CHAPTER VIII

THE PRINCIPAL STAGES IN THE HISTOR'Y OF THE CHURCH IN POLITICALLY NEOCOLONIAL LATIN AMET'ICA

Following independence, the Church in Latin America was absolutely isolated and forced to give up many of its previous advantages and privileges. During this process the Church passed through a veritable "dark night of her history," but later emerged profoundly purified, poor, and adapted to the new situation.

I. THE SIXTH STAGE: THE CRISIS OF THE WARS FOR INDEPENDENCE (1808 - 1825)

In the struggle for independence the secular and religious clergy played a significant role, even though the hierarchy for the most part adopted an ambiguous position. In view of the fact that the clergy were the most educated people in Latin America at the end of the eighteenth century, their attitude toward Spain and the question of independence was crucial for the success of the struggle for freedom. This explains the fact that immediately following the revolutions, all the governments did not move toward the secularization of society. Very soon, however, the lack of members, the disorganization, the divisions, and the weariness brought about by the wars for independence began to take their toll. As early as 1815 the Paraguayan dictator, José Gaspar Rodríguez de Francia (1816 - 1840), abolished the tithe, suppressed religious orders as well as the Inquisition, and established civil marriage. Francia's efforts to make the Church subservient to his will probably stemmed more from his determination to control the ambitious Creoles and Spaniards in the colonial oligarchy than from any theological or anticlerical convictions. By 1820, however, several new national governments had begun to suppress the Church. The discussion of this period will be enlarged not only because new nations arose in Latin America during this time, but also because the period signified for the Church enormous and irretrievable losses, especially of its professors of theology, religious communities, seminaries, churches, and ecclesiastical projects in general. This crisis, together with the missionary crisis in France and in all of Europe, helps to explain the history of Latin America until the beginning of the twentieth century.

1. The Attitude of the Episcopacy

Though it is not possible to examine the position of the higher clergy in every nation, several of the more outstanding examples can be noted. In Mexico, for example, Bishop Friar Antonio de San Miguel of Michoacán brought together a group of legal economists, some of whom were known supporters of the revolution. Other bishops, how-

ever, such as Lizana of Mexico City, Primo Feliciano Marín of Monterrey, Llanos of Chiapas, Estévez in the Yucatán, and especially Manuel Ignacio González del Campillo of Puebla, were either indifferent or openly opposed to the revolution. During the second war for independence, however, and primarily as a result of the liberal posture of the Spanish government of 1820 and the action of Canon Monteagudo in 1821, the Mexican episcopacy tended to support the patriots.

In Peru the movement for independence began in 1809, and the first rebellion or uprising occurred in Pumacagua. Bishop José Pérez y Armendáriz in Cuzco did not oppose the insurgents, and when the rebellion was crushed, Pérez was deposed by Ferdinand VII. The other Peruvian bishops supported the royalists against the independence movement, although Silva y Olave, Carrión, and Goyeneche maintained cordial relations with the victorious patriots. It was clear to the Church in Peru, however, that with the end of the colony there would be the loss of the Church's predominance in South America. Furthermore, because of the rich and powerful Spanish organization, the patriots saw the opposition as highly structured. It was the charisma of San Martín that instilled confidence in the Southern struggle for independence. "I cite the importance of what took place in the attainment of freedom and independence of Peru. ...I cite the prodigious triumph of a small group of men coming from such a long distance, half-starved, half-naked, led by a half-dozen generals who were simple, peaceful men, without any more artillery than a cannon, fighting against an army double or triple in number, and situated in its own territory." Thus did Bishop Orihela, in his "Pastoral to the People and Clergy" in February, 1825, eulogize the army of San Martín that originally had been recruited in Mendoza, Argentina.

In the area of the River Plate the situation was quite different. Bishop Lué y Reiga of Buenos Aires opposed the organization of the First Junta, but once it was constituted his opposition ceased. The bishop died, however, in 1812. Bishop Orellana of Córdoba, in contrast, allied himself with the counterrevolutionary movement headed by Liniers and was banished from the country in 1818. Bishop Videla del Pino of Salta was expelled by Belgrano because of support given to a group of royalists. As early as 1812, therefore, the episcopacy began to disappear from Argentina. Uruguay had no bishops. In Bolivia, Bishop Moxó y Francolí of Charcas adopted a more moderate and conciliatory position and even received the triumphant troops who came from Buenos Aires. Unfortunately, however, he also was banished in 1816. Meanwhile, Bishop Remigio de La Santa y Ortega of La Paz, a convinced royalist, returned to Spain in 1814. Bishop Javier de Aldazábal of Santa Cruz did not oppose the revolution, but he died in 1812, and his position remained vacant until 1821. Bishop Roque Antonio de Céspedes of Paraguay was alleged to be insane by the dictator Francia and was thus deposed.

In Chile, the Capitular Vicar, José Santiago Rodríquez Zorilla, was an unalterable royalist, as was Bishop Diego Antonio Martín de Villodres of Concepción, who supported the counterrevolution in 1813. The latter left Chile in 1815 when the victory of the patriots was evident.

The situation was quite distinct in Ecuador, however, where the president of the Second Junta was Bishop Cuero y Caicedo, who also presided over the First Constitutional Congress.

> The Reverend Bishop, Don Juan José Caicedo, was one of the most implacable enemies of the royal cause. His pastorals and revolutionary preachings attracted a great number of the clergy, and many religious were extended indulgences by the prelate when they left their

> offices to defend the country and the cause of liberty. The Bishop also provided arms for many of these roving bands who were dedicated to harassing the royalists and thus strengthened the forces of those who supported the movement for independence.[1]

Andrés Quintián, Bishop of Cuenca, was conversely a convinced royalist and fought consistencly against independence.

In Colombia, the Bishop of Santa Fe de Bogotá, Juan Bautista Sacristán, was reluctant to endorse the revolution at first but later adopted a more conciliatory position and was permitted to continue governing his diocese until he died in 1817. The Bishop of Santa Marta, Sánchez Serrudo, followed the example of Sacristán, but Sánchez died in 1813. The Bishop of Cartagena, Carrillo, was expelled from Colombia in 1812 because he refused to accept the revolutionary Junta. Salvador Jiménez de Enciso Padilla became Bishop of Popayán in 1818, and he became one of the major supporters of the revolutionary cause. His explicit support of the new governments can be seen in a letter written to Pius VII in April 1823. Bolívar in turn never ceased to be political, and he always manifested an attitude of prudence and respect toward the Church.

The Bishop of Caracas, Coll y Prat, accepted independence as inevitable and served as an intermediary between the revolutionaries and the Venezuelan Church. He was promptly recalled to Spain, however, and Venezuela was without a bishop for an extended period of time. It was not until 1829 that the Bishop of Guyana was finally consecrated. The acting bishop, Santiago Hernández Milanés, also accepted independence as a foregone conclusion, but he died in 1812.

Finally, the Bishop of Guatemala, Casaus y Torres, attacked the independence movement with an intransigent pastoral but succeeded only in alienating the episcopacy from the revolutionary effort.

It is evident that those bishops who had been named by the *Patronato* system remained for the most part strong supporters of the Crown rather than of the new revolutionary governments. But important for this study is the fact that as a result of their proroyalist sentiments or ambiguity, the disorganization of the hierarchy was virtually complete. There followed a severe decline and even absence of ordinations of priests and monks, the closing of seminaries, the vandalizing and destruction of archives, and the isolation of churches and parishes in every country. And as "medieval Christendom" suffered disunification with the constitution of the new European nation-states — over a period of four or five centuries —in Latin America the "new Christendom," as it was called by Toribio de Mogrovejo, lost its unity in the space of a single decade. Latin American bishops during the colonial era had a sense of belonging to a nation, a feeling reinforced by the fact that a bishop in Peru could be named for Mexico, or one from the area of the River Plate could be appointed to an episcopal post in the North. After independence, however, the Church became an island, and for nearly a century there was virtually no communication between the various national hierarchies. The crisis for the Latin American Church was, therefore, much greater than that suffered by the Church in France after the French revolution, not only because of France's proximity to Rome, but also because of the presence of many other "Christendoms" not affected by the events in France. This allowed the French Church to regroup and reorganize in a relatively short period of time. Latin America, on the other hand, had "suckled at the breast of Spain," and now liberated, it was forced to attempt its reconstruction alone. The whole ecclesiastical structure was in ruins, and rebuilding would have been difficult enough in an environment of peace and order. But the century that followed was one of fratricidal wars and ideological

struggles inspired by anti-Christian doctrines. The disorganized Church became in time, therefore, even more anemic. It could not have been otherwise.

2. The Attitude of the Clergy

The priests, who had played a vital role in the colonies, maintained direct contact with the people, not only with the aristocracy, but with the lower classes and Indians as well. These clerics were without doubt the most significant supporters of the revolution. In the beginning the Creole revolutionaries were really an insignificant minority without widespread support. It was only the priests who possessed the twofold advantage of being sufficiently educated and cultured and who also maintained a wide range of contact. The support of the lower clergy proved to be indispensable, therefore, to the liberation movement.

There were at least eight thousand priests in Mexico, but only six of these appear to have supported the revolution initially.[2] The valor and exploits of Fathers Miguel Hidalgo and José María Morelos, both parish priests, are well known. These two clerics incited the uprising of the Indians, as did also Fathers Izquierdo and Magos. In 1815 some 125 priests were executed in Mexico by the Spanish royalists, and the Augustinian convent in Mexico City became one of the primary centers of revolutionary activity during the first period of the struggle for independence. When their sedition was discovered, the entire group was banished. The Presbyter, José María Mercado, who was known for his virtue and was in charge of the army barracks in Guadalajara, determinedly embraced the cause of independence. No less significant was the support given to the initial efforts for revolution by Fathers Monteagudo, Pimentel, and Arcediano de Valladolid.

In Peru many of the religious were involved in the uprising in Pumacagua. In the viceroyalty, however, the clergy were less fervent in their support of the revolution.

In Argentina, in contrast, the participation of the clergy was decisive not only in their support of the revolutionary cause, but also in their individual involvement. Friar Ignacio Grela was one of the first who protested the election of Cisneros as President of the Junta, and seventeen priests signed the petition presented to the City Council requesting the naming of a new Junta. Father Funes, Dean of the Cathedral in Córdoba, helped to abort the counterrevolution of Liniers, which was, as mentioned earlier, supported by Bishop Orellana. The Chaplain of the Army of San Martín, Friar Luís Beltrán, expropriated the bells from various convents and directed the construction of the cannons that were used in the liberation of Chile. Beltrán is referred to as "the first engineer of the army of liberation." Of the twenty-nine representatives commissioned by the provinces to sign the Act of Independence on July 9, 1816, in the Assembly of Tucumán, sixteen were Roman Catholic priests.

In Uruguay, Vigodet wrote to Bishop Lué y Reiga of Buenos Aires that it would be futile to attempt to restore order and tranquility on the Eastern border for, he asserted, it was the pastors and priests who were bent on sowing discord, a clear reference to the incipient revolutionary movement. Vigodet ed that virtually all the secular and regular clergy were involved in the revolutionary ferment.[3] The fact is that the Uruguayan clergy manifested the same attitude toward revolution as did those in Argentina as well as in Bolivia.

