

BY OSVALDO LUIS MOTTESI

## Doing Theology in the Latin American Context\*

*A phenomenological analysis of the contemporary Latin American theological moment according to its historical-contextual situation. Enunciation of some of the unchaining factors of a new Christian situation. Basic implications for doing theology in the Latin American context. Ethical imperatives for living and thinking the faith in this new context.*

### INTRODUCTION

*Purpose:*

- 0.1 First, I would like to try to articulate my personal interpretation of the contemporary Christian reality of Latin America, in which I participate. That is to say, I would like to communicate, according to how I see through my own "glasses", some of the most singular and significant characteristics of this process which we accurately call *doing theology in the Latin American context*.
- 0.2 Secondly, and as a consequence of the preceding statement, I hope to provoke *creative cerebral torment* among you, my colleagues, in order to stimulate reflective dialog about what we call a *new Christian, and therefore theological, situation in Latin America*.

*Cautionary notes:*

- 0.3 The phenomenological analysis and that which follows it are about *ONE* Latin American theological movement. I have chosen what is, in my understanding, the most questioning movement of the Christian tradition: the *theology of liberation* or, more justly stated, *theological reflection in the context of liberation*. I am convinced for many reasons, some of which arise in my exposition, that we must give preferential attention to this new, radically different way of doing theology. The very *character* of this conference, its *missionary and international spirit*, demands it.
- 0.4 I am fully aware of the initial, general, tentative and provisional character of these reflections. They are a partial testimony to the present "moment" of my pilgrimage. "*Pilgrim, there is no road; it is created as you walk.*" (Gregorio Machado)

---

\*This paper was previously presented at the Theological Consultation of the Reformed Churches of the Americas and the Caribbean held at San José, Costa Rica, Central America, Jan. 31-Feb. 4, 1977. Dr. Mottesi is Professor of Political Theology, Latin American Biblical Seminary, San José, Costa Rica.

- 0.5 The quantity of aspects that must be dealt with necessitates an *allusive* rather than expository style. At times brevity encourages an almost *telegraphic* exposition. To do otherwise, that is, to go into details and technicalities, would not *generate dialog*, but rather degenerate into a monolog!

Because of this it is requested that each colleague, in his reading previous to dialog, complement what is said herein with *his own understanding*, and above all with what *his own reflections* may suggest to him.

- 0.6 Please do not interpret this brevity as a narrow dogmatism of definitive affirmations. *This is thinking out loud; reflections in draft form*. This is a text which has been thought out and written to generate discussion. The sometimes provocative tone wishes to reflect simply the humble intensity of the quest.

#### HISTORICAL-CONTEXTUAL LOCALIZATION

- 1.1 *Traditional Christianity* (conservatism) legitimized and sacralized the colonial regime and the development of the dependent, capitalistic system in Latin America.
- 1.2 *Social Christianity* ("reformism," whose greatest historical expression is demonstrated in Vatican Council II), broke the "traditional Christianity," legitimizing and popularizing (publicizing at the level of the common man) neocapitalist reformism. The "*aggiornamento*" (placing the Church at the rhythm of the neocapitalist era) was implemented theologically by means of the ideal of the *third way* between capitalism and socialism. Its political expressions were and are: *Christian democracy*, *Christian syndicates*, *Christian socialism*, etc.
- 1.3 The failure of *Christian democracy* (Venezuela and Chile), the growth of imperialist investment, the expansion of the difference between rich and poor countries and the correlative relations of dependence, clearly point out the real "rules of the game." The *struggle of classes* as an historical reality comes sharply into focus. Minority groups of Christians that recognize the necessarily unique character of the revolution arise; we break with "social Christianity" and we join revolutionary movements. We opt for socialism without surname (for example, *Christian socialism*). At the same time we reject the socialism that is dogmatic and "universal" in its positions as being as irrelevant as another "ism" that pretends to impose itself as an ideology and/or "prefabricated" science. That is to say, as a "prescriptionism" or ultra-intelligent creed. Our option, rather, is for the construction of a



*profoundly national, popular, humanistic, self-critical, Latin American socialism.* This does not weaken our clear conscience and identification with the universality of the proletarian struggle. It is the comprehension of the necessity of a *contextual and autochthonous socialism.* This is the great *qualitative leap* that some Latin American Christians have taken.

