

For the freedom to profess
religion in the contemporary
world.

Counteracting the causes
of discrimination and helping
the persecuted based on the example
of Christians



Carlos A. Casanova

PERSECUTION OF CHRISTIANS IN LATIN AMERICA: THE CASES OF CHILE AND VENZUELA

[Work for the Institute of Justice]
Warsaw 2019

Content

INTRODUCTION / 3

CHAPTER ONE CHILE / 5

1. Repressive tolerance / 5
2. The Legalization of Intolerance Against Catholics / 9
 - A) The *right* to have an abortion (2017–2018) / 10
 - B) Gender ideology (2018) / 13
 - C) “Non discrimination” (2012) / 14
3. Legislation Against Catholic Education / 15
 - A) The *law* which nearly has put an end to subsidiarity in Chilean education / 16
 - B) Norms on religious teaching in schools, combined with the admissions system to higher education / 16
- 4) The Situation of Catholics Precisely Understood at the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile / 17
 - A) Body of Quasi-Norms Which Clashes with the Most Basic Norms Applicable to the Catholic University / 17
 - (a) “Guidelines and recommendations to the Academic Body for Prevention of Deeds of Sexual Violence Against the Students” (May 2018) / 17
 - (b) Agreements Between the Superior Council of the PUC and Subversive Groups of Feminist Students Which Violently Hijacked the University in May 2018 / 19
 - B) Some cases of persecution against Catholics within the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile / 20

CHAPTER TWO VENEZUELA / 24

1. The Decapitation of the Venezuelan Church. / 25
 - A) The war of Independence. / 25
 - B) The *Conservative* rule / 25
 - C) The Liberal-Positivist rule / 26
 - D) Venezuela after 1901 / 27
2. The imposition of the Black Legend Against the Knowledge and Opinion of Venezuelan Best Professional Historians / 31
 - A. First Stage: Guzmán and the influence of Positivism / 31
 - B. Second Stage: the influence of Marxism during the Republican life of Venezuela / 32
 - C. Third stage: the influence of Marxism under Communist tyranny / 33
 - a. *Currículo del subsistema de educación primaria de Venezuela* (September 2007), by the *Ministerio del Poder Popular para la Educación* under the Minister, Adán Chávez Frías / 34
 - b. *Curriculo del subsistema de educación media de Venezuela* (September 2007), by the *Ministerio del Poder Popular para la Educación* under the Minister, Adán Chávez Frías / 36
 - c. The implementation of the *curricula* / 39

CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSALS / 40

Bibliography / 41

ANNEX / 44

INTRODUCTION

This research has as its purpose to unveil the persecution of Catholics in Venezuela and in Chile, in the hope that it will be helpful to understand analogous forms of persecution in other countries. In order to finely understand the persecution of the last centuries, we need to start with a careful definition of what must be understood by “Catholic.” The Councils of Trent, First and Second Vatican will be our guide on this matter.

By “Catholic” we understand a person who accepts as object of Faith the full contents of divine Revelation as they are contained in the Bible and in Tradition and as they have been defined by the solemn Magisterium of the Church.¹

By the Bible we understand the Sacred books according to the ancient canon of the Catholic Church, authoritatively defined during the Council of Trent against the Rabbis’ and Protestant’s changes in the canon during the first and sixteenth centuries after the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ. By “Tradition” we understand the handing down of the teachings of our Lord by His disciples in an oral way. The privileged witnesses of this tradition are the Fathers of the Church. By the Fathers we understand the holy and wise writers of the first centuries of Christianity, up to the time of John of Damascus. According to the Council of Trent, the unanimous witness of the Fathers is a criterion about what is certainly contained in the Tradition. By the solemn Magisterium we understand what has been dogmatically defined by the Ecumenic Councils in communion with the Successor of Peter or by the Successor of Peter himself, in matters of faith or morals and using the authority of the keys given to him and to the body of the successors of the Apostles by Christ Himself. According to the Second Vatican Council, it must be remembered, the Magisterium is not the Master of the Revelation but its servant. That is to say, the work of the Magisterium is not to create any doctrine, but to clarify what was taught by Christ and is contained in the deposit of Revelation.

These definitions are indispensable today, because often one finds professors of theology, clerics and even Pastors and bishops and cardinals who appear as Catholic but oppress those persons who accept as object of Faith the full contents of divine Revelation. This is due to the latest shapes which persecution has taken.

Our investigation, as follows from what has been said, will have two chapters, one centered on Chile and one centered on Venezuela.

[¹] This definition does not encompass all the notes of a Catholic and a good Catholic, but it does contain an essential note without which no one can be called “Catholic” in truth.

1. In Chile the main form of persecution is a campaign of repressive tolerance connected with gender ideology and with “ecumenism.” This campaign has led to the persecution of Catholics in secular and in Church institutions, especially in the Dioceses of Santiago.

2. In Venezuela, besides abundant examples of classical bloody persecution (which I will mention and document to some extent), the persecutors have used deeper means. In the 19th century virtually all the centers of higher culture of the Church were violently closed, mostly but not only by Antonio Guzmán Blanco. Even the seminaries and the public schools of Theology and Philosophy. Due to this, the Catholic people have survived up to now, but deprived of the highest culture. This laid the foundation for the aspect I mostly want to stress: the deep distortion of historiography which tries to hide everything that Venezuela owes to the Church (its very foundation and existence) and everything that Catholics have done in all its history, including the history posterior to the Independence. The measures taken to accomplish this go from the taking over of the Ministry of Education by Marxists, to the physical destruction of books (more than a million in 2007 from the libraries of the State of Miranda).

We will finish our investigation suggesting some measure which should be taken in order to stop the subtler forms of persecution which we find in Venezuela and Chile. Such measures are, as we shall understand at the end of this investigation, the following:

(1) To install in Chile some kind of a really Catholic Institution which could transmit the teachings of the Solemn Magisterium of the Church even against the opposition within the Church (mostly from some religious orders).

(2) To make available to all electronic publications of the abundant sources which show the huge contributions of the Church and of Christians throughout the history of Venezuela. (We could suggest what sources and how). Also, to strive to make campaigns within the country to inform the people and in this way defeat the censure imposed by the government.

CHAPTER ONE

CHILE

The kind of persecution that mainly exists in Chile has to do with the enforcement of a false ecumenism, heterodoxy and gender ideology. Such persecution comes from without the Church but often it comes from within as well. We will first briefly study the theory behind this kind of persecution and later we will expound on the implementation of such theory through the feminist and pro-gender legislation which has been put in place by the increasingly secularist State and through the legislation put in place by the government in order to exclude Catholicism from the educational system, public and/or private. After this, we will demonstrate that some traces of the ideology which the said legislation transpires has crept into the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile. Regarding the latter point, we will first present here some documents, norms and lines which the authorities of the university have issued, and then we will sketch some particular cases in which professors or students have suffered persecution for being Catholic in the sense defined above.

1. Repressive tolerance

Such words are the title of a well-known book chapter written by Herbert Marcuse in 1965 and 1968. There and then Marcuse postulated that the masses in the Western world were too influenced by “regressive doctrines” to be able to be “sovereign” and “self-ruled.” A careful reading reveals that he conflates within the label of “regressive doctrines” fascism, Nazism and Christianity. Of course, this conflation is typical of Marxist writers and preposterous, since the Catholic Church critically confronted all the Totalitarian ideologies while the Communists formed a pact with the Nazis thanks to which the Second World War started, when the Nazi and Communist powers were unleashed upon Catholic Poland. But such is the rhetorical strategy of those who accept the “Theses on Feuerbach” contained in *The German Ideology* by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: words do not intend to convey the truth as correspondence between intellect and reality,² words are weapons which intend to change the world. Words are revolutionary.

[²] The strategy to do this is to claim that partial truth is no truth at all, because the truth lies in the whole. This makes Marcuse’s wild claims sound plausible, but the real background is Hegelian, that is to say, a direct negation of the possibility to acquire real intellectual knowledge of things existing in the real world. Kant claimed that we cannot know *the thing in itself* and Hegel deepened this view. Marcuse, following Marx, is in that tradition. See “Repressive Tolerance”, pp. 83, 90–91, 98, 113. In p. 122, in a discrete

Since the masses are so influenced, then, by Christianity and the sense of “real reality” (not “ideological reality”) they must be subjected to a dictatorship and a process of thorough indoctrination. Since no class, not even the proletariat, is carrying the revolution forward, revolutionary activity must rely on “perverted” persons. They will constitute the minorities who are to carry “forward” the revolution. We are going to read some relevant passages. But we must keep in mind that since 1968 the strategy laid down by Marcuse has been effectual. He proposes that the masses be indoctrinated, and now the masses are being indoctrinated. Marcuse’s plan has been largely implemented:

Because of the tolerance then existent, in 1965 [...] *minorities which strive for social change of the whole itself [...] will be left harmless and helpless in the face of the overwhelming majority, which militates against qualitative social change. This majority is firmly grounded in the increasing satisfaction of needs, and technological and mental coordination, which testify to the general helplessness of radical groups in a well-functioning social system.*³

[...] *it is necessary to break the established universe of meaning (and the practice enclosed in this universe) [...].*⁴ Marcuse states this because, according to him, in 1965 the masses were too much under the influence of “regressive” movements, that is to say, of Christianity.

*The people [exposed to the liberal indoctrination...] would have to get information slanted in the opposite direction. For the facts are never given immediately and never accessible immediately; they are established, ‘mediated’ by those who made them; the truth, ‘the whole truth’ surpasses these facts and requires rupture with their appearance.*⁵ Not only should the people receive “slanted” information, they should be indoctrinated but by “progressive movements.”⁶

[...] *the ways should not be blocked on which a subversive majority could develop, and if they are blocked by organized repression and indoctrination, their reopening may require apparently undemocratic means. They would include the withdrawal of toleration of speech and assembly from groups and movements which promote aggressive policies, [...]. Moreover, the restoration of freedom of thought may necessitate new and rigid restrictions on teachings and practices in the educational institutions which, by their methods and concepts, serve to enclose the mind within the established universe of discourse and behavior – thereby precluding a priori a rational evaluation of alternatives. [...] I shall presently discuss the question as to who is to decide on the distinction between liberating and repressive, human and inhuman teaching and practices [...].*⁷

The aim is: *total revolution.*⁸

*In terms of historical function, there is a difference between revolutionary and reactionary violence, between violence practiced by the oppressed and by the oppressors. In terms of ethics, both forms of violence are inhuman and evil –but since when is history made in accordance with ethical standards?*⁹ Thus, Marcuse holds that there is a real violence in the existence of the police and judiciary system which apply punishments against those actions which “regressive” doctrines see as “crimes.” That is to say, Marcuse is criminalizing the existence of a legal system with natural Law and Christian moral coordinates. He denounces that as “regressive” and “repressive.” But he wants to replace such “violence” with “revolutionary, progressive violence.”

and indirect way, Marcuse subscribes Marx’s *dictum*: truth does not lie in knowing how the world is but truth lies in transforming it. In R.P. Wolff, B. Moore Jr and H. Marcuse, *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1969, pp. 81–123.

[3] “Repressive Tolerance,” p. 94.

[4] “Repressive Tolerance,” p. 98.

[5] “Repressive Tolerance,” p. 99.

[6] “Repressive Tolerance,” p. 104.

[7] “Repressive Tolerance,” pp. 100–101.

[8] “Repressive Tolerance,” p. 102.

[9] “Repressive Tolerance,” p. 103.

[...] it is possible to identify policies, opinions, movements which would promote this change [of “a satisfaction of needs which does not feed on poverty, oppression, and exploitation”], and those which would do the opposite. Suppression of the regressive ones is a prerequisite for the strengthening of the progressive ones. [...] It seems that the violence emanating from the rebellion of the oppressed classes broke the historical continuum of injustice, cruelty and silence for a brief moment [...]. The English civil wars, the French Revolution, the Chinese and the Cuban Revolutions may illustrate the hypothesis.¹⁰ In contrast, the one historical change from one social system to another, marking the beginning of a new period in civilization, which was not sparked and driven by an effective movement ‘from below,’ namely the collapse of the Roman Empire in the West, brought about a long period of regression for long centuries, until a new, higher period of civilization was painfully born in the violence of heretic revolts of the thirteenth century and in the peasant and laborer revolts of the fourteenth century.¹¹

Nota bene that Marcuse identifies as the one example of regressive movement none less than the Christendom as long as it was true to Orthodox Christianity. Of course, he is helped by the long centuries in which the so called “humanists” and the so called “enlightened” thinkers have slandered the Latin Christendom and have “Christened” it as the “Middle Ages.” In the same work, in the paragraph which follows the cited one, Marcuse links Christianity to Fascism and Nazism. From that point on he identifies them as “the Right.” But, let us resume the transcription of relevant passages:

*Liberating tolerance, then, would mean intolerance against movements from the Right, and toleration of movements from the Left. As to the scope of this tolerance: ... it would extend to the stage of action as well as of discussion and propaganda, of deed as well as of word. The traditional criterion of clear and present danger is no longer adequate to a stage where the whole society is in the situation of the theater audience when somebody cries ‘fire.’ It is a situation in which the total catastrophe could be triggered off any moment, not only by a technical error, but also by a rational miscalculation of risks, or by a rash speech of one of the leaders.*¹²

*The whole post-fascist period is one of clear and present danger. Consequently, true pacification requires the withdrawal of tolerance before the deed, at the stage of communication in word, print, and picture. Such extreme suppression of the right of free speech and free assembly is indeed justified if the whole of society is in extreme danger. I maintain that our society is in such an emergency situation, and that it has become the normal state of affairs. Different opinions and ‘philosophies’ can no longer compete peacefully for adherence and persuasion on rational grounds: the ‘marketplace of ideas’ is organized and delimited by those who determine the national and the individual interest.*¹³

*The conditions under which tolerance can again become a liberating and humanizing force have still to be created. When tolerance mainly serves the protection and preservation of a repressive society [...] then tolerance has been perverted. And when this perversion starts in the mind of the individual, in his consciousness, his needs, when heteronomous interests occupy him before he can experience his servitude, then the efforts to counteract his dehumanization must begin at the place of entrance, there where the false consciousness takes form (or rather: is systematically formed) –it must begin with stopping the words and images which feed this consciousness.*¹⁴

To the degree to which this development is actually impeded by the sheer weight of a repressive society ad the necessity of making a living in it, repression invades the academic enterprise itself, even prior to all restrictions on academic freedom.”¹⁵ Here Marcuse is laying the ground for the suppression of academic

[¹⁰] Marcuse’s essay shows an ascription to Chinese Communism and an apparent rejection of the current state of the Soviet Union (in 1965), although it shows admiration for the Soviet revolution. It might be that the echoes of Solzhenitsyn’s testimony forced the Marxists to change the strategy and their real or apparent allegiance.

[¹¹] “Repressive Tolerance,” pp. 105–106.107.108.

[¹²] “Repressive Tolerance,” p. 109.

[¹³] “Repressive Tolerance,” pp. 109–110.

[¹⁴] “Repressive Tolerance,” p. 111.

[¹⁵] “Repressive Tolerance,” p. 113.

freedom because, according to him, it is vitiated due to its presupposition of the actual history of humanity, which is nothing less than “the development of oppression. He suggests that even just narrating the historical facts “objectively,” is oppressive because the narrated facts are so.¹⁶

Marcuse is a Marxist, there is no doubt about that. But, he realizes that the “proletariat” can no longer be the instrument of revolution because the condition of the proletariat has improved too much in Europe and the USA. This is why he says:

The forces of emancipation cannot be identified with any social class which, by virtue of its material condition, is free from false consciousness. Today, they are hopelessly dispersed throughout the society, and the fighting minorities and isolated groups are often in opposition to their own leadership.¹⁷

For this reason, Marcuse starts to veer in a very relevant direction. He needs to find a different revolutionary yeast since the proletariat no longer works for Marxists: *In a world in which the human faculties and needs are arrested or perverted, autonomous thinking leads into a ‘perverted world’: contradiction and counter-image of the established world of repression. [...] a large scale movement is under way against the evils of repression and the need for being oneself. [...] Freud well knew the difference between progressive and regressive, liberating and destructive repression.¹⁸*

Sexually perverted minorities, according to the standards of the “regressive doctrines,” will be the carriers of Revolution. The new elites will be propped up by such minorities. This is the soul of his post-script of 1968:

[...] the majority is no longer justified in claiming the democratic title of the best guardian of the common interest. And such a majority is all but the opposite of Rousseau’s ‘general will’: it is composed of individuals who have effectively identified their private interests with their political functions.¹⁹

If the final democratic criterion of the declared opinion of the majority no longer (or rather not yet) prevails, if vital ideas, values, and ends of human progress no longer (or rather not yet) enter, as competing equals, the formation of public opinion, if the people are no longer (or rather not yet) sovereign but “made” by the real sovereign powers—is there any alternative other than the dictatorship of an “elite” over the people? For the opinion of people (usually designated as The People) who are unfree in the very faculties in which liberalism saw the roots of freedom: independent thought and independent speech, can carry no overriding validity and authority –even if The People constitute the overwhelming majority.²⁰

So, Marcuse has proposed a discriminating tolerance which will tolerate what is perverted according to the traditional moral standards and will not tolerate Christians, especially Catholics in the sense explained above. This is the *quid*. He in two occasions praises the Albigensian movement and deplors its suppression: ²¹ he is giving us a hint, because the Albigensians, as much as Marx himself, proposed the total abolition of the family and familiar relations.²² And this is what Marcuse wants to use as the lever for Revolution: to promote what is perverse in order to totally destroy Christianity and to indoctrinate the masses with an anti-Christian ideology which presents itself as “tolerant.”

This is the ideological framework behind the set of “norms” and “principles” which we are about to examine and which have been promulgated (2)-(3) in Chile and (4) even at the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile. It is also the main ideology behind the persecution of individual Christians, the experience of some of which we are going to summarize here (5).

[16] *Ibidem*.

[17] “Repressive Tolerance,” pp. 111–112.

[18] “Repressive Tolerance,” pp. 112.114.

[19] “Repressive Tolerance,” p. 118.

[20] “Repressive Tolerance,” pp. 120–121.

[21] See “Repressive Tolerance,” pp. 91 and 113.

[22] I. Shafarevich has well pointed out the kinship between the Marxist goal of abolishing the family and the Albigensian heresy. See “Socialism in Our Past and Future,” in: *From Under the Rubble*, by Alexander Solzhenitsyn et al., Washington D. C.: Regnery Gateway, 1981, p. 26–66.

2. The Legalization of Intolerance Against Catholics

During the last two decades Chile has suffered a normative revolution which sets the stage for a pragmatic revolution. Such movement has been directed to the dissolution of the Catholic conception of the family. It started with the distribution of contraceptives, it continued with the legalization of divorce. The next step was the attempt at declaring through an administrative order as mandatory to distribute the morning after pill (abortive). When the Constitutional Court declared unconstitutional the administrative order, at that moment an act was passed by the Parliament allowing the distribution of the morning after pill in open violation of the Constitutional Court's decision. The next step was the legalization of abortion and its elevation to a Women's right. After this the Congress passed an act concerning gender identity and another prohibiting "discrimination," and there is now a project about homosexual "marriage." Besides all this, there are several bodies of administrative norms which develop the legal prescriptions and encroach even more the freedom of Catholics, as we shall see.

