LATIN AMERICAN PROGRAM

THE WILSON CENTER

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION BUILDING WASHINGTON, D.C.

WORKING PAPERS

Number 174

RELIGION AND REVOLUTION: CUBA AND NICARAGUA

Margaret Crahan, Henry R. Luce Professor of
Religion, Power and Political Process
Occidental College

Number 174

RELIGION AND REVOLUTION: CUBA AND NICARAGUA

Margaret Crahan, Henry R. Luce Professor of
Religion, Power and Political Process
Occidental College

A portion of the research on Nicaragua included in this paper was accomplished while the author was a fellow at the Wilson Center in 1985-86. In addition to the Wilson Center, the author wishes to thank Miguel Guzmán, Arlene Sullivan and the Woodstock Theological Center for their assistance in the preparation of this paper. This paper was presented at the author's colloquium, "Religion and Revolution: Cuba and Nicaragua," on Monday, September 8, 1987.

This essay is one of a series of Working Papers of the Latin American program of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. the series includes papers in the humanities and social sciences by Program Fellows, Guest Scholars, interns, staff, and Academic Council, as well as work from Program seminars, workshops, colloquia, and conferences. The series aims to extend the Program's discussions to a wider community throughout the Americas, to help authors obtain timely criticism of work in progress, and to provide, directly or indirectly, scholarly and intellectual context for contemporary policy concerns. Support to make distribution possible is provided by the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank. Editorial Assistant for Working Paper No. 174: Maria A. Holperin.

Single copies of Working Papers may be obtained without charge by writing to:

Latin American Program, Working Papers
The Wilson Center
Smithsonian Institution Building
Washington, D.C. 20560

The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars was created by Congress in 1968 as a "living institution expressing the ideals and concerns of Woodrow Wilson . . . symbolizing and strengthening the fruitful relation between the world of learning and the world of public affairs." The Center's Latin American Program was established in 1977.

The Catholic Church[1] in Latin America over the past three decades has increasingly been identified in the public's mind with revolution. Yet the Nicaraguan bishops have recently levelled some of the same charges against the Sandinista revolution that the Cuban hierarchy used against the Castro revolution in the early 1960s. These include encouraging massification of society at the expense of pluralistic politics, using a nationwide literacy campaign and primary and secondary education to inculcate Marxism/Leninism, unjustly nationalizing private property and employing universal military service to create a standing army that is a partisan force. In addition, the leaders of the Catholic Church in Cuba and Nicaragua have evinced deep concern over what they regarded as the respective revolutions` undercutting of the church's role as the prime moral legitimator in society. It was precisely to strengthen this that in the post World War II period the Catholic Church undertook extensive reforms that were given their principal expression at the Second Vatican Council (1962-65) and the Latin American bishops' conference in Medellín, Colombia in 1968.

In the aftermath of World War II, and in the face of increasing pressures for socioeconomic and political change, particularly in areas characterized by substantial levels of poverty and repression such as Latin America, the Catholic Church engaged in an extensive process of reevaluation. There was a sense that the church had been remiss in not responding more strongly to problems such as the rise of fascism in Europe and the resultant Holocaust. In addition, surveys undertaken in Latin America in the 1950s indicated a worrisome decline in lay participation in the face of the growth of Protestantism and secular competitors such as socialist movements.[2] The upshot was a thoroughgoing attempt to reform the church theologically, pastorally, and administratively in order to respond more adequately to the challenges of the modern world. As a consequence, at Vatican II and Medellín the church defined its mission as participating actively in the struggle to create societies characterized by that socioeconomic justice and respect for human rights conducive to societal concord and, hence, peace. In Latin America such a stance propelled the church into political and ideological struggle over how best to accomplish political, economic, and social change. While the church as an institution claimed it favored no particular strategy, nor system, individual church people increasingly involved themselves in partisan struggle. This resulted in their becoming the objects of repression by those elements opposed to substantial change. This prompted even stronger ecclesial denunciations of human rights violations and stimulated church unity in the face of authoritarian governments. Such was the case in Nicaragua when in June 1979 the Nicaraguan hierarchy issued a pastoral letter holding that the insurrection against Somoza was moral and legitimate in the face of long-term gross violations of the full

spectrum of human rights by the government. This did not, however, mean that the prelates were offering a carte blanche to whatever government succeeded Somoza. Hence upon the establishment of the Sandinista government in July 1979, the bishops issued another pastoral in which they cautioned the new Government of National Reconstruction to take care to encourage political pluralism, popular participation, and avoid the importation of foreign "imperialisms." The promised revolution should be Nicaraguan in its political and social structures and be free of state idolatries. Finally, belief in God should be at the epicenter of the revolution, as only through such a focus could authentic liberation be achieved.[3]

Developments in Nicaragua since 1979 indicate that while the leadership of the Catholic Church is willing to support insurrection in the face of highly repressed regimes, it is no more disposed to support Marxist revolution than it was in Cuba in 1959. However, the clergy and laity within Nicaragua are not as united in favor of such a stance as their counterparts in Cuba were in the face of the Castro revolution. What has happened since 1959 is that the theological, pastoral, and administrative reforms that were undertaken in the 1960s and 1970s have encouraged greater pluralism within the church, particularly with respect to how best to achieve socioeconomic justice and greater observances of human rights. As a consequence, while the Nicaraguan hierarchy has been sharply critical of the Sandinista government, the latter includes four clerics at the ministerial level. In addition, the Sandinista Revolution retains vocal support of a cross section of Catholic clergy and laity. Such diversity has caused increased tension and conflict within the Nicaraguan Catholic Church and has made it the focus of intense political and ideological struggle. Hence, the Catholic Church in Nicaragua is today not as united an institution as the Cuban Church was in the early 1960s. This is in spite of the fact that at the outset of the Sandinista revolution it was institutionally far stronger than the Cuban Church was at the outset of the Castro revolution. This strength was in large measure the result of the reforms promoted by Vatican II and Medellín. These are the same reforms that paradoxically contributed to the political and ideological pluralism that divides the Nicaraguan Church today.

In order to understand better the origins of this paradox, as well as the nature, extent, and limits of the transformations the Catholic Church has undergone over the past thirty years, this paper will analyze the strength of the Catholic Churches in Cuba and Nicaragua, their identification as national institutions, their public image, the origins of ecclesial criticisms of the revolutions, links to the counterrevolution, role of the Vatican, ties to foreign actors, and relations with the

revolutionary governments. The conclusions will suggest some possible future directions of the Cuban and Nicaraguan Catholic Churches.

INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTH OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCHES IN CUBA AND NICARAGUA

The Catholic Church in Cuba historically was considered weak.[4] In the 1950s it had the lowest percentage of nominal (72.5%) and practicing Catholics (5-8%) in Latin America. Cuba also had the highest percentage of non-church members (19%). Rural Cuba had remained relatively unevangelized as indicated by a 1957 survey of 400 rural heads of families. Only slightly over one half identified themselves as Catholics, 88.84% never attended services, and only 4.25% attended three or more times a year. This was due largely to the absence of church personnel in rural areas. Only 53.51% of those surveyed had ever laid eyes on a priest and less than 8% had ever had any contact with one. More telling was the fact that only 3.4% of those surveyed believed that the Catholic Church would help them improve their lot. The vast majority (85%) of priests and religious were concentrated in Havana teaching in private schools rather than engaged in pastoral work. This meant that some urban neighborhoods were also without pastors.[5]

Prompted in part by these statistics, the Catholic Church in Cuba in the 1950s increased its rural programs and encouraged social welfare activities by lay activists. Catholic Action, intent on combating the appeal of socialism, initiated a series of projects aimed at identifying the needs of the rural workers. The Young Catholic Workers attempted to compete with labor unions for the loyalty of workers and claimed 20,000 members. Both groups injected some vitality into the church, but their activities were concentrated primarily in Havana and hence the institutional church was not a major barrier to the ideological inroads of Castro's revolution particularly in rural areas after 1959.

Catholic Action and the Young Catholic Workers were aimed at maintaining traditional Catholic cadres drawn from the bourgeoisie within the church in the face of increasing societal pressures. In so doing they tended to insulate lay-people from secular organizations, thereby limiting their influence over movements such as Castro's. While some Catholics did participate in the insurrection against Batista, overall the Catholic Church did not play a major role. Although Catholics were generally anti-Batista, there was little feeling that their faith required them to participate in his overthrow. Rather there was a strong desire to appear neutral. According to an official of the Cuban bishops' conference, the hierarchy in prerevolutionary Cuba essentially accepted the existing political, economic, and social

system, if not Batista. In contrast to the Nicaraguan hierarchy, the Cuban bishops in December, 1958 rejected a request from the clergy to issue a pastoral letter concerning the insurrection. That same month a handful of Agrupación Católica members, including Manuel Artimé who was subsequently to lead the Bay of Pigs invasion, joined Castro in the mountains.[6] The image of the Church was consequently one of passivity and acceptance of the status quo.

This was in part due to the fact that in Cuba in the 1950s there was no theological basis for justifying participation in the insurrection. The preferential option for the poor had not been enunciated, nor had the Church begun to take a prophetic role in the denunciation of human rights abuses. While some Catholics did participate in the 26th of July Movement their objective was to reform, not restructure the existing system. Hence when the Castro government began initiating a revolutionary program, most Catholics who had supported the insurrection felt duped.

Twenty years later the Catholic Church in Nicaragua was stronger institutionally, theologically, and pastorally than the Cuban Church had been in 1959. Historically, Nicaraguans had identified more closely with the Catholic Church with well over 90% identifying themselves as Catholics and 98% as believers.[7] Secularism had made fewer inroads into Nicaragua in 1979 than into Cuba in 1959. While Protestants were and are active, most of the mainline denominations reflected some of the same changes as the Catholic Church. Marxist/Leninist political parties and labor organizations incorporated a very small percentage of the population and were not a threat to the predominant position of the Catholic Church.

In contrast to Cuba the Catholic Church had penetrated rural Nicaragua, particularly in the 1960s and 1970s. While the majority of priests and religious were based in the capital, as in Cuba, there were much greater efforts to maintain a Catholic presence in the countryside. This was facilitated by extensive use of lay preachers known as Delegates of the Word and Christian Base Communities (CEBs) which were introduced even before the Medellín Conference.[8] Both served to disseminate the Church's growing support for socioeconomic justice and human rights. Priests, brothers, and nuns who previously had taught in the secondary schools in Managua became involved in grass roots social welfare work, particularly after the 1972 earthquake. This tended to politicize them by making them more aware of the extent of poverty in Nicaragua and the corruption of the government. This coincided with an overall strengthening of the opposition to Somoza and the intensification of armed struggle spearheaded by the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional

(FSLN). In response the National Guard increased repression sometimes targeting churchpeople. This caused the bishops to declare in January 1977 that a "state of terror" existed, particularly in the rural areas. While the bishops did not endorse the FSLN, increasingly priests were approached by youths seeking advice about the morality of taking up arms and joining the Sandinistas.[9]

Meanwhile a number of priests and Catholic lay leaders had incorporated themselves into the FSLN, most notably the Maryknoller Miguel d'Escoto, Fernando and Ernesto Cardinal, and Uriel Molina. At the grass roots, Catholic parishes, schools and CEBs served as sanctuaries and communications networks for the guerillas. By 1978 the Catholic Church was by and large identified with the insurrection. Hence, when the bishops issued their June 1979 pastoral stating that participation in the insurrection was moral and legitimate, they were essentially recognizing the existence of extensive involvement of Church personnel and laity in the movement to overthrow Somoza. In addition, while some Catholics hoped for a liberal, reformist regime, the majority, including the bishops, expected that the new government would undertake substantial structural change.[10]

IMAGE OF THE CUBAN AND NICARAGUAN CHURCHES

At the outset of the revolution in 1959, the image of the Catholic Church in Cuba was a somewhat marginal institution, dominated by Spaniards who cultivated local elites in pursuit of institutional interests. While Christianity was a pervasive cultural presence in Cuba and helped mold national identity, the Catholic Church retained an aura of being a missionary operation of the Spanish Church. This was due largely to the fact that approximately three-quarters of Catholic priests and male religious were Spaniards.[11] Allegations of elitism and depreciation of Cuban culture were not uncommon. The low level of Cuban vocations was frequently attributed to the supposed lack of opportunity for nationals to rise in the Church, particularly in those institutions controlled by the religious orders.

While the majority of priests and male religious in Nicaragua in 1979 were also foreigners, the Catholic Church was very much identified as a national institution. This was due largely to the presence of Church personnel throughout the country and the utilizaiton of popular religiosity to reinforce the Church's identification with nationalist sentiment. While there have been some tensions between foreign clerics and Nicaraguan priests, they have not been as serious as in Cuba. What strains do exist flow largely from the fact that the foreign priests generally are members of religious orders and hence have had more elite educations and greater access to resources via

their international contacts. Non-Nicaraguan clerics are more likely to be engaged in non-pastoral work, and are less politically conservative. The latter is in contrast to the Spanish clerics in pre-1959 Cuba. Because of their backgrounds they generally have more contact with the international press and scholars. They also have generally been more exposed to new theological and pastoral developments and tend to be innovators.