- 1.4 The major discrepancies among Christians are no longer at the confessional level. Even less so are the discrepancies that exist between *traditionalists* (preconciliar or fundamentalists). The *intraecclesiastical and "apolitical" reformism* enters into open conflict with *Christian revolutionaries.* In the Christian context, it is the classic difference between *reform* (as a "patch") and *revolution* (as a radical, qualitative change).
- 1.5 There are *three resulting characteristics* among the groups of Christian revolutionaries.
  - 1.5.1 We are well aware that our option inserts—or better yet, makes evident and active—*the struggle of classes within the churches.*
  - 1.5.2 As a consequence of the previous point, and of the ideological adjustment of Latin American Christianity, we are well aware of our open conflict with the great majority of the Christians on all levels. The character and intensity of the conflict differs according to the level of the relationship. Without unrealistic euphorias or optimisms *we accept the present solitude of our option.*
  - 1.5.3 In spite of everything, we have *trust*, realistic optimism. It is based on our clear conviction of having entered into a committed participation in an *open historic project* for Latin America's future (not to be confused with *utopia*, as a "finished, closed project"). Our trust becomes solid, in spite of the reaction and repression that are unleashed at every level within and without the churches, when we note that we are a minority that is growing numerically as well as in the radical nature of our option.

#### UNCHAINING FACTORS

- 2.1 *A new concept of the world.* This as a result of the so-called process of *historicization.* The world conceived as history. The abandonment of the *static* view of the world for a *dynamic* one. From *quietism* to *pilgrimage.* From emphasis on the *interpretation of*

*being* to the quest for the *correct task*. From *cosmology* (as a science of the origin, laws and immutable orderings of the world) to *praxeology* (reflection on conscious historic action). From the *monument* (rational interpretative system) to the *movement* (ethical-historical action). In Latin America this phenomenon acquires, among others, *five characteristics of conscientization* among these groups of revolutionary Christians.

- 2.1.1 We discover the present world as an historical reality *in conflict*. The antithesis is not underdevelopment-development, but *dependence-liberation*. The real difference is not between the rich and the poor (which is a suprastructural result), but between exploited and exploiters (which is an infrastructural cause).

The *developmentalism* promoted by imperialism, the rich countries and their lackeys, is an ideology that masks the state of dependence. The ideal model offered to the "underdeveloped" countries is the "paradise" of the "developed" ones. The "magic" word of the language that serves this ideology is *modernization*.

It is recognized that the only realistic out is bringing the conflict to a head and overcoming it by means of a rupture from dependence. There is only one name for this: *liberation*.

- 2.1.2 The present world still lives in a *dogmatic time*. This is so because the ideologies still rule in their negative or dogmatizing aspect (a system finished with thought that masks reality or monopolizes the action to the end of effecting a closed or utopian historic project). There is a growing rejection of ideological dogmatism. This is generating a *liberation of the significance and use of the ideology*. This is coming to be the necessary and positive rationality for the service of the historical praxis of liberation, and not the reverse. Because of the traditional connotation that the term ideology has, I suggest (as in the previous case of utopia), a new term: *rationality of praxis*.
- 2.1.3 The future, among revolutionary Christians, is conceived as an *open, historic project of liberation*, or better, *humanization*. The adjective "open" denotes the antisystematic attitude of the project. This is generating a *liberation of the significance and use of utopia*. There is an increasing rejection of "utopianisms," as has already been mentioned, that is to say, finished, closed, cancelled projects.