On the night in 1809 that the decision was made in Ecuador to raise the "first Shout" of revolution, three priests were involved. They concluded their meeting by singing the *Salve Regina*. Father Rodríguez, Professor of theology in the seminary, was the author of the Ecuadorian Constitution, a document that manifests the most recent

philosophical and political concepts of the nineteenth century. The royalists responded, however, by expelling many of the clergy involved in the independence movement.

Three members of the Metropolitan Chapter, along with a group of presbyters, took part in the Colombian uprising of July 1810. The royalist Morillo promptly imprisoned several of the priests for their revolutionary activities. In “El Calí” Friar Joaquín Escobar served as president. The Dominican covent of Chiquinquirá —as hundreds of others in Latin America —decided to turn over to the revolutionary government all their properties, those held in common and individually, as well as the money and other objects of gold in order to aid the new State.

The clergy was much more divided in Venezuela. Canon José Cortés de Madariaga and nine other priests played an important role in the 1811 Congress in Caracas which declared the independence of Venezuela.

In Central America the clergy was also divided. The patriotic *tertulia* of Guatemala met in the house of Father José Castilla, and the group became an integral part of the revolutionary movement. Secret revolutionary meetings also took place in Belén. When the Capitan General learned of these clandestine meetings, the participants were severely punished. Father José Matías Delgado inspired the revolutionary movements in El Salvador. In the meeting of the Assembly of Guatemala in 1821, Canon Dr. José María Castilla cast the first vote for the declaration of independence, which was subsequently signed by twenty-eight individuals, thirteen of whom were priests. Not the least significant of these events was the insistence by Dr. Simón Cañas, himself a priest, who included the rights of citizenship for the Negroes, “our brother slaves” as they were called.

It is obvious that the participation of the clergy in the revolutionary movements in Latin America was crucial. The fact is, however, that the revolution itself had in various areas two stages, and that in all of Latin America there developed afterwards two opposing govemments which succeeded in harassing the clergy, the most influential persons of the society. Expulsion, death, imprisonment, disorientation, activism, and unchecked anxiety separated the priests for many decades from their pastoral responsibility. The tragic situation resulted in the priests' adopting a very compromising position. But their compromise stemmed from the fatigue, annihilation, disorganization, and lack of continuity in their priestly endeavors. Also, guerrilla or political priests found it difficult to return to their previous life of the apostolate. It was inevitable that the Church, virtually having burned itself out, should complete its mission by sacrificing itself to the point of exhaustion.

3. The Attitude of the New Governments

The general position of the new governments was as follows: in view of the fact that the revolutionaries were a minority and not the entire population, the new governments were more or less liberal, but initially they were profoundly Catholic—even to the point of being intolerant toward other religions. They nevertheless proceeded to adopt disciplinary and economic measures in keeping with the conditions of the *Patronato*, which almost ruined the already disorganized Church that had barely survived the crisis of the independence. Throughout this period as well as during the following one (1825-1850), the governments were more conservative than liberal. It is impossible to imagine a more radical change in so short a period of time.

The general policy followed by the new governments was to initiate direct relations with Rome. But Rome was deeply committed to Madrid and the Holy Alliance. Even

so, little by little the Holy See regained its independence and began to pursue two ends. The first was an attempt to gain indirect recognition of the independence of Latin America, the moral value of which was essential. Then there was the effort to free the Church from the actual and official subordination resulting from the national *Patronato* system. But the new national governments could hardly have imagined themselves as having less power than that exercised by Spain. It was as much a question of prestige, however, as it was of power.

In Mexico the popular religious character of the revolution can be seen in the Constitution of Apatzingan of 1814, which declared, "The Roman, Apostolic, Catholic religion is the only faith which should be professed by the State" (Chapter One) and that "heresy, apostasy, or high reason would result in the loss of citizenship. Temporary residents or transients would be protected by the state ... if they acknowledge the sovereignty and independence of the nation and respect the Roman, Apostolic, and Catholic religion" (Chapter Three). When Agustín de Iturbide was able to take advantage of a chaotic situation produced by the Spanish revolution of 1821 to unite the ruling class of Creoles and Spanish under an independent, limited monarchy, he retained the established Church. The liberalism of the Spanish Court inclined the Church toward the support of the cause of Independence. The Guadalajara government's *Gaceta* (*Gazette*) of July 11, 1821, reported, "It would be impossible for us to propose a better defense for the cause of Independence than to affirm that this government will retain the Roman, Apostolic, Catholic religion, so violated and slandered in the parliamentary reports of the States General of 1820" (the Spanish parliament).[4] Father Pradt, who desired to direct the Mexican Church (the only example of this type in Latin America), proposed to free the Church of Mexico from all obedience to Rome. The measures taken in 1821, such as the suppression of the convents and the confiscation of Church properties, appeared to have been greacly influenced by him. José María Luis Mora proposed the complete separation of Church and State, but during the decade of 1820-1830 the two most important religious parties were the ecclesiastics who considered the *Patronato* null and void, thus allowing the Church to recover its freedom, and the politicians who attempted to maintain intact the conditions of the *Patronato* system.

In Peru, San Martín assumed all the powers of the *Patronato* to the point of being abusive, and the procedures of Monteagudo were even more negative. The aged Bishop Las Heras decided to retire. The Church in turn was deprived of all ecclesiastical ties, the Spanish priests were suspended, the novitiates of the religious were closed, and the taking of vows was prohibited for those under the age of thirty years. Furthermore, the government imposed upon all religious orders a special tax designed to assist the fledgling nation. In 1826 the government stripped the Church of all it convents but a short time later returned them primarily because of the poor results that came from the operation. The *Patronato* was, nevertheless, integrally exercised by the government of Peru.

In Argentina the piety of Belgrano, San Martín, and Pueyrredon —somewhat less political— contrasted with the liberalism of Castelli and later of Bernardino Rivadavia. At least seventeen priests lost the right to hear confessions because of their continued support for the royalist cause. Seventeen other clerics along with thirty-two religious were expelled from the country for the same reason. The constant interference by the Argentine government in the life of the convents began to undermine an already undisciplined religious life. In the Assembly of 1813 the government assumed all the rights of the *Patronato*, the religious hospitals were expropriated, the Inquisition was

suspended, the administration of the tithes was regulated, the religious were declared to be independent of all foreign authority, all concessions to the Church were abolished, and the bishop was declared to be the only ecclesiastical authority in the country. These and other steps were taken to control the Church despite the fact that twelve priests were present as members of the Assembly and that Article 19 stated that "the Roman and Apostolic Catholic religion is the only religion of the State." In October 1822 a more comprehensive project for the reform of the clergy was presented with the endorsement of Bernardino Rivadavia. It called for the abolition of the personal code of laws for the clergy, the abolition of the tithes, and the closing of all convents with less than sixteen members. This wave of liberalism dominated Argentina for a time and ultimately caused the failure of the Muzi mission in the country.

In Paraguay, the dictator Francia was in complete control. He had received his doctorate in Canonical Law from the University of Córdoba del Tucumán, but he never received major orders.

In Chile, the Catholic religion was declared to be the official religion of the State in 1812 as well as in 1818, even though the govemment was more liberal in 1812 and more conservative in 1818. It was during the latter period that O'Higgins, and above all Cienfuegos, made possible the Muzi mission. As early as 1823, however, the climate was changing, primarily because of the influence of events in Buenos Aires, and the process of secularization began with the confiscation of the religious properties and the closing of convents with less than eight members or where there were two or more convents in a single city. The political situation in Chile continued to be influenced by events in Argentina until 1827, even though on January 3, 1820, the Congress of Antofagasta manifested a desire to establish relations with the Holy See.

In Bolivia the reform of the religious was initiated in August 1825. Both Bolívar and Sucre desired to establish relations with the Holy See.

In Ecuador, Bolívar was unusually cautious in his relations with the Church. The First Article of the Constitution of the Province of Cuenca declared that "The Catholic, Roman, and Apostolic religion will be the only religion adopted by the Republic, and in the future no other religion will be tolerated for any reason whatsoever." During this early period of independence, there is no indication that the Liberals in Quito exercised the slightest influence.

In Colombia and Venezuela, the geographical area where Bolívar worked so strenuously, the religious issue became one of the primary causes for the separation of the area into two nations. In 1811 all the leaders of independence vowed "to defend with their lives and with all their power the states of the Venezuelan Confederation and to conserve and to maintain pure and unscathed the Holy Roman Apostolic religion, the unique and only religion of these countries." Bolívar himself had vowed on the *Monte Sacro* after meeting personally with Pius VII in 1805, "I swear by the God of my fathers ...and I swear by my country that I will never rest until the chains of the Spanish will to power which bind us are broken." In 1814 Antonio Nariño ordered the expropriation of the jewels of certain convents to defray the costs of the revolutionary armies. On the other hand, Bolívar manifested a desire in 1817 to fill the vacant bishoprics as "in the most illustrious centuries of the Church."

As early as 1820 the Masonic lodges began to organize in Venezuela, and in Mexico the Bishop of Mérida, Monseñor Lasso, stated that the Church would benefit if separated from the State. In the Congress of Cúcuta in 1821 Bolívar reaffirmed the *Patronato* powers of the state. Colombian representatives were sent to the Holy See in 1822 and 1823 for the purpose of dealing with the question of the Concordat, and

also to arrange for the resumption of the missions to the Indians. Unfortunately, these attempts were all unsuccessful. The Law of the *Patronato* was signed in Bogotá on July 28, 1824. Two years later matrimony was declared to be legal only if performed by the courts or civil tribunals, and on July 26, 1826, all convents with less than eight members were closed.

Guatemala is an example of the spirit of fidelity to the Church in all of Central America, for in June of 1823 the government declared, "The religion of the United Provinces is Catholic, Roman, and Apostolic, with the exclusion of all others."

It should be noted, however, that the crisis of neocolonial emancipation that prevailed throughout Spanish America did not have the same impact in the Caribbean or in Brazil. Cuba, for example, did not gain independence from Spain until 1898. The Dominican Republic was occupied by Haiti from 1822 until 1844 and thereafter became an independent country. Puerto Rico gained its independence from Spain in 1898 but became a protectorate of the United States. The relationship of the Church to the governments of these islands continued relatively unchanged.

In Brazil, the political sagacity of the King of Portugal led to the creation of the Brazilian Empire under Pedro I, thus allowing the great Lusitanian colony to gain independence without crisis or war. The benevolent rule of Pedro II in Brazil from 1841 until1889 explains the institutional continuity of the country, its coherent foreign policy, and its progress toward the conquest of the no-man's-land of the Amazon basin during the nineteenth century. While its neighbors —Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Paraguay, Argentina, and Uruguay—were being exhausted by the internecine struggles for national organization, Brazil was moving toward becoming the primary power in South America. The transition from Empire to Republic in the latter decades of the nineteenth century was for Brazil a logical and mature step in its progress.

