THE HOERNLE MEMORIAL LECTURE
1954

COLOUR
and
CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

by

EMORY ROSS
PRESIDENT, PHELPS-STOKES FUND, NEW YORK

S.A. INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS
P.O. BOX 97 JOHANNESBURG

THE HOERNLÉ MEMORIAL LECTURE.

A lecture, entitled the Hoernlé Memorial Lecture (in memory of the late Professor R. F. Alfred Hoernlé, President of the Institute from 1934 to 1943), will be delivered once a year under the auspices of the South African Institute of Race Relations. An invitation to deliver the lecture will be extended each year to some person having special knowledge and experience of racial problems in Africa or elsewhere.

It is hoped that the Hoernlé Memorial Lecture will provide a platform for constructive and helpful contributions to thought and action. While the lecturers will be entirely free to express their own views, which may not be those of the Institute as expressed in its formal decisions, it is hoped that lecturers will be guided by the Institute's declaration of policy that "scientific study and research must be allied with the fullest recognition of the human reactions to changing racial situations; that respectful regard must be paid to the traditions and usages of various national, racial and tribal groups which comprise the population; and that due account must be taken of opposing views earnestly held."

Previous lecturers have been the Rt. Hon. J. H. Hofmeyr (Christian Principles and Race Problems), Dr. E. G. Malherbe (Race Attitudes and Education), Prof. W. M. Macmillan (Africa Beyond the Union), Sen. Dr. the Hon. E. H. Brookes (We Come of Age), Prof. I. D. MacCrone (Group Conflicts and Race Prejudices), Mrs. A. W. Hoernlé (Penal Reform and Race Relations), Dr. H. J. van Eck (Some Aspects of the South African Industrial Revolution), Prof. S. Herbert Frankel (Some Reflections on Civilization in Africa), Prof. A. R. Radcliffe-Brown (Outlook for Africa).

The Tenth Hoernlé Memorial Lecture

COLOUR AND CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

Delivered under the auspices and in the 25th anniversary year of the South African Institute of Race Relations

by

EMORY ROSS

at

Johannesburg on 4 August 1954
and at Cape Town on 6 August 1954

PUBLISHED BY
S.A. INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS
P.O. BOX 97 JOHANNESBURG
1954

COLOUR AND CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

The days of my life have all been spent in a community—a community indeed of great width and diversity geographically, economically, politically, socially, spiritually, embracing as it does North America and Africa, with extensions into Europe, but a community none-the-less — which is not infrequently in the Occident called Christian community, even though many things happen there which are clearly not Christian.

The Christian community in which the first ten years of this life of mine were passed had many elements in it, but no colour, no persons of colour whatsoever, so far as I knew.

Then in a single day I became initially conscious of colour, of human colour. And never since, as I recall, throughout the succeeding 57 years so rapidly passed, have I ever, even for a single day, been separated from colour **and** Christian community. In these past 57 years colour has, for me, always been blended with community. Community has always been permeated with colour. For 57 years colour and Christian community have formed a sort of unitary enclosure of my life, and at the same time a vista ever beckoning. It is about Colour and Christian Community that I seek to speak now.

If those three words, Colour and Christian Community, be put in capitals here for a title let no one be misguided. I speak here not in large capitals but wholly in small letters, in homely experience, in personal feelings, about many small things present in colour and Christian community of my acquaintance. Colour and Christian community have, for me, been prevailingly personal, fashioned of delicate emotions, of inner spirit, a touch of minds, a glimpse of heart, a word not said, a glance up, and down. Bravery of the finest, bright red of anger, the yellow of the coward, the broad ocean of the true blue. And sometimes everywhere black fear, which rancour and hatred follow close.

It is of these simply that I try to speak.

A single day sufficed to make the boy that I was initially conscious of colour, of colour in human beings, of human colour and Christian community. That day was April 17, 1897. My recollection of that Saturday morning is of a normal fair spring day in my natal community of Kendallville, in north-eastern Indiana, some 150 miles below the Canadian boundary.

That April 17 probably was very much like the preceding ten April 17s I had seen in this world and that home town, except for three things. First, we were quitting and leasing to others the first dwelling ever to be painted red in that town, the home where I had lived snug and confident with my father and mother since the first days of my life. Second, we were leaving Kendallville to go to Edwards, Mississippi, which seemed to me almost out of our world despite the fact that it was only 800 miles south. And, third, the newspaper that morning carried the fairly complete details of the lynching the day before of Jesse Evans, a Negro, at Edwards, Mississippi. In that church-going community where we shortly were to live a black man had been hanged from a telegraph pole on the main street, just where it crossed the Alabama & Vicksburg Railroad.

Thus it was that, in the midst of cutting secure ties of home, school, church, teachers, playmates, community and heritage, at the moment of the earliest and greatest personal change and insecurity of my life, I came to April 17, 1897. On that day, in the third of its elements mentioned above, I received through a newspaper my beginning and remembered knowledge and shock that colour in a person, just colour, associated with heredity and blood and something called race, could, in a "white" and "Christian" community, mean enforced ignorance, humiliation, injustice, suffering and even death by lynching, with no confident remedial or preventive recourse to law or courts or public opinion.

From that day continuously now for 57 years I have been involved personally in this matter of colour relationships, racial differences and many consequent disabilities. Few or none have been the days through these 57 years when

specific problems or queries or thoughts or acts have not involved for me some colour-race aspect of human relationships in Christian community. I have been thus personally involved in race and colour and Christian community practically every day since that April morning in 1897. Many here present have been involved therein as long or even longer. That is the atmosphere and that the setting in which I seek to speak a bit.

In the invitation from the South African Institute of Race Relations' Executive Committee to deliver this 1954 Hoernlé Memorial Address, Mr. Quintin Whyte asked that I seek to approach this subject of race and colour from United States, international and Christian experiences and viewpoints.

It was with greatest hesitancy, knowing the previous nine lectures in this series, their depth and scope, that I finally found myself accepting. For I am not master of the academic disciplines from which this subject is most frequently and often illuminatingly approached. My experience and any possibly resulting knowledge is largely experiential and thus personal. My speaking on it must needs be personal.

My acceptance is probably principally due to five factors:

1. The invited approach was to include Christian experience.

2. Christian experience is basically a personal matter.

3. Personal Christian experience throughout 2,000 years has been continuously shared more dynamically, transformingly, creatively, beneficially, and more nearly universally, than any other personal experience of man, and this despite many human mistakes in the sharing.