An important point which must be mentioned is that many of these changes in legislation were in a way the implementation of an a-judicial agreement between 7 Commissioners of Human Rights at the Interamerican Commission of Human Rights, on the one hand, and the then President of Chile, Michelle Bachelet, on the other. The occasion was an accusation by one of the two most powerful associations of the homosexual lobby in Chile, Movilh. The lobby accused the Chilean State of "discrimination" for not accepting "marriage" between two men or two women, and Bachelet acquiesced on the accusation and came to an agreement with the Commission, according to which Chile was going to introduce in Chile absolutely all the legislative and public policies demands formulated by Movilh, that is to say: the reform of the Law 20.609 on discrimination, adoption by homosexual couples, public health coverage of artificial reproduction for homosexuals, and a *law* on gender identity.²³ Of course, nobody was obliged by this agreement, really, but the fact is it has been implemented step by step.

A last point must be stressed preliminarily. During these decades, the Presidents have been socialists, but they have ruled Chile in an alliance with the Christian Democrats known as "la Concertación." This would have never been possible if Catholics were in a position to receive a really Catholic education. But the Jesuits especially have muddled all centers of Catholic education and have made believe Catholics that to be "Catholic" means to accept any doctrine, to be open to any influence from the world (and especially socialist or gender doctrines).²⁴ That is to say, being Catholic actually means nothing. Because any teaching that cannot distinguish itself from any other doctrine amounts to a non-doctrine. We think that this fact demonstrates the soring need that Chilean Catholics have of an institution where really Catholic theology and philosophy are taught.

Let us now examine this *corpus* of norms which have implemented Marcuse's intolerant plans. We shall start with the consideration of the right to abort or to take the morning after pill, since this normative contains perhaps the most violent potential for the exclusion of good Catholics and even good men who do not want to cooperate in a murderous action which is punished with excommunication in the Catholic Church. After this, we will examine the legislation concerning gender ideology and its enforcement.

[²³] On all this, see T. Henríquez, "Matrimonio gay: la colusión no es solo entre privados," *El Mostrador*, July 5th 2016. It is available here: <https://www.elmostrador.cl/noticias/opinion/2016/07/05/matrimonio-gay-la-colusion-no-es-solo-entre-privados/> (September 12th 2019).

[²⁴] See, for example, Jorge Costadoat, s. j., "Un Cristo fantástico" (blog article, February 20th 2019, available here: <https://jorgecostadoat.cl/wp/>); "Jesús: hijo y hermano," *Cuadernos de Teología*, Vol II, n° 2 (2010) 162–169; "La liberación en la cristología de Jon Sobrino." En: *Teología y Vida*, Vol. 45, número 1 (2004), 62–84 (On these papers and articles Costadoat holds that acknowledging the divinity of Christ amounts to not stating the superiority of Christianity over any other religion; he moreover equates being a real "Catholic" with being in favor of gender ideology or with being socialist); Felipe Berríos, s. j., interview for *El País*, "Siento que la Iglesia católica chilena está muy alejada de la gente", January 4th 2018, available here: https://elpais.com/internacional/2018/01/04/america/1515088929_983366.html.

A) The right to have an abortion (2017–2018)

On September 14th 2017 the Chilean State published the *law* which establishes abortion as a *right*. This *law* is the most violent attack against subsidiarity, the family and the *patria potestas* hitherto seen in Chile.²⁵

It must be noted that in this country only *direct abortion* was penalized, following the terminology adopted by John Paul II in *Evangelium vitae*.²⁶ Thus, if a woman needed a real medical treatment in order to save her life, and if such treatment had as a side effect the death of the zygote, the embryo or the fetus, such death did not constitute the crime of abortion. The most frequent case of this kind found in Chilean medical practice was that of the ectopic pregnancy, when the embryo was grafted not to the uterus, but to the fallopian tube. One must keep this point in mind because when the new *law* establishes the three cases in which abortion is allowed (and even prescribed) the first one sounds as indirect abortion but, in the light of the former legislation, it will be interpreted that the new case is wider than the old one because, otherwise, the change would have no meaning. The three cases are the following:

- 1) Vital risk for the woman, so that the abortion prevents a vital danger.
- 2) Congenital pathology of the embryo or fetus incompatible with life outside of the uterus.
- 3) Rape.

The first evident attack against the freedom of Catholics is that, although the conscientious objection is established for individual doctors and other health care agents,²⁷ the right to object is interpreted in a restrictive way; it is excluded in some cases in which there would be direct killing according to the definition of John Paul II (solemnly declared, with the authority of the keys given to st. Peter), and the doctor is prescribed to cooperate in some cases of direct killing. Thus, these norms, applied strictly would lead to the elimination of all Catholics from the health care system (at least in obstetrical surgery) and/or to the corruption of Catholics and of any human being of good will.

In the first place, the doctor or any other health care agent may invoke the objection in order not to take part in an abortion only if (1) he has manifested it before the abortion is petitioned; (2) he has done so in writing and (3) to the Director of the Hospital (becoming in this way the possible target of discrimination).

In the second place, the Director of the Hospital, in case of objection by a doctor, must find immediately another doctor (or health care agent) who is willing to perform the abortion. If there is none in that hospital, he must derive the patient to another hospital willing to perform the abortion. He cannot just say: “I am sorry, I do not agree with directly killing a human being.” No, he has to send the “patient” to another hospital with an order to provide this “health” care procedure.

Institutions may use the conscientious objection, but the administrative rules exclude such power from public institutions. Thus, Directors of hospitals as such cannot object; and Directors of public institutions must cooperate in murder. This is a way to exclude Catholics from the management of public health care institutions and in the long run to ensure the discrimination of Catholic doctors and other health care agents due to the use of their right to conscientious objection.

[²⁵] Ley Nr. 21 030 (September 23rd 2017) Regula la despenalización de la interrupción voluntaria del embarazo en tres causales.

[²⁶] See art. 19 of the Código Sanitario replaced by the abortion *law*. (Decreto con fuerza de ley Nr. 725 [January 31st 1968] Código sanitario.)

[²⁷] Actually, the conscientious objection is established only for those health care agents who have to act within the operation room. All others are excluded. Thus, Catholics could be forced to cooperate in murder of an innocent human person. See articles 119ter of the *Código Sanitario* and 2 of the *Reglamento para ejercer la objeción de conciencia según lo dispuesto en el artículo 119ter del Código Sanitario*.

Explicitly according to the *Reglamento* (articles 10 and 11), no discrimination can be made against objectors or non-objectors.²⁸ But, if the State regards abortion as a *right*, who could really prevent discrimination of objectors in the long run? To begin with, they would be unable to become managers or Directors of public hospitals, as we have seen. The other side of the coin is that non-objectors could not be rejected for this reason by Catholic institutions (see, especially, article 18). This is a severe restriction to the right of association: if doctors want to form an institution which practices medicine with a Catholic identity they could be undermined by the “anti-discrimination” norms established by the State.

But, besides this, the doctor who refuses to perform an abortion, *must* tell immediately the Director that the woman must be “derived” to a different doctor. He may not just say, “I am sorry, I cannot cooperate in murder.” And, toping it all, “if the woman needs immediate and non-delayable medical attention, due to vital risk, whoever has manifested conscientious objection must perform the abortion if there is no other doctor who could perform it.” Thus, according to what we have explained previously, there could be cases of direct killing of an innocent in which a doctor would be forced to either perform it or commit a serious violation of his supposed *legal* duties.

Moreover, according to the *law*, the Ministry of Health is empowered to regulate the conscientious objection in order to ensure that his “health” care procedure is provided. So, it opens the way for more restrictions to the rights of the health care agents.²⁹ These are the following:

First, the will to become an objector must be manifested in writing previously to the petition of abortion and fulfill some solemnities regarding the content and the procedure to manifest it. Among other things, it must declare for which of the three cases the professional or technician is objecting. Instead, if an objector retracts his will to object, he or she may intervene in an abortion immediately although he or she is obliged to retract in writing afterward. This is a very tricky disposition because, as we have already pointed out, the first case established in the law encompass direct and indirect killings. So, the objector would have to know a lot about moral philosophy in order to formulate his or her objection correctly.

The problem grows and becomes immense because according to the *Reglamento* the same rules apply to institutions which are objectors: they have to define what case they object to, and the first case is ambiguous. (See articles 15 and 19). Moreover, even these institutions which do not practice abortions are obliged to efficiently and quickly send the “patient” to a different institution, cooperating in this way with murder (articles 24–25).

Second, explicitly the workers of a medical center are forced by the *Reglamento* to materially cooperate in the direct killing of an innocent person: “No conscientious objection could be made concerning the acts of information, diagnose, taking or communicating exams, reassigning, deriving a patient, or any other act directed to the preparation or required after the *interruption of the pregnancy*,

[²⁸] See Reglamento para ejercer objeción de conciencia según lo dispuesto en el artículo 119TER del Código Sanitario, Ministerio de Salud (Nr. 67), Diario Oficial del Estado, Nr. 42 187, p. 1.

[²⁹] About this, see the Spanish text: „Artículo 119 ter. El médico cirujano requerido para interrumpir el embarazo por alguna de las causales descritas en el inciso primero del artículo 119 podrá abstenerse de realizarlo cuando hubiese manifestado su objeción de conciencia al director del establecimiento de salud, en forma escrita y previa. De este mismo derecho gozará el resto del personal al que corresponda desarrollar sus funciones al interior del pabellón quirúrgico durante la intervención. En este caso, el establecimiento tendrá la obligación de reasignar de inmediato otro profesional no objetante a la paciente. Si el establecimiento de salud no cuenta con ningún facultativo que no haya realizado la manifestación de objeción de conciencia, deberá derivarla en forma inmediata para que el procedimiento le sea realizado por quien no haya manifestado dicha objeción. El Ministerio de Salud dictará los protocolos necesarios para la ejecución de la objeción de conciencia. Dichos protocolos deberán asegurar la atención médica de las pacientes que requieran la interrupción de su embarazo en conformidad con los artículos anteriores. La objeción de conciencia es de carácter personal y podrá ser invocada por una institución. Si el profesional que ha manifestado objeción de conciencia es requerido para interrumpir un embarazo, tendrá la obligación de informar de inmediato al director del establecimiento de salud que la mujer requirente debe ser derivada. En el caso de que la mujer requiera atención médica inmediata e impostergable, invocando la causal del número 1) del inciso primero del artículo 119, quien haya manifestado objeción de conciencia no podrá excusarse de realizar la interrupción del embarazo cuando no exista otro médico cirujano que pueda realizar la intervención.”

whether such acts are routinely required or they are required due to complications in the woman's health as a consequence of the procedure."³⁰ So, Catholics will be forced to serve those who want to profit from killing innocent babies.

Beyond this, both the Law (article 119ter of the Sanitary Code) and the *Reglamento*, explicitly limit the objection to participation in the operation room. But it turns out that many of the abortive procedures practiced in Chile are based on the ingestion of chemicals which are fatal for the baby or induce the birth prematurely. So, acting like mobsters, the legislators in Chile have tricked the medical professionals into believing that they could be true to the Hippocratic nature of their profession by doing the conscientious objection. Actually, some doctors have already denounced this base trick and cheat in the most important Chilean newspaper. I will copy here a few paragraphs:

On paper, the *law* allows for conscientious objection, but in truth we live a very different reality, because one can use of this right only within the operation room. Thus, the doctor objector must inform the patient regarding her *right to end her pregnancy* if she is found in one of the 3 cases established in the *law*. That is to say, the doctor is *obliged* to offer the death of a human being.

Moreover, the doctor may not refuse to prescribe or administer abortifacient chemicals, because this happens without the operation room. Therefore, this is not included in the case established in the *Reglamento*.

Lastly, when there are many objectors at a hospital, it has happened that the process of induction of an abortion/premature birth is started by a non-objector during the day but must be finally attended to by an objector during the night, because there is nobody willing to do it and at that moment it has become already an *urgent* health care intervention. Briefly, in some circumstances, the conscientious objection has come to be dead letter.³¹

Although article 119ter of the Sanitary Code explicitly allows for conscientious objection of institutions and does not distinguish between private and public institutions, the Norms of the Ministry known as the *Reglamento* make the distinction and exclude the objection by public hospitals. This has the consequences which we have already pointed out. But it also excludes some private institutions which have agreements with the Ministry of Health in order to replace the public Health Service in particular geographical areas and for particular health areas.³² This means that abortion is such an important right that the State cannot tolerate that a particular institution provide a health service in the place of the state, if the institution is not ready to perform abortions directly. So, there will be a complete separation between the State and those who regard the life of the non-born as worthy of protection. Hippocrates would not have been allowed to become a hospital director in Chile. And no real Catholic may either.

The *Reglamento* in its article 14 goes farther, taking advantage of the equivocation we have pointed out: the first case established in the law encompasses more than just the *indirect* killing. So, the said article, taking advantage of such equivocation, plausibly requires from the hospital to perform the *interruption of pregnancy* if the woman requires medical attention which cannot be delayed. Moreover, the *Reglamento* forbids that the institutions which do not perform abortions hire only doctors who are objectors (article 10). So, Catholics are prevented from using their right of association with persons who share their set of values even to fulfill such an important and traditionally Catholic service as health care.

[³⁰] "Artículo 9.- La objeción de conciencia no procede respecto de actos de información, diagnóstico, toma e informe de exámenes, reasignación, derivación, así como tampoco respecto de los demás actos de preparación o cuidados posteriores al procedimiento de interrupción del embarazo, sea que estos últimos se requieran regularmente en el procedimiento, o bien, su necesidad de entregarlos surja de complicaciones en la condición de salud de la mujer."

[³¹] J. Becker, "Objeción de conciencia," *El Mercurio*, Cartas al Director, August 27th 2019. The italics are mine.

[³²] Article 13.- "Los establecimientos privados de salud, que hayan suscrito convenios regidos por las disposiciones del decreto con fuerza de ley N° 36, de 1980, del Ministerio de Salud."

The next obvious attack is that the father of the creature has no saying on whether the abortion should or should not be performed. All third parties are excluded.³³

Another attack is that young daughters under 14 can be pushed to have an abortion by a medical team and a judge without a proper trial and against the will of her parents. (Art. 119 of the Código Sanitario). An adult woman declared unable for consent may not abort without the will of her legal guardian, but a girl under 14 may abort against the will of her parents.³⁴ There are many problems with this aspect of the *law* besides the one I am pointing out as the reader can imagine, but I want to focus now on the violation of the *patria potestas* of all parents, also Catholic parents. Please note that a girl that young cannot get married, but she can abort without the consent of her parents.

In case one medical doctor thought that informing the parents or the legal guardian of a girl under 14 years (or of a woman incapable of consenting) could cause physical or psychological coercion, a judge could give authorization for the abortion in a secret and summary procedure.

With a woman older than 14 and younger than 18, she could make the decision of aborting and she could ask that only one of the parents be *informed* of the procedure. But, if the healthcare team thought that such notification of one of the parents could cause physical or psychical coercion, they could decide to dispense with it.

B) Gender ideology (2018)

By an act of Parliament, Chile has imposed on all its inhabitants the *legal duty* to acknowledge as Law an ideology created by a single US ideologist, Judith Butler.³⁵ It is an unprecedented act of tyranny in this country: one cannot judge things according to their nature or properties, one cannot judge according to truth, but one must accept the fantasies of some people concerning their supposed “gender identity.”³⁶

According to this act, all must understand the *right to gender identity* in this way:

The right to gender identity is the legal power which every person has to possess a gender identity which does not correspond to its registered sex and name, and to petition the correction of these. According to this *law*, gender identity is the personal and inner conviction of being man or woman, exactly as the person perceives itself³⁷, which could or could not correspond with the sex and name registered in the birth official registry. This is the case even if there is change neither in physical appearance nor in the corporal function through *medical*, surgical and some other freely chosen treatments. (Article 1)

This “identity” has drastic legal effects:

Every person has the right to be acknowledged and identified according to its gender identity, once effected the correction [of the official registry]. (article 3)

[³³] See article 119 of the Sanitary Code, which is explicit for women younger than 14.

[³⁴] Here is the Spanish text: “Si la mujer ha sido judicialmente declarada interdicta por causa de demencia, se deberá obtener la autorización de su representante legal, debiendo siempre tener su opinión en consideración, salvo que su incapacidad impida conocerla. Tratándose de una niña menor de 14 años, además de su voluntad, la interrupción del embarazo deberá contar con la autorización de su representante legal, o de uno de ellos, a elección de la niña, si tuviere más de uno. A falta de autorización, entendiéndose por tal la negación del representante legal, o si éste no es habido, la niña, asistida por un integrante del equipo de salud, podrá solicitar la intervención del juez para que constate la ocurrencia de la causal. El tribunal resolverá la solicitud de interrupción del embarazo sin forma de juicio y verbalmente, a más tardar dentro de las cuarenta y ocho horas siguientes a la presentación de la solicitud, con los antecedentes que le proporcione el equipo de salud, oyendo a la niña y al representante legal que haya denegado la autorización. Si lo estimare procedente, podrá también oír a un integrante del equipo de salud que la asista.”

[³⁵] Ley Nr. 21 120 (November 28th 2018) Reconoce y da protección al derecho a la identidad de género.

[³⁶] It is tragic but funny that this *law* in its article 5, letter d, prescribes the respect to the intrinsic value of human persons and the rights which emanate from human nature. One does not know if this is a case of a post-Modern official and legal joke.

[³⁷] I will use this pronoun or article to speak of indeterminate *gender*.

Once the person has effected the “correction” of the birth registry, according to this “law,” “no person, natural or moral, public or private, will be allowed to perform a positive act or an omission which implies arbitrary discrimination and/or causes privation, disturbance or threat against persons and/or against their rights because of their identity and expression of gender. Those directly affected by a positive act and/or an omission which implies arbitrary discrimination will be empowered to introduce a legal suite in conformity with the Law Number 20.609 [...]” (article 25)

Here, the real nature or property of things has no legal bearing or value. Nobody can shield himself behind the truth concerning the natural sex of a person. “Arbitrary discrimination” is understood as “discrimination contrary to the revolutionary ideology.” A school for just boys would have to accept a natural girl if she claims that she perceives herself as a boy. Restrooms would have to be *gender neutral*, because a bearded man could claim that he is a woman and not to accept him into the restroom could bring heavy fines for the not complying person. This means total revolution, particularly of the conception of family, as we shall see briefly.

In article 5, letters e and f, this *law* prescribes that the organs of the State must watch the “superior interest of the child” above and against their parents’ concerns, particularly regarding their *gender identity*. This means once more that the *patria potestas* of non-revolutionary parents, of real Catholic parents, will be violated by this new kind of Marcusean *tolerance*. The parents will be obliged to inform their children that they can *freely* become radical revolutionaries by declaring a gender identity different from the real one.³⁸

According to articles 12–14, a 14 years old child may decide to change his gender identity with the support with just one of the parents and the opposition of the other one. Also, according to article 15, a married person could ask for the change of gender identity. This really amounts to establish the foundation for a radical abolition of the family, as it was dreamed by Karl Marx himself or Alexandra Kollontai.

Chilean society is so immersed in the revolution that both the law on abortion and the law on gender ideology were challenged before the Constitutional Court but this court declared that both were conforming to the Constitution, in a country where every individual of the human species has traditionally been considered a person according to the 19th century Civil Code, and family is declared by the Constitution as the basic cell of political society.

C) “Non discrimination” (2012)

The first and shrewd step taken by the revolutionaries who wanted to impose Marcuse’s discriminating tolerance was to pass a *law* concerning discrimination to which all the other such *laws* (abortion and gender identity by now) refer, filling it with the appropriate ideological content. Such is the Law 20,609 (July 12th 2012) against discrimination.³⁹ On its article 2 “discrimination” is defined thus:

“[...] every distinction, exclusion and/or restriction which lacks reasonable ground, performed either by organs of the State or by private persons, when it causes privation, disturbance and/or threat to the legitimate enactment of fundamental rights established in the Constitution and/or international treaties on human rights signed and approved by Chile [...]. In particular, if such distinction, exclusion and/or restriction is based on race, ethnicity, nationality, socio-economical situation, language, ideology, political opinion, religion and/or belief, on belonging or not belonging to a union or a corporation, based on sex, maternity, breast feeding, *sexual orientation*, *gender identity*, civil state, age, filiation, personal appearance, sickness or

[³⁸] This is the letter of this disposition: “El padre, madre, representante legal o quien tenga legalmente el cuidado personal del niño, niña o adolescente deberá prestarle orientación y dirección en el ejercicio de los derechos que contempla esta ley.”

