as in the case of Nicaragua and El Salvador.

When I was young they used to tell me about a revolution in our country. They said that the whole world looked on our revolution with great joy.... Our country was begun in a spirit of sacrifice for the common good -- all under God! But it became a monstrous capitalistic machine that leaves human refuse in its cities

and eats all humankind alive. It is a joy for us to live with you the Resurrection of the new and true liberation.⁶⁵

Miguel D'Escoto, the liberationist Maryknoll priest and Foreign Minister of the Sandinista Government, has echoed on more than one occasion a view harbored by his colleagues to justify their program to expand their military establishment: "North American imperialism is just waiting for a chance to destroy us."⁶⁶ This charge is readily and easily accepted by liberationists everywhere because there is the disposition to impute to the U.S. the worst motives and greatest evil.

In a recent book entitled: Archbishop Romero, Martyr of Salvador, Placido Erdozain posits that it was the U.S. which killed Archbishop Romero.⁶⁷ He concludes this not from any facts presented, but from the whole body of liberationist belief that has reinforced the view that all evil-doing in the Hemisphere results from the "system of poverty and oppression" the U.S. has imposed.

An American writer, Penny Lernoux, has ably captured the liberationist effort to attribute demonic qualities to the U.S. Her book, Cry of the People, is subtitled: "U.S. Involvement in the Rise of Fascism, Torture, and Murder, and the Persecution of the Catholic Church in

Latin America." ⁶⁸ Ms. Lernoux devotes 535 pages to a recital of alleged sins and atrocities perpetrated in the Hemisphere by the U.S. government and American multinational corporations. The charges, many of which are overdrawn, are representative, however, of the liberationists' view of the U.S. and the deep hatred they hold for the "colossus of the North."

There are historic reasons for the anti-Americanism that exists in Latin America. The Mexican-American War and the U.S. intervention in various Caribbean and Central American countries provide hooks upon which current resentments can be hung. The very size of the U.S. and the large political and economic shadow that it casts in the Hemisphere have traditionally produced a mixture of envy, uneasiness, and animosity, especially among the more prideful Spanish-speaking Latin Americans. The intellectual elites have often tended to wrap their anti-Americanism in Marxist-Leninist trappings carefully and articulately propagating their views through not only artful literature but also through the university system to the youth. In Latin universities it has long been fashionable to be both anti-American and Marxist. It is not surprising, therefore, that Catholic liberationists, in a genuine effort to gain headway among the dis-

affected youth and others, should adopt the modalities of Marxian analysis and cast anti-Americanism into a moralistic mold: capitalism=exploitation=sin; the U.S.=imperialism=evil. This approach, reasoned the liberationists, would enable the Church to strike a responsive chord among elements of society that had long lain outside its fold.

By demonizing the U.S., the liberationists have adopted a tactic very similar to one used by Muslim fundamentalists to rally public opinion in the Middle East.⁶⁹ The animosity, fear, and suspicion of the U.S., reinforced by the liberationists' message, create greater barriers of misunderstanding and make the task of communicating and carrying out U.S. policies more difficult. In this atmosphere a U.S. offer of cooperation, aid, or trade concessions is viewed as a cynical attempt to control or subvert. Likewise in such an environment, violence and terrorism aimed at the U.S. are made to appear morally justifiable, thereby adversely affecting the physical well being and operational efficiency of official Americans serving in the Hemisphere.

Beyond the violence aimed at Americans is another factor abetted by liberationism which impacts on U.S. policy and security considerations for the Hemisphere:

the ever widening degree of political violence and insurgency which Castro, with Soviet approval, is assisting. Liberationism has provided the necessary impetus at the grass roots level in various countries, especially in Central America, for mobilizing popular support for leftist insurgents against established, traditional regimes. Poverty, authoritarianism, and anti-Americanism have existed for decades in most Latin American countries -- and yet these ingredients were not sufficient tinder from which leftist insurgents could fan the flames of a popularly supported revolution. Castro's earlier efforts to export his revolution by taking advantage of these favorable elements failed dramatically in the 1960's. In comparing the ingredients for revolution today with those of the early 1960's, the striking and almost singular difference is the position of the Church.⁷⁰ Liberationism had barely begun in the early 1960's and the Church was still dedicated to anti-communism and the status quo. Today, the liberationist doctrine provides the heart of the program and message of a substantial number of parish priests who preach revolution to the rural and poorer segments of society.

Castro, noting the important change in the attitude of a significant segment of the Catholic clergy, and

sensing other advantageous conditions in Latin America (including certain policies toward the Hemisphere under the Carter Administration), determined to resort once more to a more aggressive policy of aiding Latin insurgent movements in 1978. ⁷¹ Encouraged this time by the Soviets, the Cubans stepped up training for insurgents, supplied increasing amounts of arms and information on organizational effectiveness, and lent propaganda assistance and communications facilities.