During this initial period of nation building, the Church suffered its greatest crisis, and at the same time the new nation-states began their search for a new mode of being. The governments, although inspired by liberalism, were basically conservative, and the anticlerical measures were not in the nature of a persecution, but rather a reform —as it was called in that period —which the governments were able to achieve by their use of the *Patronato*. The phrase "the Catholic, Roman, and Apostolic Church" repeatedly appears in the national constitutions, an indication of the fact that a thorough transformation was not achieved and that all the new governments desired to be recognized by the Papacy, which was seen by the Latin Americans as the major European spiritual power.

II. THE SEVENTH STAGE AND THE DEEPENING CRISIS (1825-1850)

Although there were exceptions, this period was less liberal than the preceding one, especially in regard to the measures taken by Rome. At the same time, however, a movement for true institutional and ideological revolution began. The period actually represents a time of pacification and deliberate organization of the new groups that would be in control for the succeeding fifty years.

1. The Antecedents of the Attitude of the Holy See[5]

From Europe the phases of emancipation were fourfold:

(1) Bayona resigned in 1808, and Ferdinand VII was restored to the Spanish throne in 1814. Meanwhile, Miranda began his revolutionary movement in 1808 and quickly discovered that the patriots needed direct contact with Rome. Such contact was,

however, extremely difficult in view of the impediments Spain could interpose. In 1813 Pius VII proposed an encyclical to the Latin American clergy favoring the revolution, but the Papacy had no direct knowledge of the American situation.

(2) The restoration of Ferdinand VII (1814-1817) produced a regression in the emancipation movement to the point that only Argentina could maintain independence after the expedition of Morillo against Nueva Granda. Güemes, a *caudillo* of Salta, Argentina, permitted the reorganization of the liberation effort. The Holy See named twenty-eight new bishops for thirty-eight posts between 1814 and 1820, although many of them never were able to assume their responsibilities. On January 30, 1816, Pius VII issued an encyclical to the archbishops and bishops of Spanish America entreating them to attempt to persuade their followers to submit to the authority of King Ferdinand.

> You can easily accomplish the suppression of disorders and sedition if each one of you is willing to expose zealously the dangers and grave evils of defections and will expound the noble and exceptional qualities and virtues of our dear Son and your King, Ferdinand, Catholic King of Spain, to whom nothing is more important than religion and the happiness of his subjects; and finally, let us cite the illustrious example, which should never perish, of the Spanish people who did not hesitate to sacrifice goods and life in showing their adherence to religion and fidelity to the King.[6]

The Pope was obviously committed to the Holy Alliance and acted accordingly.

(3) The inability and disaster of Ferdinand VII (1818-1823) in his attempt to suppress the transatlantic revolutions is evident, as is the failure of his attempts in Aquisgrán. Moreover, in 1820 the revolution of Riego began, and the troops that were destined to leave Cádiz to quell the uprising in Buenos Aires were suddenly involved in a civil conflict in Spain. The result was that the insurrection in Argentina spread to Chile and finally to Peru. Meanwhile, the Bourbon absolutism collasped in Spain, and the government was taken over by the Liberals, producing a situation that allowed the American patriots to pressure the Latin American Church to support the emancipation from Spain. At the same time reports arrived in Rome from Bishop Orellana of Córdoba del Tucumán, from Father Pacheco, and from the Archbishops of Caracas and Lima, but it was the communications from Bishop Lasso de la Vega which prompted Pius VII to decree in 1823 a pontifical neutrality in regard to the situation in Latin America.

(4) King Ferdinand was liberated anew by the Holy Alliance (Verona, 1823), and France began to consider Latin America as the locale for the ideal monarchy —even though America was republican because of French inspiration! The Monroe Doctrine, however, declared "America for the Americans." Bolívar and his forces arrived in Peru, and following the battles of Junín and Ayacucho on December 9, 1824, the Spanish forces were finally defeated. Great Britain's foreign minister, George Canning, formally recognized Grand Colombia, Argentina, and Mexico on December 16, 1824. During this same period Monseñor José Ignacio Cienfuegos was appointed Chief of Mission to Rome by the Chilean dictator Bernardo O'Higgins. Cienfuegos was instructed to declare the loyalty of the Chilean people to the Holy See as well as to request from the Pope an apostolic nuncio and to send to Chile auxiliary bishops to fill the vacancies. As a temporary measure, Cienfuegos proposed that an apostolic vicar be sent to Chile, and after prolonged discussion, Monseñor Juan Muzi was appointed. When Friar Pacheco insisted that La Plata was in greater need than Chile, Muzi's jurisdiction was enlarged to include all of America. Muzi wrote his famous *Cartas apologéticas* (*Letters of Defense*) and proceeded to organize the diocese of Mon-

tevideo. When Spain protested the Pope's appointment of an apostolic vicar, Cardinal Consalvi persuaded Leo XI to recognize the importance of the Latin American question and insisted that "Spanish legitimacy no longer implied any authority whatsoever."[7]

Rome seemed to take a step backward, however, with the encyclical *Etsi iam diu*, issued on September 24, 1824, the existence of which is definitively demonstrated:[8] "We have received the ill-fated news of the deplorable situation in which discord and rebellion are being sown in the Church as well as in the State" (the original text says: "*superseminata est hic zizaniz homine inimico*").[9] The most "interesting paragraph," as it is called by Vargas Laguna, addresses "... our very dear son Ferdinand, Catholic King of Spain, whose sublime and solid virtues cause him to place before the splendor of his greatness the luster of religion and the happiness of his subjects."[10]

Obviously the patriots could not accept this encyclical, and they responded to it by insisting that it was apocryphal or was falsified by the Spanish. The fact was that the pressure by Ferdinand on Leo XI was so intense that the Pope almost acquiesced but finally decided against the Spanish cause.

2. The Constructive Attitude of the Holy See since 1825

The Tejada delegation, which Bolívar sent to the Vatican and which first recommended that the bishops communicate directly with Rome, helped considerably the cause of Nueva Granada. Rome proposed the naming of bishops *in partibus* so as not to offend further the Spanish king. On November 22, 1825, France, Russia, Austria, and Spain opposed all "concessions of a spiritual nature, because they believed that they were a de facto recognition."[11] Tejada warned of the danger of a religious schism in Spanish America (1826)[12] and offered a list of candidates for the various bishoprics. On January 18, 1827, Cardinal Capelari presented to Leo XII the bishops for Grand Colombia, not *in partibus*, but rather "proprietary." This decision, together with the attached brief, was the culmination of the religious policy of Bolívar, and it produced an instantaneous change of opinion that persisted for many decades. And Rome, after seventeen years, had spoken clearly for the first time. On October 28, 1827, Bolívar declared in a public discourse: "The greatest cause that brings us together today is the wellbeing of the Church and the wellbeing of Colombia. ...The descendants of St. Peter have always been our fathers, but the war has left us orphans, as a. ..lamb that bleats in vain for its lost mother."[13]

The Vásquez mission from Mexico failed in 1829, and the same year Joaquín Pérez, Bishop of Puebla, died and left Mexico without a single bishop.

Ferdinand VII briefly broke relations with Rome, and Leo XII was obliged to retreat anew (1828-1829); nevertheless, thinking above all of Argentina where there was not a single bishop, and of Chile, he was reported to have exclaimed, "I will give my blood for my king, but I will not give my soul." And "his soul" was the responsibility of providing bishops for the vacant sees in Latin America. After prolonged and painful negotiations, Vicuña y Larraín Salas was named for Santiago and Cienfuegos for Concepción. Pius VII, well aware of the American problems, named Friar Justo Santa María de Oro as the first Bishop of Cuyo — Mendoza, San Juan, and San Luis, Argentina —who had been presented on January 11, 1828, elevated on December 15 of the same year, and finally consecrated by Cienfuegos on his trip to Chile on December 21, 1830. Thus in a matter of a few years the Argentine episcopacy was reorganized. Pius VIII, however, failed in his negotiations with the Mexican government.

Gregory XVI (1831-1835), in his first consistory of February 28, 1831, named residential bishops for Mexico. Pablo Vázquez was consecrated as Bishop of Puebla,

and he proceeded to ordain the other five. Madrid was not in a position to prevent what was an accomplished fact, and Mexico in turn was ecstatic because of the naming of the six new prelates.[14]

Several other residential bishops were also named, those who had been before consecrated *in partibus*: Medrano for Buenos Aires on March 20, 1832, and Vicuña on July 2, 1832, Cienfuegos on December 17, 1832, de Oro on September 3, 1834, Lazcano for Córdoba on December 30, 1834. Gregory XVI also established the Apostolic Vicariate of Montevideo on August 2, 1832, naming Larrañaga as the first vicar on August 14 of the same year. Because of the political instability and the lack of clergy, Montevideo continued for several decades as only a diocese.

On three occasions (1821, 1825, and 1828) reports and lists of priests were sent from Peru to Rome for the purpose of their being named as bishops. Luís José Orbegaso began negotiations with Rome, and Jorge Benavente was named Bishop of Lima on June 23, 1834. Francisco Javier Luna Pizarro was consecrated as Archbishop of Lima in 1846 in the category of *in partibus infidelium*.

On August 5, 1831, Gregory XVI issued his encyclical *Sollicitudo Ecclesiarum*, which served to prepare for the recognition of the new American republics, "more respectful of the Holy See than the current Spanish government" (of María Cristina). On November 26, 1835, Gregory XVI formally recognized the independence of the republic of Nueva Granda, that is, Colombia, and on December 5, 1836, he recognized the independence of Mexico. Other formal recognitions of national independence were to follow, but the question of political recognition for the new American nations was settled.

Finally, O'Leary of Venezuela exclaimed in Rome on April 9, 1839, "It is said (by the Pope) that we change ministers too frequently, and that revolutions in Latin America are eternal, et cetera. I said to him that France has had more revolutionary movements in these past eight years than Venezuela, and ten times more changes of ministers. ...It is very difficult to work with these people!"

The insistence by the new governments —against Spain, and at times against Europe as a whole, and even against Rome —that they establish direct relations with the successor of Peter, clearly indicates that the Catholicism of the ancient Spanish American colonies was far from being superficial. In reality, it was an essential element of the collective consciousness. That this was true speaks of the positive and profound character of Spanish evangelization.

3. The Church and the Conservative State

In each country the Church had to conform to the demands of concrete events and to develop a means of relating to the new and inexperienced governments.

In Brazil, this era was dominated by Pedro II who came to power in 1831 at the age of six, when Pedro I abdicated. Pedro II governed as emperor from 1841 to 1889. Though Catholic in his faith, Pedro II was profoundly monarchical and absolutist in the exercise of power, and the Church was obliged to subordinate itself to the State. In addition, many outstanding members of the Church belonged to the Masonic lodges. Thus, Pius IX's condemnation of Masonry resulted in a wave of negative reaction in Brazil against the Papacy. The Church was situated between three poles: the State, which exercised the *Padroado* of Portugal, the Liberal parties, and Masonry. The *Irmandades* began in 1872 with a widespread anticlerical campaign. Despite these social and political convulsions, the entire period was basically conservative, as it was in all the countries to be considered.