[³⁹] Ley Nr. 20 609 (July 12th 2012) Establece medidas contra la discriminación. It was modified for the last time by Ley Nr. 21 155 (May 2nd 2019).

discrepancy. [...] Distinctions, exclusions or restrictions based on the mentioned criteria will be considered as reasonable if they are the consequence of the legitimate enactment of other fundamental right, especially those contained in numerals 4, 6, 12, 15, 16 and 21 of the Political Constitution of the Republic, and/or grounded on any other constitutionally legitimate cause.”

Among the rights whose legitimate enactment would authorize to make distinctions, restrictions, exclusions, here one finds the freedom of religion, the freedom of expressing opinions and the right of association. So, it seems that the tolerance here established is not Marcuse’s intolerance. However, the list of especial reasons which constitute a distinction as arbitrary includes “sexual orientation” and “gender identity,” even before any Chilean law had allowed to use these expressions. Their use already points in the direction of discriminating against Catholics or whomever spouses natural Law theories. This becomes clear with the abortion law and its *Reglamento*, which establish severe restrictions to the use of *conscientious objection* of the institutions, as we have seen, and even of individual persons. This goes against any person who rightly thinks that the unborn human being is endowed with human dignity and also against the association of such persons. The same happens with the *law* on gender identity. Both bodies of norms contain articles which connect with the Law 20,609, and thus declare as unreasonable any “discrimination” even based on association, opinion or religion. For example: according to the *Reglamento* on the conscientious objection, article 10, no moral person can discriminate against those persons who are willing to commit abortions. Thus, the association of Catholic doctors finds a clear restriction, since such association would not be able to keep its identity in the not so long run. Article 25 of the *law* on gender identity gives an especial standing to this condition and exclude, in our opinion, the right of associations or religions to “discriminate” regarding gender identity. This means that the apparently not too harmful wedge established in 2012 will open a widening gap through which the freedom of real Catholics will be absorbed into nothingness. –Unless something unexpected happens.

The discriminatory act is punished in this *law* with heavy fines of 350 to 3,500 dollars per individual act. The judge can require the cessation of the “discriminatory act” and on top of that impose the fine.

3. Legislation Against Catholic Education

A different chapter of the persecution against the influence of the Catholic conception of the *cosmos* on the Chilean mind is found in the legislation which has systematically and steadily fought to reduce the influence of Catholics in the education of children. Very especially a few years ago with one stroke President Michelle Bachelet destroyed the whole system of schools which received subsidies from the State but where promoted by private initiative. She also centralized the educational system which previously was under the charge of the municipalities and also previously granted more space for free and diverse initiative. This Bachelet did in clear violation of the Chilean Constitution which has established the principle of subsidiarity and placing the Chilean commonwealth on the slippery slope of tyranny.⁴⁰ Besides this, the teaching of the Catholic religion and of any religion in the school, even in the confessional private school has been recently subjected to strict scrutiny and to the approval of the Ministry of Education.

Besides this, there is a new danger in the horizon. The Interamerican Commission on Human Rights intends to encroach on the legally recognized right of the Catholic bishops’ to withdraw from a teacher the license to teach the Catholic religion at public schools if the said teacher gives scandal by openly living in a homosexual union. According to the Interamerican Commission, this right of the bishops

[⁴⁰] Remember the teachings of Alexis de Tocqueville, according to whom a subsidiary system is the one safest from tyranny. See *Democracia en América*, tomo I, Madrid: Daniel Jorro Editor, 1911, capítulo V, pp. 106–119. (Available here: <https://biblio.juridicas.unam.mx/bjv/detalle-libro/464-la-democracia-en-america-t-i>) [June 28th 2012])

is actually a violation of “human rights;” the same Commission has also pointed out that the Chilean State must reform the law which recognizes the bishops’ right. Moreover, according to the Commission,

[...] the State ha[s] to “train” those persons in charge of assessing the aptness of the teachers—in this case, the bishops of the Catholic Church—in the scope and content of the principle of equality and non-discrimination, especially its protection of sexual orientation. Put another way, the Commission is calling on the state to “re-educate” the bishops on sexuality and discrimination, in order to make them fall in line with its agenda.⁴¹

This opinion is at odds with the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights and of the US Supreme Court. However, the Commission is evaluating to sue the Chilean State at the Interamerican Court of Human Rights, which will probably decide in favor of the Commission.

But let us turn our attention to the already approved legislation tending to reduce the influence of Catholics over education.

A) The law which nearly has put an end to subsidiarity in Chilean education

The Law 20,845 published on June 8th 2015 is the act by which the Chilean government under Bachelet has put an end to municipal schools (public schools will become all national, under the aegis of the Minister of Education, clearly under Marxist control) and to private schools subsidized with public funds.⁴² The rhetoric is most deceiving. It declares that it abolishes profit from private schools with public funds, but actually it just abolishes private schools subsidized with public funds, by forbidding the charge of any tuition.⁴³ With this same stroke Bachelet achieved another goal: to submit the Chilean State to the international financial system by creating structural deficit.⁴⁴

The reform also established “laic education” (article 1, letter b), “responsibility of the students” (article 1, letter c), exclusion of discrimination based on gender (article 1, letter e), ecological orientation (article 1, letter g). All this reveals a very strong ideological orientation. We just need to remember that discriminating tolerance was instituted by Herbert Marcuse, a Marxist, and that the former European Communist parties are today the Green parties. Not in vain Bachelet got her medical degree and specialization degree in a very short period of time in Easter Germany under Honecker. We also must remember that the children’s rights and freedoms are being proclaimed in order to subject the children to State and/or international organs instead of the parents and families: the public organs will decide in matters as crucial as gender identity and abortion, as we have pointed out.

B) Norms on religious teaching in schools, combined with the admissions system to higher education

Decree 924 prescribes that there will be religion classes in all schools.⁴⁵ In confessional schools, the classes will be only of the religion to which the school ascribes. In this case, the parents who do not

[⁴¹] Inter-American Commission of Human Rights, report on the case “Sandra Pavez v. Chile,” cited by Tomás Henríquez, “A Storm is Brewing in the Americas,” *Public Discourse*, August 12th 2019. Available here: <https://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2019/08/55749/> (September 13th 2019).

[⁴²] See Ley 20 845 (June 8th 2015) De inclusión escolar que regula la admisión de los y las estudiantes, elimina el financiamiento compartido y prohíbe el lucro en establecimiento educacionales que reciben aportes del Estado.

[⁴³] Article 1, letter a.

[⁴⁴] She introduced free education in public schools and at universities. The cost of this colossal change was financed very much with the subscription of external debt.

[⁴⁵] (January 7th 1984) Reglamenta clases de religión en establecimientos educacionales.

profess that religion may ask the school that their children be exempted from the religion classes but may not ask the school to offer classes of a different religion. The grades of the religion courses will not be expressed in numbers but in a conceptual way and will have no bearing on the student's passing from one course to the next. The religious teachers must be certified by the local official religious authority of the respective creed.

This decree is already very limiting of religious teaching. Students know that their performance is irrelevant to their promotion to the higher level. For this reason, the authority of religion professors is very much impaired.

But the Ministry of Education has published new norms which make the situation worse. By a simple "Oficio" 1007 of the chief of general education to lower officials in the Ministry, it was disposed in November 27th 2014 that religion classes will be elective. During basic school the parents will make the choice and during high school the children will make the choice. By a new "Oficio" 1032 dated December 10th 2014 the situation was slightly modified: the choice corresponds to the student "and his family." This, of course, impairs the position of the teacher even more. Besides this, in high school the students' main interest is to score high grades in order to be admitted into the studies of their choice in higher education. But religion does not count. This is a death blow to the authority of religion teachers, especially during the last two years of high school.

4) The Situation of Catholics Precisely Understood at the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile

At the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile there has been a tough situation for Catholics precisely understood since at least one decade ago. But in recent times the cause of this hardship has surfaced in the form of a body of quasi-norms which threaten to exclude the freedom of Catholics to adhere to Christ's revelation even at the Catholic University. We will briefly review this body of quasi-norms and their clash with the most basic norms applicable to the Catholic University. After this task is completed, we will sketch a brief journalistic research on a few cases where Catholics have been actually persecuted due to their allegiance to those fundamental norms.

A) Body of Quasi-Norms Which Clashes with the Most Basic Norms Applicable to the Catholic University

- (a) "Guidelines and recommendations to the Academic Body for Prevention of Deeds of Sexual Violence Against the Students" (May 2018)

The first threatening body which appeared in the open of which we have news is known as "Lineamientos y recomendaciones a la planta académica para la prevención de hechos de violencia sexual en la relación con estudiantes" (May 2018). It is supposed to deal with the prevention of sexual violence, but it actually deals as well with the "respect" for sexual orientation, in a way which is incompatible with the nature and mission of the Catholic university. We will list some of the most problematic aspects. To this end we are making use of a document drafted by a group of professors of the PUC who did not send it or publish it because doing so could have compromised their position at the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile.

First, the guidelines pose a threat to academic freedom and very especially in the area and subjects belonging to the ethical or moral sciences, such as moral theology and philosophy. Morality consists precisely in the order of love, action and character. It is unavoidable that moral reflection be

uncomfortable for those who do not conform to the rational standards which the scholar, by using his legitimate academic freedom, might establish through his moral reflection. It is extremely grave that in some subjects this document strives to establish a prohibition of teaching the truth and even the prohibition of questioning some *politically correct* dogmas and taboos.⁴⁶

Second, these guidelines incur in clear contradictions which show its lack of impartiality. Indeed, while it censures moral *reflections* which tend to find the standards which are adequate to some affections and conducts, it promulgates standards which are supposedly rational and adequate to forbid other conducts, that is to say, to forbid the public moral reflection on the correct use of human sexuality. In other words, this document forbids the reflection on the foundations of chastity.

Third, according to these guidelines the border between morally upright conducts and wrong conducts is ambiguous and the said guidelines hand over the establishment of such border to the subjective feelings of persons possibly affected. This, besides harming the most basic legal safety, threatens the indispensable spontaneity of social life and of human relations within an academic community based on trust and not on suspicion and vigilance.

Fourth, in a strict legal dimension, beyond ethical and anthropological questions, this document introduces a hermeneutical standard leading to unsurpassable antinomies: it gives rise to a contradiction of the internal legal system of the university whose hermeneutical tools have as their center the “Declaración de Principios” (Statement of Principles) and other norms of clear Catholic nature which are inspired by classical natural Law.

Fifth, the fundamental premises and conceptual categories of this document originate in secular and foreign philosophical conceptions, instantiating thus a clear case of passive cultural colonialism. Concretely:

- a) Concepts and criteria developed by US universities are a-critically imported. But such concepts are soaked of a distorted view of freedom and of sexuality.⁴⁷
- b) Categories in open contradiction with the idearium of the university are used, such as *sexual orientation, identity* [*gender* is omitted, but its meaning is explicitly adopted: “the subjective feeling of a student regarding his own sexual identity”⁴⁸], *gender stereotypes, asymmetry*, etc. The document not only introduces its usage but forbids their rational-critical examination.⁴⁹
- c) When this document censures doctrines of languages due to their offensive or violent character towards beliefs, identities, subjective feelings, and so forth, it gives the impression of being unfair and one-sided: it is useful as a weapon against the traditional conception of sexual morality, labeled as sexist and discriminatory, but it is not useful as a weapon against those

[46] See, for example, that Annex 1, lists as an example of grave sexual violence for violating opinions or feelings concerning sexual orientation the following: a professor asks the students to debate whether education by homo or heterosexual parents is or not adequate. The professor divides the course in two groups arbitrarily. One student has to defend that education should be the task of heterosexual parents. But she feels uncomfortable. The professor tells her that she does not have to agree with her debate position, she just has to find rational arguments. Thus, asking to rationally argue for case in a matter where one’s feelings run against such arguments is a case of extreme sexual violence! And this at a university! Point 1 of the document is all questionable from this perspective. We copy here two of its paragraphs: “En este marco, los académicos deben necesariamente generar las condiciones para el aprendizaje de todos los alumnos, tomando en cuenta sus creencias, identidades y valores, respetando delicadamente sus conciencias. El hecho que los estudiantes sientan que deben realizar un trabajo sobre un tema vinculado directa o indirectamente a la sexualidad que puede trasgredir sus valores, identidades, creencias o convicciones, o recordar hechos dolorosos, debe ser cuidadosamente analizado por el docente antes de implementar una actividad de esta naturaleza. Esto será especialmente importante de considerar en aquellas situaciones donde el docente estime que el tema a abordar o actividad a desarrollar no será necesariamente analizado desde todas las aristas o perspectivas posibles.” “Se recomienda, entonces, que el tratamiento de temas o actividades docentes que se relacionen directa o indirectamente con la sexualidad deben ser pensados y explicados cuidadosamente a los estudiantes, de modo que estos no sean descontextualizados y ciertamente contribuyan a generar un clima propicio para el aprendizaje. En caso que los alumnos hagan preguntas acerca de la actividad debido a que se sienten incómodos, el docente deberá abordarlas, acoger las sensibilidades particulares de los estudiantes y juzgar la conveniencia de modificar la actividad si fuese necesario.”

[47] See Introduction of the document.

[48] Point 1, p. 3 of the document.

[49] See Points 1–3.

who offend the feelings and identities of Catholics through shouts and violence, even within the Catholic University. This double standard should not be adopted by an official document of the Catholic University.

Sixth, the document entirely ignores the Catholic doctrine on chastity, which would be a better medicine against true abuses than the secular doctrines imported from the USA.

(b) Agreements Between the Superior Council of the PUC and Subversive Groups of Feminist Students Which Violently Hijacked the University in May 2018

In May 25th 2018 the Catholic University was violently hijacked by dubious revolutionary agents. After the premises were secured by them some feminist student groups of the Catholic University took over the representation of the movement and entered in negotiations with the Rector and the Superior Council. The Rector refused to use police force against the usurpers and, instead, yielded to many of their petitions. It looked as if the Rector and other authorities were eager in fact to yield to the hijackers, since their petitions went in the same direction as the guidelines which we have just referred to and which were published less than a month earlier. A little after the event, the Rector published a “synthesis” of the agreements. In May 10th 2019 the agreements were fully published. We will briefly refer here to those aspects belonging to the agreements which compromise the Catholic identity of the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile:

First, the agreements accept the revolutionary jargon, “gender.” They forbid any discrimination based on “gender.”⁵⁰

Second, the agreements directly violate the Catholic identity of the PUC, since they command that the studies of gender effect a change on the educational project of the university, both regarding teaching and research.⁵¹

Third, the agreements violate even academic freedom since they prescribe the mandatory inclusion of “gender diverse” bibliography in the different courses of each discipline. They also violate university autonomy, since they annul the power of the cloister to choose its own members: they prescribe the inclusion of women as professors, in a proportion which must be close to the proportion of women and men among the students. (See agreements 11, 13, 14, 21 and 22 of the 3rd dialogue table). They also prescribe the erection of a *Comisariat* within the university in order to control the application of this aspect of the agreements: “we propose the creation of a central equity and gender diversity organ, to oversee the education, administration and research.” (Agreement 24, 3rd of the 3rd dialogue table).

Fourth, the agreements virtually destroy the foundations of the whole ethical teaching of the Church when they accept the dualistic and anti-metaphysical conception of gender theory to its last consequences: students will have the right to choose their “gender identity” (even against their natural sexuality) and demand from professors and authorities to respect such change. (Agreements 1, 2, t and 6 of the 4th dialogue table). It must be noted that the university accepted this imposition even before the respective *law* was passed in Congress.

[⁵⁰] Here is the text: “5. Generar una estructura coordinada en violencia de género y discriminación arbitraria que permita a la UC actuar de manera institucional y articulada en la acogida a las víctimas.”

[⁵¹] Here is the text: “Proponer la creación de una entidad o estructura (cátedra, centro, oficina) que promueva, articule y coordine la incidencia de los estudios de género en el proyecto educativo, impulsando la investigación y docencia en estas áreas. VRA llevará propuesta al HCS.” Agreements 3–6 of the third “dialogue table” are just means to implement this basic agreement.

B) Some cases of persecution against Catholics within the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile

In order to demonstrate that there are actually policies being implemented to exclude Catholics in a precise sense from teaching positions (and from influential students positions as well) at the Catholic University of Chile, we are going to sketch here some cases of persecution. Of all these cases I have personal knowledge gathered from the victims (I attach a set of interviews in Spanish in the Annex to the present paper). But I have to ask that these short stories remain strictly confidential because otherwise they could have undesired consequences for them/us, for the victims. I know there are many other cases but the ones gathered here will help to understand the proposal that I will make at the end of this study: a way to counter-act persecution would be to found an institution which transmitted to the Catholic people the real teachings of the solemn Magisterium of the Church.

B.1 – My own case

First of all, I can sketch here my own case. I used to work at the International Academy of Philosophy, Campus Chile (IAP-PUC), with professors Josef Seifert and Daniel von Wachter. In 2008 for a variety of reasons professor Seifert and I were dragged to the on-going debate between Claudio Pierantoni, then professor of the School of Theology of the PUC, on the one hand, and several priests who defended Gadamerian, Ricoeurian and Heideggerian views on hermeneutics and therefore defended a radical historical relativism. One of these priests used to teach undergraduate Christology despite he endorsed Jon Sobrino's condemned views; another implicitly denied that the Bible is the Word of God; according to a third one there are no universal moral standards. Of course, Seifert and I entered the debate on the side of Claudio Pierantoni, who, besides being a professor at the school of theology, was our PhD student in Philosophy. Everything looked like an amicable, academic discussion, until in 2010 a new Rector came to the PUC, a Rector who is close to the Jesuits, which is the order of two of our debate opponents. In a few months, the Rector decreed the closure of the IAP-PUC and give us two years to close our academic programs. The excuse was financial: the Rector declared that if we found independent funding we would be able to stay. As it turned out, professor von Wachter (the third professor of the IAP-PUC) has excellent connections and he got a proposal of funding. So, we asked the PUC how much money we had to collect in order to stay open, but then the Academic Vice-Rector, Roberto González, stated clearly that the reasons of our closing were not financial. So, we asked what the reasons were, and he said that they were "confidential." A group of undergraduate students got involved in this issue. They had a meeting with the said Vice-Rector, but he just bullied them (with threatening attitudes like having their personal files on his desk while they were speaking). To them he declared bluntly that the reasons for the closure were not financial, but "confidential." We know that the reasons were doctrinal. This man, the Vice-Rector is an anti-orthodox Catholic fanatic. There were other two measures taken. An official of the PUC, who was under the authority of the said Vice-Rector sent a letter to the IAP-PUC students saying that their course work did not lead to a PUC degree, in direct violation of the agreement between the IAP and the PUC. The students were forced to hire an attorney and threaten with a Law-suite. Only thus, the PUC cancelled the effects of that letter and accepted our students into their programs when we were closed. Beside this, all three professors were fired, despite the fact that the previous Rector, Pedro Rosso, had promised that in case of closure of the IAP-PUC the PUC would absorb the professors and despite the fact that we were formally professors of the Institute of Philosophy. It must be added that the Institute hired many professors immediately after the closure of the IAP-PUC and our salaries were not very much above the salaries of the PUC professors. On top of all this, the Jesuits slandered me personally in the circles of the Chilean Deans of

Philosophy to make sure that I would not be hired by any Philosophy School. The Dean of one of the Schools told this to a close friend personally. In fact, I was jobless for 10 months during the year 2013.

