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INTRODUCTION
From 1979 until 1992, a tiny country in Central America called El Salvador became the subject of a decade-long civil war that resulted in one of the major human rights crises of the late twentieth century. The war specifically pitted peasant groups seeking to assert political power against a government led by the Western-backed Salvadoran military establishment. Much of the Civil War era in El Salvador, however, would emerge as the result of a conflict between the Roman Catholic Church and the Salvadoran state in the decade prior to the start of hostilities. In particular, the country's Catholic hierarchy antagonized the government by actively pursuing the implementation of human rights doctrine within El Salvador. In this thesis, I argue that the Church’s emphasis on human rights at a global level led to the emergence of a politically-active clergy that took a hard line against allying with governments that perpetuated unjust social structures which kept large numbers people economically marginalized and powerless. This radical shift, in turn, led to a conflict with an oligarchic Salvadoran state that once viewed the Church as an ally but now viewed it as a threat.

That the Church would become a major defender of human rights in El Salvador might seem a bit surprising at first, insofar as it had taken the side of social elites over the poor since the colonial era--even while extreme social stratification developed in Salvadoran society. If anything, the Church opposed modern liberal conceptions of human rights for most of the 1800s, with Pope Gregory XVI going so far in an 1832 encyclical as to call the idea the idea of religious liberty, “that absurd and erroneous proposition.”¹ The Church, however, moved towards the idea of individual rights as a means to condemn

abuses by capitalist employers while simultaneously opposing socialist doctrine, which was viewed as a threat to ecclesiastical interests. In 1891, the Church issued an influential encyclical entitled *Rerum novarum*, which stated that workers had a right to fair remuneration for their labors.\(^2\) As such, *Rerum* established the idea of inviolable rights within Church doctrine.

To this day, *Rerum novarum* forms the ideological basis for Catholic Social Teaching, and papal pronouncements released since have sought to build upon its precepts. Of particular note is a 1931 encyclical entitled *Quadragesimo anno*, so called because it specifically sought to honor *Rerum*'s 40th anniversary. *Quadragesimo* specifically established the idea that labor could not be treated like other commodities since human dignity needed to be taken into account when appropriately rewarding an individual for work performed.\(^3\) Although *Quadragesimo* primarily dealt with dignity in the workplace, the years following the encyclical witnessed a number of European constitutions incorporate human dignity as a legal principle. The first of these was the Irish Constitution of 1937, which opens with a preamble reading:

> In the name of the Most Holy Trinity, from Whom is all authority and to Whom, as our final end, all actions of men and States must be referred / We, the people of Éire,\(^4\) / Humbly acknowledging all our obligations to the Divine Lord, Jesus Christ, Who sustained our fathers through centuries of trial, / Gratefully remembering their heroic and unremitting struggle to gain the rightful independence of our nation, / And seeking to promote the common good, with due observance of Prudence, Justice, and Charity, so that the dignity and freedom of the individual may be assured, true social

---


\(^4\) Gaelic name for Ireland.
order attained, the unity of our country restored, and concord with other nations established, / Do hereby enact and adopt this Constitution.\footnote{Irish Constitution, Preamble. The capitalization in this passage is from the original, and the slashes are intended to represent line breaks which are also in the original. Accessed July 28, 2017. \url{https://www.constituteproject.org/constitution/Ireland_2012.pdf?lang=en}.}

While the Irish Constitution explicitly references the Christian God, other European constitutions of the era make reference to the concept of human dignity without a religious basis for doing so. For example, a draft constitution proposed in 1944 for Vichy France opened by saying, “The freedom and dignity of the human person are intangible goods.”\footnote{Vichy France Draft Constitution, 1944, Article 1. Accessed July 28, 2017. \url{http://mjp.univ-perp.fr/france/co1944p.htm}.} Likewise, the Bavarian \textit{Länder}\footnote{Administrative unit of Germany, comparable to American states or Canadian provinces} constitution of 1946 specifically mentions the violations of human dignity that occurred in World War II, stating, “In the face of the scene of devastation into which the survivors of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} World War were led by a godless state and social order which lacked any conscience and respect for human dignity…the Bavarian people herewith bestows upon itself the following Democratic Constitution.”\footnote{Bavarian Constitution, Preamble. Accessed July 28, 2017. \url{https://www.bayern.landtag.de/fileadmin/Internet_Dokumente/Sonstiges_P/BV_Verfassung_Englisch_formatiert_14-12-16.pdf}.} The human rights historian Samuel Moyn has attributed this rise of European constitutions based on human dignity to, “a new form of constitutionalism navigating between the vehement rejection of the secular liberal state long associated with the French Revolution and the widespread demand for an integrally religious social order.”\footnote{Samuel Moyn, \textit{Christian Human Rights} (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), 27.} In essence, whereas rights discourse was traditionally associated with a non-religious worldview, Europeans between the 1930s and 1940s desired a society ordered on the precepts of the Christian faith. As a
result, Moyn argues, Christian conservatives in Europe were able to take control of rights language from the secular, liberal tradition from which it had arisen. The rise of human dignity and human rights as legal precepts must therefore be considered a project of Christian conservatives rather than secular liberals.

At the same time as the idea of human dignity began to shape European constitutions, the Allied Forces started to include mechanisms for economic security in their plans for a post-World War II world. For example, in 1940, the British Labour politician Ernest Bevin told the economist John Maynard Keynes that, “social security must be the first objective of our domestic policy after the war. And social security for the peoples of all the European countries will be our policy abroad no less than at home.” The next year, United States President Franklin Delano Roosevelt included “freedom from want” as one of four freedoms mentioned in the State of the Union Address (with the others being freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, and freedom from fear). Roosevelt defined freedom from want as, “economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.” In short, a widespread consensus emerged that ensuring the economic well-being of all individuals anywhere in the world would be a crucial step to preventing future conflicts on the scale of World War II.

10 Ibid., 8.
11 Ibid.
14 Ibid.
The precepts of human dignity and economic security eventually merged together into a new doctrine called human rights. The phrase “human rights” is distinctly mentioned in the 1945 United Nations Charter, which begins with a preamble that defines some of the organization's aims as, “to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and nations large and small, and...to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.”\(^\text{15}\)

Just what human rights should entail would be determined three years later, when the United Nations adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). The UDHR’s first article specifically stated, “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.”\(^\text{16}\) While much of the UDHR guarantees political rights (such as equality before the law or not being subjected to arbitrary arrest), the document also contains articles that ensure social rights. In particular, Article 23 reads in part, “Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment...Everyone who works has the right to just and favorable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.”\(^\text{17}\)

While support for the social rights provisions existed throughout the world, the Latin American countries were particularly vocal about their inclusion in the final document.


\(^{17}\) Ibid., Article 23.
On the surface, the UDHR might not have seemed like a significant document, given that it dealt with concepts that had originated in the late 1700s with the American Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man.\textsuperscript{18} The UDHR, however, differed from these earlier documents in one important aspect: While the authors of earlier declarations had viewed rights as something to be protected by the government of a sovereign country, the signatories of the UDHR entered into a pact specifically stating that individuals held certain rights simply by having been born as humans. For such an idea to gain public traction, however, it would have to compete against any number of worldviews that similarly claimed universal status. Moyn describes this phenomenon in The Last Utopia, where he writes, “Finally, the creation of the concept of rights did not mean the immediate end of the rivalry of universalisms. Distinctive globalisms and internationalism existed all along in modern history that would have to be ruled out for a utopia based on individual rights to become the singular watchword of hopes for a better world.”\textsuperscript{19} In particular, the UDHR’s release coincided with a time when international relations were devolving into the ideological conflict known as the Cold War, which pitted the mostly democratic and capitalist countries in North America and Western Europe against the communist Soviet Union in a competition for global influence. As a result, “human rights” quickly became a buzzword for speakers in the former to oppose the ideological aims of the latter.\textsuperscript{20}

A universalist worldview that opposed communism held special significance for the Church—an institution whose own foray into rights doctrine had been based in anti-

\textsuperscript{18} Samuel Moyn, The Last Utopia (Boston: Harvard University Press, 2010), 12.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., 14.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 2.
communist sentiments. Anti-communist concerns would gain special prominence for the Church after Cuba, a traditionally Catholic country in Latin America, fell to communists in the 1959 Cuban Revolution. Two years later, Pope John XXIII issued *Mater et magistra*, the first papal encyclical to directly reference the term “human rights.” John XXIII further burnished the Church’s human rights credentials by calling the Second Vatican Council, an event which served as a fundamental reordering of Church practices in order to bring the institution into the modern world. During the Council, the Church both attacked the legitimacy of governments that failed to recognize human rights and committed itself to the advancement of marginalized economic classes.

Nevertheless, by latching onto human rights doctrine, the Church set itself up for troubles in countries where it had established itself as an ally of elitist regimes that showed little concern for the economically marginalized. This was due to the fact that the universality of human rights worked in two directions. While the ideology granted all individuals recognition before the law as people regardless of social class, its implementation required that those who violated human rights face legal sanctions. The author Kathryn Sikkink argues that this notion of the consequences of human rights violations upended centuries-old views about the immunity of state actors from criminal prosecution. In its place emerged a series of norms in which actions such as torture and summary execution could not be considered legitimate acts of state and therefore had to be

22 The First Vatican Council had taken place from 1869-70.  
treated as criminal acts committed by individuals. For the Church to be serious in its embrace of human rights doctrine, therefore, it would no longer be able to look the other way when confronted with governments that failed to follow accepted human rights standards. El Salvador represented the perfect tinderbox for a conflict between the post-Second Vatican Church and the pre-Second Vatican world, El Salvador had developed a high degree of economic stratification due to the introduction of large-scale coffee farming as well as the fact that the country had the highest population density in Latin America. Things had gotten so bad, in fact, that a Communist revolt had been unsuccessfully attempted in 1932. The Salvadoran poor also had little practical voice over their country’s government, which functioned as an alliance between the country’s oligarchy and the country’s military. In short, a Church that sought to emphasize the poor’s human rights would be a threat to the established power structures in El Salvador. Nevertheless, the Church’s new emphasis on human rights would be seen in El Salvador through the actions and policies of priests on the ground such as Rutilio Grande and ecclesiastical leaders such as Archbishop Óscar Arnulfo Romero. In their preaching, both of these men advanced the idea that human beings held a universal set of rights regardless of social class and that the Church offered a preferential option for the poor. That both Grande and Romero died at the hands of government assassins further demonstrates the extent to which political leadership came to view the new social attitude of the Church as a threat, a view that would lead to several attacks conducted against churchmen before and during the war years. Therefore, understanding the war’s roots, as well as those of the Church’s stance on human

\[24\] Ibid. 14.
rights requires one to first understand deeper conflicts between rich and poor that have come to shape Salvadoran society to this day.

In the following thesis, I aim to trace the evolution of human rights doctrine within the teachings of the Catholic Church as well as how the implementation of such doctrine after the Second Vatican Council led to tensions with the Salvadoran State. Chapter 1 will analyze how the Church arrived in El Salvador as an ally of the Spanish colonial state, only to fall victim to secularization policies pursued by liberal coffee barons. Chapter 2 will focus on the rise of human rights doctrine within Church teaching, especially through the encyclicals *Rerum novarum* and *Quadragesimo anno*. Chapter 3 will focus on the changes during the 1960s in both the global Church and Salvadoran society as a whole that led to an increased emphasis on human rights. Chapter 4 will present a case study of how the Salvadoran Church emphasized human rights during the run-up to the Civil War. Overall, the Church's post-Second Vatican emphasis on human rights at a global level led to a conflict between a politically active clergy seeking social change and a Salvadoran oligarchy seeking to preserve its traditional power.
CHAPTER 1: THE COFFEE ERA
Many of the factors that ultimately led to the Salvadoran Civil War resulted from an economic shift that occurred in the country during the mid-1800s, when coffee produced for export became El Salvador’s major cash crop. During the coffee boom, coffee producers managed to buy up large amounts of suitable land to be used in growing coffee plants. As El Salvador did not have a lot of land within its borders to begin with, this shift created a large class of landless peasants. In addition to controlling the country’s economy, the coffee oligarchy also managed to take control of the country’s government, thus also shutting out the peasant class from Salvadoran political life. It is true that other countries managed to enter the coffee industry without experiencing a devastating civil war the way El Salvador did. However, what differentiated El Salvador from other coffee-producing countries was the small amount of land within the country. As a result, the domination of productive land by coffee farmers created a large peasant class without title to land. The rise of coffee production in El Salvador heightened social stratification between rich and poor. The fact this shift occurred while the Catholic Church was emphasizing human at a global level meant that El Salvador would provide an ideal testing ground for many of the new Church teachings.

To understand the origins of the El Salvador conflict, one must first understand how the country was shaped by the phenomenon of conquest and conversion that permeated Spanish history. In particular, Spanish monarchs viewed the maintenance of Catholic worship as a central aspect of ensuring their continued rule over their subjects, a position that emanated from Spain having endured an eight-centuries long conflict between

---

Christian and Muslim forces.\textsuperscript{26} Additionally, a Spanish-sanctioned sea voyage in 1492 resulted in the modern discovery of the American continent, an event that prompted Spain to pursue the conversion of the native population. The Church granted Spain this right in 1494, when Pope Alexander VI wrote the following in the papal bull \textit{Inter Coetera}:

\begin{quote}
Hence, heartily commending in the Lord this your holy and praiseworthy purpose, and desirous that it be duly accomplished, and that the name of our Savior be carried into those regions, we exhort you very earnestly in the Lord and by your reception of holy baptism, whereby you are bound to our apostolic commands, and by the bowels of the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, enjoin strictly, that inasmuch as with eager zeal for the true faith you design to equip and despatch this expedition, you purpose also, as is your duty, to lead the peoples dwelling in those islands and countries to embrace the Christian religion; nor at any time let dangers or hardships deter you therefrom, with the stout hope and trust in your hearts that Almighty God will further your undertakings.\textsuperscript{27}
\end{quote}

Additionally, the Church also granted several other concessions to the Spanish Crown, most notably the 1508 \textit{patronato}. Under the terms of the \textit{patronato}, the Spanish monarchy gained the right to directly appoint bishops, something which the Crown recognized would provide for a degree of direct control over the Church.\textsuperscript{28} The \textit{patronato}, in fact, would serve as a major focal point in the years after Latin American independence.

El Salvador itself traces its origins to a \textit{conquistador} named Pedro de Alvarado, who arrived in the New World as a part of the Hernán Cortés expedition in 1519. Four years after arriving in the Americas, Cortés dispatched Alvarado on a mission to conquer some lands to the South. A year into this mission, Alvarado conquered the Kingdom of Cuzcatlán,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{26} Justo L. Gonzalez and Ondina L. Gonzalez, \textit{Christianity In Latin America: A History} (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 2008). 22-23
\item \textsuperscript{27} Alexander VI, \textit{Inter Caetera}, Papal Encyclicals Online, May 4, 1493. Accessed June 16, 2017. \url{http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Alex06/alex06inter.htm}.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Gonzalez and Gonzalez, \textit{Christianity In Latin America: A History}, 110.
\end{itemize}
modern-day El Salvador. The Spanish conquerors would celebrate their first Mass in the new territory on August 6, 1524, and the Spanish established a town (the Villa de San Salvador) in Cuzcatlán in 1525. For the purposes of religious governance, San Salvador itself represented a parish under the jurisdiction of the Archdiocese of Guatemala. Over the first two centuries of colonial rule, however, San Salvador gained a reputation for loose morals and licentiousness, which led the Archbishop of Guatemala to suggest that the city be made a separate and independent diocese from Guatemala’s. This movement gained further traction after the Salvadoran population completed work on a cathedral church in 1808, an event that convinced many Salvadorans of the suitability of establishing a Salvadoran diocese.

In addition to these influences from within the Church, global events came to rock the foundations of Spain’s possessions in the New World. Notably, Napoleon Bonaparte’s invasion of Spain in 1808 led to the rise of independence movements amongst the Spanish colonists, many of whom already knew about the American Revolution from 1776-83 and the French Revolution that had begun in 1791. In San Salvador itself, an uprising under the leadership of a priest named José Mattias Delgado broke out on November 5, 1811—an event considered to be the first of its kind in what is now Central America. This revolt, however, failed due to interference by troops from Guatemala, which exercised hegemonic power in colonial Central America. Although this particular revolt failed to extend beyond

---

31 Ibid., 88.
32 Ibid., 91.
the boundaries of San Salvador, comparable movements arose in Mexico and South America over the next decade.

In general, the institutional Catholic Church opposed the idea of Latin American independence. In 1816, Pope Pius VII issued the encyclical *Etsi longissimus*, in which he encouraged Latin American subjects to maintain loyalty to their colonial masters:

> Strive then, Venerable Brethren and beloved sons, to be ready to second Our paternal exhortations and Our desires, recommending greater commitment to obedience and loyalty to your king: be worthy of the people entrusted to your care; We bring more affection that you and your king will now profess, and for your efforts and your hard work will get in heaven the reward promised by Him who called blessed.”

