

The Christian and World Peace

GERALD F. WINFIELD

Part III. WINNING THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC STRUGGLE

IT IS with relief that we turn from the negative, military side of our problem to the positive, constructive side. Yet it would be a mistake to assume that the positive side is any simpler than the negative. It is a mistake we easily make, because of the sheer terror that is involved in the military phase. And the positive side must not be used as an escape from the painful aspects of the negative. We have to understand that both sides must be faced clearly and courageously, with recognition of the enormous complexities and difficulties inherent in each.

1. The Aspiration for Independence

We can lose the social and economic struggle in two ways. We can lose it by failing to stop the spread of Communism through subversion and civil wars within countries. We can lose it by failing to find solutions to the pressing social and economic problems necessary to satisfy the aspirations of the peoples of the world. These two things are closely intertwined, because much of the subversion in the under-developed countries is based specifically on the Communist claim that by their methods they can take these countries—with their limitations of poverty and technological backwardness, of overpopulation and personal and group crisis—and rule more readily and effectively than can be done by democratic methods within the framework of freedom. This is the base of what the positive part of this struggle is about.

GERALD F. WINFIELD is Chief of Communications Media Staff of the International Cooperation Administration of the State Department. This is the last of his series of lectures. The manuscript was prepared from the transcript by the Editor.

On the one hand, we have to mobilize knowledge, energy, effectiveness, and techniques to meet the problems of underdevelopment. Indeed, we can do this more effectively than can the Communists. But on the other hand, we have to do these things by working with people in their own cultural contexts. I am going to emphasize the latter, rather than the analysis of the nature of the problems: the human side rather than the technological side.

A good place to begin is with the book, *To Plow with Hope*, by Donald K. Faris.¹ He was a colleague of ours in China. A Canadian agricultural missionary, he is both farmer and preacher. He introduced agricultural and mission enterprises in the Malayan Province, until the Japanese forced Canadian missions out of Honan. I worked with him after that for several years at a University in North China in trying to develop further a program for a college for rural reconstruction in order to train community leaders to deal with their problems. During the war the dykes of the Yellow River were cut to turn the waters across the path of the Japanese army. Hundreds of thousands of people moved into the dry river bed and started farming there. After the war, under the UNRA program, it was Faris' job to persuade these people to move out of this area, which extended hundreds of miles, prior to turning the river back into its bed. Today he is in northern Thailand as director of a small school, supported by the Tech-

¹ New York: Harper and Bros., 1958. Dr. Winfield was for many years in missionary service in China. His field of specialization was biology. In 1949 and 1950 he was promotional secretary for the United Boards of Christian Colleges in China. In 1950, in response to an appeal from the Koinonia Foundation and the Government, he entered his present field of work. (Ed.)

nical Assistance Program of the United Nations, carrying on the same kind of training we had worked together on in China. This background indicates something of what you may expect to find in his book. The chapters are packed with human interest stories and facts about the problems of hunger, health, education, and industrial development. There you will find examples of the importance of our keeping close to the realities of this great mass of people, and ways by which they can be helped in closing the enormous gap between underdevelopment and our new technological era.

We have to have an understanding of the aspirations and feelings of these people, if we are going to work with them and be successful in the social and economic struggle. At the top of the list, I think we would have to put their political aspiration for independence and self government. This, of course, is the driving force behind the nationalistic explosions discussed in the first article in this series. The people stand ready to sacrifice almost anything rather than give up their newly-won independence. They will starve; they will fight; they will put up with poor, inefficient, corrupt government; they will do almost anything as long as they feel they have got control of their own households. This sometimes puts us, as we actually operate, in some very interesting situations.

An incident that happened to us in Burma will illustrate the point. Soon after the Burmese nation became independent, we went there and talked with them about their needs. They said, "We need teachers in our medical college. We have all the political teachers we need, but these medical jobs used to be filled by British teachers, who are now gone." Our reply was, "We can supply this need, because we now have a program whereby we can set up an affiliation between an American college and a foreign college; the American government will finance the cost and the

American college supply the needs." We then sat down with this group of well trained Burmese doctors of the faculty of the Rangoon College of Medicine to work out this process. We made our proposal, but ran into a blank wall. Over and over again we would bring up this subject, and they would evade it. Weeks and months went by. Finally the chief of our medical party got friendly enough with one of the Burmese doctors to uncover the root of the difficulty. It grew out of the word, "affiliation." These people spoke English with British, not American, connotations, and to them "affiliation" refers to father-son relationship. The affiliation they had had experience with was between the University of Rangoon and Mandalay college, under which Rangoon set the examinations, issued the degrees, and planned all the policy which Mandalay College carried out. Thus our proposal of an affiliation between the University of Pennsylvania Medical College and their Medical College was understood by them to mean putting their school under our control. While they desperately needed these people, they were not going to accept them if it meant the loss of their sovereignty at this point.

