

INTOLERANCE IS COMBATTED AT SEMINAR HERE

**Religious Differences Dis-
cussed by Catholic,
Protestant, Jew-
ish Spokesmen**

ROUND TABLES HELD

**Sessions Take Place at
Providence College and
Brown University**

Tests of outstanding speakers at the Providence Seminar and additional reports of the conference proceedings on Pages six and seven.

The sources of religious intolerance and social dissimilarity were thoroughly explored during the six sessions of the seminar on Human Relationships held in Providence on Tuesday and Wednesday.

Catholic, Protestant and Jewish spokesmen took part in the public meetings and round-table discussions held at Brown University on Tuesday and at Providence College on Wednesday.

The seminar was characterized by a frank and good-humored discussion of the many differences, religious, social and racial, which create friction and hostility between the people of the three religions. The meetings aroused widespread interest and were largely attended.

The outlook for the lessening of prejudice and bigotry was presented at the closing session from three points of view—a churchman's, Rev. Michael J. Ahern, S.J., of Weston; an educator's, President Robbins W. Harlow of Hartford Theological Seminary and a layman's, Hon. Joseph M. Proskauer of New York City.

Principal Speakers

Mr. Ahern, who was one of the principals in the U-table discussions Tuesday evening at Alanson Hall, Pembroke, during which the Catholic attitude on persons married outside the fold was explained, traced the historical background for religious tolerance.

President Harlow declared that the complexity of living in such a confused and mechanical age necessitates the need of education for the conditioning of contacts among individuals and groups under sound leadership. He warned of nationalistic excesses and said that an adherence to the basic factors of humanitarism, ethical principles, social justice and international relations, "touched and tempered by spiritual sensitivity" would help the seminar followers to achieve their objective.

Judge Proskauer said while there is cause for rejoicing that Americans have made progress in the age-long struggle against bigotry at least in a legalistic tolerance there still is much climbing to be done before the spiritual sumit of mutual tolerance, mutual forbearance and brotherly love is reached.

From personal experience he said that he knew many prominent college graduates who draw the barriers like deadlocks and declared it was his belief that the mere education of the mind will never wipe out such barriers. They are emotional, primarily he maintained.

(Continued on Page 7)

The Seminar

The seminar will have this week for other discussions of religious differences concentrated on educational institutions. Indeed the building up of mutual good will through a better understanding of one another's beliefs. The atmosphere will include like discussions addressed, however, to examples of good separated from bad. It is well that there was no attempt to minimize differences or "other" religious divisions.

This was in the expected since the members representing were men of conviction who did not hesitate to express their convictions. Nevertheless the discussion and exchanges proved no failure in a recognition of the truth that human knowledge is to be gained by a stable and ordered society.

It is, of course, too early to begin final decisions of this kind until after all discussions, all education, training, all meeting between the people of the different religious faiths. When they can accomplish, however, in the keeping of social peace and order, the prevalence of which, to major degree, would seriously threaten national stability.

It should not be forgotten that education reserved for each member is affected by the fundamental law of the land. The Constitution guarantees that "separation of church and state" insures a nation in which citizens of differing beliefs may live in liberty free from any religious influence or imposition. Whether the constitutional government shall require degrees upon the mind to which intelligent citizenship, guided by the choices of others, provides in the interests of the nation. The author suggests an expression of that kind of citizenship.