Though the alliance between Castro and the liberationists remains informal, the two groups hold almost identical views regarding the means toward and the necessity for revolutionary change. The pro-Castro sentiment of those who espouse liberation theology is open and unabated. ⁷² The rather substantial change in attitude of the Church toward Castro's revolution is dramatically illustrated in two statements issued by the Cuban Catholic Episcopate -- the first issued by a non liberationist group of bishops shortly after Castro unmasked the Marxist cast of his revolution in 1960 and the second issued by a group of post-concilian prelates in 1969.

Let no one ask us Catholics to silence our opposition to such doctrines (of communism and the Cuban Revolution) out of a false sense of civil loyalty. We cannot agree to that without betraying our deepest principles, which are opposed to materialistic and atheistic

communism. The vast majority of the Cuban people are Catholic and only by deceit can they be won over to the communist regime. (Statement by the Cuban Episcopate, April 7, 1960.)⁷³

In the interests of our people and in service to the poor, faithful to the mandate of Jesus Christ and the commitments made at the Medellin Conference, we denounce the injustice of this (U.S.) blockade. For it causes a great increase in unnecessary suffering and greatly impedes the quest for development. (Statement by the Cuban Episcopate, April 10, 1969.)⁷⁴

Castro's open invitation to Catholics to join in an alliance to create revolution is well-known. He has clearly taken advantage of liberationist sympathies and their desire to promote revolutionary change.

The liberationists' campaign to demonize the U.S. and the Castro-liberationist alliance are combined with yet a third effort on another front to complicate U.S. policymaking regarding Latin America: the pressure exerted by an increasingly vocal and effective Church lobby in the U.S. The pressure takes various forms and is applied at all levels. U.S. orders of nuns and priests which support missionaries in Latin America circulate newsletters, sponsor seminars, and engage in letter writing-telephone campaigns aimed at U.S. government officials, Congressmen, and the media to block military assistance programs or to criticize other aspects of U.S. policy. The Maryknoll and Jesuit orders seem to be especially

well organized. During 1979-81, for example, the Office of Central American Affairs in the Department of State received thousands of letters from American nuns and priests as well as from adult parishioners and Catholic parochial school children. These letters were usually based on misinformation and sought not to ask for information, but to condemn and castigate. The school children's letters in particular were apparently written as class assignments.

A number of U.S. bishops have also accepted the liberationist view of events in Latin America and they, with the help of certain staff members of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, have been successful in obtaining that body's endorsement of resolutions condemning U.S. activities and policies. During the past several months Catholic bishops have testified on the Hill before Congressional committees and have written to and met with ranking officials in the State Department and the White House in support of the Nicaraguan Sandinista government and against any assistance to the governments of El Salvador and Guatemala. While the murder of Archbishop Romero (March 1980) and the Catholic missionaries in El Salvador (December 1981) helped mobilize Catholic opinion in the U.S., the campaign of criticism preceded their deaths

and is based on a range of issues, often couched in the same phraseology used by the liberationists.

One well-informed Jesuit who has followed the growth of the liberationist sentiment in the U.S. Catholic community suspects that a large majority of bishops and communicants have accepted the liberationist view at face value without carefully examining the facts or the assumptions upon which the analysis is made. He believes liberationism has become so "fashionable" because of a number of factors, not the least of which is the Church's current activism in social issues and "political causes of the day." 75

Several lobbyist groups are also staffed by former or current nuns and priests who actively seek to adjust U.S. policy toward Latin America to conform to liberationist goals. The Washington Office of Latin America (WOLA) and Network in Solidarity with the People of Guatemala are two of the more noteworthy groups. Their publications and information letters reflect liberationist arguments and terminology.

Over 300 "Solidarity with the People of El Salvador Committees" have been organized in cities across the U.S. during the past two years. These groups have been actively supported and in some cases organized by Catholic

groups. They conduct public forums and demonstrations to mobilize support for the Salvadoran leftist guerrilla war effort. Besides soliciting collections and funneling funds to the insurgents, the committees are actively engaged in trying to prove that the U.S. is involved in an "immoral, imperialist" war effort like Vietnam against El Salvador's "oppressed masses." The solidarity committees provide the financing and other arrangements for leaders of the Salvadoran leftist front to visit the U.S., appear at press conferences, and give testimony before Congressional committees. Their meetings are often held in Church facilities and their propaganda materials are distributed in churches to regular parishioners.

Not only has a significant element of the Catholic Church become involved in efforts to convince the American body politic and the government of the correctness of the liberationist analysis of events in Latin America, the staffmembers ⁷⁶ of the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches have also endeavored to place these Protestant institutions squarely in the liberationist camp. In February, 1981, for example, delegates to the National Council of Churches meeting in Philadelphia adopted resolutions critical of U.S.

aid to El Salvador and Guatemala. ⁷⁷ Speakers before the conference presented only one side of the issues, and the interpretation was liberationist in slant.