Furthermore, they were being subjected to propaganda which claimed that we were ready to buy our way into control of everything. It was partly politeness on their part which kept this from coming into the open; it was partly fear that it might be true. If we are going to succeed in this type of activity, we have to be acutely aware of the high value placed on newly won independence, which is a part of emergent political aspirations.

Many Americans tend to be highly critical of India, for instance, because India sometimes votes against us on a political issue at the United Nations. These Americans ask why we should give aid to India when India can vote against us. She has to be independent of us as well as everybody else. When

she feels secure enough within herself to vote against us, this is success in this way: the only way these countries are going to be subversion-proof against Communism is to attain within themselves that sense of self-respect, of internal security, internal direction, and of managing their own affairs, that they are willing also to stand up and be independent of the Communists. We, for our part, have got to grow up enough to quit judging these struggles on the basis of whether people like us or not. We hope that ultimately they like us, but this is not a popularity contest that we are engaged in in the world, and this is a wrong standard of judgment for us to use in deciding whether we are being successful.

2. The Aspiration for Equality

Now the second aspiration that we must be aware of and work with is that for equality and justice, with complete acceptance as peoples in the modern world. This places an almost impossibly high emotional demand upon nations and individuals.

Again, a story illustrates the point. One of the finest people we had in our governmental program in Burma was Dr. Phillip Green, an orthopedic surgeon, who had been on the staff of the Yale in China Medical College for twenty-five years. He was asked to talk with the head of the physio-therapy department, because the war had cut off information about new developments in that field. Dr. Green was at that time enormously busy in several enterprises, and it was some days before he found time to look up the head of the physio-therapy department. He wasted little time on formalities and soon began pressing questions about the department. Due to the pressure he was working under, day and night, he began unconsciously to ask his questions more sharply. After about the sixth question the physio-therapist suddenly froze up and said, "Were you sent down here to examine me?" Dr.

Green instantly grasped the situation. You see, under the old colonial system, a British administrator who knew nothing about physio-therapy had the right, just because he was a white man and an official, to examine even the technically trained "native." In view of the physio-therapist's past experience, it is understandable that the sheer physical relationships of this situation fell into the former pattern, and he was not going to take it. Dr. Green replied in this wise: "Of course I'm not down here to examine you. We're colleagues on this staff together. I realize that under pressure of time, I was behaving in a way that justifiably led you to believe I was unnecessarily abrupt. I apologize. I simply want to be able to help you and I am sorry that the pressure of time that I am under led me to behave in this way, and which I feel you were right to resent." "Well," the other man replied, "if that's the basis on which you come, I'll stay in the evenings; I'll come in on Saturdays and Sundays; I'll come and do anything to work with you. But if you came down here to examine me, I'm going to resign."

This is what I mean when I say that we have to be aware of the social aspirations for equality and justice, with complete acceptance as equals, in the modern world. This is the reason my wife and I are involved in desegregation in Virginia. Around the world not only our missionaries, but our five thousand government missionaries in the technical assistance field, are up against the headlines that hit all the papers of the world, when such issues come up. What we are and the way we behave in our society in matters of race relations are an important part of carrying out our job in relation to the winning of the socio-economic battle around the world.

