

Indian Approaches to the Theology of Liberation

N. Abeyasingha

That there are social, political and economic problems in India is a fact that needs no proof. The task of the believer in this situation can be spoken of in line with the general understanding of revelation which encourages the Christian to act like Christ, who gave himself unto death; to act like the apostles who spent themselves for their brethren, because our fellow men are members of Christ and in order that the peace willed by Christ may reign in this world. Yet such a description of the task of the Christian leaves his role as regards the structures of human society relatively undefined.

In India today, there is the effort to analyse the structures themselves and establish Christian positions in dealing with them, so as to re-construct a social order in which sin as a structuring element is less present.

The present article seeks to present the general lines of the approach followed by Indian theologians and then try to offer, for the information and comment of Western theologians, certain approaches by which the theology of liberation as formulated for and in India could have an impact in regard to other approaches to the theology of liberation.

Even the most systematic considerations in the matter of the theology of liberation are formulated as "hypotheses". The present article seeks to present some of the present approaches to the theology of liberation in India. Admittedly, it is a difficult task to synthesize the perspectives of the analyses of Indian society already made and the "projects" suggested due to the "particularity" of the viewpoint of each author. But it is necessary to make some attempt in order to set our comments in perspective.

THE CHURCH

a) *The mission of the Church:*

The question that is presupposed in any attempt to establish a Christian position as regards the social order is an understanding of what the mission of the Church is.

In understanding the mission of the Church, an important consideration in the context of liberation is the Kingdom as God's

revolution, which is both historical and eschatological. This revolution, as Legrand observes, has a threefold dimension—interior, social and reaching the cosmos. But “Christ announcing the Kingdom did not dictate a programme of liberation: any programme would have been a return to the Law. He brought the good news that God’s revolution had started. He gave the Spirit that makes everything new. By doing this, he did not bring man to one more utopia in the manner of many philosophers”.¹

Kappen agrees that in most cases it is impossible to derive from the gospel any concrete model of society to be realized here and now. There may be many possible “projects”, which are equally in harmony with the requirements of the Kingdom”.²

S. Amirtham’s observation is in place here. Methodologically, one cannot take any particular concept or doctrine or historical event and draw our conclusions for the Christian understanding of development. “The only truth that we can legitimately draw from such historical incidents is that God acts in history and that his will is that people are liberated from various bondages. When we go into details, the complexities bewilder us”.³

So, while the Church must take seriously the forces of sin and evil, if development is seen in terms of a need and is motivated by love, we must look for efficacious means to deal with the situation. “It is a misuse of the word charity to use it for schemes that do not change *structures* that perpetuate that need”.⁴ Similarly, Alencherry speaks of the need for Christians to give priority to Christian principles and to work out concrete programmes of political action.⁵

Thus, while admitting the complexity of the problem, these authors take it for granted that true charity (a christian principle) and change of structures (programmes of action) are intimately connected, and some of them would say, even inseparable.

Chethimattam however, has a rather different approach. He does not directly connect the two notions charity and change of structures. He admits that the Church is not a mere charitable institution. Then he goes on to say, “The sole reason for human existence is self-realisation. Besides the struggle against poverty, misery and exploitation, Christians seek also the creation of a new man. This is a communitarian image in which the community as a whole and the person as a totality are co-relative”.⁶ For him, then, liberation is primarily liberation of the whole man and of every man from sin as a condition of life of all mankind with the Lord.⁷

b) *The mission of the Church as exercised:*

In practice, the actual interventions of the Church in Kerala (here the reference is obviously to the hierarchical and “institutional” church) have been described as “the belated attempts of a community with a medieval outlook to catch up with the demands

of modern times".⁸ It has also been said that "it is interests rather than principles that have motivated the Church to intervene in politics. Whenever her interests seemed to be challenged, she took sides with other similar opportunistic groups or sought their cooperation and followed a course of action dictated merely by expedience".⁹ On the other hand, the activity in the political sphere is considered to have re-invigorated the Church.¹⁰ So the situation is that "the Christian, in virtue of his very faith in the Kingdom is put in a situation of dialectical tension between *commitment* to concrete secular goals, economic, social and political and *criticism* of all social systems, whether existing or yet to be realised".¹¹ Thus the Christian contribution can be considered under two inter-dependent aspects—the anti-sacral and the economic and political. "The special task of the Church is to preserve contact with God, which through transcending human society offers sonship through Christ to man, who in turn by virtue of this status can overcome all bondage".¹² The great challenge of the Church is considered to be the conscientization of the world, as Our Lord did against unjust oppressions of every kind in whatever form they were found.¹³ The liturgy can be looked upon as a factor provoking the worshipper not merely to individualistic involvement e.g. charitable action, but to perceiving in the Word of God new practical implications for a commitment to social justice.

