



THE LEGACY OF IGNACIO ELLACURÍA

ten years after martyrdom

José Sols Lucia

1. Who was Ellacuría
 2. A new way of rethinking in faith: historical theology
 3. How to articulate theology and social sciences
 4. From the University, political analyst and mediator
- Notes

1. WHO WAS ELLACURÍA

In this article, we would like to remember Ignacio Ellacuría, one of those six Jesuits, commemorating him for his theological, philosophical and political reflections, as well as his biography, which remain extremely insightful to Christians and non Christians, even ten years after his death (1989-99). We want to clarify from the beginning that limiting ourselves to him by no means suggests that the others are omitted intentionally. Rather more, there are many interesting topics to be dealt with and we hope that the celebration of the tenth anniversary of that massacre will create various works to commemorate and enliven the spirit and contributions of S. Montes in sociology and politics, I. Martín-Baró² in psychology and social studies and J. López y López, A. López and J.R. Moreno in education, pastoral works and in topics of everyday life in general.

1. His formation, his teachers

We are only going to extract some key events from Ellacuría's biography to assist the reader in following our later reflections. Ellacuría was born in 1930 in Portugalete, near Bilbao, Basque Country, Spain. He was the fourth of five children, all males, born into a paternalistic and highly disciplined family, especially in education. As José, the oldest son and also a Jesuit remembers, they received a severe and noble education with a lack of sentimental expression. This partially explains some characteristics of Ignacio's personality and why he wasn't affectionate when sharing his emotions.

Ellacuría was analytically sharp, playful with concepts, critically keen and ironic, a good friend, a fearful enemy, coherent in practical matters with his theoretical principles, confident, an admirer of great teachers, a defender of the weak one, sarcastic with the lukewarm, a good soccer player, and an unconditional follower of the Bilbao Athletic. Handling this Basque's personality was no easy task, including for some of his fellow Jesuits that died alongside him on the moist grass in that dark garden. All that knew him agree that he was amazing because of his intelligence, his tenacity and because of the focused generosity of his talents which favored the weakest.

After studying at the Jesuit school in Tudela, Navarra, he entered the novitiate of the Society of Jesus at the age of 17. One year later, he was at the new novitiate of San Salvador at Santa Tecla. He studied Humanities and Philosophy at Quito, Ecuador and Theology at Innsbruck, Austria. He completed his Doctorate of Philosophy at Madrid under the direction of Xavier Zubiri, precisely on the ideology of this great Basque philosopher, collaborating with him until his death in 1983. He returned to El Salvador in 1967 where he began to work with his usual intensity at the Jesuit University until interrupted by death in 1989. He combined dedication at UCA in El Salvador and collaboration with Zubiri, which helped him to publish all of his writings since the late 1960's, in Spain. He also directed the *post mortem* publications of the Basque philosopher through the Xavier Zubiri Foundation presided by him.

An extremely violent political situation and socioeconomic structure arose in El Salvador. In some inconclusive moment, probably after the Second Assembly of Latin American Bishops celebrated in Medellín in 1968, Ellacuría decided to dedicate his life to the service of improving the political situation. And he did it as a Jesuit and as an intellectual university professor. Never did he exceed beyond his parameters, but he did widen them as far as the horizon would permit.

There is no doubt that the persons who influenced him during some stage of his life were the following: his father; his master of novices, Miguel Elizondo; his humanities professor, Aurelio Espinosa Pólit; the Jesuit poet from Navarra and settled in Nicaragua, Angel Martínez Baigorri, whom Ellacuría classified as the “essential poet”; one of his theology professors at Innsbruck, the great Karl Rahner; his philosophy professor, Xavier Zubiri; his Superior General of the Society of Jesus from 1965-83, Pedro Arrupe, and his Archbishop in El Salvador from 1977-80, Oscar Arnulfo Romero, considered by him as a prophet of our times.

If only two names should remain, undoubtedly they would be Zubiri (as teacher) and Romero (as witness). It is undeniable that the shade cast by Rahner was broadened, Ellacuría had developed his theology along the deepest insights of this German professor. Practice and experience had made the soil fertile, Ellacuría's theology, inspired by Rahner, gave new fruits, fruits that had never been savored before in the silent hallways of Innsbruck. The very own Rahner would recognize this in his last writing, his final song, the apology of Gustavo Gutiérrez and of Liberation Theology.

2. All him, philosopher

Ellacuría seems to recapture some of the ancient Greek concepts of philosophizing. A philosopher is the person who seeks the truth. The person who criticizes false ideologies hidden behind self interests. The person who, aided by reflection, is liberated from oppressing deceit. The philosopher criticizes, reasons and creates.

a) The philosopher as critic

Through critic, the philosopher unmasks the “dominant ideology”, as Ellacuría describes in his important article “Función liberadora de la filosofía” (“Liberating Function of Philosophy”), published for the first time in 1985. He is not opposed to the existence of ideologies, that for him are necessary as structures for human reflection and political propositions, but, he is opposed to “idealizations”, “visions of reality, that far from manifesting them, hide and deform them by appearing as truth, with reasoning based on the conformity of the classes or social groups and/or ethnic, political, religious, etc.”³. Ellacuría enjoyed remembering “that the great philosophers have always been great nonconformists with the beliefs of others, and that their mood was essentially critical, capable of distinguishing the truth from apparent truths”⁴.

b) The philosopher in search of foundations

We've mentioned that the philosopher not only criticizes, but that he/she also reasons. Through reasoning, the philosopher is able to lay the pillars that support a liberating reflection based on the truth. The truth is not chased blindly, it is appropriately sought in an adequate manner through

reason.

c) The philosopher as creator

And the philosopher, besides criticizing and reasoning, creates. Through creation, philosophy attempts to “illuminate, interpret and transform reality”⁵. A full project of life.

Ellacuría incorporated his entire person into creating philosophy. For him, philosophy did not distance him from reality (as we've heard numerous times from persons who detest philosophy or simply do not understand it), on the contrary, it radically brought him toward her. Philosophy for him was more than just a profession, it was a way of life. His entire being was a philosopher. He was accustomed to utilizing the idea of the “liberating function of philosophy”, which isn't exactly the same as a possible “philosophy of liberation”. All serious, honest, radical philosophy is eventually liberating for whoever elaborates it, either an individual or a group.