The reaction of Church officials towards an independent Latin America largely revolved around the fact that recognizing the new Latin American countries could result in a conflict with the Spanish Crown while not granting such recognition could result in a similar conflict with the new Latin American countries. Despite a declaration of neutrality in 1822, the Church did appoint titular bishops (who had few real powers and were not subject to the terms of the *patronato*) to the new Latin American countries. Efforts at forcing the Spanish colonists to accept Spanish rule continued as late as 1824, when Pope Leo XII wrote the following in a letter to American bishops: "We are firmly convinced that you, with the help of God, will...bring to a successful conclusion this task so onerous if you'll inform your flock of the august and distinct virtues of our beloved son in Christ Ferdinand, Catholic king of Spain, to whom nothing is more valuable than the religion of his

---

34 Gonzalez and Gonzalez, *Christianity In Latin America*, 136.
This exhortation of loyalty to Ferdinand further demonstrates the extent to which the Church served as a vehicle for elite institutions in Latin American society. While a decree of recognition would have signaled a receptiveness to the concerns of the average person, the Church elected the path of response that would stay in the good graces of the Spanish Crown.

The independence movements came to a head in 1821, when a body of Latin American nobles endorsed Agustín de Iturbide's Plan de Iguala. Under this plan, Iturbide, a Mexican general, ostensibly sought to create a constitutional monarchy in the Viceroyalty of New Spain that would be under the rule of a Spanish prince. In writing the plan, Iturbide specifically included a provision granting equal citizenship to the populace of New Spain, writing, “All the inhabitants of New Spain, without any distinction between Europeans, Africans, or Indians, are citizens of this Monarchy, and have access to all employment according to their merits and virtues.” Iturbide’s plan also established Catholicism as the official religion of this new state, stating, “The religion of New Spain is and will be Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman, without sovereignty of another.” Overall, despite the guarantees of political independence and citizenship, Iturbide’s desire for a Spanish prince to rule New Spain indicated that he did not wish to stray too far from Mexico’s colonial heritage. Additionally, Iturbide’s demand here signified a desire for the Catholic Church to maintain a favored position amongst the ruling classes in Latin American society.

---


San Salvador initially resisted incorporation into this new state; however, the country acquiesced after an invasion by the Mexican general Vicente Filísola in February 1823. Shortly after this invasion, however, a group of Mexican generals overthrew Iturbide, forcing Filísola to pull out of Central America. In July 1823, Guatemala, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Honduras, and Nicaragua proclaimed the independence of Central America from the Mexican Empire. A year later, these five countries agreed to a federal constitution as, “the United Federation of Central America.” Under this new Constitution, Central America would be a representative federal republic in which Catholicism would be the only religion permitted for public practice. The Constitution provided for legislative, executive, and judicial branches similar to those prescribed by the United States Constitution of 1788. In addition, the Constitution explicitly stated that, “Each of the component states is free and independent in its government and interior administration, and corresponds to all the power that Constitution will not grant to the federal authorities.”

In April 1825, the Federation carried out its first presidential election, a contest between the Salvadoran liberal Manuel José Arcé, and José del Valle, a Conservative with Honduran backing. Although Arcé won the election, the results were mired in controversy, as the country’s Congress overrode the vote of an electoral college that had given a plurality of votes to Valle. Congress’ rationale for changing the election results reflected a popular sentiment in post-colonial Central America against strong, central governments.

---

39 Ibid., Title 1, Section 1, Article 10.
While Arcé had made his name within Salvadoran politics, Valle had gained his as a military officer and an opponent of attempts to increase local control over Central American politics. Given this history, the electors likely decided that Arcé would offer more support for local autonomy than Valle would and therefore gave the office to Arcé. Those who voted for Arcé, however, would find themselves sorely disappointed by their decision.

Inequality between the states would also serve as a major stumbling block for the new country. In particular, the Federation of Central America had to overcome several issues pertaining to Guatemala, a country that had exercised hegemony over the region since colonial days and continued to hold an outsized influence over Central American politics. 50% of the Central American population resided in Guatemala, an imbalance that led to the Congress having eighteen Guatemalan members (twice as many as the next closest state). As a means to alleviate this situation, proposals to create a sixth Central American state in the Guatemalan highlands emerged in 1823. Politicians on both sides of the aisle, however, felt that a sixth state would upset the balance of power in the region and therefore waffled over whether to approve the new state. Efforts to combat Guatemalan hegemony would also find themselves thwarted by none other than José Manuel Arcé, who allied himself with conservative factions despite having been elected as a liberal. After several liberal politicians had declined to serve in the Arcé administration, the president appointed conservatives to fill administrative posts—thus bringing him into an alliance with conservative Guatemalan factions, whom he tried to place in power over the state.

---

42 Ibid.
Not even the Church was exempt from these territorial machinations; on the contrary, it became the focal point for a major controversy within the early days of the Central American Federation. Like the citizens of other Central American states, residents of El Salvador held long-simmering resentments over Guatemala’s status in the region. Additionally, geographic conditions made communications between El Salvador and Guatemala difficult. These concerns led to a desire amongst Salvadorans for their own bishopric, which was ultimately established on May 5, 1824, with the installation of José Matías Delgado as Bishop of San Salvador. In making this decision, however, the Salvadoran government acted unilaterally, and the new bishopric failed to gain the approval of Church leaders—either in Rome or in Guatemala. In deciding not to recognize the Salvadoran bishopric, the Vatican continued its policy of not sanctioning New World dioceses in order to appease Ferdinand VII of Spain. However, the decision not to recognize San Salvador set off a debate about the patronato, which Central American states felt had devolved onto them as a result of independence.

Interstate conflicts, however, led to the breakup of the Central American Federation in 1838. El Salvador itself wrote a Constitution in 1841, which recognized Catholicism as the official state religion, and finally received recognition as a diocese the next year. Almost immediately, however, hostilities erupted between the Church and State. In particular, El Salvador’s bishop, Jorge Viteri y Ungo, forced the country’s president out of office in favor of Francisco Malespín—who would, in turn, suffer excommunication in 1845 for executing

43 Ibid.
a priest. Viteri, however, involved himself in the country's political affairs, and in 1846 the government accused him of having instigated a rebellion. As a result of these charges, Viteri exiled himself to Nicaragua, over which he would be appointed Bishop in 1849. After Viteri's flight, the Church appointed a bishop in partibus infidelium to serve as an administrator of the San Salvador diocese.

Nevertheless, the Church and the Salvadoran state reached a Concordat in 1862. Under this agreement, Catholicism was established as the official religion of El Salvador, and the Church was given the right to censor books and publications. Additionally, the Concordat stated that all schools within El Salvador would have to conform to Catholic doctrine. However, under the terms of the Concordat, the Church granted patronato rights to the Salvadoran government, which would be allowed to offer the names of candidates for bishopric vacancies. Furthermore, the Concordat required individuals appointed as bishops to swear fealty to both the government and the Salvadoran Constitution. At first, Salvadoran bishops opposed the Concordat, on the grounds that some of the country's laws ran afoul of Church teachings. Despite these claims, the Church felt that reaching a Concordat could help establish acceptable relationships with the Salvadoran government without weakening the Church's status in Salvadoran society.

Even with the Concordat, a major shift in the Salvadoran political scene came to affect the relationship between the Church and the State. While the Conservative Party had managed to hold power for much of the time since the country gained independence,

---

47 Ibid., 200.
liberal politicians held power in the country from 1859-63 well as from 1871 until the twentieth century. Once in power, liberals sought to implement several reforms intended to modernize Salvadoran life. In 1860, for instance, the liberal President Gerardo Barrios announced the following platform planks regarding El Salvador’s government: promotion of agriculture, industry, and commerce, introduction of technological progress to El Salvador, encouragement of immigration, education reform, and construction of transportation infrastructure. In their zeal to adopt progressive policies in El Salvador, however, liberals also sought to secularize and laicize El Salvador, a policy generally opposed by Pope Pius IX. As a result, the State and the Church experienced something of a falling-out. Salvadoran officials openly accused the Church of having instigated uprisings in 1871 and 1872; these allegations, in turn, led to laws passed in 1873 and 1874 that expelled an auxiliary bishop and ended state financing to the Church. Likewise, the government expelled the Jesuit order from the country in 1872.

Furthermore, these political transformations took place as the Salvadoran economy experienced a major shift within its agricultural sector. From the earliest days of the colonial era, balsam, cacao, and indigo had served as El Salvador’s main export crops; however, under Barrios, this designation shifted to coffee, a crop whose buying power became apparent when it achieved commercial success in Costa Rica during the 1830s. Barrios sought to promote coffee exports because he recognized the popularity of the drink outside of El Salvador as well as the suitability of the country’s volcanic soil for coffee,

---

48 Burns, “Modernization Of Underdevelopment,” 298.
49 Mary Patricia Holleran, Church And State In Guatemala (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949), 152.
foretelling that El Salvador would become America’s leading coffee producer within two years. Although that prediction failed to come true, coffee production increased from 1% to 48.5% of Salvadoran exports between 1860 and 1879.

Nevertheless, the rise of coffee as an export crop required a change in Salvadoran landholding policies. While indigo production only required a seasonal workforce, coffee farming required a period of three to five years before a harvest could produce its first crop. Most of El Salvador’s land, however, was tied up in communal holdings known as *ejidos* or *tierras comunales*, which had existed since the pre-colonial days and had remained largely intact due to the fact that El Salvador held a large population of Native Americans and *mestizos*. To combat the issue of communal landholdings, the Salvadoran government passed several laws regarding land ownership. In 1879, a decree stated that private individuals could acquire title to *ejidos* if they planted 25% of the land on the *ejido* with specified, profitable crops. Further laws passed in 1881 and 1882 outlawed communal landholdings altogether. The extent of *ejido* landholdings can be seen in the impact that the law had on El Salvador’s departments. For example, the Department of La Libertad sold 37,469 hectares of land previously held in *ejidos*, the Department of Santa Ana, and the Department of San Vicente 2,667. The reform, however, alienated members of the indigenous Salvadoran population, many of whom had no concept of private land
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ownership. Likewise, these reforms further weakened the social status of the Church, which itself had to relinquish substantial landholdings.

At this point, it must be highlighted that the use of coffee as an export crop occurred throughout Central America and was not unique to El Salvador. Other countries in the region, however, differed from El Salvador insofar as their coffee elites held less political control than did the coffee producing class in El Salvador. For example, in 1910, the largest coffee producer in the Nicaraguan department of Carazo produced a yield of 5,000 quintales of coffee off 222 acres of land. Similarly, between 1935 and 1980, the coffee production of quintales per manzana\(^56\) of land in Costa Rica increased from 7.6 to 21.2. In Guatemala, coffee barons controlled twice as much land as did the comparable economic class in El Salvador.\(^57\) The prevalence that coffee farming gained throughout the Central American region demonstrates the extent to which the crop came to be viewed as a primary profit source for an area often considered to be a disunified colonial backwater.

El Salvador, however, differed from the rest of Central America in two major areas pertaining to coffee harvesting: production efficiency and land holdings amongst the lower classes. For example, although Guatemala produced more quintales of coffee than El Salvador, coffee estates in the latter country had, on average, less land area than those in the former.\(^58\) The fact that El Salvador managed to produce more coffee on less land, in turn, meant that Salvadoran coffee growers could expect to derive more profit from their land.\(^59\) Coffee growers used their newfound wealth to purchase more land to be used in

\(^{56}\) Quintal=100 kg; Manzana=0.69 hectare.


\(^{58}\) Ibid., 66.

\(^{59}\) Ibid., 67.
coffee farming. Since El Salvador already had less land than any other country in Latin America, this development had the effect of displacing members of the Salvadoran peasantry, who were then forced to go to work on the coffee plantations. In response to this situation, El Salvador experienced a series of peasant uprisings in 1872, 1875, 1880, 1885, and 1898.\(^6\) Despite these uprisings, however, coffee elites solidified their hold on Salvadoran society through the passage of the Vagrancy Laws of 1881 and the Agrarian Law of 1907, which had the effect of forcing the peasantry to labor on coffee plantations at the risk of government-sanctioned intimidation.\(^6\) Even though class differences had existed in El Salvador prior to the introduction of coffee farming, the success of coffee farmers in gaining economic power enhanced the differences between rich and poor within El Salvador.

Having taken control of the Salvadoran economy, Salvadoran coffee growers turned their attention to establishing control over both the country’s government and the relations between Church and State. In 1886, coffee-controlled El Salvador adopted a new constitution, which remained in effect until 1939. This new constitution specifically granted freedom of religion in El Salvador, as it stated, “The free exercise of all religions, without any other restrictions than morals or public order, is guaranteed. No religious act shall serve to establish the civil status of a person.”\(^6\) Likewise, the Constitution also stipulated that permanent corporations would not be able to hold real estate unless such lands were directly used by the institution in question and mandated that the state provide
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free education that would be, “laicial and free, and shall be subject to the proper regulations.”63 Taken together, these provisions of the Constitution attacked areas from which the Church traditionally drew power—thereby weakening its hold over Salvadoran society. Additionally, the Constitution also granted citizenship to, “All Salvadorans over 18 years of age and those who have not reached that age but are married, or have some literary degree.”64 The inclusion of a provision for literacy in the citizenship requirements was further evidence of the planter class trying to set itself apart from a populace that was largely illiterate. Taken as a whole, the Constitution of 1886 thus solidified the coffee oligarchy at the top of the Salvadoran social hierarchy.

The efforts of the Salvadoran coffee elites to solidify their own power at the expense of the Church further demonstrates a conflict that has extended back to the country’s earliest days. Although the Spanish colonies partly existed for the purpose of converting Native populations to Catholicism, issues such as the patronato helped to foster a divide between the Church and the Salvadoran State. Such a conflict can also be seen in the transformation of the Church from an ally of the upper class into a target of the elites. Furthermore, the coffee elite’s actions also helped to set the stage for the country’s later human rights crisis by undertaking policies and actions that increased the unequal stratification of Salvadoran society, insofar as the landless peasant class would become the most receptive social group towards the Church’s social justice push.

63 Ibid, Articles 32 and 39.
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CHAPTER 2: EARLY CATHOLIC SOCIAL DOCTRINE
During the second half of the nineteenth century, the Catholic Church faced several challenges to its ability to function as an institution. In particular, the Church viewed liberal governments arising in places such as Europe and Latin America as a threat, on grounds that such governments often tried to reduce the privileges and power of the Church. Although many countries had once offered a favored-religion status to the Church, countries now sought to promote equality of religion as well as official policies of secularization. Additionally, the Church also had to combat socialism, an ideology it viewed as heretical, as well as the increased work of Protestant missionaries in traditionally Catholic regions. Due to these challenges, the Church sought to re-establish its influence in places such as Latin America. In order to combat these challenges and counter a global perception that it was out of touch with the poor and working class, the Church openly began to adopt the idea of human dignity within its teachings.

The Catholic Church of the middle and late 1800s, found itself caught between two movements: liberalism and socialism. The former had gained prominence in the wake of the Revolutions of 1848, which elevated liberal nationalism to the forefront of European politics. One of the demands of the revolutionaries was that Church and State should be separate from one another, a position which Church leaders felt would result in the loss of temporal power. The prevailing view within ecclesiastical circles held that the Church would lose temporal power and therefore influence. For their part, liberals considered the Church to be an obstacle to social progress in a world that would increasingly be based on science and reason rather than religion. As a result of these combined hostilities, Church leadership came to recognize liberalism as a threat to the Church’s values.

In addition to the liberal movement, the Catholic Church also had to confront a worldwide rise in the popularity of socialist ideologies. Although prominent writers had expounded on the ideas that would eventually become socialism in the 1770s, the ideology gained real-world attention with the work of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Writing in 1848, the same year as the Revolution, Marx and Engels considered socialism to be a transitional phase between a society ruled by capitalists and one in which members of the proletariat gained control of the means of production. Marx and his followers soon ended up in an ideological fight with a rival socialist faction led by a man named Michael Bakhunin, who disagreed with Marx on the correct way for socialists to gain governmental power.\textsuperscript{66} The dispute between the Marxists and the Bakhunists led in 1864 to the foundation of the First International, an intellectual society for socialists from across the ideological spectrum.\textsuperscript{67} Through this organization, the Marxist branch came to take control of the international socialist movement, a development that led to the dissolution of the First International in 1876. Socialists also began to achieve political power in European elections.\textsuperscript{68} For example, in Marx’s home country of Germany, the Socialist Party increased its percentage of the vote from six to 30 percent between the elections of 1877 and the elections of 1903. \textsuperscript{69}

The Church took issue with the fact that socialism condemned institutional religion, as well as with the socialist belief that private property was inherently detrimental to a functioning society. Faced with two movements considered hostile to ecclesiastical
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interests, Church leadership issued a swift response. For example, in 1846, Pope Pius IX issued the encyclical *Qui pluribus*, in which he condemned the liberal view on freedom of religion by writing, “Also perverse is the shocking theory that it makes no difference to which religion one belongs, a theory which is greatly at variance even with reason. By means of this theory, those crafty men remove all distinction between virtue and vice, truth and error, honorable and vile action.”

Three years later, Pius issued another encyclical entitled *Nostis et nobiscum*, which primarily dealt with the status of the Church in the Papal States. In the encyclical, however, Pius wrote the following about socialist and communist ideologies:

> You are aware indeed, that the goal of this most iniquitous plot is to drive people to overthrow the entire order of human affairs and to draw them over to the wicked theories of this *Socialism* and *Communism*, by confusing them with perverted teachings. But these enemies realize that they cannot hope for any agreement with the Catholic Church, which allows neither tampering with truths proposed by faith, nor adding any new human fictions to them.

