

# THE WITNESS

VOL. 63, NO.1  
JANUARY, 1980



## Challenging the Powers That Be

Robert L. DeWitt  
David J. Kalke  
William Stringfellow

...and James Pike *Redux*



## Mary Not Political

The rejection by Catholic women of the distorted Marian images of their youth is understandable — and the courage to correct distortion is admirable — yet I disagree with several of Rosemary Ruether's suggestions in her "Liberation Mariology" article in the October *WITNESS*.

Mary is indeed a liberator — one who is beyond the bounds of any traditional or contemporary conceptualizations. Because of this, we may readily welcome her back; but more important, we need to *return* to her, without further doctrinaire manipulation; with, rather, a new and unsullied dedication to her simplicity, compassion, and hiddenness. If she helps the poor "economically and politically," she asks nothing political for herself.

She is precisely *not* the head of the church, because it is Mary's special power not to need to be the head of anything: she is "hid with Christ in God." Misunderstanding this early on, the church abused her image whenever it presented her as woman in simpering submission to men. She is equally abused by being seen as "liberated woman" savoring victory over male dominance. She is not to be used for sexual politics and war-games.

If she liberates women, in reflection of her own pure liberation, it is because she answers their need with the unfolding of opportunity as she has always done. But this opportunity, this opening, has to do with our service to the world and God, whatever the historical context. In the context of the 20th century, this means asking her intercession for a compassionate and interior transformation of our condition. The *external* means pertain to the particular secular

problems of our era, and are to be met by us.

We all know that we may not ask in our prayers to be elevated to power positions; what we ask for is the strength to meet our daily task and the guidance to serve and to speak aright. Neither do we elevate Mary to any particular position vis a vis our own battle for position — she is in no need of position, for love is not a matter of position but of response to all comers.

This response does not emerge in the form of Mary's progress in history but in relation to our progress, in spirit and history. It emerges in the eternal hidden ways by which our paths inexplicably become fruitful: courage to replace cowardice, love to replace hate, openings to replace oppression.

Furthermore, our liberty is never to be reckoned in purely material terms. The liberation of women will become utterly meaningless — and as lacking in intrinsic value as the rich man's capacity to buy — if we forget that liberty is of the spirit. Mary does not need liberation; it is the human race that needs it. And first and foremost, this liberty means the love of God.

Mary supports women in their need for justice and mercy because she belongs to God. She will not support women in their need to translate her eternal charity into their temporal battle between the sexes, any more than she will, or ever did, take sides with the political issues of men. To see Mary in such a way would be to align or identify her with the abstract cause rather than with the human person. She has always heard persons on "both sides."

God may have chosen the People of Israel, but he rebuked them whenever they considered themselves chosen. We tend to forget that it is not our history nor our vision of society that is holy. We also tend to forget that placing the Mother of God *within* our important feminist issues is idolatry on two counts: by putting her "within" we are in danger of creating a pagan goddess; and on the other hand, in perceiving the holiness in which she dwells, we need to remember that the holy is not within us, we are within the holy.

**Polly Kapteyn Brown**  
Episcopal Divinity School  
Cambridge, Mass.

## Mary Revolutionary

Several years ago, sitting in a meeting where the "appropriateness" of ordaining women was being discussed, I asked the group to name the first priest in the Christian tradition. After some quizzical looks, I said, "Mary was the first priest because she was the first person to bring Christ into the world." That has always been my most effective argument against those who oppose the ordination of women to the priesthood.

Rosemary Ruether's treatment of Mary in "Liberation Mariology" is a good treatment of Mary as the real symbol of revolutionary power that she was intended to be by Luke, and a good antidote to the sugar-coated Mommy that she has become to many. When the church gets into sugar-coating it goes all the way. Mary as a sugary Mommy can only beget a sugary Baby Jesus. On the other hand, a powerful, revolutionary Mother is likely to beget a son to carry on the tradition. That is what Luke had in mind.

I hope as a result of *THE WITNESS* that we might have fewer sermons that glorify "Mommyology" and a greater number that glorify revolutionary motherhood, Mary as mother of liberation, true head of the movement to free the oppressed, and as the first priest. And sermons that ask the hard question, "Are you ready to bear Christ in YOUR wombs?"

**Susan W. Klein, Canon**  
Christ Church Cathedral  
St. Louis, Mo.

## Mary Not Head

Rosemary Ruether concludes her article "Liberation Mariology" with the statement that "A poor woman of despised race is the head of the church" (Mary). Is not Christ the head of the church which is his body (*Eph. 1:22; 5:23; Col. 1:18*)? Since Christ has been the first to rise to the glorious life, he is head, and the head communicates his life to the body (*Col. 2:19*). As head he is the governing and unifying principle of the body which is the church (*Col. 2:19; Eph. 4:16; Eph. 1:22*).

Mary is Theotokos, which doctrine

*Continued on page 19*

# THE WITNESS

Subscription rates: \$9.00 per year; \$1.00 per copy. *The Witness* is published monthly by the Episcopal Church Publishing Company. Board of Directors: Wesley Frensdorff, Steven Guerra, Barbara Harris, Suzanne Hiatt, John E. Hines, Mattie Hopkins, Joan Howarth, James Lewis, H. Coleman McGehee, Joseph A. Pelham, Robert S. Potter, and Helen Seager. Copyright 1980 by the Episcopal Church Publishing Company. Printed in U.S.A.

Robert L. DeWitt, Editor; Mary Lou Suhor, Managing Editor; Kay Atwater, Robert Eckersley, Richard W. Gillett, Ann Hunter, Susan Small, Lisa K. Whelan, Hugh C. White, Jr. Editorial and Business Office: P.O. Box 359, Ambler, PA 19002. Telephone (215) 643-7067.

## The Powers That Be

Robert L. DeWitt

We have given careful consideration to the question of whether to print William Stringfellow's open letter to Bishop John Allin which appears in this issue. There will be those who will see it only as a petty, personal attack on the Presiding Bishop, those who will feel that criticism of a presiding bishop is inappropriate under any circumstances, those who will feel that the church needs harmony, not dispute. However, despite the dangers of seeming to be dramatic or, worse, destructive by printing such a piece, we concluded that the positive values of publishing Stringfellow's letter outweighed those risks.

For six decades, THE WITNESS has been seeking to focus the attention of the church on its mission, to alert the church to those factors in its life which distract it from that mission. And always, THE WITNESS has insisted that that mission is inseparable from the social structures by which people's lives are formed, often deformed. A church which is not devoting major concern and energies to the causes of the dysfunctioning of social structures is not faithful to its mission.

In this issue of THE WITNESS, for example, we find a typical illustration of this concern. The momentous and decisive role of transnational corporations, and the role of the executives who speak for them, are set forth in the related articles by D. J. Kirchhoff and David

Kalke. THE WITNESS has always felt it important for its readers to be thinking critically about the power and the powerful people of business and industry, so decisive are they to the present state of our country and world.

However, another institution which is crucial to the lives of many is the church itself. Criticism of the church is therefore a requirement of faithful people. The church must always be reforming itself if it is to speak a reforming word to the society of which it is a part, and which it is called to serve. And, as in industry, the leadership offices of the church are an integral part of its structure, and must not be regarded as beyond criticism. Leaders of the church should be responsive to the mission of the church. The roles of leaders in the church should be structured as democratically as possible in order to insure that responsiveness. Tenure of a presiding bishop — both how long a term should go with the office and how long a given incumbent should remain in office — is therefore not only an appropriate but an important issue to be examined. The question of tenure is a current and critical issue in the academic world. So should it be in the church.

We felt the foregoing considerations warranted the publishing of the Stringfellow letter. It raises fundamental questions about church policy and polity in essential matters touching on the church's mission.



*Are global corporations playing a positive role as "corporate missionaries" or are they widening the gap between the rich nations and the poor, between exploiters and exploited?*

*The traditional capitalist position upholding the former and reproduced here is from a speech by D. J. Kirchhoff before the Merchants and Manufacturers Association. It is reprinted with permission from Castle & Cooke, Inc., of which he is president. **Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly** printed the speech with the commentary, "Enterprise system under relentless assault from church-related activists, Marxist group. How one company refused to knuckle under to outrageous demands."*

*The article immediately following Kirchhoff's by David Kalke, a worker-pastor, takes the view that capitalism is not effecting social change or serving as a catalyst for development; that corporations, therefore, are on the defensive. He describes the strategies which multinationals have devised to blunt the efforts of their critics.*

*THE WITNESS presents these two views to alert our readers 1) to the increasing resistance by global corporations to the questioning of their policies; and 2) to the challenging by these corporations of the right of the churches to do so. Few issues could be more crucial to the social mission of the church.*

## Believers in Capitalism

I want to speak with you today about a campaign being waged against Castle & Cooke by some so-called "public interest" groups, many of them church-related. This campaign has challenging implications for everyone in this room — and for everyone who believes in the opportunity for people to grow in a climate of personal and economic liberty.