B.2 – Claudio Pierantoni's case.

I have mentioned Claudio Pierantoni in the previous paragraph. He was hired by the School of Theology of the PUC in 2000. He was well fitted while he spoke of Patristics from a historical point of view. But as soon as he began to make use of Augustinian insights to challenge as un-Catholic the radical historical relativism of the priests above mentioned and of some other professors, he started having troubles at the School. This culminated when in 2010, under the new Rector and Academic Vice-Rector, he was mercilessly fired, right after he was coming back from a trip to Italy to heal his older daughter, who has serious health problems. Of course, the University never declared the real reasons of his firing, because that is how things are at the Catholic environments in Chile: it is a well-kept secret that the official upper academic circles are very often at odds with the solemn Magisterium of the Church.

It would be helpful to add information concerning the concrete circumstances of his firing from the PUC, taken from the interview attached at the end of this study, in the Annex.

During the semester in which Claudio Pierantoni was fired, for the first time a group of 12 novices of the Jesuit order registered his class on the History of the Church, because the order was closing at the time several novitiates in various Latin American countries. It was the 11th time he was teaching this class and he was always well evaluated, but he had not had young Jesuits registered. These men were very much influenced by ideologies completely alien to the tradition of the Church. For this reason, there was a lot of debate in the class room, which was welcome by professor Pierantoni. But during the semester, this group sent a letter to the Dean accusing the professor of not following the program. Pierantoni did not know that the letter had been sent but learned the contents of the letter. So, he discussed it with the students and showed that it was not in accordance to real facts. This reply was taken by the Dean as a “conflictive” act and as sufficient reason to dismiss the professor.

Long later, some of these young Jesuits confessed that they had been asked by their superiors to send that letter. Particularly by fr. Jorge Costadoat, S.J.

At the time of his dismissal, professor Pierantoni appealed to the Rector and to the Great Chancellor of the Pontifical Catholic University, Bishop Errázuriz, but he did not receive any answer. These authorities remained inactive before the fact that a professor had been fired not due to his academic or pedagogical deficiencies, but to the fact that the heretical tendencies has become prevalent at the School of Theology and he was the only one to face and discuss them with determination.

B. 3 – Magdalena Moncada's and Juan José Tagle's case.

Amidst a climate of violent aggression against the Catholic identity of the PUC, with all sorts of talks, conferences, demonstrations, etc., permitted in campus by the official authorities regarding sex, gender, abortion, and with other aggressions not allowed by the authorities but which took place anyways, these two brave students asked permission to post on a wall of the University in a particular date the following sign: “Children have the right to have one father (XY) and one mother (XX).” It was granted, but they were unable to post it in that date. A couple of months later the same climate was prevalent, so that the students asked again for the permission, and not having received an answer, in their anguish for seeing the Catholic identity of the University derided, they posted the sign on August 22nd 2018, Wednesday. On August 26th, Sunday, CNN showed the sign on TV and then, that very day, the General Secretary replied to the petition stating that the sign may not be posted. Immediately the students'

union (FEUC) presented an accusation against the authors at the General Secretary of the University, Marisol Peña, who is the authority in charge of disciplinary procedures and punishments. The FEUC argued that Moncada and Tagle were promoting violence and incurring in the terrible crimes of *homophobia* and *transfobia*. The Secretary admitted the accusation as if *prima facie* there were grounds for its appearance of legality and opened an investigation for two faults: sowing “disunion” at the academic community, and posting a sign without permission. This development was already grave. For a long time the process advanced and the students, who knew about it, did not have access to the proceedings. When they finally did, they presented their arguments and proofs, but the General Secretary did not admit their proofs. Clinging to the circumstance that the sign was not posted with permission, the General Secretary ended up imposing a punishment to the students due not to the substance of the matter (she avoided this) but to the fact that they used the buildings of the university for a not allowed purpose. The students appealed against such decision, but their appeal was denied. So, the sentence became firm. The students were notified of the date in which the punishment would be officially imposed on them. However, in the mean time it turned out that other students had accused the FEUC of flagrant and grave violations of the PUC’s norms by the organization of events in which Catholic morality was derided and even blasphemous performances took place.⁵² She planned to acquit the leaders of the FEUC. But, before she did, some Law professors talked to the Rector about the absurdity of the punishment imposed on Magdalena Moncada and Juan José Tagle. The Rector understood how damaging for the image of the PUC among Catholics⁵³ the unfairness of Marisol Peña’s decisions would be and demanded from her to revoke the punishment of the Catholic students so as not to appear so unfair. That is how the General Secretary, the guardian of Law at the PUC, decided (a) to recall her own firm sentence,⁵⁴ and (b) to annul part of the procedure against Moncada and Tagle. These students petitioned that the Law be respected and the [light] punishment imposed on them (because they were not sure that after annulling part of the procedures they were not going to receive a heavier punishment), but the General Secretary paid no heed to their arguments or to any Law. So, she, violating once more all legal rules, “accumulated” the cases against the FEUC and against Moncada and Tagle, in order to acquit them all.

B.4 – Professor Jorge Martínez

This professor has a Catholic mindset and real Faith. He ran for the Deanship of Philosophy in the last election of 2018 and lost, defeated by the partiality of the heterodox and even atheists. Soon after, he was teaching a course. In one of the classes, Aquinas’ doctrine on the creation of man and woman was dealt with. Some students claimed that they were very offended because such *machista* doctrine was taught at the school of philosophy and accused professor Martínez. Once again, the General Secretary opened the proceedings as if the accusation had some semblance of legality. After a year of uncertainty, finally the General Secretary acquitted professor Martínez. But soon after this, Martínez is turning 65. In Chilean universities that is the age of retirement. However, the usual practice is that professors are re-hired for around 5 years. Not so in the case of Martínez, despite the fact that his students’ and academic evaluations are excellent. Instead, recently professor Burlando turned 65, and despite the fact that her evaluations are terrible and there was even the agreement to have her fired some years ago, she was re-hired. Of course, she is not a Catholic orthodox person, not by a long shot.

[⁵²] A homo-erotic dance by the statue of the Virgin Mary which stands at the center of one of the main *patios* of the *Casa Central* of the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile.

[⁵³] I would say, especially among reach, funding Catholics.

[⁵⁴] She had no legal power to do that. Only a court of Law could do it at that moment.

B. 5 – Anonymous student of Nursing

This student has asked me to strictly keep here anonymity, because she is afraid of reprisals. She tells me that some professors at the School of Nursing of the PUC press her hard to perform *health* care actions that are completely against Catholic morality, such as asking about their gender to children under 14, distributing the morning after pill or informing about abortion. Also, the students of nursing are forced to give sexual orientation to children who are 14 years old: they are required to just give recommendations in order to avoid sexually transmitted diseases (to have “safe sexual relations”), to teach the children how to have all sorts of intercourse (oral, anal, and so forth) avoiding sexually transmitted diseases. They are forbidden to make any mention of love or any kind of affection in those “recommendations.”

CHAPTER TWO VENEZUELA

There is little doubt that Venezuela as an administrative and political unit, and even as a geographical individualized place is the work of Spain and the Spaniards. Mostly of the Spaniards under the rule of the Habsburg dynasty. This means, Venezuela was shaped by the Church in a wide sense, including the lay people. Moreover, there is little doubt that the high culture of Venezuela was formed by the clergy of the Church⁵⁵ and that the conquest of an important part of the territory, including the plains, Guayana and the Eastern part (Barcelona and Cumaná) was peacefully completed (although not always peacefully started) by the clergy, mostly the Franciscan friars and the Jesuits.⁵⁶

The land and the people which rejected the French rule imposed by Napoleon over Spain in 1808 and the land and the people which created the Junta Conservadora de los Derechos de Fernando VII in April 19th 1810 were a Spanish, Catholic land and people. This plain fact has been systematically hidden from the young Venezuelan minds since 1814, I would say. The reasons which led the *Patriots* of 1814 to strive for changing our identity from *Spaniards* into *Americanos* lie beyond the scope of the present paper.⁵⁷ But I dare say that since 1830, and very clearly since 1837, the reasons have had at their source a great measure of hatred of the Catholic faith. Moreover, the agents who have hidden our Venezuelan original identity with great zeal and have tried to wipe out the high Catholic culture of the country are without a doubt the masons.

Simón Bolívar, after his years of *insania*, during which he decreed the war to death against “Spaniards and Canaries”, realized that the masons could become an important threat to the wellbeing and good order of Venezuela, Colombia (with Panamá), Ecuador, Perú and Bolivia. He even took measures to control them.⁵⁸ But he was defeated. Moreover, he himself, in his naïve admiration for

[55] See Caracciolo Parra León, *La instrucción en la Provincia de Caracas, 1567–1725, Obras (La instrucción en Caracas, Filosofía universitaria venezolana, Cronistas de Venezuela)*, Madrid: Editorial J. B., s/f, pp. 15–280; and *Filosofía universitaria venezolana, 1725–1810, Obras*, pp. 281–429.

[56] See Rafael María de Baralt, *Resumen de la historia de Venezuela*, Desclée-De Brouwer, París, 1939, pp. 294–296 y 321–322. Also: Obispo Martí, *Libro personal, Documentos relativos a la visita pastoral de la Diócesis de Caracas (1771–1784)*, Caracas: Academia Nacional de la Historia, 1998, ts. I y II. Carlos A. Casanova, *El republicanismo español en América: una evaluación*, México: UNAM, 2015.

[57] I have dealt with them in my paper “La doctrina conservadora en Venezuela”, Bogotá: Universidad Sergio Arboleda, 2019 (in print).

[58] See letters from Simón Bolívar to Francisco de Paula Santander, October 8th and 21st 1825 and October 25th 1826 and the Decree of November 8th 1828. All letters except that of October 21st 1825 have been consulted at the *Libertador's Archives*, available online, here: <http://www.archivodellibertador.gob.ve>. Little knew Bolívar that he was sending his letters to a Mason. The October 21st letter and the 1828 Decree are cited from Father Javier Olivera Ravasi, “¿Simón Bolívar masón?”, available here: http://www.infocatonica.com/blog/notelacuenten.php/1412070239-san-martin-y-bolivar-su-polit#_ftn2 Regarding the letter to Santander, Ravasi cites Brother Nectario María, *Ideas y sentimientos religiosos del Libertador Simón Bolívar*, 2nd. Ed., Madrid, 1978, p. 30.

England laid the ground for a good portion of the future masonic attacks against the Church. Indeed, he established in the Constitution of Angostura and in the Bolivian Constitution, the *Patronato* of the State over the Church, despite having declared the freedom of religion and the non-confessional character of the Great Colombia (Colombia with Panamá, Venezuela and Ecuador) and of Bolivia.⁵⁹

What I want to demonstrate in the following pages is how the masons have strived to decapitate our Venezuelan Church and to suppress any memory of our glorious Catholic past. On this latter regard, they have promoted with all their might the black legend on the Spanish-American regime. This has proved an effective way of persecution of Christians, as we shall see and explain.

Before we study the imposition of the black legend as a national dogma in Venezuela, we must briefly present the decapitation of the Church during the 19th century, renewed in hypocritical way by the Communists who have ruled the country during the last two decades.

1. The Decapitation of the Venezuelan Church.

A) The war of Independence.

During the years 1811–1817 Venezuela and its Church suffered horribly. Francisco de Miranda brought the revolutionary virus from France and started the execution of priests. After Simón Bolívar's Decree of War to death, José Félix Ribas emptied the seminary and the Schools, forcing the young men to fight difficult battles. After some months of Ribas' military command in Caracas, out of 86 seminarians only 1 was left. In May 1817, probably Bolívar commanded the execution of the Capuchin Friars who were still prisoners of the "Patriots" in Guayana (10 had died in prison, 7 had escaped, 22 were executed), out of fear of Pablo Morillo's invasion.⁶⁰ These facts, without showing a systematic will to persecute the Church but rather the cruelty of the Spanish civil war in Venezuela (known as "Independence war"), explain the enormous loss of influence of the Church in Venezuela after the secession from Colombia in 1830.

B) The Conservative rule

Simón Bolívar, as already stated, had claimed the right of Patronato for the independent governments of Colombia and of Bolivia. The *conservative* oligarchy which ruled Venezuela between 1830 and 1848 did the same. Never mind that, unlike Spain, Venezuela declared itself a lay-State with complete freedom of religion. The will to power of the oligarchs could not let go of the control over the Church.⁶¹ But they imitated neither the Catholic Monarchs nor the Habsburg in the use of the right of Patronato. They

[59] See, for example, his Address to the Bolivian Congress Introducing the Constitutional Project, here: *Pensamiento conservador, 1815–1898*, Biblioteca Ayacucho, Caracas, 1986, pp. 3–12.

[60] The responsibility for this execution remains in the shadow. Many have tried to blame it on Piar, but it seems clear that he was opposed to any such step and was not in command of the executioners. It was Bolívar who was in command. Some of Bolívar's worshippers have tried to blame it on a confusion of the subordinates, others say that the tragedy must be blamed on the circumstances. My conclusion is that Bolívar is responsible, as he was responsible of the war to death a few years earlier and for analogous reasons, the godless *ragion di Stato*. On this matter, see the interesting, although not very scholarly book by Pedro Barrios Guzmán, *Biografía del General Piar*, pp. 122–129. (Available here: <https://archive.org/details/biografiadelgeneobarr/page/n9>). The author cites all the relevant sources: O'Leary and Restrepo, Vicente Lecuna, Baralt and Díaz. He also identifies the officers who killed the friars: Commander Jacinto Lara and Captain Juan de Dios Monzón.

[61] That the will to power is the driving force can be sensed in authors such as Rafael María de Baralt, who was a military officer and supported the oligarchic regime. In his *Resumen de la historia de Venezuela* (1841), he states concerning Fernando de Aragón: "Muy avisado era Fernando de Aragón para no conocer la importancia de aquel derecho [de patronato], cuyo ejercicio, unido a las prerrogativas de la corona, le constituían de hecho en único señor civil y eclesiástico de las vastas posesiones ultramarinas de España" (p. 315). These statements concerning the intentions of the Catholic King are ungrounded regarding the king, but show the soul and mind of the conservatives.

rather imitated Henry VIII, as had done the Masonic ministers of Charles III of Spain during the 18th century. This is why in 1837 they dissolved all the male convents of Venezuela. In this way, the conservative Masons paved the way for the liberal and positivist Masons who would rule the country without opposition after the bloody war known as *Guerra Federal* (1858–1863).

C) The Liberal-Positivist rule

The result of the Federal War was the accession to unlimited power of the liberal-positivist elites. Antonio Guzmán Blanco was the real leader of this elite during a quarter of the 19th century. He and his liberal-positivist successor (Joaquín Crespo) were the authors of the systematic and almost utter decapitation of the Venezuelan Church. Indeed, they suppressed the seminaries⁶² as well as the female convents,⁶³ they suppressed moreover the Schools of theology and philosophy, they intervened the universities and deprived them of their rental goods, they submitted the academia to the good will of the State, they strove to suppress university autonomy, to impose both academic authorities appointed by the government and the positivist ideology.⁶⁴ They also attempted to create a national church⁶⁵ and assumed the right of *Patronato* and the power to appoint the bishops,⁶⁶ they expelled bishops and clerics who opposed their designs, they expelled the foreign members of religious orders, they forbade the use of religious habits even at home and they established a system of spies to enforce this measure. It could be said that Guzmán realized the dream of August Comte described by Eric Voegelin in *Science, Politics and Gnosticism*, when analyzing the phenomenon of the prohibition of questions:

[...] the Marxian prohibition of questions is neither isolated nor harmless. It was not isolated in its own time, for we find the same prohibition in Comte, in the first Lecture of his *Cours de Philosophie Positive*. Comte also anticipates objections to his construct, and he bluntly dismisses them as idle questions. For the present he is interested only in the laws of social phenomena. Whoever asks questions about the nature, calling, and destiny of man may be temporarily ignored; later, after the system of positivism has prevailed in society, such persons will have to be silenced by appropriate measures.⁶⁷

From the liberal-positivist tyranny resulted, as I said, a decapitation of the Church in Venezuela. As Mary Walters stated it:

A campaign of intimidation added to hostile legislation has discouraged still further the entrance of able men into the church. Moreover, the government does not desire such. Rarely today are there found superior men like Navarro in the ranks

[62] Cfr. Mary Walters, *A History of the Church in Venezuela 1818–1930*, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1933, p. 184.

[63] By act of the Congress promulgated on May 5th 1874. See M. Walters, *History of the Church*, p. 209. The “conservative” oligarchy had already closed the male convents in 1837 and had subjected the Church to the right of “Patronato.” In both instances the Masons were the agents, as Walters demonstrates in pp. 209–213. The masons also introduced the secularization of cemeteries, civil marriage and divorce.

[64] On these changes at the university, see: Mario Briceño Iragorry, *La hora undécima*, Ediciones Independencia, Madrid, 1956, pp. 27–31; and Alberto Navas Blanco, “Una aproximación a la fundación de la Facultad de Humanidades y Educación de la Universidad Central de Venezuela (1946)”, available here: http://www.ucv.ve/uploads/media/Navas_Los_primeros_tiempos.pdf (August 12th 2019). See also decrees 2252 of November 16th 1880 and 2253 of December 7th 1880 (A. Guzmán Blanco. *Recopilación de Leyes y Decretos de Venezuela*. Caracas: Imprenta La Opinión Nacional, 1884, Tomo VIII, 1878–1888, pp. 499–501): Guzmán gives it autonomy to the University in the first of these decrees, so that it can have its elections, but, in seeing that “it does not have the unity and cohesion of elements which are indispensable for realizing in all safety the transcendental reform which is going on and of which I am responsible (says Guzmán),” he revokes the autonomy and again submits the university to the new Conde of Public Instruction.

[65] Sobre este punto y el anterior, véase el “Mensaje del General Guzmán Blanco Presidente Constitucional de los Estados Unidos de Venezuela, presentado al Congreso en 1876”, pp. 607–608, en: Fausto de Aldrey y Rafael Hernández, *Rasgos biográficos para la historia de la vida pública del General Guzmán Blanco*, Caracas: Imprenta de la Opinión Nacional, 1876, pp. 596–639.

[66] Cfr. *La hora undécima*, pp. 31–34.

[67] *Science, Politics and Gnosticism*, Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1968, p. 26.

of the clergy; he himself has deplored the unfitnes of the majority of the clergy for their work. Although there has been some favor shown the institution under subsequent administrations, reforms have been, on the whole, partial and ineffective. The anti-clerical legislation of Guzman Blanco stands with little change.⁶⁸

This paragraph was written in 1932–1933. As we shall see, Walters was wrong. However, she had a point: for decades, to be a Catholic intellectual became extremely hard. And up to now the cultivation of theology as a discipline was obliterated.

One of the most important consequences of the decapitation of the Church which took place already in a good measure during the civil war known as “war of independence” was the implantation of the black legend concerning the Spanish past of Venezuela and the Catholic roots of the country. It pains one to see good people of Christian leanings such as Fermín Toro, Rafael María de Baralt and Juan Vicente González, accept a good deal of this black legend and in some cases, as a consequence, agree to an evident infringement of the freedom of the Church by political authorities.

