

II

THE MIND OF THE PEACEMAKER

STYLES change in the sphere of morals as well as in the realms of manners or dress. One virtue may be in vogue today; by tomorrow time may have made "the ancient good uncouth." For virtue in first-century Palestine the scribes and Pharisees, who were the style-setters, made ostentatious piety the height of good form. They paraded their spiritual exercises. Today we pride ourselves on having turned away from such smirking hypocrisy. We are determined not to pretend to be more pious than we are. We will at least be real. In fact we seem to assume that to avoid the show of being religious is a sign of genuineness, and therefore a virtue in itself. In our hearts we say, "We thank thee, Lord, that we are not as the Pharisees were, hypocritical, smug, and insincere." Thus we feel as superior to the Pharisees as the Pharisees felt toward the publicans of their day.

But in that feeling of superiority we manifest the very pride which was the basic sin of the Pharisee. Traditional theology has listed pride as the first of the seven deadly sins. At first, this seems a bit surprising, for pride looks quite respectable in comparison with crude vices like lust or stealing or murder. But second thought reveals the primacy of pride as a paralyzing force. It was because of this fact that Jesus said to the scribes and Pharisees, "Ye have taken away the key of knowledge." Pride closes the door to the kingdoms of truth and brotherhood and throws away the key.

I. HUMBLE

The first trait essential to the mind of those who would make for peace is *humility*. If we would be among the peace-makers we must be humble enough to rid ourselves of the pride of race. When we stop to think about it, pride of race is the last vantage point from which a little man can vaunt himself. When there is nothing in his own record of achievement or in his family's position to which he can point with pride, he can at least preen himself on his race—a blessing for which he is in no way responsible.

And when we stop to think further we see how ridiculous this pride of race has been made by the mutations of progress. In the first century B. C., Cicero wrote to Atticus: "Do not obtain your slaves from Britain, because they are so stupid and so utterly incapable of being taught that they are not fit to form a part of the household of Athens." Such was the advice given to a proud Greek by a proud Roman concerning what he considered the inferior race of barbarians living on the British Isles. It might be well for the proud Anglo-Saxon to ponder this historical fact when he feels himself prone to look down upon the Greek fruit vendor or to call the descendants of Cicero's line "dagoes." Cicero's statement also makes interesting reading alongside the recent declaration of General Patten: "Undoubtedly it is our destiny to rule the world—we British and Americans and of course the Russian people."¹

Furthermore, science has dispelled many of the myths surrounding the idea of supposedly superior races. "The idea of a superior race is not proved by scientific findings. Neither is there any pure race today; even in Scandinavia not fifty per cent of the population can be called pure Nordic. There is no

¹London, April 24, 1944, as reported in the press.

German or French or Aryan race. Germany is a nationality made up of members of the Nordic, Alpine, and Mediterranean races. Aryan refers to any person who speaks an Aryan or Endo-European language, but it has nothing to do with race. Hitler appears to be predominantly Alpine, which may account for his use of the term Aryan. The Jews are not a race; they are a religious and cultural group with a long tradition in common, but they have in their numbers members of the Mediterranean, Alpine, and Nordic races."

The reader need not assent to all the above assertions. But he does recognize that the purity of races has been lost by intermingling and the concept of race is being subjected to a scientific revision which makes thoughtful men loath to use the racial labels.

And as for the superiority of certain races, America's most distinguished anthropologist, the late Franz Boas, declares: "If we were to select the most intelligent, imaginative, energetic, and emotionally stable third of mankind, all races would be represented."

And along with the pride of race one must remove the feeling of social superiority if we are to have the mind of the peacemaker. We cannot understand the mind of another when we look down upon him. Like the watermark of our writing paper, the mind of masters must be looked up to against the light if we are to see its identifying texture. Edward Arlington Robinson in his portrayal of Nicodemus has a revealing passage. He pictures the discerning Nicodemus as falling under the spell of the Nazarene. After his memorable night interview with the new teacher, the Pharisee goes to Caiaphas the High Priest to sing the praises of the Carpenter's ideas. Caiaphas listens with an indulgent smile, but he does not become alarmed that he might lose a member of the Sanhedrin to the new cult. Caiaphas cynically says to

Nicodemus: "You will not go from us for a mad carpenter. . . . You will never be seen with him beside you in Jerusalem." And Nicodemus never was. He was intrigued by the Nazarene's teaching, but he was too proud of his social prestige to cooperate with a despised carpenter. Since, as history shows, pioneers and prophets usually emerge from the wrong side of the railroad tracks, our respectable citizens will have to show far more humility than hitherto if the barriers of misunderstanding are to be made into the bulwarks of brotherhood.