It is no coincidence that Ellacuría was enthusiastic about Xavier Zubiri's philosophy, which is centered on the reality and analysis of “feeling intelligence”, or human intelligence, the only intelligence capable of perceiving the reality when dealing with reality. When a person accepts that which is presented to oneself and accepts oneself, he/she does it intelligently and emotionally: understands emotionally and feels emotions intelligently. There is no division between mind and sensibility, only unity. Zubiri dedicated 18 years, 1944-62 to the analysis of the structure of reality which he wrote about in *Sobre la esencia (About Essence)* (1962). He dedicated the last 20 years of his life, 1962-83 to the analysis of feeling intelligence. This paved the way for his magnum trilogy *Inteligencia sentiente (Feeling Intelligence)*: 1. *Inteligencia sentiente. Inteligencia y realidad (Feeling Intelligence. Intelligence and Reality)* (1980). 2. *Inteligencia y logos (Intelligence and Logos)* (1982) 3. *Inteligencia y razón (Intelligence and Reason)* (1983). The principle intuitions of his philosophical beliefs were already seeded in his work *Naturaleza, historia, Dios (Nature, History, God)* (1944) where he concluded his phase of seeking the object of the philosophy: what does philosophy aim at? We've already mentioned it, of reality on reality and about feeling intelligence, both essentially open, as when the reflection dealing with the transcendental is neither disposed of or confirmed dogmatically.

3. Philosophy of historical reality: passion for history

Ellacuría followed his teacher's footsteps, writing many articles, and important book, *Filosofía de la realidad histórica (Philosophy of Historical Reality)*, published posthumously in 1990. In this book, he presents historical reality as the grade of reality that comprehends all others: physical reality (earth's movement, climate changes, physical human limits), organic reality (plants, fruits, cultures, human needs when dealing with live organisms), animal reality (although different from other animals, the human species is an animal), and human reality (on different levels: person, family, group, society, political, economical systems). No level of reality comprehends its successors (i.e.: there is no human life or animal life in vegetables) and the antecedents exist in every stage (i.e. physical and organic exist within the animal).

Ellacuría's passion for history continues from that point in which all that is real is embraced. A passion for interpreting and influencing history. Yes, influencing, because history is not a movie

brought to us by our local movie theater which we passively watch without influencing the plot or conclusion. History is dynamically our very own reality, an essentially open reality in the making. When we watch a soccer game on television and the announcer says “this game is very open”, he means that anything is possible, that any of the two teams could win because both are playing to win. From realities we know of, history is the most open. It is waiting to be done, it is being done, it is becoming.

Ellacuría dedicates his life and beliefs together, both to interpret the signs which permit us to understand what is occurring; directing history toward, not a catastrophe, but a “utopia” in civil terms and the Kingdom of God in theological terms.

Philosophy inhabited the totality of Ellacuría's spirit. Today, as we approach the tenth anniversary of his death, those of us who in one way or another live and teach philosophy should remember his methods of philosophy. We should seek the truth, a mutable and essentially dynamic truth. We should teach what we find and practice what we teach. We should place our entire being inside philosophy and allow philosophy to set us free. If it does not, is it philosophy?

4. Man of peace amidst violence

How many times did Ellacuría have to listen to criticism accusing him of promoting violence? Why did he supposedly promote it? His critics said because he defended the revolutionary guerillas. But reality was not black and white and very different from the deceitful criticism that manipulated the events.

Ellacuría dedicated his life to promoting peace amidst violence. In the 1970's, he found himself in a country overflowing with assassinations of defenseless people, committed by paramilitary groups. In a country of uprisings in protest of the eternally awaited land reform. In a country growing with poverty. It is important to know that El Salvador is a small country with a typical post colonial structure. The great majority of the land is owned by a few families that neither work it or permit others to work it. Existing cultivation is typically colonial, geared toward exterior commerce and not the necessities of the Salvadoreans. During the 60's and 70's the staple crops were coffee and cotton. It was a type of cultivation and commerce that slipped from the hands of the farmer that was subordinate to the fluctuating international market and beyond the margin of influence. In order to cultivate, the “fortunate” ones needed initial capital. Since they didn't have this capital, they would sell the future harvest at half the price of market value to a rich family or corporation. The rich got richer and the poor got poorer. That was El Salvador in those years, how about that, an economic disaster.

a) Structure violence as radical violence

Ellacuría used to say that an unjust system which prevents people from living humanely is a radically violent system. The system itself is violent because it destroys life. This is “radical violence” or in simple terms, “first violence”. As he wrote in 1986, “original violence is structural injustice, which violently maintains through economic, social, political and cultural structures, the majority of the population in a situation of permanent violation of their human rights”⁶. This idea is

not originally Ellacuría's although he developed it successfully in his writings. It appears in the documents of the Latin American Bishops Conference at Medellín (1968) where all structural unjust situations that prevent a person from living in a dignified manner are called "institutionalized violence"⁷. Another document from Medellín states, "*the situations previously mentioned are already violent, contradicting human dignity and oppressing liberty*"⁸.

b) Revolutionary violence as derived violence

Revolutionary violence for Ellacuría and for the bishops who gathered at Medellín is "derived violence", a "second violence" deriving from radical violence, which is structural, consequent of the first. "*To this [structural, radical, first] violence, once all other alternatives have been shut, the organized citizens respond; they grab their weapons and begin a revolution to overcome the oppressing structural injustices and the violence that dominates them*"⁹.

Ellacuría does not defend this revolutionary violence, but affirms that it could only be analyzed and judged if the radical violence, cause of the latter, is analyzed and judged beforehand. And if anything angered Ellacuría, and awoke his logical expertise, it was those who considered the revolutionary violence of the guerrillas unacceptable, but justified without any difficulty the existence of institutional violence, alluding to "it's always been like that", "it's inevitable" or "that's reality". But reality is not only what there is, but also what we wish there were; in essence, what we are called to do.

c) Repressive violence as a response to revolutionary violence and any other attempt to protest

*And yet, a third type of violence. The established system would not tolerate critics, silencing them eternally. This is the violence that killed Ellacuría and his friends in 1989, after ten years of death threats and assassination attempts. He described this third violence as "repressive violence". "Revolutionary violence tends to be offset by repressive violence performed by the State and the dominating class, not only legally, but also through plain terrorism"*¹⁰.

This third kind of violence not only cuts down the second kind of violence (revolutionary), but also any peaceful protest, because it does not allow that the truth should come out. This third violence or "repressive" attempts to hide the truth and the reality. Ellacuría and his colleagues did not die for being revolutionaries, but for uncovering the truth and creating awareness of El Salvador's reality, Latin America's reality in general. Ellacuría was angered by the ruthless critics of revolutionary violence, who criticized it for being nothing but violent, but on the other hand, willingly accepted this third violence, giving such lame reasons as "social order", "national security" or "it's the only language the guerrillas understand".

5. Our culture of violence

Let's take another glance at the phrase that justifies repressive violence, "violence is the only language the guerrillas understand". We should remember that this shallow reasoning appears daily on television. Any action movie, generally American, that we are able to watch nightly on our

televisions, abuses this deceitful sequence of events: the stars are divided from the beginning as “good guys” and “bad guys”, both equally violent. In order to justify the “good guys” violence, the “bad guys” violence is presented as extremely merciless, rejecting them the opportunity of sacrificing violence through peaceful petitions, and finally using violence upon them. Violence with a touch of humanitarianism so that the “couch potato” spectator doesn't have to doubt for a second “on whose side he/she is on”.

