those who are prepared to have one more
go at the tedious business of sorting out
liberal from conservative from radical
from Socialist, and then putting them
together in a possibly new way, will find
Cleak’s reflections worth their effort.

Correspondence (from p. 2)

sions of the Detroit recommendations
than he, and I would hold that other
“tributaries” (Pax Christi, Catholic
Peace Fellowship, Catholic Worker)
were far more the source of those rec-
commendations than any “revolutionary
impulse from Latin America.”

Be that as it may, however, a more
careful reading of my article should
have answered Holland’s criticism. In
my many discussions with fellow partic-
ipants in the peace and antinuclear
votes I don’t recall any who would
justify the “neofascist wave of terror”
or the governments responsible for the
excesses that are common knowledge.
Nor have I encountered opinions that
could be described as “tendentious,”
“permissive,” or (perish the thought!)
“approving” of such actions. Unfortunately,
quite the reverse is true with
respect to violence attributed to the
forces of liberation—and, again, I am
concerned with the movements and their
supporters, not the theological precepts.
Indeed, I have encountered individuals
who would describe themselves as part
of the peace movement who wax quite
indignant over any effort to criticize
guerrilla tactics or terrorism by the
“good guys.”

If there have been open criticisms,
they have not received much public
notice. Perhaps the Center of Concern
has gone on public record to protest
some of the excesses committed in the
name of liberation. If so, it would have
strengthened Holland’s case considerably
had he made mention of the fact.

James Finn Responds:
There are so many misreadings packed
into Joe Holland’s brief letter that one is
tempted to call them willful. For example,
Worldview did publish a review-
article about Gustavo Gutierrez, but it
has also published the work of Gustavo
Gutierrez.

But to push on to my own article. Joe
Holland has picked up a number of
phrases that, in my text, are separated
by many paragraphs. I did not intend to
make a direct relation between libera-
tion theology and strong pacifist posi-
tions. It can’t be done. Currents of
liberation theology did feed into the
final recommendations in which, as I
wrote in those neglected paragraphs,
“there are few positive words about
capitalism (even modified), free enter-
prise, or multinational corporations.”

However, to take liberation theology
seriously is, for many people, to be-
come an active agent for liberation. For
some people that both Joe Holland and I
could identify, this means opposing nu-
clear weapons systems (which are in-
struments of oppression), but to support
armed liberation movements and asso-
ciated guerrilla activities. Support for
the strongly worded pacifist resolutions
voted on in Detroit came primarily from
members of the kinds of pacifist organi-
izations Gordon Zahn has been asso-
ciated with over the years.

Joe Holland’s last paragraph is sim-
ply name-calling—for which I suggest
he substitute rational discourse.

I am particularly grateful for Sister
Maggie Fisher’s letter, coming as it
does from a representative of the Na-
tional Assembly of Women Religious.
With her observation that delegates at
the conference often regarded their
decisions 1 don’t recall any who would
choose to go.

Multinationals and
the Peace Movement

To the Editors: Gordon Zahn’s “The
Bondage of Liberation: A Pacifist Re-
fection” (Worldview, March) treats
competently the issues of peace and
liberation in the normal framework of
the peace movement. His appeal for
reinforcement of peace without vio-
ence, for not leaving the movement
solely to those who would choose vio-
ence is moving and convincing.

The portion of the article devoted to
the insidious nature of nationalism is a
major contribution to the needed “con-
scientization” of those who now con-
sider themselves liberated. This recalls
an essay by the late Professor Frank
Tannenbaum in the Columbia Journal of
World Business (March-April, 1968). Professor Tannenbaum stated
eloquently the case for utilization of the
natural emphasis of multinational cor-
porations for the achievement of world
stability and prosperity. He concludes
that “the ultimate business of the world
corporation is the people of the world,
not the people of any one nation or of
any one political ideology. Its ideology
is the provision of abundance.”

Exploitation has and can occur, but
the correction must not be more control
of the extranational activity of corpora-
tions by home governments. Each na-
tion must be free to control all commer-
cial and economic activity within its
boundaries. International control must
be accomplished through international
institutions. The obvious cases of inap-
propriate action by multinational corpo-
раtions will, upon close examination, be
seen to result from an excessive linking
of the economic power of the corpora-
tion with the political and military
power of its home national government.
I hope that Professor Zahn will reexam-
ine his prejudices and join the cause not
of abolition of multinationals but of
appropriate global guidelines for direct-
ing their constructive attributes. They
must be urged to go beyond the adoles-
cent phase of asking for home country
protection to follow them wherever they
choose to go.

The “peace movement” has no more
natural ally than the mature, globally
responsible national corporation. The
rejection of the multinational corpo-
ration as an ally is as debilitating for the
movement as the excesses practiced in
the cause of liberation.

James D. Head

Freeland, Mich.

Please notify the
subscription department
six weeks in advance
of your move to
insure uninterrupted
delivery of the journal.