An even more forceful statement came in 1864, when Pius issued the Syllabus of Errors, a compendium of beliefs considered heretical by the Church. Overall, the syllabus represented a pushback by the institutional Church against the efforts of liberals to strip the institution of its temporal power. Nonetheless, the Syllabus served as a mere list, and as a result did not convey a vision for society beyond what the Church viewed as “wrong” with the secular world.
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The specific definition of such a vision would fall to Pius' successor, Leo XIII, who
gained election to the papacy in February 1878 and would reign as Pope until 1903 (a
papacy that ranks as third-longest amongst Popes of the modern era). In December 1878,
Leo continued his predecessor’s anti-socialist views through an encyclical entitled *Quod apostolici muneris*, in which Leo described socialists, communists, and nihilists by saying, “They refuse obedience to the higher powers, to whom...every soul ought to be subject, and
who derive the right of governing from God; and they proclaim the absolute equality of all
men in rights and duties. They debase the natural union of man and woman, which is held sacred even among barbarous peoples; and its bond, by which the family is chiefly held
together, they weaken, or even deliver up to lust.”

Instead of simply attacking socialists, however, Leo offered concrete means by which practicing Catholics could respond to the rampant anticlericalism they faced on a daily basis. For example, in an 1884 encyclical entitled *Humanum genus*, Leo argued for the implantation of workmen’s guilds, writing,

“Those who support themselves by the labour of their hands...are also especially exposed
to the allurements of men whose ways lie in fraud and deceit. Therefore, they ought...to be invited to join associations that are good, lest they be drawn away to others that are evil.”

Leo further called on bishops to take an active role in forming these guilds.

---
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Leo’s *magnum opus*, however, came in 1891, when he released the encyclical *Rerum novarum*, which to this day has come to form the basis of Catholic Social Teaching. Like preceding encyclicals, *Rerum novarum* condemned socialism, this time attacking the ideology for denying people the right to property. Leo described socialist doctrine by writing, “To remedy these wrongs the socialists, working on the poor man’s envy of the rich, are striving to do away with private property, and contend that individual possessions should become the common property of all, to be administered by the State or by municipal bodies.”\(^75\) In addition to his attack on socialism, however, Leo also condemned the inhumane conditions to which members of the working class had been subjected. For example, Leo wrote, “The great mistake made in regard to the matter now under consideration is to take up with the notion that class is naturally hostile to class, and that the wealthy and the working men are intended by nature to live in mutual conflict… in a State is it ordained by nature that these two classes should dwell in harmony and agreement, so as to maintain the balance of the body politic.”\(^76\) While *Rerum novarum* condemned the ideology of socialism, it also condemned the economic disparity between elites and individuals of the working class.

*Rerum novarum* thus had to strike a balance between socialism at one end and unrestrained capitalism at the other end. The encyclical achieved this goal by establishing the idea that all humans were entitled to a set of universal rights. For example, Leo explicitly stated that men had a right to property, writing, “For every man has by nature the right to possess property as his own.”\(^77\) Leo also argued that men had an entitlement to the
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fruits of their labors, stating, “Now, when man thus turns the activity of his mind and the strength of his body toward procuring the fruits of nature...that portion on which he leaves, as it were, the impress of his personality; and it cannot but be just that he should possess that portion as his very own, and have a right to hold it without any one being justified in violating that right.”\textsuperscript{78} To justify this right to private property, \textit{Rerum} argued that men had a right to a family. On this matter, Leo wrote,

> That right to property, therefore, which has been proved to belong naturally to individual persons, must in likewise belong to a man in his capacity of head of a family; nay, that right is all the stronger in proportion as the human person receives a wider extension in the family group. It is a most sacred law of nature that a father should provide food and all necessaries for those whom he has begotten; and similarly, it is natural that he should wish that his children, who carry on, so to speak, and continue his personality, should be by him provided with all that is needful to enable them to keep themselves decently from want and misery amid the uncertainties of this mortal life.\textsuperscript{79}

Although the encyclical does not specifically use the term, “human rights,” its precepts would form the basis for the Catholic Church’s later involvement in the formulation of that doctrine. Furthermore, \textit{Rerum}’s focus on class justice demonstrated that the Church was starting to break away from its traditional alliance with socio-economic elites. Instead, \textit{Rerum} promoted a worldview where laboring was considered honorable and that it was, therefore, the obligation of the employer to properly provide for his workers.\textsuperscript{80} \textit{Rerum}’s significance to Church history thus emerges from its ideas that some rights were common to all humanity.
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In addition to *Rerum Novarum*, Leo also sought to solidify the Church’s influence over Latin America. Though nominally Catholic, the Latin American countries had witnessed a steep decline in the number of missionaries arriving in the country from Europe. This development, which resulted from the fact that independent countries could no longer rely on European monarchies to bring missionaries through their right of *Patronato*, meant that the Latin American Church found itself cut off from Rome and in a state of neglect.\(^{81}\) While Pius IX had tried to solve this issue in 1858 through the foundation of the *Colegio Pio Latinoamericano*, a Roman-based institution that sought to promote ties between the Church and Latin American countries, the emergence of liberal regimes in Central America helped to exacerbate tensions between the region’s countries and the Church.\(^{82}\) Leo thus saw himself as a Pope who could bring Latin America back under the full and unquestioned influence of Rome.

To this end, Leo issued the encyclical *Quarto abuente saeculo* in 1892 to honor the 400\(^{th}\) anniversary of the European discovery of the Americas. In the encyclical, Leo heavily presented the discovery through a religious lens. For example, the Pope described Christopher Columbus’ actions in the New World by writing, “Upon whatsoever shores he might be driven, his first act was to set upon the shore the standard of the holy Cross: and the name of the Divine Redeemer...he conferred upon the new islands. Thus at Hispaniola he began to build from the ruins of the temple, and all popular celebrations were preceded
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by the most sacred ceremonies.” Leo tried to portray Columbus as a person whose concern was first and foremost the religious salvation of the New World’s indigenous population rather than the discovery of new trade routes for Spain. This explanation thus allowed Leo to emphasize the connections between the Catholic Church—and, by extension, Rome—to Latin America. However, the fact that Leo elected to use a Columbus metaphor four hundred years after Columbus set sail demonstrated a disconnect between the Roman Curia and non-European Catholics that increasingly constituted a larger share of the global Catholic population.

Efforts to return Latin America to the Roman fold further continued in 1899, when the region’s bishops met at the Latin American Plenary Council, which lasted from May 28 to July 9. At the Council, the bishops reaffirmed basic Church doctrine, stating, “We admit and embrace the Apostolic and Ecclesiastical traditions, and the Sacred Scripture, which conforms to the sentiment that the Holy Mother Church has sustained and continues to sustain, and each and every of truths taught, defined, and declared by the Holy Ecumenical Tridentine and Vatican Councils, especially agreeing with the primary and infallible majesty of the Roman Pope.” Additionally, the Council also defined the ideal role for the Church in society, stating, “On the contrary, if they arrogate authority to those who do not have it by right, and pretend to be teachers and judges; if the inferiors approve and try to maintain in the ecclesiastical government a method different from that which adopts the legitimate authority, the order is disturbed, the judgment of many is disturbed and the path
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is completely eroded.” Put another way, the pronouncements of the Plenary Council stood as an indication of the Church’s desire to overturn the erosion of ecclesiastical status that had occurred as the various Latin American governments had adopted secularization policies. Although secular governments existed in other countries such as the United States, the Church made an overt effort to keep Latin America in its fold due to the traditional associations between the Catholic Church and Hispanic culture.

Leo’s attitude towards both the idea of rights and the appropriate role for the Church in Latin America can be viewed through the lens of yet another ideology that was troubling the Church: the rise of Protestant missionaries in traditionally-Catholic lands. While such missionaries had historically ignored Latin America due to the influence that the Church held there, some Protestant traders had arrived on the Continent during the late 1800s. Normally, however, members of this latter group would agree not to proselytize and to use their native languages in worship. In 1894, two British missionaries wrote a book entitled The Neglected Continent, in which they made the argument for evangelizing Latin America by stating, “We have not seen them—but what difference does that make? Six weeks’ journey away from us, 6,000 miles distance across the Atlantic and Brazil, they are just as real as if they lived in Liverpool or Leicester. Is there no shame to the fact that if they live in Liverpool or Leicester we should carry to them at once the message of God’s love and free salvation, but because they live in Lima we forget them?” Nevertheless, the 1910 Edinburgh Missionary Conference, a worldwide meeting for Protestant evangelizers,

limited its discussion of Latin America to conversion efforts aimed at the region’s indigenous population rather than at Spanish speakers.  

In response to the lack of attention devoted to Latin America at the Edinburgh Conference, a missionary named Robert Speer organized a similar conference that would be held in the Panama Canal Zone in 1916. At the conference, 481 participants from Latin America, the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Italy decided that Latin American evangelization efforts would focus their energies on the popular classes, which they felt had been largely ignored by the Catholic hierarchy. To this end, missionaries decided that they would speak in indigenous languages when dealing with the indigenous population so as to counter the suspicious perceptions of foreigners. Needless to say, the Church hierarchy did not take kindly to this encroachment on its traditional turf. In particular, officials in the Catholic hierarchy viewed the influx of Protestant missionaries as a way for liberal governments to further neutralize the role of the Church in Latin American society. In the early days of the increased Protestant evangelization in Latin America, Church officials resorted to hostile response tactics such as locking evangelical meeting halls, slashing tires on missionary vehicles, and even organizing Bible burnings.

Doctrinally, the Church moved towards recognizing the inherent dignity of all persons. In 1931, for example, Pius XI issued the encyclical Quadragesimo anno, which honored the fortieth anniversary of Rerum novarum. In the encyclical, Pius called attention to the fact that industrialization had spread beyond European borders, stating, ”But since

88 Ibid., 7.
89 Anthony Gill, Rendering Unto Caesar: The Catholic Church And The State In Latin America (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 82.
90 Ibid., 93.
manufacturing and industry have so rapidly pervaded and occupied countless regions, not only in the countries called new, but also in the realms of the Far East that have been civilized from antiquity, the number of the non-owning working poor has increased enormously and their groans cry to God from the earth.\textsuperscript{91} While the conditions addressed in \textit{Rerum} had largely improved in the Western world, social justice was now a global issue that the global Church needed to address on a global level. In effect, Pius had made class justice a top issue for a Church that was allegedly out of touch with its members.

Like \textit{Rerum}, \textit{Quadragésimo Anno} emphasized the necessity of establishing justice between individuals of different socio-economic classes. For example, Pius proposed that workers and employers enter into “partnership-contracts,” which would allow workers to share in both the ownership of their means of production as well as any fruits of what their labor produced.\textsuperscript{92} Unlike the socialists, however, Pius viewed labor as a process involving both workers and owners, as he stated, “It is obvious that, as in the case of ownership, so in the case of work, especially work hired out to others, there is a social aspect also to be considered in addition to the personal or individual aspect. For man’s productive effort cannot yield its fruits unless a truly social and organic body exists.”\textsuperscript{93} Pius thus considered work to be a social institution involving both the owners and the employees that required a moral system to safeguard laborers against the worst abuses. In effect, this reaffirmed the idea that humans held a universal dignity and that taking advantage of laborers, therefore, demeaned humanity.
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The El Salvador of Pius’ era represented one of the concerns expressed in *Quadregimo anno*. In particular, rising class tensions in El Salvador boiled over during in the 1920s, an era in which coffee production increased by around 50%. Much of the expansion occurred in regions such as Sonsonate, which contained large indigenous communities that had faced the brunt of the impact of the 1881 law abolishing communal landholdings. Moreover, the Salvadoran population increased by 323,000 during the years between 1918 and 1930—two-thirds of which increase came out of coffee-producing territories. This situation, in turn, increased the issue of landlessness in an already densely-populated country. Without land, many of the workers on coffee estates lacked the ability to sustain themselves beyond what could be produced through coffee-related labor. This meager source of income itself disappeared in the wake of the 1929 stock market crash, which had the result of driving down global coffee prices. The expansion of coffee as a cash crop had decreased the economic power of the Salvadoran poor, and their consequent inability to acquire land led to their permanent position as cogs in an oligarchic society.

Things came to a head in 1932 with an insurrection in the Western part of El Salvador that has gone down in history as *La Matanza*. The immediate buildup to *La Matanza* involved the results of the 1931 Salvadoran Presidential election, in which the social reformer Arturo Araujo gained the country's highest office. Araujo differed from his predecessors insofar as he wasn’t a handpicked successor of the outgoing President, and
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was overthrown in a coup the next year. In response, the Communist leader Agustín Farabundo Martí organized a revolt amongst the indigenous communities in western El Salvador. Despite the fact that government officials arrested Farabundo Martí two days before the planned attack, members of the peasantry carried out the insurrection anyway, resulting in the deaths of between 10,000 and 30,000 people. Farabundo Martí himself would be executed on February 1, 1932.

Despite the failure of La Matanza, the event would go down in Salvadoran consciousness as one of the first revolts by a marginalized class against an economic elite. As a result, the event has helped to shape much of the cultural and political discourse of post-1932 El Salvador. For example, the Marxist Salvadoran poet Roque Dalton wrote about the revolt’s legacy in his poem Todos, and the event has been invoked by politicians on both sides of the Salvadoran political spectrum. Of particular note about La Matanza, however, is the fact that many of the Native Americans who participated in the uprising belonged to religious organizations called cofradías, which ostensibly existed to promote the worship of saints or holy figures. Many of the Native leaders, however, supported the Communist Party—so much so that the cofradías replaced the official party in many Western areas. The cofradías, in fact, have been cited as the first instance of a “popular Church” that differed from the official hierarchy. In later years, such “popular Churches” would become a major part of the Salvadoran religious landscape.
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Additionally, Pius also followed his predecessor in desiring a stronger ecclesiastical role within Latin American society. Notably, in 1929, Pius introduced the group Catholic Action to Latin America with the establishment of a Cuban chapter for the organization.\textsuperscript{102} Modeled after comparable groups in Europe, Catholic Action sought to provide lay Catholics with a means by which to enact Catholic values through the political system.\textsuperscript{103} The movement quickly spread throughout the region, with Catholic Action branches opening in Argentina in 1930, Uruguay in 1934, Costa Rica and Peru in 1935, and Bolivia in 1938.\textsuperscript{104} The movement especially gained support amongst the young people of the region, as 8,000 people attended a meeting of the Argentine Youth for Catholic Action in 1943 and a comparable organization in Brazil claimed 120,000 members by 1961.\textsuperscript{105} The Catholic Action movement further led to an increase in Christian Democratic Parties throughout the region (such as the PAN in Mexico in 1939).\textsuperscript{106} By the 1940s, in fact, Catholic political parties had come to subsume Catholic Action. In essence, then, Catholic Action helped to increase the Church’s clout in Latin America by allowing its members a greater means to influence public policy through Church values.

The onset of World War II further pushed the Church towards a legal framework for rights. In particular, Pius XI’s successor Pius XII espoused the idea of universal, legally-backed rights during a 1942 Christmas Address delivered amidst the horrors of the war.
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and the Holocaust. In the speech, Pius stated the following regarding the idea of universally-held rights:

He that would have Star of Peace shine out and stand over society should...uphold respect for and the practical realization of the following fundamental personal rights the right to maintain and develop one's corporal, intellectual and moral life and especially the right to religious formation and education; the right to worship God in private and public and to carry on religious works of charity; the right to marry and to achieve the aim of married life; the right to conjugal and domestic society; the right to work, as the indispensable means towards the maintenance of family life; the right to free choice of state of life, and hence, too, of the priesthood or religious life; the right to the use of material goods; in keeping with his duties and social limitations.\(^{107}\)

Pius XII further argued that universal rights were not only a moral matter but also a legal one. For example, he stated, "From the juridic order, as willed by God, flows man's inalienable right to juridical security, and by this very fact to a definite sphere of rights, immune from all arbitrary attack."\(^{108}\) In essence, according to Pius, governments had to ensure the lives and safety of all their citizens. By making this proposition, Pius recognized the notion that the state played in safeguarding the rights of its citizens or subjects, Pius established the idea that all people held a universal right to be secure from abuses by the state. As a result, Pius XII expanded the moral conception of rights between employers and laborers into one between states and citizens.