We in America have boasted our freedom from the rigid caste system which fixes the social ceilings of certain Old World cultures. But we have a cult of success which may prove almost equally unsocial. True, in our fluid democracy a lad can rise from a city slum or from a small town blacksmith family to be the candidate for our nation's highest office, as witness the two presidential candidates in the election of 1928. But so often it happens that the successful man who has had initiative and enterprise sufficient to lift him up the ladder of achievement assumes that every other person can do likewise if he will but exert himself. Thus the ten-talent man may lack sympathetic understanding toward his one-talent brother. Class consciousness derived from pride of achievement may be quite as cruel in its consequences as if it were based on family titles and tradition.

Then too the peacemaker must have a virility which can overcome the pride of party. Public opinion lives and moves and has its being in the medium of parties. Men have to join in groups in order to be effective, and then, alas, this group-mindedness makes them so defective. Party spirit causes the members to see issues through a glass darkened by self-interest, organized antipathies, and stupid herd-mindedness. Political parties retain their coherence after the reason for

The Mind of the Peacemaker 115

their existence has faded away, and then lacking genuine meaning they stand on platforms laid by those who want to walk thereby to office. As Dean Sperry of Harvard recently wrote, it will be several years before a truly objective biography of Woodrow Wilson can be given us. The events connected with Wilson's career are still like fresh lava from a volcano, too hot to tread upon. It takes about two generations before a creative personality can be appraised with unbiased clarity.

At the present moment, it is almost a sign of backwoods boorishness to call oneself an isolationist. But wait until the concrete issues of international cooperation become nailed to party platforms, and see how the partisan spirit will divide communities and churches on principles now taken for granted.

Pride of opinion is another hurdle to be overcome in reaching the humility needed for peacemaking. Nothing more clearly attests the dignity of the human mind or gives more confidence in its progress than to hear men with honest differences of opinion argue their views in a sincere effort to arrive at truth. But how often arguments deteriorate into controversies. Instead of an honest desire to be put right, the disputants clearly show that their motive is to show themselves right. Not truth, but personal prestige is desired. And, of course, in such an atmosphere they do not arrive at truth. The key to the kingdom of truth is in the hands of those who manifest the spirit revealed in Thomas Huxley's memorable letter to Charles Kingsley. Huxley wrote: "Science seems to me to teach in the highest and strongest manner the great truth which is embodied in the Christian doctrine of entire surrender to the will of God. Sit down before fact as a little child, be prepared to give up every preconceived notion, follow humbly wherever and to whatever abysses nature leads,

or you will learn nothing. I have only begun to learn content and peace of mind since I have resolved at all risks to do this."¹

The first plain principle in peacemaking is humility. Humility is an atmosphere, and every individual attitude helps to condition this climate. The cultivation of humility must begin in our closest and most intimate circles. Saint Francis used a most practical method. Whenever anyone said anything in praise of him, he promptly sought out a fellow monk and asked him to sit down and tell him his faults. (Of course, if Saint Francis had been married he could have had this useful service delivered at home.) In our homes and friendships the curbs of our pride can and must be cultivated. Our private conversations and table discussions can be utilized to mellow the pride of opinion and the partisan spirit. The news broadcasts can serve as starting points for family talks which prevent children from catching the insidious germs of racial, religious and class pride. Too often, however, the radio makes against humility rather than for it. Our grandfathers, if they were godly folk, were wont to begin and end the day with a period of devotion in which by prayer or Scripture they practiced the presence of God, thus begetting a mood of repentance. We, on the other hand, are prone to begin and end the day with the news broadcasts retailing the evils of our enemies and the crimes of cruel dictators, which turn our thoughts away from repentance for our own sins into condemnation of the sins of others. We must counteract these influences which tend to induce pharisaical pride by devotional periods which humble us before the One altogether holy and good.