4. If enough Christians in this world and generation personally so decide, conflict over race and colour can be stopped. And,

5. It is the Christian's job to stop it, not only because he can, but because the conflict is so largely the Christian's, the white Christian's, creation. It is the so-called white and the so-called Christian individual and society which has been the principal architect in three centuries past of what generally today is called the problem of race and colour. It is

very personal responsibility which the white Christian has both for creating and for curing the ill.

I therefore make no pretence to speak in other than a personal fashion, largely out of personal experience and observation.

From Kendallville, then, we travelled that day in April down to my grandparents' homes in Union City and Winchester, Indiana. There the protests poured in from our families. We **must** not go to Mississippi. For not only was it that we were proceeding to that backward and frightening state, but we were proposing to identify ourselves there with the hapless majority, the Negro 75% of the population in Hinds County, one of the counties in the South and in the United States that had a black majority, a practically helpless black majority.

Our identification with that almost powerless black majority was to lie in the fact that my parents were going to teach in a Negro elementary rural farm school in Hinds County, on the Big Black river and on the east-west main dusty road and railroad between Jackson, capital of the State of Mississippi, and Vicksburg, the state's big Mississippi river town.

Further, that was the school, the Southern Christian Institute, whose young men students had been reported by the newspapers just a few hours earlier as having made a forced and slow parade before the hostile eyes of a white mob and a confused white woman, a woman who made a hesitant identification of one of the students as her possible assailant.

Whereupon the president of the school, the Rev. Joel B. Lehman, white and a Northerner, had forthrightly said to the mob four things:

1. The young man tentatively tapped was a Jamaican, a British subject;

2. In 1891 eleven other foreign subjects, Italians, had been lynched in New Orleans and after vigorous Italian protests had compelled the United States' payment of substantial ($24,330) indemnity, the United States government had publicly rebuked the state involved, and an uncomfortable domestic and international time was had by all;

3. If the present Jamaican were taken and harmed, another and perhaps worse international affair would ensue; and

4. In any case, if they determined to take the Jamaican student they would have to do it over the president's dead body.

This further weakened the confused woman's uncertain identification and somewhat deflected the mob's irresponsible rage. The lawless horde checked itself, hesitated, then left the campus, found an American citizen, black, who was also somewhat haltingly identified by the woman and about whom No. 10 Downing Street (an address probably not then known to many involved) was unlikely to intervene, and hanged him on the wooden telegraph pole, this on April 16, 1897.

What sense was there at all, our families asked, in our needlessly going into a mad and revolting situation like that.

But my parents were committed, were in no mind to retreat. My mother was of an English-Welsh Quaker Cadwallader family. My father was of a Scotch-Irish Methodist family, doubtless budded from Presbyterian and Catholic stock. With other members of the Society of Friends my mother had, as a young girl there in Indiana, helped hide from the law, feed and pass on escaping brave slaves who were northward headed along the "underground" to Canada. My father as a young man had been deputy to his father, the county sheriff there in Indiana, and had had experience of this unlawful but unhindered escape. As for me, even at ten I could picture somewhat that experience of my parents: the inattentive official eyes and the private outstretched helping hands as the underground's illegal but human traffic flowed slowly, bravely, hopefully North.

So we went South to Edwards.

Now white Mississipians, as I came later to understand, were in 1897 some seven years free from a 25-year rather corrupt and what understandably seemed to them "foreign" government, an imposition from the victorious North after the South's Civil War defeat in 1865. In this bitter quarter-century the governing of the state was largely by a combination of "carpetbaggers" from the North, apparently animated

as many war victors in history have seemed to be, and Negroes who worked with them. There was an inevitable revulsion among the white Mississipians who felt they had just regained their freedom. As with most great revulsions, excess tended to replace excess. Exclusion was different in object but like in quality. Freedom was for those who had it.

Therefore it was perhaps understandable, although it struck our little family of three very strangely at the time, that it should be unmistakably conveyed to us that I was not to attend the only white public school available to me, the one at Edwards, two miles east of the Southern Christian Institute. The reason, simply stated: my parents were "nigger teachers." That seemed to cover it. It was all quite definite. No particular heat appeared to accompany it. My parents identified themselves with the educational advancement of the Negro. Very well. Let their son, the only white child on the place, advance the same way.

For five years the white Mississipians, nearly always courteous externally, showed forbearance. They refrained from arresting my parents for sending me to school with Negroes in violation of Mississippi state law — laws which only now in 1954 are likely to be altered somewhat.

Half of the five years passed before the kindly white minister of the Edwards Presbyterian church and his devoted wife drove the two miles out to the Negro school to invite its one white boy to come to Sunday School in their comfortable church. This led to one Sunday morning hour each week being spent with "whites". The town's banker and largest store owner, who was also one of the county's largest landowners, taught the boys' Sunday School class.

This continued till the Sunday the visiting boy made an error: he arrived too early one Lord's Day morning. Neither minister nor teacher was there, just boys and girls, white. They tolled the visiting white behind the church. Suddenly they had him down. A girl loaned a hat pin. Its prick was sharp. His cries were likewise. So were the others' commands — that he say two things: Damn the Yankees! To hell with the niggers! More sharp cries instead. Then the teacher came. The minister was very deaf. There was only

a little blood. The boy rode the horse the two miles back. At the Southern Christian Institute were colour and Christian community. He was again with solace, security, peace.

Five years went and we moved North, for my further schooling. The touch with colour and race, however, was not broken. Young men, American Negroes and Jamaicans, came North too to Eureka College, in Illinois. I met others of colour. Then when I was graduated I went back to the Southern Christian Institute as its secretary-treasurer. Two years later I was again in Eureka College, teaching. And the second definitive decision of my life was taken, tied tightly to colour.

It was like this. A Negro young man from Missouri, Jacob Kenoly, eleven years older than I, came in 1899 to the Southern Christian Institute. We were in classes together, for he had not had much schooling. He took me under his wing, taught me hunting, fishing, trapping, helped keep me out of mischief, did me good. I grew for him great admiration and affection.

One day I nearly caused his death. A crude telephone line I had rigged from a playhouse to the printing office, where he worked, was struck by lightning, blew the playhouse to pieces, blasted the side out of the print shop and knocked Jacob unconscious. I was desolated till he recovered; in his debt ever after, for many things.