The expanding Hispanic population in the U.S. is largely Catholic and is providing the Church with one of its most important challenges as it seeks to restructure programs to meet the needs of this community. The political power potential and the ability to influence American foreign and domestic policies of this soon-to-be-largest minority have not been lost on Catholic liberationists. Enrique Dussel outlined in 1976 a "strategy for action of the Latin American-Chicano Christian in the U.S." He calls upon American Catholic leaders to take this relatively new Latin minority through a series of nine steps of logic to make them aware of their culture and their oppression. Dussel says the message must consist of the following.

1. The Latin American-Chicanos are a 'people'.
2. The Latin American-Chicanos are a dependent and oppressed people.
3. The Latin American-Chicanos are a dependent and oppressed people within an imperial nation.
4. The Latin American-Chicanos must become aware.
5. The Latin American-Chicanos must become aware in order to liberate themselves.

(It is not a question, then, of entering into the system as we find it, but rather of freeing oneself from oppression in order to change the totality of the system.)

6. The Latin American-Chicanos must become aware in order to liberate themselves and to liberate the poor nations of the world. (They must struggle so that their brothers and sisters to the south, from the Rio Grande to Antarctica, can also liberate themselves.)
7. Christian Latin American-Chicanos are part of a people who must become aware. (The Latin American-Chicano people are a beaten and robbed people.)
8. Christian Latin American-Chicanos are part of a dependent and oppressed people who must become aware in order to liberate themselves.
9. Christian Latin American-Chicanos are a dependent and oppressed people within an imperial nation who must become aware in order to liberate themselves and to liberate the poor nations of the world. 78

The propagation of this message, which sums up almost perfectly the liberation viewpoint, could clearly affect U.S. policymaking in the future as it attempts to address outstanding issues in U.S. relations with Latin America. It is already apparent that the force of the liberation argumentation has influenced and activated the U.S. Catholic Church to exert pressure on the government's policymaking machinery. Whether the "internal revolution" support by liberationists in the U.S. to obtain their

objectives abroad can be realized through the manipulation of the Hispanic community remains to be seen. It is a factor, however, which should be understood and appreciated for its potential.

Chapter VI

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE U.S.

Does liberation theology pose a serious challenge for the U.S. in Latin America, and if so, what policies should we adopt to deal with it? Unquestionably, both the content of liberation theology and the approach it proposes complicate the ability of the U.S. to conduct business in the Western Hemisphere. Liberation theology's insistence on a total economic and political restructuring through violence (if necessary) and its effort to ascribe the ills of the Hemisphere to the U.S. naturally create a difficult if not dangerous atmosphere in which to try to maintain constructive relationships. And from a geopolitical perspective, the informal alliance between liberationists and the radical left poses a security problem, especially as Castro and the Soviets have decided to take advantage of it for their own purposes.

Several alternatives are worth consideration. We could ignore the social and political dynamics set in motion by liberation theology and do nothing. This approach is appealing in that given the limited economic and military assistance we possess and the heavy commitments we have in Western Europe, the Middle East, and

the Far East, we simply do not have sufficient resources to respond to the full range of challenges posed in the Western Hemisphere. This option is rather shortsighted, however, and ignores the threat to our security and other interests of an increasingly hostile Hemisphere. The other extreme would be to accept as valid the tenets of liberation theology and adjust U.S. policies toward Latin America accordingly. Besides being unrealistic in that it would require either reshaping our national psychic completely or ignoring our economic and security interests, this approach could eventually reduce the Hemisphere to a group of pitifully poor socialistic states with governments more authoritarian than ever, incapable of meeting the economic and political needs of their peoples.

A middle course would seem both more reasonable and advisable. The U.S. should seek: (a) to engage the liberationists in an active dialogue to determine areas of agreement and to correct misimpressions, (b) to expose the fallacies and false hopes of liberation theology, and (c) to encourage where possible moderate Catholic elements, including the Vatican, in their efforts to keep the Church on the path toward promoting social justice through evolutionary change, free of radical

ideological content and violence. At the same time we should continue pushing imaginative aid, trade, and investment programs, such as the Caribbean Basin Initiative, to help correct the economic and social disparities plaguing the region.

