

Correspondence

Buddhism and Politics

To the Editors: Unlike Professor Donald E. Smith ("The Politics of Buddhism," *Worldview*, January), I cannot claim any expertise about Eastern religions. I do wonder, however, about a certain bias that seems to be evident in his writing. He suggests that we should not place undue hope in the sporadic Buddhist uprisings of the past decade against the abuses of the Saigon regime. Buddhism, we are told, has little sustaining power to effect significant social change. While this may well be the case, Smith hardly mentions the possibilities of world religious alliances through which the social activist dimensions of Western religion may be able to make a lasting impact upon Eastern religions. Certainly we have heard a great deal in recent years about what we Westerners have to learn from the East. Is it unthinkable that we may also have something to offer?

Sustained contact between Eastern and Western religions is already provided, at least to some extent, through such ecumenical bodies as the World Council of Churches. Add to this the fact that the dynamics of modernization and industrialization are inescapably Western in origin and shape (whether we like the fact or not). The result would seem to be that, unless the "secular mentality" is once again going to relegate religion to the sidelines, we should be more hopefully exploring the possible syntheses between Eastern and Western religious insights. *Worldview* has carried a number of articles on the ethics and politics of Buddhism, Confucianism, Islam, etc. Most of them tend to deal with these religious traditions on their own terms, that is, quite apart from the growing impact of Westernization. May I suggest that a more

promising kind of article would deal with these religious traditions in terms of *what they are becoming* as a result of Westernizing influences.

D. L. Corcoran
Minneapolis, Minn.

Ethnic: The Economic Connection

To the Editors: Sensible angels would fear to tread into the battle area occupied by Michael Novak and Richard Neuhaus (cf. "Exchange," January). Their lively debate, however, does raise questions with which they do not deal explicitly. One wonders, for example, whether the stress upon ethnicity might not be one more in a long series of tactics resulting, perhaps inadvertently, in the division of the working class. The great struggle of more than 60 per cent of the American population that earns less than \$10,000 per year is to achieve some degree of economic equality. (It is estimated that less than 2 per cent of the population receives more than 20 per cent of the national annual income.) Religion (one thinks of the old "nativist" controversies) and race have in the past been divisive factors hindering the working man's struggle. Now Novak et al. would seem to be introducing ethnicity, to much the same effect. I am surprised that Neuhaus did not, in his exchange with Novak, pursue this line of argument.

At the same time, we have learned in recent years that there are positive values involved in a group's celebrating its distinctive identity "beyond the melting pot." Most notably this has happened with blacks, and it would seem that the ethnic renaissance is in many ways little more than an imitation of the "Black Is Beautiful" festivity. Whether the economic struggle of working people will be enhanced by a union of disparate self-affirming identities or should try to build a common economic identity as "working class" is a question not developed by either Neuhaus or No-

vak. On a tactical level the question might be answered either way. But surely the universalist thrust of Christian ethics would suggest the more inclusive, working class definition of group identity.

William S. Schultz
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pa.

Key 73

To the Editors: After reading Richard J. Coleman's article on "Key 73" (*Worldview*, January), I have come to the conclusion that Key 73 will unlock the door to a new wave of religious reaction and "patriotic" flag-waving Christianity that I thought this country had outgrown. To call it a new ecumenism is an absurdity, for the ecumenical movement sought (and still seeks) to knock down the walls of religious bigotry, not only among different Christian denominations but among non-Christians as well (particularly Jews, always victimized by such "evangelical" drives). On the other hand, Key 73, by emphasizing fundamentalism, will further alienate those Christians who rightly see their faith as a means of liberating the oppressed rather than further oppressing them by complacency.

One need only read the list of Key 73's supporters: Campus Crusade, American Bible Society, Billy Graham's organization, etc. Not one of these groups has spoken out against our barbaric war in Indochina, against the racism that pits white against nonwhite, against the daily exploitation of the poor. Instead they wish us all to be pious churchgoers on Sunday; complacent "citizens" the rest of the week, oblivious to the crises around us. Once more the realization of Marx's dictum "Religion is the opiate of the people" in America.

Besides, why is it so necessary for Key 73 "to reach every unchurched family in North America"? First, this approach . . . will attempt to deny people of the Jewish faith
(continued on page 63)