I strongly believe that those values — especially as represented by the U.S. corporate community, because of our spectacular economic success — are under siege, and in greater danger today than at any time since the industrial revolution . . .

Until the mid-1950s we had a good image. Capitalism could rest on its own merits. We were effective and efficient. No one quarreled with that thesis. Visible proof of its success was witnessed in a high standard of living, political freedom and unlimited economic opportunity.

We had no specific five-year plan of action. We did not program the lives of others. We were free to build and to create wherever a free market existed. We were accepted or rejected based on the quality of our performance and workmanship.

Such is not the case today. We are required to defend our very existence to a carping melodramatic "elite minority" that produces absolutely nothing for its fellow man. Few, if any, of this elite ever developed blisters on their hands from any honest, productive labor. I personally refuse to accept the principles of this minority and I refuse to accept as part of corporate life increased government control, corporate abuse, terrorist attacks or

other pressures which are being generated by this pseudo elite.

I intend to do something about it — within the spirit and letter of the law — as part of my responsibility to my stockholders, to my employees and to the American people.

Every recent survey indicates that the American people want less regulation; that they want to keep more of their income; that while 10% consider "big business" a threat to American values, 32% consider "big government" the greater threat; that the lack of faith in business leaders is exceeded by the lack of faith in bureaucrats and academics; and that the American people want to keep their economic system, despite its faults, because it is more capable of correcting those faults, and of providing personal opportunities in a climate of freedom than any other economic system.

What concerns me today is a more direct assault on our economic system. This siege is spearheaded by what can only be called a "movement" — an amorphous group of people who believe as an act of faith that capitalism is inefficient, wasteful, unjust, inhumane, exploitative, monopolistic and profit-oriented at the expense of the worker. These may sound like 19th century Marxist cliches, and indeed they are. But cliches aside, this movement is totally committed to these distorted perspectives. It seeks, by whatever means, to bring about what is euphemistically called "social change," and it poses a very real threat to corporate survival.

Now, you and I believe in our system on the basis of personal experience. We see how it benefits people in the real



# Must Fight Back

by D. J. Kirchhoff

world and gives countless millions the chance to make something of their lives, but we are at a loss in dealing with this anti-capitalist movement because it is outside of our normal experience, and because we believe it peripheral to our work, and because we have grossly underestimated its capabilities.

I am convinced that affirming our values in competition with the movement, and combating the movement's tactics to erode our national economy, is central to our survival.

As does any proponent of the free market, this Association, with over 2,000 members who are responsible for almost two million employees, represents a major target of the movement. Its objective is to destabilize your companies, one by one, by alienating you from your work force, your stockholders, and from the public-at-large whose acceptance you need to stay in business.

I, therefore, want to speak about the challenge posed by this movement to one company — Castle & Cooke — and how this company perceived, evaluated and confronted its antagonists. I would like to share this experience with you.

We have a visible profile in some very poor and socially tense Third World countries. The people, in a desire to improve their lot, are sometimes inflamed by unrealistic expectations. We are visibly successful. So it is no accident that Castle & Cooke has been singled out by the anti-business advocates of "social change." We have been in business continuously for 127 years. Like all publicly owned U.S.-based companies, we are accountable to our shareholders, to our employees and

their unions, to regulatory agencies, to the U.S. Congress and to the people and governments of the 20 host nations outside the United States where we have facilities.

We operate in the open, withholding only proprietary information that would benefit competitors. Our finances, ownership, management and product lines are all known.

Like all successful companies, we are adaptable. We shift resources into more productive channels with a view toward increasing profits, dividends and employment.

Our overseas investments in production facilities require us to be responsive to the changing needs of the people in those countries and their governments. Our continued success demands we demonstrate a sincere working relationship with our foreign partners. We are, I am certain, more responsive than any government agency or so-called "public interest" group.

Quality control and product integrity are paramount to our corporate objectives, but they do not transcend in importance our employee relations, or the contribution we make to the welfare of the communities in which we participate. This has been an integral part of Castle & Cooke's success, and we are proud of it.

We have opened once-inaccessible territory to commerce by building rail and vehicle roads, schools and sewer systems, by providing housing, social services, and medical care. We have raised the standard of living of our employees in every foreign country where we have facilities. We are constantly increasing the productivity of our own farms and have a collateral

program with local farmers to raise the productivity of their own property.

Although increased production costs favor vertical integration, we have adapted to local considerations in recent years by selling off company-owned farmland, railroads, and other assets to local ownership, while training local citizens to manage them.

We practice good business and good citizenship in every country in which we do business. As a result, we are welcome by the people and governments wherever we are involved.

I like to think we are bearing constant witness to the missionary objectives of our company's founders.

It is against this background, which I believe epitomizes the virtues of the free market at home and abroad, that what appears to be an obviously orchestrated effort has been launched to impugn the character and intentions of Castle & Cooke. In view of our high standards and our outstanding track record, these attacks seem incredible. We were targeted for destabilization-through-propaganda precisely because of our dependence upon, and our enhancement of, our Third World partners-in-profit.

If the movement can succeed in bringing down Castle & Cooke, and driving it out of the Third World nations, it can do the same thing to any other multinational company. It can bring economic development in these countries to a dead stop, creating untold human misery and desperation, and — this is the real objective — lay the groundwork for violent insurrections that will bring them to revolutionary power. *We must not, by default, allow them to succeed.*

It is ironic that our principal

antagonists, or at least our principal visible antagonists, come from the church community. Eliot Janeway puts it best: "The Kremlin has found a new outlet for its well known technique of harnessing the religious cadres it detests to the political conspiracies it hatches."

Spokesmen from prestigious church organizations have confronted Castle & Cooke at annual stockholders' meetings with charges so outlandish that they would not normally warrant any comment. We have been accused of depressing the social conditions of our host countries, holding down wages and contributing to Third World malnutrition by exporting goods for profit.

We have been accused of failing to improve the conditions of three million people in one country because we only employ 5,000. We are to be held responsible for the forms of governments in various countries and, best of all, condemned for cooperating with martial law authorities in Hawaii after the bombing of Pearl Harbor in World War II.

Because of our policy of public accountability, we brought those church critics to our overseas facilities and allowed them to inspect conditions for themselves. It was to no avail. They returned to our most recent annual meeting last April and repeated the same general and groundless charges in support of a radical resolution. They were determined not to be confused by the facts.

While most churches provide greatly needed missionary services among the poor and needy, some church groups, dedicated to a non-specific "theology of liberation," respond to ideologies alien to the church and confuse "social change" and "political ministry" with sound religious commitment.

They truly believe that profits are synonymous with greed, and that greed is the principal motivator of the corporate mind. Eliminate us, they say,



put production into the hands of the workers, redistribute corporate wealth, and you have eliminated a major sin of Western civilization. Even terrorist campaigns waged by international guerrillas find aid and comfort in the secular church.

The intentions of these particular groups may appear to be overtly Christian, but their work pays blind homage to the purveyors of revolutionary violence.

They argue their points by touting the alleged accomplishments of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and Cuba. No amount of facts concerning mass murder, agricultural failure, stagnating living standards, rising discontent, political prisoners and the lack of human rights in these countries makes any impression on this type of closed mind.

They refuse to believe that the world's rapidly growing population can only be fed by modern agricultural methods of production combined with incentives of private ownership. Such realism is rejected by the secular church. They simply will not accept the most obvious fact: capitalism works and socialism does not. After 61 years of trying, the Soviet Union, with its vast arable land area, still cannot feed its own people; neither can China nor Cuba. The secular church mentality believes the world should stop here — divide its current wealth — without any

recognition that such an action would have no measurable effect on the world's needy except to create many more of them. They reject the need to create more wealth.

I spoke of the attacks on Castle & Cooke by these church groups as being orchestrated. In one Central American country, where we have made important contributions to personal welfare and the national economy, a leftist newspaper tried to discredit our operations by alleging that we were paying local police to break strikes. The seeds of this slanderous "Yankee go home" attack were sown by a Marxist, tax-exempt New York and Oakland-based organization called the North American Congress on Latin America, or NACLA. NACLA was organized in 1967. It is a principal source of so-called "research" against U.S.-based multinationals.

