

Romero: Person and His Charisma with the Pontiffs.

It is my intuition that 'the annunciation' is just around the corner; that is an announcement from Rome - not from the Angel Gabriel, but from the Cardinal 'Angel' (Angelo) Amato, Head of the Congregation for the Causes of the Saints - an announcement that our beloved Servant of God, Oscar Romero, will be raised to the altars during 2015. Oremus! Archbishop Romero is not only the most famous Salvadoran of our times, but also the most loved and simultaneously the most hated. Nevertheless it seems entirely fitting to me to adapt the words from Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, "he was the noblest Salvadoran of them all". Indeed today he is recognised as such, repeatedly acclaimed by President Funes as the 'spiritual guide of the nation' - with monuments and memorials in almost every town and village in El Salvador. He has been described as a national treasure. As a holy prophet and martyr, Oscar Romero is, I would suggest, a precious diamond, who adds a special redemptive lustre to the universal Church of the 20th century.

For over 30 years, however, Archbishop Romero's detractors inside the Church have tried to paint a picture of him as a rather cheap fake diamond - naïve, vain, manipulated, doctrinally heterodox and politically extreme. (In truth they feared Romero's canonisation might be interpreted as the canonisation of liberation theology.) And they are still not finished - even though their curial leader, the Colombian Cardinal Alfonso Lopez Trujillo, has now gone to that great dicastery in the sky, with God. But his Romero-phobia lives on; and a number of self-appointed Devil's Advocates¹ have continued to press the same core contention: that Romero might conceivably have been a holy man but he was definitely not a martyr for the faith. Happily, Pope Francis' impatient reference to the '*odium fidei*' issue² on the plane home from Korea seems to signal closure on the medieval quibbling in this matter.

So Romero, the Person... and His Charisma. The word charisma retains a mysterious, elusive quality. I've had in the back of my mind Max Weber's definition of charisma.

Charisma is a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which s/he is set apart.....and treated as endowed with..... exceptional powers or qualities. These are..... regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them, the individual concerned is treated as a leader.

In that case, Archbishop Romero certainly had charisma. Let's look back and see.

Through all his seminary, priestly and episcopal years, Oscar Romero embraced a lifestyle of great simplicity - and even frugality. He had humble beginnings in the Salvadoran country town of Ciudad Barrios. And throughout his life he remained close to the poor. He listened to the poor, he actually consulted the poor, he articulated their sufferings and their aspirations. It was one facet of his charisma.

Romero lived simply - but he was no simpleton; he was very intelligent and far from naïve. He showed great humility but he was not a doormat. He was open but shrewd; he was well-read, and cultured; he knew the great spiritual writers and he studied assiduously all the teaching documents that emanated from Rome. After ordination in 1942 he had even begun a doctorate in ascetics but the Second World War made it impossible for him to continue.

For me Romero was the evangeliser par excellence. He was a self-effacing man with a special gift from God; and that was his spectacular talent as a preacher. I have sat through hour-long sermons in his cathedral; the packed congregation was focused on his every word - the only interruption being their applause, the people's Amen. He unpacked the Gospel and presented it as truly good news to his people, to his poor; and then he set about making that good news a reality in their lives.

He reflected on the Word of God, he absorbed and he inhabited the Word of God - and he allowed himself to be inhabited by that Word of God; simultaneously he listened, he sensed and he inhabited the world of the poor; and he was also inhabited by that world of the poor. **Here was the core of Romero's charisma. He inhabited, and was inhabited by, the Word of God and the world of the poor.**³ Romero's homiletic style could be described as the osmosis of the Word of God into his people's ongoing history⁴.

In fact his episcopal ministry, and his very way of being and living, were a beautiful blend of orthodoxy and orthopraxis, a synthesis of right teaching and right action. A certain Joseph Ratzinger has said that orthodoxy without orthopraxis is empty and void; whilst orthopraxis without orthodoxy is blind⁵. **Romero was the man of the synthesis**⁶. His rich prayer life, when he put everything before God, was intrinsically linked with action to support and defend the poor through social projects and the legal aid office. The service of faith and the promotion of justice were intimately fused in Romero's life.