In 1903 at the St. Louis world's fair in Missouri he met some Africans, crystallized his idea of going to Africa as a missionary, worked his way to New York, Liverpool, Monrovia; landed there with a saw, a frow, an adze and a hammer to build a mission. He did.

In 1911, while fishing to supplement the rations of his 50 boarding pupils, his canoe capsized and he and four others were drowned. Partly through my mother's efforts — she had always kept in touch with him and he had named his two-storey hewn-lumber schoolhouse and boys' dormitory the Ross Building for her and my father — he had been taken on as a missionary by the foreign board of our church in the United States. That board asked me now to go out to Liberia as a missionary, with a Negro couple from the

Southern Christian Institute, the Rev. and Mrs. Harry G. Smith, friends of mine and of Jacob's, to take his place.

I had thought little, never seriously, of going as a missionary. But I went. My parents had set the home mission pattern. That gave me Jacob's friendship. He had set the foreign mission pattern. My life from 1912 has been tied with the continent where today we meet.

My fiancée, Myrta Pearson, graduating from Eureka College, went to the Southern Christian Institute to teach and counsel the young Negro girls. Then she joined the staff of Flanner House, Negro Christian social centre, in Indianapolis. My second time back from Africa we married. My wife came with me here in 1918. Our first African footfall together was on Cape Town's docks. Our three children were all born on Africa's equator at the Congo's second crossing. We feel at home here as in the United States, as with friends in Europe. Our enrichment has been great. We have gratitude to many for it, first of all to parents and to Jacob Kenoly. Vision, example, influence, friendship know no race, no colour, nor does gratitude.

By no special intent, by just following a leading, my parents and I, my wife and children have all been involved in colour and Christian community. We have lived between and on each side of something called a colour line. We have felt, to some small extent, how each position feels — between, and on each side.

You will see, thus, the personal bias I bring to this occasion. For as are all men, I am biased. When a man says "I speak without bias" he should perhaps become the object of scrutiny. Even Our Lord appeared to have a bias, a partiality — for justice, and right, and love. Rarely if ever can bias be absent.

* * *

Some of the hardiest undergrowth of the colour problem in the United States has come out of slavery. It can be said that slavery, both in symbol and in actuality, preceded freedom in America. The first African slaves were landed from a Dutch ship in 1619 at Jamestown in what is now Virginia, 12 years after the first settlers came ashore there from England. It was the next year, 1620, that the Pilgrim Fathers, in a sense the forerunners from Europe of freedom for the new America, landed at Plymouth Rock within the state later to be called Massachusetts, 600 miles north of Jamestown.

For the succeeding 150 years the struggle for America's freedom built up and up. Economic sinews based on slave labour helped to build it up. The Revolutionary War against the Britain of George III eventually came. There was victory for freedom. But not all allied with victory shared freedom. The slaves were still slaves. The Red Indians were not free Americans though some years before they had been the only free "Americans."

The free economy of a free America was still in considerable part the product of slaves. That free economy, however, was by no means freely shared by the slaves. Nor was it fully shared by many others of that day whose skins were white. But these latter ones, whites, rather luckless in the East, had two priceless freedoms no slaves possessed: freedom to move and freedom to work — to work for themselves, their families and their communities. The land was large and open. Westward they went.

They were citizens, these white free men. They had the vote. They could move and work as they thought best. They delimited western territories. These became states. Somewhat luckless in the East, many of them feeling excluded, pushed out, they made the West. For they were white. They were of the restricted group actually admitted to the unrestrictive Declaration of Independence of July 4, 1776, which held "these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal . . . " They were created equal, these men, these women, these children trekking from the East, these creators of the West, because they were created white.

Generally freedom marched with these pioneers to the West — except freedom for the Red Indians who bit by bit were forced and contained within reserves. This colour-characterized containment device of Red Indian reserves was one of the first patterns in modern time of seizing indigenously-possessed land and cramping indigenous peoples of colour — always peoples of colour — within a fraction of it.

No more than the economy was the society of the settled eastern United States open to slaves. Nor education. Nor the established churches. Nor recreational facilities. No politics, either. Nor the possession of land. No fixed roots of their own growing or choice were theirs.

For eight generations, something more than 240 years, this went on. Fresh, raw, human, dark slave material was shipped in from Africa during most of those years. Procreation was facilitated. Some "white" blood — though all blood is red — was admixed. Some slaves got some education somehow. Some were freed or bought their freedom. But through it all was this one sign, symbol, signet of slavery, of sub-status: a dark skin, colour, the colour of a human being.

Now during the past century several million other people of other hues and other tongues, with other hair and features and food and folkways, have come to America too. When they first came they rather hived off, clustered in special corners of the cities or the country. At first they kept their costumes and their cuisine, their language and their **turnverein.** They were new and numerous and neighbourly among themselves, and not yet especially feeling the urge to be mingled through the existing native American society.

But presently they got that urge. It is a human urge. It is truly a universal urge. They wanted to mingle, to be accepted, to belong. What then to do? They had a problem.

For they were so different in so many ways. Nordic and Sicilian, gaunt and globose, towheaded and black headed, garlic and shish kebab, fez and poke-bonnets, guttural and staccato — the differences were many.

But there was this about each difference: it could be modified, reduced, shed, sloughed; in five years, ten years gone completely. They would be publicly accepted without a

second glance. They would belong. If they wanted to conform, the changes could be made, the accents worked off, the clothes standardized, the habits modified — and they were accepted.

Their earlier and present outer differences were something they could change. They needn't be excluded if they didn't want to be. Their handicaps, if they felt them such, were things they could do something about. Their future was in **their** hands.

They acted. America came to be called the melting pot. But the initial melting was more nearly moulting, and it was done by the non-Americans, the very new Americans. America was the scene but the acting was by those who wanted to belong and who, belonging, have made incalculable gifts to their new land.

They could, if they desired, gain acceptance. For the outward and superficially-barring differences were things about which they themselves could do the initially necessary things. **They** could make the changes, begin the transformation, initiate the integration — if they wanted to. And they did.

But that is not so with men and women of deep colour or just of colour, in a society where colour, mere colour, is the barrier, or is set up, for whatever reason or combination of reasons, as the symbol of the barrier. For skin colour is something people of colour can do nothing about in their lifetime, nothing.