- 2.1.4 Because of the characteristics already mentioned, there is a growing awareness that we are entering into Latin America in a *praxeological time* (this term differs from "political time" because it expresses the activation of an "open historic project" and not the attainment of a "utopia." As shall be noted, it is another step in the creation of *a new language*).
- 2.1.5 The history of salvation is conceived as the *salvation of history*. That is to say, a unique vision of history of salvation, which is the real history of the world. This we could baptize with the term *realistic soteriology*. Within it the Church does not have the mission of constructing another separate, juxtaposed or parallel history. The Church is called to be the most explicit conscious emergence and vibrancy of the only meaning of the only history.
- 3.1 *A new means of thinking the faith*. This should be seen as a result of the new concept of the world mentioned above. The process of historicization has affected theology and, in its turn, theology has produced significant developments in that process. We must recognize that this change has taken place not only in Latin America, or even the Third World, but is rather a world-wide phenomenon. It is not very recent, nor did it find its origin outside of the "North Atlantic theological metropolis." It is the theologizing of the rich Christians in the last years that originally assumes this historicization, or better yet, it is derived from it. Let us look at some characteristics.
- 3.1.1 Biblical theology has rediscovered *the God of Action* instead of *the God of Being*. This provokes a shift in the purpose of the theological task. It ceases to struggle with the correct interpretation of the *truth (orthodoxy)*, so as to busy itself in reflection on Christian *action (orthopraxis)*.
- 3.1.2 Teilhardism, the theology of secularization, the European intellectual dialog between Christians and Marxists, the Catholic's post-conciliar reformism, the theology of the death of God, the European political theology and/or the theology of hope, the theology of development, etc., sink their roots in the process of historicization.
- 3.1.3 All of the above-mentioned developments are *theological and exegetical progressisms of the rich world*. Therefore, they smuggle in, consciously or unconsciously, their reformist ideologies (although at times they employ revolutionary terminology). Except for a very few exceptions, their themes revolve around irrelevant matters. There is a "silence of death" hovering above the extremely serious problems of the world. Some Latin American theologians

have called this silence *theological cynicism*. Because of that, the almost aggressive rejection of all of this theology by Latin American theologians of liberation is very understandable.

3.1.4 The "Latin American theological moment" today is qualitatively different from the North Atlantic world. In the wealthy world the process of historicization has assumed and developed only partially and in a limited way. This is due to the lack of comprehension, or better yet, acceptance, of the world as an historic reality *in conflict*. It is Christian living in the midst of the conflict that is producing a radically distinctive way of thinking the faith in Latin America. The reality of dependence and exploitation is what generates the initial but growing movement of the *Theology of Liberation*. Allow me to allude to only some of its characteristics as a radically distinctive means of thinking the faith.

3.141 Theology is considered to be *critical reflection on praxis*. Praxis is the historic-dynamic expression of the faith, which is expressed as a *political commitment*. Because of that the first moment in the process of thinking the faith in Latin America is the priority of action. That is to say, *to act in behalf of the liberation of the oppressed*. The second moment is the one traditionally termed *theologizing*. This is a critical reflection from within the action itself, upon the action that is provoked and realized because of the commitment. Its purpose is to enrich, perfect, orient and energize the praxis. This can be no longer an isolated, "intellectual" task of professional or specialized theologians, but the fruit of the experiences lived through and in the praxis of revolutionary Christians. It must be, and ever more is, a reflection in community by means of dialog and the sharing of the *grupos de base* ("communities at the roots"). Their purpose: to make more effective the Christian option for the poor, which is expressed by means of a liberating praxis at all levels and in all situations.

3.142 It is a *theology of the situation*, a doing and a thinking of the faith in contextual terms. The point of departure is Latin America. The direction (goal) of its "creating a path" is the "open historical project of liberation or humanization."

The priority of the political is obvious and fundamental. The center of reference is the antithetical and



correlative binomial "dependence-liberation." Its purpose: to radicalize the *political* aspect (no longer simply the "social") of the commitment as an expression of the faith. To question the "order" and the dehumanizing power of man and, consequently, *incorporate* Christianity into the movements of liberation.

3.143 The *theological concepts* most clearly expressed to date in the theology of liberation in Latin America are indicated below in a list compiled by Hugo Assmann<sup>1</sup>—possibly the most brilliant spokesman of the movement—and amplified and clarified by this author:

1. View of the world as a world in conflict.
2. Situation of slavery in Egypt and Latin America's dependence.
3. Exodus and liberation (correlative of 2.).
4. Social situation of sin and institutional violence.
5. Liberation and salvation.
6. History of salvation as the salvation of history.
7. A unique vision of creation and redemption.
8. Liberating political action and eschatological anticipation.
9. The animating Christ of history.
10. Christianity and the Church interrogated in relation to their liberating significance in history.
11. The option of the Church in the decade of the 70's: *liberation*.
12. Struggle of classes and the gospel.
13. A new ecumenical situation.

---

1. Hugo Assmann, *Opresión-Liberación: Desafío a los cristianos* (Montevideo: Tierra Nueva, 1971), pp. 69-81.

- 3.144 Some of the immediate consequences of this new way of "creating a path" have already been referred to under the section on *Historical-contextual localization*. What we omit here should be commonly understood, but I want to comment briefly on *four basic implications for doing theology in the Latin American context today*.