In Mexico this period (1824-1857) terminated with the coming to power of the Liberals and the proclamation of the Juárez law, the Lerdo law, and the Iglesias law, which confiscated the properities of the Church, prohibited any financial subsidies from the government to the parishes, made matrimony a civil act, and declared that Roman Catholicism was no longer the religion of the State. Herein began the first great rupture between Church and State, which would be augmented and structured under the dictatorship of Porfirio Díaz. The Masons were well organized beginning in 1825 and slowly became the primary power group in Mexican politics. Santa Ana, first a Liberal and then a Conservative, is an example of the instability of this era (which progressed from the *puros* to the *moderados*). There was, however, no significant change for the Church. In 1827 Dominique de Pradt enumerated the personnel of the Mexican Church as one archbishop, nine bishops, 1,194 parishes, 3,483 secular priests, 1,240 of whom were dedicated to the *cura animarum*, six monastic orders, 151 convents, 969 religious —323 of whom were members of the *Propaganda*, 101 were missionaries, and forty were in parishes —and a total Mexican population of eight million.[15]

From the time of its discovery by Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca until the founding of Santa Fe in 1610, the area known as the Southwest was slowly developed in the north of New Spain with the regions of New California, New Mexico, and San Luís de Potosí, which included the present North American states of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, Utah, Nevada, and Colorado. In 1803 Napoleon ceded Louisiana to the United States, giving birth to the doctrine of Manifest Destiny—which ultimately legitimized for the North Americans their expansion to the Pacific Coast. The occupation of the Mexican territory was slow and deliberate. The Mexican federalists, including those from the Yucatán to those north of the Río Grande, were strongly opposed to Santa Ana. The North Americans meanwhile encouraged the federalist spirit until the Texas revolution in 1835-1836. Santa Ana crushed the weak resistance of the Texans at the Battle of the Alamo in San Antonio, which prompted Sam Houston to declare war and gain the independence of Texas, which remained an independent nation until 1845. Mexico finally ceded the entire region including California to the United States in 1848. Thus there exists in the United States a large number of Latin Americans, a nation of Spanish-speaking people who are virtually without the Church and relegated to their “folk Catholicism.”[16]

Central America was unified in the Confederation from 1824 to 1839, but its relations with the Holy See were tenuous and difficult primarily because of the presence of the semischismatic Bishop Delgado of San Salvador. The Conservative governments of Rafael Carrera (1839-1865), Francisco Ferrer (1840- 1853), and of the “Conservative Regime” in San Salvador (1839-1871) did not, however, produce any significant change. The confiscation of ecclesiastical properties began in 1822, and the Dominicans, known for their wealth, lost more than the other religious orders. They had founded, for example, five cities around Lake Amatitlán. In 1818 the Archbishopric of Guatemala had seventeen vicariates, 131 parishes, 424 churches, 85 missions in the valleys, 914 in the haciendas, and 910 in the sugar plantations, and a total of 1,720 brothers and 505,000 parishioners.[17]

In 1824 the Republic of Colombia declared the *Patronato* in force, which resulted in innumerable and lamentable abuses on the part of the government and its continual interference in ecclesiastical issues and problems. The instability resulting from the resignation of Bolívar in 1830 continued indefinitely in Colombia. The government of Santander (1832-1837) is another example of tyranny. José Ignacio Márquez clashed openly with the Church, and José Hilario López's Liberal government (1849-1886)

in 1849 produced the first open schism between the Church and the State in Latin America. The conflict between the Conservatives and Liberals has always been exceedingly violent in Colombia and apparently has been detrimental for both parties.

In Venezuela there were 200 fewer priests in 1837 than there had been in 1810. There was only one priest in Guyana, and in the plains of Apuré the people had only auxiliary priests. Some had died, others had emigrated, still others had been exiled not only by the royalists but also by the patriots. If the situation was difficult for the Church during the war years, it worsened as a result of the enforcement of the new laws. The government of José Antonio Páez (1829-1846) attempted to normalize relations and manifested some concern for the deterioration of the missions.

In Ecuador the government of Juan José Flores (1829-1834) and of Vicente Rocafuerte (1835-1839) proclaimed that the "Roman and Apostolic Catholic Religion" was the official religion of the State to the exclusion of all others. Despite this fact, Rocafuerte allowed the introduction of Protestantism into Ecuador. The anticlerical reaction was stemmed by the government of Gabriel García Moreno (1860-1875).

Peru experienced a prolonged period of instability from 1823 to 1845, with nine different presidents or dictators. The governments of Ramón Castilla and of José Rufino Echenique (1845-1862) established some equilibrium in public affairs. Roman Catholicism was declared to be the official religion of the State with the exclusion of all others. Thus in 1915, when Protestant groups attempted to organize missions among the Indians, they were forbidden on the basis that it was contrary to the Constitution.

The ecclesiastical reform of Rivadavia (1826) in Argentina almost resulted in the disappearance of the religious orders. The dictator Juan Manuel de Rosas (1835-1852) achieved a significant measure of national unity, even though his means for doing so were despotic, such as the lamentable *mazorcas*.[18] Rosas was in reality a Conservative and manifested respect for the Church. He even invited the Jesuits to return to Argentina. The party slogan during his rule became "religion or death." The *caudillos* were still in control of various provinces, however, and one of them, Justo José de Urquiza of Entre Ríos, together with other opponents of Rosas, were able to overthrow him. But the Constitution of 1853 maintained "the Roman and Apostolic Catholic religion" as the religion of the Argentine nation. It was with the triumph of Buenos Aires, thanks to Bartolomé Mitre in 1861, that the break with the past became clearly evident.

In Uruguay the conflict between the *Blancos* and the *Colorados* (1830-1852) divided the country for three decades. Once Monseñor Larrañaga died, his successors were unable to halt the deterioration in the Church that followed the war. Free commerce between England, France, and Uruguay introduced early the European ideologies, and eventually a liberal elite developed that has governed the country until the present.

In Chile the Conservatives, the *pelucones* or "bigwigs," were in control from 1831 until 1861, while Ramón Freire and other Liberals, the *pipiolos* or "novices," were exiled. The Constitution of 1833 declared that the State would exercise the *Patronato* but simultaneously indicated that Roman Catholicism was the official religion of the State and that all other religions were excluded. The true religious state of affairs, however, can be seen in the fact that in 1831 there were only 147 priests for the 60,000 inhabitants in Santiago, a ratio of only one to four thousand.

Dean Friar Matías de Terrazas wrote to the Pope from Bolivia: "There are eighty

parishes which are vacant in this country ...which have not been attended because of the disruptions of the war. In all of the Bolivian Republic there is not a single bishop. ...We must turn to the Republic of Bajo Perú where there are only two bishops, in Cuzco and in Arequipa, who are 1,500 kilometers away."[19] When Andrés de Santa Cruz (1829-1839) began his dictatorial government, peace was imposed by force, but from 1840 until 1864 there was political chaos. The Church was unable to develop in this climate.

4. The European Missionary Crisis

Another factor which should not be overlooked is that Spanish America had depended upon the assistance of the *Patronato* for its missionaries. Once the countries were independent, the *Patronato* ceased to exist as an institution, and at the same time there was a severe decline in the number of European missionaries,[20] all of which left the new American republics in a state of religious abandonment. The Secretary of the Congregation of Propaganda expounded on the painful situation in 1773, saying that the expulsion of the Jesuits, the French Revolution, and the struggles between royalists and republicans in Europe simply aggravated an already critical situation.

As a result of the wars for independence in Latin America, virtually all the missions were in a terrible state of disorganization. In Chile, for example, with the closing of the Seminary of Chillán (1811) and with the expulsion of the last thirty-one missionaries in 1817, the missions among the Indians ceased to function. The Franciscans who had replaced the Jesuits in the *reducciones* of Paraguay were likewise expelled in 1810, and the 106,000 Guaraní dispersed into the jungles while their church buildings and villages were looted by Bolivian, Paraguayan, and Portuguese colonists. Some advances, however, were achieved in Peru with the creation of the mission stations of Conibos and Sendis in 1812.

During the pontificacy of Gregory XVI, the Franciscans were expelled from Texas, New Mexico, and California (1833-1834). By not reinforcing these missions, Mexico in effect invited the United States to take over these territories. The 30,000 Indians whom the Franciscans had evangelized and civilized were dispersed, and in 1908 only 3,000 of them remained. They became no more than vagabonds and beggars.

One can observe, however, a slow reawakening. Andrés Herrero, a Franciscan who was Commissioner General of the Missions in Spanish America, in 1834 commissioned a group of twelve Franciscans to evangelize the Indians of Bolivia. The Indians, incidentally, constituted the majority of the population. A short time later eighty-three other Franciscans were commissioned for Bolivia. Catholic schools reopened in Peru, Chile, and Bolivia, and in 1843 the Dominicans returned to Peru. In 1849 feminine congregations (nuns) began to arrive in Brazil and continued to come in significant numbers until 1872, even though the government closed the novitiates of all the religious orders from 1854 until 1891 when the Church was separated from the State. Pius IX, as a young canon, was in Chile in 1825. The flourishing missionary activity in Latin America in the nineteenth century began with him.

During this entire period, however, the Church was further weakened. The economic, political, and intellectual climate reminds one of those times in history that represent the end of an era, in this case the end of the colonial empire and of Latin American Christendom. It was an agonizing period not unlike the barbarian invasion of Europe, and at the same time a little hope for the future was slowly being generated. Subsequently the deepening crisis appeared to erase all possibilities of a solution. If Christianity continued it was more because of inertia and the valor and generosity of

a few rather than the faithfulness and commitment of the many. The people maintained the testimony of colonial Chistianity, but the new elite governments, who were in fact the nucleus of a new civilization, turned their backs on the past and likewise on the Church.

The conditions in the universities, the few that existed, worsened along with the reorganized seminaries; neither one nor the other was able to stimulate any widespread intellectual activity. Theological and philosophical texts did not arrive from Spain, and the Church lacked the means of publication. The stimuli for a renaissance simply were exhausted, and all hope was lost for a future renovation.

III. THE EIGHTH STAGE: THE FINAL RUPTURE (1850-1930)

At the level of *civilization* the Latin American nations began to feel the enormous Anglo-Saxon impact from Great Britain and North America, an impact which was in reality neocolonialist with its commerce, technology, and schools of engineering. On the level of *culture* and of the *mythical-nucleus*, liberalism for the first time made an impact on the opinion of the political-cultural elite. This resulted in a veritable transformation of the elements of the collective Latin American conscience, first at the level of the institutions and subsequently among the populace as a whole. A pluralistic society, a secular civilization developed in Latin America and is a twentieth-century fact —especially in the large cities, the universities, the labor unions, and among the ruling minorities.

1. The Church and the Liberal State

The schism was at times imperceptible, but in general it began in 1850. The separation of Church and State in Brazil was delayed until the formation of the Republic in 1889, even though the Liberals had been in control for many years. Positivism had a growing influence in Brazil beginning in 1870, and it was in fact an ideological element in the Constitution that formalized the separation of Church and State on an institutional level.