Let's now see what Pontiffs and theologians were, and are, saying posthumously about Romero.

Archbishop Romero was a 'zealous pastor' – this was the oft-repeated epithet of St John Paul II – 'a zealous pastor whose love of God and service to his brethren led him to surrender his life in a violent manner'.⁷ Contrary to the popular belief amongst the chattering classes across the Christian churches, John Paul considered Romero a martyr and he did want to beatify him. There can be little doubt of that. Others in Rome continually blocked the road to sainthood.

Pope Benedict had his epithets too. In an interview in 2007 on the plane to the CELAM assembly in Aparecida he offered a pithy summary of Romero's character: 'a credible witness of the faith', 'a man of great Christian virtue', 'who worked for peace and against the dictatorship'⁸. There then followed the unexpectedly powerful statement: 'That Romero as a person merits beatification, I have no doubt'.⁹ This last sentence was strangely cut from the interview transcript placed on the Vatican website. By these words Benedict had virtually pre-empted the convoluted saint-making process; and apparently he received criticism for this from the Romero sceptics within the Curia.

And Pope Francis? Earlier this month Pope Francis declared to journalists¹⁰ quite simply, 'For me Romero is a man of God.'

Others have said it too. Soon after Romero's assassination in 1980, the Jesuit Ignacio Ellacuría, himself later to be martyred in the massacre at the UCA¹¹, made the remarkable declaration¹²: 'With Monseñor Romero God passed through El Salvador'. Those of us who knew Ellacuría, brilliant academic, (distinguished theologian, philosopher, and political scientist) also know that he would not, and could not, speak lightly of God; still less of God and Monseñor Romero. He had written in a letter to Romero from exile in Europe: 'I have seen in your actions the finger of God'. Ellacuria never ever indulged in flattery but he went on to express his admiration for the 'glorious happenings' in the archdiocese; and he praised Romero's evangelical spirit, his clear Christian discernment, and the extraordinary leadership displayed in building unity in the People of God.¹³

What Ellacuria and subsequently his brother Jesuit, Jon Sobrino, are saying¹⁴ is that Romero was a faithful follower of Jesus Christ, a model and an example to be sure; but much more. That Romero was sent by God; he was a grace from God; he was a presence of God for those three years that he led the Church in San Salvador. He did not simply affirm and encourage his people and generate unity and hope amongst them, he 'carried' people in their faith. He

carried those around him, the base communities, clergy and religious and even intellectuals like Ellacuria and Sobrino too. They followed him. That was his charisma.

Together with Roberto Cuellar, Mgr Urioste, Fr Pelton, Tom Quigley, all here present, I too was touched by Monseñor's charisma. He gave me that unforgettable and indescribable sensation of God, the God of Jesus, at work in the world. His authenticity to the Gospel evoked our esteem and affection – and in a real sense we became his disciples. At the time of Romero's most difficult moments in 1979 I remember telling my colleagues at the Catholic Institute¹⁵ where I worked: 'Romero is a man for whom I would walk to hell and back'.

Romero's love of God and his deep relationship with God, his closeness to and his love of the poor, have to be seen together with his love of the Church, the third leg of the tripod. From minor seminary with the Claretians in San Miguel he never wavered in that love.

From the Pio Latino College in Rome, the young Romero's monthly letters home were full of joy, excitement and fascination at being so close to the epicentre of the Church's mission, observing and listening to Popes Pius XI and Pius XII there in the flesh. He quickly felt at home in Rome. Definitely for him Rome was 'the eternal city', which he grew to love and which he has described as his 'segunda patria', his second fatherland.

As the Second World War overtook Europe, Romero looked up to Pius XII with pride. He viewed him as a gentle parent and a fine diplomat, a Pontiff with great piety and great dignity.