### BASIC IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 *Doing theology in today's Latin American context implies living and thinking our faith within and in opposition to oppression. That is to say, not from a geographical standpoint, but from the standpoint of a particular situation and by means of one option.*

- 4.1.2 The confrontation is not Latin American "versus" North Atlantic theology, as if the former were always synonymous with liberation and the latter with oppression. Not everything that comes from Latin America is liberating, nor even necessarily Latin American. The dominant theology and culture of our lands have been imported from centers of power, and therefore are oppressive. We are dominated and dependent countries.

On the other hand, not everything that comes from the North Atlantic is oppressive: in Europe and the United States there are theologies of liberation.

- 4.1.3 It is essential to destroy the abstract, folkloric, chauvinistic myth surrounding Latin America. It is only a disguise, an ideological mask, which hides the real problems. As a Latin American I feel closer to the North American theologies of liberation than to the Latin American theologies of oppression.
- 4.1.4 The root of the principal contradiction in the present theological confrontation must be sought in the *oppression-liberation* dialectic. We speak with Paul Richard: "If the theology of liberation has arisen in Latin America it is because her imperialism and capitalism have massively loosened their irrational force of oppression and repression, and under-development and dependence have become intolerable. If there exists a specifically Latin American element in theology it is that it has focused on the central problem of our continent: the subsistence and liberation of our 250 million exploited and dominated brothers. The theology of liberation is Latin American because liberation



is the most profound, most human, most Christian, most Latin American struggle in Latin America. We have discovered our Latin American identity because we have discovered our dependency and under-development generated by the imperialist and capitalist domination in our continent. Our theology is not anti-North Atlantic a priori, but it is anti-imperialist, and we feel closer to those North Atlantic people who fight for liberation than to the Latin Americans who fight to maintain capitalist domination in our great homeland, Latin America."<sup>2</sup>

4.2 *Doing theology in today's Latin American context implies living and thinking a faith of protest. That is to say, to assume a prophetic ministry in the full sense of the term.*

4.2.1 In this role the church is called to be the voice of those who have no voice. It must assume the prophetic denunciation of every dehumanizing situation that is contrary to brotherhood, justice and liberty.

4.2.2 In this ministry of protest, of prophetic answers, the church must judge itself and condemn every oppressive system or situation it has sanctified, or to whose development it has contributed.

4.2.3 As José Comblin has said: "The prophet's adversary is not the atheist, but the false prophet, one who holds forth a God who pleases men and justifies what they do, a God that men have created in their image and likeness, who they fling into the universe so that they can pretend to worship him, while in reality they worship the works of their own hands."<sup>3</sup>

4.2.4 In realizing his mission of protest against injustice, the prophet suffers a reaction, even a violent one, from many Christians. This is no more than the testimony of the historic reality of the *class struggle* which has reached into the churches.

History teaches us that the prophet does not abandon his people, but that his people reject him. This happens because *the prophet cannot be neutral*. When he opts for and acts out his praxis, he must expect to live the cross. *The prophetic church has no other way than the way of the cross.*

---

2. Pablo Richard, *Teología de la liberación latinoamericana: Un aporte a la teología europa* (mimeographed article) p. 2.

3. José Comblin, "Misión Profética de la Iglesia en los Tiempos Actuales" *Mensaje*, June, 1974, p. 218.

- 4.3 *Doing theology in today's Latin American context implies living and thinking the faith in the midst of repression. That is to say, to develop a liberating, pastoral theology from a position of captivity.*
- 4.3.1 The decade of the 60's saw the birth of the biblical concept of liberation as an option and goal of Christian praxis in Latin America. *Medellin, August-September, 1968 (CELAM)*, accompanied by the diverse protestant conscientization was the point of departure at the Catholic institutional level. Medellin was followed by meetings, proclamations, documents, a sea of literature and an overall euphoric revolutionary climate. The climax of this effervescence was the first Meeting of Latin American Christians for Socialism, held in *Santiago, Chile April 23-30, 1972*. But *Chile*, as a result of the "coup d'etat" *on the 11th of September, 1973*, saw the bursting forth of escalated, repressive facism in Latin America as the socialist government of Salvador Allende was hurled to the ground. Today repression shrouds the continent in mourning.
- 4.3.2 Doing theology today, *from a position of captivity*, implies proclaiming that *a Christian's gravest sin is to lose hope*. Yes, we are in captivity and exile, but unlike the peoples of Egypt and Babylonia, we have before us the liberation of all captives and exiles through the resurrection of the Suffering Servant, our brother and Lord, Jesus Christ.
- 4.3.3 The theology of liberation under a regime of captivity has other tasks than that of rejoicing over liberties gained. It must sow, prepare the exodus, maintain hope, console victims, and fight for the rights of the offended and humiliated.
- 4.3.4 We affirm the following words of Leonardo Boff: "For Israel the captivity in Egypt and Babylonia signified a time of building up the hope and the dynamic necessary for the inevitable moment of their liberation. With the establishment of military regimes in the Latin American countries, and faced with the totalitarian ideology of national security, the tasks of the theology of liberation have changed. It is necessary to live and think from the point of view of captivity. A true theology must be developed within this captivity. This is not an alternative of the theology of liberation, but rather a new phase of it within and from the standpoint of repressive regimes. The captivity constitutes the major horizon in which we must work for and reflect on