White people who want dark skins can, and do, lie in the sun. And it is the convention that when they are deep tanned their friends remark how well they look. Not so, in too many societies, with a birthright of deep tan. That means taboo, exclusion, segregation, Jim Crow, humiliation, deprivation, injustice, and sometimes death, even yet — and because of a physical characteristic, indeed because of a God-given physical characteristic, about which one can, oneself, do nothing, absolutely nothing.

It has been this complete and almost hopeless inability personally to do anything about changing a God-given but man-handicapping physical group characteristic which has so

embittered the racial problem in the United States through the generations past.

The only alternative to physical change such as in sufficient degree other immigrants to the United States made but American Negroes cannot, is social, cultural, spiritual change in the American racial and total climate. Fortunately there has long been, among American Negroes and others, sufficient hope of that to keep all hope alive and faith strong though strained.

As a result, continual slow progres has been made and in later times the rate of progress has increased. There is encouragement in this, I should judge, to almost all Americans, even probably to some Americans who are not yet able publicly to attest all the inner encouragement, peace of mind, ethical and personal satisfaction they increasingly feel.

Let me at this point say something about two of the forces in America which have greatly contributed to this progress from the early stages, have constantly kept hope lighted, faith unfailing, courage and daring ever evident. These two forces are religion and education, often almost inextricably intermixed. Concerning them let me put three statements before you.

The first statement is that the earliest education of Negroes in the United States was by Christian agencies. (Indeed, even before that, the earliest education of anybody in what became the United States was by Christian forces. The dynamic of the Christian religion was the initiator of education everywhere in North America.) After President Abraham Lincoln's proclamation of January 1, 1863, emancipating the slaves, and the close of armed hostilities of the Civil War on April 9, 1865, and the adoption on July 28, 1868, of the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution prohibiting slavery, slavery was officially, legally finished.

But the slaves were far, far from free. They were not free from habit, from convention, stigma, illiteracy, ignorance, economic dependence, political exclusion. Nor were they free from other factors that still separated them from many of the dynamic, contributory elements of American life.

The Christian forces, largely from the North of the land but with aid also here and there from the South, came for-

ward offering education of head, heart, hand. Hampton Institute in Virginia and Atlanta University in Georgia were founded in 1865; Fisk University in Tennessee, Talladega College in Alabama, and Howard University in the District of Columbia in 1867; Tuskegee Institute in Alabama in 1881; and scores of other teaching units, large and small, lasting and ephemeral, were scattered through the South.

About these two forces of education and religion, so inseparably linked in those days, one could sum up a first statement thus: it was the first, great "home missions" experiment anywhere, an organized (and sometimes unorganized or even seemingly dis-organized) Christian effort of a kind and scope never before undertaken by Christian forces within any land.

The second statement is this. Besides being the first great "home missions" movement, it had another "first" quality. It was an educational drive under Christian dynamic aimed not just at the children and young people who are often referred to as "of school age." It was aimed at, gradually offered to all ages, sexes, units within the emancipated community: parents, grandparents, spinsters, bachelors, everybody desirous who could be reached. It was not called adult education or mass education or fundamental education or community education, but it was all of that. And this was the first time all of that had been undertaken on so wide a front.

This venture was guided by little experience. It had qualities of patronage, paternalism, unilateralism whose end result could be detrimental. But it was nevertheless the beginnings of mass education of some $4\frac{1}{2}$ million untutored but basically capable under-privileged people such as had never before been tried.

The third of these three statements concerns a third pioneer venture in which whites and Negroes joined, and some Red Indians as well. This third pioneer element grew directly out of the first two, the "home missions" and the mass education programmes. It is what has been called the "extension" programme — carrying education of many kinds outside of the schoolroom, off the campus, beyond the

academic walls, right into the homes, farms, barns, pig-pens and chicken-coops, the kitchens, workshops, factories, churches, clubs, of the town and country — wherever the people live and work and want.

This permeative, daily educational process of learning by watching and doing right where you daily are is common in primal societies from which we have all come. But Western specialization and increasing compartmentalization of life had begun to get away from it. Specialization alone, with its constant widening of knowledge and skills to the point where no one person can know and impart them all, had demanded the classroom technique, the bringing of the many learners to the small corps of more and more specialized teachers. Now, however, 4½ million people had suddenly been freed from **de jure** slavery but were still **de facto** slaves of ignorance and of inexperience, of survival and contribution in a free and competitive society. Education was not just a question of boys and girls. A whole mass was needy. The mass couldn't "go" to school. Enough schools couldn't be built. And besides, the mass had to work daily to feed and clothe and house itself as best it could while learning better to do all those jobs. Education of various practical kinds had to go to them. "Extension" work seemed the only answer.

Mention of these three pioneer advances in the United States following the ending of slavery and the initial, partial admission of 4½ million Negroes into a wider American relationship is made in this discussion for four reasons:

First, the "home missions" experiment, with all its baffling problems and many inadequacies, was nevertheless a tremendous boost and backer for the "foreign missions" vision and energy of the American Christian churches. In the next two generations American overseas Christian services of several kinds expanded into the largest one-nation effort in history. Multiple forces caused this, indeed very diverse forces, as is true in all human relations.

But I venture to suggest this view: that the "home missions" effort right in our own midst, amongst the largest and most under-privileged mass ever suddenly to be introduced into such an "advanced" society, with the relatively

good results and rewards of that effort for **all** concerned, gave such confidence and urge to the "foreign mission" effort from America as might never have come in any other way. It was a large factor in the world-wide expansion of the Christian mission.

Second, the "mass education" experiment was really forced upon America by the slowly rising opposition to slavery, by its eventual abolition, and by the resulting mass shock of $4\frac{1}{2}$ million freed slaves being presented and presenting themselves for participation in an advanced society more speedily than had ever before been deemed possible.

Third, the "extension" aspects of aiding the whole community to begin better to help itself right in its tracks, right where it was, right while it was carrying its own struggle for daily existence at its current low level, came solely as a result of unprecedentedly sudden mass need within a community which, professing the Christian religion, felt with some urgency the desire to help.

Fourth, these three things would not, and even perhaps could not, have happened as they did except in the presence of two basic factors:

One, the incalculably strong human appeal in many hearts and minds, of white and black alike, of privileged and under-privileged, for community, for belonging, for being essentially decent one to the other, for giving mutual help, for getting along, for performing a certain duty to one's fellows, for achieving a certain wholeness, for gaining a bit of progress toward a completeness of life. There are few challenges of this kind which are harder and greater than that found in what we now sometimes call a multi-racial society. America had a sudden and shock presentation of this multi-racial society challenge in the mid-nineteenth century.

