

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 Clecak'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 recommendations 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 participants in the peace and antiwar movements I don't recall any who would justify the "neo-Fascist wave of terror" or the governments responsible for the excesses that are common knowledge. Nor have I encountered opinions that could be described as "tolerant," "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 liberation theology and strong pacifist positions. 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 enterprise, or multinational corporations." However, to take liberation theology seriously is, for many people, to become an active agent for liberation. For some people that both Joe Holland and I could identify, this means opposing nuclear weapons systems (which are instruments of oppression), but to support armed liberation movements and associated guerrilla activities. Support for the strongly worded pacifist resolutions voted on in Detroit came primarily from members of the kinds of pacifist organizations Gordon Zahn has been associated with over the years.

Joe Holland's last paragraph is simply 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 National Assembly of Women Religious. With her observation that delegates at the conference often regarded their votes as "prophetic voices," I agree completely.

Multinationals and the Peace Movement

To the Editors: Gordon Zahn's "The Bondage of Liberation: A Pacifist Reflection" (*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 violence, for not leaving the movement solely to those who would choose violence is moving and convincing.

The portion of the article devoted to the insidious nature of nationalism is a major contribution to the needed "conscientization" of those who now consider 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 corporations 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 corporations by home governments. Each nation must be free to control all commercial and economic activity within its boundaries. International control must be accomplished through international institutions. The obvious cases of inappropriate action by multinational corporations will, upon close examination, be seen to result from an excessive linking of the economic power of the corporation with the political and military power of its home national government. I hope that Professor Zahn will reexamine his prejudices and join the cause not of abolition of multinationals but of appropriate global guidelines for directing their constructive attributes. They must be urged to go beyond the adolescent 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 anational corporation. The rejection of the multinational corporation 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
Worldview
subscription department
six weeks in advance
of your move to
insure uninterrupted
delivery of the journal.