The circles of public discussion should be multiplied pro-

¹Quoted in *Rebuilding Our World* by Willard L. Sperry (New York: Harper, 1943), p. 93.

vided that in them we observe the apostolic injunction of "speaking truth in love." The exchange of ideas in an atmosphere of mutual respect and sincere search for truth is essential to clarifying personal convictions and developing public opinion. It is the modesty of the seeker that can keep us from blinding political partisanship and contentious sectarian bigotry. When we come to realize the vastness of truth, we catch the humility of Sir Isaac Newton who confessed near the end of his distinguished career that he felt like a boy playing on the beach of a great untraversed ocean of knowledge. And when we of the church "speaking truth in love grow up in all things unto him who is the head, Jesus Christ," we are made humbly aware that our little finite minds do not know it all and other sheep there are beyond the bounds of our fold. The voice of the church has the semblance of "sounding brass and tinkling cymbal" when it calls for world peace in its present divided state. A Protestantism with some two hundred and fifty-six sects is a poor demonstration of the unity which it demands of nations. The announcement of Sunday services in any city attests the spirit of divisiveness. The list of cults grows apace: Jehovah's Witnesses, I Am, Father Divine, Theosophy, Liberal Catholics, Spiritualist, Divine Science, Holy Rollers, Church of the Essences, Mormons, First Temple of Universal Law, the Bedanta Society, The Sufi, Rosicrucians, The Midnight Adoration Society—these are but a few of the numerous groups into which religious devotees are now divided.

Of course, there are differences of taste and temperament which cause men to desire differing types of worship; but when these degenerate into a spirit of divisiveness which leads to narrowness, exclusiveness, and ever-multiplying groups, it is a manifestation of the motives which keep the international scene in disunity and chaos. If we cannot

worship God in a spirit of brotherhood, it is hardly to be expected that we can foster unity in the secular field of social and international cooperation. The church must lead the way toward world peace by demonstrating a new spirit of unity within the religious sphere. For that we need the modesty of the seeker who is humbled by the vastness of truth and the greatness of God.

Last summer (1943) I visited the site of the new volcano near Uruapan in Mexico. Five months before my visit the surface of a cornfield blew up and an eruption began. When I saw it, the volcano had grown into a mountain two thousand feet high, hurling huge rocks two thousand feet still higher in the air. At night it was a cone of fire from crest to base. As we were being driven out to view it, the Mexican guide turned to a Roman Catholic priest and myself who were riding in the car with him and said rather whimsically: "You men tell us to be good, but this volcano makes us want to be good." I saw what he meant. To him with his religious training, that volcano was a vivid symbol of the fiery punishment reserved for sinners. While that was not the impression made on me, the volcano did reveal a divine power which was truly humbling. It dwarfed the sense of human power of which we boast in these days of battling nations and giant bombers. It drove from my mind all thought of the sectarian divisions which separated me from my Roman Catholic fellow spectator. We were in the presence of a God whose greatness and power made our differences seem petty. And the words which came to my mind were those of the Psalmist: "The heathen raged, the Kingdoms were moved; he uttered his voice, the earth melted. . . . Be still and know that I am God."

II. HOSPITABLE

The mind of the peacemaker must be hospitable. This means that it must be an open mind—and something more.

The Mind of the Peacemaker 119

A mind may be open and yet be too cool to be hospitable. In opening the mind to the light of truth, one need not open the windows and let out all the warmth of conviction. Some minds are so open that like my sleeping room on a winter morning, they are too cold to get up in—at least with enthusiasm. Great living can only be inspired by strong convictions. There is no tolerance worthy the name unless we care deeply about the issues involved. And perhaps the term tolerance should be abandoned just because it has become so cheaply used by weak-kneed persons who care so little and stand for less. The peacemaker's mind must be warmed by burning convictions.