Two, the essentially and powerfully creative and unconquerable influence of the Christian religion in the hearts of many men — not necessarily the Christian church as now organized and acting, but the Christian religion, the dynamic and directive force of the Palestinian gospel spoken, acted and willed by Our Lord. It was this Christian power, not always wisely and never fully applied, which moved to try

to make such a multi-racial community in these United States.

The confrontation of these two factors within a society — the challenge of great human multi-racial need, and the power contained in the Christian gospel — beginning around a century ago in the United States, has, among other things, helped America greatly in its contribution to world Christian missions, home and overseas; to mass education; and to the companion pioneering in extension work, self-help for underprivileged people learning to employ more and more usefully the materials right at their hands. This combination, developed independently, pooled internationally and used co-operatively by peoples of and in many lands, has produced Point IV, technical assistance, mutual aid efforts of great variety. In the case of America and many other societies, these efforts have been in major part produced to meet the many needs of colour and Christian community. The whole world has profited thereby.

If these latter brief mentions of creative co-operation sparked by colour in Christian community a century ago in America have made it appear that then all was favourable and easy, that impression needs sharp correction. For there were tremendous opposition and almost equally difficult deep inertia. Indeed the accomplishments were in the end strikingly notable precisely because they were grown from out a sour soil of much prejudice, fear and no small hate.

First of all there was some general sub-soil of selfish, satisfied inertia. In the North where no slavery was, such satisfaction with things as they were existed quite widely. Why stir oneself? Let nature take its course. Let others fret, if fret they must . . . 'Tis so in every human society. It is among other things a stabilizing quality, this inertia, this attachment to what is. Such is needed in society, but needing change also.

Second, there were those whose whole way of life had seemed dependent on slave labour. For many it was terrifying and the height of injustice to think of having completely to revamp their lives and society just to set some black folk "free" — what **could** freedom mean to such but starvation, or anarchy for the South?

So opposition was mustered. And just as on the side of abolition of slavery the Christian leaders led, so on the side of maintenance of the **status quo** Christian leaders led.

In the public and generally acknowledged Christian atmosphere of that day the Bible was publicly used for a great variety of purposes. It was so in this critical period. Scripture was quoted and carefully explained as a bulwark of slavery, ordained of God.

The Rev. E. D. Sims, a professor in the Methodist Randolph-Macon College, is quoted in 1846 as saying "Having (in the foregoing references to Scripture) established the point that the first African slaves were legally brought into bondage, the right to detain their children in their bondage follows as an indispensable consequence. Thus we see that slavery which exists in America is founded **in right**."[1]

The Rev. Wilbur Fisk, D.D., president of Wesleyan University in Connecticut, applying I Cor. 7:20-23 to Negro slaves, is also quoted: "This text seems mainly to enjoin and sanction the fitting continuance of their present social relations; the freeman was to remain free, and the slave, unless emancipation should offer, was to remain a slave. The general rule of Christianity not only permits, but in supposable circumstances enjoins, a continuance of the master's authority."[2]

The Charleston, South Carolina, Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church, searching God's holy Word regarding slavery, concludes that slavery "is compatible with the most fraternal regard to the best good of those servants whom God may have committed to our charge; and that therefore they who assume the contrary position and lay it down as a fundamental principle in morals and religion that all slaveholding is wrong, proceed upon false priciples."[3]

The Rev. W. T. Hamilton, D.D., in 1844, discussing slavery and the agitation for its abolition, said "Sound policy and Christian benevolence do, then, both warn us to beware (of) demanding the immediate emancipation of slaves regardless of consequences; which in the present condition of

---

[1]Barnes, Albert: **An Inquiry into the Scriptural Views of Slavery.** 1846.
[2]**Ibid.**
[3]**Ibid.**

southern society could not be but eminently disastrous to all parties . . . the law of Christian love still points to the necessity for leaving this institution undisturbed for the present . . . "[4]

J. H. Hammond in 1845 addressed two letters to Thomas Clarkson, Esq., President, British Anti-Slavery Society, in which he says: "I firmly believe that American slavery is not only not a sin, but is especially commanded by God through Moses, and approved by Christ through His Apostles.

"In the 20th chapter of Exodus, 17th verse: 'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house; thou shalt not covet they neighbour's wife, nor his man-servant nor his maid-servant', etc., etc.

" . . . does it not emphatically forbid you to disturb your neighbour in the enjoyment of his property? . . . man-servant and maid-servant who are distinctly consecrated as his property and guaranteed to him for his exclusive benefit in the most solemn manner.

" . . . In the 25th chapter of Leviticus you will find domestic slavery, as maintained in these states, ordained and established by God in language which I defy you to pervert so as to leave a doubt on any honest mind that this institution was founded by Him and decreed to be perpetual. I quote: " 'Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen (Africans) that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids.' 'And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you; to inherit them for a possession. They shall be your bondmen forever . . . '

" . . . Be assured, then, that posterity will not regard the Abolitionists as Christians, philanthropists or virtuous citizens. They will, I have no doubt, look upon the mass as silly enthusiasts. . . . The leaders themselves will be

---

[4]A Discourse delivered in the Government Street Church, Mobile, Alabama, by the Rev. W. T. Hamilton, D.D., pastor of the church, on Sunday night, December 15, 1844, on **Duties of Masters and Slaves Respectively** (or) **Domestic Servitude as Sanctioned by the Bible.**

regarded as mere ambitious men . . . whose base thirst is for notoriety; who cloak their designs under vile and impious hypocrisies."[5]

Not only religionists but men with training in science were sure slavery was an absolute requirement for a happy, stable and prosperous world. J. H. Van Evrie, M.D., wrote "White Supremacy and Negro Subordination." I quote from the preface of his 1868 second edition — the book's sale had apparently been good:

"To the Reader: . . . written to dispel that Abolition delusion which plunged us into Civil War. . . . to show beyond a doubt that the so-called slavery of the South was the Negro's normal or natural condition . . . that the Negro is the lowest and inferior of all distinct races of men . . . that the Negroes in their so-called slavery in the South were happier and more improved, intellectually, than the same number of the same class in any other portion of the world. . . . that in every country where the Negro has been left in his normal condition, that country has advanced in wealth and prosperity . . . that in every single instance in which the true relation of the races to each other has been interfered with, and the Negro forced into political and social equality with the whites, such nation has lost her power, her commerce and prosperity.