In Argentina Liberalism burst forth with Mitre and Sarmiento, but an open clash between the Church and the government did not ensue. The Law of Lay Teaching (1884) signified at the popular level a severe blow to the collective conscience of the type of colonial "New Christendom."

In Chile the Liberals (1861-1891), beginning with José Joaquín Pérez, produced a period of political and religious peace. President Aníbal Pinto (1876-1881), however, attempted to decree the freedom of religion and civil matrimony. The latter was accepted and put into effect beginning in 1884. Nevertheless, reaction of José Manuel Balmaceda (1886-1891) and his tragic fall from power impeded the separation of Church and State, which was finally promulgated by the Constitution of 1925.

The *Colorados* were in control in Uruguay during this entire period (1852-1903). The separation of Church and State came, however, in 1917, together with a veiled religious persecution and a wave of antireligious sectarianism. The laws of secularization and laicism were decreed during this period. In 1856 José Benito Lamas was named the first Bishop of Montevideo, and in 1897 the Uruguayan capital became an Archbishopric.

In Paraguay, under the governments of both Carlos Antonio López (1841-1862) and his son, Francisco Solano López (1862- 1870), the *Patronato* was exercised, and the Church remained under government control. The war with the combined forces of Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil, which continued from 1864-1870 —surely the

most inexplicable and savage war in Latin American history —left the Paraguayan society in a state of unequaled decadence. The Church did not escape the consequences of this internal crisis.

An attempt by Bolivia to establish a Concordat with the Vatican failed in 1851 and again in 1884. There was political chaos from 1864 until 1870 during the government of Mariano Melgarejo. With the election of Narciso Campero in 1880 the Conservative government maintained cooperative relations with the Church. When the Liberal party regained control in 1898, however, the situation changed. Freedom of religion was decreed in 1906, officially permitting the diffusion of Protestantism.

There was a prolonged period of instability in Peru until the election of the government of Nicolás Piérola (1895-1899). No fundamental changes occurred at the institutional level, but at the cultural level positivism began to exercise significant influence within the society. This was followed by several indigenous and socialistic movements that signified the various currents of thinking, and by individuals who were developing an authentic pluralism of thought in the country.

In Ecuador the militant Catholic Christian, Gabriel García Moreno (1860-1875), reinforced the union of Church and State established by the Concordat of 1862. The first Provincial Council convened in 1863, but when the Liberals again came to power in 1897 the Concordat was abolished. The antagonism between the Conservatives and Liberals, between the Catholics and the anticlerics, has produced only misfortune for this small country.

In Colombia the Liberals were in power from 1849 until1886. Religious persecution began under the regime of José Hilario López (1849-1853), and the Jesuits who had returned to the country were again expelled. The separation of Church and State was effected in 1853, the first such separation in Latin America, and was accompanied by a great deal of violence. Freedom of speech, universal suffrage, as well as civil marriage and divorce were instituted. In 1861 the State confiscated all ecclesiastical properties together with the schools and centers of charity. Many bishops were exiled along with the Apostolic Delegate. In 1863 when the legal status (*personería jurídica*) of the Church was nullified, a new wave of persecution ensued, and a number of priests and bishops were exiled. With the triumph of the Conservatives in 1886, the Church was reunited with the State it was not until 1930 when the Liberals finally regained power that freedom of religion was proclaimed. This last governmental act allowed the diffusion of Protestantism throughout the country.

In Venezuela, following the fall of the Monagas brothers in 1858, there was a series of revolutions, sometimes instigated by the unitarians and other times by the federalists. Antonio Guzmán Blanco (1870-1888), a Liberal with dictatorial propensities, clashed with the Archbishop of Caracas, Monseñor Guevara y Lira, who in turn was obliged to seek refuge in Trinidad. In 1872 seminary courses in theology were transferred to the national university, convents were closed, and ecclesiastical properties were confiscated. Two years later civil marriage was instituted and the religious were expelled from the country. Guzmán Blanco, a Grand Master in the Masonic Order, promoted Protestantism, and even went so far as to offer Protestants one of the confiscated church buildings for their services. He further antagonized Catholic ecclesiastical leaders by naming a bishop on the basis of the *Patronato*.

In Central America the situation was very similar. The Liberal presidents of Guatemala, Justo Rufino Barrios (1881-1885) and Manuel Estrado Cabrera (1898-1923), promulgated laws of laicised teaching, instituted the Napoleonic Code, separated the Church from the State, confiscated the properties of the religious orders and priests,

and opened the country not only to Protestants but also to North American capitalists such as the International Railways of Central America. President Jorge Ubico (1931-1944) opened the country to United Fruit. The Liberals came to power in Honduras in 1880 and that same year separated the Church from the State, imposed taxes on Church properties, and thereby reduced the number of clerical residences as well as church buildings. In Nicaragua the Conservative regime (1857- 1893) permitted the creation of the "Conservative Catholic Party," but with the Liberal revolt in 1893 and the coming to power of José Santos Zelaya (1893- 1909) the Church was separated from the State, religious orders suppressed, and bishops and priests exiled. These events occurred between 1893 and 1904. The Liberal party controlled El Salvador from 1871 to 1945. The federal Constitution separated Church and State, instituted civil marriage and divorce, promulgated laicised teaching, and proscribed religious orders. In Costa Rica, in contrast, the Conservatives imposed order and stability in the country beginning in 1870, even though freedom of religion existed from 1864. A Liberal government, however, expelled the Jesuits as well as the Bishop of San José in 1884 and instituted laicised teaching as well as other reforms. These laws were repealed in 1942.

In Mexico the break with the past has been most radical, to the point that all the struggles of the period are referred to as *La Reforma*, in opposition to the *Continuistas* or Conservatives. "The Reform consummated the struggle for independence and gave it its true significance by setting forth an examination of the bases of Mexican society and of the philosophical and historical presuppositions which supported it. This examination concluded with a threefold negation of the Spanish heritage, the indigenous past, and of Roman Catholicism, the first two being reconciled by a previous affirmation."[21] A study of the general history of Latin America, however, reveals that these three "negated" constituents survived the Reform and continued pleading for authentic validity in the adult Latin American conscience. The Constitution of 1857 produced a breach with the Church, and even more so with the triumph of the Liberal forces of Benito Juárez in the following decade. The Church was separated from the State, and the ecclesiastical properties were confiscated.

During the presidency and subsequent dictatorship of Porfirio Díaz (1876-1910), the government promulgated positivism as a national doctrine, instituted civil marriage and burial, nationalized the properties that still remained under the control of the Church, and expelled the religious (1873-1875). The government claimed to be one of the *científicos* (scientists), as they were called, and manifested a capitalistic, industrial, and urban propensity. In the rural areas, however, the Indians —under the direction of various *caudillos*, especially Emilio Zapata and Pancho Villa —brought about the downfall of the government in 1910. The revolution of Mexican socialism in 1910 turned in part against the Church and initiated the greatest persecution of modern times in Latin America.

From 1848 until the end of the Second World War the *Chicanos* or Mexican Americans survived a history of lamentable oppression without help from either Latin America or the Church. In reality they have been more oppressed than the Negroes in the United States. The number of original inhabitants also has been greatly augmented by immigrations of Mexican *braceros*, agricultural migrant workers in the southwest United States. Slowly the leagues, federations, and trade unions for Spanish-speaking workers have arisen, but not without major repercussions.

After gaining independence from Spain, Puerto Rico was incorporated into the

United States as a protectorate[22] and Puerto Rican immigration into the United States, minimal before the Second World War, increased appreciably afterwards.

In the nineteenth century opinions were polarized between the Conservatives and Liberals, the former composed generally of those who supported the continuation of the Catholic Church (although within a *patronato* system) and represented the oligarchy and the Creole aristocracy. The latter group, influenced by the French and other foreigners, proposed a complete break with the past. They were anticlerical, primarily middle class intellectuals —lawyers, doctors, and teachers. Obviously each country had its differences and peculiarities, but the basic patterns were comparable.

Early in the twentieth century these two factions divided. The Conservatives were made up of a right wing— many times a Catholic right, a populist right, or military dictatorship —and a central wing composed of the old oligarchy newly become capitalist and somewhat fond of anything foreign. These groups formed the real Conservative parties. The Liberals also had their right wing, which was sometimes confused with the central wing of the Conservatives. These right-wing Liberals represented certain members of the new bourgeois oligarchy. The popular wing of the Liberal parties was constituted many times by the so-called radicals or by those of analogous persuasion who continued to be dedicated to the old causes but with popular support from regional *caudillos*. All of these groups, nevertheless, suffered a loss of influence for lack of doctrines to support their actions, and also because of the residue of a narrow nineteenth-century nationalism.

Two new forces then appeared: first came the socialists, Marxists, and the Communist parties, which attracted the most active of the old Liberals, and then there appeared the Christian parties, organized in an the Latin American countries.[23] These two forces have been the only ones consciously opposed to each other in every part of the continent, and because of this they have had not only a nationalistic hue, but also a continental hue.

These historical parties, consisting of all those named above, have for the most part retired their candidates —one example among many of the new situation that exists in Latin America and of the function that Christianity is beginning to have in the new civilization. The time of the *Patronato* has ended, as wen as that of colonial Christendom.

2. Inorganic Development

The Church is clearly an integral part of the global situation of the existing civilization. And if Latin America is an oppressed, underdeveloped continent, the Church cannot be otherwise. The continual political, social, and economic movements, the instability, the poverty, and even the misery, the struggles and persecutions simply have not allowed for the restructuring of the Church since the wars for independence. Moreover, since 1880 there has come a second wave of emigration of Spaniards and Italians in large numbers, as well as lesser numbers of Germans, English, eastern Europeans, and even Asians. The result has been a demographic growth without precedence. The present crisis for the Church is that it is surrounded by a growing number of baptized but not catechized constitutents.

The European who arrived in Latin America during the last century was forced to live without the sociological support of a regional or national Christianity which he had enjoyed on the continent. His faith, whether he was Spanish, Italian, French, or German, was engendered in an environment that had been Catholic for more than a thousand years. In Latin America, however, the Church was persecuted, and with the indifference that characterized the middle class, the Church had no possibility of caring

Demographic Growth In Latin America 1650-1950[24]

1650	12 million inhabitants	(80% Indians 6.4% White)
1700	" " " "	
1750	11 " " "	
1800	19 " " "	(35% " 18.8% "
1850	33 " " "	
1900	63 " " "	
1950	163 " " "	(8.8% " 44.5% "
2000	592 " " "	

for the newcomers. These emigrants, who for the most part were Catholics, lost their faith or at least ceased to practice it. Those who lived in the rural areas, which had been more or less Christianized during the colonial era, migrated to the large cities in search of employment. The lack of parishes, of clergy, and of Christian organizations produced a general disorientation. Slowly in all the larger cities —which are the heart of Latin American civilization —a process of profound de-Christianization took place. The working classes lived in this environment of the semi-industrial, semipagan, pluralistic, and secularized city. The old pastoral of the colonial "New Christendom" was impotent before this invasion of foreigners who emigrated into Latin America and who subsequency, migrated within the various countries. The universities were controlled by the positivists and the political arena by the Liberals. The end of the nineteenth century was truly agonizing for the Church, and the twentieth century began with a sense of tragic hopelessness.