liberation."<sup>4</sup> The future, then, is in a *pastoral theology of liberation from within captivity*.

4.4 *Doing theology in today's Latin American context implies living and thinking from, with and for the Church.*

4.4.1 As José Míguez Bonino aptly pointed out in 1971, "Perhaps the greatest discrepancies between Christians committed to the process of liberation is seen in their attitudes about the institutions and objective celebrations of the Christian faith. These attitudes go from non-critical participation to the point of systematic negation of all objective worship or institutional forms, to the critical participation or creation of alternative groups and celebrations."<sup>5</sup>

4.4.2 The Latin American Christian who opts for liberation has to resolve the problem of his ecclesial praxis, without which his Christian identity remains incomplete.

4.4.3 *I would like to give my own personal testimony.* I respect and understand those Christian brothers who, not being able to survive within the sometimes oppressive structures of the institutional church, choose to leave the communion of the traditional church. Obviously they search for and find other groups where they then can live their *ecclesial* experience.

Three times within the last ten years I decided to live that experience; to leave the institutional church. It was not a crisis of faith, but rather an attempt at rebellion by a son against a difficult and uncomprehending mother.

I remember writing a letter to my wife from London in August of 1967, in which I said: "I have decided to leave the ministry, in order to be able to serve Jesus Christ faithfully." I tried in 1967, in 1972 and in 1975 . . . but I could not. I simply could not. I was born in a church pew. A thousand times I had been angry with this sick, stubborn old woman we call the church, but I could not leave her. *The church may be a bad woman, but she is my mother. And so, I have decided that I must do theology within the church, with the church and for the church in spite of what the institutional church has become.*

I recognize that this is a personal option, or better, a personal need. I respect the options of others, but I have

4. Leonardo Boff, *Teología desde el Cautiverio* (Bogotá: Indo-American Press Service, 1975) p. 23.

5. José Míguez Bonino, "Nuevas Perspectivas Teológicas" in *Pueblo Oprimido, Señor de la Historia* (Montevideo: Tierra Nueva, 1972) p. 211.

chosen my own. I will stay with the old woman who, in spite of the fits of anger she has given me, has given me all that I am through the grace of God.

## ETHICAL IMPERATIVES FOR LIVING AND THINKING THE FAITH IN A NEW ERA

5.1 *Toward new, dynamic expressions of the faith:* We will only allude to the problem of new symbols and language. The *religionizing and ideologization* of the faith mask the most intense and fundamental human realities. Thus, Christianity serves as one of the most effective means of the dehumanization of man. The symbols and language, on all levels and in every situation, are instruments of this domestication. The problem is not only that the Christian symbols and language have lost their force, power and relevance throughout history. This is only a small part of the problem. The dramatic problem is that the symbols and language are the historic implementation of religion as the *opiate of the people*.

Therefore, the problem of new symbols and language is not merely a theme for "the renewal of the Church," but *an unavoidable ethical imperative*.

5.1.2 Primitive Christians created symbols for their historical context and age. Even more, they created them as a function of their reality: *a religious, prophetic, vitalizing movement of the history of salvation*.

The existing symbols of our Latin American era can yet and must be revitalized. New symbols must be created and must arise as fruit of two basic contextual imperatives:

*First:* They will have to be genuine, natural expressions of the *Latin American being*. The primary imperative is to discover the Latin American man in the midst of a true cultural revolution. The symbols will follow.