As a post-conciliar institution, the Nicaraguan Church in 1979 was more open to lay participation pastorally, and in terms of decision-making, than the Cuban Church in 1959. In fact, the Cuban hierarchy resisted pressures to increase lay input for twenty years after Vatican II. This resulted in an exodus of lay persons, particularly young people, from the Cuban Church up through the mid-1970s.[12] It also meant that at the outset of the Cuban revolution, the Church's image was as a strongly hierarchical institution, with limited lay input. This contributed to the low levels of practicing Catholics and lay activism. In contrast the Nicaraguan Church in 1979 was regarded as an institution more dependent on and responsive to the laity. Hence, it is not surprising that the level of practicing Catholics and their loyalty to the institution were higher. It also meant that Catholics in Nicaragua were likely to be less susceptible to hierarchical control. In fact, the Nicaraguan Catholic Church was a far less monolithic institution with a greater diversity of opinions within it. Hence, it had more potential for internal conflict in the face of the challenge of a revolution than the Cuban Church.

In Nicaragua in 1979, the Catholic Church's image was populist, largely as a result of its efforts to implement the preferential option for the poor enunciated at Medellín. This had resulted in the channelling of Church resources to grass roots evangelization, conscientization, and social welfare activities. While one-quarter of Nicaraguan students attended private Catholic schools, these tended to be less elitist than those in Cuba. A good number were located in poor neighborhoods and received part of their financing from surpluses generated by wealthier schools.

All the Cuban churchpeople I have interviewed have agreed that their church in the pre-revolutionary period lacked a concern for socioeconomic justice and was too preoccupied with institution building. Humanitarian programs were felt to have been used to avoid confronting the structural bases of poverty and exploitation, and there was a real failure to condemn repression and corruption. There was also criticism of the traditional dependence on foreign and domestic elites and lack of identification with the poor. The Church was also felt to have been racist and paternalistic.[13] Such an image contrasts with that of

the Nicaraguan Church. Hence the latter was the object of greater loyalty on the part of its members and exercised strong moral leadership within Nicaraguan society. As a consequence, it should have had greater capacity to mobilize the general populace than the Cuban Church. Nevertheless, in November 1959 a National Catholic Congress attracted an estimated 1,000,000 Cubans to Havana where chants of "Cuba sí, Comunismo no!" filled the air. The only comparable gathering in revolutionary Nicaragua was the March 4, 1983 open air Mass celebrated by Pope John Paul II in Managua. There the crowd was obviously deeply split between pro and counterrevolutionary Catholics.[14]

The reality of the church in Nicaragua today is as a severely divided institution. This suggests that the image of the Nicaraguan Church in 1979 as a strong, vital institution committed to revolution that was frequently presented in the press, and in some of the scholarly literature, was a misperception. It also suggests that the post conciliar Catholic Church has not been as profoundly transformed as has been thought.

ISSUES IN CHURCH - STATE RELATIONS

At the crux of Church-State tensions in post-1959 Cuba and post-1979 Nicaragua was fear on the part of the hierarchy over the prospect of the consolidation of a Marxist revolutionary government inimical to the interests of the Church as defined by them. While Fidel Castro did not proclaim the Cuban revolution Marxist/Leninist until April 1961 in the aftermath of the Bay of Pigs invasion, as early as February 1959 disquiet was being expressed over Communist influence in the government. In that month Monsignor Enrique Pérez Serantes, Archbishop of Santiago, cautioned the government against "utopian egalitarianism," a catchword for Marxism. On November 17, 1979 Nicaraguan episcopal preoccupation over possible Marxist inroads was expressed in a pastoral letter that warned against the "massification" of society via the creation and expansion of Sandinista organizations. It was also feared that the projected national literacy campaign would be used to spread materialist atheism. Nevertheless, the prelates stated that they supported the revolutionary process albeit insisting on recognition of the necessity of "freedom of expression and criticism as the only way of indicating and correcting errors in order to perfect the achievements of the revolutionary process."[15] Throughout the letter the prelates made clear they were reserving to themselves the right to determine the moral legitimacy of the revolutionary process. These cautionary words coming as they did at a time of increasing criticism of the government on the part of the newspaper La Prensa and the Superior Council of Private Enterprises (COSEP) were interpreted by some as support for opponents of the revolution.

Something of the same ambiguity characterized the position of the Cuban Catholic Church in the early months of the Castro Revolution. In March 1959 while Bishop Evelio Díaz, in the name of the hierarchy, expressed approval of a proposed agrarian reform law, some leaders of the lay organization, Agrupación Católica, publicly opposed it. In June the Jesuits organized a meeting of sixty-two clerics at Fidel Castro's alma mater Belén to discuss the legislation, as well as the general direction of the revolution. The majority were critical of the agrarian reform program and suspicious about Communist influence in the government.[16] In the aftermath of the meeting increasing numbers of priests began denouncing the government from their pulpits. This stimulated counterrevolutionary sentiment among the laity and resulted in the incorporation of some individuals who previously had not been involved in the church.

Another concern was a draft education law that proposed a unified curriculum for public and private schools. Many Catholics feared this would diminish the quality of private education, as well as allow the government to inculcate Marxism. They were also disappointed that the new government was not willing to reintroduce religious education in the public schools and increase financial support for parochial schools. Failure to do the latter was regarded by some as proof of an anti-religious bias on the part of the government. The 1961 literacy campaign was regarded, with some justification, as an attempt on the part of the government to increase its influence over Cuban youth and mold them ideologically. The right of Catholic parents to determine fully the nature of their children's education hence became a rallying point for opponents to the revolution and was a prime motive for emigration abroad.[17]

Control over education also became a contentious issue in Nicaragua and was the focus of one of the two addresses that Pope John Paul II delivered during his 1983 visit to the country. In it he asserted an absolute right for parents to choose the type of education they desire for their children and of confessional schools and teachers to freedom in discharging their responsibilities.[18] At root is fear that the adoption of a standard curriculum for all primary and secondary schools would foster Marxist indoctrination of students. The issue is complicated because approximately 10% of Nicaraguan primary students and 25% of secondary students attend Catholic schools most of which receive financial assistance from the government.[19] Catholic school students and parents have, in a number of cases, been in the forefront in organizing anti-government protests some of which have been disrupted by Sandinista youths. In one case in Masaya there was one death.