D) Venezuela after 1901

During Gómez’s regime, the government was less aggressively anti-Catholic. The Masons continued their work, but the tyrants or *Caudillos* were not ideologically and systematically enemies of the Church. Since 1928 an outstanding young Catholic was appointed Academic-Vicerrector of the Central University of Venezuela. This man, Caracciolo Parra León, reopened the School of Philosophy and gave a very much Catholic content to its studies. Also, he, single handedly, was able to perform two important cultural feats: (a) he wrote two dissertations, one on political science and the other on Canon Law. The second one was really on theology: the necessary conditions for mystical poetry; and (b) he destroyed two integral aspects of the black legend concerning the Spanish regime in America: its supposed obscurantist character. In two of his major works, *La Instrucción en Caracas 1567–1725* and *Filosofía universitaria venezolana, 1725–1821*, he showed how Venezuela enjoyed, despite the difficulties of the conquest and stabilization of the country, an up to date system of public instruction based mostly on the disinterested work of the clergy and an up to date system of university teaching since the erection of the Royal and Pontifical University of Santa Rosa de Caracas. His method was so impeccable that his opponents were reduced to irrational complaints. Indeed, Parra León just recovered the documents concerning the system of instruction which nobody had gathered before him and, more importantly, delved into the university archives where he found nothing less than the academic theses, courses and dissertations of professors and students. With these materials, he demonstrated, for example, that at the university there was “full freedom of studies”. There were, therefore, diverse doctrines. There was a constant debate between diverse theses, metaphysical, psychological; some scholastic, some Lockean, Cartesian or Berkeleyan. Concerning natural science, the exact state of the art was known. Newton, Kepler, Copernicus, Huygens, Lavoisier, Kirwan, Franklin, Galvani, Boyle, Torricelli, Brisson, Buffon, Lamarck, etc., found their way to university courses. A quotation contained in the dissertation to obtain the degree in Arts by José María Vargas is noteworthy: he cites “the theory of D. J. B. Lamarck, student of the Institute of the Republic of France, concerning the origin, duplication, progress and destruction of living bodies, devised in 1802, whose theorems are the following [...]”. This dissertation was written in 1803.

The historical work by Caracciolo Parra León had wider scope. He edited extremely important sources for the study of the Spanish regime. One of them he re-discovered, the documents of the Pastoral Visit of Bishop Martí to the Diocese of Caracas, which is an authentic X Ray photograph

[⁶⁸] *History of the Church*, p. 213.

of the state of Venezuela by the late 18th century. One can have a very colorful and truthful picture of the social, economic, political, as well as religious state of the Province, first, and later also of the Capitanía, through this mass of intelligent and disinterested observations.

In his editorial enterprises Parra León added a study on the authors he offered to the consideration of the public:

In the task he took on himself, enlightening the Venezuelan people on how each of the regions of the Republic had started its existence, Parra thought that it was not sufficient to offer very careful editions of the great chroniclers. No, indeed that effort should be combined with the simultaneous publication of a brief study on the character and the work of each one of such chroniclers [...].⁶⁹

But, beyond this, Parra León expressed a very deep reflection on the nature and goals of historiography, which he applied to the study of the Venezuelan past. This is the main reason, I think, for the deep impact of his work (along with the thorough examination of the original documents and the archives). I will borrow the abstract which Tomás Polanco Alcántara formulated of this philosophical approach:

Parra thought that in humanity's history there are two kinds of factors which have influence on its direction: the one is material, determined by unchangeable and mechanical physical and physiological forces. This factor has to do with the set of social laws which regulate the march of the peoples and which allow us to find some constants in the way in which human beings behave. But there are in history actions which are the effect exclusively of the free will of human beings, of the ideas which he assumes at a given moment because he wills to do so. Ideas with which he falls in love because they fill him with enthusiasm so much so that they direct his activity.

These ideas of human beings [would be the second factor and], as Dr. Parra used to say, "such factor works with an amazing effectiveness. They leave their footprints everywhere. They are born, they grow, they ignite and multiply, and then they either live always young within the soul of humanity or they stay behind in the twilight of the past, sometimes dressed in poverty and egotism, sometimes stained with blood, sometimes patient and humble just waiting for the future resurrection." Parra baptized his way of thinking the "dualist or organic conception of history."⁷⁰

Parra really went further than Polanco allows. He holds that the dualist view of history sees social entities as having a body and a soul which must be considered by the historian. Moreover, this kind of historiography acknowledges that there is a First Cause, Divine Providence, and finds in history the marks of that Sovereign Lord.⁷¹

His conception of history, besides "dualistic" must be considered as "organic." He wanted the regional history of Venezuela to be written. But not concerning the independence, which is not the formative event of the country, but concerning the slow formation of the roots from which the independence sprouted. The diverse regional historiographic efforts should be afterward combined to form a faithful picture of the soul of our Fatherland as a whole. Three elements had to be combined: the American element, the Spanish spirit and the integral conception of life. Not only political, military and juridical elements of society should be considered, but also its social, economic, intellectual, religious, and "all other manifestations which are useful in order to conceive the fullness of the social substance and the wholeness of its evolution in time and space."⁷² Because of this philosophical depth and because of

[69] T. Polanco Alcántara, *Conversaciones con un joven que fue sabio (Semblanza del Dr. Caracciolo Parra León)*, Caracas: Academia Nacional de la Historia, 1988, p. 63.

[70] See *Conversaciones*, p. 43. The literal citation of Parra is taken from his discourse with which Parra was accepted at the National Academy of History in January 28th 1932, pp. 33–34, in *Obras*, Editorial J.B., Madrid, s/f, pp. 19–64.

[71] See the above mentioned discourse, pp. 34–35.

[72] Parra is commented and cited by Polanco, *Conversaciones*, pp. 45–46.

the pains he took to base his judgments solidly on documents, solid and unquestionable documentation, Parra León became, as Guillermo Morón acknowledged, “the man who laid the foundation for historical studies with scientific basis in Venezuela.”⁷³

The School of Philosophy was closed again in 1934 by the Ministry of Education. It reopened later, but its Catholic identity did not reappear. The annals of the Central University, in fact, keep silence concerning that period of the School between 1928–1934: it is as if it did not exist.⁷⁴ Parra León’s theological efforts were also obliterated in several ways.

The earthquake caused by Parra León’s historical investigations and publishing enterprise, however, could not so easily be stopped. The National Academy of History picked up this line of research and the result was a great mass of publications concerning the “sources” for the “Colonial” History of the country, amounting to hundreds of volumes. Despite the early death of Parra León, some authors like Mario Briceño Iragorry continued for decades his work.

Due to the activities of the Academy and of many individuals who followed Parra León’s footsteps the upper spheres of historical research in Venezuela were in possession of important truths concerning the formation of the country. Venezuela did not exist before the coming of the Spaniards to the new world. Its formation started during Columbus’ third voyage to the Indies. The conquest was not particularly cruel, and its cruelest stages in Venezuela were led by the Germans in the Western part of the country (the Welzers) and by the rebellious slave traders in Cubagua. The significant reduction of the Indian population was due to a pest of *viruelas* brought into Venezuela by a Portuguese ship from Guinea accidentally. The conquest was started peacefully in some places such as Caracas (by the mestizo Fajardo and his mother, the cacica Isabel) and Barcelona (one time by Bartolomé de las Casas and another by Franciscan friars). But the conquest was completed peacefully in Guayana, the plains of the South and in the Eastern part of the country. In Guayana this was made possible because of the pre-existent war between the four main tribes, among which the Caribbeans. The civilization of the country was a hard job but it started as soon as the neighbors and the Crown were free from the immediate requirements of the consolidation of the Spanish rule. There was much warfare between the inhabitants of Venezuela, on the one hand, and the British, Dutch, French and Caribbeans, on the other. Very early the institution of the collective property of the lands by the Indians was introduced in two kinds of towns: the missionary towns and the so called doctrinal towns. Spain did not trade with slaves, unlike Portugal, Great Britain, France and Holland. The African slaves were well treated in Venezuela. There was a fairly good system of education based on the work of the religious communities and of the secular clergy. As soon as it was possible the Seminary was established. After it the university was founded. This was an establishment which enjoyed great academic freedom and financial and administrative autonomy. The science taught there was up to date but no atheistic doctrines took hold of the minds of its scholars. The encomienda was abolished in 1687. There was an important economic growth in the 18th century. The *Compañía Guipuzcoana* helped in the beginning to bring order to the finances of the country, but it was felt soon after as an oppressive structure. There was an enormous rebellion against the Company in 1749 and another one in 1750, both led by the Militias Captain Juan

[73] See Polanco Alcántara, *Conversaciones*, p. 64. He is citing Morón’s prologue to the 1965 edition of the *Historia de Venezuela* by Ovidedo y Báños, published at the Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, Volume 107.

Luz Coromoto Varela Manrique in her paper “Una mirada historiográfica sobre un texto de historia para la educación media en Venezuela: el manual de Arias Amaro” (*Revista de teoría y didáctica de las ciencias sociales*, Mérida-Venezuela, 2008, No. 13, pp. 217–243) traces the origin of some aspects of Venezuelan historiography to the French School of the *Annales*. I think one must be very careful on this point because one can see that Caracciolo Parra León’s conception of historiography might sound similar to the French School, but it is clearly independent and avoids the materialistic shortcomings on which that School sometimes fell. Luz Varela follows the report of our historiography by Germán Carrera Damas, but as we shall see, Carrera, who is a Marxist, ignores our greatest historian.

[74] In the essay by Alberto Navas Blanco, “Una aproximación a la fundación de la Facultad de Humanidades y Educación de la Universidad Central de Venezuela (1946), the reopening of the School in 1928 (after its closing in 1874) is not mentioned. This essay can be read at the official website of the *Facultad de Humanidades y Educación* of the Central University of Venezuela.

Francisco de León. It was not a rebellion against the King. In 1743 the militias defeated the regular army of England, which tried to invade Venezuela with 10,000 men. In 1806 the whole country rejected Francisco de Miranda's treacherous rebellion against the Crown. In 1808 the Napoleonic invasion and the resignation of Charles IV and Ferdinand VII broke the traditional obedience of the Venezuelan people to the Monarchy. This is why in 1810, only four years after Miranda's adventures, the population was ready to start the independence movement. This movement, however, was seized by the radicals, Bolívar, Ribas and Miranda. This was the undoing of the country and connects with what I have said happened during the independence war and afterward.⁷⁵

Thus, the conditions existed in Venezuela to break once and for all the black legend. Especially because since 1958 at least, and perhaps since 1948, the Church enjoyed freedom as She had not enjoyed it since the Spanish regime of the Habsburg. This break did not happen, however. Why?

Because there were material and spiritual forces which opposed the dissolution of the black legend. The spiritual forces which prevented a whole hearted reception of Parra León's research were identified by the same historian in a letter addressed to Tulio Chiossone: "the hatred against Spain, the anti-Catholic reaction and the difficulty to change traditional theses."⁷⁶

The material forces were the following: (a) the Masonic lodges, which controlled the Ministry of Education, and (b) Marxist cliques which were very active at the universities' educational activities in history. Thus, for example, Germán Carrera Damas, history professor of the Central University of Venezuela, disqualifies the activities of the National Academy of History by saying that they are part of the "official history." He underlines instead, as the highest quality historiographical teaching,⁷⁷ the teaching done at the Central University. He also disqualifies as "reactionary" any historiography which tries to dispel the black legend. And he clearly judges that the more advanced form of historiography is that which expels the "reactionary" individualism, and also any "providentialism." That is to say, he prefers the historiography which subscribes to the Marxist conception and uses Sociology, Political Economy and Anthropology as its "scientific" tools. Carrera Damas does not even mention Caracciolo Parra León.⁷⁸

There was, then, a divorce between the research of the historians of the National Academy of History and the teaching activity at the Central University, and also there was a divorce between the Academy's research, on the one hand, and the programs and syllabi which the basic, middle and higher education students received, on the other.⁷⁹ We are going to focus on this phenomenon in the following pages.

But we must warn the reader that the situation after the Communists won full power since 1998–2003 has got much worse. In 2007–2008, Diosdado Cabello as Governor of Miranda, destroyed more than one million books. With 62,262 of them he made toilet paper.⁸⁰ In 2008 Adán Chávez, the head

[75] Much of what I state in this paragraph is expounded in my book *El republicanismo español en América: una evaluación*, published by the Instituto de Investigaciones Jurídicas Mario de la Cueva of the UNAM, México, in 2015. It is available online. Some aspects can be found in the following works: Rafael María de Baralt, *Resumen de historia de Venezuela*; Mario Briceno Iragorry, *Tápices de historia patria, Obras completas*, Caracas: Ediciones del Congreso de la República, 1989, Tomo 4, 3–211; Caracciolo Parra León, *La instrucción en Caracas, 1567–1725*, and *Filosofía universitaria venezolana, 1725–1821*.

[76] Tomás Polanco Alcántara, *Conversaciones*, p. 106.

[77] He acknowledges that there is not much research at the university.

[78] See Germán Carrera Damas, "La historiografía venezolana actual," *Ideas y valores*, 1969, Número 32–34, pp. 77–82. This perspective appears in Carrera Damas' book, *Cuestiones de historiografía venezolana*, Caracas: Ediciones de la Biblioteca de la Universidad Central de Venezuela, 1964. On this book (p. 12), the reader can see that part of Carrera Damas' historiographical studies were done in response to a petition by the Soviet Union's Academy of Sciences. The reader can also find there an explicit confession of historical materialism (see p. 182). Federico Brito Figueroa has had much influence over the recent conceptions on the history of the Venezuelan historiography. Unfortunately, as Carrera Damas has pointed out, Brito Figueroa is also a Marxist (See *Cuestiones*, pp. 140–141). This means that the Marxists have entirely distorted the history of Venezuelan historiography and have successfully hidden the transcendence of Caracciolo Parra León's work. –And this happened even before the Communist tyranny took hold of the country under Hugo Chávez Frías, Nicolás Maduro and Diosdado Cabello.

[79] Also at universities the Communists were very active. Moreover, the biggest and most influential school of education, the "Pedagógico" had tight connections with the Ministry.

[80] I have been unable to find the original article published by Laura Helena Castillo in *El Nacional* on March 29th 2009. But there is full information of the event here, in Graciela Pantín, "El día del libro y la lectura en Venezuela", *La Vanguardia* (Barcelona),

of the so called “Ministerio del Poder Popular para la Educación”, decreed a thorough change in the curriculum of all subjects in basic school, including history, and later (2011) the government printed 42,000,000 text books, distributed them for the use of 6,000,000 children and imposed them as the unique text book allowed in each of their respective subject matters. There is a serious attempt to destroy any remnants of Catholic high culture and of the revision of the black legend. This, of course, has gone hand in hand with the physical elimination of Catholics who could pose a threat to the cultural project of the Communists, such as Fernando Albán or the military chaplains (who were killed in *common robberies* during the first ten years of Communist rule).⁸¹

2. The imposition of the Black Legend Against the Knowledge and Opinion of Venezuelan Best Professional Historians

The first step to understand this section is to realize that the destruction of the historical conscience of Christians, achieved through a systematic slandering campaign, is one of the most effective tactics for the persecution of Christians, because it produces de-moralization by hiding the golden fruits of the Gospel, and cuts any effective proposal of a model of life for the concrete circumstance of contemporary Christians. Orwell showed a deep understanding, if partial, of political theology, when he wrote in 1984: “He who controls the past, controls the future; and he who controls the present, controls the past.”

A. First Stage: Guzmán and the influence of Positivism

Guzmán Blanco is the man who laid the foundations for transforming the State into the “Teaching State,” a monster who would impose the official ideology as much as it could on its subjects. Positivism is the ideology which promoted this in 19th century Spanish America. As we have seen, Guzmán strove to decapitate the Church and to destroy philosophy as an autonomous discipline. He imposed positivism as the higher culture in Venezuela, and he did it by the State’s force, that is to say, by raw violence and tyranny. That monster, the teaching State, grew step by step. Already in 1911, under a very different tyrant, the monster was able to impose on Venezuelan families a particular and only way of teaching. It is well documented that under the Spanish regime the missionaries could not teach catechism or baptize children without the consent of the parents.⁸² But the believers in Positivism and Progress were far less respectful of the basic freedoms of families. And they saw and see their impositions as a duty and a right of the “Teaching State,” which, as a *Leviathan* (an Apocalyptic sea-monster), finds itself at war with Christianity.

So it was, then, that in 1911 the State established the *curriculum*, the official programs for all courses of the basic schools and of high school. The apparent goal was to “uniformize” teaching in the whole country. These programs would define the contents of all courses and would offer direction regarding

April 15th 2009. Available here: <https://www.lavanguardia.com/lectores-corresponsales%20/20090415/53681633592/el-dia-del-libro-y-la-lectura-en-venezuela.html> (4 March 2009).

[⁸¹] I did not save evidence of the assassination of the chaplains. I remember clearly a case in the Caracas neighborhood called “Alto Prado.” The official statement was that he was killed in a robbery. Dozens or even hundreds of thousands of those whom the regime considered “enemies” were killed in this way, but I cannot enter into this subject now (I gave a lecture in December 2007 where I touched this subject. I used sources many of which are no longer available. The title is “Chávez, su llegada al poder, su consolidación, su imperio.” I published it in my blog a couple of years ago. Here it is: <http://carlosacasanovag.blogspot.com/2017/08/chavez-su-llegada-al-poder-su.html?q=la+revoluci%C3%B3n+comunista+en+venezuela>. Regarding Fernando Albán I have published a short article, “Dios saca los mayores bienes de los grandes males. El martirio de Fernando Albán,” available here: <http://carlosacasanovag.blogspot.com/2018/10/diossaca-los-mayores-bienes-de-los.html> (August 13th 2019). About Fernando the government held that he had committed suicide.

[⁸²] See, for example, my own investigation, *El republicanismo español en América. Una evaluación*, p. 94.

the strategies of the teaching activity. They had to be followed by public and private schools alike. Their guiding ideology was Positivism and one of their aims was to supersede the then current philosophical guidelines of Venezuelan education.

B. Second Stage: the influence of Marxism during the Republican life of Venezuela

Since 1936 the Ministry of Education takes on the design, reform and approval of the programs. Afterward, all governments, even the Christian democrats, have assumed that the power of imposing the programs, belongs to the State. And a sad aspect is that the Christian democrats, unwisely, when they had the power to prevent it, allowed the neuralgic center of the Ministry of Education to fall and/or remain in Marxist hands, as we are about to see in what regards the history programs.⁸³

Since the 1970s up to 2008 the series of History handbooks most used in Basic School and High School in order to explain Venezuelan history were those written by Alberto Arias Amaro.⁸⁴ These books were written in accordance to the official curriculum in the elaboration of which Arias Amaro himself took part. An astonishing fact is that this man was a member of the Communist Party and his book is clearly a Marxist book.⁸⁵ A Venezuelan researcher has determined that Arias Amaro borrowed much of its theoretical framework from a Marxist author, Marta Harnecker. Her works (the booklets of Marxist pedagogy and her widespread book, *Los conceptos elementales del materialismo histórico* [*The Elementary Concepts of Historical Materialism*, 1970]), are Arias Amaro's main inspiration regarding his fundamental concepts and perspective, although he did not quote her,⁸⁶ probably in order not to cause alarm. In the first book of the series, written for 12 years old children, one can see the complete distortion of historiography which creeps into this book:

The essential characteristic of Venezuelan society since the conquest of its territory by Spain up to this day, has been its permanent relation of dependence from other, foreign societies which have subordinated our economical, political and social development to their own interests. [This is due to] situations and processes which, although unfolded outside of our territory, have directed its energies into the direction which was more expedient to the dominant powers in each period of time.⁸⁷

Through a doctoral dissertation written for the Universidad de Barcelona we can establish that in 2002–2004 (a) Alberto Arias Amaro's book was a text very much used in many schools and (b) the general content of the courses, prescribed by the programs and present in all text books used by the schools, was thoroughly anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish. They just entirely silenced the Catholic character of Venezuela.