While Pius had European circumstances in mind during his Christmas address, Latin American countries became strong proponents of the idea of legally enforceable human rights. This was especially noticeable at the 1945 San Francisco Conference establishing the United Nations, where Latin America represented twenty-one of the fifty
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countries in attendance. Unlike the larger countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union, Latin American countries were especially active in trying to ensure that there would be a statement on human rights included in the United Nations Charter.\footnote{Paolo G. Carozza, ”From Conquest to Constitutions: Retrieving a Latin American Tradition of the Idea of Human Rights” (2003), Scholarly Works. Paper 581, 285. \url{http://scholarship.law.nd.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1584&context=law_faculty_scholarship}.} Although they failed in this goal, Panama sought in 1946 to have the United Nations General Assembly pass a human rights resolution, and the initial drafts of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights came from Cuba, Panama, and Chile.\footnote{Mary Ann Glendon, “The Influence of Catholic Social Doctrine on Human Rights.” \textit{Journal Of Catholic Social Thought.} 10, no. 1 (2013): 71.} While these proposals from Latin American countries traced their origins back to state constitutions and political parties, said constitutions and parties traced their own origins back to \textit{Rerum novarum} and \textit{Quadragesimo anno}.\footnote{Ibid.} For example, Article 157 of the 1946 Brazilian Constitution laid out a set of measures meant to improve working conditions. These included a minimum wage on which a worker could support himself and a family, a legal recognition of collective bargaining agreements, and a right to social security (among several others).\footnote{Brazilian Constitution, 1946. Article 157, (Superseded 1967). Accessed July 31, 2017. \url{http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Constitutions/Brazil/brazil46.html}.} The Brazilian case is especially notable here because, despite an attempt by secularists in 1891 to reduce its power, the Church had seen an increase in clergy in the years following \textit{Rerum Novarum}.\footnote{Eric Patterson, \textit{Latin America’s Neo-Reformation: Religion’s Influence On Contemporary Politics} (New York: Routledge, 2005), 48.} As a result, the Brazilian Church had come to assume a
central role in the country’s society, and was in fact a vital locus of support for Brazilian politicians.\textsuperscript{114}

That these provisions could be codified into a state constitution demonstrates the extent to which Catholic Social Doctrine had come to influence legal codes. Further Church influence over the Universal Declaration can be seen in the fact that the U.S. National Catholic Welfare Conference (the predecessor to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops) acted as an observer to all meetings of the commission that drew up the Universal Declaration, as well as the fact that the influential Catholic philosopher Jacques Maritain served on a UNESCO committee that studied human rights theory. \textsuperscript{115}

Overall, the process that led the Church to start emphasizing human rights reflected the manner in which the institution responded to the worldwide spread of socialism, liberalism, and Protestantism. In essence, in order to combat movements that it viewed as heretical, the Church began to make itself more relatable to average people. As a result, Church teachings began to emphasize the idea that all humans were entitled to certain rights, such as protection from state abuses as well as the excesses of unrestrained capitalism. As we shall see, however, this stance would bring the Church into conflict with a society like El Salvador’s, in which much of the economic power was controlled by an oligarchy while peasants lacked political and economic power.
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CHAPTER 3: CHANGE IN CHURCH AND STATE
Up to this point, we have seen how the introduction of coffee farming stratified El Salvador’s society as well as how the Catholic Church began to emphasize human dignity in response to threats such as the rise of Protestantism and Socialism. These differences came to a forefront within the Catholic Church during the 1960s, as the Second Vatican Council sought to realign the Church as an institution that would ally itself with the poor. In so doing, the Church explicitly adopted the doctrine of human rights as well as the necessity of opposing any government that failed to recognize such rights. Overall, the decade of the 1960s marked a transformational time for the Church, in which the institution came to support the poor rather than the upper classes or political parties and interests aligned with elite groups. Such a shift, however, necessarily pulled the Church away from countries such as El Salvador, where elite backing served to ensure governmental legitimacy. The doctrinal reforms of the 1960s, then, came to lay the groundwork for the Church-State conflict that would characterize El Salvador throughout the 1970s.

After *La Matanza*, El Salvador underwent a series of military dictatorships that gained their legitimacy through allying themselves with the coffee oligarchy. Salvadoran governments of the post-*Matanza* era typically followed a cycle whereby a group of officers would consolidate their power, increase repression against political opponents, and then be removed from power by a coup when other dissatisfied armed forces decided to express their ideological differences with government policy. Furthermore, oligarch-backed governments often utilized security forces to control the population, and government

---

officials further dismissed political dissent by claiming that it was the work of communists. In fact, under Martinez, who ruled the country in the immediate aftermath of *La Matanza*, the Salvadoran government discouraged the formation of labor unions and issued an outright ban on peasant organizations, reasoning that such institutions engaged in subversive actions.\(^\text{117}\) The Salvadoran government had reached a point where it sought to crush any threat to the country’s oligarchy rather than protect the people who had to live under its rule.

This worldview, however, brought the Salvadoran government into conflict with the ideology of the Catholic Church, both at the local and the global level. From 1939 until 1977, San Salvador’s Archbishop Luis Chávez y González focused many of his archdiocese’s efforts towards progressive causes. Chávez, in fact, took an openly anti-government stance during an uprising in 1944, when he reportedly sheltered and facilitated the escape of opposition leaders.\(^\text{118}\) Furthermore, Chávez also founded the Diocesan Social Secretariat, an organization which promoted assistance programs, in 1958.\(^\text{119}\) While there were conservative elements to Chávez’ theology, his actions as Archbishop nevertheless laid the groundwork for a clash between a Church for the poor and a State for the elite.

Furthermore, Chávez also enacted initiatives designed to increase priestly vocations within San Salvador, as he opened a new seminary and sent a number of young priests to study in Europe. Instead of insulating his seminarians behind Church walls, Chávez sought to integrate them with the Salvadoran community by taking them on visits to the

\(^{117}\) Ibid., 39.
Salvadoran countryside. The archbishop’s efforts in increasing the priestly class within El Salvador paid off, as the number of priests in El Salvador increased from 199 to 279 between 1945 and 1960. As a result of Chavez’ efforts, El Salvador had 141 native-born diocesan priests, the highest number in Central America (albeit still low given the population density of El Salvador). Moreover, Chávez’ efforts also meant that El Salvador would have a young clergy, as 49.7% of the country’s diocesan priests in 1960 were under the age of 40 years old—despite a comparable figure of 41.4% for the rest of Central America. Even with this increase in priestly vocations, however, El Salvador maintained a ratio of 16,600 persons per diocesan priest. Nevertheless, Archbishop Chávez had laid the groundwork for a progressive clergy that would assume an active role in Salvadoran society during a transformational time for both Church and Country.

Chavez’ directives as Archbishop reflected a larger movement within the institutional Church that stemmed from two issues discussed in the previous chapter: the spread of Protestantism and the fear of Communism. The seriousness with which the Church took the proliferation of Protestant missionaries can be seen in a 1945 editorial from the Jesuit-published magazine America, which described Protestant evangelization efforts in Latin America by stating, “This is not ‘missionary’ zeal, for Latin America is not a ‘missionary field,’ and Protestant workers have aroused widespread resentment there by
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designating it as such. But it does call for a hard and sustained effort on the part of the Church in the United States to reinforce its sister Church in Latin America so that it will be able successfully to meet and counter this threat.”

The American Catholic Church had adopted a hardline position that indicated the necessity of rescuing Latin America from Protestant influence lest the latter religion gain a significant position in Latin American society. The idea of losing Latin America gained further credence on the grounds that the region represented a traditional Catholic stronghold where the Church had already completed evangelization efforts.

In addition to the increase in Protestant missionary work, the Church had to contend on a global level with the spread of communist ideology. As seen in the previous chapter, the Church had always considered communism to be heretical on the grounds that the philosophy rejected the existence of God. While the Church had always been forceful in its condemnation of Communism, the issue gained renewed prominence in the twentieth century, as the philosophy became the governmental basis for the Soviet Union and China in addition to several smaller countries under Soviet and Chinese influence. On July 1, 1949, Pius XII issued a decree that mandated excommunication for Catholics who joined Communist Parties, disseminated Communist publications, or defended Communist doctrine. The idea that Communism presented a threat to the Church—both in Latin America and the world—also gained prominence amongst lay Catholics. For example, the English writer Douglas Hyde, who had been a Communist prior to his 1948 conversion to Catholicism, recounted a trip to Latin America by stating the following:
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The first time I went to Latin America, I attended the Catholic Rural Life Movement conference in Panama. As I traveled around Latin America on that occasion, I said to myself, ‘If I were still a Communist leader, if I’d been sent from Moscow to Latin America in order to try and bring Communism here, what a gratifying, rewarding assignment it would be. How easy it would seem--because everything a Communist would look for and hope to be able to use is here.’ It looked to me like huge areas scattered with inflammable material and all that was required as that someone would come along and put a match to it.\(^{127}\)

The match that lit the fire came in 1959, when Fidel Castro successfully organized a takeover of the Cuban government. At the time of the takeover, which has gone down in history as the Cuban Revolution, the island had six Catholic dioceses and 210 Catholic parishes.\(^ {128}\) Nonetheless, the Church lacked a strong hold over the Cuban population, something evidenced by a 1956 study which found that while 72.5% of Cubans identified as Catholic, only 25% of that group claimed to be practicing Catholics, and only 11% of the practicing Catholics claimed to receive the sacraments regularly.\(^ {129}\) The disconnect between the Church and the Cuban people was further enhanced by the fact that only 125 of the island’s 681 priests had been born in Cuba, with the majority hailing from Spain.\(^ {130}\) Moreover, the Cuban Church concentrated many of the social services it ran (such as schools, hospitals, and clinics) in well-off urban neighborhoods—thus failing to satisfy the needs of rural Catholics and providing an air of colonialism to Church activities.\(^ {131}\)

Despite this level of alienation, Catholic media in the United States came to lament the fact that a successful Communist revolt could occur in such a Catholic stronghold. For
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example, an *America* editorial from 1961 described Cuba under Castro by stating, "In the United States, too, we rejoiced in the hard-fought victory of the *barbudos* who whipped Batista. We, too, looked forward to a new era for Cuba. But we have seen Fidel systematically betray the island to an alien ideology, to an anti-Christian code...But now, apart from the threat to our own security which a stronghold in Cuba represents, we are saddened by the Cuban people's loss of independence."\(^{132}\)

Castro's success in establishing a communist stronghold ninety miles south of Florida led the United States to take an increased role in Latin American affairs. On January 4, 1961, a Task Force on Latin American Issues recommended that President-Elect John F. Kennedy assume the following positions in his dealings with the region: human freedom, social and economic well-being, legitimacy gained by the free assent of the people, and that the United States would maintain influence over Latin America.\(^{133}\) Kennedy utilized these principles in a March 1961 speech, where he described his ambition for Latin America: "If we are to meet a problem so staggering in its dimensions, our approach must itself be equally bold, an approach consistent with the majestic concept of Operation Pan America. Therefore I have called on all the people of the hemisphere to join in a new *Alliance for Progress*—*Alianza Para Progreso*—to satisfy the basic needs of the American people for homes, work, and land, health and schools - *techo, trabajo y tierra, salud y escuela.*"\(^{134}\) To finance the Alliance, which would be finalized in a meeting that August at Punta del Este,

Uruguay, Kennedy requested an appropriation of $500 million from Congress, which he said would be used for such priorities as combatting disease, making educational improvements, and land reform. The introduction of the Alliance for Progress would lead to some democratic reforms in El Salvador, such as the introduction of proportional representation in the legislature and a progressive income tax. Nevertheless, El Salvador failed to introduce full democracy, and the military ended up financing local development initiatives through a program known as Acción Cívica Militar. The United States, however, not only tolerated but actively encouraged this situation, as President Kennedy even once said, “Governments of the civil-military type of El Salvador are the most effective in containing the communist penetration in Latin America.” In fact, pressures from both government and business to contain communism at all costs would ultimately prevent the Alliance from fulfilling most of its goals.

Kennedy found his efforts at holding influence over Central America aided by the fact that the five countries on the isthmus were themselves seeking regional economic integration. In 1960, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua agreed to a treaty that called for, “a common market which shall be brought into full operation within a period of not more than five years from the date on which the present treaty enters into

---
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force.” Under the terms of the treaty, which laid the groundwork for what would be known as the Central American Common Market, the signatories agreed that they would adopt uniform tax incentives with regards to industrial development in Central America. Between CACM and ALIPRO, El Salvador found itself amidst a period of industrialization during the 1960s. From 1961 and 1971, the industrial sector percentage of El Salvador’s gross domestic product increased from 16.76% to 19.20%, the industrial sector percentage of the Salvadoran workforce increased from 12.84% to 20.93% and the number of unionized workers increased from 21,556 to 47,000. Leaders of this newfound industrialization, however, more often made use of mechanical rather than human labor, a fact which meant that the number of new jobs in the Salvadoran manufacturing center only increased 6%. A concrete example of the resulting industrialization-fostered poverty can be seen in the capital city of San Salvador, which saw its population reach 350,000 as a result of migration. Most of the migrants, however, found themselves without running water, sanitation, or electricity—a fact that helped to exacerbate the conflict between the country’s rich and the country’s poor.

---


141 Berryman, The Religious Roots Of The Rebellion, 98.

142 Robert Armstrong And Janet Shenk, El Salvador: The Face Of Revolution (Boston: South End Press, 1982), 47.
At the same time as these vast changes occurred throughout Central America, the Church itself went through a transitional period on a global level. In October 1958, John XXIII assumed the papacy upon the death of Pius XII. Unlike many of his predecessors, who came from elite backgrounds, John XXIII had grown up in Italy as the son of sharecroppers, and he demonstrated a willingness to break from his predecessors in a manner that would help to make the papacy more humanly relatable. For example, after acceding to the throne, John decided that he would attempt to visit all 192 of Rome’s Catholic parishes—an action which differed from the conduct of his two immediate predecessors, who largely stayed within the Vatican even after the territory gained sovereign status in 1929. A further contrast can be seen in the way in which John XXIII treated the Holy See’s own labor force. Under Pius XII, garden workers at the Vatican had taken to scattering whenever they heard the Pope approaching due to Pius’ desire for solitude. John XXIII, however, took an active interest in the lives of these individuals, something that led him to discover that many of the Church’s own employees did not earn enough to support their families. As a result, John ordered a raise in salaries throughout the Vatican staff, with the largest increases going to those who earned the least. Anecdotes such as the ones mentioned above demonstrate the extent to which John XXIII would emphasize the social justice themes of Rerum Novarum during his papacy. As a result, Church leadership from the 1960s would take a more active role in the world outside the Vatican than the insular Church of a previous era had.
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John’s concern for human dignity also permeated his writings as Pope. In 1961, to honor the seventieth anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*, John issued an encyclical entitled *Mater et magistra*. Like *Rerum novarum* and *Quadragesimo anno*, *Mater* condemned wage inequality, stating:

In economically developed countries, relatively unimportant services, and services of doubtful value, frequently carry a disproportionately high rate of remuneration, while the diligent and profitable work of whole classes of honest, hard-working men gets scant reward. Their rate of pay is quite inadequate to meet the basic needs of life. It in no way corresponds to the contribution they make to the good of the community, to the profits of the company for which they work, and to the general national economy.\(^{146}\)

Furthermore, John also directly stated that national economies should seek to ensure such things as the employment of the greatest number of workers, an equilibrium relationship between wages and prices, and a balance between economic expansion and new social services.\(^{147}\) The most telling part about *Mater*'s directives, however, may be the following statement: “The solidarity which binds all men together as members of a common family makes it impossible for wealthy nations to look with indifference upon the hunger, misery, and poverty of other nations whose citizens are unable to enjoy even elementary human rights.”\(^{148}\) While *Rerum* and *Quadragesimo* had addressed individual topics that people could claim as rights, *Mater* was the first encyclical to specifically mention universal human rights as a codified Church policy. In essence, John’s statement here indicated that a person’s socio-economic status should not be regarded as a barrier to being guaranteed rights protected by a state.

*Mater*, however, only represented the tip of the iceberg in terms of the extent of
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John’s willingness to transform Church practice. On January 20, 1959, the Pope suggested to the Cardinal Secretary of State that the Church seek, “an Ecumenical Council, a Diocesan Synod, and the revision of the Code of Canon Law.”\(^{149}\) Five days later, the Pope announced his desire for such a council to a group of bishops convened at St. Paul’s Outside The Walls for the Feast of the Conversion of Saint Paul.\(^{150}\) This set into motion the plans for the Second Vatican Council, which convened three years later in 1962. Although John died the next year, his successor Paul VI continued the work of the Council, which itself would last until 1965. Overall, the Second Vatican Council has gone down in history as one of the most influential events in modern Church history, as it produced 16 documents that helped to bring the Church in line with the twentieth-century world. For example, as a result of the Council, Masses could be celebrated in vernacular languages, the Church recognized freedom of religion as a right to be protected by the State, and bishops received an increase in their authority.

Of particular note, however, is that the Council further emphasized the role that human rights would play in Church teaching. Notably, in April 1963, the Church issued the encyclical *Pacem in terris*, which would be the last one released during John XXIII’s papacy. In *Pacem*, the Church described human rights by stating, “For ‘to safeguard the inviolable rights of the human person, and facilitate the performance of his duties,’ is the principal duty of every public authority. Thus any government which refused to recognize human rights or acted in violation of them would not only fail in its duty; its decrees would be

wholly lacking in binding force.”\footnote{John XXIII, \textit{Pacem in terris}, Vatican Website, April 11, 1963, 47., Accessed April 15, 2017. \url{http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-xxiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_11041963_pacem.html}.} This statement extended much further than what had been laid out in \textit{Rerum Novarum}, \textit{Quadragesimo Anno}, or even \textit{Mater et magistra}, as it specifically attacked the legitimacy of state governments which refused to acknowledge the universality of human rights, and seemed to endorse and justify revolution against such governments. In essence, this encyclical laid the groundwork for much of the conflict that would occur in El Salvador over the next decade between the Catholic Church and the military-oligarchic Salvadoran state.