3. The Inheritance of Inequality

Another phase of the aspiration for equality and justice is that in these countries they are undergoing a break-up of their own old, unequal societies and unequal social patterns. There are

enormous internal struggles going on within every one of these countries. This creates a real dilemma for us, as a people and as a government, because while we stand for democracy, very frequently we find ourselves having to work with governmental institutions and relationships that are far from being democratic. The only basis on which we go in with our government programs is that of being officially invited in by the country, operating under a publicly arrived at treaty of agreement, and which can be abrogated by either government on ninety days' notice. In a good many cases it has been abrogated by the foreign government. I, myself, negotiated the close-out of our first program in Burma, because the Burmese government used that ninety-day clause. This grew out of a political issue involving the remnants of the Chinese Nationalist armies that had fled into Burma. We now have the program going again in Burma. After we left they became convinced that we meant to have this on a basis of mutual respect and equality, and two years ago they invited us back.

This puts us in quite a different position than that of the Communists. They work subversively within these societies. Sometimes the popular underground features those people in the society who are most set against their old inequalities and the old imperialist injustices of the past. They latch on to these processes. We cannot go in, in agreement with the local government, to work for overthrow of that government. So we have to stop subversion, and there is a disadvantage in that. What we have to do is to work patiently and carefully to bring our influence to bear on moving these governments from being feudalistic, autocratic and corrupt, toward helping them become more democratic, more responsive to the needs of their people, and—what is perhaps our most difficult task of all—convincing the traditional leadership of these countries that their survival

as leaders is dependent upon greater responsiveness to the needs of the masses of their people. The leaders in many of these countries—this is particularly true in the Middle East—have for generations wielded such absolute power, which they received by inheritance, that it is next to impossible to get them to be aware that they have got to change if they are going to maintain leadership in this revolutionary age. And I can say at this point, thank God for Communism as a driving force in the world to necessitate bringing about some of these changes.

4. The Aspiration for Economic Development

Now, finally, these people have economic aspirations for industrialization and development of an expanding economy to achieve rising standards of living. This is an era in which we have to work at trying to find a solution for economic development. Ultimately such economic solution, in order to be viable, must be commensurate with the solutions of the other problems of mankind on a global basis. Only in effective extension of a democratic industrial revolution throughout the world, outside the Iron Curtain, based upon and expressing the highest and best human values of the Free World, can we win the positive part of our struggle with Communism. This means engineering the development of the underdeveloped countries. Again I would emphasize that we find ourselves doing this in a context that is not altogether happy. As the most wealthy nation, and having inherited the leadership of the capitalistic world, we have also inherited all of the disadvantages that have accrued through the historic development of colonialism. This constitutes one of the most difficult tasks that any group of human beings has ever faced. Even so, it is not one whit more difficult or complicated than the solution of our military problems.

Wherein does this difficulty and com-

plexity arise? First, we are involved in a process of the simultaneous impact of a half dozen revolutions within these countries: Political, social, economic, technological, medical, agricultural, and industrial revolutions—and the sheer confusion that all these processes generate within the minds of both the leadership and the youth of these countries. Therefore, one of our big problems is the introduction of new social techniques. We in our country are so used to the fact that if you move into a new community, and if a problem arises on which you would like to work, you can find the natural leaders in the community. These natural leaders will help bring together, in a committee or some type of grouping, persons who can associate themselves together, and who know how to function together to initiate processes of change. But in these other societies, by and large they have never had committees; they do not know any of these processes; there has never been any pattern for the generation of change out of the grass roots level.

Secondly, these societies have for centuries been under the domination of centralized groups, who have by tradition and accepted position exploited the people. When the new—well trained, well motivated, and modern—representative of the government comes down into the village to try to help them solve an agricultural or health problem, the villagers are afraid that this man is coming in to wield the kind of power that has normally been the power of government in their society. A great amount of time and effort is required to demonstrate otherwise. And it must be convincingly demonstrated, because ultimately the solution of such problems has to be in the freeing and constructive harnessing of the human capabilities of the people, who may be illiterate and ignorant, but not stupid. One of the things I stress in my lectures to American technicians, as they leave for all parts of the world, is that the

common people of the world are conservative about change, because they are smart, and not because they are stupid.