A second attitude which must not be confused with open-mindedness is mental emptiness. Sometimes a man's conscience is clear mainly because his head is empty, and sometimes a person thinks he is broad-minded because there is so little mental content to obstruct the horizon of what passes for his thinking. In *Main Street*, Sinclair Lewis said of the complacently conventional husband: "He believed in the church but seldom attended its services. He believed in Christianity but never thought about it. He was worried over Carol's lack of faith but was not sure just what it was she lacked."

Sinclair Lewis' description of Dr. Kennecott is too pertinent for us to dismiss. Let us not boast too much about the religious knowledge possessed by our church communicants. Few of the members in our churches really understand their own faith or could interpret it to others. Fewer still can distinguish what is fundamental in it from what is peripheral. Many do not even feel the need of trying to make such a distinction; or what is harder still, the need of understanding the convictions of those who follow a different way of life. Leading laymen may often counsel their socially-minded pastors

to “stick to the simple gospel”; but they would be hard put to it if they were asked to define their terms.

The late Professor William Adams Brown asks why there are so many otherwise intelligent people who are strangers to their own religious convictions. And he answers his own question thus: “I venture to suggest that it is because of a basic fault which runs through all contemporary education and is reflected in the teaching of the church—the loss of the sense of proportion. By this I mean the loss of the conviction that there are some things so important to successful living in any social order that everyone must know them, whatever else he has to leave unlearned.”¹

The empty mind is not an open mind; and the way to true tolerance is not by reducing our convictions to the lowest common denominator. Only as our own principles and beliefs are precious to us can we have the necessary respect for the convictions of others. Our attitude should be that of appreciation, which is more than tolerance. Our minds should be hospitable, which is more than merely open.

This hospitality of mind cannot be discussed or developed in the abstract. Virtues are not a set of attitudes which can be carried around like a plumber’s kit of tools and used wherever there is a moral leak. Open-mindedness, like other virtues, is developed in life situations; and its application is conditioned by special sets of circumstances. A person may be broadly tolerant in his theology and narrowly opinionated in his politics; he may be brotherly in his ecclesiasticism and bigoted in his economics. Hence in discussing open-mindedness it is more profitable to consider specific areas.

How hospitable, let us ask, should our minds be toward the traditions, the precedents, the dogmas of the past? Society

¹William Adams Brown, *The New Order in the Church* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943), p. 107.

The Mind of the Peacemaker 121

is a compact between the living, the dead, and the great unborn. The title of a significant new book suggests the continuing power of the past. The title is: "How New Will the Better World Be?"¹

Professor Eduard C. Lindeman of the New York School of Social Work of Columbia University writes: "It seems to me that modern religious institutions, and this applies particularly to those religions which stem from Hebraic-Christian sources, will discover a genuine and redeeming function in this world of tensions, if, in the first place, they will clearly define the relations of dogma to human welfare. I do not ask the abandonment of dogma since such a request would ignore realities. I only ask that the part that dogma must play in the preservation and enrichment of human values should be understood and clearly stated."²

In order to live rationally we must organize and institutionalize our behavior, which means giving a sort of mechanical or automatic power to yesterday's thoughts. But as soon as an institution or habit becomes established, it tends to resist rational inquiry with respect to itself. We repeat the Emersonian dictum that an institution is but the lengthened shadow of a man; but the shadow somehow got staked down and after a while so much of life's surface lies in the shadow of institutionalism that new ideas have difficulty in finding a place in the sun. The free inquiry of one age may harden into the persecuting inquisition of the next.

Every area of life is crisscrossed by precedents and ringed round by restraining orthodoxies. Professions have their traditions, and sometimes in our scientific pursuits innovations face the worst ostracism. In educational circles we praise freedom in the abstract, but often restrain it in the

¹Carl Becker, *How New Will the Better World Be?* (New York: Knopf, 1944).

²*International Journal of Religious Education*, Feb. 1944, p. 3.

particular, and especially in emergencies. In the church no minister was ever brought to trial for being too orthodox; and to my knowledge applicants for the ministry are not tested as to their willingness to guard the guarantees of freedom. The rigidities of political orthodoxies and social convention are too obvious to need elaboration.

After London's great fire in 1666, Sir Christopher Wren designed a remodeled city which would have been an architectural glory. But the plans were foiled by the property holders who clung to their privileges. One wonders whether after the bombings of the present, the planners of the new world will be similarly thwarted by entrenched privilege.