The first point (a) is established by the fact that Arias Amaro was one of the three books used in every level (7th grade of basic school through 9th grade) of the study of Venezuelan history and Venezuelan

[⁸³] See Ramón Uzcátegui, "Elementos para la conformación de una historia del currículo desde la memoria educativa venezolana", pp. 10–13. (This is a "Working paper" by a professor of the Central University of Venezuela, available at Research Gate and downloaded on July 31st 2019). Uzcátegui assess the imposition of the programs as a very positive step. He mentions José Gil Fortoul as one of the architects of this change.

[⁸⁴] One of the most used books since 1972 until 2008. See Luz Coromoto Varela Manrique, "Una mirada historiográfica sobre un texto de historia para la educación media en Venezuela: El manual de Arias Amaro", nota 18, p. 239.

[⁸⁵] See *ibidem*, p. 227.

[⁸⁶] See *ibidem*, p. 233. He also copies Lenin and does not give the source, perhaps not to cause alarm among the parents. *Ibidem*, p. 233.

[⁸⁷] "La característica esencial de la sociedad venezolana, desde la conquista de su territorio por España hasta nuestros días, ha sido su permanente relación de dependencia respecto de otras sociedades extranjeras, que han subordinado nuestro desarrollo económico, político y social a sus propios intereses. [Esto se debe a] situaciones y procesos que se desarrollaban fuera del territorio, y que lo han orientado en el sentido que más convenía a las potencias dominantes de cada período" (p. 23 of the 1995 edition of the *History of Venezuela for 7th grade of Basic School*). Cited by Ramón Uzcátegui, *op. cit.*, pp. 239 and 232.

culture (under the name of “Cátedra Bolivariana”). Only Arias Amaro was used at the same time in the three levels by any of the schools examined in the doctoral dissertation.

The second point (b) can be established because, for example:

- (1) There is no reference to the missions or the “pueblos de doctrina”, institutions to which we owe the conquest of more than a half of our territory and the reduction to the civic life of most of the descendants of the Indians who inhabited Venezuela when the Spaniards arrived. The focus lies on the political institutions (which are seen just as a shell) and on the “relations of production”, the “encomienda” and the “Compañía Guipuzcoana”.
- (2) There is little or no mention of the schools, the seminaries, the scholar activity of the convents, the university, etc.
- (3) The extinction of the encomiendas in 1687, the severe impairment of the power of the “Compañía” at the end of the 18th century, the introduction of the new crops by clerics (café, añil)⁸⁸ are not touched.
- (4) The Indians are presented as the originary Venezuelans, so that the fact that the very existence of Venezuela is actually a Spanish feat (in which the Indians were, of course, incorporated) is obliterated.
- (5) No mention is made of the *milicias*, of the participation of the Indians and all the *castas* in them, of the constant aggressions by England, Holland and France, of the defeat of the regular army of England by the *milicias* in 1743, of the movement led by Juan Francisco de León. This is so, I think, because especially these events and institutions demonstrate that Venezuela was a unit of political and military action in history, different entirely from the Neolithic or Paleolithic tribes found in the territory in the 15th century. Clearly a unit which was integrated in the Spanish Monarchy.
- (6) No mention is made of the debates between Sepúlveda and Las Casas, or of Vitoria or of the Laws of Indies or of the *Consejo de Indias*.
- (7) There is no mention of the Patronato introduced by Bolívar in the Constitutions of Bolivia and Colombia.
- (8) There is no mention of the expulsion of the religious orders in 1837.
- (9) There is no mention of the secularization of the civil registry, the cemeteries, marriage, etc.
- (10) There is no mention of the suppression of the seminaries, the Schools of philosophy and theology, the intervention of the universities by Guzmán Blanco. Etc., etc.⁸⁹

C. Third stage: the influence of Marxism under Communist tyranny

But, since 2008, with the new *Bolivarian* curriculum, the situation is even worse. Because now the government has imposed as a matter of a mandatory rule that only the text books officially printed by the Ministry of Education itself (*Ministerio del Poder Popular para la Educación*) can be used. But

[⁸⁸] Cfr. Rafael María de Baralt, op. cit., pp. 365 and 366. Don Pablo Orrendain introduced the *añil* in Guatemala in 1774 (and from there it was brought to Venezuela) and the pastor of Chacao (later bishop of Guayana) introduced coffee in 1783. Mohedano was helped by don Bartolomé Blandín and Fr. Pedro Sojo. Orrendain was helped by don Antonio Arvide.

[⁸⁹] All these data can be checked here: Ana Millán Lugo, *La historia que se aprende en la escuela básica venezolana. Percepción y conocimientos del alumnado*, tesis doctoral dirigida por el Dr. Joaquim Prats Cuevas y presentada en la Universidad de Barcelona, Departamento de Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales, Facultad de Formación del Profesorat, en febrero de 2008, pp. 203, 206 y 552 y ss. Disponible aquí: http://diposit.ub.edu/dspace/bitstream/2445/41454/1/AML_TESIS.pdf (August 1st 2019).

the printed books regarding history are disastrous. Let's first examine the new *curriculum* and then refer to the implementation of the same.

- a. *Currículo del subsistema de educación primaria de Venezuela* (September 2007), by the *Ministerio del Poder Popular para la Educación* under the Minister, Adán Chávez Frías⁹⁰

This curriculum covers grades 1st through 6th.

Already in the *Prologue* of this document one can see the thorough historiographical distortion which maims it. According to the Ministry, the document is inspired by a “thorough respect and esteem of the multicultural and multiethnic diversity of Venezuela, and of the highest principles and values which have formed our Venezuelan nationality, such as liberty, equality, fraternity, justice, peace, common good, the unity of America, among others, with which was grounded the independence of Venezuela in 1811 and was founded the First Republic.” Thus, the Ministry has decided by Executive order, that Venezuela was not founded before 1811 and that, when it was founded, Spain had not the main agency. Also, the Ministry has replaced the Catholic identity by the *enlightened* one.

In p. 18, paragraph 1, the Ministry has decreed that in Venezuela there is no main culture. We have always been, they claim, a non-digested mosaic. So, one of the main *values* the curriculum wants to implant in small children is: “respect and esteem of the cultural, multiethnic, pluricultural and pluri-lingual diversity of the peoples and indigenous and afro-descending communities under the principle of equality of cultures.” Of course, such equality and diversity are promoted from the perspective of Marxism and in Spanish, in a way similar to that in which another totalitarian ideology, that of the Nazis, tried to destroy the Christian identity of Germany and to highlight its pagan ancestry. There is nothing new under the sun.

a. For first grade, in p. 36, the Ministry tells the 6–7 years old Venezuelan children that their country started with the key events of the war of independence. Then Big Brother tells the little ones that their culture is very diverse and that they have to receive the ancestral inheritance of the “originary peoples” and of the “Afro-descending.” Thus the Spanish element and very notably, the Christian, Catholic element is silenced. In the whole curriculum from 1st to 6th grade there is no mention of Christianity, not in the history courses, not in any other course. Not one. Not by any chance.

Again in pp. 36–37 the *heroes* which the Ministry has chosen to present the children with are identified: they will be the same ones year after year from 1st to 6th grade: Simón Bolívar, Simón Rodríguez, Francisco de Miranda, Ezequiel Zamora, Antonio José de Sucre. They are, supposedly the creators of our citizenship. The previous 313 years did not happen. But even these heroes are distorted,⁹¹ they become a shell in which Marxism is poured in order to indoctrinate the children with this totalitarian, ecumenical religion, while appearing as “nationalists.”

b. In pp. 48–49, the Ministry determines the contents which the second grade children are going to study in social sciences, citizenship and identity. The same heroes are mentioned again, the same feats are celebrated as in first grade. Once more the inheritance of the “originary peoples” and of the former slaves is stressed. No mention of Christianity.

[⁹⁰] This curriculum is available here: http://www.cerpe.org.ve/tl_files/Cerpe/contenido/documentos/Actualidad%20Educativa/Curriculo%20Educacion%20Primaria%20Bolivariana.%202007.pdf (August 6th 2019).

[⁹¹] After wandering spiritually, both Miranda and Bolívar died Catholic. Sucre was always Catholic. Zamora because a mason. I do not know the religious position of Simón Rodríguez. But all this disappears from the official history of Venezuela, due to the Marxist piety of its designers.

c. In pp. 61–63, we find the contents for third grade. Explicitly the children begin to be immersed in the policies of the State, the so called “Bolivarian” “Republic” of Venezuela. The same heroes are mentioned, once more. Some others are added: Hipólita Bolívar, Matea Bolívar, Guaicaipuro, Baruta, José Leonardo Chirino and Zambo Manuel. Thus, two women slaves whose merit was to be close to Simón Bolívar, two caciques from the time of the conquest of Caracas, and two rebellious zambos (one from the 16th century and one from the 18th century) are studied. No mention of the conquerors, founders, no mention of the *mestizo* who was the first founder of Caracas, silence concerning the peaceful policies of Fajardo and Losada and concerning the constant warfare against the British and the Dutch, etc., is made. As values which formed our fatherland, three are mentioned: liberty, equality and fraternity. These values are studied in the light of fragments from Bolívar’s writings. Again, no mention of Spain and/or Christianity is made.

In page 62 the contributions of different ethnicities to the formation of Venezuela are subject to study. It reads thus: “Understanding the importance of the contributions of communities (indigenous, African, European, Asian and Latin-American) for the formation of the Venezuelan person and for the formation of Venezuelan society and feeling.” Thus, the Spanish element becomes “European.” The Asian element appears at the same time and level. The “Latin-American” appears as if it was something different from the Spanish or Portuguese element mixed with the Amerindian and the African.

In page 63 the main line of the *formation* of the children can be seen: the meaning of history is the struggle against slavery. The central holiday is the following: the Day of Indian Resistance and the Struggle for the Abolition of Slavery. In this chapter the rights of children are included in the way they are understood by the LOPNA, the Venezuelan legislation on this matter, which already in 1990 included the “rights to sexual and reproductive health” (arts. 43, 50), for example.

d. In pp. 73–74 we find the contents for fourth grade. On this level Miranda, Bolívar and Sucre are highlighted as heroes. But other heroes are mentioned, always with “diversity” and “gender equity” in mind. The novelty is that now some facts are examined, all of them concerning rebellions against Spain, and the war of independence (in Venezuela and in Colombia, Ecuador, Perú and Bolivia) and its aftermath. Besides these facts, the meaning of history appears again to be the liberation of the indigenous and Afro-descending peoples. No mention is made of the Spanish element of Venezuelan culture, at least not *qua* Spanish.

In p. 75 there is another novelty: the Ministry starts to stress the importance of “communal organization.” The teaching of Chavista ideology becomes explicit through the study of the Preamble of the *Constitution*. It is identified as “Bolivarian idearium.”

e. In pp. 84–85 we find the contents for fifth grade. A worrisome aspect appears at this moment. The unities of production are identified as: “fundos zamoranos, conucos, hacienda, granjas, among others”. Slowly in the following years the children will hear that the economic production is either “communal” (like in the so called “fundos zamoranos”) or of subsistence (like in the *conucos*).

Then, the “social processes from 1830 through 1936” are mentioned. According to what follows, such processes would be: *caudillismo* and *latifundio* and socio-political imbalances; the Federal War and the leadership of Ezequiel Zamora; the government of Guzmán Blanco; Venezuela after Guzmán; The blockade; the Dictatorship of Gómez and the discovery of oil in Venezuela.

In p. 85 some ideological studies are included, such as the rights of children once more, and the so-called Venezuelan “Popular Power.”

f. In pp. 94–95 we find the contents for sixth grade. The political history of Venezuela continues, divided in three periods: the transition from 1936 to 1958, and then the “representative democracy”

and the “participative democracy.” This latter term means the whole Chavista ideology, the so called “socialism of the 21st century.”

Afterward, the program insists on the importance of “communities” and of the units of “social production”, such as the *centers for agro-industrial development* and the *fundos zamoranos*.

After a careful reading of the whole curriculum, we can safely state that the government in Venezuela attempts to utterly erase any trace of the Christian past of the country.

- b. *Curriculo del subsistema de educación media de Venezuela (September 2007), by the Ministerio del Poder Popular para la Educación under the Minister, Adán Chávez Frías⁹²*

This curriculum covers years 1 through 5 of the Venezuelan highschool.

The prologue is the same as that of the basic school’s curriculum. Let’s examine the programs for social science and citizenship. But, before doing this, we must preliminarily observe a disconcerting trace of this document. It betrays the “humanistic” character of the whole Chavista enterprise: man must be the center.⁹³ With this pseudo-religious conviction, the *curriculum* is organized having man at its center. In this way, the scientific disciplines become all of them the study of man. Mathematics and Natural Science are no longer autonomous disciplines, they are aspects of the consideration of “human being and its [sic] interaction with other components of the environment.” This large area has 4 sub-areas: “human being with itself,” “human being with his like and with other living beings,” “human being in the ecosystem,” and “mathematical processes [sic] and their importance for the understanding of the environment” (p. 19). There is war without quarter against God: nothing escapes the grasp of Man. Therefore, no discipline can be seen except as an aspect of the Marxian self-made Man, Socialist Man. The seriousness of the project is overwhelming: the Chavista-ideologues want to change the conception of reality from its very foundations. The section of the *curriculum* reserved for philosophy, ethics and society, excludes religion and any reference to God, of course. Its center is “society, human being, ethics and citizenship.”

The area of social science and citizenship is directed, supposedly, to promote equality, equity and inclusion; “historical conscience,” and “Venezuelan culture and identity.” But it always keeps in mind the presence of violence: “for the national sovereignty, defense and security” (p. 20).

a. In pp. 31–32 one finds the historical contents of the curriculum for the 1st year of high school. This content starts with a long reference to the “Amerindian Venezuela,” which is already deceiving because “Venezuela” as a geographical unit did not exist before the conquest by the Spaniards. The program mentions the conquest and colonization of Venezuela, the *capitulaciones* and the *encomienda*, the towns and cities, the provinces, the cultural and economical activities, and it immediately comes to “the inequality.” Then, to the “Indigenous resistance” and the anti-slaver struggle (?). Immediately after it reads: “colonial Venezuelan population. Social inequality: conflicts and their significance for the origin of Venezuelan independence. Libertarian movements of Afro-descending, indigenous people, creole whites and margin whites.” A little later, the program says: “socio-cultural diversity and richness: ancestral contributions which identify us as a nation.”

[⁹²] This document is available here: http://www.cerpe.org.ve/tl_files/Cerpe/contenido/documentos/Actualidad%20Educativa/Curriculo%20Liceos%20Bolivarianos%20-%20MPPE%202007.pdf (August 6th 2019).

[⁹³] In p. 46 “Humanism” is mentioned as the current philosophical interpretation of the world.

So, it seems that the identifying mark of the Spanish presence in America was inequality and conflict, which is ridiculous. We did have frequent conflicts, with the British, the Dutch, the French and with the Caribbean tribes (sometimes allied to the French). The class or ethnic tension had nothing to do with the Independence movement. Some internal conflicts which had enormous relevance are not mentioned: very particularly, the rebellion of Juan Francisco de León against the Guipuzcoan Company.

After such unilateral and distorting presentation of the Spanish period, the program speaks of the Independence. Bolívar and Miranda are mentioned once more.

In p. 34, one can read a very frightening chapter on “equality, equity and social inclusion.” There, the Armed Force and the “communities” (as a “right of the collective”?) are the center of consideration. Family is mentioned, but immediately after this is added as a central topic: “domestic abuse.” In p. 37, under “physical education,” one finds “prevention of pregnancy in teen agers.”

b. In pp. 46–47 lies the historical contents of the curriculum for 2nd year of high school. Now political facts from 1830 through 1899 are presented. But they are very unilaterally explained. Here, Ezequiel Zamora, a *caudillo* during the Federal War, takes pride of place. The Ministry wants to impose this character of our history as a forerunner of the Chavista revolution: “Movement for equality, liberty and justice.” But, actually, what is known about the thought of Ezequiel Zamora is very little. We know, however, that he was no socialist.⁹⁴

In p. 46 we have a new reference to the fight against ... “pregnancy in early ages.” And again we find a central place for the Armed Force and the national sovereignty. In p. 50 the Ministry insists: “preventing pregnancy in teen agers.”

In p. 47 there are several interesting points but I will highlight only a couple, to give the reader an idea of the real nature of the Chavista movement: “collective property as the foundation of productive relations”⁹⁵ and gender equity. In p. 49, in the context of physical education, one finds a clear indication that the government plans to organize camps, like the “pioneers’ camps” of other totalitarian movements.

c. In pp. 58–59 there is a bit of universal pseudo-history with Marxist leaning: “originary community”, feudal society, Counter-Reformation in Spain and its influence on the conquest of America, capitalism, French Revolution and its influence in America. After this *excurso* through universal history one can understand the situation of Venezuela in the 20th history, the Ministry seems to think. So, the history of Venezuela is resumed from 1899 to 1935. It is described succinctly as: “the consolidation of foreign capital in national economy.”

In p. 59 the Chavista ideology is presented as a form of “humanism.” Its connections to the global movements directed to freedom is underlined. In p. 60 the Ministry instructs the students on the mutual relations of individuals in order to make possible the collective production. And, Lo and behold!: “economical activity as the result of the needs of survival and reproduction articulated in the community.” Thus, the Ministry, like Marx in the *Communist Manifesto*, includes the “couple relations” and the children as an aspect of the “productive process.” It is really moving.

In p. 61 the camps appear again. In p. 62, “preventing pregnancy.”

d. In fourth and fifth years of high school, education bifurcates. Traditionally in Venezuela, the main possibilities were “science” and “humanities.” But the Marxists have suppressed such non-sense. Everything is “humanity” and everything is “science.” So, they now divide: “Natural Sciences” and “Social Sciences.”

[94] Roberto Lobera de Sola, “El verdadero Ezequiel Zamora”, *Analítica*, July 6th 2009. Available here: <https://www.analitica.com/opinion/opinion-nacional/el-verdadero-ezequiel-zamora/>

[95] In this context, one finds the institution: “Fundos zamoranos, structure and functioning.”

In fourth year of both branches there is a bit of study of Simón Bolívar's and Simón Rodríguez's writings (pp. 63 and 88).

In pp. 65 and 91, so in both branches, one finds this: "Education for a responsible sexuality.⁹⁶ The couple, affective relations and convivence."

In pp. 74 and 100, within the Natural Science branch (characterized by the study of psychology), family is mentioned, thus: "Family. Its role in personal identity. Attitudes towards your couple. Disfunctions. Characteristics of the Venezuelan family and the socialization of teen agers."

In pp. 69 and 94 the contents of the little history of Venezuela studied in 3rd year are repeated for the 4th year of high school in both branches. Afterward, the history of 20th century Venezuela is again reviewed and divided in three periods: transition (1936–1958), representative democracy (1958–1998) and participative democracy (1999–today). Afterward the Ministry directly speaks of the need of defending the revolution and commands the military instruction of the youth.

In pp. 71 and 96 collective property is again presented as the foundation of productive relations. And then the praises of collective production are sung. The materialist conception of man is concretized in the "philosophical" conception of the relation "Education-Work" under the guise of Bolivarian, Zamoran and Simón Rodríguezian [so called *Robinsonian*] thought.

e. In the 5th year of high school there is no more historical teaching.

In the branch of "Social Science" there is a short reference to philosophy. Most of it is a reflection on the official ideology. One item, for example, is: "the agency of social collective entities and its relevance in transforming human reality." There is no "disinterested," speculative study of philosophy. There is no speculative study even of mathematics. In this context, the program includes a "brief history of philosophy: Greece (including Socrates, Plato and Aristotle), philosophy after the Greeks, Roman and Christian philosophy, Modern philosophy (from Descartes to Kant). Oriental philosophy. This is the highest point of openness of the whole curriculum. It follows Marx's view: after socialism reigns, philosophy will become a history of philosophy which ended in the appearance of socialism.⁹⁷ Only here Christianity is mentioned and it is as a "philosophy" of the past, which disappeared with Modernity.