The guises frequently used are "The New International Economic Order," "Alternative Economic and Social Solutions" and "Economic Democracy." These are buzz words and are palatable, at least on the surface. They are, nonetheless, the siren songs of the Marxist ideologues who have simple, uncomplicated goals: the destruction of the world's most efficient economic machine and the assumption of political power through default.

NACLA research may simultaneously appear in attacks against your

company at stockholders' meetings, in the straight and underground press, in the hostile press at your overseas locations and in the journals that NACLA itself publishes and distributes.

Castle & Cooke is a stabilizing force in our host countries, contributing to their political and economic well-being. We operate at cross purposes to NACLA and its front organizations, because they view social improvement as an obstacle to revolutionary change. We, therefore, are a high-priority target of NACLA and those church groups that are either NACLA's allies or unknowingly provide an appearance of respectability.

Confronting any church organization is neither an easy nor a comfortable task. It is somewhat akin to kicking your dog or tripping your grandmother. However, churches beg for criticism when they forsake the ethics of civilized — and Christian — conduct.

When a church group contributes \$85,000 to terrorist revolutionaries in Rhodesia, who oppose the concept of free elections in a multi-racial society, it forfeits any immunity from criticism.

When organized religious institutions attack corporate investment in South Africa — basically a move to strengthen Russian political intervention in the area — even though South African black workers want foreign businesses to remain in their country to work with all of the people there to promote social and racial justice, immunity from criticism is forfeited.

Another major Protestant church has been credited with funding Puerto Rican terrorists who are suspects in a wave of bombings which killed and maimed dozens of innocent victims in New York City. This church group can be clearly identified and should receive maximum publicity for this culpable act.

The principals involved in the decision to fund this "ministry" should

be held fully accountable before their membership and the American public.

Through these church groups, millions of tax-exempt dollars are being laundered into the coffers of this movement to decimate the free market and end personal liberty and economic opportunity in the Third World. At the same time, these organizations are using tax-exempt privileges to attack our traditional political, social and economic institutions here in the United States.

I believe that the time for corporate timidity is over. Discounting our antagonists as a minor irritation is a dangerous disservice to the cause of freedom. Every survey indicates that those who seek to destroy our political and economic system are but a small minority of the American people. Nevertheless, they are a highly vocal minority, armed with pseudo facts and documentation, and a great talent for manipulating receptive groups and news media. They cannot be taken lightly.

We can live with diverse opinion. We can grow stronger from it. We can live with dissent. We can learn and improve from it. However, I see no reason why a corporation must subsidize hostile adversaries of this particular political inclination.

Industry and labor (our free-trade unions are also under attack) must rally forces to counter this real threat to our economic and social system. We must ascertain if these groups are representative of the churches' constituency. I firmly believe they are not. We must determine whether the churches' funding, your contributions and mine, are being used for the exempt status of groups who are blatantly political in their organized attack to undermine the basic economic structure of our society.

We at Castle & Cooke decided to meet our antagonists head on at our annual meeting. We asked them where

they got their facts and how they were supported. We challenged their assumptions as to the productivity of China and Cuba. We provided witnesses who could rebut the false charges of our conduct and policy in our host countries. They were totally unprepared to be challenged by an informed body. We defeated them with the full support of our employees and shareholders. Of equal importance is the fact our straight-forward debunking of these malicious charges was fairly reported by the press, reinforcing the need for factual debate.

The one development these organizations cannot stand is a public understanding of who they are and what they stand for. Every poll indicates the American people are stongly in favor of economic freedom. These groups — stripped of their clerical camouflage — will not be accepted by an informed public.

We must overcome Western civilization's growing sense of guilt. *There is nothing evil about profit*, in spite of the semantic games played by the agitators. If it were not for profit and incentive, the Western world would not be providing food, hard and soft goods, technology, services, and loans to the rest of the world . . .

The survival of truth and common decency are never certain, and must be fought for constantly. We are at war, but it is a guerrilla war. It is being fought in the courtroom, the boardroom and the media. The enemy is organized, discernible and has ample resources.

Castle & Cooke does not intend, after 127 years, to forfeit its principles to guerrillas of any political stripe.

I am convinced that our path, rather than theirs, is the one that offers more hope for the future, but it cannot be accomplished in a vacuum or by one corporation. Let's revitalize our corporate leadership and take the offensive, in the best tradition of American capitalism. ■



# Unmasking the Strategies Of Multinational Corporations

by David J. Kalke



D. J. Kirchhoff's remarks indicate that the transnational corporations are on the defensive. Kirchhoff and many other transnational executives, are beginning to feel the pressures being placed on them by individuals, groups and organized movements which are challenging a system based on profits for a few at the expense of social development and the meeting of basic human needs for the many. A careful analysis of the strategies for this defensive posture is in order as we examine the tools used to prop up the capitalist system.

Kirchhoff's words are not the isolated remarks of one transnational president attempting to defend his institution from a few public critics. His speech is one of a series of cleverly articulated rebuttals as transnationals attempt to clean up their image and isolate their enemies. By his own admission, Kirchhoff is concerned about more than Castle & Cooke. He is speaking for and to the corporate mind. Behind his words we can see the ideological arguments used to justify and rationalize the international flow of dollars through the multinationals' accounts. He projects his concerns for "everyone who believes in the opportunity for people to grow in a climate of personal and economic liberty." In order to appreciate the significance of

---

**The Rev. David J. Kalke** is a worker-pastor of the Metropolitan New York Synod, Lutheran Church of America. He is a national staff member of Theology in the Americas, having lived in Chile and traveled extensively in Central America.

Kirchhoff's remarks, we must view them in the larger context of transnational strategies.

In September of 1975 over 250 persons involved in public relations and advertising divisions of the world's largest transnationals came from 20 countries to Geneva, Switzerland. These corporate minds came to develop — as the invitation to the meeting put it — "a strategy to meet future attacks on the multinationals." While no master plan was devised and passed which would suggest a conspiracy theory, their discussions did concretize several approaches for dealing with critics. The strategies that they developed can be seen in subsequent public relations efforts during the last few years. Indeed, as we will see below, some of these suggested approaches are evident in Kirchhoff's remarks.

The three day symposium involved a series of presentations and small working groups designed to improve the image of the transnationals. The problem which needed most attention, as stated by Charles J. Hedlund, President of Esso Middle East (based in New York), was one of information. "During the oil crisis we did a good job in profits, but a bad job in information."

While no final document was produced nor official minutes provided of the meeting, one Swiss journalist, Urs P. Gasche, did note the following elements as common ingredients for a counter-strategy of the transnationals for dealing with their critics:

1. The critic is to be identified as an opponent of the system and thus

discredited as a discussion partner.

2. Dubious motives need be attributed to the critic: ideological or national prejudices, envy, stupidity, ignorance and lack of experience. Hence, s/he is again discredited as a discussion partner.

3. When criticism is global or circumstantial, the contrary is "proved" by means of isolated instances (e.g. description of an individual project).

4. When criticism is indisputable around a specific case (e.g. in the case of ITT in Chile), emphasis is put on the fact that it is an individual case, moreover still under investigation.

5. In any case, it should be said in public that defending free enterprise is in everybody's interest. Therefore, it should be shown, especially in the mass media, that criticism of multinationals was basically criticism of free enterprise and that behind it were the enemies of the free world, whose view of life was based on Marxism. One Swiss executive reportedly began a discussion session by saying, "There is only one enemy, and he is in Moscow."

If we reflect a few moments on the media image of the multinationals over the last four years, I think we can note a change in the way they project themselves. Oil companies are presented as friends of the environment. Other large companies are seen as the promoters of cultural events. Still others present themselves as the family business that got a little too large thereby necessitating an employment force. Others are portrayed as the means by which problems such as hunger and illness can be overcome.

In the case of Castle & Cooke we are reminded that it was founded in 1851 (by two lay missionaries of the United Church of Christ) and that it is primarily involved in the production of food (Dole bananas, pineapples and mushrooms, Bumble Bee tuna and vegetables). In another speech given Sept. 12, 1979, for the Financial Writers' Association in New York, Kirchhoff goes on to say the following about his company: "We have 31,000

stockholders; 42 percent are women. Our shares are typically held by small investors. Half of our stockholders own fewer than 200 shares each. Only 10 percent own 1,000 shares or more each." This small company attempting to live out the "missionary objectives of its founders" is now one of the world's largest agribusinesses.