Yet tradition and precedents are necessary for progressive action. Just as physical science advances by conserving and capitalizing the formulas established, so in the social and religious spheres our fairest structures are built upon past thinking as well as through present thinking. Pure romanticism may be useful now and then as a spur, but it is never the horse that carries the load.

Religious circles are recognizing that purely individualistic freedom of thought means disintegration. It would reduce the church to the absurdity expressed by Coleridge when he said: "I belong to that holy and infallible church of which at the present time I am the only member." Writing in 1900, Adolf Harnack declared: "When we are reproached with our divisions and told that Protestantism has as many doctrines as heads, we reply: 'So it has, but we do not wish it otherwise; on the contrary, we want still more freedom, still greater individuality in utterance and in doctrine; . . . we want still more confidence in the inner strength and unifying power of the Gospel, which is more certain to prevail in free conflict than under guardianship; . . .'"¹

¹Adolf Harnack, *What Is Christianity?* (New York: Putnam, 1912), p. 280.

The Mind of the Peacemaker 123

The climate of Christianity has changed since Harnack wrote those words forty years ago. Adolf Keller tells us that in Europe, Protestant individualism and subjectivism are waning under the rising emphasis on the doctrine of the church. Modern evangelical theology aims to be a theology of the church. Considering the church not as a subjective organization of the moment but a venerable fact in history, church tradition is again becoming an important element of study.

This emphasis on the doctrine of the church is paralleled in American Protestantism. Combined with it is the Ecumenical movement, awakening us to the world-wide solidarity of the church. By conferences such as those at Jerusalem and Edinburgh, Protestants are getting clearer light on the tradition which has been growing up since Biblical times.

The road ahead for the peacemaking mind lies between blind traditionalism and near-sighted individualism. Open-mindedness demands that we neither bow down to tradition nor bow it out. It requires that we give respectful attention to time-tested dogmas as the scientists do to the findings of forerunners in their fields. Inherited doctrines should be regarded as funded experience passed over to us and not as a straight-jacket put over on us. And if we keep our minds open toward the great corpus of inherited truth, we shall not run off on those individualistic tangents which lead to dead ends.

Progress requires a viewpoint similar to that which the chauffeur's mirror gives to the driver of a motor car. The mirror on the windshield is so adjusted that the motorist can see the road behind as well as the road ahead. It is quite as important on our crowded highways to see what is coming behind us as to see what is ahead of us, for there is almost more danger of collision from the rear than in front. And the

peril of collision from the rear is most acute when we make a left turn. In social experience, the expression "turning left" means turning to the radically new. And it is precisely at the point where we turn to the new that we most need to see what is behind us, lest some old fallacy bearing a modern license plate come dashing down the road to wreck us.

But this hospitality of the mind toward the past must not be allowed to close the mind toward coming values. We should remember that the present tendency to exalt institution and doctrine in religion is part of the contemporary mood which welcomes authority, even regimentation.

The popular attitude toward authority manifests a pendulum-like swing. After the last war there was a swing away from all forms of authority. Youth felt they had been deceived by their leaders in the state, in the church, in the schools, even in the home. The so-called revolt of youth led to an individualism about as atomistic as a sandpile. That uncharted freedom tired after a while, and we entered the era of dictatorship and totalitarianism. The atmosphere of the last decade has been congenial to authoritarian attitudes in religion as in other realms.

But the pendulum of popular mood will swing again. There will be a reaction from regimented thinking and living. Men will call for authorities consonant with free minds.

And there is such a type of authority. Let an illustration suffice. The president of a university at commencement time grants degrees, as he says, by the authority vested in him by the trustees of the institution and the laws of the state. That is authority by institutional investiture. But in that university is a professor, let us say, of English. He does not take up *Hamlet* and say to his students, "By the authority vested in me I pronounce this a masterpiece of literature. Take my word for it without reading." No, he says, "Here is a work

The Mind of the Peacemaker 125

which the readers of three centuries have regarded as a masterpiece. Let us read it and see for ourselves." And under his guidance those students enter into the study of Hamlet and Ophelia until they, out of their own experience say, "This is a masterpiece, and this teacher is an authority." Such is a type of authority resting not on investiture, but on intelligence. And such is the form of authority which will appeal more and more as the pendulum of reaction swings away from the decade of the dictators, and as liberal secular education lifts the thinking of our people.