Although we may have a greater fund of technical knowledge, that does not mean that we necessarily have the solution to the villagers' problems. Even with greater human relations experience, the solution of the problem is still out there, and we do not know very much about the concrete situation. For example, a group of medical missionaries, some forty years ago, made an agricultural survey in North India. They found that the yield on cotton was low in quantity and quality, so poor that you could not spin it on a machine. So the missionaries brought in American strains and tested them for years. Finally, having adapted a variety well to the Indian situation, they persuaded about fifty farmers to plant this new strain. The Americans were overjoyed with the results, but the next spring they came back and found these farmers planting their old cotton. The reason, they found, was that "the stalk was not good for anything." To the American cotton farmer the stalk is an unmitigated nuisance. But in this part of India the stalk represented building material, fuel and fodder. This meant that they simply had to have a sturdy stalk for the thatched roof, fencing for the chicken or pig pen, and so forth, while they needed only enough cotton lint to hand spin and weave to clothe their own backs. Their old cotton plant in its totality was more useful for their survival than our high productive variety. Thus the engineering of change in these countries is one that is fraught with complexity; it must happen slowly, and we do not automatically have the answers.

5. The Awakening of Hope

We run into other social problems. Not only do we have the problem of introducing social technology and new forms of community organization that

make it possible for them to make use of new technical structures, but we have frequently to help the leaders in these countries generate a faith in the possibility of change and improvement in living conditions.

Again, a story illustrates the point. I have a friend who is an amateur anthropologist. He loves to make trips to strange parts of the world just to study people, and he has a delightful habit of buying a large quantity of very attractive and inexpensive gifts for his friends. A few years ago he went to Mexico and got into the back country, where he found some beautiful little baskets with lovely designs and colors. He spoke enough Spanish to be able to learn that the baskets were made by a peon who brought a load of them down from the hills each market day. Early on market day he went out to meet this man, who soon appeared with a couple of dozen of these baskets on his burro's back. My friend, being aware of the processes of bargaining by which people there operate, passed the time of day and then began bargaining for one of the baskets. This was in order to set the price. After a long time they settled the price, and he bought this one basket. Then he said, "Now I want to buy your whole load at this price." Although the price was probably two and a half times the market price, the peon refused. The bargaining started all over again, only now the price was going up instead of down. Finally, the peon said, "Senor, I have sold you a basket. I have no desire to sell you any other baskets. Good day." And he led his burro on into the town.

Now, why did he behave this way? I think because he—with many, many millions of other poor peoples of the world—has lived in a non-expanding economy. These people do not have any faith in their ability to change their real status for the better by the accumulation of a little more wealth. And this is correct according to their ex-

perience and the experience of their fathers and grandfathers. Our experience, and therefore our faith, is different. We have been living in the most rapidly expanding economy in world history.

Every one of us has changed his status. We continue to do so by paying attention to economic factors. This is one of the reasons that the rest of the world looks on us as money grubbers. We have found that so many of the non-material values that are good in life—education, better opportunities for our children, medical services—are dependent on the way we accumulate and use our economic factors. But in a society where people have lived for centuries with a tight, unchanging lid on the situation, they simply do not have faith in economic factors as genuinely helpful. To this peon the chance to sit all morning in the market place, to haggle over his baskets, to pick up the gossip to break the isolation of two weeks of living alone with his family up in the hills was more important to him than the extra pesos he could get by a killing sale to my friend. Sometimes we find ourselves up against the lack of any will to change at all, because people do not have any faith in our solutions or contribution to solutions of their problems. Whether we are attacking problems of health, modernization of agriculture, production of new industrial processes, expansion of education and welfare, we are up against the human elements of all these social complexities.

6. The Inevitability of Gradualness

Still another complicating factor is the low level of absorbability of our assistance, which many of these societies have. There is a limit to the amount of money and the quantity of things that you can pour into one of these societies, and have the assistance used at all. For you have to have trained people; you have to have organization; you have to have a will to work and

the will to use; you have to have an overcoming of suspicion, fear, and uncertainty; and you have to get through all the barriers that have been set up by history and by accident.

If we are going to win this socio-economic struggle, we have got to be able so to manage this complex process of human factors; we have to be willing to spend the sums of money required; we have to be willing to spend the time and the patience required, so that working with and through the peoples themselves, we begin to help catalyze a rise in the standard of living of the peoples around the Iron Curtain. And if we are going to move toward a time when we can find a basis for solution of our conflicts with the Communistic world, we have to reach beyond containment to the development of what I call a counterthrust in Asia. There is no better way to begin the process of changing Communism itself, than by demonstrating by our choices, our actions, and the consequences of our actions, that with the free peoples of the world we can indeed develop a rising standard of living in the non-communist, underdeveloped world that is superior to that in the Communist World. This is what will begin to force the Communist World to ask fundamental questions about its own presuppositions.