ANALYSIS OF INDIAN SOCIETY

a) *Using Marxist categories*

One of the more common tools used in the analysis of Indian society is Marxist categories—used sometimes explicitly, but more often implicitly.

An example of one who advocates the use of Marxist categories explicitly would be Fr Joseph Vadakkan. His book, *A priest's encounter with revolution* is not a theological work. It is his autobiography. For that reason it is interesting to read this book as the story of a man who grows to the point of ultimately opting for Marxist categories.

"By the word poverty," he says, "I had in mind not only material poverty. I included in the broad definition of the term, intellectual poverty. So, I divided the products of poverty into four categories—ignorance, hunger, disease and homelessness".¹⁵ This was a poverty which Vadakkam knew from experience.¹⁶

In the analysis of this poverty, he found himself unable to accept Marx's theory of dialectical materialism.¹⁷ But he says, "Marx's economic theory has completely overpowered me. I believe in class war and revolution. If other democratic means fail, I firmly believe that the Indian people should attain economic free-

dom by a bloody revolution. Can it not be that the stage when the State withers away is the temporal form of the Kingdom of God envisaged by Christ? When the dimension of spirituality is added, Marx's Dictatorship of the Proletariat will become the rule of Christ with his twelve fishermen. I firmly believe that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the final culmination of democratic values".¹⁸

Such an analysis requires that Vadakkan seek for theological legitimation of his vision. Thus he says, "I do not find true theology in saying that the voice of a people's representative in a true democracy is less divine than the voice of the leaders of the Church which does not allow people's participation."¹⁹ Individuals and collectivities who oppose this goal of an egalitarian society stand condemned.²⁰

There are others who are not so explicit in their use of Marxist categories. Yet one can perceive that the Marxist idea of class struggle and conflict forms the background of their statements. Thus for example, after presenting an analysis of the Church's developmental activities in Kerala, Francois Houtart and Genevieve Lemercinier say, "There is a lack of planning, but even more, an absence of the analysis of society in terms of the *existing opposition* between social groups."²¹ Kappen says that the presence of the Church in education for over a century has not hastened the march to socialism, but would seem to have contributed "to the strengthening of the existing exploitative social system and to the perpetuation of the values of western bourgeois civilization."²² Kappen in fact actually cites Marx²³ and goes on to analyse society in terms of the conflict of classes. He says that the traditional spiritualistic conception of religion as a way of liberation from the historical conditions of human existence cannot inspire to create a better social order.²⁵ In this context, the task of the Church is seen as a prophetic proclamation of the eschatological community of love—a classless society. Yet at the same time, this task is referred to as not being unenlightened enthusiasm of material and economic development. It is called social criticism—accepting the relativisation of all historical stages of development; a politicization, which percolates to the level of the masses and revolutionary action for the eradication of unjust structures.²⁶

b) *A more "humanistic" approach.*²⁷

Cherian, in an approach which he calls that of a communist, speaks of a dynamic concept which insists that man and not law is supreme. But he says that the State at present sustains the domination of one class over the other.²⁸ It is therefore not surprising that Christians like S. Ryan reflecting this perspective speak of new factors today, among these the Marxist emphasis on the

earthly and material and a shift of emphasis in society and religion from systems, mental constructions and institutions to the human person.²⁹ P. T. Chacko speaks of politics as helping considerably towards humanization and says that Christians have a duty to help in this.³⁰

THE NEW TESTAMENT BASIS FOR LIBERATING ACTION

a) *Re-interpretation of the gospel image of Jesus:*

Several authors have recourse to the gospels to find in them guidelines for handling the situation which has emerged from their analysis.