But, strangely perhaps, it was his predecessor, the blunt-spoken no-nonsense Pontiff, Pius XI, who made the far greater and lasting impact on the young Romero - and became an early exemplar for him. Romero especially admired Pius XI's courage in standing up to the totalitarian regimes of Hitler and Mussolini. Pius XI boycotted Hitler's visit to Rome in 1938 because of the persecution of the Catholic Church in Germany. This act, Romero has suggested¹⁶, was "the greatest slap in the face that could have been given to Hitler". Perhaps no surprise then that in July 1977 Romero boycotted the installation of the new Salvadoran President, General Carlos Humberto Romero, because the persecution of the Catholic Church in El Salvador was in full swing and the death squad killers of Rutilio Grande had not been brought to justice. Pius XI had stated¹⁷ "*The Church is not involved in politics, but when politics touches the altar, the Church defends the altar.*" Romero in 1977 proclaimed¹⁸

with the same defiance "*Anyone who attacks one of my priests attacks me.*"

Romero admitted that the living example of Pius XI in Rome in those years had been more important in his formation than the whole cycle of studies he undertook there. He remained devoted to Pius XI for the rest of his life – "*this is the Pope I most admire*" he said at his tomb in St Peter's on his last visit to Rome in 1980.

That stay of six years left an indelible mark of 'Romanisation' on Romero and brought with it the flowering of an unbreakable attachment to the person of the Successor of Peter that never left him. There are declarations of his filial adhesion to the person of the Pope, going back to his first Mass in San Miguel in 1943 right up to his last weeks on earth. The difficulties that emerged between Romero and Rome, as we shall see, were not the relationship with the Pontiff himself. Rather they were with Cardinals and Monsignori in the departments inside the Vatican to whom the Pope delegates authority to act on his behalf - and for whose actions, of course, in the end, the Pope remains responsible.

Paul VI made Romero auxiliary bishop of San Salvador in 1970 and bishop of Santiago de Maria in 1974. Against all expectations, he appointed Romero archbishop in 1977 on the recommendation of Cardinal Sebastiano Baggio, the then Prefect of the Vatican's Congregation of Bishops, his name having been put forward by the Papal Nuncio in El Salvador, Archbishop Emanuele Gerada.

There had been much lobbying both in Central America and in Rome by the Catholic land-owning elite and the military government to block auxiliary Bishop Rivera Damas¹⁹, widely regarded as the natural successor to the outgoing Archbishop Chavez - and virtually anointed as such. Oscar Romero, by now appointed as a member of the Vatican's Pontifical Commission for Latin America (CAL), and therefore virtually a member of the Roman Curia himself, was seen as a solid conservative prelate. They took for granted that he would share their disdain for the social activism of the clergy and halt the church's programmes of conscientisation with the rural poor.

However, they were wrong. When the nature of Romero's option for the poor became apparent in his preaching and action following on from the assassination of Fr Grande in March 1977, they felt deceived and betrayed. The Nuncio was stung by the 'misa unica'²⁰, the 'single mass' which he had strongly opposed. And the outcry from the wealthy classes against Romero began from then.

Over the next three years letters and telegrams from the famous fourteen families poured into Rome, and they went in particular to the self-same Cardinal Baggio, who had heeded their opposition to Rivera's appointment and whom they considered their friend. Amazingly, it turns out, Baggio had served as a young diplomat in the Nunciature in San Salvador between 1938 and 1940 and would therefore have met and known personally the distinguished Catholic families that ran the country and owned the bulk of its land. Gerada, the inexperienced Nuncio of Romero's times, frequently echoed their complaints in his dispatches to Rome - and he thereby gave them credibility. Later as the hostility from four of Romero's episcopal colleagues (Aparicio²¹, Alvarez²², Barrera²³, and Revelo²⁴) became open and virulent they added dramatically to the antagonistic traffic of protest and denunciation to Rome, seeking to have Romero removed as archbishop.

So the first of four visits to Rome by Archbishop Romero came at the end of March 1977. He went to explain to Paul VI and the Vatican authorities the full story of Rutilio Grande's killing, the 'misa unica' and the measures taken by the diocese, and the implications of this first government-sponsored killing of a priest in El Salvador. It was a successful visit from Romero's perspective. He met in private audience with Paul VI. He presented the Pope and the Secretariat of State with an impressive dossier containing detailed descriptions and a comprehensive analysis of the events. The Pope listened to him and with great warmth took both of Romero's hands in his and urged him "Courage! Take heart. You are the one in charge".