" . . . will show that the Abolitionist and Mongrelite is not only an enemy to his own race; that he is an enemy to the blackman; an enemy to stable society; an enemy to true liberty; and above all an enemy to God in that he has interfered with the design and intention of Providence and should therefore be shunned and despised by every man."[6]

Prophecy was also bravely ventured by another. Thomas R. Cobb, of Georgia, furnishes an example in Vol. I of his "Inquiry into the Law of Negro Slavery in the United States," 1858:

" . . . it would require a prophetic vision to foretell the future of the American Negro slave. Emancipation in this

---

[5]Hammond, J. H. Two Letters on Slavery in the United States — addressed to Thomas Clarkson, Esq., President British Anti-Slavery Society, in 1845.

[6]Van Evrie, J. H., M.D., **White Supremacy and Negro Subordination.** Sec. ed. 1868

present location can never be peacefully effected. Until the white race of the South is exterminated or driven off, it can never be forcibly effected. Amalgamation to any great extent is a moral impossibility . . .

"So long as climate and disease and the profitable planting of rice, cotton, tobacco and cane make the Negro the only labourer inhabiting safely our southern savannas and prairies, just so long will he remain a slave to the white man. Whenever the white labourer can successfully compete with him in these productions and occupy this soil, the Negro will either be driven slowly through the Isthmus to become amalgamated with the races of South America, or he will fall a victim to disease and neglect, begging bread at the white man's door."[7]

Further quotes here are quenched by time. I can make no more. But I can suggest a real treasury of this sort — the pamphlet published in 1860 by the Rev. Thornton Stringfellow, D.D., on "Slavery — Its Origin, Nature and History Considered in the Light of Bible Teaching, Moral Justice and Political Wisdom."[8] For minds among us now beset and bewildered regarding colour and Christian community this work, and others like it, should give some real light today — for reflection.

That light, like all light, is composed of many elements. The especially reflective element striking me as again I have reviewed the writing, the speaking and the slowly progressive action of a century ago in America is this: that despite all rationalization and reactionism, all volume and vehemence, all blinders and blunders, rabble rousing and reason routing, all special pleading and sophist prophecy the struggle of man in Christian community is ever and always toward brotherhood under the fatherhood of God, toward helping one's family and community, toward Our Lord's trilogy in man: faith, hope, love. That is the struggle in the past and today

---

[7]Cobb, Thomas R., **Inquiry into the Law of Negro Slavery in the United States,** Vol. I. to which is prefixed **An Historical Sketch of Slavery.** T. & J. W. Johnson Co., Philadelphia, 1858.

[8]Stringfellow, Thornton. **Slavery — Its Origin, Nature and History Considered in the Light of Bible Teachings, Moral Justice and Political Wisdom.** Pamphlet of 32 pages published in 1860; 52 pages in 1861. Virginia Sentinel Office, Alexandria, Va.

in colour and Christian community. Man's enjoyment, satisfaction, security and all good for all are increased as he advances toward victory in that struggle.

In America's colour and Christian community struggle the advance has been indispensably, strikingly, aided by men and women of colour. Dr. George Washington Carver, Negro agricultural chemist, was pioneer in developing more than 100 products from the sweet potato; over 150 uses for the peanut; upwards of 60 articles from the pecan; extracted useful dyes from Southern clays; with all and above all lived an unswerving, purposeful humble Christian life.

Daniel Hale Williams (1858-1931), Negro physician; established Freedman's Hospital, Washington,D.C., and Provident Hospital, Chicago; surgeon-in-chief at both, and at Provident established the first training school for Negro nurses. "Chief determination: to see throughout America hospitals where colour is no bar." In 1893 performed world's first operation on human heart. (Published in 1954: "Dr. Dan, Pioneer in American Surgery," by Helen Buckler; Atlantic Monthly Press book, Boston.)

Booker T. Washington, Marian Anderson, Ralph J. Bunche bear names known in nearly every clime.

Charles Richard Drew (1904-1950), Negro doctor, was a pioneer organizer in America of the system of blood banks and in October of 1940, selected by a group of distinguished blood experts, went to Britain as medical director of plasma project for the United Kingdom. This experience served as guide for later expansion in U.S. Army, and among its allies. Dr. Drew set up the first blood collection unit for the American National Red Cross — at a time when his own blood would have been refused by the Red Cross had he offered it.

In sports, music, arts, poetry, fiction, insurance, education in many branches, politics, sciences, religion, medicine, and many specialized fields Negroes in America, along with other persons of colour coming from China, Japan, India, Near East, Pacific Islands, Central and South America, have made individual and group contributions to America and the

world without which our generation could probably not have accomplished many of the useful things it has.

And in the heart and midst of it all have been the several million Americans, of African descent and of more recent "foreign" background — none of us in America except the Indians is more than three and a half centuries away from foreign descent — who are plain, honest living, usefully working, co-operatively minded people such as give pride and strength to every land.

Despite the United States' experience in receiving more people of colour and more people of different societies, languages and religions than any other nation in history, and accepting them and being strengthened by them, our American cultural and racial relations internationally have too frequently been sharp and costly.

Our divers policies respecting Asians have often been judged as not respecting them, with colour prejudice felt to be at the base. An unprecedented Japanese Christian delegation in the spring before Pearl Harbour came to America on its own initiative and on funds supplied solely by Japanese Christians, to try to avert war. An equal number of American Christians met them in California and then escorted them across our land to the Atlantic shore. These fellow-Christians from Japan placed high on the list of a dozen causes felt to have emotionally pushed Japanese political, military, naval and public opinion toward war, even war, with America, the deep hurts they felt about Asian exclusion barriers and other racial acts committed and approved by American people.

When war thereafter came to America by Japanese attack at Pearl Harbour, America further reacted, with colour seeming to play the decisive rôle, by the mass arrest of practically all of the tens of thousands of American-born citizens of Japanese or part-Japanese parentage, **Nisei,** forcing them from their owned lands and businesses into detention camps under armed guards, confiscating their properties, all under the authority of an administrative order from Washington, without any recourse to law or courts. Nothing like that had ever happened in the United States before. It happened

without the provocation of sabotage or a cause of any kind being given by the **Nisei,** the great majority of whom were shocked by Japan's action and evinced great loyalty to America.