Public relations and advertisements are being designed to present the transnational within the traditional understanding of the family or small business. They present themselves as moral institutions which still have the human touch. They present themselves as being concerned about local and neighborhood issues, while they may be involved in red lining or in removing capital from certain areas to other parts of the world where labor is cheaper and profits higher. Chemical Bank, with investments in Pinochet's Chile, has provided a Corporate Social Policy Advisor whose task is to listen to the concerns of the neighborhood or special interest groups. Channels are being developed to hear complaints, to neutralize the voices of the poor and the oppressed without effecting the necessary structural changes being called for which would enable workers and non-shareholders to participate in an economic democracy.

Recently, I was part of a religious delegation given an audience with a team of Chemical Bank officials, including the head of the International Bank, the Corporate Social Policy Advisor, the head of the Bank's Latin American desk and other high ranking officials. They provided what appeared to be a rather well versed team for "hearing the concerns of church persons." An atmosphere of openness and dialogue enabled us to discuss Steve Bikko and Chemical Bank's commitment to change in the apartheid system in South Africa. But when it came to discussing the Chemical Bank's investments in Chile, the head of the International Bank stated: "Economic conditions have improved dramatically since Pinochet has been in power . . .

with the economic well being of people at large in the process of improvement . . . indeed there has been some social dislocation (his words for torture and systematic repression), but one dare not conclude that there is a correlation between repression and the economic system . . . human rights is a question of degree . . ." And then the conversation broke into a discussion of the Soviet Union. The liberal facade soon gave way to the hard line typified in the strategies outlined above: 1) linking critics to the Moscow line, 2) discrediting the members of our delegation "who hadn't been in Chile recently," and 3) a defense of the capitalist system.

I don't mean to single out Chemical Bank, but merely to illustrate that these public hearings or efforts to listen to concerned groups are not designed to effect change; they are designed to prevent it. Nowhere is this process seen as a means by the corporation for ultimately changing the profit motif of the corporation, nor the basic role of the transnational in the Third World, nor basic employment policies, practices and pay scales. Rather these are efforts, as seen in the Geneva symposium, on the part of the transnationals to improve their image and to neutralize opposition.

It is within this context that we must place Kirchhoff's comments. He comes before Merchants and Manufacturers' Association to defend not only Castle & Cooke, but the entire profit making system and most especially the transnational corporation. His remarks do not deal with the specifics of the role of his corporation in the political arena of Honduras (the Central American country where Castle & Cooke has been accused of cooperating with a military regime in the repression of workers' movements). Rather his speech is a call to his colleagues in an effort to develop support for a McCarthy-like campaign against critics.

It follows that *Barron's*, the National Business and Financial Weekly related

*Continued on page 12*

# An Open Letter to the

## Church Post-Denver

Some months prior to the recent General Convention, THE WITNESS contracted with William Stringfellow, noted lay theologian and social critic, to do a pre-convention series on critical issues in the life of the church. THE WITNESS published these articles in the hope that they would make a contribution to discussion and action on these issues at Convention. THE WITNESS also commissioned Stringfellow to do a post-Convention piece, an appraisal of "Where does the church find itself, after Denver?" This open letter to Bishop John Allin is his considered response to that question.

## Dear Bishop Allin:

In the Body of Christ each baptized person has pastoral charge of all the members and each becomes responsible, in his or her ministry, to all the others. The integrity of the life and witness of the whole church is nurtured in this elementary interdependence of the various members of the Body of Christ, as Saint Paul's *Letters to the Corinthians* and the *Ephesians* especially emphasize. As Christians, each of us is called to care for one another, to counsel one another in charity and candor, to exhort one another.

Accordingly, the Anglican tradition has insisted, from its inception, that those installed in ecclesiastical office are accountable to those over whom they exercise the authority of such office.

I uphold that aspect of Anglicanism, and, heeding the *Letters*, I am prompted to write to you, in the aftermath of the General Convention lately convened in Denver, about your demeanor as the Presiding Bishop. At the same time, I write out of concern, long felt, for you as a human being. Probably I would forbear this open letter, lest it intrude upon your business or arouse a defensive response or, otherwise, vex you, if it brought you only my own view. As it is, however, my own observations are also shared throughout the church by devout, knowing and earnest people, both laity and clergy. This has been confirmed to me in the last few years when I have visited congregations, clergy conferences and other church events, and it was repetitiously confirmed to me at Denver.

For these years of your incumbency as Presiding Bishop, I have hoped, as have so many others, that you would sometime evince a strong and definite

conviction concerning the mission of the church in this world and, particularly, that of the Episcopal Church in contemporary U.S. society. None has been forthcoming. Instead, you have again and again manifested an absence of conviction, a failure of candor, a spirit of confusion, a doublemindedness, a tendency to tailor utterance to the circumstances of the moment. Your image of ambivalence and elusiveness was noticeable throughout the controversy attending the ordination of women, after your initial hysteria about the Philadelphia ordinations subsided. It was not until after the General Convention had acted definitively that you confided your skepticism about the vocation of women as priests, and then you did so in a manner which seemed calculated to incite defiance or circumvention of the law of the church. In consequence, the so-called conscience clause has been inflated far beyond the scope of conscientious dissent or protest into a virtual act of nullification which jeopardizes the efficacy of canon law and scandalizes the very polity of the Episcopal Church.

All of this had been foreshadowed, of course, in the *Wendt* trial in the Ecclesiastical Court in the Diocese of Washington, when in violation of your canonical duty you defied the subpoena of the Court to appear and testify and were thereupon duly adjudged in contempt of that Court. You have done nothing to purge yourself of that contempt.

There are those who refer to you as a "conservative," but that is hyperbole. Such disrespect for the law of the church as you have shown and encouraged is not a conservative trait.

I attribute this behavior, rather, to a lack of conviction, or to expediency which, lamentable in any circum-



# Presiding Bishop

by William Stringfellow

stances, is essentially incongruous to the office you hold. That is why I have mentioned, now and then, that I would much prefer as Presiding Bishop a vigorous and principled reactionary. At least, then, there could be disagreement and dispute in the Church that would be candid and wholesome. As it is, instead of leadership, in these past six years, there has been aimlessness.

Yet aimless is not the same as harmless. You have not been in a situation of the bland leading the bland if only because so many have suffered so much harm on your account, whether by reason of deliberate intent or omission. After all, it cannot be overlooked that your improvidence occasioned the imprisonment of two church employees, facilitated the subsequent imprisonment of seven other Hispanics, and seriously impaired the constitutionally sanctioned freedom of the churches in this country. Nor can the countless hassles, obstacles and discriminations encountered by women qualified and called to ordination as priests be overlooked. Nor can the cruel and hypocritical attitude toward the ordination of homosexuals. Nor can the neglect of all the other issues between the church and this society whilst the dissipation of sham debates and churchy charades continues.

Leadership could have made a difference in all of these matters, but alas, the Episcopal Church has been deprived of leadership. When you were elected at the Louisville General Convention a void opened in the leadership of the Episcopal Church, which has been filled by management. In the church, as with other principalities and powers, management is preoccupied with institutional preservation and with condiments of statistical prosperity. To management, substantive controversy is perceived as threatening *per se*, rather than as a sign

of vitality, and conformity to the mere survival interest of the institution gains domineering priority. In the church, such a governance stands in blatant discrepancy with the image of the servant community whose life is risked, constantly, resiliently, for the sake of the renewal of the life of the world. In the church, to put it another way, such a managerial mentality capitalizes the worldliness of the church. The church becomes most conformed to this world where the church is most preoccupied in the maintenance of the ecclesial fabric.

If a management regime in the church, so inverted and so trite, persists for long, it renders the church self-indulgent, supercilious, self-serving and silly. At Denver, one sign that the credibility of the Episcopal Church nears that point was the three page spread in the *Denver Post*, published at the end of the first Convention week, which highlighted, as news of the Episcopal Church in solemn assembly, the brisk trade in Amish cheeses that was happening in the Exhibit Hall.

The suppression of issues pertinent to the servanthood of the church in the world is symbolized prominently in the emergence of the Urban Bishops' Coalition. That effort holds promise of reclaiming a viable witness on the urban scene. I applaud the Coalition and such headway as happened at Denver through its efforts, but the point not to be missed is that it should never have been necessary to undertake such a campaign in the first place; the church at large should have been open to and committed to the urban priority so as to obviate the extraordinary program the Coalition has had to mount.

Beyond all this — the default on issues, the harm done persons, the playing at church, the mentality of management, the lawless attitude, the leadership void, the absence or ambiguity of conviction — is the

consequence for you as a human being. I believe, Bishop Allin, you are the most poignant victim of the present malaise of the Episcopal Church. In that perspective your role is more symptomatic than causal. I do not for a moment consider that you are to blame for everything that is amiss now in the church. At the same time, though, you are blameworthy because you are the incumbent Presiding Bishop.