3. The Missionary Renaissance

Under Pius IX the *Colegio Pio Latino Americano* was founded in Rome in 1858, and concordats were signed with several Latin American nations: with Bolivia in 1851, Guatemala and Costa Rica in 1860, Honduras and Nicaragua in 1861, Venezuela and Ecuador in 1862. The Church, however, failed to obtain any financial support from the Latin American governments for the missions of the *Propaganda Fide*. In 1848 twelve Capuchins began evangelizing the Araucanian Indians in Chile. Today there are more than 340,000 Araucanians, and at least 327,000 of these are professing Christians. In 1855 twenty-four Franciscans began work in Argentina followed by fourteen others in 1856. In 1850 the island of Guadalupe was made the Suffragan of Bordeaux. Evangelistic work among the Indians of the Amazon basin of Brazil was begun in 1860 by the Franciscans and Capuchins. They were reinforced by the Domincans beginning in 1880 and by the Salesians in 1895. Pope Leo XIII exhorted the Peruvian episcopacy in 1895 to increase its missionary efforts among the Indians who at the time represented 57 percent of the Peruvian population. The first group of Augustinian missionaries arrived in Peru in 1900. The Salesians of Don Bosco initiated a successful evangelization among the Araucanians in the Argentine Patagonia and among the Fuegians of Tierra del Fuego beginning in 1879. The reorganization of Catholic missions began in Colombia in 1840, but the Augustinians did not arrive until 1890, the Montfortists in 1903, the Lazarists in 1905, the Clarentians in 1908, and the Carmelites and Jesuits in 1918, Between 1928 and 1953 Colombia had missions in twenty different areas ("mission territories"). These missions among the Indians, though important, did not, however, constitute the major challenge that the Church faced in the twentieth century, except in Bolivia and Peru.

The nineteenth century closed with the Church maintaining the structures of the old colonial "New Christendom," though it was a part of a secularized and pluralistic

civilization. Even more lamentable, the Church —dreaming of a civilization that no longer existed —continued to struggle to protect its rights and privileges and to recover the ones long lost. One cannot help but think in this regard of the First Vatican Council, which expended so much energy in defending the territories of the Holy See. Advocating the preservation of traditions already lost is a kind of anachronism that too often has characterized the struggles of the Church, although, as we will see, there were prophets who had begun even before the end of the nineteenth century to lay the foundations for a broad and profound renaissance for the Church in the succeeding century.

4. The Plenary Latin American Council of 1899

On December 25, 1898, as a result of the Apostolic Letters *Cum Diutumum*, the First Continental Council of the Latin American Roman Catholic Church was convened. Leo XIII had already issued his encyclical *Quarto abeunte saeculo* on July 16, 1892 to the Latin American episcopacies, an encyclical that celebrated the fourth centennial of the discovery of the Americas. The Council was held in Rome in 1899 for the expressed purpose of reiterating the conciliar decrees of the sixteenth century, and it became the basis for the Code of Canonical Law of 1917.[25] Thirteen archbishops and forty-one bishops were present. This Council of 1899 was preceded by a meeting promoted by Monseñor Casanova in 1890 in Rome, the Plenary Latin American Council.

The Latin American bishops (*Nos, Patres huius Concilii Plenarii Latinoamericani*, Chap. I, *tit*. 1) dealt with the problems of paganism, superstition, religious ignorance, socialism, Masonry, and the press, and attempted to develop a strategy whereby the advance of these as well as other anti-Christian movements could be checked. The Council issued 998 canons or articles that proposed the reorganization of the Church in Latin America. Obviously these articles were inspired by the "School of Rome" as well as by current theology and Canonical Law. The thrust of the articles was, however, designed more to conserve or defend the faith than to be a strategy by which the faith could be spread. The importance of the meeting, nonetheless, was that it represented the reawakening of the collegial consciousness of the Latin American episcopacy and became the foundation for all the initiatives that would be taken in the future.[26]

IV. THE NINTH STAGE: THE RENAISSANCE OF THE LATIN AMERICAN ELITES AND THE MODEL OF A "NEW CHRISTENDOM" (1930-1962)

The world economic crisis of 1929 had profound repercussions for the history of the Church in Latin America. In reality it represented the end of an era, for by that time the neocolonial pact between the Latin American bourgeois oligarchy and the United States and England had run its course. The Liberals came to power in Brazil in 1930, and in Argentina a military takeover toppled the regime of Hipólito Irigoyen. The oil boom began in Venezuela, Velasco Ibarra was elected president of Ecuador, and Rafael Trujillo initiated his rise to absolute power as president of the Dominican Republic (1930-1961). The "Socialist Republic" in Chile came to an end in 1932 with a military takeover, and the Chaco War errupted between Bolivia and Paraguay. In Mexico, Plutarco Elías Calles lost control of the government, while in Peru the military was the government. The ruthless Cuban dictator Gerardo Machado fell in 1933, and an army sergeant, Fulgencio Batista, seized control (1952-1958).

During the 1930s the Church was forced to adopt a different posture in regard to

economic and political structures. From Europe the influence of Jacques Maritain began to excite the dream of a "New Christendom" for Latin America, and partially as a result of Maritain's philosophy, Catholic Action emerged as a significant force. Christian Democracy was a reaction to the rightist propensity of the Spanish Fascist government of Francisco Franco, who came to power in 1936, the year when the Christian spirits divided in a germinal way, a division that would be accentuated during the time of the Second Vatican Council. The following stage in the historical development of the Church will demonstrate the limitations of experience and the difficulties of finding one's way in a totally new, unpredictable situation.

1. The Intellectual Renewal

The Catholic intellectual in Latin America during the nineteenth century was a "loner," a kind of theological sniper. But the beginning of the twentieth century saw the emergence of several important national groups dedicated to theological and philosophical issues. It was only after 1955, however, that these groups began to organize and make their presence felt on a continental scale.

An important antecedent of the contemporary awakening can be seen in the work of José Manuel Estrada (1842-1894) in Argentina. Estrada was greatly influenced by the Spanish traditionalism of Jaime L. Balmes and Juan Donosco Cortés. Earlier, Friar Mamerto Esquiú (1826-1883) and Jacinto Ríos (1842-1892) were challenging the dominance of positivism. A neo-Thomist school began to emerge with Martínez Villada (1886-1959) as a prototype of the new direction. Martínez was especially influenced by Augustine, Pascal, and the French traditionalist Joseph de Maistre. Martínez also devoted himself to the study of the *Summas* of Aquinas as well as to the thought of Maurice Blondel and Jacques Maritain. A whole generation of Martínez's disciples followed: the Thomist, Nimio de Anquín (a specialist in German thought), Manuel Río, Rodolfo Martínez Espinosa, Guido Soaje Ramos (who has greatly influenced this writer), Alfredo Fraguerio (a specialist in the work of Francisco Suárez), Ismael Quiles, Octavio Derisi, Juan Sepich, and Alberto Caturelli. The philosophical journal *Sapientia*, clearly Thomist, has been published for several years in Argentina.

These distinctly Argentine developments can be said to have occurred in all of Latin America. Brazil owes a great deal to Jackson de Figueiredo who was educated in the Protestant *Colegio Americano* in Salvador, Bahía, studied law there, and in 1916 wrote *Algunas Reflexôes sobre la Filosofía de Farias Brito: Profissão de fé espiritualista* (*Reflections on the Philosophy of Farias Brito: Aritualist Profession of Faith*). Sergio Buarque of Holland wrote that Figueiredo belonged to "that caste of men, captains of a noble heroism who by nature are designated to stimulate, orient, direct and combat" (*In Memoriam*, p. 148). Figueiredo is reported to have said one day to V. de Mello Franco, "Dissolvent socialism and iconoclastic bolshevism are nibbling away at the European organism like leprosy. But Europe is prepared to defend herself. What will happen to us, I wonder, when we have to defend our poor bones against these evil assaults?" Buarque's eulogy continued: "The entrance into the Church was for Figueiredo a struggle, a conquest, a peaceful victory. ...His encounter with Catholicism was for his great intelligence a revelation, the discovery of something new. It was an unexpected vision into truth ... of peace, and of the complete appreciation of mankind" (*In Memoriam*, pp. 298; 336); Alceu Amoroso Lima, who wrote under the pen name of Tristão de Ataide, came later. He was a friend of Maritain, a founder of the Catholic student movement in Brazil, and a guiding light for Brazilian youth. Figueiredo

died in 1930 at the age of thirty-seven, but Lima continued as a leader among the Brazilian intelligencia. A legion of Christian thinkers in Brazil has followed these men.[27]

The Catholic universities, although deficient in some respects, have made a significant contribution to Latin American Christian thought. For example, the old University of Santiago, Chile, founded in 1869 and now with a student body of some five thousand, has provided an environment conducive to the revival of Christian reflection. The same can be said of the Javeriana University of Bogotá, founded in 1937, and of the Catholic universities of Lima (1942), Medellín (1945), Río de Janeiro and São Paulo (1947), Porto Alegre (1950), Campinas and Quito (1956), Buenos Aires and Córdoba (1960), and Valparaíso and Centroamericana (Guatemala) in 1961. As can be seen, all of these Catholic universities, with the exception of Santiago and Bogotá, were founded after the Second World War, and all are part of the ODUCAL (Organization of Latin American Catholic Universities) and the student movements organized through the ORMEU (Office of Relations of University Student Movements) of Santiago. One should observe that in a recent meeting of Latin American university syndicates in Natal, Brazil, the Christian representatives constituted the majority of the executive committee as opposed to large numbers of Marxists who defended their position, even including the use of arms. Friar Sanhueza, Secretary General of ODUCAL, said, "We face the future with confidence."[28]

2. Catholic Action

In Latin America the beginning of Catholic Action as conceived by Pius XI was preceded by many individual and collective developments in nearly all the countries. In Argentina, for example, Félix Frías founded the Catholic Association in 1867. In Mexico the first Mexican Catholic Congress met in 1903 and decided to begin "workers' clubs" and to commend them to the parish priests. Refugio Galinda began the publication of *Restauración y Democracia Cristiana* (*Restoration and Christian Democracy*) in 1905 as an organ of the *Asociación Operarios Guadalupanos* (*Association of Workers of Guadalupe*). By 1908 there were at least twenty thousand members of the Catholic Workers' Union, from which was born in 1911 the Catholic party. The Confederation of Catholic Workers' Clubs was functioning by 1912 in conformity with the principles enunciated in the encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. In the *first Jornada Social Obrera* (Workers' Social Organization), which met in Zapotlán el Grande, Jalisco, in January 1923, it was decided to begin agricultural syndicates to provide loans for farmers. Many other movements sprang up during these years. The persecution that began in 1910 was not directed against the colonial Church, but rather against the Church that had begun to comprehend its function in contemporary society. Consequently the revolutionaries were determined to suppress their only real opposition. It should be understood, however, that the large majority of those Catholics who were awakening to their social responsibility were *Conservatives*. It was necessary to wait until the Second World War, nevertheless, before the Catholic laity became sufficiently detached from the Conservatives so that they could adopt their own position and overcome the long-standing Conservative-Liberal conflict and consciously face up to and dialogue with Marxism.