But in pp. 78 and 103, so for both branches, it is stated as a content of the program: "Education for a responsible sexuality. The couple, affective relations and convivence."

Along the whole *currículo* marriage is not mentioned. Its place is taken by "preventing early pregnancy," "responsible use of sex," and "responsible couple relations." All this will give rise to the new "Venezuelan family." We confront here the full Marxist religion, the marks of which are three, according to Shafarevich:

- the abolition of private property.
- The destruction of the family.
- The abolition of Christianity.⁹⁸

This explains why the *currículo* imposes the idea of collective property and of the "new family" (that is to say, no family except as an aspect of the process of production). It also explains why the *currículo* avoids the slightest mention of Christianity shaping the Venezuelan past and present.

[⁹⁶] This "responsible sexuality" reminds one a lot of Comrade Lenin, who, seeing the disastrous results of Kollontai's debauchery, called for a responsible use of sex.

[⁹⁷] See *German Ideology*, Part I, A. Idealism and Materialism, section First Premises of Materialist Method. Moscú: Progress Publishers, 1968.

[⁹⁸] "Socialism in Our Past and Future". Published in *Under the Ruble* by Alexander Solzhenitsyn et al., Washington: Regnery, 1981, pp. 26–66.

c. The implementation of the *curricula*

During the harsh confrontation between the government and the rest of Venezuelan society due to the publication of the *Curriculo* in 2008, the AVEC (Asociación Venezolana de Educación Católica), through a nun who is or was its public relations representative, took sides for the government.⁹⁹ This fact is extremely alarming and I suppose it to be a sign of the deep infiltration which the Church has suffered in Latin America. Religious orders, through the agency of the Jesuits, have become unreliable for Catholics in the sense defined in the general introduction to this paper.

The AVEC was born in 1946 precisely when the Marxist leaning of *Acción Democrática* had led to a big conflict between the government and the Catholic population of Venezuela. Catholics organized themselves to protect their children from ideologization. In 1991, under President Carlos Andrés Pérez, with his Minister Miguel Rodríguez, the government started subsidizing the AVEC, probably to make it dependent on the government, following towards the Church the course of action recommended by Adam Smith in *The Wealth of Nations*.¹⁰⁰ Even today *Fe y Alegría*, a Catholic organization, has in its classrooms hundreds of thousands of children. Sadly, *Fe y Alegría* is under the control of the Jesuits, who in Venezuela have taken sides for the revolution, despite some ineffectual statements to the contrary. It is well known that Arturo Sosa has strong Marxist leanings. Such is the rule among the Venezuelan Jesuits.¹⁰¹ So, very often, the clergy which should protect the sheep are in fact a part of the pack of wolves, but “with the smell of the sheep.”

Despite the support of the AVEC, this Chavista *curriculum* went to rest for some years. But since August 2011 the government proceeded to print 42 million text books for 6 million children in all the levels of the official school, from 1st grade of Basic School to 5th year of High School (Colección Bicentenario).¹⁰² This provoked a very irate reaction of the parents and teachers. As it was to be expected, the Marxist government paid no heed to the massive opposition to its program and went forward with its implementation. Marxists do not understand other language than that of force. But, sadly, in Venezuela they have the force. Inés Quintero states the situation of these years in this way:

During an interview with the newspaper *Últimas Noticias* the current Minister [2015], Héctor Rodríguez, stated his support to the Collection [*Bicentenario*]. [...] In a report published by *El Nacional* (December 8th 2013), María Elena Hurtado, co-author of several of the Social Sciences collection, [...] has stated her view in these terms: “How can we write a history against the ideology of the State?” Professor Zully Millán, from the area of Mathematics, stated on the same subject: “... every teacher is political; you form and educate the students and you know that you are doing it in a particular direction.” Not only do they acknowledge that there is a political position in the contents given to the books, but this fact is ratified and justified. The State, the education and the texts are at the service of a political project, that of the *Bolivarian* government. And that is it. This position is taken very similarly by professor América Bracho, coordinator of the text books for Social Science in an interview given to *Correo del Orinoco* on September 29th 2013.¹⁰³

[99] Ramón Uzcátegui, “Elementos para la conformación de una historia del currículo desde la memoria educativa venezolana”, pp. 23–24.

[100] See *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1869, book 5, Chapter 1, article 3, vol. 2: pp. 374–376.

[101] See A. Francés, “EXCLUSIVE – The Marxist Revolutionary: New Jesuit Superior-General revealed by those who knew him in Venezuela,” available here:

<https://rorate-caeli.blogspot.com/2016/10/exclusive-marxist-revolutionary-new.html> (August 7th 2019).

[102] Inés Quintero, “Enseñar historia en Venezuela: carencias, tensiones y conflictos”, *Caravelle* 104 (2015), pp. 71–86.

[103] “Enseñar historia en Venezuela.”

And, a few paragraphs later, Quintero adds:

Far from accepting any critique by the teachers, experts, institutions consecrated to study the way in which history must be taught, parents, historians and professionals of the didactics of history, the free and massive distribution of the text books by the government through the Ministry of Popular Power for Education has gone forward with no modifications. It is clear that there is a political decision for directly intervening in the educational process through a clearly ideological and politicized content which catches the eye in the history text books.

Among the criticisms directed against these text books one finds that they not only silence some aspects of history as we have pointed out, but they very straightforwardly lie about central subjects of national interest. Thus, for example, the texts have a map of the *Capitanía General de Venezuela* which diminishes its real geographical extension.¹⁰⁴ The monster known as the “Teaching State” is really not “teaching” but “brain-washing.”

The situation, then, is that the poor Christian children or at least the children of Christian parents are being raised within a spiritual ambience in which no mention of the Christian past of Venezuela is made and in which the action of the Spaniards in America is thoroughly distorted. The lie is so deep and wide that if one could succeed in getting the truth to reach the children some how the whole edifice would collapse. But I do not deceive myself: I do not see how one could get the truth to reach the children effectively. Even under the republican regime of 1958–1998 the Marxists managed to control the programs and the textbooks.

However, perhaps with the help of a government there could be hope of breaking the iron curtain of slander and lies. With websites available for Venezuelans in exile and with booklets smuggled into the country, perhaps Christians could learn the truth and find models to imitate and raise their morale.

CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSALS

In this short briefing on the persecution of Christians in Chile and Venezuela we have focused in a few of the main strategies that the current persecution is using, mainly the thorough distortion of historiography, the use of selective intolerance and the destruction of the Catholic character of supposedly Catholic higher education centers. Especially in Venezuela, the reader must realize that the situation of Christians is far worse than we have depicted here. There is a genocide going on in my wretched country. But since I am unable to stop the death machinery of the Communists, I wanted just to point out a way to sow seeds in the souls of Venezuelan Christians, seed which could lead to a future flourishing of Catholic culture, despite the hell that has been unleashed against the Venezuelan people and Church.

Without a doubt there is systematic persecution in both countries. We propose here as possibly feasible measures to counter act it the following:

(1) For Chile:

The funding of an excellent small Academy or Institute where Catholics could acquire the philosophical and theological training necessary for an adequate assimilation and defense of the solemn Magisterium of the Church. I think this would be the most feasible and effective measure, since the Catholic mind

[¹⁰⁴] This was pointed out by Migdalia Lama, a professor of the Catholic University Andrés Bello in Caracas. See Inés Quintero, “Enseñar historia en Venezuela.”

is groping in darkness due to the gradual disappearance of any high culture institution which fulfills this indispensable task. Perhaps this could be accomplished with the cooperation of a Polish university by founding a Chilean campus. Some German universities have done so in the past.

I do not see as feasible for the time being the reversal of the legislation which has been approved in order to crush Catholics who could have a public influence in the official health care and educational systems. Perhaps there could be some measure of diplomatic pressure to exact the respect of the right of conscientious objection in the case of abortion and/or the cases in which the *gender identity* jargon be used against the freedom of the Church or of Christians in general. Also, perhaps there could be pressure to prevent the crushing of the parental power over children. For example, it would be interesting, if the Polish state granted asylum to a family whose parents are suffering the threat of losing their parental power due to their opposition to gender ideology. I do not think we have come yet to this point, but I do think that we will and soon.

2) For Venezuela:

To make available to all electronic publications of the abundant sources which show the huge contributions of the Church and of Christians throughout the history of Venezuela. The whole collection of “Fuentes para la historia colonial” and the whole collection “El pensamiento político venezolano del siglo XIX” should be made available to everybody. I suppose that we would have to solve the problem of the intellectual rights in negotiations with the National Academy of History. Some of the documents might be of public domain already or will become soon. The works by Mario Briceño Iragorry are an important source and I am sure his daughter would grant permission for this project. The works by Caracciolo Parra León should also be available for all. I do not know who holds the intellectual rights, but I do know that he died more than 70 years ago: so, if we could find old editions we would have no legal problem.

Also, to strive to make campaigns within the country to inform the people and in this way defeat the censure imposed by the government. I think that if the situation does not change dramatically, this could be at least partially done even through contacts that I have in the country, if we have resources to do it.

Bibliography

Books, articles and papers, interviews, internal guidelines and agreements of the Catholic University

Aldrey, F. de; and Hernández, R. *Rasgos biográficos para la historia de la vida pública del General Guzmán Blanco*, Caracas: Imprenta de la Opinión Nacional, 1876.

Rafael María de Baralt, *Resumen de la historia de Venezuela*, París: Desclée-De Brouwer, 1939.

Barrios Guzmán, P. *Biografía del General Piar*, available here: <https://archive.org/details/biografiadelgeneobarr/page/n9>

Bécker, J. “Objeción de conciencia”, *El Mercurio*, Cartas al Director, August 27th 2019.

Berrios, F., S.J. interview for *El País*, “Siento que la Iglesia católica chilena está muy alejada de la gente”, January 4th 2018, available here: https://elpais.com/internacional/2018/01/04/america/1515088929_983366.html

Bolívar, S. Letters to Francisco de Paula Santander, October 8th 1825 and October 25th 1826 at the *Libertador's Archives*, available online, here: <http://www.archivodellibertador.gob.ve>

Address to the Bolivian Congress Introducing the Constitutional Project, here: *Pensamiento conservador, 1815–1898*, Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho, 1986, pp. 3–12.

- Briceño Iragorry, M. *La hora undécima*, Madrid: Ediciones Independencia, 1956.
- Tapices de historia patria*, “Obras completas,” Caracas: Ediciones del Congreso de la República, 1989, Tomo 4, 3–211.
- Carrera Damas G. *Cuestiones de historiografía venezolana*, Ediciones de la Biblioteca de la Universidad Central de Venezuela, Caracas, 1964.
- La historiografía venezolana actual*, “Ideas y valores,” 1969, Número 32–34, pp. 77–82.
- Casanova, C.A. *El republicanismo español en América: una evaluación*, UNAM: México, 2015
- Chávez, su llegada al poder, su consolidación, su imperio*, blog article, available here: <http://carlosacasanovag.blogspot.com/2017/08/chavez-su-llegada-al-poder-su.html?q=la+revoluci%C3%B3n+comunista+en+venezuela> (October 11th 2019)
- “Dios saca los mayores bienes de los grandes males. El martirio de Fernando Albán,” blog article, available here: <http://carlosacasanovag.blogspot.com/2018/10/diossaca-los-mayores-bienes-de-los.html> (August 13th 2019)
- La doctrina conservadora en Venezuela*, Bogotá: Universidad Sergio Arboleda, 2019 (in print)
- Costadoat, J. “Un Cristo fantástico” (blog article, February 20th 2019, available here: <https://jorgecostadoat.cl/wp/>)
- “Jesús: hijo y hermano,” *Cuadernos de Teología*, Vol II, n° 2 (2010) 162–169
- “La liberación en la cristología de Jon Sobrino”. En: *Teología y Vida*, Vol. 45, número 1 (2004), 62–84.
- Francés A. “EXCLUSIVE – The Marxist Revolutionary: New Jesuit Superior-General revealed by those who knew him in Venezuela,” available here: <https://rorate-caeli.blogspot.com/2016/10/exclusive-marxist-revolutionary-new.html> (August 7th 2019)
- Guzmán Blanco, A. *Recopilación de Leyes y Decretos de Venezuela*. Caracas: Imprenta La Opinión Nacional, 1884, Tomo VIII, 1878–1888.
- Henríquez, T. “Matrimonio gay: la colusión no es solo entre privados,” *El Mostrador*, July 5th 2016. It is available here: <https://www.elmostrador.cl/noticias/opinion/2016/07/05/matrimonio-gay-la-colusion-no-es-solo-entre-privados/> (September 12th 2019)
- “A Storm is Brewing in the Americas,” *Public Discourse*, August 12th 2019. Available here: <https://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2019/08/55749/> (September 13th 2019)
- Lobera Sola R. *El verdadero Ezequiel Zamora*, “Analítica,” July 6th 2009, available here: <https://www.analitica.com/opinion/opinion-nacional/el-verdadero-ezequiel-zamora/>
- Marcuse, H. “Repressive Tolerance.” In: R. P. Wolff, B. Moore Jr and H. Marcuse, *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1969, pp. 81–123
- Martí M. (Obispo) *Libro personal*, “Documentos relativos a la visita pastoral de la Diócesis de Caracas (1771–1784),” Caracas: Academia Nacional de la Historia, 1998, ts. I y II.
- Marx K. and Engels F. *German Ideology*, Moscú: Progress Publishers, 1968.
- Millán Lugo A. *La historia que se aprende en la escuela básica venezolana. Percepción y conocimientos del alumnado*, Doctoral dissertation directed by Dr. Joaquim Prats Cuevas and accepted at Universidad de Barcelona, Departamento de Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales, Facultad de Formació del Professorat, February 2008, pp. 203, 206 y 552 y ss. Available here: http://diposit.ub.edu/dspace/bitstream/2445/41454/1/AML_TESIS.pdf (August 1st 2019)
- Ministry of Popular Power for Education (Venezuela), *Currículo del subsistema de educación primaria de Venezuela* (September 2007), available here: http://www.cerpe.org.ve/tl_files/Cerpe/contenido/documentos/Actualidad%20Educativa/Curriculo%20Educacion%20Primaria%20Bolivariana.%202007.pdf (August 6th 2019).
- Curriculo del subsistema de educación media de Venezuela* (September 2007), available here: http://www.cerpe.org.ve/tl_files/Cerpe/contenido/documentos/Actualidad%20Educativa/Curriculo%20Liceos%20Bolivarianos%20-%20MPPE%202007.pdf (August 6th 2019).

- Navas Blanco, A. “Una aproximación a la fundación de la Facultad de Humanidades y Educación de la Universidad Central de Venezuela (1946)”, available here: http://www.ucv.ve/uploads/media/Navas_Los_primeros_tiempos.pdf (August 12th 2019)
- Nectario María, Brother. *Ideas y sentimientos religiosos del Libertador Simón Bolívar*, Madrid: 1978.
- Olivera Ravasi, J. “¿Simón Bolívar masón?”, available here: http://www.infocatolica.com/blog/notelacuenten.php/1412070239-san-martin-y-bolivar-su-polit#_ftn2
- Pantín G. *El día del libro y la lectura en Venezuela*, “La Vanguardia” (Barcelona), April 15th 2009. Available here: <https://www.lavanguardia.com/lectores-corresponsales%20/20090415/53681633592/el-dia-del-libro-y-la-lectura-en-venezuela.html> (4 March 2009).
- Parra León, C. *La instrucción en la Provincia de Caracas, 1567–1725*, “Obras (La instrucción en Caracas, Filosofía universitaria venezolana, Cronistas de Venezuela),” Madrid: Editorial J. B., s/f, pp. 15–280. *Filosofía universitaria venezolana, 1788–1821*, “Obras” (cit), pp. 281–429.
- Polanco Alcántara, T. *Conversaciones con un joven que fue sabio (Semblanza del Dr. Caracciolo Parra León)*, Caracas: Academia Nacional de la Historia
- Quintero I. *Enseñar historia en Venezuela: carencias, tensiones y conflictos*, “Caravelle,” 2015, 104, pp. 71–86
- Rectoría Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, “Guidelines and recommendations to the Academic Body for Prevention of Deeds of Sexual Violence Against the Students” (May 2018), available here: http://m.uc.cl/images/Lineamientos_planta_academica_03092018.pdf (October 10th 2019)
- Agreements Between the Superior Council of the PUC and Subversive Groups of Feminist Students Which Violently Hijacked the University in May 2018, published in May 10th 2019, available here: http://uctransparente.uc.cl/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=195&Itemid=1369 (October 10th 2019)
- Shafarevich, I. *Socialism in Our Past and Future*, in “From Under the Rubble”, by Alexander Solzhenitsyn et al., Washington D. C.: Regnery Gateway, 1981, p. 26–66.
- Smith, A. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1869.
- Tocqueville, A. *Democracia en América*, tomo I, Madrid: Daniel Jorro Editor, 1911. Available here: <https://biblio.juridicas.unam.mx/bjv/detalle-libro/464-la-democracia-en-america-t-i> (June 28th 2012)
- Uzcátegui R. *Elementos para la conformación de una historia del currículo desde la memoria educativa venezolana*, pp. 10–13, “Working paper” available at *Research Gate* and downloaded on July 31st 2019.
- Varela Manrique L.C. *Una mirada historiográfica sobre un texto de historia para la educación media en Venezuela: el manual de Arias Amaro*, “Revista de teoría y didáctica de las ciencias sociales”, 2008, No. 13, pp. 217–243)
- Voegelin, E. *Science, Politics and Gnosticism*, Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1968
- Walters, M. *A History of the Church in Venezuela 1818–1930*, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1933.

Legislation¹⁰⁵

- Decreto con fuerza de ley N^o 725 (January 31st 1968) Código sanitario.
- Decreto N^o 924 (January 7th 1984) Reglamenta clases de religión en establecimientos educacionales.
- Ley N^o 20 609 (July 12th 2012) Establece medidas contra la discriminación.

[¹⁰⁵] I am using the rules of the most important Chilean Juridical Journal, *Revista Chilena de Derecho*, for citation of norms. See: <https://www.leychile.cl/N?i=1042092&f=2019-05-02&p=> (October 14th 2019)

Ley 20 845 (June 8th 2015) De inclusión escolar que regula la admisión de los y las estudiantes, elimina el financiamiento compartido y prohíbe el lucro en establecimiento educacionales que reciben aportes del Estado.

Ley N^o 21 030 (September 23rd 2017) Regula la despenalización de la interrupción voluntaria del embarazo en tres causales.

Ley N^o 21 120 (November 28th 2018) Reconoce y da protección al derecho a la identidad de género

Ley N^o 21 155 (May 2nd 2019) Last modification of Ley Nr. 20 609.

Reglamento para ejercer objeción de conciencia según lo dispuesto en el artículo 119^{TER} del Código Sanitario, Ministerio de Salud (Nr. 67), Diario Oficial del Estado, N^o 42 187, p. 1.

ANNEX:

Interviews with the victims of Discrimination at the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile

1. Claudio Pierantoni

¿En qué contexto tuvo lugar su desvinculación de la UC? ¿Qué procedimientos o protocolo siguió la acusación hecha por los alumnos de teología?

El contexto inmediato de mi desvinculación fue mi curso de “Historia de la Iglesia Antigua” del año 2010, en la Facultad de Teología.