Fortunately, other fine movies prove that the world is not divided between the “good guys” and the “bad guys”. They demonstrate that the person is a complex being that experiences how good and evil battle in the arena of individual liberty.

Ellacuría never spoke about “good” or “bad” people, not even after the Sumpul River and the Lempa River massacres. During these massacres, the Salvadorean and the Honduran armies shot and killed helpless multitudes seeking refuge. Ellacuría spoke of a structure that is violent in itself, a consequence of human sin which generates sin.

Unfortunately, violence continues to exist in all of the continents. It may be interesting to review Ellacuría's analytical outline (1. structural violence, 2. revolutionary violence, 3. repressive violence), adapting it to new situations, different from the ones he lived.

1. The difficult condition of Magrebi, African, Asian, and Eastern Europe immigrants in West Europe.
2. Delinquency among some of those immigrants.
3. European jails filled with foreigners.

Or, 1. The almost non-existent role of youth in society. 2. Drugs and delinquency among youth (i.e. “skinheads”). 3. Social rejection of this “extremely violent youth”.

It would be convenient to add the extremely complex and abundant “culture of violence” to the Ellacurian outline¹¹. We've chosen to refer to it when mentioning American action movies. Movies bomb us, not only with violence, but also with a certain species of “aesthetic violence”: extraordinary explosions, hallucinating car chases and morbidly beautiful destruction. This is how, while our conscience idiotically repeats, “violence is wrong...”, our subconscious penetratingly whispers, “you're dreaming... violence is fascinating”. Why is it that there are multitudes of people of all ages from different social classes making long lines to watch “action” movies, which means “extremely violent” movies?

It is not improbable that Ellacuría, in the 1990's would have attacked the subject of “cultural violence”, as well as new forms of imperialism. (i.e.: cultural imperialism). Much more seductive than the American logistical support to puppet military dictators or French support of grotesque African dictators. Culture of violence and cultural imperialism: two new frontiers.

2. A NEW WAY OF RETHINKING IN FAITH: HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

When Ellacuría, Christian theologians and contemporary intellectuals found themselves inside the panorama of injustice and violence, previously alluded to without barely scraping the surface, they had two options: speak of that reality “from their faith” or “from outside of their faith”, as if it wasn't necessary for the Christian faith to get caught up in worldly matters and politics. This was the crucial experience for the so called “Liberation Theology”, promoted by Ellacuría since it first appeared toward the end of the 1960's.

1. Liberation: a claim in front of injustice

Ellacuría and other theologians opted for speaking from the interior of their faith. Why? Is it possible for a religious denomination (Christian, Muslim, Jewish or Buddhist) to impose its faith on a civil society? Apparently not. When European bishops or other Church leaders publicly state their opinions on abortion, birth control, divorce, etc., we often face the same problem here. Many criticizing voices are heard telling them that they are intending to impose their faith on a civil society in which a plurality of denominations exists within the frame of a modern State declared non denominational, i.e., they are not inclined to support any specific religious denomination. Well, a good number of Latin American theologians from the end of the 60's and into the 70's decided to deal with the large problems in their societies and they decided to do so as theologians, because of three fundamental reasons:

1) It was not about a typical ordinary problem, it was about the survival of the majority of the world's population. This problem was not indifferent for the God of Life of Israel and of Jesus Christ. 2) Latin American society in those years, although somewhat different today, was openly Christian and many people spontaneously asked themselves questions such as, “Does God want us to suffer so much?” And at times it was not just a question, but a sad confirmation. “It's God's wish, we must be content”. 3) Often, those in power utilized theological arguments to justify the established order by stating, “It is the will of God for things to be as they are”, in other words, the Latin American version of Marx's famous quote, “religion is the opium of the people”.

Theologians and Christians in general screamed, “This is not God's will; God vomits injustice; God listens to the cry of this nation, just as he listened to the cry of Israel thousands of years ago while captive in Egypt”.

A new popular outcry arose in the 60's - 70's, “liberation”, throughout Latin America, especially in El Salvador. Its origins were civil, political. Ellacuría was honest in recognizing that this clamor did not reach the Church via the poor, but through leftish radical groups demanding, obliging the Church to open its eyes to look at the misery of the masses. *“Liberation Theology has vigorously*

introduced “liberation” as a topic, in reflection and in practice, into the Church's Magisterium. It discovered “liberation” externally, not within the Church itself, at least initially; not by listening to the cry of the oppressed, but by observing the social-political liberation movements that had listened to the cry of the oppressed and had effectively articulated it into different forms of political struggle”¹².

This is worth remembering, especially for us Christians, to keep in mind that the truth may come from “outside” of the Church. Believing in the true God does not mean that we possess the truth on all topics concerning human life, it means we are convinced God dwells in our hearts and He does so by giving us life and wisdom. The Church should not be ashamed of the fact that it has learned from outsiders; only in this way can it be truly wise, only in this way can it be supportive from its interior, knowing that only the humble are wise.

2. The controversial birth of a new theology

Parting from El Salvador's and the rest of the continent's historical present, Ellacuría assisted in creating a new theology. It was based on a theological reflection of a historical drama. This implied incorporating faith into life and life into faith. Today, this may seem trivial, probably because it's now familiar, but in the Latin America of the late 60's, it was not taken for granted. Whoever defended this ideology was accused of being “Marxist” or “communist”. This is where the Brazilian Cardinal Helder Camara's famous quote emerges, “When I give bread to the poor, I am called a saint ; when I ask myself why the poor do not have bread, I am called a communist”.

There is much to be said, which was already said in the 70's, about the compatibility and incompatibility between Christianity and Communism (and also about the compatibility and incompatibility between Christianity and economic liberalism or capitalism). But what is important here is that these Latin American theologians wanted to confront the inhumane situation from their Christian faith, and that their eyes were opened thanks to the leftish groups, many of whom were Marxists.

It is worth noting that much of the criticism those theologians received didn't only come from the political and economical groups involved, but also from certain ecclesiastical authority. For example, in 1984, a preparatory text from a Vatican document on Liberation Theology prepared by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith was leaked to the press. The text was attributed to Joseph Ratzinger, Prefect of the Congregation.

The document (Instruction on some Aspects of Liberation Theology) mentioned Liberation Theology as the “great heresy of our time” and it clearly affirmed the following: “*Lib-eration Theology constitutes a fundamental danger in the faith of the Church because it deals with a new method of global comprehension and of Christian realization in its totality, and because it changes all of the methods of the life of the Church, its hierarchy, liturgy, catechism, moral options. It deals with a new way of interpreting Christianity, its severity is not sufficiently valued because it does not classify into any of the traditional heretical configurations*”¹³.