The problem posed by liberation theology is principally conceptual and ideological in nature. The U.S. should therefore approach the problem with an effective counterforce of ideas. Our information programs and dialogue should be refined to focus on the errors inherent in the liberationists' Marxian analysis and the bankruptcy -- both morally, politically, and economically -- of radical reforms that sacrifice human individuality and liberties for illusive utopian ideals. Instead of avoiding contact with liberationist advocates we should actively engage them in open debate to correct misinformation and challenge the bases of their philosophical orientation. We must also concede that much of the turmoil in Latin America today derives its impetus from legitimate social and economic grievances which current regimes have often failed to address or have sought to perpetuate. We should make clear our conviction that these grievances can only be corrected through steady, long term reform efforts conducted in an atmosphere of peace and stability. While

it would be too much to expect the dialogue to result in the conversion of liberationists to the U.S. point of view, the exchange would open their eyes to the rational bases of U.S. policies and would, at the same time, deprive them of the argument that their views are not being listened to by policymakers before decisions are made. Regular contact between churchmen and State Department and Embassy officers throughout the Hemisphere should be increased with these purposes in mind. With U.S. Catholic leaders we should be especially persistent in our explanation that the course prescribed by liberation theology does not offer a solution to the area's basic problems and instead increases violence and heavy human and material destruction. A thorough understanding of liberation theology would, of course, be a prerequisite in such an extensive undertaking.

Frequent exchanges with the Vatican and the Catholic leadership among the Latin American moderates should be conducted as well with a view toward adjusting our policies where possible to meet their concerns. In our efforts to encourage the moderates, we would, of course, have to be sensitive to their position, avoiding too close an association to prevent compromising them. As time passes, and if current trends continue, we can expect

the moderates themselves to gain ascendancy over the liberationists to control Church institutions and policies to a greater degree. But the primary weight of this struggle should appropriately rest with the Church's moderates. The U.S. government, while keeping engaged as already indicated, should avoid becoming the chief protagonist.

Pursuing this policy approach should enable the U.S. to deal effectively with the more immediate negative aspects of liberation theology and would permit other, more qualified advocates to carry on the long range effort to free the Church of an alien force and ideology.

Notes

Chapter I (p. 1-5)

1. Daniel H. Levine, ed., Churches and Politics in Latin America (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1980), p. 20.

2. See also Juan Luis Segundo, Liberation of Theology (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1976), pp. 165-166 for a discussion of how a liberationist views the use of violence.

3. Robert McAfee Brown, Theology in a New Key: Responding to Liberation Themes (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), pp. 53-54. Also see The Church in the Present Day Transformation of Latin America, Second General Conference of Latin American Bishops, Conclusions, U.S. Catholic Conference, Washington, D.C., 1973.

Chapter II (p. 6-16)

4. There were conflicts between the Church and certain liberal, republican elements throughout the nineteenth century which centered around the enormous property holdings of the Church. The "liberals" in that age were dedicated to reducing the Church's power in this particular area and were often associated with the Masonic Lodge. They were labelled "anti-clericals" by their contemporaries. The Church's political role was also challenged by this group and in fact the Church had its influence curtailed in a number of countries, especially in Mexico.

5. Enrique Dussel, History and the Theology of Liberation (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1976), p. X.

6. Thomas G. Sanders, The Puebla Conference (Hanover, N.H.: American Universities Field Staff, 1979), p. 3.

7. William D'Antonio and Frederick B. Pike, Religion, Revolution and Reform, New Forces for Change in Latin America (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1964), pp. 130-42. See also: Luigi Einaudi, Richard Maullin, Alfred Stepan and Michael Fleet, Latin American Institutional Development: The Changing Catholic Church, Rand Corporation, Oct., 1969, p. V; J. Lloyd Mecham, Church and State in Latin America (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966), p. 424.

8. John J. Considine, Social Revolution in the New Latin America Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Publishers, 1965), p. 168.

9. See Daniel H. Levine, Religion and Politics in Latin America: The Catholic Church in Venezuela and Colombia (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1981), for a more detailed description of these different approaches.

10. Karl M. Schmitt, ed. The Roman Catholic Church in Modern Latin America (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1972), pp. 139-42.

11. Ibid., p. 146.

12. Gustavo Gutierrez, A Theology of Liberation (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1973), p. 36.

13. Ibid., p. 37.

14. Ibid., p. 87.

15. Gustavo Gutierrez, Praxis of Liberation and Christian Faith, Mexican American Cultural Center, San Antonio, Texas, 1976, p. 30.

16. Ibid., p. 18.

17. Ibid., p. 1.

18. Ibid., p. 1.

19. Penny Lernoux, Cry of the People (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co. Inc., 1980), p. 432.

20. Jose Comblin, The Church and the National Security State Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1979), pp. 236.

21. Ibid., p. 88.

22. Ibid., p. 33-34.

23. Ibid., p. 215.

24. Ibid., p. 216.

25. Jose Miguez-Bonino, Christians and Marxists, The Mutual Challenge to Revolution (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975), pp. 6-9 and p. 124.

26. Karl M. Schmitt, ed., op. cit., p. 151.

27. U.S. Department of State, Airgram from AmEmbassy Guatemala, 3 June 1981. SECRET

28. Telephone conversation with Thomas Quigley, International Commission of Justice and Peace, U.S. Catholic Council, Washington, D.C., 10 February 1982.