Furthermore, a second document released by the Council, entitled \textit{Gaudium et spes}, laid out the groundwork for the Catholic Church to assume a greater role in affairs of state. \textit{Gaudium} opens by explicitly emphasizing the position of the poor amongst the human family, stating:

\begin{quote}
The joys and the hopes, the griefs and the anxieties of the men of this age, especially those who are poor or in any way afflicted, these are the joys and hopes, the griefs and anxieties of the followers of Christ....United in Christ, they are led by the Holy Spirit in their journey to the Kingdom of their Father and they have welcomed the news of salvation which is meant for every man. That is why this community realizes that it is truly linked with mankind and its history by the deepest of bonds.\footnote{The Holy See. Paul VI. \textit{Gaudium et spes}. December 7, 1965, 1. Accessed April 16, 2017. \url{http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-xxiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_11041963_pacem.html}.}
\end{quote}

\textit{Gaudium}’s clear description regarding the humanity of the poor further established the idea that all members of the human family were entitled to the same, universal rights. To ensure that these rights would truly be upheld, \textit{Gaudium} called on Catholics to play an active role in the political lives of their respective countries, stating, “Those who are suited...
prepare themselves for the difficult, but at the same time, the very noble art of politics...With integrity and wisdom, they must take action against any form of injustice and tyranny, against arbitrary domination by an individual or a political party and any intolerance." The document even called for increased cooperation between the Church and the State, saying, “The Church and the political community...are devoted to the personal and social vocation of the same men. The more that both foster sounder cooperation between themselves with due consideration for the circumstances of time and place, the more effective will their service be exercised for the good of all.” In essence, if Pacem in terris had called into question the legitimacy of governments which failed to acknowledge human rights, then Gaudium explicitly forbade Church support of such governments.

The ethos behind documents such as Pacem and Gaudium would have a profound impact in Latin America. For example, the Peruvian priest Gustavo Gutierrez described the aftermath of the Council amongst Latin American clergy by stating, “A clearer perception of the tragic realities of the continent, the clear options which political polarization demand, the climate of more active participation in the life of the Church created by Vatican II...all these factors have made priests and religious today one of the most dynamic and restless groups in the Latin American Church.” Gutierrez even recounted that priests themselves had taken the duty of assuming clear political positions, something which he said reflected a subversion of the social order. To Gutierrez, this change in clerical political activity represented a new vision for Latin America, in which the existing social order would be
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overthrown. On this matter, Gutierrez stated, “Among more alert groups today, what we have called a new awareness of Latin American reality is making headway. They believe that there can be authentic development for Latin America only if there is liberation from the domination exercised by the great capitalist countries...This liberation also implies a confrontation with these groups’ natural allies, their compatriots who control the national power structure.”  

In fact, the movement Gutierrez described—and is often credited with founding—has gone down in history as “Liberation Theology.”

As the Second Vatican Council took place in Rome, El Salvador witnessed the first of the popular organizations that would later play a major part in the country's civil war. In 1963, Church officials began to organize rural cooperatives in conjunction with the Catholic Workers National Union. The next year, the Church and the Christian Democratic Party united a number of peasant groups under the banner of the Federación Cristiana de Campesinos Salvadoreños* (FECCAS)  

While FECCAS would take a more militant turn in the 1970s, it organized peasant conferences in 1965 and 1968. Not to be outdone, however, the government launched an organization of its own, which it called Organización Democrática Nacionalista, or ORDEN. Led by General José Alberto Medrano, ORDEN sought to serve as a network of informers under the command of the military, and based its structure on counterinsurgency organizations in other countries. Despite its connection to the government, ORDEN engaged its members in religious training. For example, the
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priest José Inocencio Alas, who would be kidnapped by government forces in the 1970s, stated that ORDEN sought to equate communists with atheists, saying:

During the first day of the religious arm of the training, Bible in hand, the priest explained to [ORDEN recruits] the following: God created all things; they are therefore sacred. Private property is part of God’s creation and as such is sacred, a necessary means to continue life on this planet. Whoever threatens private property threatens God, and it means he is an atheist. A good Christian, a believer in God, must be against atheists. Communists are atheists. They are our enemies. To kill a communist means to defend private property and constitutes an act of love to God.159

In essence, Alas’ account indicates that the government itself would utilize Catholic doctrine in order to emphasize the fight against communism. Although such a position occurred elsewhere within Catholic circles, its use here is noteworthy because ORDEN would later become known for sanctioning death squads and engaging in hostilities against the Church. In effect, then, the Salvadoran government sought to utilize the Church as a tool in the preservation of power over the Salvadoran State.

The outset of the Second Vatican Council, however, coincided with a rare moment of agreement amongst the Church and the Salvadoran State: the need for a new university. Both Church leaders and the coffee elites viewed the existing National University as a site of Communist radicalization for Salvadoran youth—a contention that gained some traction after an effort to establish an exchange program with the University of Moscow.160 In 1964, a delegation consisting of Archbishop Chávez, the Papal Nuncio, and representatives from the Salvadoran Bishop’s Conference formally requested that the Society of Jesus take control of the new university, which would be known as the
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The importance of opening a Jesuit university in El Salvador also exemplified the notion that the conciliar reforms would require an increased catechesis amongst the Latin American populace. For example, the Jesuit-published magazine Estudios Centro Americanos stated the following in an article from its January 1965 issue: “In other words: If this liturgical renovation should promote the education of the faithful, the degree of its cooperation depends at this time on esteem that the faithful public has of [the Church] as a result of an earlier education and a vigorous Christian life.”

The same article also acknowledged, “We will have to start with a labor of catechizing that instructs the public and foments its participation in the liturgy, like the word that precedes the sacrifice and the faith of the Sacrament.” Similarly, in the same ECA issue, Ricardo Fuentes Castellanos, O.P., argued that failure to improve education on religious matters had led to the rise of leftist ideologies, writing:

Precisely because of this superficiality, and above all cultural snobbery, many men who receive a religious formation in the home later become
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indifferent and end up incredulous and hostile to religion. For this lack of a profound Catholic culture, for this lack of knowledge about the great authors of Christian thought and, most of all, the almost absolute lack of knowledge about the papal teachings on many important matters, the average man in Latin America has become Liberal, Jacobin, Socialist, or Communist.\textsuperscript{166}

The reforms of the Second Vatican Council thus offered an opportunity for the Church and its believers to become more in touch with each other. In order to facilitate this objective, however, Catholic clergy recognized the necessity of bringing religious doctrine right to the people.

Further discussion of the implementation of the Second Vatican Council occurred in 1968, when Latin America’s bishops met in Medellín, Colombia. At Medellín, the bishops recognized the current class situation as one of, “institutionalized violence,” in which the emergence of entrenched, stratified power structures had denied Latin American societies the ability to develop themselves. In describing the unacceptability of this situation, the bishops utilized the discourse of human rights, stating, “We should not be surprised, therefore, that the "temptation to violence" is surfacing in Latin America. One should not abuse the patience of a people that for years has borne a situation that would not be acceptable to anyone with any degree of awareness of human rights.”\textsuperscript{167} To help solve this issue, the bishops at Medellín decided that they needed to take a more active role in the lives of the economically marginalized, stating, “The Lord’s distinct commandment to
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"evangelize the poor" ought to bring us to a distribution of resources and apostolic personnel that effectively gives preference to the poorest and most needy sectors and to those segregated for any cause."¹⁶⁸ In essence, at Medellín, the Catholic Church abandoned its traditional alliance with the elites in order to support a Church for all and an advocate for the forgotten man. Such a shift, however, would have profound ramifications as powerful institutions like the Salvadoran establishment came to view the Church’s new position as necessarily being anti-elite.

The social conditions denounced in Medellín became vividly manifest over the last two years of the 1960s. For example, the National Association of Educators of El Salvador conducted a strike in 1968 over pensions, health care benefits, and a proposed education reform in El Salvador.¹⁶⁹ Government leaders, however, portrayed the striking teachers as foreign agents with Communist sympathies and oversaw the arrests of 30 labor leaders. Ultimately, the strikers were not able to achieve most of their major demands and lost a month’s pay as a penalty for the strike. Nevertheless, union leaders viewed the strike as a win for Salvadoran organized labor, as it had preserved the union and increased the knowledge of class struggle amongst Salvadoran teachers.¹⁷⁰ The labor force of El Salvador had begun to advocate for the same precepts of social justice that were regularly emanating from the halls of the Churches.¹⁷¹

A more drastic situation occurred the next year when a war broke out between El Salvador and Honduras—ostensibly over a qualifier for the 1970 World Cup, a
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development which led the conflict going down in history as the "Soccer War." On a deeper level, however, there were several macroeconomic causes that precipitated the outbreak of hostilities. Because Honduras had more land area and a smaller population than El Salvador, thousands of peasants had traveled from the latter country to the former in order to find work. Honduras, however, had similar issues of inequality to El Salvador, and the Honduran government decided to expel the Salvadorans in the face of a land-reform movement. Moreover, in the wake of the Central American Common Market, light manufactured goods from El Salvador had begun to flood the Honduran market. As Honduras had started to industrialize after El Salvador, its industry could not catch up—even though the Salvadoran products were of lesser quality than the American products that had previously been utilized in Honduras.\footnote{Berryman \textit{The Religious Roots Of The Rebellion}, 101-102.}

Although the Soccer War only lasted five days, it produced severe consequences for El Salvador. For example, diplomatic relations between El Salvador and Honduras broke off for the next ten years. The war also had the effect of killing off the Central American Common Market, a situation exacerbated by the fact that no land route existed for the transport of goods from El Salvador to Nicaragua and Costa Rica. As a result, manufacturers had to ship their products by an expensive ferry to Nicaragua, meaning that they had a vested interest in cutting off the nascent Salvadoran manufacturing industry. Additionally, El Salvador had imported most of its corn and beans from Honduras prior to the start of the war, and the prices of these goods increased after the start of the Soccer War. As a result of
this economic fallout, the average real income of people with less than one hectare of land declined from around $330 to $323 per family per year.173

The situation at the end of the 1960s thus laid the groundwork for Church leaders in El Salvador to assume a greater role in advancing human rights doctrine throughout the next decade. While both the Church and the country had undergone significant transitions during the 1960s, change had largely hurt the former through the war-induced exacerbation of already-existent inequality. As a result, in order to truly live up to the ideals of the Second Vatican Council and Medellín, the Church would have to take on the oligarchic-military establishment that ruled Salvadoran politics. Therefore, El Salvador would become the testing ground for the Church’s commitment to advancing human rights as laid out in Mater et magistra, Pacem in terris, and Gaudium et spes.
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CHAPTER 4: THE SALVADORAN CHURCH IN THE 1970s
Following the Second Vatican and Medellín Councils, the Catholic Church and the Salvadoran state stood at loggerheads with one another. In particular, the Church’s emphasis on social justice and self-proclaimed “preferential option for the poor” contrasted with an economic and military establishment bent on retaining power for itself. El Salvador thus represented an ideal situation for the Church to demonstrate whether it truly stood with the poor and marginalized or whether its newfound rhetoric was mere window-dressing. Under the direction of the Jesuit Priest Rutilio Grande and the San Salvador Archbishop Óscar Romero, the Salvadoran Church truly evolved into a voice for human rights, as it emphasized the matter in its theology and often politically involved itself over human rights abuses committed by the Salvadoran government. For this stance, however, the Church would often become the victim of state-sanctioned violence—something which would claim the lives of both Grande and Romero.

Despite the conciliar pronouncements, the Church was not the only institution seeking to gain influence amongst the Salvadoran poor. To the contrary, a large number of left-wing organizations emerged within El Salvador. The emergence of left wing organizations began in 1970, when Salvador Cayetano Carpio broke away from the Salvadoran Communist Party in a dispute over whether the Communist movement in El Salvador should pursue its goals through militant or political means. Carpio founded an organization called the Fuerzas Populares de Liberacion—Farabundo Martí and justified his decision by saying, "Concretely, the traditional organizations denied the possibility of the Salvadoran people undertaking the process of revolutionary armed struggle. They also denied the mounting element of revolutionary violence in the struggles of the broad
popular masses.”174 Two years later, another left-wing organization, the *Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo*, emerged under the leadership of Joaquin Villalobos. Like Carpio and the FPL, Villalobos felt a need to organize the armed groups that had emerged amongst the Salvadoran left wing, as he described the ERP’s founding by saying, “Basically, the ERP came into being in answer to the need to create and organize the armed apparatuses that would make it possible to carry out new forms of struggle in the Salvadoran revolutionary process.”175 The ERP mainly drew its support from university students, and gained a modicum of success in carrying out kidnappings—a tactic which Villalobos rationalized with the statement, “But kidnapping is a fundamental weapon for punishing the oligarchy; they are made to finance the work of the Salvadoran revolution with money stolen from the people.”176 In 1975, the ERP itself split in a dispute that resulted in the execution of the Salvadoran poet Roque Dalton, a member of the ERP. Dalton’s supporters formed yet another leftist organization, this time called the *Fuerzas Armadas de Resistencia Nacional*.

The effectiveness of the left-wing organizations, however, was compromised by the fact that they failed to reunify until 1980, when they joined together as the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front. Villalobos described the effects of this disunity amongst the left-wing organizations by saying, “At first there were problems regarding essential differences in political lines, especially during the period of the first ruling junta...But there are other problems whose solution will mean that the coordination process must establish ways and means for eliminating subjectivism, reservations arising from the way the
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revolutionary struggle was conducted in the past.” This situation contrasted with the Catholic Church, which boasted a strong, centralized power structure revolving around the Vatican and the bishops.

Church-State relations throughout the 1970s would also be marred by anti-ecclesiastical repression. The first such notable incident came in 1970, when a group of men in plainclothes kidnapped Father José Inocencio Alas, a diocesan priest in the town of Suchitoto, in response to a speech supporting agrarian reform at a national conference on the matter. Upon learning of the kidnapping, Archbishop Chávez traveled to the Ministry of Defense and insisted on staying until such time as Alas could regain his freedom. Additionally, the archdiocese’s radio station YSAX broadcast news of the kidnapping throughout the period of Alas’ captivity. According to Alas, who was drugged and beaten during the ordeal, the leader of the kidnapping was a liaison officer working with ORDEN. In short, Alas’ kidnapping indicated the extent of the suspicion with which the Church and State in El Salvador had come to view each other. In essence, the oligarchy viewed the Church as a threat to its own power and therefore sought to break the Church through the possibility of military control.

Even in the face of repression, Church leaders began to take the message of the Gospels to the rural poor of the Salvadoran population. An important example of this occurred in 1972, when a team of four Jesuit priests under the leadership of Rutilio Grande arrived in the rural parish of Aguilares for the purposes of evangelization. Born in 1928, Grande had grown up in a situation not unfamiliar to Salvadoran peasants insofar as his family lacked adequate land for food production. Furthermore, Grande also faced an
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unstable family situation, as his parents separated when he was four. After the separation, Grande’s father sought work in Honduras, leaving Grande to be raised by his elder brother and grandmother. At the age of 13, Grande met Archbishop Chávez, who invited the boy to join the seminary after being impressed by Grande’s knowledge of Catholic prayers and doctrine. Four years later, Grande entered the Jesuit novitiate at Caracas, Venezuela because no comparable institution existed in Central America. The main stages of Grande’s Jesuit formation lasted until 1959, when he made his final vows at Burgos, Spain, after which he returned permanently to El Salvador. Even after his ordination, however, Grande rejected many of the trappings of the priesthood. For example, residents of his hometown claim that he preferred to be addressed as “Tilo” rather than “Don Tilo” and that he rejected the food offerings that local peasants would often make to him by virtue of his clerical status. Overall, then, Grande was a priest of the people, and his own life history would make him especially receptive to the struggles of the Salvadoran peasant class at a time when the Church decided to emphasize ministry to such individuals.

Within Aguilares, Grande dealt with a situation that represented a microcosm of the stratification seen elsewhere in El Salvador. Around 10,000 people lived in the city proper and 2,000 more lived in a town of El Paisnal (which happened to be Grande’s hometown) The remaining 21,000 people, however, lived in a number of rural villages which lacked basic services like sewage and electricity. In a 23-page journal article about the group’s travels, Grande described the importance of working in Aguilares by stating, “In light of the concentration of clergy among the urban minorities…it seemed urgent to insert us into the marginalized majorities, the poor peasants, the great reservoir of religious

people in this country.” The parish displayed much of the stratification seen throughout El Salvador, as around thirty-five estates owned by sugarcane producers controlled the majority of the region’s arable land. While most of the mill owners lived in the city of Aguilares, the peasants had to rent small plots of land in rocky areas not deemed suitable for sugarcane production. As a result of this situation, the peasantry often had to find work in the region’s sugar mills—something which Grande described by saying, “Many people settle in an area without the ability to buy land or find more permanent work, they basically are slaves because sugarcane does not require the labor of other crops.” The mill owners also denied the peasantry legal protections such as a minimum wage, interpreting laws in such a way as to favor employers. The fact that Aguilares had a surplus of labor meant that workers knew they could be easily replaced and therefore had no means by which to protest such violations.