Religious bodies must demonstrate their authority by their spiritual power. They must vitalize their teaching function until it redeems this membership from religious illiteracy. Their program of recruiting must be speeded up, but on the principle of sharing rather than of propaganda. Their pulpits must preach more doctrine, but not do it dogmatically. Their ministers must win respect for their right to be ambassadors of God, not because of the hands that were laid on them, but because of their ability to lay their hands with sure touch and healing power on the ills and sins of men.

And this attitude of religious bodies must pervade our political and social thinking. We must avoid "the lust for abandonment" which has vitiated modernity by leaving the lasting thing to run after the latest thing. On the other hand, we must live on the growing edge of things, alert and hospitable to the values which have not yet been accepted by the popular mind, for "God hath chosen . . . base things of the world, and things which are despised . . . yes, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are."

Let us now ask how hospitable the mind of the peacemaker should be toward the contemporary forces and factors which constitute our cultural pluralism.

In this war we have abandoned the aim of twenty-five

years ago to make the world safe for democracy. But certainly we have not discarded the goal of keeping America safe for democracy. This means, of course, keeping our democracy safe for racial, religious, and political minorities. That is an axiom of the American way of life. Thomas Jefferson in his first inaugural laid down the rule of conduct by which such safety is insured. It is "the sacred principle that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal laws must protect, and to violate which would be oppression."

This is a principle which must be pressed home to those who are in the majority and also to those minority groups which aspire to become a majority. We cannot overlook the dangers which would imperil our free institutions if authoritarian types of teaching, now in vogue among certain minorities, should gain a numerical ascendancy. The minority always shouts for tolerance but such shouts may be motivated in part by self-interest. The test of courage comes when we are in the minority; the test of tolerance comes when we are in the majority. And any minority group which does not recognize this fact cannot be safely trusted with majority rule.

The separation of church and state is a doctrine dear to the American heart. Our Founding Fathers were determined that our political rights should not be affected by our religious affiliation and that governmental channels should not be used to further the special privileges of any church. But the safeguarding of this separation has worked out in some places to strip education of all religious and almost all ethical content. In cities where religious minorities are strong, they have been so fearful of indoctrination that they have combined to prevent all religious teaching in the public schools. As a result it is now possible for a student to move from the

The Mind of the Peacemaker 127

kindergarten to the doctor of philosophy degree without having been given any exposition of the religious fundamentals of thought and action on which this self-styled Christian nation was established.

Can the churches and the homes make up for this lack of religious instruction in the schools? At present they are not doing so. But even if our Sunday Schools were as efficient as our public schools, the impression is given to the child that religion is something apart from the main stream of life and something to be protected from free and open inquiry. The doctrine of separation of church and state has been allowed to deteriorate into a separation of religion and life.

No religious group is worthy to grow in a free country unless it is willing to submit its teaching to free and fair comparison with other faiths. When we become alarmed to protect our own faith from the inroads of other groups it is a sign that we distrust our own doctrines. We should not be afraid to let our beliefs demonstrate their validity on the original Christian principle, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

John Robinson's farewell inspiration to the departing Pilgrims was that the Lord had more light to break forth for his Holy Word. The divine revelation is not exhausted. We should prepare minds hospitable toward the values which have not yet arrived and welcome the efforts of any sincere group which seeks to make a cultural or religious contribution.

And here again the primary responsibility for this open-mindedness rests on the majority groups. We of the Gentile group must go the second mile on the road toward cooperation with the Jews, trying to understand how we should feel if we found ourselves banned from certain clubs and residential areas, labeled with "Jewish" characteristics because of our race even though as individuals we might be free from

them. We of the Protestant faith must go the second mile on the road of tolerance toward the Roman Catholics, not only because we are still the majority group in America, but also because we are the boasted protagonists of liberal thought and action.