Romero was thrilled, heartened, and overjoyed. He had received the full backing of the Pontiff. A meeting with Archbishop Casaroli and Mgr Silvestrini at the Secretariat of State also went off reasonably well, but with exhortations to prudence. However, perhaps as a sign of things to come, the meeting at the Congregation of Bishops with Cardinal Baggio was less satisfactory - with, it would seem, Romero being lectured about his episcopal responsibilities by one of Baggio's assistants.

Over the next twelve months the situation in El Salvador worsened significantly. Romero's preaching and teaching but above all his prophetic denunciation of the atrocities and exploitation became a major issue. He was alongside his people supporting them in their suffering and trauma and seeking social and economic change and an end to repression. He was validating many of the demands coming from the popular organisations - and seeking non-violent solutions yet always pointing to the prior institutionalised violence

that lay beneath the crises. Not surprisingly, this infuriated the army and the landed oligarchy.

In May 1978 Romero received a summons to Rome from Cardinal Baggio²⁵ who referred to the quite unprecedented volume of correspondence and complaints that he was receiving regarding Romero and the archdiocese of San Salvador. Romero was asked to bring definitive clarification of the dangerous situation pertaining - always of course "in a fraternal and amicable dialogue". Accompanied by Bishop Rivera²⁶, his sole episcopal ally, and Mgr Urioste, his Vicar General, Archbishop Romero saw it as a great opportunity to be able to respond to the avalanche of misinformation going to Rome and to lay to rest the false accusations being made by Aparicio and the other bishops, so often underwritten by the Nuncio.

Although Romero's diary skips quickly over this meeting, the nine-page memorandum-letter he wrote to Cardinal Baggio immediately afterwards²⁷, summarising the issues that had been raised, clearly indicates he had been faced with a veritable charge sheet of misdeeds to answer and he felt "pejorative judgments had been made". It clearly pained and distressed him that wild allegations and pernicious distortions of the facts of events, made by those who wished to discredit his apostolic effort, were actually being believed²⁸. It was not exactly the brotherly and friendly conversation he had been invited to. There were substantive and sometimes difficult discussions too in the Congregation for Education and the Secretariat of State during this visit - but nothing like this encounter with Baggio.

The next day, June 21st 1978, was a new dawn. Romero had his second private audience with Paul VI. In an utterly different tone Paul VI had clearly discounted the briefings from Baggio and others "I already know" he said "that not everyone thinks like you do, and I know it is difficult in the circumstances of your country to have this unanimity of thinking. Nevertheless proceed with courage, with patience, with strength, with hope." It was another unforgettable experience for Romero, "a breath of the spirit", he said, which brought him "confirmation of my faith and my service and great joy in my working and suffering with Christ - for the Church and for our people". If Tuesday with Baggio had brought mild depression, Wednesday with the Paul VI brought Romero great 'consolation' in the Ignatian sense. As he departed Rome he said "I have felt the Pope so close. I leave grateful to him because my heart, faith, and spirit continue to be nourished by this rock where the unity of the Church is felt so palpably."²⁹

Paul VI died within a few weeks in that 'Year of Three Popes'. By the end of October we had John Paul II, the Pope from Poland.

In the meantime the divisions amongst the Salvadoran bishops became still sharper and more scandalous. A lengthy joint pastoral letter³⁰ issued by Romero together with Bishop Rivera, discussing and analysing the political organisations and the response of the Church, was followed two days later by a riposte from the other four bishops in the form of a brief statement taking an almost diametrically opposed position. The half-hidden split in the body of bishops was thereby advertised for all to see. Together with the Nuncio and Cardinal Mario Casariego from neighbouring Guatemala they intensified the pressure to have Romero removed.