It seems reasonable to believe that the **Nisei's** colour was a chief factor in this unconstitutional mass arrest, for nothing remotely like it was perpetrated on newly-come Italians or Germans in our land, although German sabotage and spying were clearly occurring. Such cases among Germans were handled by individual arrest, detention and trial, never by seizure of Germans **en masse.**

This raises an important point about **colour** in Western, predominantly white, society. Does colour on the outside of a human being tend, in white eyes, to obscure, to hide the individual, the personality, the realness, the humanity of the being **within** the coloured skin? There has been in America and in some other places a tendency of whites to lump all Negroes, to speak of them collectively: "they" are so-and-so; "they" do this; "they" think this; "they" can't be trusted. That kind of impersonal group reference can be found in relation to other groups which can somehow be identified and lumped. But is it skin colour in a community dominantly white that increases white blindness to **persons?** The unprecedented American arrest of a mass of unoffending **Nisei** would seem to so indicate when compared to the individual arrest of personally offending Germans.

Despite such treatment the loyalty to America of the **Nisei** survived the war-time detention camps. By the last winter of the war numbers of **Nisei** were in the U.S. armed forces, fighting in Italy and other lands, winning personal and collective citations, giving of courage and of their blood — blood that ebbed as red as any as men lay dying in the snow.

And American Negroes in American armed forces also — they fought as well as any men, with morale the highest and courage soaring when grouped as men with men, colour ignored, assigned as human and not by hue.

World wars are wrong but our last two have at least added one strength to the American fabric. There are millions of whites who have shared trench and tank, attack and retreat,

billet and chow, sick bay and leave with men of colour. They have found them men, strong and weak, funny and grouchy, laggard and leader. They are just men. No black skin of itself repels the white feather. No white skin is its own guarantor of the shining armour. Man has an outside and an inside. The Lord knows where to look, and Samuel got from him the truth: "The Lord looketh on the heart."[9] In their own fashion there must be hundreds of thousands of American service men and women scattered throughout the States who have at last looked within a dark skin. They see men and women, just that.

In the danger of the battle-field, in the drudgery and exhaustion of supply and services behind the lines, these American armed forces, black and white, have seen the truth of what Henry Ford is credited with saying years ago as he was starting a revolution in industrial production lines: "Coming together is a beginning; keeping together is progress; working together is success."

Segregation in the U.S. armed forces is now all but abolished. It will be a thing gone, one hopes for ever, within the year or two.

Our Creator put us here all together on earth. He has given us a great storehouse of land and sea and air and sun. He has helped His creatures give proof in every century that no height or girth, no colour or contour, no eye-set or nose-shape, no external of any sort, even if one be deaf and dumb and blind, bars man from using reasonably his patrimony, from contributing to man. We have different histories and tongues and views. But in His sight we all have the potential our Creator gives, and all men can help fellow men.

An old rabbi whimsically gave the answer in part when asked why God made only two people, Adam and Eve, by answering: "So that nobody could say, 'I come from better stock than you do.' "

A notable thing in my experience in colour and Christian community is this: That when people of colour are on the defensive, segregated, deprived, refused ordinary human

[9] I Samuel 16: 7.

acceptance, many tend to think and talk and react and try to move as a group, or as groups of colour within the colour group. But as they gain acceptance within a whole community and so greater breadth of potential action they tend to act more distinctly as individuals, as persons, just as human beings, subject to the same sort of likes and dislikes, emotions and sensitivities, hesitancies and urges, splits and groupings as are their fellow citizens.

The freer a Negro is to be a citizen in America the less he feels need to act as a Negro. He is simply another American. Past fear of white Americans that American Negroes as they gained power would form a self-seeking, bludgeoning bloc has proved to be false fear. When men long they will fight to have. But when they belong they tend to behave.

The greater the security, stability, faith of all, the better the chances in human society for understanding, co-operation, peace and resulting progress. A man alone precariously perched on a wind-swept pinnacle in blinding rain or snow is in no position or mood to act as he might in a sunny garden with tea at hand, wife and children about, neighbours known and trusted, and bread for the morrow probably by his own free and co-operative effort.

A fearful man shutting his house from within, barring doors, shuttering windows, darkening rooms finds himself trembling at every sound from without. He cannot see, he cannot know, he cannot weigh. He can take counsel only from his ignorance, his frustrations, his fears. It is so when men thus close their minds, their hearts, their souls. Fear, hate, desperation are never far away. America's past has been thus in this matter of colour. But the new welcoming and light of practised Christian community begins to illumine the scene and dispel the scares.

It is not yet everywhere effective. For insecurity and instability of persons and groups are never wholly absent. This is strikingly shown in Chicago today. For months and months a thousand policemen have been mobilized to permit a handful of American Negro couples to live in a new housing development built for racially non-restrictive occupancy. The white mob-spirited people who curse and claw,

who stone and shoot the unoffending Negroes, and boo and taunt the police, are in great majority of newly-arrived European stock who in their newness and uncertainty, their insecurity and inner fear, turn to a rejection and oppression like unto that which at least some of them left their former homes to escape.

One of the most terrible of the Communist leadership techniques today is to keep millions blinded by fear, uncertain, off balance, hating all others, bitter and boiling, so that they will not rightly see their fellow-men, or gain their own land, satisfy their own hearts, fulfil their own lives and thus be in a mood to live peaceably and co-operatively with all men. Communist policy for disruption and conquest of the world today is largely based on social turbulence and class fears and hatreds.

Slavery, racial prejudices and segregation, colour walls in America's past century are now seen by most Americans as what they actually are: social, economic, political, spiritual techniques not very dissimilar in effect to elements in modern-day Communism. They were not planned that way. In their early day they were given by some the air of economic desirability, political reasonableness, even of Scriptural authority. But, as history shows, they had none of these lasting qualities. They were against them all. Even unity amongst white Americans was never achieved until slavery was abolished. It was abolished by whites fighting against whites, not by blacks rising against whites. Slavery predictably, but nevertheless surprisingly for those supporting it, resulted in white fratricide. Out of this grew unity, for the struggle at last was seen in its true light, a moral struggle, in which elements of high morality were agonizingly gained. Nearly all whites now are proud that slavery was done away with. For in the unity thus won have grown an economy, a productivity, an educational and technological structure of greater strength than the United States ever before had, and a political and judicial structure of considerable worth, with ethics and morale slowly mounting.