The wave of criticism against this preparatory document was so immense, that numerous phrases from the original draft were omitted. The final document even incorporated quotes from some of the original critics. Josep Vives and Juan Luis Segundo were among the original critics. Their

work can be found in this same collection “Cristianisme i Justícia”, numbers 4 and 13. May this document, attributed to Joseph Ratzinger, serve as proof of the criticism received by Liberation Theology as being “heretical”, “Marxist” or “communist”.

3. Historical theology

What Ellacuría truthfully sought, as others of his generation, was not to contaminate Christian theology with Marxism, but rather, to create what he termed a “historical theology”.

a) *What is historical theology*

Ellacuría understood “historical theology” as a proper theological method: reflection on faith from the historical present and reflection on the historical present from faith. He often said that all theology, as well as all human knowledge in general, conscious or not, is conditioned by the historical present, and it has been so since the beginning of Christianity, even more, since the beginning of human knowledge. Historical the-ology desires to consciously reflect its historical origins and assume it entirely. The one reflecting does so from a personal standpoint, what are the voices he/she is listening to and those he/she intends to answer sincerely.

The “locus theologicus”, the theological place acquires a great importance in this theology: Where from is reflection being performed? Whom is reflection for? Ellacuría and his contemporary theologians desired to do so from the oppressed majority in Latin America, from the Third World majority in general. And when they realized they could spend the rest of their lives doing so, they did not hesitate, they proceeded, and some like Ellacuría, even in giving their lives.

b) *What is “place”*

“Place” for Ellacuría does not imply a “geographic location”. In El Salvador, as in any other Central American country, the poor are the majority, there is a small middle class and a rich minority, all sharing the same land. “Place”, in a more appropriate way, means “human situation”.

c) *Sociopolitical amplification of the Bultmannian “hermeneutic circle”*

The German theologian Rudolf Bultmann developed existential biblical hermeneutics in this century. This is the belief that every individual can only read and understand the Bible from their personal existential situation, similar to the idea that the Bible comes to life when related to an experience of faith by the lector, when the lector accepts, from his/her existential present, the author's experience. Thus, producing a “hermeneutic circle”, or a “circle of interpretation”, once the lector understands the Bible from his/her existential presence and understands his/her existential presence from the Bible.

Joining the hermeneutic movement, along with many other protestant and catholic authors, Ellacuría moves one step further: the reader is not only an individual, but the lector is a community, as it was Israel in the Old Testament. Personal experience is not undermined (it remains priceless),

it is placed as a collective experience. Ellacuría often remembered how the community's faith came first and then the individual faith of each member of the community in the biblical history of Israel. All shrouded inside the collective experience of the New Covenant (admitting that the collective experience is impossible without the corresponding personal dimension).

d) The New Testament does not forget the Hebrew tradition, it radicalizes it, makes it universal and advances it to fulfillment

The New Testament does not either exclude or conclude the community aspect of faith, it radicalizes it, makes it universal. First of all, it radicalizes it by remembering God's covenant with his people is more than laws and a series of liturgical rituals, its an invitation to charity and justice, not as exceptional acts, but as a stable structure (this is where the covenant links to the law). It is an invitation to a justice that flows from the human heart and does not reduce itself to the fulfillment of exterior precepts. Secondly, the New Testament makes the community aspect of faith, found in the Old Testament, universal. Jesus, the Good News, communicates with all, regardless of race, culture, sex, religion or social condition and Israel is discovered as “chosen” precisely because He (the Messiah), the One who transmits the Covenant to all nations, is from Israel.

Ellacuría, answering the criticism received for making Christianity Semitic through Liberation The-ology¹⁴, for dissolving Christian novelty into Judaism, said, “*Wanting to remain only with the spiritual of the New Testament without observing the historical or limiting the significance of one for the support of the other would be a double mutilation*”¹⁵.

The Old Testament is not forgotten with the New Testament. Stated somewhat differently, Christianity is not the destruction of Judaism, it's, as previously stated, the radicalization (returning to the root of the Hebrew experience with God) and the universalization (taking this experience to the heart of all humans and all nations). And now adding, it is its fulfillment. God's promise to Israel was fulfilled in Jesus, although in some unforeseen way to the majority of the Hebrews, as tends to happen with matters of Divine nature. God fulfills His promise, but the promised does not coincide with our expectations.

4. Not only a place, but an adequate place

Let's return to the importance of “place” in historical theology. For Ellacuría, not everything is reduced to strictly performing theology from a place. It is preferable to determine which is the “adequate place” in order to the theological outcome to be authentically Christian. It is known that God chooses throughout the Bible specific inhumane situations (not just any situations) that allow the humanity of God to be revealed as a gentle and penetrating breeze.

Creating awareness of the importance “place” (the historical situation) has for the resulting the-ology, which would be in the present (El Salvador, Latin America, the 1970-80's) the most valuable place? Without a doubt, it is the crisis of the majority living below livable standards. First of all, because they are a majority, nothing trivial if we possess a democratic spirit. Secondly, because they live a grave situation, “*There is no significant world problem that can be understood with sufficient severity and amplitude without viewing and analyzing it from a Third World*

perspective (...). To understand a global fundamental problem, one cannot depreciate the viewpoint, better yet, the objective reality of those who constitute the major part of the human race”¹⁶.

5. Liberation Theology: an historical theology, Latin America's theology

Let's begin by stating that Liberation Theology is composed upon two elements, and although of simultaneous origins, they are different of each other and should not be entangled.

a) A manner of forming theology

On one hand, Liberation Theology, the one Ellacuría is included among its principal advocates, is a new method of forming theology, what he calls, as previously mentioned, “historical theology”. Once again: reflection on faith from the historical present (and upon all inhumane situations that require special

attention) and reflection on the historical present from faith, not only to understand the present, but to influence it by making it more humanitarian. Liberation Theology, in this sense, would be what is academically known as a “fundamental theology”, in other words, a reflection concerning the fundamentals of faith and the method utilized in its elaboration, in the development of doctrine.

b) A reexamining of Christian faith from an historical context

On the other hand, Liberation Theology is the application of this theological method known as “historical theology” to the Latin America of the 70's, 80's, and yes, unfortunately, even the 90's. Liberation Theology, in this sense, would be what is academically known as a “systematic theology”, in other words, a reflection concerning the Christian faith.

Why is it convenient to distinguish “systematic” (investigating the components of faith) from “fundamental” (reflecting upon the fundamentals and methods of faith) in Liberation Theology?

Because if it were only a systematic theology, then once the historical situation that gave it birth is overcome, the theology would become outdated and uninteresting. What would be the purpose of speaking about “God, Liberator of the Poor”, once the oppressed have vanished in a hypothetical futuristic ‘oppressed-less’ society ? Not much. This is why every now and then we may hear people saying, “Liberation Theology, oh yes, very interesting, something of bygone time, but no longer relevant”, meaning that its historical context, the very reason for its existence, has disappeared. First of all, it must be stated that these assumptions are erroneous because the majority of the world's population continue to live in inhumane conditions. And also, this pre-sumed extinction of Liberation Theology has “ulterior motives”, it tends to be affirmed by those who have never encountered it. They say that it has been supplanted in order to avoid confronting the truth, for if they do, their bank accounts and lifestyle may be altered. The human spirit is weak at times, even when hiding behind beautiful manifestations.