There is a certain Anglican (or, perchance, merely English) etiquette that sometimes inhibits the telling of the truth. It causes people to say privately what they will not speak publicly, or otherwise to be coy or euphemistic. That etiquette does not hinder me from writing to you. I verify my regard for you as a person and evidence my respect for the office you hold by telling the truth to you.

During the General Convention it was reported that you remarked that you long to return to the parish ministry. I take your word at face value. And I say to you: The time is *now* to implement your impulse. As your brother in Christ, I appeal to you to resign forthwith as Presiding Bishop.

Faithfully yours,



## No Reply to Come

THE WITNESS invited the Presiding Bishop to respond to Stringfellow, either in this or the following issue. The invitation was declined through a letter written by his assistant, the Rev. Canon Richard Anderson, who said that while the Presiding Bishop appreciated the offer, "the press of other commitments" would not allow him to do so.

*Continued from page 9*

to Dow Jones and Company, would deem it appropriate to reprint Kirchhoff's corporate homily. Indeed it is a sermon that represents the thinking and strategies of the corporate world in its efforts to confront a growing number of critics (*Barron's* has subsequently printed a piece by James Grant, July 16, 1979, which, using similar approaches, defends the Nestle's Corporation against those leading the infant formula campaign boycott).

Kirchhoff's remarks come at a time when the political, economic and social functions of the transnationals are being questioned by an increasing number of Third World governments, organized labor, church leaders and concerned American citizens. They come at a time when a growing number of U.S. politicians are becoming concerned about the role of U.S. corporations in Third World politics. The role of ITT in its efforts to block the election of Salvador Allende in Chile; of United Brands in bribing the president of Honduras; of General Motors in cooperating with the apartheid government in South Africa; of Coca Cola in union busting in Guatemala; of the increased profits of companies operating under right-wing military dictatorships in Latin America: these have created a sensitivity among democratic law makers to the growing contradiction between capitalism as an economic system and democracy as a political system. These scandals have created a new awareness in the public arena as well. A recent Harris poll indicates that only 18 percent of Americans express significant confidence in business leaders, compared to 55 percent in the early 1970's. Kirchhoff and the other defendants of the multinational corporations have correctly perceived the difficult times they face.

Within this context we can begin a more careful analysis of Kirchhoff's position. Four dimensions have been singled out for special consideration. They are 1) the use of a McCarthy-like

approach, 2) the projection of the transnational as the protector of democratic capitalism, 3) the avoidance of issues and 4) the self-concept of the corporation as a missionary.

Perhaps the most distressing aspect of Kirchhoff's remarks is his attack-by-innuendo approach. Rather than dealing directly with the questions of his critics, those posed by the North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA) and the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, he attempts to discredit these organizations as credible discussion partners. In the spirit of McCarthy and the Geneva symposium, his first effort is to link them to the "Kremlin," to accuse them of using "19th century Marxist cliches" and to imply international connections with terrorist organizations. His tactic is one of "red baiting," a tactic of the McCarthy era which defenders of democracy and libertarians had hoped had been laid to rest. Kirchhoff attempts to avoid the criticism of several internationally credible secular and religious research centers by merely labeling them as "Marxist." He assigns to them an ideology heretofore invoked to create fear and disbelief in the minds of his listeners, but which tactic loses credibility today as more and more respected citizens are revealing themselves to be socialists.

He attempts to create an image of

assault, the good guys vs. the bad guys. The good guys are the transnationals, the defenders of "personal and economic liberty;" the bad guys are the Marxists, the intellectuals and now parts of the church. In this climate of emotionalism, he concludes his remarks by declaring war on the enemy. "We are at war, but it is a guerrilla war. It is being fought in the courtroom, the boardroom and media. The enemy is organized, discernible and has ample resources." (The total budget of NACLA is less than one half of Kirchhoff's annual salary.)

While Kirchhoff's remarks against his critics may strike us as insubstantial the return to the tactics of McCarthy is serious. By discrediting his critics, he clearly hopes to divide the popular forces united in their attempt to change the role of the transnational.

A second tactic is to portray the transnational as a friend of the people, as the defender of democracy and capitalism. The defense of the free enterprise system is projected to be in everybody's self interest. "Like all publicly owned U.S. based corporations, we are accountable to our shareholders, to our employees and their unions, to regulatory agencies, to the U.S. Congress and to the people and governments of the 20 host nations outside the United States where we have facilities." Kirchhoff implies



Rini Templeton

throughout his remarks that capitalism and democracy are one and the same. Yet how do we, or much less people under military dictatorships as in Honduras, exercise control over transnationals? How are they accountable to us? Those who make decisions must own stock . . . not exactly "free" elections. Those critics who have purchased stock are now being discredited as Marxists. Unions being organized to represent workers are busted with their leaders jailed. Yet Kirchhoff tries to convince his audience that Castle & Cooke is accountable to the people.

How does a transnational remain accountable "to the people" when "the people," be they we or peasants in Honduras, have no access to the decision making body governing the transnational? In the speech referred to above delivered to the Financial Writers' Association, Kirchhoff uses the term "democratic capitalism" to describe his understanding of our political and economic system. How Kirchhoff defines the democratic participation of "host governments," "people" and the U.S. taxpayers in the transnational corporation remains unclear.

"I like to think we are bearing constant witness to the missionary objectives of our founders." Kirchhoff's homily avoids the accusations of his critics and is rather an expose of a value system used to defend and justify the role of the multinational corporation. By discrediting his critics and stating the pious platitudes for "democratic capitalism," Kirchhoff hopes to bypass the serious accusations being made against Castle & Cooke. In 1977 it was alleged that Castle & Cooke was involved in union busting activities in Honduras. It was alleged that company vehicles were used by the military on a raid against a workers' cooperative. An internal document from Castle & Cooke's subsidiary, the Standard Fruit Company, indicates that Honduran military and policy personnel have been on their payroll. Unfair salaries and

poor medical plans for workers have been concerns. Other sources have alleged close cooperation between Castle & Cooke executives and the Honduras police that led to the arrest of over 200 trade unionists.

These and other documented accusations against Castle & Cooke go unanswered in Kirchhoff's remarks.

Kirchhoff's missionary zeal, attributed to the company's founders, is determined to set the agenda for the church's mission. A fourth corporation tactic is the bringing together of a rationale for the capitalist system and a system of religious beliefs which can support it. It is an effort to enslave the Gospel to the needs of an economic system on the defensive.

By appealing to the company's missionary founders and the large donations of transnationals to churches, Kirchhoff gives the message to the progressive Christian sector that the corporations and their economic power will attempt to regain control over the church's missionary agenda. "Confronting any church organization is neither an easy nor a comfortable task. It is somewhat akin to kicking your dog or tripping your grandmother. However, churches beg for criticism when they forsake the ethics of civilized and Christian conduct . . . We must determine whether the churches' funding, your contributions and mine, are being used for the exempt status of groups who are blatantly political in their organized attack to undermine the basic economic structure of our society." His McCarthy tactics are directed against those sectors of the church which have helped those persons with whom he disagrees. By labeling these persons "terrorists," Kirchhoff would dehumanize them, camouflage their legitimate struggle for liberation, and would forbid the church from being involved with them. In this way he also discredits the World Council of Churches' contribution of goods and medical supplies to the Patriotic Front in Zimbabwe.

Kirchhoff appeals to the old

dichotomy between the sacred and secular by creating the category of "secular church" to describe those Christians involved in social change. This is a "church" he would like to see destroyed as it threatens the interests not of the Gospel, but of the "basic economic structure of our society." He attacks the theology of liberation as another secular tool divorced from "religious commitment."

It is on this level of developing ideological supports for the transnationals that progressive Christians are challenged to be alert. Who determines the agenda for the progressive Christian? The Gospel? An economic system? Can the church as an institution withstand the inevitable pressures from the financial elite?

Kirchhoff has indicated a more aggressive role in the future for the transnationals. We can expect to see more efforts from their representatives to make the missionary enterprise serve their corporations. The unity of those Christians standing with the poor and exploited will be challenged. We need to remain strong as the corporate missionaries begin to develop tactics designed to divide and conquer us. The missionary agenda of the church dare not fall prisoner to the objectives of the transnational corporation. By using religious symbols and values, the dominant class hopes to develop yet another weapon which can help them maintain and justify their power.

The remarks by Kirchhoff are but the tip of the iceberg. There is a much larger effort on the part of transnational corporations to build public support for their enterprises. In the Christian sector, we will need to be as innocent as doves and as wise as serpents as we move forward in our analysis of their work. We may see further attempts to divide the Christian community through continued efforts to discredit certain sectors. The ideological struggle is being advanced on new levels.