The judicial and moral progression in this matter of colour and Christian community has been evidenced by a long series of decisions, at all judicial levels, against the

multiple forms of oppression and injustice which colour segregation typically takes. The latest and greatest of all thus far was the Supreme Court decision on May 17 last on the five key cases before it (from South Carolina, Virginia, Kansas, Delaware and the District of Columbia) regarding colour segregation in the public schools of the nation, heretofore compulsory in the District of Columbia and seventeen states, and permissible in four other states.

Two special things might be noted about this decision. It was unanimous, justices from the South and justices from the North, all nine, voting for it, whereas in the past split decisions on the most important cases have not infrequently been handed down. Second, it was based almost wholly, in its short 1,500 words, on moral and social grounds, on public opinion, indeed on Christian-based public opinion.

The **New York Times** editorially[10] named three principal reasons for such a decision. First, the nation has reached the point where the injustice of segregation is no longer tolerable. Second, taxpayers in the twenty-one states and the District of Columbia can no longer meet the high cost of the racially separate but presumably functionally equal school facilities decreed by a split Supreme Court in its 1896 decision, now annulled. Third, "We need to make the most extensive use of the gifts of all our children, and this we cannot do if, to adapt Chief Justice Warren's words, we 'generate a feeling of inferiority' among any group among them."

Chief Justice Earl Warren, who wrote the opinion unanimously approved, summed up the decision in a question and a five-word answer by the court: "We come then to the question presented: Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though physical facilities and other 'tangible' factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does."

Other hopeful and private steps are taken today in this American struggle. The Southern Presbyterian Church in General Assembly on May 29 last, by a vote of 236 to 169,

[10]**New York Times**, May 23, 1954.

called upon its 3,776 local churches to open their membership to all individuals regardless of race. This is a church which broke from its other Presbyterian brethren in the United States a century ago over the question of slavery. Its present four theological seminaries now all have Negro students enrolled.

The Tennessee State Medical Association, heretofore throughout its existence a white-only group and the state's representative in the nation-wide American Medical Association, announced on June 17 its first admission of Negro doctors.

On June 17 also the Protestant Episcopal Church, United States sister of the Church of England, through the Rt. Rev. Henry Knox Cherrill, Presiding Bishop, announced that its triennial general convention in September 1955, would be held in Honolulu, capital of Hawaii where the population is about 80% non-white, instead of in Houston, Texas. Reason: the Houston diocese could not give unqualified assurances of delegates' reception and treatment satisfactory to the church from an interracial standpoint.

On June 21 last officers from fifteen Southern states of the United Church Women[11] met in Atlanta, Georgia, and adopted unanimously an unequivocal statement against segregation based on the fact that " . . . we are impelled to promote a Christian society in which segregation is no longer a burden upon the human spirit."

I end as I began: on a personal note. This matter of racial relations is a matter of personal relations. Economics, politics, other group factors enter in. But our American experience would seem to show that all those problems have a solution, at least in America's multi-racial society, if the personal desires of enough Americans are for it.

And let me just comment here that America's multi-racial society has almost all the elements in it of any other multi-racial society, with this one major difference: that the predominant religious acceptance in almost all of its multiple groups is, in some form and in some degree, Christianity.

---

[11]United Church Women is a department of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., and has a constituency in more than 30 denominations of about 10,000,000 church women.

From this and many other human experiences of men in other parts of the world it might be reasonably suggested that where Christianity has the greatest acceptance and is interpreted and practiced, always by imperfect human beings, in the sense and spirit in which Jesus taught of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, of the example of the Samaritan, of the impulsion of the beatitudes and the Sermon on the Mount, of the three deep realities of life — faith, hope, love, the latter being the deepest and greatest — that there the personal decision and guidance leading to the group action can solve problems of any multi-racial society. For there is nothing which, in the end, can withstand the **spirit** of man illumined by God, creator and father of all.

There will be no civil war in the United States over the abolition of segregation in the public schools. The changes now decreed by the land's highest court will not be simple or easy to make, either for Negroes or whites. But they will be made.

They will be made because enough Americans personally have decided they want them made. The influence of true Christian community in that decision is so great and intimate as to be incalculable. White Christians in the past three hundred years or so have personally been largely responsible for creating what we call "the race problem." White Christians personally acting in group decisions are now the strongest single force in seeking to end it in America. They know now that the way to begin is personally to stand and act, where we are, with what we face, with what we have.

Kipling once had a king soliloquize in verse. The poem was called "The King's Job." One verse was this:

"The wisest thing, I must suppose,
That a man can do for his land
Is the work that lies under his nose,
With the tools that lie under his hand."

Dwight Eisenhower as person and president, speaking of America as persons and America as nation, recently said, "Whatever America hopes to bring to pass in the world must first come to pass in the heart of America."

Another true word spoken long ago by Edmund Burke has deep meaning in the problems of colour and Christian community today confronting us: "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

We in the West fear and detest Communism. We arm, proscribe, imprison, shoot, take all sorts of measures to contain it, bar it, destroy it. But an ex-Communist, Whittaker Chambers, had this simple thing to say about the real strength and weakness of Communism: "Communism is never stronger than the failure of other faiths."

The only sure defence against Communism for us is Christian offense — not offensive Christianity, but a Christian offense springing from the faith, hope, love of our Lord's winsome power, available to our spirits and our forces of today if we want it and seek it and use it.

Napoleon had a certain experience of armed might and of the attempted physical containment of unwilling people. Toward the close of his life he remarked: "There are two powers in this world, the sword and the spirit. In the end the spirit is always the conqueror."

Emotionally and spiritually there is perhaps no greater conquest for Christians to make in our embattled world today than the conquest of colour barriers to Christian community. It is being done in many places. It can be done in all places if enough Christians personally so decide. For in the end the spirit is always the conqueror.

Cobden once said: "All things shall yield to energy."

Today we know two sources of inexhaustible energy: the atom, and the soul.

The world is currently and fearfully aware of the energy of the atom.

The world is currently and doubtfully aware of the energy of the soul.

Yet it is soul, and soul alone, soul of the individual Christian joining kindred souls of countless others, that can blot out colour as in Our Father's sight it is blotted out, and in blotting out Colour can leave simply and triumphantly a great host of God's children imbued with limitless power from on high: men and women in Christian Community.