Catholic Action was organized in Cuba in 1929, in Argentina in 1930, in Uruguay in 1934, in Costa Rica and Peru in 1935, .and in Bolivia in 1938. These few examples indicate the beginning dates of this important phenomenon in the history of the Latin American Church. Originally, Catholic Action followed the Italian pattern, but after

the Second World War the French influence became evident. In Latin America the movement adapted rapidly to the national situations in Argentina, Uruguay, Venezuela, Peru, Cuba, Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay, and Colombia, and in reality it became a unique Latin American institution. It filled a need and role uncharacteristic of the organization in Europe and other continents. Laymen assumed responsibility for problems that the Church faced to the degree that when Latin American lay leaders traveled to Europe they were shocked at the amount of "clericalism" in the Church there as well as the secondary and passive role of the laymen in European ecclesiastical communities.[29]

In 1934, for example, 600 young people attended the national assembly of Argentine Youth for Catholic Action (JAC), and in 1943 there were 8,000 present in Mendoza. These youth movements have afforded not only broad opportunities for involvement but also reasons for hope. The Brazilian JAC had some 15,000 members in 1953, and by 1961 it had grown to 120,000 members in more than 500 chapters. The JUC (Catholic University Youth) have inspired a spate of movements that progressively exercised increasing influence in Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Peru, and even Bolivia. The fact is that in Latin American history the university movements have signaled the most significant historical changes. The European observer does not discern clearly these "signs of the times."

Obviously, the elites in Latin America also fulfilled an essential function, and Catholic Action has certainly formed, although with varied success, a small but responsible elite group. Furthermore, it can be affirmed that no other elite group of such number, coordination, and formation existed on the Latin American continent.. Consider, for example, the Chilean Agrarian Youth Movement (JAC), which in less than ten years did an incredible amount of work. In fact, in many respects the Chilean movement has been the most outstanding Catholic youth movement in the world.

3. The Social Struggle

The Church, after having been allied with the regal power of the colony, with the Creole aristocracy during the period of independence, and with the Conservatives during the nineteenth century, slowly began to be aware of its freedom, of its prophetic function, and of its renewing and even revolutionary responsibility —as the bishops of Northeast Brazil have expressed it. The collective Pastoral of the Chilean episcopacy, *El deber social y político en la hora presente* (*The Present Social and Political Duty*), citing Pius XII, declared:

> Peace is not equivalent to a tenacious, infantile, obstinate clinging to what no longer exists. ...For a Christian aware of his responsibility, even for the most humble of brothers, indolent tranquility does not exist, neither is there escape. Rather there is struggle against all inaction and uninvolvement in the great spiritual conflict which now endangers the formation, even the soul itself, of future society.[30]

In a sense history has forced the Latin American Church to adopt positions that the European Church eventually will be obliged to follow. The situation has been extremely difficult, and the Latin American Church found it necessary to make unanticipated commitments. For this reason, the European Christian parties, more conservative in their orientation, and the Latin American parties, which have been clearly more revolutionary, have almost experienced a break in their relationship.

At the political level this attitude is seen in the trade union movements in Latin America. In 1954, for example, trade unionism had only four national organizations in the whole continent, whereas today only Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Cuba are

without these organizations. (Trade unionism existed in Cuba prior to Castro's revolution but was then dissolved.) There are now at least twenty-three national organizations with a total membership surpassing one million. One should note in this regard, however, that membership includes the elites and not the masses. Also, in order to reach the ninety million workers, the Latin American Confederation of Christian Trade Unions has a budget no larger than most North American parishes.[31] Schools for training in trade unionism exist in Argentina, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela. There have been four continental seminars that brought together ninety delegates from fifteen different countries. These seminars have received financial and technical assistance from OIT, UNESCO, and CEPAL. In 1961 the Christian Confederation sponsored the Seminar on Rural Issues, the first meeting in Latin American history for the purpose of organizing rural workers. "The amount of money, however, expended by Cuba for the diffusion of Marxism in Latin America has been at least fifty times more than the budget of the Confederation. In Latin America Christian trade unionism could save the continent from the implantation of Marxism."[32] But the Marxist challenge is bearing fruit.

Numerous other examples of social experiments and efforts could be cited, such as Sutatenza Radio in Colombia, Integral Reform of Northeast Brazil begun by the Bishop of Natal, the Radio Schools of Mexico and Brazil, the Fómeque Cooperative, and others. The number and creativity of these efforts are indisputable, and the Christian parties, although completely autonomous, represent a new reality that must be taken into account.

The social investigations being done by various groups should also be noted. Among them has been an organization known as Human Economy, the Institute for Political Studies in Latin America (I.E.P.A.L. of Montevideo), and the Belarmino Center in Santiago, Chile. There have been others in Peru, Mexico, and Colombia.

4. Sources of Renewal

Since the Second World War Latin America has experienced not only a change of spirit but also a change of direction. Little has been written about this phenomenon, primarily because Christians as well as others in Latin America work without giving sufficient time for reflection and writing, which would enable others to know what is being done. This lack of information has caused observers to assume that little is happening. The following are indicative of the events, movements, and changes that have taken place.

(1) The contemplative life

We cite the words of a Christian brother:

> The history of the first centuries of the Latin American Church is virtually unknown not only by Europeans, but also by Latin Americans. ...The chapters of the *Historie de l'Eglise* by Augustin Fliche and Victor Martin dealing with this period are not only insufficient but laced with negative judgments which oftentimes one author copies from another when attempting to write of the work of the Spanish in America.[33] The evangelization of Hispanic America and the Christian life in those countries during the colonial era is without doubt one of the most impressive pages in the history of Christianity. This is true not only of the missionary effort, ...nor merely because of the adaptation of the Gospel to the primitive people, ...nor only because there has emerged in a short time a large number of Creoles who wanted to become priests and nuns —so much so that the abundance of secular and religious clergy constituted a problem for the authorities and inhabitants of Spanish America,[34] but also *because of the existence of a contemplative element*.[35]

In Peru and Ecuador, Santa Rosa de Lima (1586-1617) and Mariana de Jesús Paredes (1619-1645) promoted the contemplative life. Such a large number of hermits existed in Peru that the Council of Lima in 1583 had to decree that the religious habit must be black. There was, among others, the edifying example of the hermit Juan de Corz who lived near the City of Guatemala in the seventeenth century. These recluses sprang up almost by spontaneous generation, as did the Augustinian nuns in Santiago, Chile, in 1574. Also, in the southern Chilean town of Osorno a community of contemplatives was founded in 1571. The town itself lived under an almost Constant stage of seige by the Araucano Indians, so much so that between 1600 and 1604 the nuns almost perished from hunger and fatigue, and the town was finally abandoned.

> At the time the Spanish nuns and brothers left the city, the majority on foot, without any food, the women carried the children. Some were forced to give up the journey because of exhaustion, and others because of hunger. ...The saintly nuns, who for reasons of decency and modesty traveled apart from the other members of the party, moved together, barefoot but joyful because of the hardships they were suffering for God, recited their offices during the journey and sang praises to God, so much so that they inspired devotion and courage in everyone.[36]

This is but one example among many.

In the nineteenth century "one could almost conclude that the Spanish American Church had ceased to exist ...but this is precisely the period of liberal indifference when the first monasteries for men were founded in Latin America." The Brothers of Melloc founded the Abbey of the Infant Jesus in Entre Ríos, Argentina, in 1899. The Brothers of Samos, Spain, founded the Priory of Viña del Mar, Chile, in 1920, and the Brothers of Santo Domingo de Silos, Spain, founded San Benito in 1919. The Benedictines of Sainte-Odile founded a monastery in Caracas in 1923, and the Solesmes founded a monastery in Las Condes, Chile, in 1938. The Benedictines also founded the Abbey Santa Escolástica in Buenos Aires in 1943, and the Abbey of Einsiedeln founded Los Toldos in Argentina in 1947.

Beuron continued the work of Las Condes while the Argentine Abbey of the Christ Child (*Niño Dios*) founded another abbey in Tucumán, Argentina. The Cistercians began their work in Brazil, and the Trappists in Azul, Argentina, and in Orval, Brazil. The Community of the Niño Dios Pauvres of Landes, France, founded a community on Isla del Rey (King's Island), Chile, and the Petits Frères and Petites Soeurs of Charles de Foucauld began work in Buenos Aires, Santiago, and Lima. These examples are indicative of the reawakening that was taking place.

One should not conclude, however, that the contemplative life has been limited to the monasteries. The opposite has been the case, for the life of prayer has been emphasized among dedicated lay groups—minorities to be sure—as well as in the Christian family movements and among priests and religious. Father Alberto Hurtado of Chile wrote the book *¿Es Chile un País Católico?* (*Is Chile a Catholic Country?*) long before Godin thought of writing *France, pays de mission*? Father Hurtado died a saint, and his prayers were certainly contemplative. As a matter of fact, it was Hurtado who persuaded the Petits Frères to see the importance of their contemplative presence in Latin America.

(2) The theological, biblical, liturgical, catechetical, and parochial reawakening

The bibliography in regard to the comprehensive religious awakening in Latin America is fragmentary because it is so recent. We will, nevertheless, outline the general

direction of what has transpired. Although Latin America has not produced up to the present time a great theologian as such, a progressive theological reawakening has occurred because of the availability of European theological works in translations and because of the studies done in various centers such as the Catholic University of Santiago, the older seminaries such as Villa Devoto of Buenos Aires, and because of the theologians of the various religious orders such as Máximo de San Miguel of the Argentine Jesuits. The theological journals like *the Revista Eclesiástica Brasileira* published in Petrópolis, *Teología y Vida* published in Santiago, and *Stromata* published in Buenos Aires all have indicated that there began, although timidly, a study and reflection adapted to the existential reality of the Latin American Church. In the past, in Rome —because of the *Pio Latinoamericano* and the *Pio Brasileiro* more recently — and in Spain, the Latin American theological student received a doctrinally sound formation, but he was left with the task of adapting his universal and scholastic dogmatic to the concrete reality of a continent in profound change. This deficiency produced a schism between the theologian, life, and spirituality. The inffuence of Louvain, Innsbruck, and Paris have permitted —thanks to a more existential theology —a somewhat slow but effective beginning of a scientific and theological reflection on the Latin American reality. But this reflection has hardly begun.

In the biblical field, although there are two or three relatively good translations of the Bible that can be secured at a modest price, the Church is unable to compete with the North American and British Bible societies, especially if one considers the innumerable Indian languages into which the Bible has been translated by Protestant groups. Their work, nevertheless, has prompted Catholic ecclesiastical leaders to do something specific in regard to biblical studies. In a meeting in Rome in 1958, CELAM decided to begin the biblical institutes, and various scholars with their doctorates or licentiates in biblical sciences who had studied in Rome or Jerusalem began to publish their first works. The parochial biblical centers were then organized in various Latin American countries. There is, however, a lack of a dynamic organization and the hierarchical authority to supervise the interest in biblical studies in Latin America. In regard to the exegetical reawakening, a certain static and anachronistic concept still exists, which has tended to smother important groups that are attempting to do relevant Catholic exegesis such as certain teams in Buenos Aires.

