

Correspondence

Radical Fundamentalism

To the Editors: I read with great appreciation James Smyley's "Ethics in the Revival Tent" (*Worldview*, November, 1973). As someone who has over the years borne the stigma of being called a fundamentalist, it was gratifying to see Smyley's very perceptive analysis of the growing social consciousness among conservative Protestant Christians.

Were I to make a criticism, however, it is that Professor Smyley over-emphasizes the newness of the phenomenon. I can attest from my own experience that while liberal Christians no doubt grabbed most of the headlines, hard, biblically based analysis of social questions has been going on among conservative Christians for a very long time indeed. It seems to me that the awareness that we are only now coming to is simply this: that the more conservative (read "serious") one is about the Christian tradition, the more radical must be his critique of the "principalities and powers" of the present order. Of course, the form that radicalism takes will not always fit neatly anywhere on the prevailing political spectrum as it is presentedly designed by liberal secularists. But it is radicalism nonetheless.

William Purdy
Orlando, Fla.

Chile's Fall

To the Editors: One can readily appreciate defensive outrage in Laurence R. Birns's "Chile: A Bloody Fall" (*Worldview*, November, 1973). However, Mr. Birns seems singularly indifferent to the failure of the Allende regime to address the very real economic and political fears of the vast majority of the people of Chile.

About the same time I read the article I noted that the new government of Chile had issued a 264-page book explaining "their side" of the coup and its necessity. It is highly predictable that, while the alleged atrocities committed by the new government receive extensive treatment in the American media, the

official explanation by the government will be almost totally ignored.
Charles Hupe

Chicago, Ill.

A thorough critique of the Libro Blanco issued by the Chilean junta will be featured in a forthcoming issue of Worldview—The Eds.

Misusing the Fifties

To the Editors: Leo P. Ribuffo's "Abusing the Fifties" (*Worldview*, November, 1973) is no doubt a real contribution. He correctly reminds us that far from being a time of bland tranquillity, it was a period of great self-examination and even public controversy.

At the same time, however, I am sure it was not Professor Ribuffo's intention to suggest that the questions posed in the fifties were as ominous in their implications as those raised by subsequent events, such as assassinations, the Indochina debacle and the still unfolding case of Watergate. And so, while appreciative of Professor Ribuffo's historical footnote, I am concerned that his article might be misunderstood as suggesting that what we are going through now is somehow "normal."

Frank Richards
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Growing Up "Palestinian"

To the Editors: The two autobiographical pieces on "Growing Up Palestinian" (*Worldview*, November, 1973) may be viewed by some as an effort to give a voice to a much neglected group in the Middle East. That would seem fair enough. In fact, however, by publishing these pieces, the editors reinforce the myth that there is such a thing as a "Palestinian people."

It is not surprising that the New Left in this country, desperate in their search for oppressed people with whom to identify, has celebrated the Palestinian invention. In historical fact, however, there has never been a Palestinian nation, and if it is even now under consideration in any form, it is only because Israel has finally been forced by the United

States to compromise with the terrorist elements who threaten Israel's annihilation.

I was deeply disturbed by "Growing Up Palestinian" because it seems to me to fit a pattern in *Worldview's* publishing articles hostile to Israel. One does not lightly suspect a publication of anti-Semitism, and when the suspicion emerges, one tries hard to resist it. I am still trying.

Susan Foxson
San Francisco, Cal.

The Cause of Soviet Trade

To the Editors: In an otherwise first-rate issue that I found truly exciting I was greatly disappointed by Martin and Dina Spechler's "The Human Cost of Soviet Trade" (*Worldview*, November, 1973). It seems to me very strange indeed that a liberal publication such as *Worldview* should lend itself to the pro-Israeli propaganda promoted by the Spechlers and by so many others.

When one weighs the enormous benefit of the U.S.-USSR détente in terms of putting at several removes the threat of nuclear war against, on the other hand, what we find objectionable in Soviet domestic policies, it seems to me obvious that complaints about the latter are irresponsible. I do not always find myself in agreement with Dr. Kissinger, but on this it seems we all ought to be able to agree, namely, that the practice of foreign affairs has to do with international relations, not with our approval or disapproval of what a country may do internally.

There is an obvious connection between pro-Israeli propaganda and the growing criticism of Russia's policies toward its minorities. Were U.S. power not so inextricably tied to the war policies of Israel, criticism of the Soviet Union's policies toward Jews might be in place purely in terms of concern for human rights. As it is, however, political designs are not so cleverly disguised in the clothing of humanitarian and compassionate appeals.

Terence Armstrong
Austin, Tex.