During his time in Aguilares, Grande mainly focused on empowering the community’s laypeople. This decision arose in part from the fact that the four priests had to move throughout the parish rather than stay in one place for the duration of their ministry. However, Grande also recognized the social status with which local villagers viewed clergy, as he defined one of his missionary tactics by stating, “Separate money from the sacraments and worship. Give priority to the marginalized and to the community over the individual. In conflicts, be with the oppressed.” For the mission, Grande and his team
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divided Aguilares proper into ten zones that would be visited for two weeks at a time and
established fifteen mission centers in the parish’s rural areas. During the day, the priests
met with local families in order to ascertain the “fiscal, economic, social, political, cultural,
and religious realities” that the population of Aguilares faced in their daily lives. At night,
the priests conducted study sessions during which members of the community read and
discussed passages from the New Testament. At the end of each mission, the priests
designated several “Delegates of the Word,” who were laypeople tasked with continuing
the mission’s work within each community once the priests had moved on to a different
zone. The bodies led by the Delegates of the Word became known as “Christian Base
Communities,” of which thirty-seven emerged as a result of Grande’s mission.

Grande credited the mission with fostering a deeper sense of the Gospel’s meaning
amongst the people of Aguilares. However, he also believed that the mission had developed
amongst the locals a notion that the poor were capable of solving the issues that permeated
their daily lives. For example, Grande included the following points amongst the results of
the missionary tour: “[The people of Aguilares] begin to rise out of their magical
consciousness: ‘What can the poor actually do...?’ ‘to be conformed to the will of God,’ and
they have begun to realize that there is no will of God that things have been the way that
they are”; “They have confidence in themselves, they lose the widespread complexes, the
shame, the disability, and discover that they can express themselves”; “They begin to
realize that many social ills come from not ‘being united’ and they have begun to acquire a
sense of community”; and “They begin to meet, to mobilize, and to see what they can do.”
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Although none of these points explicitly mentions “human rights,” Grande had instilled amongst the community a sense that organized action could overcome the unjust treatment to which they had been subjected by local employers.

The Aguilares mission, however, coincided with a rather controversial election in El Salvador. In 1972, the presidential campaign pitted Colonel Arturo Molina of the ruling Partido Nacional de Conciliación against José Napoleon Duarte of the United National Opposition, a coalition of leftist groups and the Christian Democratic Party.\footnote{Jose Napoleon Duarte, Duarte: My Story (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1986), 70.} Despite Duarte’s having facing two attempts on his life during the campaign, results as reported on February 20, 1972, favored UNO, which claimed to be leading by a margin of 327,000 to 318,000 votes.\footnote{Ibid., 76.} Nevertheless, the government issued fake identification cards to its employees in order to stuff the ballots, and Molina claimed to have received 370,000 votes.\footnote{Ibid.} Although the election council supported the original total for the government, it stripped 30,000 votes from the opposition.\footnote{Ibid.} A recount later found that that Molina had won 334,000 votes to Duarte’s 324,000 after vote totals were changed in five provinces.\footnote{Ibid., 76.} In response, UNO told voters in San Salvador to invalidate part of the ballot during a legislative election the next month. This trick was intended to trigger a clause in the Salvadoran constitution that would nullify an election if the number of null votes exceeded the number of valid votes.\footnote{Ibid., 78.} When this situation happened, however, the Salvadoran government once again changed the results to keep itself in power. This decision ultimately
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led to an unsuccessful military coup on March 25, during which Duarte issued a statement over the radio in support of the rebels.\textsuperscript{195} As a result, government forces arrested Duarte, had him charged with treason and then exiled him to Venezuela.\textsuperscript{196}

The electoral fraud had the effect of driving a wedge between the Jesuits at UCA and the government. Conflict had already developed between the two institutions in 1971 after the university’s publication of its analysis of a teacher’s strike, a decision that led to the government stripping the university’s subsidy for 1972.\textsuperscript{197} While the university had tried to patch up its relationship with Molina, its position worsened with the publication of a book that questioned the president’s legitimacy. The book’s publication divided the UCA faculty; nevertheless, it was successfully published in Guatemala.\textsuperscript{198} The UCA-State rift only deepened after an event called the Externado affair, in which a Jesuit high school (the Externado San José) subsidized some classes and modified its curriculum to emphasize current issues in Latin America.\textsuperscript{199} The Externado, which had been considered one of the top high schools for students of the Salvadoran elite, made the curricular alterations in order to better align the school with the spirit of Medellín. However, parents of students at the Externado charged the school with attempting to inculcate their children with Marxist ideology. Although Archbishop Chávez found that the Externado was innocent of the charges against it, UCA rector Ignacio Ellacuría wrote an article entitled \textit{El Externado Piensa Así}, which appeared in both \textit{Estudios Centroamericanos} as well as in local newspapers.\textsuperscript{200} In the article, Ellacuría rationalized the Externado’s curriculum by placing it in the context of
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the changes promoted by the Second Vatican and Medellín Councils, writing, "The Church has changed, and this change has begun to affect its position amongst the social structure from being, by its most external and striking fact, a supporter of the established social order to being one of the most radical forces of social change." As a result of these changes, Ellacuría argued that the Externado had an obligation to expose its students to realities of Salvadoran life, which he described by saying, “The diagnosis of the Latin American reality is not optimistic. Serious problems of justice, peremptory need for liberal integration, the search for a new structural order, resistance to change...ambiguous presence of Christians before the Eucharist, and bastard political implications are some of the signs that denote the existence of irreconcilable evils with the most basic human rights to life, community, and property.” In essence, Ellacuría’s argument centered around the idea that the Church of the post-Second Vatican world would have to take a more integral part in fighting against ingrained social injustices. Ellacuría’s reference to human rights, therefore, indicates a willingness to actively oppose the entrenched social structure that had emerged in El Salvador under oligarchic dominance.

Even with this falling out between UCA leadership and the Salvadoran government, the Church’s outreach to the poor did produce some tangible results on the ground for members of the Salvadoran lower class. In 1973, for example, 1,600 workers at the Las Cabañas sugar mill in Aguilares went on a strike after being denied a promised raise. Many of the strikers belonged to CEB's founded by Grande, and some Delegates of the Word
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assumed an active role in the strike. Ultimately, the peasants did receive their raise, although it was less than what they had expected going into the strike. That members of a peasant class would take such a drastic and financially significant step as resorting to a strike demonstrated a sense that the campesinos no longer regarded themselves as worthless beings that could be easily subjected to the whim of oligarchs. Instead, they saw themselves as beings worthy of having a set of rights that had to be respected. The strike also developed in Grande a sense that political organization would be a necessary part of the social justice fight he had organized in Aguilares. The Jesuits at Aguilares asserted that the peasants had a right to organize, stating, “The Salvadoran Constitution in Article 160 recognizes the right of all Salvadoran citizens to assemble and form associations. The constitutionality of this fundamental right cannot be arbitrarily denied to the peasants.”

Nevertheless, landowners frequently took revenge against the peasantry of Aguilares. For example, in 1975, the government arrested a group of students for attempting to teach peasants how to read. In response, the Jesuits stated, “The administrators of haciendas refused jobs to people who were organized; informers denounced them to foremen and officials; the authorities did not recognize their unions. This crude reality taught them that the defense of their human rights was going to be a long, hard struggle. Those who cause this struggle have vested interests and are unmoved
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by the plight of the peasant.”206 The next year, several peasants saw their land flood as a result of the Cerrón Grande Dam. During a protest against the dam, a landowner was killed, a development which led to a spate of anti-Church propaganda at the hands of the local oligarchy. In particular, other landowners accused the priests of being subversive communists who deliberately sought to spread chaos.207 This level of conflict demonstrated the level of stratification that had developed in El Salvador. By virtue of its power, the oligarchy sought to deny peasant Salvadorans constitutionally-protected rights and failed to recognize that peasants could hold title over land. That such an attitude existed demonstrated that the oligarchy had no conception of “human rights” with regards to the Salvadoran peasantry. As a result, the Church took it upon itself to organize peasants in support of such rights.

Concerns of the poor reached the Salvadoran government in 1976, when President Molina proposed a land reform in the lowland departments of San Miguel and Usulután.208 The majority of land in these areas was held by five landholders, who themselves earned the equivalent income of 7,000 peasant families. Conversely, 98% of the families in the two provinces lacked adequate sanitation, 65% lacked literacy, and only 50% had access to clean drinking water.209 Under the proposed reform, the government would grant small plots of land to the peasants, and the landowners would receive a total of $53 million in compensation.210 Although the plan would take a total of five years to implement,

206 Ibid.
207 Ibid, 71-72.
208 Whitfield, Paying The Price, 67.
209 Ibid., 67.
210 Lernoux, Cry of the People, 68.
landowners denounced Molina’s actions as “communist subversion,” and the only institutions to offer their full, unwavering support were a strange assortment of bedfellows including the United States embassy, the Communist Party, and the Salvadoran Communal Union. Initially, the Jesuits at UCA had also supported the measure; however, they denounced it in the October edition of ECA by saying, “Its most visible face consisted of the daily pronouncements that appeared with wasted money and arrogance in the commercial press and four relatively small concentrations, promoted and paid for by the capitalists themselves.” Ultimately, opposition to the reform ended up killing it off.

Both the Aguilares mission and the curricular changes at the Externado represented concrete ways in which the Church had sought to develop a social justice consciousness amongst its flock. In the Archdiocese of San Salvador, these efforts had the full support of the progressive Archbishop Luis Chávez y Gonzalez. While San Salvador was the only Salvadoran diocese to officially endorse liberation theology, it was also the largest by population and therefore the most influential. As a result, the Archdiocese stood at a point of transition in 1977, when Archbishop Chávez submitted his resignation on reaching the age of 75 as required by canon law. The battle to succeed Chávez came down to two men: Arturo Damás y Rivera, the auxiliary bishop of San Salvador, and Óscar Romero, the bishop of Santiago de María. Of the two, Rivera was seen as the more progressive, by virtue of his relationship with Archbishop Chávez. Both the Church and the ruling oligarchs viewed
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Romero as the more conservative choice, a view borne out by the fact that he had defended a military occupation of the National University during the 1972 election, and had written a controversial editorial during the Externado Affair which charged the school with spreading Marxist propaganda. Ultimately, Romero would be installed as Archbishop on February 20, 1973.

Despite being a favorite of the elites, however, Romero was not initially a favorite amongst the people of San Salvador. For example, one Salvadoran woman described her reaction to Romero's appointment by saying, "The world fell around me when I knew that Romero was the new archbishop. I went to the UCA crying bitterly, 'I am not going to obey a Church that has a similar chief. Now we must go to the catacombs.' " Another person recollected, "I worked for various progressive priests in the peasants organization. We were at a meeting when I received the news about Romero. Without saying anything, all feared what happened...We felt that it was a great triumph for the conservative, oligarchic sector. And we were prepared to confront it." For his part, Romero addressed many of these concerns in a February 21 letter to the bishops, in which he stated, "I wish to speak with you about the spirit of cooperation I offer you and need from you, so that together we can participate in the honor Christ gives us to help build his church, each according to his
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calling.”

Romero assigned his predecessor to the parish of Suchitoto, from where Father Alas had been kidnapped.

The new archbishop took over El Salvador at a controversial time in the country’s history. Two days prior to Romero’s assuming control of the Archdiocese, El Salvador had conducted a presidential election, this time between General Humberto Romero (no relation to the archbishop) and Colonel Ernesto Claramount. As in 1972, the government sought to rig the election in favor of its preferred candidate, which in this case was General Romero. Claramount’s supporters claimed that the government had added 400,000 fictitious names to the voting rolls, and produced radio recordings using coding language such as, “put more “sugar” (PCN votes) than “coffee” (UNO votes) in the tank” (ballot box). As a result of this rigging, protests erupted in San Salvador’s Plaza de la Libertad as well as El Salvador’s Second City of Santa Ana. Nevertheless, five days after the vote government announced that General Romero had won the election by a margin of 812,281 votes to 394,661, a decision that the government followed by announcing a state of siege, suspending Constitutional liberties, and exiling Claramount to Costa Rica. The rancor between the government and the protestors culminated on February 28, when government forces conducted a massacre inside the Church of the Holy Rosary.

The fact that the government would openly attack a church was in line with a spate of officially sanctioned anti-Church measures that occurred in early 1977. In large part, these consisted of measures to expel or kidnap priests. For example, in January, the
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government forcibly expelled multiple members of the clergy, including the diocesan priest Mario Bernal, who served in a parish neighboring Aguilares. In response to Bernal’s expulsion, Grande stated the following in a controversial sermon:

I’m afraid that if Jesus of Nazareth were to enter by the border, there by Chalatenango, they would not let him pass. There, by Apopa, they would stop him…They would bring him before many supreme boards as unconstitutional and subversive. The man and God, the prototype of a man, would be accused of being a rebel, a foreign Jew, a deceiver with exotic and strange ideas, contrary to ‘democracy,’ that is, against the minority.224

The government, however, did not simply stop at expelling foreign priests; it denied entry on February 22 to a group of seven priests that included UCA rector Ignacio Ellacuría, as well as one the priests that had worked with Grande on the Aguilares mission.225

In response to the anti-Church repression, Romero and the other bishops of San Salvador drew up a letter to be read at Masses on Sunday, March 13.226 The day before the letter was to be read, however, Rutilio Grande drove with two others on the road from Aguilares to El Paisnal, where the priest was scheduled to say Mass. En route, however, the party noticed a group of armed men on either side of the road, a development to which Grande reputedly said, “We must do as God wills.” One of the ambushers, a National Guardsman by the name of Julio Sanchéz, later gave the following account of what ensued:

We were in plainclothes, but a few kilometers prior, there were uniformed members of the guard. They told us that the car was coming towards us, so we waited in the street, and when it appeared, we opened fire. All opened fire at the same time, from different points on the street. I saw that the car went
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back and forth, and we continued shooting.\textsuperscript{227}

Grande, who was struck by bullets in the throat, ear, skull, and back, perished in the attack, as did the other occupants of the vehicle. In his account, Sanchez claimed that his unit had been instructed to kill Grande because, “he was Communist, was rising up the campesinos, speaking ill of the government.” In any event, however, the attack crossed a line regarding relations between the Church and the State, insofar as the latter had moved beyond merely kidnapping and expelling clerical figures to outright assassinating a priest. Moreover, the attack exemplified the class stratification present in El Salvador, in the sense that an elite-backed government had murdered a person whose reputation had been built around his work to advance the status of the poor.

Grande’s assassination would have a profound impact upon the ideology of Archbishop Romero. Although the two men had, up to this point, espoused radically different bases for their theology, Grande and Romero had known each other since their days in the seminary and had developed a close relationship with each other—so much so that Grande even served as the Master of Ceremonies when Romero was ordained bishop of San Salvador. Upon learning of the assassination, Romero traveled to Aguilares, where he said a Mass for the victims. The archbishop also spoke at a funeral Mass for the victims held two days later at the San Salvador Cathedral, an event where he stated, “The Pope reminds us that...those bishops from the Third World, cried out on behalf of those who remain on the margin of life, famine, chronic disease, illiteracy, and poverty. The Church cannot absent itself from this struggle for liberation, but its presence in this struggle for

liberation, must lift up and respect human dignity.”\textsuperscript{228} Despite having been appointed as a conservative, Grande’s murder pushed Romero closer to the theological direction that the Church had espoused at Medellín. It was a shift that would last for the remainder of Romero’s life. The archbishop’s response to Grande’s murder would also extend into the political realm. In a telephone call immediately after news of the assassination reached San Salvador, Romero requested that President Molina conduct an official inquiry into the murder. However, after a cursory examination of Grande’s body revealed that the fatal bullets likely came from weapons used by Salvadoran police forces.\textsuperscript{229}

Romero further pressured the government by issuing a bulletin announcing that San Salvador’s Catholic schools would close for three days so that families could reflect on religious persecution, that there would be a single, diocesan-wide Mass on March 20, and that the archbishop would not attend official government events until an official investigation could be conducted into Grande’s murder.\textsuperscript{230} These measures helped to increase tensions between the archdiocese and the government. For example, UCA Jesuit Jon Sobrino described elite reactions to the school closure, “Besides celebrating the One Mass, they collectively feared the decision to suspend classes in Catholic schools for the three days prior to the Mass in order that the students could reflect on the situation in the country.”\textsuperscript{231} That the elites reacted in this way demonstrated a sense of alienation from the idea that the once-pliant Church hierarchy could openly accuse them of having engaged in
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religious persecution. Additionally, Sobrino also records that Emmanuele Gerada, the papal nuncio to El Salvador and a government ally, tried to shut down the One Mass on the grounds that Romero did not have the right per Church laws to deny Catholics the right to attend Mass. While the poor Catholics that would be most impacted by such a shutdown were not normally of such importance to members the oligarchy, elite concerns actually stemmed from the fact that Romero’s directives drove a wedge between a Church and State. In particular, members of the Salvadoran oligarchy took the One Mass as an indication that that the Archbishop would not be as loyal to the conservatives as expected. Despite the nuncio’s objections, however, Romero won out regarding the One Mass, which was celebrated as scheduled.

It was in this context that Romero began the focus on rights which would come to define the remainder of his time as archbishop. In a homily on May 8, 1977, Romero argued that the Church had a duty to involve itself where matters of human rights were concerned, stating, “The rights of the human person are of great interest to the Church. Indeed, when life is endangered, Mother Church is interested...The Church is interested in those who are unable to speak, or are tortured or silenced. This is not being political. Rather, politics has touched the altar, has touched morality, and the Church has the mind to speak its word of moral orientation.”