6. A new method of forming valid theology for other historical situations

So, if Liberation Theology is also a fundamental theology (termed “historical theology”), its application could have an extensive horizon since it deals with the manner of applying theology to other historical contexts very different from the Latin American one, or even in Latin America with historical situations different than those of the 70's and 80's. It deals with a manner of making theology that captures the ‘inhumane’ of our societies (European, Asian, African, American) and attempts to observe the progress for humanization in the light of the Good News of Jesus; retrieving the peoples questions, doubts, anxieties and hopes of our time.

The famous theologian from Sri Lanka, Aloisius Pieris, referring to Liberation Theology, says: *“Latin Americans affirm, and us Asians should concede that, maybe it's not about a new theology, but rather, a new theological method, certainly, the correct method for executing theology”*¹⁷. Pieris specifically argues by demonstrating that, besides Classical European Theology's and Liberation Theology's Western character, both known in India, the latter is more apt for Asia because of one reason, its method.

Ten years after the death of Ellacuría, we can ask ourselves, from Europe and from other parts of the world, how this theological method can enrich the way we live our faith and also humanize the society in which we live in. Difficult problems and difficult human realities are plentiful:

- large groups of immigrants that reach Europe from other continents and find settling very difficult: Magrebies, Black Africans, Pakistanis, Indians, Turks, Kurds, Latin Americans, etc.,
- the “Fourth World”: social marginalization in the modern large cities,
- foreigners in jails: defenseless in practice but not in theory,
- the culture of violence,
- international drug trade: corrupting even its combatants,
- Eastern Europe's disaster: undefined borders; centralist and bureaucratic socialism, ferocious capitalism with a lack of democratic culture; a ground ready for any kinds of organised crime,
- islamic violence: capable of agglutinating nations against their “western enemy”,
- nationalist terrorism: North Ireland, the Basque Country, Corsica,
- International Prostitution Chains of minors: where even important personalities are implicated and tend to be protected, such as is the case in Poland and Belgium,
- the presence of underpaid children in the production of famous products used daily without scruples,
- large macro economic quantities that hide the precarious microeconomic ones...

A humiliating long list, making the arena for the reflection of new theologies enormous. The legacy of Ellacuría for a Christian today does not consist of grinding and repeating some of his theological thesis', it consists in making new historical the-ologies fertile in new human contexts, in Latin America as well as in other continents.

These new historical theologies may appear to be very different from Ellacuría's theology, when in reality they are fundamentally related as sisters.

3. HOW TO ARTICULATE THEOLOGY AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

The systematic aspect of Liberation Theology rediscovers that the Hebrew experience of God is one in which God is the liberator of Israel, oppressed by Egypt. God speaks to Moses in the following manner,

“I have witnessed the affliction of my people in Egypt and have heard their cry of complaint against their slave drivers, so I know well what they are suffering. Therefore I have come down to rescue them from the hands of the Egyptians and lead them out of that land into a good and spacious land, a land flowing with milk and honey... The cry of the Israelites has reached me, and I have truly noted that the Egyptians are oppressing them. Come, now! I will send you to Pharaoh to lead my people, the Israelites, out of Egypt” (Ex 3:7-10).

God wishes to liberate the popular masses of today, 70's and 80's, in the same way He liberated the Israelites in the past from slavery in Egypt. He wishes to liberate a majority, which is oppressed by a structurally unjust system and wounded by a cruel political and military repression.

1. Biblical roots of the question

Liberation Theology, born in the “Old” and having matured in the “New” Testament, acknowledges that today's oppressed majorities are a crucified people, living their “Good Friday”: Reflect upon the Crucifixion of Jesus from this reality.

Ellacuría actively and passively affirmed and argued firmly that God's salvation, repeatedly offered to all throughout history, is presently offered in the structural liberation of the popular majority. Without a doubt, salvation is not simply reduced to a political liberation, but salvation without political liberation is only a fairy tale no one is willing to believe.

God's salvation of Israel passed from the political liberation of slavery in Egypt through the path toward the Promised Land, but, it was not reduced to this. We know of the flight and of the years of wondering, of the ambiguity (i.e. how the Israelites expelled other peoples from their land, which deals with conquering rather than liberating). The historical aspect of salvation does not imply the exaltation of a political ideology or an historical process, it deals with a salvation which is related to the foundation of what is human, and what is human is always historical.

2. The poor, object and subject of salvation

Salvation passing through political liberation (the majority living inhumanely beginning to live

humanely) has a double meaning for Ellacuría: that the poor are objects of salvation and that the very same poor are subjects of salvation.

“The poor, object of salvation” means that the poor need an end to oppression, they need for God to liberate them through the free action of others. “The poor, subject of salvation”, although a bit more difficult, is equally true. The poor are subjects of salvation means, in other words, they bring us their salvation. It is not that they are the source of salvation (only God is the source), but that we obtain salvation through them...because that is how God is, because God gives Himself through the “kenosis” (humiliation), because His love was revealed by lowering Himself. The Bible overflows with this depiction of God: the chosen are the Hebrews (slaves), and not the Egyptians (free); the chosen is the humble Mary and not the flamboyant Cleopatra; the chosen is Jesus, the son of a Nazarene carpenter and not the High Priest or the King of Galilee. And today the chosen are the crucified, those who really suffer and not those who suffer from insomnia because they worry about their investments on Wall Street.

3. Social Sciences and Theology at the service of only one humanity

Ellacuría never wanted for this type of reflection to simply remain as pious considerations full of good intentions. His desire was the application of the social sciences in the analysis of the historical reality. And this desire was moved by his rigorous spirit and work ethic, proper of a Rahner and Zubiri disciple and by his tenacity, proper of a Basque son of St. Ignatius.

If a theologian desires to understand and transform the reality, he or she should recognize that theological doctrine does not supply the necessary instruments to analyze the social, the political or the economical. The only solution is to seek the assistance of the social sciences and of contemporary social theories, comprehending that they are basically: sciences, theories and analysis techniques, and although of no lesser importance, they are susceptible of being improved or substituted in the future. Does this mean that theology gets contaminated with other sciences? If we use these sciences in the proper way, the answer is: no. Let's see.