Very soon after the new Pope's installation, therefore, knowing that John Paul had little or no knowledge of Central America and acutely aware of the suspicion and the negative judgments that prevailed in key departments of the Roman Curia, on November 7th 1978 Romero wrote a private letter to John Paul. It was bold and simple - but probably ill-advised. He spoke bluntly, but in confidence, opening his heart to the new Pope and outlining with great frankness all the problems he faced and the fears he had in the diocese and the tricky issue of the Nuncio's stances and the total rejection he faced from four fellow bishops.

In December he discovered that an Apostolic Visitor, Argentinian Bishop Antonio Quarracino, was in the country - sent by Cardinal Baggio to assess the pastoral work of the diocese. It did not augur well. Romero gave every help and assistance but he probably underestimated its significance. It was a deadly serious inspection not only of the diocese but of Romero himself. Quarracino seemed to recognise Romero played an honourable role as a committed pastor amidst the horrendous challenges he faced. Yet his report to Rome included a suggestion that Romero's powers might be transferred to an apostolic administrator '*sede plena*' with Romero left simply as a figurehead with the title of archbishop. In other words it would be his effective removal from office - which is precisely what his four fellow bishops and the traditional Catholic families had been trying to engineer.

Archbishop Romero went to Rome in May 1979 for his third visit and after a lot of obstructionism from curial officials he finally got to see John Paul II. His experience of a persecuted Church in Poland and the crucial importance, in facing up to the Communist regime, of a united Bishops' Conference standing shoulder to shoulder, with a common approach to government and political issues, was at the front of John Paul's mind. He would have a lot of questions for

Romero - so publically at odds with four of his fellow bishops and accused by them of giving succour to Marxist organisations.

John Paul listened carefully as Romero sought to explain the context of Catholic El Salvador where human rights violations were largely, although not exclusively, the responsibility of the right - and as he tried to find words to describe the intransigence of his episcopal brethren. It was a difficult and tense exchange; but there was no rebuke. John Paul told Romero of Quarracino's recommendation and, not for the first time, Archbishop Romero offered to resign if that were the Holy Father's wish. We cannot know exactly what was said between them. But it is clear that in his response Romero convinced John Paul of his unbreakable fidelity and the integrity of his actions - and Quarracino's proposal was put aside.

John Paul's guidance to Romero was that he be more general and less specific in his words of denunciation and that especially he should strive anew for unity with the other bishops. 'Courage and boldness tempered with the necessary balance and prudence' were the words that Romero took away. It was a very basic affirmation for him and his ministry - but Romero had naturally hoped for a more unequivocal endorsement in the style of Paul VI or such as he received from Cardinals Hume, Marty, Suenens, Pironio, and Lorscheider, from the Jesuit General, Pedro Arrupe - and subsequently from Opus Dei's Prelate, Alvaro del Portillo.

There can be no denying that Romero was left feeling sad, and momentarily disheartened, after this particular encounter with the Pope. And he became periodically depressed when he reflected on how much the tendentious accusations about his pastoral work seemed to have influenced the Pope. But it did not destabilize him. As he absorbed it he placed it before God - and it took him some time to be able to put it into its proper context for his continuing ministry in San Salvador. But he did so.

And in regard to the unity of the Bishops' Conference: he acted. Despite their outrageous allegations, in writing to Rome, that he was supporting cold-blooded Marxist-Leninist criminals, blessing terrorism and defaming the government, he made a fresh approach to the other bishops for a united stance in the country's crisis. Once more their intense personal animosity towards him prevailed. They told him that he was responsible for most of the country's and the church's troubles - and his overtures were rejected.

Without Paul VI's extensive experience of the Latin American Church, John Paul II had little alternative but to rely on the briefings he received from Cardinal Baggio and the Secretariat of State - and

in Romero's case he was clearly mis-briefed. But John Paul had listened and had heard Romero; and soon afterwards the tone of the exchanges with the Congregation of Bishops and the Nuncio softened noticeably. Romero's visit had had an impact he did not appreciate at the time. John Paul's Secretary and closest confidante, Mgr (now Cardinal) Stanislaus Dziwisz, has said "After that meeting John Paul was so convinced of Romero's arguments that he always defended him in the ranks of the Curia". To some that may seem like re-writing history but it's what is written in his book³¹.