The Sandinista agrarian reform program has been a less

controversial issue than in Cuba. This reflects a liberalization on the issue of private property and state-controlled economies within the Catholic Church as a whole. In its November 17, 1979 pastoral the hierarchy stated that a species of socialism was acceptable if it did not usurp the free will of individuals and peoples. What the bishops had in mind was a welfare economy that would guarantee that the resources and development of the country would ensure the meeting of basic needs. The prelates warned against any system that encouraged class hatred.[20] There has not, however, been any official statement on the part of the episcopacy concerning the Sandinista agrarian reform program. This is, in part, the result of some differences of opinion on the part of the prelates concerning it.

Cardinal Obando y Bravo in his frequent trips to the countryside in 1985 and 1986 appealed to rural discontent over inefficiencies in the agrarian reform apparatus and the fears of some small-and medium-sized farmers that their independence was being encroached upon. At the grassroots, Catholic sentiment concerning agrarian reform reflects whether or not local communities have benefitted from it. Overall, it has not become as major an issue as it was in Cuba.

What has become a critical issue in Nicaragua has been universal military service. In August 1983 the government announced a draft for all men aged 17 to 50, in response to the upsurge in contra warfare. Nicaragua had never had universal military service and there was general consternation. On August 29, 1983 the Nicaraguan Episcopal Conference sharply criticized the proposed draft on the grounds that it was intended to create an army identified with a political party, rather than the state. This the prelates said was an illegitimate mixing of the legal rights of the state with the desire of the FSLN to indoctrinate Nicaraguan youth. Hence, the bishops concluded draftees could refuse to serve.[21] This position has encouraged draft evasion, as well as an upsurge of Nicaraguans declaring themselves seminarians. While the latter are not legally exempt from military service, the practice of the government has been not to draft those officially enrolled in seminaries. However, there have been considerable numbers of youths who some priests and bishops have claimed were seminarians that the government has disputed. The extensive coverage of this dispute in the first issue of the church's publication, Iglesia, was thought to have been a reason for its suppression in October 1985.[22]

Universal military service in Cuba also became a bone of contention in the early years of the revolution, but not to the same extent as in Nicaragua. Since a good many Cuban youths opposed the draft, the Cuban Council of Evangelical Churches in 1964 requested that a program of alternative service be insti-

tuted.[23] This resulted in a number of churchpeople being drafted into the Unidades Militares de Ayuda a la Producción (UMAP), forced labor batallions.[24] UMAP was disbanded in the late 1960s under public pressure, but some Cuban churchpeople continued to be imprisoned for draft evasion, most notably Jehovah's Witnesses.

Charges that the Cuban and Nicaraguan governments were intent on creating docile national churches have been made repeatedly. In the fall of 1959 two Cuban priests in Miami mounted a campaign charging that Castro planned to create a national church. This was strongly denied by the Bishop of Pinar del Río, Evelio Díaz, on behalf of the Cuban hierarchy.[25] Ironically when the Cuban church attempted to implement some of the reforms of Vatican II in the late 1960s, particularly the use of the vernacular and optional use of clerical garb, some Cubans resisted on the grounds that it was actually an effort by Castro to create a national church.[26] More recently some Cuban exiles have alleged that the February 1986 Encuentro Nacional Eclesial Cubano, the first national Catholic meeting since 1959, was another effort to create a national church.[27]

In Nicaragua charges that the Sandinistas are intent on creating a national church have centered on the alleged existence of a potentially schismatic, "popular" church. What is being referred to is the pro-revolutionary sector within the Catholic Church which incorporates a good portion of the intellectual elite among the clergy, some base Christian communities, the Centro Antonio Valdivieso, student groups, and others. On June 29, 1982, Pope John Paul II publicly criticed the "popular" church on the grounds that it was too ideological and radical. In particular, he alleged that it encouraged class hatred and violence, rather than encouraging the church's ideal of non-conflictual societies. He also stated that it undercut the magisterium, or teaching authority of the pope and the bishops, as the ultimate interpreters of church doctrine.[28] Pro-revolutionary Catholics replied that discord within the Nicaraguan church was the result of differences over politics, not over faith or doctrine, and they had no intention of undercutting the unity of the church.[29] This, however, did not resolve the problem, and allegations continue that the Sandinistas and their allies within the church are intent on creating a schismatic church.[30] In an interview I conducted with Cardinal Obando y Bravo in 1984, he repeatedly denied the existence of such a church, although he has attacked it publicly on a number of occasions. The problem appears to arise from increasing heterodoxy within the Catholic Church in Nicaragua and elsewhere with respect to the means to accomplish socioeconomic justice, as well as the degree to which theological orthodoxy and hierarchical discipline must be maintained. These are clearly issues that do not lend themselves to rapid resolution. That

they will result in the establishment of a national church in Nicaragua appears unlikely at present.

CHURCHES AND COUNTERREVOLUTION

In both Cuba and Nicaragua there have been charges that the Catholic Church has served as the institutional base for counter-revolution. The emergence of the Cuban church as the institutional base for the opposition was amply demonstrated by the one million plus turnout at a National Catholic Congress in Habana in November 1959. This gathering assumed considerable importance in the face of the disintegration of most Cuban political parties. The significance of the meeting was confirmed by Castro's attendance at the opening session. While many of the speakers avoided political topics, the gathering came alive when the Agrupación Católica leader, José Ignacio Lasaga, ended his speech with the exhortation "Social justice yes; redemption of the workers and the farmer yes; communism no!" The crowd responded "Cuba sí, Communismo no!"[31]

One month later, Manuel Artimé, another Agrupación Católica leader, left for Miami having made contact with the CIA via a Jesuit priest. While still in Cuba he had begun organizing the counterrevolutionary group Movimiento de Recuperación Revolucionaria (MRR).[32] Eventually, he commanded the Bay of Pigs invasion force which incorporated a good number of Catholic lay leaders and three Spanish priests.

The year 1960 witnessed a spate of pastoral letters from the Cuban bishops attacking the government. On May 16, 1960, Fidel Castro's former defender Archbishop Enrique Pérez Serantes declared "We cannot say that communism is at our doors, for in reality it is within our walls, speaking out as if it were at home."[33] This resulted in a series of pro-government demonstrations in front of churches at which the revolutionaries shouted "Cuba sí, Yanqui, no." Catholics replied "Cuba sí, Russia, no."

During this period the Cuban bishops issued a series of pastoral letters attacking the legitimacy of the government and the revolution. They also stated that in any conflict with the U.S. and the USSR over Cuba, they would support the former.[34] The hierarchy emphasized their belief that since the majority of Cubans were Catholics a Marxist revolution was inappropriate. A multi-party system was strongly urged and the revolution was criticized for lacking a spiritual conception of life, a recognition of the dignity of the person, and for attempting to impose ideological orthodoxy.[35] These are all charges that have been made by individual Nicaraguan prelates, particularly Cardinal Obando y Bravo and Bishop Pablo Vega.