Let's imagine a homely woman that throughout her entire life has never had the opportunity to study. Let's also imagine a pediatric doctor that has studied in several universities and is exhausted of reading and practicing his specialty. There is no doubt that the woman and the doctor have very few things in common. So let's begin with their differences. The woman has a son. She knows him inside out. He's “her son”. The son gets sick, she notices immediately and takes him to the pediatric. And now we have two very different persons with the sick boy. The doctor analyzes the symptoms carefully and prescribes medication. Being a specialist, he recognized the illness very well. The mother knows also very well her child, and she is able to perceive details of his behaviour which would be not be noticed by anyone else: she is his mother. The unity of the boy (one boy, not two) makes that the maternal knowledge and the medical knowledge may enhance each other in order to obtain the boy's health. The mother does not cease to be mother, nor the doctor to be doctor. Her maternal instinct and his professionalism complement each other.

Something similar occurs with theology and the social sciences. It could be difficult to find similarities if we commence from their differences. On one hand, theology is fortified by the revelation of God in Israel and in Jesus Christ as conveyed in the Bible, faithfully accepted with the

expectation of being profoundly understood while facilitating men and women of every generation to learn and live it. On the other hand, the social sciences attempt to analyze society from different aspects: History studies the causes and consequences of past events (with an interest for the present and for the past). Soci-ology analyzes the characteristics of the members of the actual society. Cultural Anthropology studies the characteristics of societies different from ours. Economics studies the trends of production, the wealth, the transit of capital and the distribution of goods and services. Social Psy-chology investigates the behavior and psychic processes of individuals and applies them to social groups. Etc.

Theology and the social sciences are distant relatives. But, as in the case of the mother and the doctor, both (theology and social science) are concerned with the same object: men/women of today. Or in a more abstract manner: Man/Woman. And it is in this union that theology and social science are called to express themselves, each respecting the other's autonomy while enriching itself through diversity. The social sciences contribute analysis techniques to theology that will never to be found in the Bible or in the Magisterium. And theology contributes the radicalization of the question dealing with humanity to social science: not only why men/women behave one way or another, but where does he/she come from, where is he/she going, why is he/she there, what is he/she, what is the meaning of his/her life. Which by no means is little.

Obviously, theology and philosophy have many elements in common although their roots are radically different: theology originates from the faithful acceptance of Revelation, while philosophy originates from the limitless interrogational and critical spirit proper of the human spirit.

4. Liberty meets Marxism

Ellacuría found two social theories of special importance during his years of study: Marxism and the Theory of Dependence. Let's briefly mention Ellacuría's position on Marxism.

He didn't chose Marxism among other possible theories, he came in contact with it in his historical present. Remember, in those years, Marxism was the economic and philosophical doctrine of a large number of radical groups in Europe, Latin America and Asia, and the political doctrine of the leftist became identified with it.

Ellacuría wanted to avoid two dogmatic absurdities when dealing with Marxism: completely accept it or completely reject it. Ellacuría used to say that if scholastic theology had learned to separate the wheat from the weeds with non-Christian and non-Hebrew philosophical systems such as Aristotelianism and Platonism, and certain modern theology had learned to do something similar with Heidegger, why couldn't the same be done with Marxism? Yes, it was possible.

Ellacuría felt comfortable and non biased with Marxism, maintaining a critical spirit. For him, the two essential arguments of Marxism were not incompatible with the Christian faith. They are:

a) Material reality determines social conscience

Material reality is not only previous to the conscience, it determines it in the ultimate instance. It determines it without depriving it of its autonomy and accepts it. However, the conscience also

determines the reality. Ellacuría preferred to alter this Marxist theory by stating that it was not so much each individual's conscience that was determined by the economic structure, but the social conscience. And he criticized Marx for not precisely defining the terms “determine” and “in ultimate instance”¹⁸.

b) Criticism of Capitalism: Theory of the Passage and the struggle of classes

Marxism's criticism of capitalism is based on the theory of exploitation (plussage) and on the struggle of classes, “*primarily understanding this as an objective reality and in no way as a psychological attitude, and even less, as a personal attitude*”¹⁹. It was often heard during those years that class struggle was opposed to Christianity. But Ellacuría remembered that precisely contrary to Christianity is the confrontation of social classes (Capitalism), not the dialogue about that confrontation (Marxism).

Ellacuría was everything but naive. He knew very well that Marxism also has a pretentious cosmic vision that attempts to explain the totality of the real. Ellacuría did not accept a Christian to be in communion with all Marxist philosophy in the same way that he did not accept a Christian to be in communion with all Aristotelian or with all Platonic philosophy. In that manner, for example, he found no difficulty for a Christian accepting the historical materialism thesis, a scientific affirmation only disputable on a scientific level. But he did find obstacles in accepting the theory of dialectic materialism because it deals with a metaphysical theory that contains a cosmivision. Utilizing Marxism's socioeconomics, this is one theory among others (very important historically, without a doubt) in which Christianity, technically, has nothing to say regarding religious beliefs. Ellacuría often remembered Marxism's immense complexities, making it impossible to briefly mention its validity or invalidity. He regretted excessive criticism demonstrated by certain sectors of the Church regarding Marxism while blindly accepting various philosophical and economic theories subjacent in the Social Doctrine documents of the Church.

With his habitual dialectic humor, Ellacuría affirmed that dogmatic scholasticism as well as dogmatic Marxism were attractive systems for lazy minds, because they contain simple establishments that make them attractive and comfortable for a spirit which is intellectually lenient.

5. Interest for the Theory of Dependence

Ellacuría willingly pondered the so-called “Theory of Dependence” because it was not implicated among the many controversies in the heart of the Church, as was Marxism.

This theory was very interesting for him for various reasons: 1) Because it recompiles some of Marxism's principle intuitions without acceding to its philosophical structure. 2) Because it helps understand what was already occurring in the Third World. And 3) because it inspires Liberation Theology. As far as Ellacuría could see, the Theory of Development is extremely ambiguous and the Theory of Dependence intends to exceed the Theory of Development. The Theory of Development mentions “developed countries”, “developing countries” and “underdeveloped countries” indicating that all countries are found on the same line of economic development, although in different moments. And this is a false statement according to Ellacuría.

On the other hand, the Theory of Dependence affirms that there are poor countries because there are rich countries and that there are rich people because there are poor people. The rich get rich impoverishing the poor. There is no single line of development, only the exploitation of some by others.

The Theory of Development contains a certain spirit of naive kindness, typical of certain relevant ecclesiastic positions in which only negligence is mentioned instead of evil and sin. The acceptance of the Theory of Dependence with a theological interest permits speaking about structural sin, institutionalized evil and the systematic destruction of humanity. And finally, of the possibility of conversion, of structural changes. Some of these structural changes are found as ideas in the social encyclicals of John Paul II. Ellacuría affirms that *“the Theory of Dependence not only offers possibilities for a new theology, but also offers guidelines for finding the unity of a Christian praxis and a secular political praxis without confusion”*, as is the case of the Third World, simultaneously seen as *“historical place of the objectiveness of domination”* (political vision) and as *“theological place of the objectiveness of sin”* (theological vision)²⁰.