At the end of 1979 Brazilian Cardinal Aloisio Lorscheider travelled to San Salvador to see Romero. It was not a canonical visitation in the strict sense but a fact-finding mission on behalf of the Holy See. He later wrote of the visit "I saw how much Archbishop Romero was committed to his people and the force and authenticity of his witness. He was a true shepherd who was ready to give his life for his sheep." Lorscheider's exceedingly positive report to Rome helped ensure a very different, more cordial, reception for Romero at his second meeting with John Paul in January 1980.

At that meeting there was straight talking and probably testing moments too - and Romero recounted the meeting in a homily ten days later. "He (*the Pope*) did not scold me as some have said but rather it was a dialogue about criteria, like when Paul went up to Jerusalem to speak with Peter about the content of his preaching." At the end of the meeting, John Paul had embraced Romero and told him that he prayed every day for El Salvador. Romero wrote "I felt here God's confirmation and his force for my poor ministry," This was Romero's considered judgment - and Romero did not tell lies.

His meetings with Paul VI gave Romero full affirmation and great joy; with John Paul II there was, undeniably, a certain ambiguity. The meetings gave him the basic affirmation he was seeking which brought him joy, but perhaps I could describe it as two-dimensional, rather than three-dimensional, joy; it was joy tinged with sadness.

Romero wrote soon after his appointment³² "My new post seems to have put me on the road to Calvary". On that *Via Crucis* many things brought him pain and desolation but I have not the slightest doubt that the attitudes and behaviours of the four brother bishops and the Papal Nuncio were his crown of thorns. He spoke about it to me and to many others: the bishops' resentments, their trickery and dishonesty, their abusive language towards him, their outrageous accusations, their plotting behind his back with the military, their seeming indifference to human rights atrocities and

their wilful blindness to the reality of the persecution of the Church even after six priests and dozens of catechists had been murdered.

Maltese Archbishop Gerada, in his first posting as a Nuncio, revealed a blinkered concern to maintain warm diplomatic relations between the Holy See and the Salvadoran regime which he thought Romero was sabotaging. Essentially he took the side of 'the gang of four' who as a result became ever more extreme and unyielding. Romero was hurt and upset but he was not intimidated by the Nuncio's approach. He never confused the person of the Holy Father with his diplomatic representative in San Salvador. In earlier years Romero had become acquainted with the workings of the Nunciature and he had confided that he felt very much at home there. This was because as a highly articulate priest he had been enlisted to draft the speeches of the then Nuncio, Bruno Torpigliani - and he prepared over thirty such texts for visits and events in El Salvador and Guatemala!

Amongst the 'gang of four', as a journalist I met Bishop Aparicio at Puebla in 1979; and I was the interviewer to whom he made his preposterous claims and allegations about Romero and the Jesuits; I know too that he plotted with the military to try to stop Romero's Nobel Peace Prize nomination, but apparently the military used to say of him derisively 'If you give him a morsel he always wags his tail'.

Another was Bishop Alvarez, or Colonel Alvarez. He refused to protest after one of his own priests was tortured by the security forces adding that he was not tortured because he was a priest but because he was subversive. There were similar breath-taking statements from Bishops Barrera and Revelo. Having examined some of their correspondence with Romero I came to the reluctant conclusion - which I believe is the kindest possible explanation of their words and deeds - that all four were very probably mentally unstable. They, not Romero, should have been brought to order and retired. Instead they were treated by Cardinal Baggio and his colleagues in Rome, by the Nuncio and by Bishop Lopez Trujillo at CELAM in Bogota, as if they were loyal and orthodox prelates whilst Romero was viewed as the black sheep. An impression was created and widely disseminated by the oligarchy-controlled media in El Salvador that Romero was an archbishop out on a limb, something of an embarrassment to the Vatican and the hierarchical Church. And when perceived this way by the military and those wealthy families who bankrolled their death squads - then the unthinkable became just about thinkable. And the nuclear option was on the table.