Similar phraseology was used in the Nicaraguan bishops' April 1984 call for a national dialogue of all the contending parties including the contras. In that pastoral letter they criticized the government for promoting:

> Materialistic conceptions of the human being (that) distort the person and teachings of Christ, reduce human beings to merely material categories without supernatural content, with the result that the human person is left subject to material forces called the "dialectic of history." Alienated from God and from themselves, people are left disoriented, without moral and religious reference points, without transcendental content, insecure and violent.[36]

They also charged that a "materialistic and atheistic educational system is undermining the consciences of our children and young people."[37] Particular condemnation was levelled at a sector of the church which the prelates alleged had "abandoned ecclesial unity and submitted to the orders of a materialistic ideology. It is sowing confusion inside and outside Nicaragua through a campaign extolling its own ideas and slandering the legitimate pastors and the faithful united with them."[38] Foreign economic and ideological exploitation was also condemned.[39]

Since 1981 thirteen clerics have been charged with counter-revolutionary acts and expelled from the country by the Nicaraguan government. The most senior of these is Bishop Pablo Vega of Juigalpa, who was expelled on July 4, 1986 on the grounds that he had repeatedly indicated support for the contras. The government cited his attendance at a forum sponsored by the Heritage Foundation in Washington in March 1986 when he met with the contra leaders Adolfo Calero and Arturo Cruz. On June 5, 1986 Bishop Vega also participated in a conference sponsored by PRODEMCA, a U.S.-based organization which supports U.S. aid to the contras. At that meeting he was reported by two pro-Sandinista newspapers to have said, "In Nicaragua there is a totalitarian Marxist-Leninist regime. Armed struggle is a human right. What remedy is left to a repressed people?"[40]

The chief spokesperson for the domestic opposition to the Sandinista government has been Cardinal Miguel Obando y Bravo. In early 1986 he met with the United Nations Secretary General, Javier Pérez de Cuellar, and the Secretary General of the Organization of the American States, João Clemente Baena Soares, to present a list of charges against the Nicaraguan government. These included allegations of harassment of church personnel and institutions, censorship of the religious media, and expulsions of foreign clergy. These charges he reiterated in an op ed piece in The Washington Post and an interview in Newsweek. Obando's

action was followed up by a letter from the Nicaraguan bishops' conference to all such conferences worldwide making similar allegations.[41] Such activities and statements have convinced the Sandinista leadership of the counterrevolutionary sentiments of the episcopacy. However, not all the Nicaraguan Catholics share the bishops' opinions, and hence the church as a whole cannot be characterized as counterrevolutionary.[42] It is also unclear to what degree the bishops' positions have generated material support for the contras.

The passage of time in Cuba has allowed for greater clarity concerning the role of the Catholic Church in the counterrevolution. In 1970 the rector of the Catholic seminary of San Carlos stated that "many priests actively supported the counterrevolutionary movements that arose, especially after the summer of 1960, and that culminated in the Bay of Pigs invasion in April, 1961. I don't know how much, but I am certain that counterrevolutionary meetings were being held on church property, and that some priests urged Catholics to take part in counterrevolutionary activities and to go into exile."[43] At the Latin American bishops' conference in Puebla, Mexico in 1979 a report from Cuban Catholics stated that in the early 1960s the hierarchy "supported...counterrevolutionary tactics, and at other times...was indifferent to them. These tactics oftentimes incorporated the use of religious symbols in an effort to penetrate the popular conscience. The right wing also used many clergy, primarily foreign, and lay leaders."[44] Mateo Jover, the President of Catholic Action in 1959, who subsequently left Cuba, characterized the conflict as not between church and state, but rather between "revolution and counterrevolution, and this latter kept making religious freedom one of its battle cries -- at least for reasons of propaganda."[45] The prime difference between the Cuban and Nicaraguan situations is that in Cuba the counterrevolutionary stance was shared by the vast majority of Catholic clergy, religious and laity. In Nicaragua Catholics are much more divided in their attitudes towards the revolution.

The unity of the Cuban Church did not, however, translate into a long-term threat to the government due to the fact that over one half of priests, religious, and lay leaders left the country by 1965.[46] Of the more than 2,500 priests and religious who left approximately 8% were expelled.[47] By 1965 some had begun to return, but to date the Catholic Church in Cuba remains seriously understaffed. In contrast the clergy and religious in Nicaragua have not left in great numbers irrespective of their political stances.

RELATIONS WITH THE VATICAN

Another difference between the Cuban and Nicaraguan

experiences has been the role of the Vatican. At the outset of the Cuban revolution Pope John XXIII counselled the Cuban episcopacy not to generate tensions with the government. In 1961 he appointed a Florentine diplomat, Monsignor Cesare Zacchi, as the papal representative in Cuba. Over the next fourteen years he worked to improve church-state relations in the face of strong opposition from within the Cuban church.[48] The strength of this opposition made any efforts at rapprochement highly suspect. Hence it was not until the late 1960s that the first steps were taken with the issuing of two pastoral letters, the first opposing the U.S. economic embargo of Cuba and the second urging Catholics to cooperate with Marxists for the common good.[49]

The process of rapprochement was closely controlled by the bishops who limited themselves to improving relations with the government rather than attempting to assert any influence over Cuban society. The latter is only now being contemplated after a five-year-long process of reflection and evaluation that resulted in a national assembly of Catholics in February 1986. A prime emphasis of the meeting was integration into Cuban society through dialogue with non-believers and participation in building a better society. The meeting concluded that this was possible since "the Christian faith which is not an ideology, can live in any political system or in any historical process. The Church in Cuba knows its specific mission is not of the political, economic or social order, but eminently religious, even though that which is religious-Christian always has a social and political dimension."[50] The Vatican encouraged the meeting at which Cardinal Eduardo Pironio, president of the Pontifical Council of the Laity, represented Pope John Paul II. During his stay in Havana Pironio discussed the possibility of a papal visit to Cuba in 1987.

Such developments are the result not only of changes in attitudes and behavior within the church, but also within the Cuban government. At a 1972 meeting with Christians for Socialism in Chile, Fidel Castro raised the possibility of strategic alliances between Marxists and Christians since he asserted "both wish to struggle on behalf of man, for the happiness of man."[51] Given the Cuban government's official position that religious beliefs are a private matter and that freedom of conscience and worship are guaranteed by the Cuban constitution (Article 54), there has been increasing space for churchpeople and institutions to operate, so long as they do not adopt a counterrevolutionary stance.