Thus, Ellacuría is not the least bit embarrassed when recognizing that *“Latin American theology and the closely related Latin American socialism originate together”* and even more so, that *“there is a close relationship between Liberation Theology and the Theory of Domination-Dependence”*²¹.

Ellacuría's position on Marxism and on the Dependence Theory demonstrates something of great value: if we recognize along with Vatican Council II, that the Church cannot forget the joys and hopes, nor the tears and anxieties of today's men and women²², then we cannot but otherwise accept that theology must be exposed to the investigations of the social sciences, knowing that the analysis techniques the social sciences support are not to be found in the Bible, the Magisterium or in Church Tradition.

Opening ourselves to these investigations does not mean accepting them in their totality with open arms as if referring to a new religion. It means patient discernment. Patient discernment on those issues that will enable us to better comprehend the reality that the men and women of today are living. As well as considering the possibilities of an efficient historical transformation.

5. FROM THE UNIVERSITY, POLITICAL ANALYST AND MEDIATOR

Ellacuría's intelligence was admirable. Due to an ecclesiastic necessity, he submerged himself into theology despite his philosophical background and emerged a contemporary renowned theologian of his generation. He was also forced to submerge himself into politics because of an historical necessity and became considered a sharp political analyst and an important mediator during the civil war in El Salvador.

In order to understand his genius, the following must be understood: Ellacuría was a combination of a great intelligence and a profound humility.

Humility, not in the external sense which is contrary to his ironic, keen and authoritarian style, but in way which was manifested through his conscious will to learn and continue learning, also proper of a disciple.

He learned from his father, from his master of novices, from his finest professors (Espinosa Pólit, Rahner), from the grand Zubiri, from his Superior General Pedro Arrupe, from the archbishop-prophet Oscar Romero (assassinated while celebrating mass in 1980). And he learned from his friends and colleagues, specialists in subjects he hadn't studied earlier in life: Luis de Sebastián (Economics), Jon Sobrino (Christology), Ignacio Martín-Baró (Psychology), Segundo Montes (Sociology), among others.

1. A university mind at the service of the political reality

This attitude of his led him into theology and politics. Reading and listening to those who had something interesting to say. Ellacuría knew how to read and how to listen; easier said than done. His theological writings are testimony of the particular interest he placed on the writings of contemporary theologians as well as his intelligence. His political writings are testimony of the particular interest he placed on political events and on analysis of the society, which he practiced scrupulously while he was at the UCA.

But in order to really understand Ellacuría, a third element must be added to the already mentioned intelligence and humility. These two were sufficient for a Rahner or a Zubiri, but not for an Ellacuría. He possessed a third virtue: the will to transform the historical reality. I once heard his good friend and colleague Jon Sobrino say, "Ellacuría had a tremendous interest for comprehending history, and even more so for influencing it". And here, "influencing in history" means being an active participant in it, contributing to the course of events in order to allow history to make this world in which we live in more humane, especially for those living infra humanely.

Ellacuría entered politics as a priest and a university scholar. And how! We can make the following affirmation without being fearful of exaggerating: it is difficult to find anyone that may have analyzed better than Ellacuría the inferno of events that occurred in El Salvador during the

70's and 80's, taking into consideration that he did this during and from within that living hell and not afterwards. He did not have the luxury of examining the circumstances from a broader and more serene historical perspective.

His political career did not consist of supporting one political faction over another, it consisted in inviting the different segments of the society to make peace. He never doubted in communicating with all through dialogue. He even participated on one occasion in a televised debate with Major D'Aubuisson, leader of the Death Squads (“Escuadrones de la Muerte”) and responsible for the murders of an infinite multitude of Salvadoreans, including Archbishop Romero. It is really worth watching the taped video of that debate, a true evangelical lesson in a country bathed in violence and dripping with blood. When remembering this debate, one must bear in mind that D'Aubuisson would order the assassination of anyone who dared to criticize him in public. It is evident that Ellacuría knew this while debating on Salvadorean television because of the tense look on his face. He was tense but completely confident of what he was saying.

Also, he was repeatedly consulted by the Salvadorean government, by the United States embassy (often, the true “government”) and by guerrilla leaders and he flew to Ma-nagua, Nicaragua, on numerous occasions to meet with Villalobos, the FMLN leader at the time.

2. The only solution: a negotiated peace

Besides his numerous articles on political analysis already published by UCA in three volumes and many written commentaries for the San Salvador diocesan radio station YSAX, proof of his knowledge concerning the political reality was his early conviction that none of the opposing parties were going to win the civil war. Each predicted victory, claiming him to be mistake. Both, the leaders of the National Army, abundantly supported economically and militarily by the Reagan Administration and the strategically superior but financially inferior Guerrilla anticipated victory.

Even though they consulted him often, neither paid much attention to his stance on this issue. As the years went by, it was evident that the civil war was a “permanent draw”. The great offensive Guerrilla surge in 1989 proved, once and for all, that the stubborn Basque had been right for years. The army took advantage of this uprising to kill Ellacuría and the others. Only afterwards did they realize that they were even unable to prevent the Guerrilla from occupying the capital. And the Guerrilla realized that without an Air Force nor anti-aircraft missiles, even though they had taken possession of the capital, were inevitable targets for the National Air Force regardless of using civilians as human shields.

The death of the Jesuits and of the two women demonstrated internationally that the war, like many others, was absurd. Fatal. Provoking such immense resentment, that the Bush Administration, pressured by Congress' Commission of Truth (responsible for investigating the case of the Jesuits) and spurred by the American Jesuits had no other choice but to advocate for a peace process. The signing of peace was achieved on the last day of Javier Pérez de Cuéllar's term as Secretary General of the United Nations, December 31, 1991, in New York. The official signing was made publicly before numerous Chief's of State at the Chapultepec Palace in Mexico City on January 16, 1992. The cease fire commenced on February 1. The National Army and the Guerrilla, as well as the United States Presidential Administration, had to implicitly recognize that

Ellacuría's argument was valid since 1981, ever since he publicly began stating and writing in the magazine ECA that the Civil War was not going to be won by either party, that the only viable solution was peace through negotiations.

3. A grave error in American diplomacy

Ellacuría, the sharp analyst, quickly realized that American diplomacy committed a grave error which was detonating to the civil war. They forced an unusual alliance between the Christian Democrats, the Army and the few, wealthy, ruling Landowners, leaving out the FDR (Social Democrats), considering them of little importance.

Underestimating them, the alliance caused a political division; the Christian Democrats, Army and Wealthy Landowners on one side and the FDR and Revolutionary Forces on the other. If American diplomacy had forced a democratic alliance with reform as its goal between the Christian Democrats, the Social Democrats and the Communists, and would have supported the alliance, there probably would have been no war in El Salvador. No war. Only a peaceful transition, difficulties and all, but no war.

The American error in diplomacy caused 75,000 deaths, unimaginable amounts of money wasted on military equipment, a country ravaged by 12 years of war and psychosocial consequences still difficult to evaluate.