*Second:* They must arise as a dynamic expression of *the faith as a political commitment*. That is to say, they must express a faith-made Christian praxis as a *religious, prophetic, vitalizing movement in the history of salvation in Latin America*, which is the salvation of the history of Latin America.

5.1.3 The primary role that politics assumes in the new way of "doing and thinking the faith" determines the new type of language that will be needed to express it. Two basic



contextual imperatives arise as presuppositions of the creation of this language:

*First:* It will have to be the dynamic expression of an "open historical project of human liberation."

Therefore, the *ideological anti-dogmatism and the anti-systematic attitude* which characterize the commitment to such a process must be the die from which it is cast. This means rejecting the language of "isms," that is to say, closed thought processes, which we also reject.

*Second:* It must be a language that gives names to totally new and specifically Latin American situations. An example of this, and I use it because there is no exact equivalent in English, is the term *comunidades de base*. To translate this term as "reflection groups" or "encounter groups" is not equivalent. This testifies to the new and particular context of many situations.

5.2 *Toward a new way of living the faith.* I want to conclude with *four brief allusions*, or what I call the *existential parameters* that characterize a new type of Christianity. They are, as I understand it, both the cause and effect of this new way of doing theology. Traditional theology has been the daughter of the Cartesian axiom "*cogito ergo sum*" = "I think therefore I am." This produced extensive theological treatises, ultra-intelligent creeds, and phenomenal scientific-technical advances, but separated and divorced the head from the rest of the man. One of the most dramatic consequences of this is that man, as *subject*, was and is considered to be master of society *in terms of what he could comprehend intellectually*: against this, *and in terms of community*, go the following points:

5.2.1 *We change, therefore we are:* When constant changes are the expression of the fact that our lives are realized as we "make the road as we walk," as Machado says, then we are subjects of change. Thus, we live the adventure of the transformation of the world in permanent personal-community transformation. The new is not only that we don't know, but what, gloriously, we can create. To change is to create, and we change as we move toward a challenging "open future."

5.2.2 *We choose, therefore we are:* Our faith, as an historical commitment to liberation, demands that we choose. In opting for the humanization of man, we are humanized. To opt for the poor puts us on God's side. We must not forget

the words of Paulo Freire in their Biblical spirit: "the poor are able."

- 5.2.3 *We trust, therefore we are:* I would like to quote here a few select phrases from a lengthier poem by Julio Girardi:<sup>6</sup> "The first, the new, the only commandment is that we *trust*. Because without trust there is neither love, nor faith, nor hope, nor liberation.

The Christian conversion is conversion to trust. Trust in God, therefore in man. But to trust in men as a Christian is to make a clear choice, an option. It is to trust, above all, in the poor and the oppressed. Only he who trusts in the poor trusts truly in God and understands the gospel.

To trust in the poor is to trust in their liberating virtues, in their revolutionary potential, even when the repression and violence of the system push them to an apparent mediocrity.

To trust in the poor is to enter into life for them and with them. It is to participate with them in the class struggle. It is to link our destiny with theirs."

- 5.2.4 *We love, therefore we are:* *Change, choice and trust* are what make our *love* relevant. When we *change* our minds for the mind of Christ, *choose* the poor, and *trusting* in them we fight against their oppressors, doing so *out of love for the oppressors as well as the oppressed*. We must love everyone, but not in the same way: We love the *oppressed* by liberating them from their *misery*. We love the *oppressors* by liberating them from their *sin* (which includes misery of its own). Christ's love is *universal and reconciling* because it *makes class distinctions*. He loves the poor, the captives and the oppressed in order to liberate them from their oppression (Luke 4:16-21).

He loves the Pharisees and Scribes with a severe and conflictive love (Matt. 23), denouncing their attitude and longing tearfully to see them liberated from their oppressor.

The universality of the Christian message implies the universal ransom of humanity from a sinful situation of which we are all a part, albeit for different reasons. Therefore, we all have different social and historical roles.

6. Julio Girardi, "Confianza y Liberación" in *Fe Cristiana y Cambio Social en América Latina* (Salamanca: Sígueme, 1973) pp. 385-389.



Christian love does not evade confrontation. It is not merely *conciliatory*, but also *reconciling*. That is to say, it faces the conflict and looks for a way to overcome it. It is love which serves *all* men. To serve and serve effectively. This is the key. *Because if one does not live to serve, his life serves no good.*