One thing is clear: the transnationals are on the defensive. They have felt our strength. ■





Bishop Pike 10 Years Later

# The Loveable Paradox

by Robert L. Semes

Sept. 2, 1979 marked the passage of a decade since the death of Bishop James Albert Pike in the Judean desert, but the storm surrounding his controversial personality, lifestyle, theological and ethical views still rages.

Despite the passing of time, I continue to have a fascination with Jim Pike, from my initial seminary days in the early '60s. In many ways my own life was influenced by his writings and personality. I too "left the church" in early 1969, although I returned several years later to finish seminary and be ordained.

Noting that Pike's name continues to appear in articles and letters to editors of both conservative and progressive church periodicals, I became curious regarding the continued impact of his

---

**The Rev. Robert L. Semes** for the past three years has been rector of the Church of the Epiphany in Newtown, N.C. He taught at college level for five years and was in business for three before graduating from Episcopal Divinity School in 1976. He is currently living in the Bay Area, California.

life and writings upon the present day church, and decided to research the subject. I sent out 100 questionnaires to those whose ministries were contemporary with Bishop Pike, specifically those who publicly voiced opinions during the '50s and '60s. In the responses, upon which this article is based, I found that many of his critics and supporters still hold strong opinions about the man and his message.

We may not have an adequate historical perspective for many years to come, but 10 years after his death I felt it was time to take another look at this loveable paradox — Jim Pike.

Perhaps no one else in the history of the Episcopal Church has captured the imagination and pricked the minds and hearts of so many as this curious bishop who was loved and hated by friends and enemies alike. To measure the feelings of those who knew him or were affected by his life and views, and to measure possible changes of attitude since his death, I sent out questionnaires asking the following:

- Did you support or oppose Bishop Pike's writings and attitudes on the major issues facing the church and society during his lifetime?

- How would you characterize your feelings toward Bishop Pike today, 10 years after his death?

- Do you feel that Bishop Pike substantially influenced the direction of the Episcopal Church since the 1960s?

- If you have changed, even slightly, your opinion of the man and/or his writings, work, etc. since 1969, which factors would you guess influenced this change?

- Do you think that the whole question of heresy in the church is a dead issue today?

- In hindsight, do you feel that the Episcopal Church leaders, the House of Bishops and others were unjust or wrong in their move to censure or depose Pike for his views in the mid-60s?

I also had a personal interview with Bishop John E. Hines, who served as Presiding Bishop during those

tumultuous years of the 1960s. It seems to me that in the '60s the only thing a conservative House of Bishops had on its mind was to "get Pike," the Episcopal Church's own freedom marcher and peace picket. But I also feel that the 64% response to my survey reveals some significant changes in attitude by some who opposed Pike.

Twenty-four percent of those responding felt that their minds had changed on all or some attitudes regarding Pike. Only two said that their minds have changed from support to opposition in the last decade. Both are bishops, and both changed their mind for "moral" reasons. One labeled the so-called "secular theology" espoused by Pike as "bad-evil!" Another claimed that he thought less of Pike since he learned that Pike kept a mistress.

Edward Welles, retired Bishop of West Missouri, who once called Pike a "publicity seeker" with a "deep-rooted martyr-complex" who might be "thirsting" for a heresy trial, (*Stringfellow and Towne, The Bishop Pike Affair*) now says that he has changed his mind and has grown to accept many of Pike's theological and social views, having become "more flexible since 1964." Nine others said that although the church has not taken over all of Pike's views, they have grown to accept many of them anyway. Dean Harvey Guthrie of the Episcopal Divinity School pointed out, however, that Pike was "not radical enough in assessing the fundamental issue" at the time of his writings and subsequent censure. "We are in a different cultural-philosophical-theological ball park than when the heresy/orthodoxy category originated."

Joseph Harte, Bishop of Arizona, who in the '60s was an anti-Pike crusader, having labeled the bishop a heretic, said that he has grown to accept many of Pike's theological and social views. One of the surprise responses came from Francis W. Lickfield, retired Bishop of Quincy. (In 1964 Bishop Lickfield was president of the American Church Union, many members of which have now retreated into "traditionalist"

schismatic groups.) Lickfield now says that "insofar as I can recall them, I would support all issues he supported."

That Pike left a legacy to the church is obvious from those who write about how their minds have changed over the years. His real contribution lies, many believe, in his influence on the great church movements of the '70s: Women's ordination, revision of the prayer book, "secular theology," and freedom of theological inquiry. His late developing interest in the supernatural, the psychic and spiritualism, whatever its etiology, has not been his major contribution. Since some work in these areas is being done by a few English theologians, however, it is possible that years from now Pike will be affirmed as one of the pioneers.

Eighty percent of the responders said that Pike had substantially or partially influenced the cause of the ordination of women to the priesthood; only 14% said that he had not. With regard to the revision of the prayer book, 61% said that he substantially or partially influenced that development, although 34% said that he had no influence at all. On present day "secular theology" there appeared the largest number of "substantially influenced" responses: 48%, with 31% saying that he partially influenced the course of theological inquiry since his lifetime. Of the 15% who said Pike had no influence in this area, most were those who had opposed him or had mixed feelings about him.

Pike's influence in contemporary theology, call it Tillichian, Bonhoefferian, Heideggerian, secular, process, or Incarnational theology, is the subject of hearty discussion and debate. The works of J.A.T. Robinson, Gregory Baum, Norman Pittenger, Hans Kung and many others reflect "secular theology" today. Pike undoubtedly borrowed thoughts from some of these writers. The majority of responders felt that Pike's influence was that of a popularizer. But in comparison with Robinson, for example, John Hines remarks, "Pike was more incisive than Robinson was; in his popularization he was more original."

Most of those who thought that Pike's influence was great said little on the matter, but those who commented at length seemed to be more defensive. Bishop Jonathan Sherman, retired Bishop of Long Island, for example, pointed out that "we have all of Bishop Pike's books in the Mercer Library; his cards do not reveal any great interest in his books."

Sherman Johnson, former dean of Church Divinity School of the Pacific, called Pike "an able and clever theologian though not in the top rank. Many of the ideas that he publicized and in which he was in agreement with John Robinson are of course important, and theism must take them into account." On the other hand, Charles Price of Virginia Seminary said that "before he became Bishop of California, he was a most useful and articulate popularizer of a brand of Niebuhrian-Tillichian theology which had — and probably continues to have — a fairly widespread following. He was *not* an original thinker." Price concluded that Pike's work was more an "haute vulgarization."

Regardless of what Pike's detractors and the skeptics say, he evoked a storm of protest over his theological and ethical writings, especially the books *A Time for Christian Candor*, *What Is This Treasure?* and *If This Be Heresy*, plus a few articles in *Look* magazine and others. I would guess that the answer to the question of Pike's theological influence today lies somewhere in the mind of each beholder. As a result of the uproar over Pike's writings and lifestyle came one of the most salient contributions he made in the church — forcing the church to make a presentment and censure him in the House of Bishops.

More comments appear on the whole issue of Bishop Henry Louttit's presentment of Pike and Pike's subsequent censure by the House of Bishops in 1966 than on any other questionnaire issue. The remarks run from unqualified backing for the House's action to outright condemnation. The feelings are still intense.

Much of this issue formally centered on the question of heresy in the church with regard to Pike's teachings, although his style seems to have been actually more weighty. While almost all bishops thought heresy to be a crucial issue in the church of the mid-'60s, the respondents are now almost evenly split on whether the whole question is dead. Their comments were likewise polarized. Remarks upholding the censure are like the sampling which follows.

"I felt that the House of Bishops was right in censuring him. It was the only way the church could separate itself

#### Statistical Information

Questionnaires sent	99
Interviews	1
Total contacts attempted	100
Questionnaires returned	63
Percent of response	64%
Those receiving questionnaires	
Episcopal bishops	64
Former & current seminary deans & professors	14
Episcopal priests	19
Others	3

**N.B.:** Recipients of questionnaires were those whose ministries were contemporary with Bishop Pike, specifically those who publicly voiced opinions during the 1950s and '60s. Respondents had the choice to remain anonymous and many did.

from his statements on theology and many subjects" (Frederick Lawrence, retired Suffragan of Massachusetts). "It was not so much his views that irritated the House of Bishops as his individualistic and anarchic behavior. It is one thing to say a doctrine (e.g., the Trinity) needs reinterpretation; it is quite another to ridicule it. He was correctly censured, because he was no longer one of us" (Richard Emrich, retired Bishop of Michigan). "I was a member of the House of Bishops and voted for censure. I would have voted for his deposition if it had been proposed" (a retired bishop). "The

censure was of his practice of compromising fellow Bishops" (Chandler W. Sterling, retired Bishop of Montana).