Kappen points out that the Christian faith has been alienated from the historical Jesus along three principal lines—cultic, dogmatic and institutional.³¹ So he sets out to point out that Jesus “believed that God would come to free man from every kind of bondage and usher in a new age of justice, freedom, love and universal brotherhood”.³² Though there was in his time, accumulation of wealth in the privileged classes on the one hand, and unemployment and poverty on the other, he did not call for economic liberation. Nor did he join the nationalist liberation movement led by the zealots. As for political liberation, his own non-involvement probably resulted from his own reading of the times and from his understanding of the divine challenge as revealed at that particular juncture by history. But this is no justification for social conformism today. On the contrary, the basic thrust of his message demands *radical* commitment where the *social system* is unjust and oppressive as in India. One cannot believe in the reign of God as the total liberation of man from every kind of bondage, a liberation to be brought about by human initiative, and at the same time remain neutral to *structures* of oppression. When therefore, Christians commit themselves to *social revolution*, they are not going against, but along with Jesus”.³³

Ryan views the movement of Jesus as “a movement of *radical love* and *radical action* in favour of men and of basic human values which make life worthwhile and for which God gave himself and went to extremes”.³⁴ He says in another article that “Jesus was there on the cross because he refused to be a conformist and a thing that fits into a system.... It is the manly suffering like his own, native to the *conflict* that is inherent in any firm stand taken for justice, dignity and freedom for the common man”.³⁵ It was Jesus’ imagination that transformed religion from bondage into a liberating influence.³⁶ Exorcisms are instances of God’s struggle in Jesus against powers which were considered intractable and dangerous.³⁷

Men have developed life styles and structures—economic, religious and cultural—in which power, authority, influence, decisions

and wealth are all in the hands of the few, while the vast masses of the people are poor, powerless, hungry, humiliated. This goes counter to God's dreams of man and of the human community.³⁸ The struggle still continues. Jesus is still on the battlefield in Calcutta and Delhi.³⁹ "It seems clear that the death of Jesus was a historical necessity called for by the new and non-conformist path he chose to tread in obedience to the Father's plan to redeem mankind from every brokenness, humiliation and captivity... The price is being paid today with the tortured students and hanged priests of Brazil...."⁴⁰

J. Descrochers in *Christ the Liberator* seeks to "look at Jesus as a genuine human being acting at a particular period of history and living the story of his life with its daily routine, its crises and turning points.... Thus full weight is given to the historical choices he made, the options he rejects and the values and insights that inspired him".⁴¹ The conclusion he reaches is that the message of Jesus was focussed on the socio-religious field and that by his work for the new Israel, Jesus went beyond the field of "prophetism" and directly challenged the Jewish religio-political establishment.⁴²

b) *Techniques and Tactics:*

The re-interpretation of the image of Jesus only points out the general need of liberating action. But the form this action is to take remains to be specified within the Indian context. The present author has not found much discussion of this question, and its legitimation through direct recourse to the gospel.

The obvious starting point in India is the Gandhian teaching. Satyagraha has been considered the blue print for revolution. Thekkevilayil points out however that "Satyagraha is more than a political technique, it is essentially a religious movement, a spiritual attitude. It demands complete self-conquest and overcoming of passions".⁴³ It is in this context that Jayaprakash Narayan's movement is evaluated. "Even if the motives of some of his present allies are questionable and their integrity doubtful, his basic position is quite commendable. Inspired by Gandhiji's ideas, he has strongly advocated the people's power as against that of the State. He is deeply concerned that people should be masters of their destiny and not mere playthings in the hand of the State. This is something which would have appealed to Jesus of Nazareth".⁴⁴

WHAT IS THE SPECIFICALLY INDIAN CONTRIBUTION?

Without confining ourselves to one particular author, from the broad panorama of views presented, one can say that there are two basic approaches to the Indian situation of poverty and oppression. The first is to analyse the situation using Marxist categories

or in a more humanistic manner. What emerges is the need to change the structures and more precisely to change the infra-structures⁴⁵ of the situation which perpetuates injustice. The gospel image of Jesus is re-interpreted in terms of love and justice, calling one to deal radically with these structures. It entails for the person of Jesus (and consequently for the follower of Jesus who takes the same attitude) suffering and even death.

The second approach represented especially by Chethimattam, who unfortunately does not develop his thought at any length, seems to be an attempt to analyse the situation in terms of the man/men who is/are in the situation. The goal of the struggle against injustice is not merely to eradicate poverty, misery and exploitation, but also to create a new man. In such a view, it would seem to us, that what is primary is not necessarily the eradication of the infra-structures (freedom from), but rather providing the men in the structure (one could say both the oppressed and the oppressor) a freedom *to* develop to their fullest or a freedom *for* self-realisation.

