Correspondence

Update: Paik Nakchung Has Been Arrested

To the Editors: In early October, 1978, an intermediate appeals court in Seoul, Korea, acted on the cases of Paik Nakchung and Lee Yong Hui. (See “Paik Nakchung Has Been Arrested,” Worldview, June, 1978.) We have heard about the action only in the last few weeks. Both convictions were affirmed, but the sentences were reduced. Mr. Lee’s sentence of three years in prison at hard labor plus three years’ suspension of civil rights was reduced to two years plus two years. And Mr. Paik’s sentence—one year plus one year—was suspended. We understand that they are now appealing to the Korean Supreme Court, but no further modification of judgments, or mitigation of the sentences, can be reasonably expected, although their friends continue to hope.

The chances are we will never know whether efforts on behalf of these men had any effect on the results of their trials. We feel reasonably satisfied, however, that the sentence would have been harsher had there been no expressions of disapproval sent to the Korean Government and our own nor the national and international publicity the cases were given.

Thank you for your efforts on these cases.

Edward J. Baker
Cambridge, Mass.

Anti-Catholicism Etc.

To the Editors: In regard to Professor James Hitchcock’s article, “The Not So New Anti-Catholicism” (Worldview, November, 1978): As a non-Catholic and what might be described as a devout evangelical Protestant, I would like to thank the editors for publishing Professor Hitchcock’s article...

...[W]e do not live in an unbiased society, but in a monolithic, humanistic consensus, which increasingly will tolerate no views but its own. Either views expressed by those in opposition to the secular humanist position are deliberately and often unfairly dismissed in the marketplace of ideas, namely, the media, or they are simply ignored, while a broad platform is often extended to those who actually represent a far smaller minority of opinion in society but, nevertheless, are in tune with the general humanistic antimeral consensus that surrounds us....

For many years this has been the official doctrine of the totalitarian regimes of Eastern Europe and the Communist world and has been enforced there with unremitting harshness. In its own way the West is today doing the same thing, and increasingly will continue to do so. This is not surprising when one considers that the humanistic materialist base—philosophically and morally—is now the same in both East and West, and we can expect such unthinkable as actual repression of religious bodies in our society in the not-so-distant future if they do not conveniently limit themselves to what secular society will decide are the areas they may operate in. If this is to be averted or at least postponed, the time to speak out is now. Professor Hitchcock has done so in one area, and I congratulate him.

Franky Schaeffer
President
Franky Schaeffer V Productions
Chesieres, Switzerland
and Los Gatos, Calif.

What Revolution Is

To the Editors: In his article “What Revolution Is—and Is Not” in the November issue of Worldview, Robert Weir claims that nonviolent revolution is a contradiction in terms. That is certainly true if one accepts his definition of revolution. Indeed, it seems he has formulated this definition precisely in order to bring this contradiction about.

Asserting that violence is a defining feature of revolution is somewhat like saying that the color red is a defining attribute of art. Violent acts constitute a subset of all possible acts, and the entire spectrum is available to anyone, including revolutionaries. Weir’s contention—that there never has been or will be a government that could be undone rapidly*—seems insupportable. No reasoning from instances can establish this, though a single counterexample can dis...

(Continued on page 59)