To cultivate this mental hospitality requires more accurate information regarding other groups. We must let in the light of knowledge to dispel the rumors which darken the minds of even the "better people." How often we hear, for instance, that the Jews control the press of the nation and therefore color the news and shape public opinion. The fact, however, is that the great newspaper chains such as Scripps-Howard, Gannett, McCormick-Patterson, Hearst, are all owned and controlled by Gentiles. The main news-distributing agencies, the Associated Press and the United Press, are in the hands of non-Jews. The only Jewish-owned newspaper of national prominence is the New York *Times*.

Or consider the comment which circulates in so many dinner conversations, that the Federal Government is run by Jews. A survey of the employes shows about four percent are Jewish, which is somewhat near to the proper ratio based on population.

Or think of the view held by many Protestants that Roman Catholics are not bound to high moral standards because they feel that they can do whatever they please and then cleanse the state through the confessional. No devout and sincere Romanist believes that the confessional is to be treated in such a light way.

And those who assert that the Negro is congenitally irresponsible and untrustworthy would do well to read James Truslow Adams' reminder that during the war between the states Negro slaves almost universally remained loyal to their masters, molesting neither their property nor their persons, while the men of the white households were away at war.

The Mind of the Peacemaker 129

When we ponder this fact, we are left wondering how many of the present tensions between Negroes and whites may be due to tendencies developed during "the tragic era," of reconstruction—an era, be it remembered, directed under white leadership.

These few citations serve to suggest the vast areas of misinformation to be cleared. But imagination is needed quite as much as information. We must cultivate the art of putting ourselves in the places of those belonging to other racial, religious, and national groups. The Golden Rule fails in practice because too many of us lack the imagination to feel what we should want done to us if we were in the other person's place, with the result that we do to him what we think is good for him and that usually irritates him. The Golden Rule practiced without imagination is often just sheer irritation.

And in this sensitizing of the imagination the church plays a primary rôle, because through its worship it lifts men's thoughts to the God and Father of all mankind. Looking up to Him, the sincere worshipper sees more clearly how life looks to the man whose skin is black or brown, or whose residence is in Chungking or Tokyo, London, or Berlin. When we think of this universalizing and socializing effect of sincere worship, we comprehend the truth back of the Archbishop of Canterbury's broadcast in which he declared that "this world can be saved from political chaos and collapse by one thing only, and that is worship." At first such a statement suggests an ecclesiastic pleading for church attendance. But ponder the Archbishop's definition of worship, get the range and depth of it, and you will see its bearing on the problem of peacemaking. It reads: "To worship is to quicken the conscience by the holiness of God, to feed the mind with the truth of God, to purge the imagination by the beauty of God, to open the heart to the love of God, to devote the will to the purpose of God."

To get the force of those phrases, let us run them slowly over in our minds again.

To worship is "to quicken the conscience by the holiness of God." Here are our consciences like watches run down and out of condition. We bring them to God, the One altogether holy, to be wound up, cleaned, and reconditioned.

To worship is "to feed the mind with the truth of God." We bring our minds filled with false reports, with prejudice and propaganda, yet starved for the vitamins of truth, and hungry for good news; and God feeds us with the facts that good is stronger than evil, that truth outlasts the lie, that courage is better than fear, that faith is truer than doubt.

To worship is "to purge the imagination by the beauty of God." We bring our imaginations stained with impurity, littered with the cheap and the vulgar, darkened with distrust; and God cleanses the thoughts of our hearts, replaces the pictures of battles with scenes of beauty, reveals the loveliness of virtue, lets in the light of heaven.

To worship is "to open the heart to the love of God." We bring our hearts closed against the winter of war, sometimes barred with bitterness; and in the presence of God they open to the glimpses of his love as revealed in the good earth, the fidelities of family loyalties, the beauty of Bethlehem, the last full measure of devotion on the cross.

To worship is "to devote the will to the purpose of God." We bring our wills, wayward, stubborn, rebellious, selfish; and in the presence of God we dedicate them to his service, we align them with His loving purpose.

When we think of worship as meaning all these things, we begin to agree with the Archbishop that it is an essential part of the preface to peace. Such worship prepares the mind of the peacemaker.