The two approaches then seem to manifest a different concern as to the end product or the praxis which each of them envisages. The first starts with a sociological analysis of the situation and the praxis which emerges is a political strategy. The second follows a more introspective and psychological approach. While not condoning the structures of injustice, wiping them out is not the only goal envisaged. As Chethimattam says, liberation in India refers primarily to the liberation of the whole man.⁴⁶ The tendency in the Indian tradition is to move away from all structures and system. It seeks for what is meaningful for life. In this context, "theology is not a system, but rather an activity. It is not an activity that builds up a tower of Babel rising towards heaven, but rather the digging up of the human channel through which the heavenly Ganges can descend and flow".⁴⁷

In terms of the Marxist analysis, the economic aspect is primary. The Church has to opt for economic reform and work, as Vadakkan suggests, for the dictatorship of the proletariat adding spirituality to it. But the question arises whether this can be harmonised with the second approach of Chethimattam.

To try to decide which of the two approaches is more firmly rooted in the Indian tradition, one has to start perhaps with the figure of Gandhi, who has left a deep impact on India.

Gandhi's vision envisaged the totality of the Indian reality. In all human affairs, there was to be justice, honesty and truth. In social affairs, he stressed the equality of all as children of God (*hari-jans*). In the economic field, he wanted to stimulate human potential both in villages and cities to create and produce enough for the needs of each, but abjuring luxury and superfluity. In relig-

ious matters, he wanted respect and tolerance for the varied expressions of the work of the one God. In life-style, he proposed utter simplicity and austerity marked by self-discipline. In the face of adverse forces and human injustice, he wanted two weapons used—*ahimsa* and *satya*—both consonant with the dignity of the human person. One can say that this entire vision of Gandhi was one that resulted primarily from his commitment to the truth, and not from his effort to do away with an infra-structure. He said of himself “I am a seeker after Truth. I claim to have found the way to it. I claim to be making a ceaseless effort to find it. But I admit I have not found it. To find truth completely is to realise one’s destiny, that is to become perfect. I am particularly conscious of my imperfections and therein lies all the strength I possess, because it is a rare thing for a man to know his limitations”.⁴⁸

Gandhi’s theory of non-violence flows from this. For non-violence in the true sense is the capacity to control oneself. He speaks of three levels of non-violence. The lowest level is that of the coward and effeminate, “who desires revenge, but being afraid to die, he looks to others, maybe the government of the day, to do the work of defence for him”. The second is the non-violence practised as a policy of expediency. “The weak and the helpless are non-violent in action, because they must be. But in reality, they harbour violence in their hearts and simply await the opportunity for its display”. The third and highest level is the non-violence of the brave. “The bravest man allows himself to be killed without killing. And he desists from killing or injuring because he knows that it is wrong to injure”.⁴⁹

Thus, the Marxist critique of Gandhi is significant. The Marxists accept Gandhi’s leadership, because he was able not only to mobilise the masses, but also to restrain them. They however, considered him an opponent of the class struggle, because he was able to arouse the masses, limiting the scope of their actions to the struggle against British Imperialism without affecting the interests of the Indian Bourgeoisie.⁵⁰ Illustrative of this are the events of 1921-1922. Gandhi’s non-cooperative movement was well under way in 1921, when in February 1922 a wayward mob in Eastern Uttar Pradesh killed a policeman. Gandhi immediately called off his struggle. He preferred to fail to achieve his goal, rather than lead his people along the path of bloodshed.

The mainspring of Gandhi’s thought then lies in permitting the self-realisation of every man. The change of structure is the consequence and fruit of this self-realisation. Perhaps, it may be true to say that even Indians who seem to be explicitly committed to the class struggle, do not actually carry their commitment to its logical conclusion. Vadakkan has already been referred to. But it is interesting to note that when he came to handle the *satyagraha* at Irin-

jalkuda, he does not try to intensify the conflict that existed. Rather he works towards trying to bring about an agreement among the agents in the struggle.⁵¹

Thus, it would seem that it is more in keeping with the deep-rooted aspirations of India not to speak so much in terms of class struggle and changing the infra-structures when formulating a theology and praxis of liberation, even though the majority of Indian theologians advocate this. Indian theologians advocate this, it is true; but they do not carry it further than wanting it to eradicate poverty. Their strategies are not so clearly worked out.