Romero’s statement here demonstrates that the Church had a moral obligation to uphold the conciliar pronouncements regarding human rights. The next week, Romero told his flock, “Those who want to preach liberation but are unwilling to take any action --- these people are upset with the Church. Others are angered because the Church’s
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teaching touches their personal interests, while still others, who profess a firm belief in this false theory of “state security”, are disturbed by the Church’s demands for respect for the rights of those who suffer the abuse of those in power.” This statement demonstrated that the Church under Romero would oppose abuses by the state against the lives of the marginalized.

Romero’s sermons, however, came at a time of increased violence amongst various sectors of Salvadoran society. On May 11, the body of El Salvador’s foreign minister, Mauricio Borgonovo, was found along a roadside with three .22 caliber bullet holes in the head. Borgonovo had been kidnapped by the FPL three weeks prior to his death, and his disappearance had drawn international attention from officials as high as Pope Paul VI and United Nations Secretary General Kurt Waldheim. In response to Borgonovo’s death, a right-wing death squad called the White Warriors Union murdered Father Alfonso Navarro Oviedo, the parish priest at the Church of the Resurrection, which served several middle-class neighborhoods on the outskirts of El Salvador. At Navarro’s funeral, Romero would once again emphasize the idea that the state needed to respect all human life, saying:

I want to direct the following words to the President: When we spoke yesterday by telephone, if your words were sincere...you said that you would investigate this crime just as you were concerned and, I suppose, still are concerned about investigating the crime against your Chancellor. Because the life of Mauricio Borgonovo is as sacred as the life of the priest who has just perished, as sacred as the life of Father Grande who was
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assassinated two months ago and in his case, despite the promise of an investigation, we are still very far from knowing the truth of this matter.

Romero’s contrasting the government’s response to Borgonovo’s death with its responses to the deaths of Oviedo and Grande highlighted the idea that the right to life was not dependent on social status. Romero’s insistence on an investigation of the deaths for the two priests, therefore, emphasized the notion that their lives were entitled to just as much respect as Borgonovo’s. In other words, Navarro and Grande held the same right to life solely by virtue of being human; needless to say, the state had violated this right by carrying out and failing to investigate their murders.

On May 19, 1977, the government invaded Aguilares in a strike that would go down in history as “Operation Rutilio.” Salvador Carranza, one of the priests remaining in the parish after Grande’s murder, recollected the events by saying:

It was a Dantesque dawn in Aguilares. The Army had surrounded the town and besieged the Church, a tank at every door. There were six of us inside, three priests and three peasants. We were nervously ringing the bells to call for help from the people when soldiers with rifles burst into the bell tower and shot one of the peasants. We were tied up and forced to descend the stairs, all this accompanied by shouts, shots, and the breaking of windows. Hosts were scattered everywhere; bullets sprayed the altar. In the patio, we were thrown to the ground, half-nude, face-down. We knew nothing more of the wounded man.²³⁶

Carranza would be captured along with his fellow Jesuits Marcelino Pérez and José Luis Ortega, who recounted his experience by saying, "They handcuffed us, three priests, and brought us to the Guard post in the town hall...From the town hall, they threw the three of us in a vehicle. After, they deported us to Guatemala. Just starting the car, the guards machine-gunned the tabernacle, watering all the hosts on the ground and repeatedly
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kicking them with their boots.” The guards, however, did not stop with the attack on the Church. Instead, troops cut off the town’s electricity and cordoned off a five-hundred square-mile area in which they searched every house. While precise totals are not known, the government is believed to have killed 350 to 400 people, and accounts state that 50 campesinos disappeared that day.

Upon learning of Operation Rutilio, Romero and two other Salvadoran bishops met with the President and President-Elect. At the meeting, the archbishop recorded that the president promised to consult with the bishops prior to pursuing an expulsion of the three priests; this promise, however, would not be kept. In his homily that Sunday, Romero acknowledged that the University of Notre Dame would honor three bishops for their work in human rights, saying, “This is a most appropriate theme to address since these bishops are being honored for their defense of human rights. I am very pleased that the bishops of El Salvador have placed themselves in this same line of thought.” Romero also took his own country’s government to task for rights abuses, saying, “A campaign has been waged against the Episcopal Conference of El Salvador, and from the shadows of anonymity, this campaign attempts to choke and silence the voice of the Church and justify the most horrendous abuses against Human Rights.”

Taken together, these statements demonstrated that Romero had officially aligned his ecclesiastical position with human rights doctrine against the actions of the Salvadoran state. The state’s own abuses against

---

237 José Luis Ortega, Interview, in Vigil, Piezas Para Un Retrato, 157-159.
238 Lernoux, Cry Of The People, 62.

<http://www.romerotrust.org.uk/sites/default/files/homilies/violence_that_grieves_country.pdf>
human rights had pushed Romero towards a stronger emphasis on the doctrine in his theology.

Under Romero, the Church’s promotion of human rights and criticism of human rights abuses also extended into the political realm. In a letter to President Molina about Operation Rutilio, the archbishop wrote, “You do not explain to me, Mr. President, why on the one hand you proclaim yourself a Catholic by formation and conviction and why on the other hand you permit these unspeakable outrages on the part of the security corps, in a country that we call civilized and Christian.” 240 Similarly, an article in the April-May 1977 issue of ECA specifically cited United States President James Carter’s support for human rights, stating, “To the surprise of not a few, a North American President has promised to practice what sometimes is a purely formal declaration: The defense of human rights. The first steps of this practice have made themselves felt in Latin America, that has stood thunderstruck at how at first military aid was conditional on there not being crass violations of fundamental human rights.” 241 As has been discussed, Romero was not immune to calling for political condemnation of human rights violations from the pulpit itself. Nevertheless, that he and publications supported by Salvadoran Catholic institutions actually engaged in this level of rhetoric indicated that the Catholic hierarchy of El Salvador had committed itself to actually changing the situation on the ground. Likewise, the highlighting in ECA of Carter’s human rights policies represented a marked contrast to the situation that the Salvadoran peasantry experienced on a daily basis.

The Church would not regain control of the Aguilares Parish until June 19, 1977, when Romero gave a sermon stating, “Yet Father Carranza has said it well: the harsh sound

of rifles will be silenced and the voice of the prophet will remain vibrant.” Despite this optimistic message, however, attacks against the Church continued throughout 1977. In the wake of Father Navarro’s murder, a flyer had emerged in San Salvador reading, “Be A Patriot! Kill A Priest.” Moreover, two days after Romero’s sermon at Aguilares, the White Warriors Union issued a communiqué threatening to kill any Jesuits that failed to leave the country by July 21, 1977. Although the group never carried out this threat, the fact that it was issued got the attention of the United States. In particular, Georgetown University President Timothy Healey, himself a Jesuit, sought to convince President Carter that the United States could demonstrate its commitment to human rights by issuing a statement against the letter. In describing his efforts, Healey stated, “It is obvious that the government of El Salvador is tolerating terrorism. To do anything less than protect the Jesuits would be for the government of El Salvador to abdicate its authority to a death squad of political gangsters.”

The threat also faced defiance from Jesuit leadership. For example, Salvadoran Jesuit provincial César Jerez stated, “We shall continue to be faithful to our mission and stay here until they liquidate us.” Pedro Arrupe, the worldwide head of the Jesuit order, similarly defended the Salvadoran Jesuits, stating, “They may end up as martyrs, but my priests are not going to leave because they are with the people.” A third voice of defiance came from the San Salvador archdiocese press secretary, who stated, “If
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we have to die for the truth, to defend the poor, human rights, and justice, we believe that our Lord will give us sufficient strength to accept any consequence.”

Romero, moreover, continued to demonstrate his commitment to human rights through a series of pastoral letters. For example, in his second such document, entitled “The Church, The Body Of Christ In History” and issued on August 6, 1977, Romero wrote:

The Church is not dedicated to any particular ideology as such. She must be prepared to speak out against turning any ideology into an absolute. As several of the Latin American hierarchies have said time and again in recent years, worldly interests try to make the Church’s position seem Marxist when it is in fact insisting on fundamental human rights and when it is placing the whole weight of its institutional and prophetic authority at the service of the dispossessed and weak.”

In the letter, Romero cited the right to life, housing, education, medicine, and to organize in unions as specific examples of human rights. By doing so, Romero echoed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which also contained provisions for each of the specified rights. Moreover, Romero’s contrasting the pursuit of human rights with the pursuit of Marxism indicated that the Church viewed human rights as a means to stay out of the ideological Communist-Capitalist debate, which produced extreme positions that the Church considered unacceptable.

A year later, Romero specifically attacked the abuses against the right to organize in a pastoral letter entitled “The Church And Popular Political Organizations.” In the letter, Romero specifically highlighted violations of the right to organize, stating:

We are...interested in examining the practical freedom of any human group to exercise its natural right of association and the support and cooperation
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it can expect from an authority genuinely concerned with the common good whereby men, families, and associations more adequately and readily may attain their own perfection. It is here, faced with the absence of this real freedom, that we have to denounce the violation of this human right of association proclaimed by our Constitution and by an international declaration of human rights accepted by our country.

That Romero specifically cited the Salvadoran Constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights demonstrated that he had moved beyond the spiritual realm and into the legal realm in terms of the basis on which individuals derived rights. Romero further highlighted the government’s obligation to protect human rights when he included the following point in a list of appeals to the Salvadoran public authorities: “Let them take notice of the people’s rejection of the Law of Defense and Guarantee of Public Order and in its place let them promulgate other laws that in fact guarantee human rights and peace...so that no one need be afraid to express ideas that may benefit the common good, even if they imply a criticism of the government.”248 The archbishop, therefore, recognized the need for the government to ensure the rights of all its citizens instead of selectively enforcing those of the upper class. In this way, Romero emphasized the notion of “human rights” as a concept that legally bound all individuals regardless of social status. Moreover, that he would call on the government to ensure the protection of human rights demonstrated a willingness to back up his assertions about clerical political involvement on human rights issues.

The Latin American Church as a whole again faced the question of human rights when it conducted an episcopal conference at Puebla, Mexico, between January and February 1979. While the Church had adopted a more progressive direction at Medellín, conservative factions within the Church gained the upper hand during the preparations for
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the Puebla conference. For example, the Chilean priest Sergio Torres described a preparatory document for Puebla by saying, “It is a dismal document, full of fears. The reality is that it betrays Medellín.”²⁴⁹ In an opening address to the conference, Pope John Paul II went so far as to suggest that lay Catholics lead the defense of human rights, saying, “It is necessary to avoid supplanting the laity, and to study seriously just when certain forms of supplying for them retain their reason for existence. Is it not the laity who are called, by reason of their vocation in the Church, to make their contribution in the political and economic dimensions, and to be effectively present in the safe-guarding and advancement of human rights?” Nevertheless, the Council itself stated, “A person’s fulfillment is attained as a result of the exercise of his fundamental rights, efficaciously recognized, defended, and promoted. For that reason the Church, out of its experience, of humanity, must be the voice of those who have no voice (of the person, of the community, in the face of society, of the weak nations in the face of the powerful ones).”²⁵⁰ Puebla also called on the Church to develop, “a praxis of service,” with regards to the promotion of human rights. Romero attended the Puebla Conference, and described its proceedings by saying, “This document is a pastoral treasure. In spite of everything else that might be said, it is clear that the Holy Spirit has triumphed. The Holy Spirit responded to the prayers of


the people for it was not only the people of El Salvador who were praying but the people of the entire continent.”

In fact, there exists evidence that Romero himself faced some level of pushback from the other Salvadoran bishops with regards to his political involvement on human rights. In a diary entry dated May 18, 1979, Romero wrote, “Bishop Rivera came to see me...and we talked about the secret document of denunciation the other four bishops are preparing. In it, they denounce me to the Holy See in matters of faith, say I am politicized, accuse me of promoting a pastoral work with erroneous theological grounding—a whole series of accusations that completely impugn my ministry as bishop.”

In the document, entitled “Political-Religious Situation Of El Salvador,” bishops in the four Salvadoran dioceses outside of San Salvador openly accused Romero of promoting Marxist teachings from the pulpit. To make their point, the bishops portrayed murdered priests such as Rutilio Grande and Alfonso Navarro as radical leftists and charged diocesan media outlets such as the radio station YSAXOrientación with having manufactured the Salvadoran human rights crisis. The authors described Romero’s preaching by writing, “In his Sunday homilies he receives with satisfaction the applause with which people interrupt his talk; this applause always coincides with his charges and attacks against the government and with his support
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and defense of subversive groups.” Most of these allegations, however, were libelous and misrepresented Romero’s theology. For example, in “The Church, The Body Of Christ In History,” Romero had portrayed the Church’s mission by saying, “Far from betraying the gospel, she has done no more than fulfill her mission. She has spoken out about events in this country precisely because she is interested in the good of each and every individual. This has been required of her for the defense of human rights and for the salvation of souls.” Romero stated in his diary that he felt, “great peace” regarding the lack of veracity towards the allegations brought against him by the other bishops.

That October, the human rights situation in El Salvador would come to a head when a military junta conducted a bloodless coup against the government of Carlos Humberto Romero. A day after the coup, Archbishop Romero read a statement over radio station YSAX in which he encouraged the Salvadoran people to act wisely, and directed the following message at the elites: “Our call is also directed to those who in order to unjustly defend their interests and their economic and social privileges, have been guilty of so much unrest and violence. Allow me to remind them that they should listen to the voice of reason and justice and the voice of the poor as the voice of the Lord himself.” The Jesuits at UCA, however, took a different line towards the coup, writing in ECA, “The people have the right
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not to believe in those that have not had the manhood to fight against the tyrants on the
ground where the truth and the principles that they defend with the life and not from the
comfort of those who after sixty years of turning their backs to the people’s fight, return in
order to incorporate a fight with which they have never given honor or courage.”

The post-coup government, however, managed to gain the support of the United States. In February 1980, the United States announced an aid package to El Salvador consisting of $25 million for economic development, $15 million for housing investments, $4.8 million for food and peace distribution, and $5 million for economic support. The American government also requested $5.7 million in non-lethal military aid to El Salvador. This latter development concerned Archbishop Romero to the point where he wrote a letter to President Carter requesting that the aid not go through. Romero appealed to Carter’s status as a Christian and a human rights advocate, stating, “I ask you, if you truly want to defend human rights: to forbid that military aid be given to the Salvadoran government [and] to guarantee that your government will not intervene directly or indirectly, with military, economic, diplomatic or other pressures, in determining the destiny of the Salvadoran people.” That Romero made this drastic of an appeal indicated the importance of human rights to his philosophy insofar as he was willing to directly
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contract a foreign government on the matter. Furthermore, Romero’s appeal to Carter’s principles demonstrated the concept of human rights as a global phenomenon.

The archbishop also appealed directly to the Salvadoran military to respect human rights. Notably, in a homily on March 23, 1980, Romero stated:

Brothers: you are of part of our own people. You kill your own campesino brothers and sisters. Before an order to kill that a man may give, God’s law must prevail: Thou shalt not kill! No soldier is obliged to obey an order against the law of God. No one has to fulfill an immoral law. It is time to take back your consciences and to obey your consciences rather than the orders of sin. The Church, defender of the rights of God, of the law of God, of human dignity, of the person, cannot remain silent before such abominations. We want the government to understand seriously that reforms are worth nothing if they are stained with so much blood. In the name of God, and in the name of this suffering people, whose laments rise to heaven each day more tumultuous, I beg you, I beseech you, I order you in the name of God: Stop the repression!

In making this poignant statement, Romero indicated that the military was not above human rights law, and that following orders would not be an excuse to commit human rights violations. The importance of human rights in international law thus stemmed from the doctrine’s position in a higher moral order that the Church charged itself with upholding. Ignoring human rights abuses, in turn, would place the Church in a position of failing to recognize human dignity. In other words, Romero’s address to the soldiers represented an explanation for why human rights had gained such prominence in the archbishop’s teachings and why the Church saw fit to intervene in political matters concerning human rights.

This address to the soldiers, however, would be the penultimate sermon of Romero’s life. The last would occur the very next day in a chapel at a local cancer hospital, where Romero said a Mass in memory of Sara Meardi de Pinto, the mother of a Salvadoran newspaper editor. As he
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finished his homily, a man in a car parked outside of the church fired a gun into the building. Sister Rosa Abalos Escobar, a nun present at the Mass, described her recollection of the event in a 2001 documentary: “Monseñor instinctively bent his head forwards over the altar, but the force of the bullet flung him back to fall here, between the crucifix and the tabernacle.” Romero’s death had been arranged a day or two prior to the assassination, when a group of soldiers drew lots for the express purpose of killing the Archbishop. In murdering Romero, however, the Salvadoran State demonstrated the extent to which a Church that favored human rights presented an obstacle to its own power. By opposing the government in the interests of supporting human life, Archbishop Romero, like others before him, ended up sacrificing his life.