We are not achieving this yet. We are laying the foundations for it. We must learn a great deal more; we must work a little harder at the job; we must improve our skills at the job, if we are going to make it. But if there is ever going to become the hope of a time when the world can be depolarized, the tension between the Communist World and the Free World reduced enough to really sit down and talk about disarmament with the hope of achieving it, it will come only through some kind of process which changes both Communism on its side and us to some degree on our side. Such a new set of relationships would make

it possible for us to discharge this tension of polarity without war. This is why the socio-economic part of the equation that we are struggling with is so important. Unless we can demonstrate in the course of history—if you please, by the way we conduct history—that the application of our total energies as a free society, working with free men in the underdeveloped societies of the world, that the Communist theory of the course of history is erroneous, we will never change their minds.

7. The Dynamics of Change

Now both the process of maintaining atomic military sterilization and the process of developing socio-economic counterthrusts are the principal tools that we foresee as being useful in forcing a change of Communism at its source. You will note that I say “forcing” a change. This is not something that is going to come by persuasion or from sitting around a table and having a meeting of minds to solve these problems under the present circumstances. What we have to work for, over the decades, is some fundamental shifts that grow out of situations of action. I would go on to say that we have to learn many new things, too, because our positions are not the final right ones either. As we work with these problems we have to discover better answers within the framework of our own processes, that are more peaceful, more complete, and more perfect.

PART IV. THE REAPPRAISAL OF OUR RESOURCES

The question which now comes before us is this: What are some of the things that we as Christians, both as individuals and as organized groups, can do to carry out the positive side of this struggle for world peace? In order to know what to do, we must consider some aspects of our situation, which we frequently neglect. There are three processes, in addition to those previous-

ly mentioned, which we must consider and work in terms of. First, we must gain increased understanding of the resources of our own affluent society. Second, we must learn to live by a growing knowledge of truth. Third, we must work to synthesize a new world of culture.

1. The Use of the Resources of Our Affluent Society

In the same world in which there is such misery and want, we have the problems of our own affluence. This new society came into being unintentionally, but nevertheless, by its emphasis on production, it has become unbelievably wealthy. We must do some rigorous thinking about this new society if we are to do what we must do to create peace in the world. For a full and very able survey of this subject, I recommend highly *The Affluent Society* by John Kenneth Galbraith.²

It is Galbraith's thesis that we make our decisions in America today by means of the "conventional wisdom." This outmoded economic "wisdom" dominates the processes by which we decide things about our budget and things about the control of our whole economy. This "conventional wisdom" was born out of human experience which seemed to affirm that man can never get further than the borderline of subsistence. That, of course, is not true of our present society. However, on the basis of this supposition, we have built so much into our emphasis on the production and distribution of consumer goods that we have now thrown our entire economic machine out of balance. Believing that men could never produce enough goods for everybody, we have arrived at the condition where there is a surplus of consumer goods. There must, then, be a renewed emphasis on the public services in our total national expenditures. These are the channels through which

we invest in people and in those community enterprises which come nearer expressing and meeting the spiritual needs of our society than do the purely physical things that we get through consumer goods.

Education is a case in point. We may be standing behind Russia in the scientific competition, because we are not willing to spend enough money on education. The reason we do not do this is, in very large measure, that we shrink from the thought of taxing ourselves enough to put through the public channel a big enough percentage of our total output to provide ourselves, not only with the basic education we require, but also the basic scientific research and research institutions we require. Those who follow the conventional wisdom call this "creeping socialism," when this idea is presented of creating a more reasonable balance between the use of our energies through the private channels of goods production and distribution, on the one hand, and the public channels of the development of basic services, on the other. But what we need is to consider what this means concretely, not what names we can throw about. An example is found in that the Russians operate a tremendously effective centralized translation bureau. This bureau gathers together the scientific literature of the world and translates it into Russian. Thus no Russian scientist need ever be lacking in the latest word from publications in English, French and German from all over the world. We, for our part, have not set up anywhere an adequate center for even skimming the translation of Russian scientific publications. Now that attention has been focused on this by the Sputniks, we discover that the scientific material of many aspects of Russian advances had been published. We did not realize this, because, wealthy as we are, no privately run group has had the disposable dollars to hire people to do this job.