Chapter III (p. 17-30)

29. Arriving at general percentages where there is no data base is always difficult and imprecise. The percentages I have chosen are broad estimates based on a combination of my personal knowledge of the Church in Latin America and of estimates provided by others on the Church in specific countries. I feel fairly confident of my estimates regarding the general political dispositions of the Brazilian Church based on my first hand experience during my tours in Rio and Recife. Daniel Levine's studies of the Church in Venezuela, Colombia, and Chile were very helpful in obtaining a general fix on the percentage of those countries. My recent experience with Central America gave me some insights into the Church there. I drew upon both conversations with Catholic leaders and our Embassies' reports to arrive at my estimates there. The airgram of June 3, 1981, from our Embassy in Guatemala did contain some precise information on the numbers of priests involved with the liberationist movement, bearing out conclusions I had reached on my own. Also the well publicized struggle prior to and during the Puebla Conference between the "liberal" and "conservative" camps provided some inkling of the general order of magnitude of each group's size.

30. U.S. Department of State, Airgram from AmEmbassy Guatemala, op. cit.

31. U.S. Department of State, cables from Tegucigalpa, March 2, 1981 (CONFIDENTIAL) and July 8, 1981. SECRET

32. Alan Riding, "Religion Becomes Political Battleground in Nicaragua," The New York Times, 29 May 1981.

33. Thomas C. Bruneau, The Political Transformation of the Brazilian Catholic Church (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974), p. 79. See also: Penny Lernoux, op. cit., p. 40. Teofilo Cabestrero, Mystic of Liberation: A Portrait of Pedro Casaldaliga (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1981), p. 132.

34. Daniel H. Levine, ed., Churches and Politics in Latin America, op. cit., p. 121.

35. Sergio Torres and John Egelson, ed., The Challenge of Basic Christian Communities: Papers from the International Ecumenical Congress, February 20-March 2, 1980, Sao Paulo, Brazil (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1981), p. 69.

36. Ibid., p. 70.

37. Ibid., pp. 62-65.

38. U.S. Department of State, cable from AmEmbassy Tegucigalpa, op. cit., 2 March 1981.

39. Daniel H. Levine, ed., Churches and Politics in Latin America, op. cit., p. 20.

40. Ibid.

41. Piero Monni, Puebla '78, "Interview with Bishop Lopez Trujillo," (Rome: Edizioni Stadium, 1978), pp. 75-80. See also Alfonso Lopez Trujillo, Teologia Liberadora en America Latina (Bogota: Paulinas, 1974). Alfonso Lopez Trujillo, Liberacion Marxista, Liberacion Christiana (Madrid: B.A.C., 1974). Alfonso Lopez Trujillo, Liberacion or Revolution (Huntington, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor, Inc., 1975), pp. 128.

42. U.S. Department of State, cable from AmEmbassy Managua, 17 July 1981. CONFIDENTIAL

43. Letter from Pedro Arrupe, S.J., to the Provincials of Latin America and for Information to All Superiors. "On Marxist Analysis," 8 December 1980.

44. Sari Gilbert, "Pontiff Orders Jesuits to Stress Spiritual Matters," The Washington Post, 28 February 1982. p. A24.

45. Sari Gilbert, "Vatican Stresses Ban on Priests' Political Work," The Washington Post, 9 March 1982, p. A12.

46. U.S. Department of State, cable from AmEmbassy Santiago, 27 March 1981. LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

47. Daniel H. Levine, ed., Religion and Politics in Latin America, op. cit., pp. 58-60.

48. Ibid., p. 306.

Chapter IV (p. 30-36)

49. Placing political labels on groups is always difficult if not deceptive. Those prelates who are on the far left end of the political spectrum call themselves "progressives"; they and their supporters identify all others as "conservatives", "reactionaries", or "traditionalists." I have chosen to distinguish among the groups using the usual terminology employed by most political analysts: those on the far left are "radicals"; those in the middle are "moderates" or "middle-of-the-roaders"; and those on the far right are "conservatives."

50. Penny Lernoux, op. cit., Chapter XI. See also U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR), "From Medellin to Puebla: Controversy and Change in the Church," (U) (n.p.: 24 April 1979), p. 6. CONFIDENTIAL

51. The 184 were divided as follows: 18 from the CELAM Secretariat, 150 bishops chosen from and by the national bishops conferences, and the 16 presidents of those conferences.

