

sustained the shock. There could be no unity in such fundamental diversity. It is difficult to see the race issue in any different light.

It is doubtful, indeed, if there are many Christians in America today who, faced by the necessity of rendering a judgment, would not admit that a segregated church is a denial of Christianity. This is why such a statement as that promulgated at Columbus should have a catalytic effect in inducing renunciation of a sin that has gone unconfessed.

Reforms do not come about by fiat. This one has many angles. It involves not only the pattern of congregational worship but the conduct of hospitals, schools and theological seminaries, and employment practices in a great variety of establishments. Time, patience and courage will be required. But it is to be hoped that the church in America is entering upon a new phase in respect to race relations; that while differences will persist as to strategy, we are approaching agreement upon the abolition of segregation, as a Christian goal. A failure in this crucial matter would go far to sustain the disturbing judgment often heard today that the church is no longer the custodian of the Christian gospel.

F. E. J.

## Editorial Notes

Tardily we move to meet the needs of a starving world and to bring at least the "crumbs which fall from the rich man's table" to alleviate the hunger of many nations. One hopes that what we do will not be "too little and too late." The President's appointment of a commission under Herbert Hoover to deal with the food problem is the kind of action which was suggested months ago, but which he was unwilling to take at that time because it was assumed that the American people were not ready to make the sacrifices, which would be required to meet Europe's need. The commission is going to try to reduce American food consumption, particularly cereals and fats, through voluntary effort. One wonders whether this voluntary system will be adequate. Would it not have been better to introduce a modified rationing system? Might not the American public have responded to such a measure, even as now it responds to measures which were thought politically inadvisable several months ago? We may be fat, comfortable and somewhat ignorant of the world's needs. But we are not without conscience or soul.

The growing tension between Russia and the West, heightened by Churchill's ill-timed and ill-advised suggestion for an Anglo-American military alliance, makes a creative solution of the atomic

bomb problem more and more difficult. Any proposal for turning the secret over to the UNO means, in the present circumstances, sharing it with Russia. That has become a political impossibility. The only remaining alternative is to make a solemn covenant never to use the bomb first and to destroy our stock pile as a proof of our *bona fides*. However irresponsible the Russian intransigence of the moment may seem, we ought not to forget that our possession of the bomb gives us the most tremendous advantage of unilateral security.

The idea that we ought to make a covenant never to use the bomb first has spread spontaneously in various parts of the country. Various organizations have taken it up. Hanson Baldwin, the military critic of the *New York Times*, has given it support. This is an idea worth writing your senator about.

There is a tremendous contest in Washington between those who want to place the atomic energy, primarily under military control and those who would support Senator McMahon's senatorial committee in establishing a primarily civilian commission. The conflict takes the form of support for the McMahon bill on the one hand, which has the right of way in the Senate and the old May bill, which has the right of way in the House. All the scientists and university authorities, not to speak of liberal citizens in the country, are strongly supporting the Senate bill. Yet the chances at the moment are that the principals of the May bill will win the day until the general public is aroused to the issues.

The theologians committee of the Federal Council, which brought in a report to the Council on the Christian attitude toward the atomic bomb, suggested that Christian people of America ought to make a gesture of repentance for the guilt of the irresponsible use of the bomb without warning. The suggestion is that some relief work for Hiroshima and Nagasaki be made the token of our sense of guilt. The suggestion has been, on the whole well received, though not without criticism from some Christians who think it wrong to express such guilt toward the foe. Are we not the righteous victors? Before we engaged in this war, many Christians thought we were not righteous enough to defend the cause of justice. Now there are many who think we proved our righteousness by defending justice against tyranny. Both types of Christians were wrong. We had to defend justice even though we were not righteous enough to do it. And we must confess our guilt as unrighteous men and nations, particularly in the hour of victory. We are covered with many forms of guilt, including the guilt of doing so much evil while we tried to do good.

R. N.