This is but one of many examples.

² Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1958.

Not least among those which might be added is the fight that goes on in our Congress every year over whether we are going to have enough money for scientific research, necessary military development, and our farm economic programs. People who follow the conventional wisdom say that we can spend ourselves into bankruptcy. It is my personal opinion that just about the opposite is the truth. We can come nearer spending ourselves into bankruptcy down the private channels of private debt-building, under the pressure of advertising, perhaps more readily than if we took a sensible approach to taxing ourselves sufficiently to provide the monies that our localities, state and federal government need to develop the necessary services. This would also create the basic, unfluctuating fly-wheel of demand for production that would keep us from the dizzy economic cycles that are among the real risks of our economic system. Thus one of our great tasks is that of facing up to and working through the problems that lie ahead, involving a reappraisal of the use of the resources of our affluent society. To do this we must get over those inherited fears that we are a poverty-stricken people, without sufficient resources to develop ways of meeting our greatest public needs.

2. The Process of Living by a Growing Knowledge of Truth

Communism can be met, dealt with, and changed only by the action of people who are living and conducting the whole of their lives—personal, community, national, international, economic, social, political, cultural, moral, and religious—in conformity with an expanding discovery of total truth. This is the great value of freedom. Freedom refuses to choke off or limit the search for truth. If that freedom to search for new truth is coupled with discipline and devotion to live by all the truth that has been found and to incorporate new truths into a

world pattern of total truth, then the "is" of society can move closer to the "ought" which defines the good society wherein life finds its fullest expression. The total truth—philosophical, scientific, artistic and religious—on which such a good society can be founded is an objective reality. It is here; it is in the universe; it is what God is creating. It is what God is creating among and through and with us. One way in which we reflect the image of God is that we now participate with Him in that creative process in bringing into being several types of atoms and kinds of matter which we are not at all sure occurred naturally anywhere in the universe. Man, who through all his ways of finding truth—revelation, intuition, direct perception, speculative thought, scientific observation and experimentation—can find and verify in practice this whole truth. In this process and in this process alone lies the way to survival.

The great conflicts of our time can move toward resolution only as errors and misconceptions—like those of social history, as followed under Communism, and those of all other imperfect philosophies, including much of our own—are corrected and changed on the pattern of an ever-widening discovery and practice of new and more complete truth. We must continue to discover this new truth urgently and effectively, and put it to work on a global basis, or die.

3. Growth Toward a Synthesis of a New World Culture

We have been forced to characterize our problems in terms of the conflict with Communism. But if tomorrow Communism suddenly disappeared, or if tomorrow those changes which I predict will take place suddenly occurred in the minds and hearts of the Communist world and in our world so that we could sit down together and wipe out this enormous area of conflict, mankind would still have lying before it

an almost unbelievable series of unsolved problems. And as we look beyond this area of conflict, we see that we will be faced with the problems of a global industrial society.

There would be the material problems of that global society: enough food, the problem of population growth, and the problem of energy.³ In the political field there is the problem of achieving governments under law and the development of a positive law for all mankind. For our part, we have to face up to the fact that in many parts of the world men have learned much truth and have incorporated what they have learned into systems of relationships and systems of law that must be harmonized and related to those systems which we happen to have developed. Even if we had no problem of Communism, the problem of generating an international law that can deal with the conflicts which are sure to arise would confront us. Above and beyond this, we have the problem of the cultural syntheses which must go into a new world culture. There is a remarkable richness of diversity in the old cultural heritages of sub-global civilizations, held together by a few great, basic concepts and beliefs. Thus, even our religious approach is going to have to be open-ended enough to make room for the religious insights of millions of people, who do not interpret their understanding of God through the theological constructs which we attach to Christianity. We must still be able to have fellowship with them and find the great areas of common understanding of truth which God has revealed through other channels than those of our heritage down through the centuries. One of the things we have to outgrow is our overly narrow definitions of the uniqueness of our understandings of the nature of God. The challenge of survival is to achieve a new moral climate. We

can survive only if we discover God's way of working in history. All of this can be summed up very simply: we must build the kingdom of God on earth. All that I have been saying is, I believe, caught up in the teaching of Jesus.