Allan Brown, retired Bishop of Albany, writes poignantly of the whole House of Bishops as being guilty in the "Pike Affair." "I believed then as I believe now that almost every man had a share in the responsibility for the Pike affair. If I read him correctly his fundamental concern was with the inadequacy of human language to communicate spiritual truth. Here he was a prophetic theologian. Unfortunately he lost his sense of perspective for whatever reason and became more enamored with Pike the prophet, Pike the egoist, Pike the publicity seeker than the cause itself. How easy a thing to do! But we all shared in his guilt: Some would not listen to what he was attempting to say because of theological rigidity and refused to face basic issues. Others were so lacking in theology as to face no issues as long as he seemed to espouse 'liberalism.' Others were afraid to challenge him publicly because of his considerable knowledge, skill at debate, and articulateness. Others should have said, 'Jim we love you, but you are wrong — let us talk this through.' To have been silent, to have been irresponsible to the whole church or to a brother in need, to have been cowardly is quite as offensive as anything J.P. may have done or said. The censure was inevitable and perhaps even inadequate, but the guilt involved most bishops at that time and I certainly do not exempt myself."

Bishop Welles, himself censured for his participation in the Philadelphia Eleven ordinations in 1974 said, "As a bishop who has been censured since Bishop Pike was, I feel the censure was justified as a means of showing official disapproval of an as yet unaccepted theology or action; I favor censure and then moving on to the church's mission. I tell those who still feel censure is not severe enough: 'then why don't you try us, and if we can be convicted, depose



us?" But not enough bishops are willing to go to a trial; reason: charity or lack of guts; some bishops fall in each category, and a trial might not convict! Many bishops also believe a trial would hurt the church more than help."

### Process 'Ridiculous'

Those who feel that the whole censure process was ridiculous expressed themselves as frankly as their opponents. "I largely supported him on the grounds of theological liberty of thought, and I thought the Wheeling trial unfair and farcical. I voted against this censure" (Leland Stark, retired Bishop of Newark). "As for the 'heresy' trials, they were a farce. Unfortunately Bishop Louttit turned it over to incompetent persons to draw up the charges" (an anonymous respondent). "I think the question of injustice is superfluous in this instance; what the church leaders did was stupid, divisive and immensely costly, especially in terms of driving out many of the better minds in the church. So much fear of intellectual and moral openness was manifested that it became difficult to maintain any level of respect for the 'authorities' of the church. In terms of the attitudes which were revealed in Pike's 'persecution' it could be seen as inevitable that such a program would have occurred one way or another" (a California priest).

"There was little effort to grapple with his views or engage in dialogue on them; rather there were attacks on his style and methods without fairness or due process" (George Barrett, retired Bishop of Rochester). "I really feel that the church is 'larger' today than in the '60s in accepting attitudes, data, feelings and even innovative thinking. Some day perhaps it will be as creative as the first parish" (John Riley, priest and longtime friend of Pike). "Procedures of the House of Bishops in dealing with heresy were so changed, as a result of the Pike issue, that is now virtually impossible to prove that charge" (Bishop Hines).

Whatever one feels about the influence of Pike's personality on his legacy, Pike as bishop was more often than not "cautious and conscientious. this is specifically verified in Pike's pastoral letters, which repeatedly appeal to biblical citations and ancient practice" (Stringfellow and Towne, *Death and Life of Bishop Pike*). John Hines agreed that Pike was "very pastoral" as a bishop, particularly in the prickly thicket of the glossolalia matter. One of Pike's pastoral letters which was to have a far-reaching relevance in the next decade was his letter on the phenomenon of "tongues-speaking" and the growing Pentecostal movement in the Episcopal Church in California. The joint letter with his Suffragan, Bishop George Millard, was required reading in the diocese in 1963. Pike and Millard said that the "religious categories and practices borrowed from Pentecostal denominations raise serious questions as to their consistency with the sacramental theology of the Holy Catholic Church and with the role of the three-fold ministry; and the imbalances and overemphasis of this other system of thought and practice present the church with heresy in embryo."

The respondents were almost equally divided on this now more current issue. John Hines and others said that again the problematic word here is "heresy." He feels Pike was correct in his judgment, "especially where the incipient sidetrack manner of the charismatic movement" is concerned. Sherman Johnson remarked, "I have said that Jim was correct in his pastoral letter about the charismatic movement, because as I remember it he did not condemn it out of hand but warned against a heresy that could develop. When the movement goes beyond the bounds of *I Cor. 12-14* it is of course destructive."

Others felt that Pike erred or was treading on shaky ground. Bishop Campbell, retired, of West Virginia, said, "All theology is 'heresy in embryo'

including Pike's books." A priest who was a member of the Georgia clericus charging Pike with heresy said, "I suspect Bishop Pike felt they (the charismatics) believed too much." One retired bishop noted that "it is one of the few spiritual movements alive in the Church today."

There were almost as many opinions as to Pike's place in Episcopal Church history as there were respondents, but only four persons referred to Pike as "a heretic." Nineteen thought that he was "a confused and mentally ill person." The majority considered Pike to be "a theological pioneer" or "a prophet" in the church. Three even felt that he should be included in the prayer book calendar under "lesser feasts and fasts."

### Negative Sampling

A sampling of negative assessments follows. "Admittedly Jim was a Unitarian . . . Jim served as a tutor at the General Seminary, but as far as I can determine, he never had a tutor, i.e., one who would help him to analyze his own prefabricated theological ideas before he turned from law to the ministry. He was brilliant and courageous in applying Christian ethics to current issues, but I doubt that he can be resuscitated as the theologian for our time. *De Mortuis Nil Nisi Bonum*" (Jonathan G. Sherman). "With many ancient heresies he espoused, he did influence theology in his time, especially from St. John Divine pulpit" (Joseph Harte). "I look back at his life with sorrow at the waste of so many gifts and wish I had Diane's (Pike) confidence who told me that on Jim's death, she saw the Heavens open up and our Lord and Martin Luther King and President Kennedy awaiting Jim to usher him into the land of promise" (Charles U. Harris, former dean of Seabury-Western Seminary).

From among those who thought that Jim Pike was a prophet and a theological pioneer came the statements that follow. "He was a valuable gadfly"

(Bishop Campbell). "He was very open and liberal in his ideas about homosexuality and sex for the non-married. He would have been leading the attack for the sexual freedom of the non-married. At first he was anti-gay but made a real about face in the mid-60s" (Robert Cromey, once Canon to Bishop Pike). "He had a great capacity to articulate issues; an excellent and compassionate pastor in an honest and powerful way" (Bishop Barrett). "His effect on the Episcopal Church was enormous. He was a galvanizing and polarizing element. He compelled most people who took their call and vocation in ministry seriously to reexamine their feelings in light of what he said. Jim Pike took his role of bishop seriously, but he saw his willingness and ability to move into theological controversy as part of his office to lead wherever — this was part of life" (Bishop Hines). "Jim was a prophet, and it is not required of all prophets that they be orthodox or mentally stable in every respect; what is good in such people continues" (Sherman Johnson).

Three things about Pike touched one priest's life. First, "when we were fighting for admission of blacks to Sewanee . . . he placed the issue on the front page of the *N. Y. Times*, the church had to face it, and Sewanee (I believe) was saved." Second, "when Mrs. McNair and I got a divorce in Philadelphia in 1960, he personally brought me to CDSP and was first on this issue." Third, "he publicly announced he was an alcoholic in *Time* magazine, and was first here. Pike is about the only American bishop that has stood for very much in his lifetime" (Dr. Robert McNair).

One of the most intriguing assessments came from Bishop Lickfield, who has definitely changed his mind about Pike. The former president of the A.C.U. says "He was a liberal catholic, far ahead of his time. The Episcopal Church has not caught up with him, though some Roman Catholic and Protestant thinkers have. I voted for his censure but regretted it later and still do." He adds that Pike "might some day, in the light of a more

distant view" be a person worthy of inclusion in the prayer book calendar under lesser feasts and fasts.