In recent years the Cuban government has consciously sought to improve relations with churches in Cuba, as well as with the Vatican. This appears to have been prompted by a desire to eliminate pockets of dissent within Cuba, improve the

government's image internationally and build alliances with progressive churchpeople worldwide. Given the Vatican's interest in promoting Catholicism in Cuba, there has been an increasing degree of cooperation between Havana and Rome.

The same cannot be said about Rome and Managua. Since 1980 Pope John Paul II has generally supported critics of the Sandinistas, particularly Cardinal Obando y Bravo. The Pope's March 4, 1983 visit to Nicaragua served not only as encouragement of the Cardinal, but also of the Sandinista opposition. As one Nicaraguan businessman phrased it:

> The Pope helped us a hell of a lot. ... That's the best thing that could have happened to us.
>
> His comment reflected a widely held assessment that the church hierarchy increasingly could become the focus of political opposition in this overwhelmingly Catholic country. Under Obando y Bravo's uncompromising leadership, it is considered more able to attract mass following than the alliance of conservative parties and business groups that constitutes the Sandinistas' tolerated political opposition.[52]

There is evidence that the Vatican's Secretariat of State under Cardinal Agustín Casaroli has sought to reduce tensions, as has the Sandinista leadership. It appears, however, that there is not sufficient flexibility either in Rome or Managua for any substantial advances.

FOREIGN INFLUENCES

The influence of the Spanish Catholic Church in Cuba at the time of the 1959 revolution was substantial. In particular, it inclined church personnel to conceive of the Cuban situation in terms of the 1930s struggle in Spain in which the Catholic Church supported Francisco Franco out of fear of Communist influences in the republican forces. The deeply rooted anti-Marxism of the Spanish clergy colored the perceptions of Cuban Catholics and gave fervor to their counterrevolutionary sentiments. It also stimulated the tendency of church personnel to leave Cuba for Spain, Latin America, or the U.S. where they were assisted by local churches. The exodus helped defuse church-state tensions and with the elimination of some of the strongest opposition elements facilitated the consolidation of the revolution.

The high degree of identification of the Cuban bourgeoisie with the United States inclined a good number of Cuban Catholics,

including the bishops, to side with the U.S. as tensions grew between the two countries. The proximity of the U.S. encouraged Cuban Catholics to take refuge there, at least until the expected U.S. invasion might overthrow the Castro government. When the Bay of Pigs failed and the Cuban government closed all private schools and the headquarters of Agrupación Católica, there was a virtual hemorrhage of Catholics leaving the country. A 1969 survey of Havana parishes estimated that 50-70% of their members had left Cuba.[53] Of 723 priests in Cuba in 1960, 220 remained in 1965. Nuns declined from 2,225 in 1960 to 191 in 1965. The chief consequence of the international links of the Cuban church was to predispose Catholics to resist the revolution and abandon the island out of fear of Marxism. By the mid-1960s the Catholic Church had lost most of its leadership and had become a refuge primarily for those who opposed the revolution, but did not emigrate abroad. It became a church for the disaffected and, as such, was marginal to the revolutionary process and Cuban society as a whole.

While the Second Vatican Council encouraged Marxist/Leninist Catholic dialogue and Christians for Socialism groups sprang up in Latin America in the late 1960s, the profundity of anti-Marxist feeling within the Catholic Church does not appear to have been appreciably diminished over the last thirty years at the level of the hierarchy. There is also strong evidence of anti-Marxist feeling among rural Catholics. In addition, identification with the U.S. has caused some churchpeople to support this country's Nicaraguan policy. The Reagan administration has used the issue of religious persecution to justify contra aid, and recent revelations indicate that some Nicaraguan churchpeople have been assisted by the U.S. government in organizing resistance to the revolution. According to the Washington Post the U.S. embassy in Managua has assisted anti-Sandinista clerics by expediting:

> multiple entry visas, normally hard to obtain, and assisted in their ticketing to the United States. One minister said the embassy helped him attend a meeting in California addressed by presidential hopeful Marion G. (Pat) Robertson and Gen. Efraín Rios Montt, former president of Guatemala, who is an evangelical and a fierce opponent of the Sandinistas.[54]

Dissident ministers also reported that the embassy has helped a national organization of pastors drawn from the Baptist, Assembly of God, and Central American Church. U.S. foreign aid funds have also gone to the Archbishopric of Managua for creation of ecclesial communities, leadership training, and overhead according to testimony before Congress by then Assistant Secretary of State

for Inter-American Affairs Thomas O. Enders and former AID official Otto Reich.[55]

Pro-revolutionary churchpeople in Nicaragua also have extensive contacts in the U.S., including with groups opposed to Reagan administration policy. These links are used to obtain funds for their projects, such as those sponsored by CEPAD, an ecumenical organization that represents over forty churches. It has been very active in cultivating support abroad for the Nicaraguan revolution via its counterpart churches. It also engages in social welfare projects. Religious orders such as the Jesuits, Maryknollers, and Capuchins have used their international networks largely in support of the revolution. Hence the Catholic Church's foreign links cannot be said to support one particular position, thereby reflecting the diversity of views within the church itself.

CONCLUSION:

This brief comparison of the reaction of the Cuban and Nicaraguan churches to revolution suggests that Catholicism has been less changed at its institutional core than many analysts have presumed. The changes stimulated by Vatican II and Medellín, together with generalized pressures in post-World War II Latin America, have resulted in some transformations in the church's theology, pastoral forms, political behavior and decision-making processes. There has not, however, been an abandonment of many traditional political beliefs and practices. Rather, as the church has traditionally done, it has adapted to its existential situation to the degree that it believes it can without jeopardizing itself as an institution. To date, the leadership of the Catholic Church, as well as a fair proportion of the faithful, perceive Marxist/Leninist governments as a threat to its existence. What is notable is that while the Catholic hierarchy in Nicaragua is determined to prevent the consolidation of a Marxist revolution, the Catholic bishops in Cuba are engaging in a dialogue to deepen the rapprochement initiated in the 1960s. The Cuban hierarchy has taken this position in spite of the fact that of all the Latin American churches theirs was the least affected by Vatican II, Medellín, liberation theology, and related developments. This suggests that while the initial reaction of the Catholic Church to revolution may be determined largely by general institutional characteristics, eventually the existential reality will determine its specific stance.

The Cuban and Nicaraguan experiences also suggest that the likelihood of a unified Catholic response to political developments is increasingly unlikely. While the Cuban church in 1959 was institutionally relatively weak, it was able to focus

and mobilize counterrevolutionary sentiment largely because of its traditional role as the prime moral legitimator within Cuban society. Although the Nicaraguan church appeared eminently stronger institutionally in 1979, the increasingly theological and political heterodoxy within the church, has diminished its capacity to mobilize its members in favor, of or against the Nicaraguan revolution. Hence, while both pro- and anti-Sandinistas adduce the church to legitimize their stances, the church as an institution does not speak with a single voice.