52. Placido Erdozain, op. cit., p. 56.

53. Thomas G. Sanders, op. cit., p. 4.

54. U.S. Department of State, INR paper, op. cit., p. 9.

55. Thomas G. Sanders, op. cit., p. 3.

56. See earlier discussion of the definition of liberation theology on p. 1 of this paper.

57. U.S. Department of State, INR paper, op. cit., p. 9.

58. Thomas G. Sanders, op. cit., p. 5.

59. Ibid., p. 7.

60. U.S. Department of State, INR paper, op. cit., p. 9.

61. Thomas G. Sanders, op. cit., p. 9.

Chapter V (p. 37-50)

62. See p. 11 of this paper and Jose Comblin, op. cit.

63. Gustavo Gutierrez, A Theology of Liberation, op. cit., p. 88.

64. Jose Miguez-Bonino, Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), pp. 28-29.

65. Sergio Torres and John Egelson, ed., op. cit., p. 255.

66. Ibid., p. 195.

67. Placido Erdozain, op. cit., p. 81.

68. Alan Riding, The New York Times correspondent covering Mexico and Central America, praises Ms. Lernoux's book (New York Review of Books, 28 May 1981) but contends that the subtitle was written by Ms. Lernoux's publisher, Orbis Books of the Maryknoll Order in New York.

69. As do the Muslim fundamentalists, liberationists also proclaim as "martyr" any person who dies fighting for or while serving the cause. Ms. Lernoux's book lists a sizeable number of persons considered to be modern martyrs.

70. Alan Riding, "The Sword and the Cross", New York Review of Books, 28 May 1981.

71. U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Cuba's Renewed Support for Violence in Latin America, Special Report No. 90, Washington, D.C., 14 December 1981.

72. See Dom Helder Camara, Revolution Through Peace (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), 149 pp. and also Jose Miguez-Bonino, Christian and Marxists, the Mutual Challenge to Revolution, op. cit., 167 pp. Also important is: Denis Goulet, A New Moral Order (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1974), p. 124.

73. Enrique Dussel, op. cit., p. 120.

74. Ibid., p. 121.

75. Interview with Francis Winters, S.J., Professor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.: 3 November 1981.

76. The staffs of the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches are not representative of the Protestant effort in Latin America. Protestant missions are generally conservative and apolitical, though they are composed primarily of the economically poorer segments of both the rural and urban populations.

77. Frank P.L. Somerville, "Church Body Asks Reagan to Promote Salvadoran Talks," The Baltimore Sun, 9 February 1981.

78. Enrique Dussel, op. cit., pp. 172-177.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Blasier, Cole. The Hovering Giant. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1978.
- Brown, Robert McAfee. The Theology in a New Key: Responding to Liberation Themes. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978.
- Bruneau, Thomas C. The Political Transformation of the Brazilian Catholic Church. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Camara, Helder. Revolution Through Peace. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- Cabestrero, Teofilo. Mystic of Liberation: A Portrait of Pedro Casaldaliga. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1981.
- Comblin, Jose. The Church and the National Security State. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1979.
- Considine, John J., ed. Social Revolution in the New Latin America. Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Publications, 1965.
- D'Antonio, William V. and Pike, Frederick B. Religion, Revolution and Reform, New Forces for Change in Latin America. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1964.
- Dussel, Enrique. Ethics and the Theology of Liberation. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1974.
- _____. History and the Theology of Liberation. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1976.
- Einaudi, Luigi, et. al. Latin American Institutional Development: The Changing Catholic Church. Rand Corporation, 1969.
- Erdozain, Placido. Archbishop Romero: Martyr of El Salvador. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1981.

- Goulet, Denis. A New Moral Order. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1974.
- Gutierrez, Gustavo. A Theology of Liberation. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1973.
- _____. Praxis of Liberation and Christian Faith. San Antonio, Texas: Mexican American Cultural Center, 1976.
- Hodges, Donald C. The Latin American Revolution: Politics and Strategy from APRA-Marxism to Guevarism. New York: William Morrow & Co., 1974.
- Houtart, Francois and Pin, Emile. The Church and the Latin American Revolution. New York: Sheed and Ward, Inc., 1965.
- Horowitz, Irving L., et. al. Latin American Radicalism. New York: Random House, 1969.
- Illich, Ivan. The Church, Change and Development. Chicago: Urban Training Center Press, 1970.
- Landsberger, Henry A., ed. The Church and Social Change in Latin America. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1970.
- Lernoux, Penny. Cry of the People. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1980.
- Levine, Daniel H., ed. Churches and Politics in Latin America. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1980.
- _____. Religion and Politics in Latin America: The Catholic Church in Venezuela and Colombia. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- Lindquist, Sven. The Shadow: Latin America Faces the Seventies. New York: Penquin Books, Inc., 1974.
- Lopez Trujillo, Alfonso. Liberation or Revolution. Huntington, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor, Inc., 1975.
- _____. Teologia Liberadora en America Latina. Bogota: Ediciones Paulinas, 1974.

Medellin Conference Conclusions: The Church in the Present-Day Transformation of Latin America. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Catholic Conference, 1973.

Mecham, J. Lloyd. Church and State in Latin America. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1966.

Miguez-Bonino, Jose. Christians and Marxists, The Mutual Challenge to Revolution. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1976.