4. The social function of the university: analyze the reality “at a university level”

Many aspects of Ellacuría's life could be emphasized. We've mentioned the philosopher, the theologian, the politician, the advocate for peace. We haven't touched upon Ellacuría the priest or his religious life as a Jesuit, interesting topics for discussion. It is impossible to cover his entire life and his beliefs in so little space. Others are sure to embark upon those dimensions of his life commemorating the 10th Anniversary of his death.

It is worth mentioning one final aspect regarding Ellacuría that may enlighten our present, Christians and non Christians alike. Ever since the 70's, he insisted that a university should be at the service of the society and not enclosed in itself. He believed that every university should have the study of the present reality from different points of view as an objective (let's not forget Ellacuría the philosopher, analyst of the reality and of feeling intelligence: intelligence that perceives reality according to reality). The natural sciences, the liberal arts, technical careers and the fine arts are studied in universities. All these careers are at the service of society, helping society become better acquainted with its reality through analytical, constructive, artistic and other types of prisms.

He persistently defended, during his years as president of UCA (1979 until his death), that UCA's primary objective must be the analysis of the Salvadorean reality. Because of his dedication to this

cause, Ellacuría used to say that “the José Simeón Cañas Central American University was the world’s finest university in the comprehension of the Salvadorean reality”. And beside its humorous undertones, it was true. Was this contradictory to the principle that all universities had to support a “universal” understanding, as the name university indicates? Ellacuría defended that “universal”, according to UCA studies, consists in guaranteeing the authenticity of the investigations in order to make them “universalizable”, as Kant’s ethics affirms: act in a certain manner in order for our behavior to convert into a universal ethical law. Applied to UCA, studying the Salvadorean reality in such a way that the investigation may be “universalizable”.

And this is where the interests arises. UCA adopted such a relationship with the social and political reality, that it continues to cause other universities, educational centers, and social institutions to ponder. Whom do they serve? For whom do they exist? Where are they headed? How many of their colleges are completely disconnected from the human reality of their students and the other members of their society! How many schools and cultural centers forget the fundamental problems of the men and women they supposedly serve!

Ellacuría insisted that a university’s service to society should be “at a university level”. He disliked observing how certain universities, pretending to confront political issues in their countries, would practically turn into political establishments, losing seriousness in studies and exams; dedicating themselves to organizing manifestations, opposition rallies and pamphlets. Distinguishing this as a legitimate scholar. The university has to serve society as a university and not as trade union, a political party or a popular group. He would have said the same about a school, a cultural center or a union if he had worked at either of the three. Every institution should ask itself what are its goals and who should it serve, and should do this according to the type of institution it is. Nothing else. The university as a university, the parish as a parish, the political party as a political party, the school as a school.

UCA, the university Ellacuría left only because of his death, must be acknowledged as a model university because of its academic program which includes investigations that service not only a country, but an entire continent in sociopolitical upheaval. That manner of functioning as a university, as a cultural institution can very easily be adopted, not only in Latin America, but in other continents as well. Are we capable of allowing ourselves to become affected by the legacy of Ignacio Ellacuría?

It is now ten years since the shocking assassination of the six Jesuits and two women. Remembering one of them, Ignacio Ellacuría, we are not so much interested in admiring his intellectual capacity or his ability to perform, but in recognizing that the path he initiated was valid and that it can be applied to other historical situations. Let’s not make a dinosaur out of Ellacuría. Enormous but dead. Let’s remember him as a professor, yes, one that has passed away, but one whose teachings and testimony continue vibrating inside those who desire a more humane world.

NOTES

1. The acronyms which must be remembered from now on are: FMLN, “Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional” (“Farabundo Martí Front for the National Liberation”), a revolutionary guerrilla known as “El Frente” (“The Front”), which is allied to the FDR, “Frente Democrático y Revolucionario” (“Democratic and Revolutionary Front”), which is social democratic; UCA, “Universidad Centroamericana” (“Central American University”; there exists an UCA in San Salvador and another one in Managua, Nicaragua); ECA, “Estudios Centroamericanos” (“Central American Studies”), which is the cultural, social magazine of the Central American Jesuits, and notes by: E., Ellacuría.
2. The Spanish publishing house Trotta has recently brought out a commendable compilation of some Martín-Baró's works: *Psicología de la liberación* (“Psychology of Liberation”).
3. E.: *Veinte años de historia en El Salvador (1969-1989)*, UCA Ed., San Salvador, 1991, 99.
4. *Id.*, 100.
5. *Id.*, 105.
6. *Id.*, 169.
7. *II Conferencia del Episcopado Latinoamericano*, Medellín, Colombia, 1968, II, 16.
8. Quoted from: E.: *Teología política*, Ed. Secretariado Social Interdiocesano, San Salvador, 1973, 33. (In English: *Freedom Made Flesh: The Mission of Christ and His Church*, Orbis Books, New York, 1976).
9. E.: *Veinte años...*, 169.
10. *Id.*
11. ECA magazine dedicated the October 1997 issue (No. 588) to “La cultura de la violencia en El Salvador” (“The Culture of Violence in El Salvador”).
12. E.: “Liberación”, *Revista Latinoamericana de Teología* 30 (1993), UCA, San Salvador, 214.
13. *Vida Nueva* (magazine) 1.421 (March 24th 1984), Madrid, 619.
14. For instance, Han Urs von Balthasar in: COMISIÓN TEOLÓGICA INTERNACIONAL: *Teología de la liberación*, BAC, Madrid, 1978, 169-170.
15. E.: “Historicidad de la salvación cristiana”, in: ELLACURÍA-SOBRINO: *Mysterium Liberationis*, Trotta, Madrid, volume I, 330.
16. E.: “La paz mundial vista desde el Tercer Mundo”, *Sal Terrae* (magazine) 6 (1983), Santander, 433.
17. PIERIS, A.: *El rostro asiático de Cristo*, Sígueme, Salamanca, 1991, 65.
18. E.: “¿Es conciliable el análisis marxista con la fe cristiana?” (“*Responsa ad interrogationem 'Utrum christifidelis suam facere possit analysim marxisticam'*”), Society of Jesus), December 31st 1979, *Unpublished Text*, 4th paragraph.
19. *Id.*
20. E.: “Teoría económicas y relación entre cristianismo y socialismo”, *Concilium* 125 (1977),

Madrid, 287.

21. E.: “Tesis sobre posibilidad, necesidad y sentido de una teología latinoamericana”, in: VARGAS MACHUCA, A. (ed.): *Teología y mundo contemporáneo: homenaje a Karl Rahner*, Cristiandad, Madrid, 1975, 330.

22. Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et Spes*, No.1.

© Cristianisme i Justícia, Roger de Llúria 13, 08010 Barcelona (Spain), February 1999
espinal@redestb.es