This further suggests that the exercise of hierarchical authority within the Cahtolic Church has become more difficult, reflecting the increased decentralization of decision-making since the 1960s. There are some who see in this, and the growing pluralism within the church, an increase in ecclesial democratizaiton. It is unclear whether such a process will be consolidated, particularly given Pope John Paul II's emphasis on reasserting orthodoxy.

The divisions within the Nicaraguan church have been attributed to Marxist penetration and credited with promoting the creation of a schismatic church. The current situation of the Nicaraguan Catholic Church is more the result of the redefinition of the role of the church which has been underway since the 1960s. In its efforts to be more responsive to critical problems of the modern world, the church increasingly emphasized identification with the struggle for socioeconomic justice, human rights, and peace. It also enunciated a preferential option for the poor. This forced the church into political and ideological struggle in regions such as Africa and Latin America and placed strains on its traditional elite alliances. While it was never the intention of the church to abandon the latter, it has been difficult to maintain them, particularly in the face of such developments as liberation theology. In the midst of the ferment generated by the church's commitment to a preferential option for the poor, it has been difficult for it to continue to promote its objectives of salvation for all and the promotion of non-conflictual societies. This is especially true given the fact that while there is general unanimity concerning broadbased goals this does not translate into agreement over how to achieve them. Hence the multiplicity of strategies supported by churchpeople to achieve socioeconomic justice, greater observance of human rights, and peace tend to conflict. Until the church transcends this, it is unlikely that the internal debate and discord will diminish.

Such ferment has not, however, caused any substantial exodus from the church. Rather it appears to have increased its image of vitality and hence its appeal, particularly to the young. This suggests that the strife within the Nicaraguan church will not necessarily diminish it. Furthermore, it is notable that

conflict within the church has not seemed to have diminished loyalty to it from all sides. Rather, there appears to be a shared belief that through the action of grace in the church such earthly conflicts will be overcome. The prevalence of this belief in Nicaragua suggests the unlikelihood of a schismatic or national church.

That such a church did not emerge in Cuba even in the face of its tremendous loss of human and material resources in the 1960s indicates further the unlikelihood of such a development. In fact, the attitude of the Cuban church leaders at the recent Encuentro Nacional Eclesial Cubano was one of optimism, particularly because of the progress made since the late 1970s in developing a theology adequate to the situation. Theology in Cuba prior to the revolution had been created in Europe or North America and had limited relevance to Cuban conditions. Pastoral forms suffered from the same deficiency. What has occurred since 1959 in Cuba has been the Cubanization of the Catholic Church, not the creation of a national church dominated by the government. Today Cuban church leaders regard that as the key to institutional resurrection.

NOTES

1. Due to limitations of space this paper will deal exclusively with the institutional Catholic Church.

2. A 1954 survey undertaken by Agrupación Católica Universitaria in Cuba indicated that only 72.5% of the population identified themselves as Catholics. Protestants had increased to 6% from 1% in 1940. Those claiming no religious affiliation constituted 19% of the population, spiritists 1%, and Jews 0.5%. While Cuba had the lowest level of Catholic identification in the 1950s, declines in number of practicing Catholics and increases in Protestants and secularism were preoccupations throughout Latin America. Agrupación Católica Universitaria, "Sobre el sentimiento religioso del pueblo de Cuba, 1954" in Manuel Fernández, Religión y Revolución in Cuba (Veinte cinco años de lucha ateista (Miami: Saeta Ediciones - Colección Realidades, 1984), p. 22; J. Merle Davis, The Cuban Church in a Sugar Economy (New York: International Missionary Council, 1942), pp. 52, 62-63.

3. Conferencia Episcopal de Nicaragua, Presencia Cristiana en la Revolución: Dos mensajes - momento insurrecional 2 de junio 1979; Iniciando la Reconstrucción, 30 de julio 1979 (Managua: Cristianos en el Mundo, Comisión, Justicia y Paz, Documentos, 1979).

4. Luis Aguilar, Cuba, 1933: Prologue to Revolution (New York: W.W. Norton, 1974), pp. 21-22; Davis, p. 49; Leslie Dewart, Christianity: The Lesson of Cuba (New York: Herder & Herder, 1963), pp. 93-99; François Houtart and André Rousseau, The Church and Revolution (Maryknoll, N.Y. Orbis, 1971), pp. 113-14: J. Lloyd Mecham, Church and State in Latin America (rev. ed.) (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966), pp. 423-24; Lowry Nelson, Rural Cuba (New York: Octagon, 1970), p. 268; Ramón E. Ruiz, Cuba: The Making of a Revolution (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1968), p. 162.

5. Houtart and Rousseau, p. 115; Agrupación Católica, p. 22; Oscar A. Echevarría Salvat, La agricultura cubana, 1934-66: Regimén social, productividad y nivel de vida de sector agrícola (Miami: Ediciones Universal, 1971), pp. 14-16; 25; René F. de la Huerta Aguiar, "Espiritismo y otras supersticiones en la población cubana," Revista del Hospital Psiquiátrico de la Habana, II 1 (enero, febrero, marzo, 1960), pp. 45-47.

6. Dewart, pp. 3, 108; Alfred L. Padula, Jr., "The Fall of the Bourgeoisie: Cuba, 1959-1961" (Doctoral Dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1974), pp. 438-39.

7. Anuario Pontificio, 1970, 1975, 1980, 1985; Statistical Abstract for Latin America; World Christian Encyclopedia.

8. In the northeastern province of Zelaya alone the Capuchins trained 900 Delegates of the Word. Philip Berryman, The Religious Roots of Rebellion: Christians in Central American Revolution (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1984), pp. 59-60; 70.

9. Ibid., pp. 72-73.

10. Conferencia Episcopal, July 30, 1979.

11. Dewart, p. 95.

12. Pablo M. Alfonso, Cuba, Castro y los Católicos (Del humanismo revolucionario al Marxismo totalitario) (Miami: Ediciones Hispanamerican Books, 1985), passim. Interview IM 5771112. In 1973, 1974, 1976, 1979, and 1984 I conducted some 60 interviews of Cuban churchpeople on the island, in Spain, and in the United States. Since some of those interviewed in Spain and Miami requested anonymity, all the interviews are designated by letter and number only.