_____. Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation. Philadelphia: Fortress press, 1976.

Monni, Piero and Grieco, Gianfranco. Puebla '78. Rome: Edizioni Studium, 1978.

Murray, John Courtney. We Hold These Truths. Garden City, N.Y.: Image Books, 1960.

McCann, Dennis. Christian Realism and Liberation Theology. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1981.

Sanders, Thomas G. The Puebla Conference. Hanover, N.H.: American Universities Field Staff, 1979.

Schmitt, Karl M., ed. The Roman Catholic Church in Modern Latin America. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1972.

Segundo, Juan Luis. Liberation of Theology. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1976.

Torres, Sergio and Egelson, John, ed. The Challenge of Basic Christian Communities. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1981.

Periodical Articles

Hofmann, Paul. "The Jesuits." The New York Times Magazine, 14 February 1982, pp. 24-39.

Langan, John, S.J. "Liberation Theology in a Northern Context." America, 27 January 1979, pp. 46-49.

Ostling, Richard N. "The Jesuits Come to Rome." Time, 15 March 1982, p. 78.

Riding, Alan. "The Sword and the Cross." New York Review of Books, 28 May 1981.

Newspaper Articles

"Brother Bishops." (editorial) The Washington Post, 23 November 1981, p. A18.

Buckley, William F. Jr. "Love the Lord, Not Fidel Castro." The Washington Star, 16 June 1981, editorial page.

Geyer, Georgie Anne. "American Catholics Are Being Used on El Salvador." The Washington Star, 13 March 1981, editorial page.

Gilbert, Sari. "Papal Encyclical Urges Greater Rights, Benefits for Workers." The Washington Post, 16 September 1981, pp. A1 and A18.

_____. "Jesuits Meeting in Rome to Confront Pope's Criticism of Activist Priests." The Washington Post, 24 February 1982, p. A17.

_____. "Vatican Stresses Ban on Priests' Political Work." The Washington Post, 9 March 1982, p. A12.

Gorney, Cynthia. "The Gospel of Brazil's 'Red Bishop'." The Washington Post, 1 September 1981, pp. B1 and B6.

Gourley, Marshall. "Haig Misjudges Conflict in Central America." The Denver Post, 14 February 1981, p. 6B.

Hyer, Marjorie. "Catholic Bishops Urge Halt to Arms for El Salvador." The Washington Post, 20 November 1981, p. A11.

_____. "Demonstrations Mark Anniversary of Nun's Slayings." The Washington Post, 3 December 1981, p. A38.

_____. "New Direction: Archbishop Hickey Revitalizes Church." The Washington Post, 2 January 1982, pp. B1 and B5.

Jenkins, Loren. "Maryknollers Reconsider Role in El Salvador After Action by Priest." The Washington Post, 14 May 1981, p. A15.

McCarthy, Colman. "The Maryknoll Order: Contending with Criticism of their Presence in El Salvador." The Washington Post, 19 April 1981, pp. G1 and G4.

Riding, Alan. "Religion Becomes Political Battleground in Nicaragua." The New York Times, 29 May 1981.

Schall, James V. "Priests as Revolutionaries, Religion as Power Politics." The Washington Star, 27 March 1981, editorial page.

Shaw, Terri. "Groups Compete in Central American Policy." The Washington Post, 7 March 1982.

Somerville, Frank P.L. "Church Body Asks Reagan to Promote Salvador Talks." The Baltimore Sun, 9 February 1981.

Unpublished Material

Letter from Pedro Arrupe, S.J., to the Provincials of Latin America and for Information to all Major Superiors, 8 December 1980.

Williams, Edward J. "The Emergence of the Secular Nation State and Latin American Catholicism." Unpublished Research Paper. University of Arizona, Tempe, Arizona: 1971.

Interviews

Interview with Mr. James Buchanan, Research Analyst, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.: 11 November 1981.

Interview with Dr. Luigi Einaudi, Director, Office of Policy Planning, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.: 27 October 1981.

Interview with Alfred T. Hennelly, S.J., Woodstock Theological Center, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.: 28 October 1981.

Interview with Thomas Quigley and Edward Doherty, Staff Members, Committee on International Justice and Peace, U.S. Catholic Council, Washington, D.C.: 12 November 1981 and 10 February 1982 (telcon).

Interview with Dr. Alexander Wilde, Fellow, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.: 29 October 1981.

Interview with Francis Winters, S.J., Instructor, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.: 4 November 1981.

U.S. Government Documents

U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs: Cuba's Renewed Support for Violence in Latin America, Special Report No. 90. Washington, D.C., 14 December 1981.

U.S. Department of State, Foreign Broadcast Information Service, Cables from Chiva Chiva PN as follows: 111530Z May 1981, 132225Z May 1981, 222208Z May 1981, 221524Z May 1981.