Para entender esto han de tenerse en cuenta dos antecedentes: el primero, que en dicho año me encontraba dictando el curso por décima vez en la misma facultad (desde el año 2000), habiendo obtenido siempre buenos resultados, reconocidos por la gran mayoría de los alumnos. El segundo, que en ese año ingresaron a la Facultad un importante número de seminaristas jesuitas, cerca de una docena, de diferentes países latinoamericanos, como consecuencia del hecho que se acababan de cerrar muchos noviciados jesuitas en todo el continente. Estos alumnos venían todos con una carga ideológica alejada de la tradición de la Iglesia. Este dato explica a su vez por qué tales noviciados habían tenido que cerrar, evidentemente por la pérdida de una identidad católica reconocible. De todos modos, yo siempre he acogido el debate en mis clases, de manera que el curso, aun teniendo presente las diversidades ideológicas, desde mi perspectiva procedió bastante bien.

El hecho que dio inicio al proceso de mi destitución fue una acusación, presentada por los alumnos jesuitas mediante una carta enviada al decano, en la que primero dichos alumnos reconocían que: “el curso ha marchado bien en sus aspectos formales, correspondiente al nivel de contenidos académicos del curso, la asistencia, el cumplimiento horario, la devolución de las correcciones de pruebas y trabajos”, y a continuación, expresaban su descontento, como sigue:

“a) Las cátedras del profesor carecen de una metodología que logre cumplir con la finalidad de ampliar nuestros conocimientos histórico-eclesiales.

b) Presentó un programa que planteaba un recorrido histórico prácticamente paralelo al curso de Trinidad y Cristología I, sin embargo, dispuso de dos meses completos para definir el objeto de estudio de la “Historia de la Iglesia”.

Y agregaban: “El profesor parece estar más preocupado por realizar una apologética de la Iglesia, en la que ésta aparece amenazada por multiplicidad de males (léase el gnosticismo, el modernismo, la fenomenología, etc.), que por enseñar el proceso de configuración de la Iglesia [...]”.

A raíz de las anteriores consideraciones, solicitaban que se eligiera a otro profesor para el curso troncal de Patrología (que yo dictaba) y que les esperaba en el siguiente semestre.

Habiendo venido en conocimiento de este texto, y suponiendo que éste no había sido todavía entregado al decano, envié por correo al curso un mensaje que desmentía de manera documentada las

falsedades contenidas en los puntos a) y b) de la señalada carta, gratuitamente afirmadas y no probadas en absoluto. En efecto, el punto a) era simplemente enunciado, sin ninguna fundamentación ni prueba, mientras que en el punto b) había una evidente deformación de la verdad: en efecto, el programa se había atrasado levemente en la parte inicial, en concreto, dedicando tres clases al tema del objeto de estudio “Historia de la Iglesia” (¡no ciertamente dos meses!); pero eso se debía precisamente a mi apertura al debate y a mi esfuerzo por responder las críticas que los mismos alumnos planteaban. ¿Cómo proceder a analizar datos históricos, si alumnos de teología, además religiosos, tenían una perspectiva tan diferente? Valía la pena al menos discutir un poco tales diferencias.

Yo admitía, por otro lado, que mi curso contenía aspectos apologeticos, por ejemplo, en referencia al gnosticismo y al modernismo, pero que aquello no estaba de ninguna manera en contraste con los criterios pedagógicos que deberían observarse en un curso de Historia de la Iglesia en una facultad de Teología católica.

Para dar un ejemplo concreto, recuerdo que una de las objeciones que recibí durante una clase fue el siguiente: “¿Por qué usted trata a los gnósticos de ‘herejes’? ¡El profesor de Trinidad y Cristología nos enseña, en cambio, que los gnósticos fueron cabezas pensantes, brillantes teólogos!”

A lo cual yo repliqué: “Yo no niego que los gnósticos hayan sido personas inteligentes y agudos teólogos. Pero eso no quita que hayan sido herejes, con respecto a la doctrina católica. En efecto, para ser hereje, hay que tener inteligencia y preparación intelectual. También lo dice san Jerónimo, en una famosa frase, donde se refiere al hecho que precisamente el debate con los herejes es lo que hace progresar la ortodoxia.” Como reflexión al margen agregó: no es que yo discrepara de la postura de mi colega sobre el nivel intelectual de los teólogos gnósticos, pero mi postura resultaba políticamente incorrecta, al agregar yo expresamente la calificación de “herejía”, no solo como un dato histórico atribuido a la Iglesia antigua, sino como algo en lo que yo me identificaba directamente. Ciertamente mi colega consideraba el gnosticismo un interesante movimiento intelectual que había que estudiar de forma “imparcial”, por su interés intrínseco, como algo que esencialmente pertenece al pasado: en suma, que es sabido que en su momento fueron considerados herejes, pero no es tanto eso lo que nos interesa hoy: no se trata de avisar a los alumnos acerca de un peligro siempre actual, sino solo de informarlos académicamente. Yo, en cambio, cada vez más me estaba dando cuenta que el gnosticismo es una herejía aun presente hoy, con diferentes matices y disfraces, y que era urgente prevenir a futuros teólogos de un peligro actual. En suma, mi postura era más cercana a la disposición psicológica de los antiguos Padres (quienes combatían con un peligro grave y actual) que a la disposición propia del historiador moderno, que en la calma y la imparcialidad de la academia se esfuerza por reconstruir un fenómeno del pasado. Ahora bien, ¡esa postura era precisamente lo que resultaba intolerable para un consistente grupo de religiosos católicos!

¿Qué razón expuso la autoridad de la UC para desvincular a un profesor que defiende los principios fundacionales y directrices de una institución católica?

Esencialmente tanto el decano, Sr. Joaquín Silva (con quien mantuve una conversación al respecto), como el Consejo de Facultad, acogieron sin más la petición de los alumnos, que pedían mi sustitución para el curso del siguiente semestre, sin tomar en consideración en lo más mínimo las aclaraciones y correcciones hechas por mi parte, todas debidamente documentadas. Aceptaron sin prueba alguna las calumnias que provenían de un grupo de alumnos, fundadas en razones ideológicas. Además, y esto es más grave, pasaron inmediatamente, al final de ese primer semestre de 2010, a reducir mi contrato de 42 a 21 horas. Esto es muy grave desde un punto de vista ético-jurídico, pues se consideró cierta sin más una acusación, sin siquiera darle al profesor ocasión de presentar su defensa de un modo formal. También es grave desde un punto de vista académico y laboral, pues, aunque hubiesen sido enteramente ciertos los reclamos presentados por los alumnos, los presuntos defectos del curso podrían haber dado pie, a lo sumo, para una llamada de atención al profesor de parte de las autoridades, a corregir ciertos

aspectos del curso mismo, no ciertamente para recortarle el contrato en un 50%. Pero esa fue solo la primera mitad de la maniobra. A fin de año, el decano pasó a pedirme directamente la renuncia, sin que hubiera intervenido otra causa adicional a la ya expuesta. Esta fue la confirmación definitiva de que la carta de los alumnos había sido una mera ocasión, o pretexto, para orquestar la maniobra de mi destitución de la universidad. Poco después, me enteré por algunos amigos entre los alumnos, de que la carta misma había sido escrita por instigación de los superiores jesuitas de la casa donde residían los estudiantes jesuitas alumnos del curso. Dichos superiores eran también profesores de la Facultad (uno de ellos, el P. Jorge Costadoat, era incluso director del *curriculum*) y, habiendo escuchado en la casa algunos comentarios sobre el curso, instigaron a los alumnos a transformar dichos comentarios en una queja formal. Varios de los alumnos religiosos manifestaron después su arrepentimiento a sus compañeros laicos, afirmando que se habían dado cuenta después de que “los habían utilizado”; pero solo una alumna laica me pidió una disculpa en forma directa.

¿Su desvinculación podría caer dentro de alguna especie de discriminación cuyo sustrato es la defensa del Magisterio de la Iglesia?

Sin duda. Pero, para comprender bien esto, hay que tener presente el contexto más amplio en que esta maniobra se fue gestando. En los primeros años de mi enseñanza en la facultad de Teología de la PUC, yo todavía no comprendía muy bien el alcance de las diferentes corrientes de pensamiento que iban cobrando fuerza en la facultad misma. Siendo un laico formado en filología clásica y después en Patrística, no había tomado contacto aun con las corrientes de la teología moderna y contemporánea. Me limitaba a dar mis clases sobre Iglesia Antigua y, en el postgrado, sobre San Agustín. Sin embargo, poco a poco, sobre todo gracias a la participación en el seminario de profesores que tenía lugar en la Facultad, me fui dando cuenta que las posturas que se presentaban en las discusiones iban más allá de normales diferencias de enfoque entre profesores católicos. Me impresionó la fuerza que en la facultad tenían corrientes heréticas, como la teología de la liberación y la teología inmanentista de K. Rahner. En las discusiones sobre *Veritatis splendor* y su doctrina sobre los actos intrínsecamente malos y, más aun, después de la llegada al pontificado de Benedicto XVI y su lucha contra el relativismo, me fui percatando de la fuerza creciente que tenían las herejías del proporcionalismo ético y del historicismo en todos los campos de la filosofía y la teología, desde la teología natural a la teoría del conocimiento, desde la doctrina trinitaria hasta la doctrina de los sacramentos. Comprobé que las “autoridades” tenidas en cuenta por los profesores más influyentes, muy lejos de ser san Agustín, santo Tomás, o cualquiera de los Padres y doctores de la Iglesia, eran en cambio Hegel, Heidegger, Rahner, Tillich. Así, en mis intervenciones orales, y a veces escritas, empecé a llamar las cosas con su nombre, insinuando cada vez más claramente que las opiniones expresadas por algunos de los colegas no eran conformes a la doctrina católica. Así, poco a poco, se fue gestando en varios colegas la urgencia de liberarse de mi incómoda presencia. Por otro lado, si bien una parte de los colegas no compartían las opiniones heréticas, e incluso en forma privada también las criticaban, no se atrevían a hacerlo abiertamente, de manera que yo quedaba como un elemento aislado, al que se atribuía la calificación de “perturbador de la paz y armonía en la facultad”. Finalmente, es de señalar que **las autoridades de la Universidad, tanto el rector como el Gran Canciller, no tomaron en la menor cuenta los reclamos que envié oportuna y detalladamente para denunciar la calumnia de los alumnos y el procedimiento incorrecto que estaba adoptando el Consejo de Facultad de Teología, ni se preocuparon mínimamente por investigar la verdadera razón del procedimiento mismo.** En resumen, se trató de la expulsión de un profesor de parte de la dirección de la facultad de Teología, no por motivos académicos ni didácticos, sino porque las tendencias heréticas habían llegado a ser dominantes por sobre la ortodoxia; en tal ambiente, aunque no faltan algunos elementos más ortodoxos, sin embargo, éstos no se atreven a denunciar la herejía y poco a poco terminan siendo silenciados e influidos por aquella. Es de recordar, sin embargo, como reacción positiva de parte del Card. arzobispo R. Ezzati,

que un tiempo después, respondiendo a reclamos de muchas personas, (incluyendo los míos), suspendió de la enseñanza, al menos, al P. Jorge Costadoat, S.J., ciertamente uno de los heterodoxos más connotados de la facultad.

2. Magdalena Moncada

En junio de 2018, con un grupo de estudiantes de la Facultad de Derecho de la Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, pintamos un lienzo que contenía la frase “los niños tienen derecho a un papá (XY) u una mamá (XX)”. Solicitamos el permiso requerido para exponerlo en la universidad en julio del 2018. Las autoridades aprobaron la solicitud. Sin embargo, en el mismo período nos encontrábamos en período de exámenes, por lo que enviamos un correo a las autoridades comunicándoles nuestra decisión de no colgarlo.

El 18 de agosto pedimos nuevamente el permiso para colgar el mismo cartel, ahora el día 22 de agosto. Al momento de efectuar la solicitud, se estaba realizando en la universidad la semana universitaria de la FEUC (Federación de Estudiantes de la Universidad Católica) que incluía un foro de pornografía y feminismo, un foro de aborto libre, un desfile de drags queen y foro de maquillaje drag. Nosotros solicitamos el permiso para colgar el cartel como medio de contrarrestar dicha actividad de la FEUC. Llegó el 22 de agosto y aun no recibíamos respuesta a la solicitud, por lo que decidimos colgarlo de buena fe, sabiendo que contábamos con una aprobación previa y que no existía razón por la cual se rechazaría la solicitud, que era idéntica a la anterior salvo por la fecha. El domingo 26 de agosto recibimos un correo de parte de la Secretaría General de la universidad indicando que no se puede colgar el cartel. Coincidentemente, ese mismo domingo apareció nuestro cartel en CNN.

Tres semanas después se nos informa que la FEUC inició un proceso de sumario en contra de los alumnos identificados como autores de la manifestación. En la denuncia efectuada por la FEUC, se señala que dicha manifestación incentivaba a la violencia y al odio, a la homofobia y transfobia. Se nos presentan dos cargos: i) atentar contra la unidad de la comunidad universitaria, y ii) no contar con la autorización para colgar el lienzo.

El proceso dura un año si que se nos haya reconocido el derecho de presentar pruebas en nuestra defensa. En este proceso contamos con el amplio apoyo de algunos profesores de la Facultad, entre ellos del Departamento de Fundamentos del Derecho.

Nos citan a comparecer y oír sentencia el día 19 de junio del 2019, fecha en la cual yo me encontraba fuera de Chile, en vacaciones, ya que había rendido todos los exámenes y la universidad se encontraba en período de término de semestre. Esto parece, a simple vista, haber sido de mala fe, ya que da a entender que la universidad quería amortiguar la reacción mediática aparejada a la sanción. Se nos notifica, vía correo electrónico, que la sanción impuesta sería una amonestación verbal por no contar con la autorización para colgar el cartel. A dicha resolución nosotros recurrimos. El recurso fue rechazado y se nos cita a oír la amonestación el día 2 de agosto de 2019, a las 15:30, tres días antes del inicio de clases del segundo semestre. Habiéndonos presentado en la fecha indicada para oír la amonestación, se nos informa, a las 11:30, cuatro horas antes, que no nos presentemos, pues existe “un problema de agenda”. Posteriormente, el martes 6 de agosto se nos notifica una nueva resolución señalando que el proceso se retrotraía hasta antes de la presentación de cargos por la FEUC y nuestra causa se acumulaba con otras dos. Esto es, todo el proceso de sumario en nuestra contra queda anulado, configurándose un proceso nuevo y distinto, que incluye otras dos causas acumuladas a la nuestra, designándose incluso un nuevo investigador. El día 7 de agosto, presentamos una carta ante esta irregularidad, señalando que esta decisión vulneraba el debido proceso, nuestras garantías constitucionales, e incluso la Declaración Interamericana de Derechos Humanos. Esta carta no fue respondida por las autoridades de la universidad.

El día 13 de agosto se nos informa por correo electrónico, que debemos comparecer a oír el resultado del nuevo proceso. Ante esto enviamos una segunda carta, alegando que el actuar de Secretaría General es injustamente arbitrario y, por ello, inválido, así como que nuestro proceso estaba concluido y que nos encontrábamos a la espera de la recepción de la amonestación verbal, que era el fallo de nuestro sumario y, por lo tanto, no concurriríamos a la última citación hecha por Secretaría General. No asistimos a la citación a oír el fallo, y se nos comunica, vía correo electrónico, a todas las partes acumuladas al nuevo proceso, que somos sobreseídos de los respectivos cargos. El fundamento para la acumulación es la identidad de denunciante, en un caso la FEUC habría iniciado un proceso de sumario contra nosotros, mientras que en los otros dos procesos, nosotros habríamos iniciado un proceso en contra de la FEUC y en contra del Centro de Alumnos de Derecho (CADE), a modo de entender según la Secretaría General, sin embargo esto es falso, pues la FEUC que inició un sumario en nuestra contra está compuesta por miembros distintos a los que conforman la FEUC contra la que se inicia un proceso el 2019, además, los cargos contra la FEUC y el CADE no fueron presentados por mí ni por Juan José, el único vínculo entre nosotros y esos procesos es nuestra comparecencia como testigos en ellos. ¡De hecho los denunciante contra la FEUC y contra el CADE son sujetos distintos! Pero la Secretaría General insisten la identidad de denunciante y denunciado.

Respecto a los casos que se acumularon a nuestro proceso, el primero, contra la FEUC, alude una actividad denominada “Sexo, sexo y más sexo”, parte de la “semana del bienestar” organizada por la FEUC, en la que tuvo lugar una clase de “salud sexual”, la que fue denunciada oportunamente a las autoridades, pero que no cancelaron, que consistía en una clase de masturbación femenina en la Facultad de Medicina a la que asistí, tomé fotos y grabé, se rifaron juguetes sexuales. La charlista fue Jane Morgan, dueña del sex shop “Japi Jane” Por su parte, Secretaría General señala que en este evento se hizo publicidad no autorizada a un sex shop, sin pronunciarse en ningún momento a la transgresión de los principios de la universidad (Reglamento PUC letra a), causa de la presentada denuncia. Según Secretaría General, yo asistí a dicha actividad para obtener antecedentes y pruebas para así fundar el sumario contra de la FEUC. En esto basa que yo soy denunciante en los procesos acumulados, ya que en el proceso de sumario contra la FEUC yo fui citada a comparecer como testigo a solicitud del denunciante.

Se iba a celebrar el día contra la homofobia en la Facultad de Derecho, en el que se iba a colgar una bandera LGBT en el patio de Derecho. La solicitud para el uso de espacios públicos y esta fue rechazada, pero no porque dicho acto transgrediera los principios de la universidad, sino que porque algunos alumnos de la facultad se podrían “ofender” (la misma resolución de Secretaría General alude a un grupo de personas conservadoras de la Facultad de Derecho). El día 22 de mayo se realizó una concentración contra la homofobia, transgrediendo la orden de Secretaría General colgaron igualmente la bandera LGBT y una bandera Trans, además de tener lugar testimonios públicos sobre diversidad sexual. Finalmente, en el patio de la virgen un drag bailó con un machete, con música obscena, y simuló hacer sexo oral a un hombre frente a la estatua de Nuestra Señora. Todo esto yo lo grabé. Todos estos hechos fueron corroborados y certificados por Secretaría General.

Sin embargo, en la resolución que nos sobreesee a todos, se señala que el cartel expuesto por Juan José y yo fue ofensivo para las personas homosexuales y transexuales de la universidad, a la vez que las actividades de la FEUC y del Centro de Alumnos de Derecho fueron ofensivos para otro grupo de personas de la comunidad, como todos los actos son ofensivos y todos tienen un carácter político se sobreesee a todos. Esto fue notificado el 14 de agosto del 2019.

Por último, las resoluciones dictadas por la Secretaría General difieren no solo en su juicio, sino que también en sus fundamentos: la primera resolución nos sanciona porque no solicitamos la autorización para colgar el cartel en la fecha respectiva, sin embargo, la segunda resolución nos sobreesee, pero señala que colgar el cartel fue un acto que vulnera la armonía de la comunidad universitaria, pero como los otros también los vulneran la sanción ha de ser la misma para todos los casos. Ahora,

como la sanción mediática y política es mucho peor si se abre proceso de sumario en contra de alumnos pro-LGBT y Trans, que si se abre contra alumnos que defienden los principios de la universidad, Secretaria General decide no continuar con ningún proceso.

Frente a estas irregularidades ¿cuál fue el verdadero resultado del proceso? Tengo dos sanciones contradictorias: una que me sanciona y otra que me sobresee. Para todos los efectos fui sancionada y posteriormente se me sobreseyó irregularmente, completamente irregular e inválida, ya que el proceso se encontraba concluido; fuimos utilizados como una moneda de cambio para perdonar en conjunto al CADe y a la FEUC.