Furthermore, Romero knew it. He was under unimaginable pressure and in great danger with the country teetering on the brink of civil war. Whilst firmly rejecting bodyguards and body armour³³, Romero craved the comprehension and solidarity of his fellow bishops and he longed for moral support from the Nuncio, the official intermediary of the Vatican with the Salvadoran regime. But these were not forthcoming.

And on March 24th 1980, Oscar Romero, the sacrament of God's love, went like a lamb to the slaughter; it was a life freely given not a life snatched away. He was certainly a martyr to the option for the poor. But I believe it can also be argued that he was a martyr to the teaching of the magisterium of the Church - which he lived and preached with absolute loyalty and amazing charisma right up to his very last breath. Santo subito!

¹ For example Msgr Richard Antall. <http://www.firstthings.com/web-exclusives/2013/10/oversimplifying-oscar-romero> also Fr Alberto Royo Mejía <http://www.famillechretienne.fr/croire/l-eglise-et-son-histoire/mgr-oscar-romero-une-cause-de-beatification-mouvementee-149040>

² <http://www.zenit.org/en/articles/vatican-approved-transcript-of-pope-francis-airborne-press-conference-from-korea>

³ I am greatly indebted to Fr Enda McDonagh for this form of expression

⁴ Bartolomeo Sorge SJ: La Herencia de Monseñor Romero. RFS - Revista de Fomento Social 60 (2005)

⁵ 'On the Way to Jesus Christ' Joseph Ratzinger, Ignatius Press. See Chapter 7.

⁶ Bartolomeo Sorge SJ, *ibid*

⁷ On the first visit to El Salvador, March 1983.

⁸ http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2007/may/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20070509_interview-brazil_en.html

⁹ <http://ncronline.org/news/day-one-transcript-news-conference-aboard-papal-plane>

¹⁰ <http://www.zenit.org/en/articles/vatican-approved-transcript-of-pope-francis-airborne-press-conference-from-korea>

¹¹ Universidad Centroamericana José Simeon Cañas – the Jesuit University in San Salvador

¹² At a mass soon after Romero's death. *Revista Latinoamericana de Teología* n. 65, pp. 117-137.

¹³ Jon Sobrino writes that discernment before God (and only before God) is difficult but not impossible for a member of the ecclesiastical hierarchy given the special obedience/loyalty that is owed to superiors in the hierarchy. Romero harnessed them together comfortably.

¹⁴ 'El impacto de Monseñor Romero en Ignacio Ellacuría', Jon Sobrino, *Revista Latinoamericana de Teología* n.90, pp. 195-212.

¹⁵ Catholic Institute for International Relations (CIIR) in London. Now re-named 'Progressio'.

¹⁶ Homily, Sunday September 3, 1978.

¹⁷ See Homily, Sunday May 8, 1977.

¹⁸ 'Misa Unica' Homily, Sunday March 20, 1977.

¹⁹ Bishop Rivera Damas attended Vatican II and served as Archbishop Chavez's trusted right-hand man

²⁰ In response to Rutilio Grande's assassination Archbishop Romero cancelled all the masses in the diocese on Sunday March 20 1977 except for a single mass which celebrated in front of the cathedral.

²¹ Bishop of San Vicente

²² Bishop of San Miguel and the Military Ordinary.

²³ Bishop of Santa Ana

²⁴ Auxiliary Bishop of San Salvador

²⁵ Letter dated 16 May 1978

²⁶ By now, Bishop of Santiago de Maria; and after Romero's death Archbishop of San Salvador

²⁷ Dated 24 June 1978

²⁸ 'Oscar Romero - bishop and martyr' James Brockman, Orbis Books, pp115-119.

²⁹ 'A Shepherd's Diary' See entry for 29 June 1978.

³⁰ 'La Iglesia y las Organizaciones Politicas Populares' 6 August 1978

³¹ 'Ho Vissuto con un Santo,' Book in Italian (2013) by Cardinal Dziwisz in conjunction with Gian Franco Svidereschi.

³² Letter to Bishop Alfonso Lopez Trujillo, 23 March 1977 in reply to his of 4 March.

³³ "Why should the shepherd have protection when his sheep are still prey to wolves?"