U.S. Department of State, Foreign Broadcast Information Service, Latin America VI, 18 September 1981, pp. D1-D5.

U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR). "From Medellin to Puebla: Controversy and Change in the Church" (U). n.p.: 24 April 1979. CONFIDENTIAL

U.S. Department of State, Airgram from Amembassy Guatemala (A-23), 3 June 1981. SECRET

U.S. Department of State, Memorandum of Conversation, Amembassy Brasilia, 17 May 1981. CONFIDENTIAL

U.S. Department of State, Memorandum of Conversation, Amconsul Porto Alegre, 19 June 1981. CONFIDENTIAL

U.S. Department of State, Cables from Embassies as follows: Brasilia 3989, 12 May 1981. LIMITED OFFICIAL USE; Brasilia 7259, 5 September 1981. CONFIDENTIAL; Managua 2625, 13 June 1981. CONFIDENTIAL; Managua 3122, 17 July 1981. CONFIDENTIAL; Sao Paulo 558, 10 March 1981, LIMITED OFFICIAL USE; San Salvador

1761, 3 March 1982. CONFIDENTIAL; Santiago 1801,
27 March 1981, LIMITED OFFICIAL USE; Tegucigalpa
1448, 2 March 1981. CONFIDENTIAL; Tegucigalpa,
8 July 1981. SECRET

484

National Security Council
The White House

Package # 8927

103 P5: 19

	SEQUENCE TO	HAS SEEN	ACTION
John Poindexter	<u>1</u>	<u>[initials]</u>	<u>I</u>
Bud McFarlane	<u>2</u>	<u>m</u>	
Jacque Hill	<u>3</u>	<u>[initials]</u>	
Judge Clark	<u>4</u>		<u>I</u>
John Poindexter			
Staff Secretary			
Sit Room			

I-Information A-Action R-Retain D-Dispatch N-No further Action

DISTRIBUTION

cc: VP Meese Baker Deaver Other _____

COMMENTS

RECEIVED 30 DEC 82 12

TO CLARK

FROM DAILEY, PETER H/

DOCDATE 15 DEC 82

SAPIA-BOSCH

03 JAN 83

KEYWORDS: LATIN AMERICA

EL SALVADOR

BROWN, RICHARD

MEDIA

IRELAND

SUBJECT: FWDS DOCUMENT ON LIBERATION THEOLOGY BY BROWN RE US POLICY IN CENTRAL AMERICA CRITIZED BY CHURCH LEADERS

ACTION: PREPARE MEMO FOR CLARK

DUE:

STATUS C

FILES WH

FOR ACTION

FOR CONCURRENCE

FOR INFO

SAPIA-BOSCH

FONTAINE

NORTH

MYER

SIMS

BLAIR

COMMENTS

REF#

LOG

NSCIFID

(HW MB)

ACTION OFFICER (S)

ASSIGNED

ACTION REQUIRED

DUE

COPIES TO

- 9/10/84 Orig ret'd to NSC/S

DISPATCH

W/ATTCH

FILE

(C)

88

FROM BARRY, WALTER H.
BARRY-ROCK

CLASS

BROWN, STEPHEN

EL BARAZAN

SYNDICATE LATIN AMERICA

REMARKS

MEDIA

OBJECT: THIS DOCUMENT IS DESIGNATED CONFIDENTIAL BY BROWN RE US POLICY IN GENERAL

AMERICA CONTROLLED BY COMMUNIST LEADERS

ACTION: PREPARE MEMO FOR DEAR ... DATE ... STATUS: FILED IN

FOR ACTION ... FOR DEAR ...

BARRY-ROCK ... BROWN ...

DATE ...

COMMENTS

REF: ... RECEIVED ...

ACTION OFFICER (S) ... ACTION REQUIRED ... COPIES TO

2/1/54 prep into to HSC/2

RECEIVED 30 DEC 82 12

DOCDATE 15 DEC 82

SUSPENSE

TO CLARK FROM DAILEY, PETER H

KEYWORDS: LATIN AMERICA EL SALVADOR BROWN, RICHARD
MEDIA IRELAND

SUBJECT: FWDS DOCUMENT ON LIBERATION THEOLOGY BY BROWN RE US POLICY IN CENTRAL AMERICA CRITIZED BY CHURCH LEADERS

ACTION: PREPARE MEMO FOR CLARK DUE: 03 JAN 83 STATUS S FILES

FOR ACTION	FOR CONCURRENCE	FOR INFO
SAPIA-BOSCH	FONTAINE SIMS	NORTH BLAIR MYER

COMMENTS

REF# LOG NSCIFID (H /)

ACTION OFFICER (S)	ASSIGNED	ACTION REQUIRED	DUE	COPIES TO
	<i>C 3/1</i>	<i>DNK</i>		

DISPATCH _____ W/ATTCH FILE *6/27* (C) *sub*

12

SUSPENSE