What would perhaps express more aptly the “Indian-ness” of the theology of liberation is to make the notion of self-realisation central and foundational. Change of structure will come through a change (in the person/persons) of their relationship to the causes of oppression. Therefore, while admitting a situation of poverty and oppression in India, one must understand that the counter to this situation is not one of economic affluence. Rather the antonym of poverty and injustice is non-acquisitiveness.

To speak of the contrary of poverty as non-acquisitiveness expresses a different emphasis from current Latin American and North American theologies of liberation. To use the text of a well-known prayer to illustrate this difference, one can cite a passage from the so-called Universal Prayer attributed to Pope Clement XI. Here we read, “Let me vanquish pleasure by self-denial, avarice by generosity, anger by meekness and lukewarmness by fervour”. In the Indian context, however, one would have to word the prayer differently. One would have to speak of non-pleasure, non-avarice etc. This is very much in the line of Indian thinking which has a whole series of negative expressions to articulate its concept of perfection—non-greed (*alobha*), no hate (*adosa*) etc.

The significance of negative expressions, it would seem to us, is not merely a quibbling with words. Avarice for example, is wrong. It is a wrong relation of a person to material things. Non-avarice (non-acquisitiveness) is a negation of the relation. If however, the antonym of avarice is considered to be generosity, then the relation of the person to material things (as its owner) remains. Generosity is a new way of expressing ownership—distributing it among many and creating many owners. Thus, Indian liberation theology would have to take this perspective into consideration. In fact, it is known by those who have been engaged in “liberation” projects in India that merely material objectives without some element of the negating of the relationship have failed. The success of Gandhi and of other followers of his philosophy can perhaps be explained in terms of his harmonising the ideal of self-realisation with every project which he proposed to the Indian people. Perhaps, other liberation theologies too should ask the question about

the goal of the praxis which emerges as an imperative from their analysis of the situation of oppression. Is praxis aimed directly at the structure or infra-structure? or, is it aimed directly at the person and indirectly at the structure?

- 1 L. Legrand "God's Kingdom and Liberation", *The Living Word* 79 (1973). p. 324 Cf. pp. 311-325.
- 2 Cf. S. Kappen "The Christian and the call to revolution", *Jeevadhara* 1 (1971) p. 39. It is well to note that there is a similarity here to *Gaudium et Spes* 43.
- 3 S. Amirtham "Theological guidelines for Christian participation in development", *Religion and Society* 18/4 (1971). p. 15.
- 4 *Ibid.* pp. 22-23 (emphasis mine).
- 5 Cf. G. P. Alencherry, "Is political service a tribute to Caesar or God?" *The Living Word* 80 (1974). pp. 316-328.
- 6 J. B. Chethimattam, "Towards a theology of liberation", *Jeevadhara* 2 (1972). p. 31.
- 7 Cf. *ibid.* pp. 29-30.
- 8 A. Kallunkalpurayidom, "The involvement of the Kerala Church in politics", *Jeevadhara* 1 (1971). p. 61.
- 9 Cf. M. Kanjirathinkal, "Christian participation in politics: A case study of Kerala Church's political involvement", *Jeevadhara* 6 (1976). p. 146.
- 10 Cf. A. Paikada, "Political parties", *Jeevadhara* 5 (1975) pp. 54-55.
- 11 S. Kappen, "The Christian . . .", p. 39.
- 12 S. K. Chatterji, "Towards a revolutionary transformation of society", *Religion and Society* 14/1 (1967) p. 24. Cf. pp. 23-25.
- 13 Cf. T. Chankiath, "Conscientization, a process of humanization", *The Living Word* 82 (1976). p. 216.
- 14 Cf. H. Volken, "Liturgy, a factor for social justice and liberation", *Word and Worship* 7 (1974). p. 109. Cf. pp. 107-109.
- 15 J. Vadakkan, *A priest's encounter with revolution* (Bangalore, 1974). p. 118. Cf. p. 37.
- 16 Cf. *ibid.* 124.
- 17 Cf. *ibid.* 43.
- 18 *ibid.* p. 44. (Note that Vadakkan, *ibid.* p. 10 considers Gandhi weak on the economic aspect).
- 19 *Ibid.* p. 155. Vadakkan (cf. id.) speaks of God giving light to his people directly in spite of the leaders of the Church.
- 20 Cf. *ibid.* p. 6 (condemnation of landlordism), p. 3 (religion exploiting people's fears), p. 133 (no salvation for unemployed unless the economic order is changed).
- 21 Cf. F. Houtart and G. Lemercinier, "Social commitment and theoretical motivation: An analysis of the Church's developmental activities in Kerala", *Jeevadhara* 6 (1976), p. 121 (emphasis mine). Cf. also pp. 111-124.
- 22 S. Kappen, "The future of Christian education and Christian education of the future", *Jeevadhara* 3 (1973), p. 61.
- 23 Cf. ID. "Christianity in India's development", *Jeevadhara* 2 (1972). p. 49.
- 24 Cf. *ibid.* pp. 48-53.
- 25 Cf. *ibid.* pp. 54-55.
- 26 Cf. *ibid.* pp. 60-62. We note here that while he criticises the "spiritual" concept of religion, he seems to imply something spiritual in the task of the Church, requiring that her proclamation be not unenlightened enthusiasm for the material.
- 27 We note here that authors like F. Tonnies, *On social idvas and ideologies* (Tr. E. C. Jacoby, New York, 1974), p. 80 would think that Marx's contrast of the material against the mental can in fact not be found in social life.
- 28 Cf. M. M. Cherian, "The rule of land and human rights in the promotion of social justice" *Religion and Society* 15/3 (1968). pp. 58-67.