Overall, Romero’s transition from an ally of the oligarchs to a defender of the helpless paralleled the transition that the Salvadoran Church had undergone as a whole. Whereas the Church came to the ‘New World as an arm of elite interests, it ultimately divided within itself over ideological questions such as how to apply doctrines on human rights towards Latin American poor. While it is true that the Church moved towards the defense of human rights doctrine in its global theology, the application of this doctrine in El Salvador gained prominence due to the intense socio-economic divide that resulted from a few families gaining control over the majority of the country’s limited land resources. Therefore, the attitude of the Salvadoran Church towards the country’s peasantry stood as a barometer of whether it would truly adopt the positions on human rights it publicly pronounced during the Second Vatican Council. In analyzing the El Salvador, it must be noted that the violence conducted by the state against members of clergy meant that issues of human rights would touch close to home for the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Nevertheless, the fact that the Church sided with the poor over the elites
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demonstrated the extent to which Church was able to use its doctrines to help formulate a concrete doctrine of human rights in El Salvador.
CONCLUSION
In pivoting towards an emphasis on human rights, the Church had thrown its line into an ideology whose main precepts were that human beings should be treated with dignity by authority figures and that governments should ensure that all individuals should have the same economic opportunities. By adopting human rights as part of its official doctrine, the Church thus signaled that it would be seeking to expand its outreach to the world’s poor and marginalized communities and committed itself to a normative structure that condemned actions such as state-sponsored torture and killings. However, the Church’s decision to implement the pronouncements of the Second Vatican Council in one fell swoop rather than through a gradual process resulted in the development of a major fault line amongst the Church’s own clergy members. On one side, some priests (such as Rutilio Grande) interpreted the Second Vatican Council as a call for Catholics to take a greater role in political activism. These clergy members endorsed radical concepts such as liberation theology, which advanced the notion that society’s most marginalized individuals could overcome their station in life through concerted political action. On the other hand, priests of a more traditional bent sought to advance the teachings of the Council while maintaining the traditionally apolitical role of the Church. In the Salvadoran case, the conflict between these two factions manifested itself when Óscar Romero was appointed Archbishop of San Salvador on the assumption that he would act as a conservative counterweight to the liberal policies pursued by his predecessor, Luis Chávez. Ultimately, however, Romero himself would come to exemplify this conflict given the extent to which his ideology shifted after assuming the post of archbishop.

Furthermore, the response of the Salvadoran church to human rights abuses must also be viewed in light of the fact that a number of other Latin American countries had to
confront military-controlled governments during the 1970s. In many of these cases, the ecclesiastical hierarchies followed a similar path to that of the Salvadoran Church. For example, the South American country of Chile operated under a military dictatorship led by General Augusto Pinochet from 1973-90. Like in El Salvador, the Pinochet regime attacked clergy members as part of larger effort of execution and torture against political opponents. Shortly after Pinochet’s takeover, Cardinal Raúl Silva Henriquez, the archbishop of Santiago, established the Committee for Cooperation for Peace in Chile (COPACHI), which consisted of members from a number of different faith traditions and was the only organization in the country at the time to aid victims of the regime’s human rights violations. COPACHI became enough of an issue for Pinochet that he asked the archdiocese to shut down the organization. Henriquez complied with the request, only to establish the Vicariate of Solidarity, an organization comparable to COPACHI that was under the direct control of a vicar general. Both COPACHI and the Vicariate kept records pertaining to the extrajudicial killings, torture, and disappearances carried out by the Pinochet regime. In order to avoid detection by the Chilean Secret Service, the Chilean Church sent these records to the United States Catholic Conference, which then transferred photocopies of these materials to the United Nations and the Organization of American States. The Chilean Church thus helped to hold the Chilean government accountable for its actions through its documentation of human rights violations.
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In other cases, however, the Church’s attitude towards human rights was more mixed. For example, in Managua, Nicaragua, Archbishop Miguel Obando y Bravo publicly declared that an uprising against Anastacio Somoza’s regime was justified due to Somoza’s disregard for human rights doctrine. The archbishop, in fact, went so far as to sell a Mercedes which he had received as a gift from Somoza and then donated the sale’s proceeds to the poor. However, while Obando y Bravo had supported the removal of the Somoza administration, he ultimately turned his back on the Sandinista regime which followed Somoza into power, mainly due to the Sandinista’s support for communist policies. Instead Obando y Bravo allied himself with American-backed Contras, despite the fact that human rights watchdogs documented cases of murder, and torture by Contra forces. After being named a cardinal in 1985, Obando y Bravo went so far as to say a Mass in Miami for a largely pro-Contra crowd of Nicaraguan exiles in the United States—an occasion at which he was accompanied by two prominent anti-Sandinista leaders. That Obando y Bravo supported the Contras thus signified that the Nicaraguan Church
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prioritized a strong opposition to communism over the continued condemnation of human rights abuses. Thus the Nicaraguan Church can thus be said to have opposed human rights violations only if doing so was favorable to Church interests rather than across-the-board.

For some Church officials, even the limited public opposition to human rights violations seen in Obando y Bravo’s dealings with the Somozas would be too much. A particularly notable case in this regard involves an Argentine priest named Jorge Mario Bergoglio, who served as that country’s Jesuit provincial from 1973 until 1979. Bergoglio’s time as provincial also partly coincided with a military junta that ruled Argentina from 1976 until 1983. Unlike his fellow Jesuit Rutilio Grande, Bergoglio opposed the political aspects of liberation theology, even going so far as to expunge the ideology from the curriculum that Jesuit novices studied as part of their ordination. Bergoglio also sought to remove two pro-liberation theology Jesuits, Orlando Yorio and Francisco Jalics, from a ministry they were carrying out in the Bajo Flores slum of Buenos Aires so as to protect them from facing arrest. The provincial’s efforts, however, failed, as Yorio and Jalics were kidnapped by men associated with the Argentine Navy in 1976, a development which resulted in the priests being imprisoned and tortured five months. Bergoglio’s handling of the situation, combined with his failure to denounce the human rights violations of Argentine junta, led to charges at one end that he had not done enough to protect the priests and that he had directly colluded with a junta responsible for human rights
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violations at the other. Nevertheless, the Yorio and Jalics incident failed to taint Bergoglio’s legacy in any significant way. On the contrary, he has since followed a rather unusual career path for a Jesuit, as he was appointed an auxiliary bishop of Buenos Aires in 1992, elevated to Archbishop of Buenos Aires in 1998, declared a Cardinal in 2001, and elected to the papacy in 2013 under the name of Pope Francis.

The fact that individuals like Miguel Obando y Bravo and Jorge Mario Bergoglio have been allowed to assume high Church offices despite a mixed legacy in the area of human rights conveys the idea that the Church is still grappling with how to correctly advance human rights doctrine. This divide regarding human rights is also seen in the debate over whether or not to canonize Óscar Romero, which has inspired fervent opinions on both sides. Although Salvadorans often refer to Romero as “Saint Romero of the Americas,” the official Church hierarchy has shown a lukewarm reception to the idea due to the notion
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281 Canonization refers to the process by which the Catholic Church declares an individual to be a saint. The process is normally begun posthumously, and without going into too much detail, requires the Church to attribute two miracles to the prospective saint. A person who has only one such miracle can undergo a ceremony called beatification, which is a step towards canonization. Furthermore, a person canonized as a martyr can have a verified instance of dying for the faith substitute for one of the two miracles.

that many of Romero’s pronouncements (as well as the motivations for his assassination) were political rather than religious. Nevertheless, the Vatican began the beatification process for Romero in 2005, only to have it be interrupted by the death of Pope John Paul II that same year.283 In turn, John Paul II’s successor, Benedict XVI, blocked Romero’s path to canonization for seven years as part of a larger effort to reduce the number of individuals declared a saint.284 Benedict XVI resumed the canonization process in 2012, and the archbishop was beatified by Francis after being declared a martyr 2015.285 The Church’s response to the idea of canonizing Romero has contrasted with the way secular organizations have chosen to honor Romero. Notably, in 2010, the United Nations General Assembly declared March 24, the anniversary of Romero’s assassination, to be the “International Day for the Right to the Truth Concerning Gross Human Rights Violations and for the Dignity of Victims.”286

The Church’s slow response to acknowledging those members of the clergy who fought for and supported human rights is not so much of an indictment of human rights doctrine as it is a reflection of the seismic shifts on the issue that emerged as a result of the Second Vatican Council. Prior to the Council, the Church had allied itself with social elites in countries such as El Salvador, where economic structures produced widespread class
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disparities. However, the Council’s objective of bringing the Church into the modern world resulted in the formation of a wing of activist clergy that took an expressly political stand against human rights violations. In so doing, these clergy members left the realm of spiritual matters and stepped into the arena of political affairs. As a result, oligarchic political establishments, such as that in El Salvador, which had once supported the Church came to feel threatened by the institution, even going so far as to carry out attacks on the clergy.

The Church-State conflict in El Salvador was thus the result of a Church undergoing a radical shift in its political leanings which emerged from the comparably profound theological shift that came about during the Second Vatican Council. Moreover, the increased activism within the Church led to a traditionalist clerical wing that felt the Church had gotten too political in its advancement of human rights. In short, the Church tried to reorder society around human rights while having to deal with divisions within itself, and therefore ended up fighting social institutions such as national governments that had not previously had to worry about enforcing human rights law. The Salvadoran case, therefore, demonstrates the extent to which the rushed implementation of major institutional reforms (such as those implemented at the Second Vatican Council) can result in a violent backlash from institutions that feel threatened by such reforms.
Figure 1: Map of El Salvador (Source: United States Central Intelligence Agency, Perry Castañeda Library Collection, University of Texas-Austin).
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Figure 9: The Universidad Centroamericana José Simeon Cañas, a Jesuit University in San Salvador which opened in 1964. (Source: www.uca.edu_sv)
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Figure 12: Ordination Ceremony of Óscar Romero. From left: Rutilio Grande SJ, Luis Chávez, Romero, Arturo Rivera Damas. (Source: Romero Trust).
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APPENDIX II: TABLES

TABLE 1: CENTRAL AMERICAN ELECTORAL COLLEGE RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Presidential Vote</th>
<th>Vice-Presidential Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>Valle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Philip F. Flemion, “Manuel José Arce And The Struggle For Central American Union

TABLE 2: PRESIDENTIAL VOTES BY CENTRAL AMERICAN LEGISLATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State, With Overall Vote</th>
<th>Deputy</th>
<th>Political Orientation</th>
<th>Individual Vote</th>
<th>Deviation From District Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala (Arce 11, Valle 5)</td>
<td>Francisco Carrascal</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>José María Castilla</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Valle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>José Francisco Córdova</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mariano Córdova</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domingo Dieguez</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>José María Echeverría</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francisco Flores</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos Gálvez</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mariano Gálvea</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juan Montúfar</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Valle</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>José María Ponce</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramón Solís</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Valle</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doroteo Vasconcelos</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Mariano Fuñez</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>PLATFORM</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Isidro Menéndez</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>José Antonio Peña</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Juan Manuel Rodríguez</td>
<td>Valle</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Carlos Salazar</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Ciriaco Villacorta</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Santiago Milla</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Toribio Arguello</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Filadelfo Benavent</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Francisco Benavent</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Francisco Quiñones</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Pablo Alvarado</td>
<td>Valle</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Policarpo Bonilla</td>
<td>Arce</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS: ARCE 22, VALLE 5**

Source: Philip F. Flemion, “Manuel José Arce And The Struggle For Central American Union

### TABLE 3: EJIDO SALES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SAN VICENTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EJIDO</th>
<th>Number Of Titles</th>
<th>Size (In Hectares)</th>
<th>Hectares Per Title</th>
<th>Price (In Pesos)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apastepeque</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Cayetano</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tepetitán</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verapaz</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teoluca</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Estebán</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,056</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,667</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,039</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Ejido Sales in the Department of La Libertad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Number of Hectares</th>
<th>Cost (Pesos)</th>
<th>Free Hectares</th>
<th>Down Payment (In Pesos)</th>
<th>Debt (In Pesos)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nueva San Salvador</td>
<td>3,832</td>
<td>9,429</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4,453</td>
<td>4,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuevo Cuscatlán</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>1,861</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaragoza</td>
<td>1,469</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San José</td>
<td>2,936</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huizucar</td>
<td>2,251</td>
<td>3,055</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Libertad</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>4,367</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>3,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comasagua</td>
<td>3,321</td>
<td>6,016</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2,129</td>
<td>3,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiltitupan</td>
<td>3,949</td>
<td>5,373</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>3,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jicalapa</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>2,294</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>1,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teotepeque</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>4,039</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>3,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tepecoyo</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>1,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacatecoyo</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>1,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayaque</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>2,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talnique</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>2,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamanique</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opico</td>
<td>2,081</td>
<td>6,398</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2,974</td>
<td>3,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quezaltepeque</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37,469</td>
<td>64,494</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>26,269</td>
<td>38,225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Aldo Lauria Santiago, An Agrarian Republic: Commercial Agriculture And The Politics Of Peasant Communities in El Salvador, 1823-1914

Table 5: Sizes of Coffee Estates amongst Farmers in the Department of Carazo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Producer</th>
<th>Estates</th>
<th>Area (Manzanas)</th>
<th>Production (Quintales)</th>
<th>Total Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arturo Vaughan</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José E. Gonzalez</td>
<td>La Providencia</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monte Cristo</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Palma</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolfo Bernard</td>
<td>San Dionisio</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rappacioli (Vincente y Hnos.)</td>
<td>El Paraíso</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Pochotón</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Moca</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando Chamorro</td>
<td>La Amistad</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Brasil</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teodoro Tefel</td>
<td>Chilamatal</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincente Rodriguez</td>
<td>Santa Cecilia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Ramiro</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Gonzalez</td>
<td>San José</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las Delicias</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignacio Baltodano</td>
<td>El Brasilito</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José M. Sierro</td>
<td>Santa Gertrudis</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andalucía</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasio Somoza</td>
<td>Santa Julia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Convoy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Porvenir</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Jeffrey T. Paige, *Coffee And Power: Revolution and The Rise Of Democracy In Central America.*
### TABLE 6: MEAN AREA OF CENTRAL AMERICAN ESTATES GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 100 MANZANAS, AND TOTAL AREA OF CENTRAL AMERICAN COFFEE ESTATES LARGER THAN 50 MANZANAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Mean Area (Manzanas)</th>
<th>Mean Production (Quintales)</th>
<th>Total Area (1,000 manzanas)</th>
<th>Total Production (1,000 quintales)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1,722</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>196.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>304.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2,713</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>1,098.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>2,479</td>
<td>202.1</td>
<td>1,278.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Jeffrey T. Paige, *Coffee And Power: Revolution and The Rise Of Democracy In Central America.*

### TABLE 7: EVOLUTION OF TOTAL NUMBER OF PRIESTS IN EACH LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>1912</th>
<th>1945</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1955</th>
<th>1960</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF PRIESTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARIBBEAN</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>1,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>4,511</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>4,412</td>
<td>5,617</td>
<td>6,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>2,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>2,557</td>
<td>3,003</td>
<td>3,457</td>
<td>4,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>1,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perú</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>1,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>1,703</td>
<td>1,846</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>2,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Diocesan Priests In Country (All)</td>
<td>Native-Born Diocesan Priests</td>
<td>Percentage of Native-Born Priests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARIBBEAN (1)</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica (2)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL AMERICA</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perú</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile (3)</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>4,259</td>
<td>3,543</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AMERICA</td>
<td>12,294</td>
<td>9,945</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Isidoro Alonso, *Estructuras de la Iglesia Latinoamericana*

**TABLE 8: DIOCESAN PRIESTS BORN IN EACH LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRY**
LATIN AMERICA | 13,358 | 10,590 | 73.9

Source: Isidoro Alonso, *Estructuras de la Iglesia Latinoamericana*

(1) Without Cuba and Mexico
(2) In the study of the ecclesiastic structures of this country, this statistic about dioceses does not coincide with the one studying the age of priests
(3) Includes 58 absent or retired priests that were not classified by age or nationality.

### TABLES 9 AND 10: AGE GROUPS OF DIOCESAN CLERGY IN ABSOLUTE FIGURES AND AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PRIESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Under 25 Years Old</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>65-69</th>
<th>70 and Older</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARIBBEAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panamá</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL AMERICA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perú</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>4,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>1,601</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>12,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>Under 25 Years Old</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>70 And Older</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARIBBEAN</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panamá</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL AMERICA</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AMERICA</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATIN AMERICA</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Isidoro Alonso, *Estructuras de la Iglesia Latinoamericana*
### TABLE 11: INHABITANTS PER DIOCESAN PRIEST, PRIESTS IN RELIGIOUS ORDERS, AND ALL PRIESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Inhabitants Per Priest (In Thousands)</th>
<th>Diocesan Priests</th>
<th>Priests In Religious Orders</th>
<th>All Priests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARIBBEAN</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL AMERICA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perú</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AMERICA</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATIN AMERICA</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Isidoro Alonso, *Estructuras de la Iglesia Latinoamericana*
TABLE 11: INDICATORS OF INDUSTRIALIZATION, UNION GROWTH, AND INDUSTRIAL UNION GROWTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Industrial Sector Percentage of GDP</th>
<th>Industrial Sector Percentage of Total Workforce</th>
<th>Number Of Unionized Workers (Total)</th>
<th>Number Of Unions (Total)</th>
<th>Industrial Sector Percentage Of Unionized Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>13,521</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14,088</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>21,566</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24,126</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KL Griffith, Colonels And Industrial Workers In El Salvador
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