Preconciliar liturgy has passed through two stages. During the first period the practicing faithful were reached, beginning in 1930, by the bilingual translations of the Catholic Missal, a work of the Benedictines. This allowed the already practicing Catholics to understand the liturgy and to participate in it personally. During the second period there has been an emphasis on community renewal inspired principally by French groups. These have been centered primarily in parish churches such as *Todos los Santos* in Buenos Aires, but the movement is now slowly and somewhat unevenly spreading through all the dioceses and countries.

The official editions of the sacraments and other liturgical acts—some directed by CELAM for the whole continent while others are of a national character—have continued to produce a profound change in the life of the community at the level of the "mediations." On the catechetical plane the advances have been more impressive, primarily as a result of the Latin American Institute of Catechesis, which has strong parish, diocesan, and national support. Given the fact that in many countries teaching is laicized in the schools, the Church must develop some means for reaching the children. Until the present, no such means have been forthcoming. Catechetical teaching is, therefore, very deficient if one believes that the masses in all of Latin America

should be reached and Christianity perpetuated. On this level, nevertheless, theological, biblical, and liturgical renewal is producing its first fruits, leaving aside the traditional scholastic catechism in order to concentrate on the religious education of the child in the life of the Christian community.

All of this is clearly dependent on parish renewal. Everywhere one feels the necessity for a profound reform, and partial initiatives are many, especially with respect to the economic problems and the freeing of the priests from handling finances, the liturgical life celebrated and lived in common, parish services, Catholic Action, the parish itself, and the missionary community. Many negative factors are, nonetheless, encountered: the great distances, the lack of priestly teams, the strength of traditionalism, and the opposition to the overall Pastoral.

Religious sociology has provoked a profound desire to know the parochial, diocesan, and national reality. The reforms are proposed and are accepted slowly primarily because of the gradual awakening to the reality that is taking place. Various institutes of religious sociology now exist, such as the Center of Social and Religious Investigations of Buenos Aires, the Center of Investigation and Social Action of Santiago, Chile, the Center of Social Investigations of Bogotá, and the Center of Socio-Religious Investigations of Mexico, as well as others in Brazil and other Latin American countries. Slowly the CIAS are being founded by the Jesuits in all the countries.

5. The Attitude of the Episcopacy

In line with the episcopal collegiality and as a step toward reawakening, one must consider the General Conference of the Latin American Episcopacy (CELAM), which met in Río from July 25 until August 4, 1955;[37] Its historical importance cannot be exaggerated. Europe, for example, after having lost its medieval unity, never recovered it on the ecclesial level. Latin America, on the contrary, in a century and a half regained the unity that it enjoyed during the period of colonial Christianity. The recovery, however, involved innumerable difficulties. At the present, the Church is gradually coordinating its work without depending on any *Patronato* at a continental level. In this sense the Church has moved beyond many Latin American political, economic, and cultural organizations, and in one sense —at the level of civilization — represents a prophetic achievement. Evidence of this can be seen in the conclusions adopted by this historic General Conference, conclusions that continue to determine all the action of the 1955 Latin American Episcopal Conference.

Cardinal Adeodato Piazza gave an address on July 30, 1955, from which we have taken certain significant texts.[38] He said,

> To be able to go back to the origins of the apostolic mandate is always a great source of encouragement for us. We know that the mission of the Church is the continuation and the gradual development of the mission of Jesus Christ in the world. In Nazareth Jesus himself defined his mission by appropriating unhesitatingly the passage from the Prophet Isaiah:
>
> The Spirit of the Lord has been given to me,
> For he has annointed me.
> He has sent me to bring the good news to the poor,
> to proclaim liberty to captives
> and to the blind new sight.
> To set the downtrodden free,
> to proclaim the Lord's year of favor. (Luke 4:18)
>
> It is especially moving for us to observe the mission of Christ, formulated in its multiple aspects, in the history of the evangelization of the peoples of this immense continent. But

how was the mission of Christ converted into the "apostolic mission"? You will well remember how the transmission of power occurred on the same night as the Resurrection when Jesus said to his Apostles

As the Father sent me,
so am I sending you. (John 20:21)

This is the central event of our lives and the most moving experience in our memories, namely, the episcopal consecration. ...The history of the evangelization of this new continent constitutes one of the most prodigious chapters in the history of the Universal Church in the modern era which began with what is called the "discovery of America.". ..This historical account reminds us of the prophetic announcement:

The people that walked in darkness
have seen a great light. (Isa. 9:1)

...The question is, however, Has this light shone in all of Latin America? ...Has this preaching of the Gospel reached "every creature"? Have all the children of Latin America been transformed into children of God and of the Church? ...Obviously, the evangelization is still being done. ...I believe at this point it is well to note a serious problem which exists in all our countries, namely, the question of the conversion and Christian formation of the Indians and simultaneously of the colored peoples. In the urban centers, where local wealth contributes to a prosperity "whose appearance is materialistic, hedonistic, and almost pagan," Christianity has been reduced to a formalism of good customs rather than something deeply felt (p. 99).

Cardinal Piazza saw the problem of a secular civilization with its "almost pagan Appearance" and the necessity to continue the work of missions on every level— "the evangelization is still being done." With a clear theology one can see that all ecclesiastical efforts should be founded on and should originate from the episcopal consecration and from its adherence to the example of Jesus of Nazareth who, annointed by the Holy Spirit, evangelized the poor.

Pope Pius XII, also speaking to the Conference, declared,

It is necessary that precious energies not be wasted, but rather multiplied by proper coordination. If the circumstances so indicate, new methods of the apostolate should be adopted, and new ways of evangelism should be tried (*nova exercendi apostolatus general novague carpantur tinera*) in order that, while remaining faithful to ecclesiastical tradition, we will be more in tune with the demands of the times and take advantage of the advances of civilization.[39]

The conclusions of the Conference were arranged under eleven headings. The first three headings were dedicated to the serious problems of vocations and the formation of foreign as well as autochthonous seminarians, priests, and religious. There was already a Subsecretariat for the Clergy, Religious Institutes, the Care of Souls, Vocations, and Seminaries (see further *Estatutos y reglamentos del CELAM, Estatuto*, c. III, art. 13.2; *Reglamento*, c. I, art. 2,2) besides the *Latin American Confederation of Religious* (CLAR, Río de Janeiro, 1958[40]), the *Latin American Organization of Seminaries* (OSLAM, Tlalpan, Mexico, 1958), *Spanish Organization for Collaboration* (OCSHA, Madrid, 1947), *Collegium pro America Latina*, Louvain, 1957), and *The Missionary Society of St. James the Apostle* (Boston, 1958).

Section IV deals with lay involvement in Catholic Action. There also existed a Subsecretariat (ibid., 4), as well as the Interamerican Secretariate of Catholic Action (SIAC, Santiago, Chile, 1946), the Regional Conference of the International Federation of Catholic Youth (Buenos Aires, 1953), the Information Center of the JOC (Río de Janeiro, 1959), the General Delegation for Latin America (UNIAPAC, Santiago, 1958), and the Christian Family Movement (Montevideo, 1951).

Section VI dealt with the special means of propaganda. A Subsecretariat already

existed for the Defense of the Faith, Preaching and Catechesis, the Press, Radio, Cine, and Television. Also created were the Latin American Headquarters of FERES (Religious Sociology, Bogotá), and the Latin American Union of the Catholic Press (ULAPC, Montevideo, 1959). In addition, there was the third meeting of CELAM in Rome in 1958, which projected the founding of biblical, liturgical, and other institutes.

Section VII dealt with Protestantism and other non— Roman Catholic movements. As far as can be determined, a subsecretariat or institute has not yet been organized to deal specifically with this issue.

The social problems that CELAM had indicated as being especially serious or significant were dealt with in Section VIII. A subsecretariat that already existed (ibid., V) was the subject of the fourth meeting of CELAM in Fómeque, Colombia. There was also the CIASC, founded in Mexico City in 1942, the Latin American Christian Penitentiary Movement (Santiago, 1958), and the Latin American Confederation of Christian Trade Unionists (CLASC, Santiago, 1954).[41]

Section IX dealt with the questions of missions, especially to the Indians and colored peoples, which already had its own organization as a part of the Subsecretariat of the Propagation of the Faith. The Conference proposed the additional founding of an "Intermissional Seminary for the Formation of Native Clergy" (Section IX, 86b), and of an "Institute of Ethnological and Indigenous Character" (89b). Unfortunately, however, neither of these organizations has been created. In Mexico there is a seminary for foreign missions, and several missionaries have already been sent out to East Asia.

Section X dealt with the issue of immigrants and seamen throughout the continent.

As to culture, there already existed the Interamerican Confederation of Catholic Education (CIEC, Bogotá, 1945) with three subsecretariats: The Interamerican Secretariat for Pedagogy (Santiago), and the Interamerican Secretariat for Freedom in Teaching (Río de Janeiro). There also existed the Interamerican Union of Parents of Families (UNIP, Lima, 1952), the Organization of Catholic Universities in Latin America (ODUCAL, Santiago, 1953), the Union of American Christian Educators (Buenos Aires), and the International Catholic Center of Coordination of Work with UNESCO (Santiago)[42]

Two other factors should be noted. First, all of these organizations are of relatively recent origin, which can be explained by the fact that the awakening of Catholic laity began about 1930 in most of the countries of Latin America, and it has taken almost a full generation for these movements to develop continental organizations. The second factor that should be noted is the importance of Chile in the coordination of all these movements. The Chilean Church, because of certain priests such as Father Hurtado and bishops such as Monseñor Manuel Larrain of Talca, together with certain progressive lay groups, was a prime mover in CELAM as well as in the other organizations already cited.

We have reviewed rapidly the factors that have preponderantly affected the contempory situation in Latin America. The new elites have neither a sense of solidarity nor culpability in regard to the actual situation; neither do they attempt to relive the agony of colonial Christendom. Rather, they are attempting with intelligence and enthusiasm to consolidate a vibrant, mature, unified Catholicism within a secular and pluralistic society. At the same time they are aware of being the only group able to assume responsibility for all of Latin American history and to give it at this crucial stage its fullest meaning.

Demographic growth as well as the revolutionary nature of the present situation

forces the Latin American Church to initiate completely new avenues in the field of the Pastoral. The "diaconal" function, one of the most profound concepts of the priesthood (that is, collaboration with the laity), is awaiting a total restructuring which is possible for the elites who have been emerging. The experiences in Natal, Brazil, among others, demonstrate that "Latin American Catholicism can fulfill a decisive role which will have repercussions beyond its own borders, in that the crucial problems faced here will sooner or later be faced in the entire world."[43]

All the above indicates that on the level of the elites there has been a profound renewal, the ultimate fruits of which are impossible to determine at this time.