Pike was in many ways a product of the ferment of the '60s and was undoubtedly a prophet about many things that were to happen in the church of the '70s and probably into the next century: Women's ordination, "secular theology," human sexuality, the charismatic movement and its influence. It appears that his critics continue to put him down over his personal life but do not really grapple with his message and his writings. Perhaps the most important contribution that Pike made came about as a result of his censure for "heresy." Since that time others have felt much more free to question the traditional stand of the church in theology and ethics. The questioning that was once the domain of seminary scholars is now possible publicly throughout the rank and file of the church. This is Jim Pike's greatest legacy, and for that and much more we thank God for his life. ■

## THE PREACHER SAT IN THE PEW

by Eldred Johnston

Recently I was out of town for the weekend. I attended incognito (without collar) a church near my motel. I came away with a startling new insight: *It's much easier to preach a sermon than to listen to one!*

For one thing, there is the contrast in physical settings. The preacher is free to move: to stretch the arms, shake the finger, bend the knees, twist the head. The listener is pinned between two

other captives; the most one can do is slump.

Then, there is the difference in levels. The people are not seated around a table where they can look the preacher in the eye as in a conversation; they must look upward. They are at a distinct disadvantage gravitationally; the ponderous phrases come rolling downhill and there is nothing to dodge behind.

One also feels like the dental patient: the mouth is full of three immense instruments while the dentist gives a lecture as to why

pastors should spend more time praying rather than reading *The New York Times*.

Finally, the person in the pulpit asks too many questions which one has no chance to answer. The preacher asks the question, then, without pausing for a response from the pew, proceeds to answer it. In the first place, I wasn't interested in the question posed; in the second place, I had several questions to ask but I was never given an opening.

Thank goodness, I won't be in the pew next Sunday. I'll have it easy. I'll be preaching!

**The Rev. Eldred Johnston** was rector of St. Mark's Church in Columbus, Ohio, for 20 years prior to his retirement.

Continued from page 2

points to the Incarnation and guards us against docetism. The experience of the Risen Lord in the lives of men and women would still seem to be the best place from which to begin theology; this is fully attested to in Scripture for persons of each gender. Eastern Christians appear to have this worked out very well. While giving Mary, the Mother of God, great reverence for her part in God's salvific plan, they also point to Peter who was the first to confess that Jesus was the Christ. Since they interpret this passage soteriologically rather than institutionally, each one of us believers can become another Peter on whose faith Christ will build his Church. There are plenty of other examples which could be given of persons whose lives are examples to us all as expressed liturgically in the Prayer Book, but Christ is still head of the church.

**Edward Franks**  
**Church Divinity School**  
**of the Pacific**  
**Berkeley, Cal.**

## Mary Obscure

Professor Ruether's interpretation of Blessed Mary's revolutionary declaration in the Magnificat is cogent and compelling, but might not the statement that "without human response God cannot act," the idea of the "dependence of God on humanity" be somewhat presumptuous? With the next breath so many others have so tediously reiterated: "humanity invented God; He is a figment of our fantasy, a myth." Being omnipotent, God can certainly act without human response, even outside of human knowledge and

perception. To put the human response before the divine act is like putting the cart before the horse.

What Mary accomplished by her "Fiat," her faith, was no manipulation of God-head, but re-alignment of man: re-uniting the creature with his Creator. She did not introduce God into man's dimension, (He already encompassed that, being the Author of human history) but made possible the readmission of finite man into God's eternal dimension.

Yes, Our Lady, Mary, was "a poor woman of despised race" who could claim the top spot, "head of the church." But like her Son, who in taking upon Him our humble estate, forsook the glory that was rightfully His at the right hand of His Father in heaven, she chose to serve rather than be served, content to live where true freedom is to be found — in obscurity. We poor and oppressed are no longer that when we occupy preferential position.

How, I wonder, except for St. Luke's sensitivity to the subjugation of women, does Professor Ruether account for the fact that, beyond this one revolutionary declaration, the Magnificat, Holy Mary did not pursue, further, or otherwise live out a revolutionary, liberation-type role in either the church or secular society?

One answer might be that she didn't have to: She was FREE in the eternal dimension, as we, too, can be in the Love of JESUS.

**Jean Hennig-Baarson**  
**Canaan, N.H.**

## U.S. Lost Before

That was an elegant September issue, devoted to the work of the Urban Coalitions, and a real charge upon us all to get moving again. Only one thing: "American troops returned from Vietnam, without victory for the first time"? (page 4).

General Robert E. Lee and the entire Confederate Army would deny this myth. So would any survivor of the War of 1812, in the unlikely event he is still among us. So would every American Indian. And please note that all of these are "Americans" as much as any denizen of New England or the Middle Atlantic States.

The only reason it is important lies in

the dangerous fact that there are all too many Ultra Machos among us anxious to avenge this "stain upon the national honor." Viz, *Mayaguez* and its attendant idiocies; and the current talks about the existence in Cuba of fewer than 3,000 Russians. It is time we learned to live with the notion of ourselves as occasional losers; as survivors in the struggle toward a fuller humanity, and away from the current Dance of Death we seem to be engaged in.

True, it's a nit, but I pick it because of its potential for fatal misunderstanding. Otherwise, full congratulations to you, to Janette Pierce and to the Black United Fund.

**Ruth Malone**  
**Swarthmore, Pa.**

## Kindness Oppressive

I like your literature but I consider you to be unacquainted with the folks you espouse and oppressive in your kindness. "Helping" is only helping when one does not think he or she has solutions. *To Hear and to Heed* described well, but heed Paulo Freire: You have to be part of the problem to be part of the solution. You do not get involved by saying you are coming to help. But I do think you're the better part of the Episcopal Church.

**Louise Loomis**  
**Hartford, Conn.**

## Eager to Subscribe

Many of us interested in Integrity/National are grateful for the support which THE WITNESS has provided to this cause of human dignity and rights. It is because of this that I am eager to be a subscriber.

**Clinton R. Jones, Jr., Canon**  
**Christ Church Cathedral**  
**Hartford, Conn.**

### Correction

THE WITNESS neglected to identify the Rev. Richard W. Gillett, author of "Christian Tactics for the 1980s," in the December issue. He is the newest addition to the staff of the Episcopal Church Publishing Company, charged with development of the Church and Society Network, and for the past six years has served as director of community outreach for All Saints Church, Pasadena.

### CREDITS

Cover, page 8, adapted from a graphic in *The Catholic Worker*; p. 12, Rini Templeton; p. 14, Bill Plimpton.



The Episcopal Church Publishing Company  
P.O. Box 359  
Ambler, Pennsylvania 19002  
Address Correction Requested

NONPROFIT ORG.  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
North Wales, Pa.  
Permit No. 121

## Urban Caucus Gains Momentum

by Jan Pierce

The mounting churchwide interest in the plans and programs of the Urban Bishops' Coalition and the Church and City Conference has amazed and delighted both the staff and leadership. All signs point to maximum participation in the important assembly which the two groups are sponsoring in Indianapolis Feb. 13-15 to form an Episcopal Urban Caucus.

Among indicators of increased interest in the church's mission in the cities is the positive response to last fall's regional institutes. The planners of the Southeast Institute in Atlanta reported difficulty in holding enrollment there to double the number originally expected.

The December institutes in New York City and Los Angeles also reported excellent response. At press time interest was running high in the January institutes scheduled in Boston and Detroit.

The Rev. Jim Friedrich's slide/tape show, "An Urban Pilgrimage," which

received high praise at General Convention has been booked solidly with four copies in almost constant use. Showings throughout the winter and early spring are being booked now through Jan Pierce, 1930 Chestnut, 11th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19103 (215-564-2010).

The revision of the draft study document first presented at General Convention is also going forward under the leadership of Bishop John Krumm of Southern Ohio. The revised document will be ready for debate at the February assembly.

Final plans for the assembly were approved Dec. 12 at a meeting of the leadership of the Urban Bishops' Coalition and the Church and City Conference in Washington, D.C. The assembly will enable those attending to establish a long range national agenda for the caucus by clearly defining the issues which confront the church and to develop action strategies for urban congregations and dioceses. Participants will also decide on a structure to help the caucus and its

members carry out the agenda and will develop an "ongoing, self-conscious process to encourage theological reflection and practical evaluation for parish, diocesan and national work."

In issuing a call to the assembly in mid-December, Bishop John Walker, chairman of the Urban Bishops' Coalition, and the Rev. Michael Kendall, chairman of the Church and City Conference, described their vision of the caucus as an organization which will "provide material and spiritual support for those already engaged in urban mission, continue to confront the whole church with the urgency of this mission, and create a base within the Episcopal church from which we can join hands with other religious and community agencies to address the plight of our cities and their people."

Response indicates many Episcopalians share both their concerns and their vision. For information on joining the Episcopal Urban Caucus, contact the Rev. Hugh White, Urban Bishops' Coalition, 4800 Woodward Ave., Detroit, MI 48201.

**Jan Pierce** is news editor of *The Episcopalian* and a member of the Steering Committee of the Urban Bishops' Coalition.