- 29 Cf. S. Ryan, "Human well-being on earth and the gospel of Jesus", *Jeevadhara* 2 (1972), p. 36.
- 30 Cf. P. T. Chacko, "Towards a theology of politics" *Jeevadhara* 1 (1971), p. 21. Cf. pp. 12-28. In this regard, we also note that this trend is found in several articles in: T. Paul Ed. *Justice and development in the Indian Context* (Fr Zacharias Lectures, Alwaye, 1976).
- 31 Cf. S. Kappen, "Jesus today", *Jeevadhara* 4 (1974), pp. 169-181, especially pp. 170-175.
- 32 *Ibid.* p. 179.
- 33 Cf. *ibid.* pp. 180-181 (emphasis mine).
- 34 S. Ryan, "Jesus and the Father", *Jeevadhara* 4 (1974), p. 246 (emphasis mine).
- 35 ID. "Human well being . . ." p. 45 (emphasis mine).
- 36 ID. "Jesus had imagination". *Jeevadhara* 2 (1972), p. 219.
- 37 Cf. ID. "The price he paid". *Jeevadhara* 5 (1975), p. 220.
- 38 Cf. *ibid.* p. 221.
- 39 Cf. *ibid.* p. 223.
- 40 *Id.*
- 41 J. Descrochers, *Christ the Liberator* (India's search for development and social justice: Vital issues for today's India, No 17, Bangalore 1977), pp. 19-20.
- 42 Cf. *ibid.* pp. 272-273.
- 43 P. Thekkevilayil, "Social justice through revolution", *The Living Word* 80 (1974), p. 44. Cf. pp. 34-45.
- 44 K. Kunnumpuram, "Jesus and Man", *Jeevadhara* 5 (1975), p. 188.
- 45 Cf. for example S. Kappen, "The future . . ." pp. 29-30.
- 46 Cf. Cf. J. B. Chethimattam, "Towards . . ." pp. 29-30.
- 47 ID. "The spirit and orientation of an Indian Theology". *Jeevadhara* 1 (1971), p. 453. Cf. pp. 454=455.
- 48 *Young India*, 30 July 1931 (emphasis mine).
- 49 Cf. J. Thekkinedath, *Love of neighbour in Mahatma Gandhi* (Alwaye, 1973), pp. 99-103.
- 50 Cf. B. Wielenga, *Marxist views on India in historical perspective* (Bangalore, 1976), pp. 125-131. See also M. Dandavate, *Marx and Gandhi* (1977).
- 51 Cf. J. Vadakkan, *op. cit.* pp. 107-108. The entire chapter (pp. 84-116) can be read in this light.

Body And Person: A Reply To

Daphne Nash

J. M. Cameron

Perhaps you will allow me to make two comments on the piece (*New Blackfriars*, Dec 1978) by Daphne Nash and four others, on my January 1978 article 'Body and Person'.

1) 'His treatment of ethics concentrates largely on questions about motives, and the importance of the outward form of actions' (p. 555). This is untrue. The word motive is used on only two occasions and in neither case does it sustain the thesis of Nash