4. What Then Can We Do?

What are some of the plodding, day-to-day practices that are appropriate to our world situation? What steps can we take toward the achievement of the goals that have been presented? The first thing, I think, is that we have to sharpen our understanding. Just consider what we have to challenge our young people with! We must try to help them begin to face up to the sheer wonder, magnitude, and excitement of this universe and this world and this society that we live in. There is a real danger that we will fail so to challenge them, because of our own lack of understanding of what is going on in the world. Are we allowing them to avoid this challenge by preoccupation with too many things and too much television? Are we so cowardly and so fearful of the capacity of the human brain that we are unwilling so to challenge them? Are we so afraid of the possible criticism and misunderstanding of the set ways of our elders that we will fail to set this challenge and, instead, continue to articulate the conventional wisdom? There is a temptation to repeat the conventional wisdom, knowing that people will nod their heads and say we preached a nice sermon and that it was very pleasant, while in our own thought we feed egoistic satisfaction from the approbation that comes from having again said the plain and obvious things. So I would challenge you to an ever-growing range of understanding.

A second thing that we can do is to turn our energy, our wealth, our creative ability to the service of all men, friend and enemy. This requires that we respect all men. That is ALL men, not just some men. This, too, is one of our great spiritual problems as we send

³ Cf. Harrison Brown, *The Challenge of Man's Future*, New York: Viking Press, 1954.

American technicians overseas. Theoretically they believe that they respect all men. When I talk to them, before they leave this country, most of them would swear on a stack of Bibles a mile high that they have completely outgrown notions of white supremacy. Yet when they see the lepers that still sit by the streets of the world, with the stumps of their fingers held out to beg, it takes a very big person not to draw his coat about him and move along for fear of contamination. It takes something great to walk into the kind of hut that so many people of the world live in, with chickens roosting under the kitchen table—if there is a table at all—the pigs sharing the room next to the children's room, mud floors, the stench of unwashed bodies, and all that belongs in this picture, and still to respect these people as people. And yet, millions of people live like this.

This, again, is a gap that our very affluence places between us and these people. I think I can live with these people a little more readily than some of my younger colleagues, because I can still remember when the only sanitary facility we had in our home was in the back yard. But we now have a generation of young Americans who have not had any experience by which to relate to such conditions as I have described, and it requires something of them to make this adjustment. Thus the question is, can we find ways to respect these people—to respect their warm, human wisdom—in spite of the fact that they do not have much material wisdom? Can we sit and listen to them and really hear what they are trying to say to us out of their understanding of family and human relationships? Mainly they speak of it in connection with a God whose name is Allah or a man of enlightenment called Buddha. Can we listen despite these differences, so strange to us? And can we carry to them our treasure of new knowledge and share it with a deep humility, offering it morsel by morsel as priceless truth we have discovered,

not because of some superior virtue of ours, but because we have been fortunate enough to be lured into its discovery? Can we remember that it is the kingdom of God on earth that we are trying to build? This kingdom is within us. It is within us not only as individuals, but also as a fellowship in the church, within us as families, as communities, and as the whole enormously complex range of interacting organization that is human life. Can we be big enough to grasp the fact that our gospel is not an either-or gospel, but a both-and gospel? It is as truncated when it focuses its attention on only the narrow realm of personal experience as it is truncated when it focuses attention on only the social issues of man's life. Can we, fast enough, share this vision with enough people? Can we create the fellowship of a church such that will carry the burden of creating with God this kingdom on earth? I have put these matters in the form of questions, because they are the questions that must be faced as we think about the Christian and world peace.

In generations gone by people had the privilege of working at this job or not. Of course we have the freedom to work at it or not, but there is this one vastly different situation now. In the past the wages of failure to create with God—which, after all, is sin—has been only personal death. But we live in a new age. Let me say it again: Mankind has the power to crucify God all over again, not in the body of one son hung on a cross, but in the body of the whole human race on this planet. Now God cannot be defeated. If we choose to destroy ourselves, God has this whole, vast universe in which to work. He can start all over again on this lifeless planet to create once again sons and daughters to have fellowship with Him. It is only we, ultimately, who can fail in this situation. So it is that we face this enormously complex task of building the kingdom of God in the sure confidence that it is God's will that He give us the kingdom.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.