13. It should be noted that all of the Cuban churchpeople I interviewed, clerical, religious or lay, in Cuba or abroad, agreed on these criticisms. The former Latin American Secretary of the World Council of Churches, Theo Tschuy, reported similar findings. G. Rivas, Minutes of the Cuba Sub-Group, Latin American Methodist Task Force, March 1, 1971, p. 4; United Methodist Board of Missions, Minutes of May 14, 1971 Meeting, Cuba Sub-Group, Latin American Task Force.

14. Edward Cody, "Tension Grows in Nicaragua: Sandinistas Take Harder Line," The Washington Post (March 5, 1983), pp. A1; A10.

15. Nicaraguan Episcopal Conference, "Christian Commitment for a New Nicaragua," (11/17/79), Managua, p. 2.

16. Houtart and Rousseau, p. 119; Padula, pp. 143, 449-54; Claude Julien, "Church and State in Cuba: Development of a Conflict," Cross Currents, XI, 2 (Spring, 1961), p. 187.

17. Padula, pp. 441-45.

18. Juan Pablo II, "Laicado y Educación," (4 de Marzo 1983) León, Nicaragua.

19. In 1986 there were 247 private schools in Nicaragua of which

173 were religious. Approximately ten percent of primary school students attend private schools, while about twenty-five percent of secondary students do. Government financial assistance is received by 188 private schools of which 152 are Catholic and 21 are Protestant. The remainder (15) are non-confessional. Universities are free and largely supported by the government. Statement of Ambassador Carlos Tunnerman, Nicaraguan Minister of Education, 1979-1985, New York University Law School, April 19, 1986.

20. Conferencia Episcopal Nicaraguense (CEN), Compromiso Cristiano para una Nicaragua Nueva, (11/17/79), Managua, p. 8-9.

21. Conferencia Episcopal Nicaraguense, Comunicado, (8/29/83), Managua, pp. 1-3.

22. "Clero granadino protesta: Por reclutamienito SMP," "Capturan seminaristas de Río San Juan," "Otros seminaristas reclutados," Iglesia, 1,1 (10/12/85), pp. 6-8; Margot Hornblower, "Ortega in N.Y., Defends State of Emergency," The New York Times (October 21, 1985), p. A17.

23. Interview ISM 67516.

24. Raimundo García Franco, "Pastores e la U.M.A.P.: "Diálogo e la U.M.A.P.," manuscript (February 10, 1966), pp. 1-8.

25. Padula, p. 466.

26. Piero Gheddo, "What I Saw in Cuba," LADOC `Keyhole' Series, 7 (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, nd), p. 13.

27. Eduardo Boza Masvidal and Agustín A. Román, "Declaración", (2/25/86), Miami; Wilfredo Ramírez, "The State of the Church in Cuba," Express News (3/2/86), San Antonio, Texas, pp. 1-F-8F.

28. John Paul II, "Letter to the Nicaraguan Bishops," (June 29, 1982), Rome.

29. Católicos de Nicaragua, "Carta a Juan Pablo II," (15 de Agosto de 1982), Managua, Nicaragua, Informes CAV, 15-16 (Septiembre de 1982), p. 7.

30. Alvaro José Baldizon Avilés, "Nicaragua's State Security: Behind the Propaganda Mask," The Institute on Religion and Democracy, Briefing Paper, 6 (September, 1985), pp. 1-6.

31. Julien, p. 188; Padula, pp. 458-59.

32. Julien, p. 188; Padula, p. 466.

33. Enrique Pérez Serantes as quoted in Julien, p. 188. For the full Spanish text see "Por Dios y Por Cuba," (May 16, 1960) Santiago in Ismael Teste, Historia Eclesiástica de Cuba, V (Barcelona: Artes Gráficas Medenacelli, S.A., 1975), pp. 562-68.

34. Conferencia Episcopal de Cuba, "Carta Abierta del Episcopado al Primer Ministro," (December 4, 1960), Teste, V, pp. 603-06; Enrique Pérez Serantes, "Ni Traidores, Ni Parias," (September 24, 1960), Teste, V, pp. 569-72; "Roma o Moscu," (November, 1980), Tests, V, pp. 572-77; "Con Cristo o Contra Cristo," (December 24, 1960), teste, V, pp. 585-90.

35. Dewart, pp. 298-309.

36. Nicaraguan Episcopal Conference, "Pastoral Letter on Reconciliation," (4/22/84), Managua, p. 2.

37. Ibid., p. 3.

38. Ibid., p. 3.

39. Ibid., pp. 3-4.

40. Barricada and Nuevo Diario (6/6/86). See also Marjorie Muller, "Dissident Catholic Bishop Expelled from Nicaragua," Los Angeles Times, (7/5/86), pp. I-1; 27.

41. Cardenal Miguel Obando y Bravo, "Statement to U.N. Secretary General Pérez de Cuellar, (January 21, 1986), New York, N.Y.; "Statement to OAS Secretary General, João Clemente Baena Soares," (January 23, 1986), Washington, D.C.; Conferencia Episcopal de Nicaragua, "Carta del Episcopado Nicaraguense a las Conferencias Episcopales del Mundo," (7 de julio de 1986), Managua, Nicaragua.

42. E.g., "A Word of Freedom and Christian Love Regarding the Recent Pastoral Letter by the Nicaraguan Bishops' Conference: Declaration of the Jesuit Delegate in Nicaragua with his Council of Advisers," (May 5, 1984) Managua, Nicaragua.

43. Carlos Manuel de Céspedes quoted in Antonio Benítez Rojo "Fresh Air Blows Through the Seminary," LADOC 'Keyhole' Series, 7 (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, nd), p. 53.

44. María Teresa Bolívar Arostegui, et al., "Cuban Christians and Puebla," LADOC 'Keyhole' Series, 17 (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, nd), pp. 42-43.

45. Mateo Jover, "The Cuban Church in a Revolutionary Society," LADOC IV: 32 (April, 1974), p. 21.

46. Anuario Pontificio.

47. Houtart and Rousseau, p. 124; Interview IH4714111.

48. Alfonso, passim.

49. Episcopal Conference of Cuba, "Pastoral Letter, April 10, 1969," LADOC 'Keyhole' Series 7 (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, nd).

50. Eve Gillcrist, "Cuban Catholic Encuentro Calls for Evangelism, Dialogue," NC News Service, (2/27/86), p. 2.

51. Fidel Castro, "There Are No Contradictions," p. 5.

52. Edward Cody, "Tension Grows in Nicaragua: Sandinistas Take a Harder Line," The Washington Post (March 5, 1983), pp. A1; A10.

53. Jover, p. 27.

54. James A. Gittings, "U.S. Link to Nicaraguan Churches Seen," The Washington Post, (8/30/86), pp. B7.

55. Interview with an official of the United States Catholic Conference (8/4/82), Washington, D.C.