

THE BASIS OF BROTHERHOOD

SIR ROBERT HOLLAND*

LONG before the coming of Jesus Christ, man learned that only by loving his neighbour as himself could he hope to avert the chastisements of war and social discord! (See, for example, Leviticus, 19:18). Primitive peoples, blindly conscious that all things were created by a supreme power beyond the world of sense, devised many worship forms — animistic, polytheistic and monotheistic — to propitiate the mighty unknown and enlist aid for human progress. Religious practices and taboos moulded family and communal institutions by implanting discipline and a sense of social responsibility. Prophets and priests of countless religions taught their followers that peaceful enjoyment of life's benefits could be attained only through a long-drawn struggle in fulfilment of the Creator's purpose, for subduate of selfish passions and for promotion of common welfare. In the language of philosophy, the concept was that, since the world is created by God, time has a moral content; the edifice of civilization is founded upon spiritual values; and regard for those values, and especially for the "love-your-neighbour" ordinance, must be constantly fostered through exhortation and discipline.

Civilized nations of the present day are no doubt generally agreed that public peace and individual happiness must be built on brotherly cooperation, in a family of democratic states or in a one-state Utopia; but world opinion is sharply divided as to the source, and continuing inspiration, of the human will to cooperate. Christianity has illumined the superstitious deistic and philosophical conceptions of the past and has proclaimed that God is Love; that He is working out His purpose for man, revealed through the coming of Jesus Christ; and that the Church is the instrument of the living God for uniting all men in brotherhood, and for the setting forward of His reign on earth. Many other religions teach that all men are children of one God and should live together as brethren. Opponents, ranged on various fronts, not only deny this but would rub out from the human mind what they regard as outworn and superstitious beliefs about the existence of God. The battle is joined, and the fate of humanity depends on the outcome.

On one front, intellectual challenge to religious belief is rooted in misgivings about the real significance of humanity's

brief existence and achievements when viewed against the immense space-time background of the universe. The argument is that if the whole of history is reduced to an incident too ephemeral to be of consequence, it is ridiculous to attach moral meaning to any event. Upholders of religion retort that, although the human experiment may be but a tiny speck on the surface of a boundless creation, yet its meaning and worth must be assessed by man, not in the light of his own limited intelligence, but through his intuitive and progressive perception of the Creator's will and wisdom. They point out that the intellectualists' gloomy theory offers no incentive for brotherly cooperation, even on grounds of expediency. Neither side can ever hope to adduce arguments or evidence that will convince the other. The contest on this front does not engage many, because the issue is too abstruse for common comprehension.

On another front, scientists and protagonists of social reform assert that for the proper guidance of errant human beings we should abandon moral exhortations and imperatives, and endeavour instead, by scientific enquiry and technique, to tabulate the fundamental causes of breakdowns in human cooperation. Then, they say, we shall be in a position to provide the optimum conditions for the elimination of war, industrial friction and crime; and a world society will be created enshrining democracy and cultural liberty. Knowledge wrung from Nature by empirical science is the only certain knowledge capable of verification through the senses, and since theories about the soul and God cannot be so verified, they are in the realm of personal taste and choice. Research should therefore be pursued in complete independence of ethics, even though man's religious sense may be atrophied as a result. This is the substance of conclusions reached by some of the eminent men who, as members of UNESCO (The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) conducted an enquiry during 1947 into the problem of finding common ground for understanding and agreement between diverse philosophies and religions.¹

Three assumptions underly the scientists' programme.

First, that human capacity is unlimited; that man's past achievements and his amazing progress in recently opened fields make it certain that he can and will develop supreme

1. The results of the enquiry are to be found in a publication entitled "Reflections on our Age", being lectures delivered at the 1948, Paris, session of UNESCO.

mastery over physical conditions on this planet, and perhaps beyond it.

Second, that scientific research will be planned, and its discoveries applied, with the single and unselfish aim of benefiting humanity, provided that the governments of nations will only stop interfering with the operations of scientists and perverting them into destructive channels.

Third, that just as in the field of medicine and therapy great success is being achieved because we have learned how to aid the human body's natural resistance to disease, and to stimulate its automatic striving to recover health, so also it is in our power to assure social health and security for all, through studying how to assist man's natural capacity for cooperation; since there is in every man's heart as strong a drive to cooperate with others as there is in his body a drive towards health.

To these assumptions reply is made as follows:

First, the potentialities of scientific discovery may be limitless, but in his quest for and application of ever mightier weapons, mechanisms and atomic secrets, and in his metaphysical exploration, man runs the risk of destroying instead of building civilization. Because science can teach men to do many things formerly thought impossible, it does not follow that its inventions will ultimately ameliorate living conditions, or foster brotherhood, or even endure. More than 2,000 years ago, the "Preacher" said that, though men have sought out many inventions, 'Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright.'" (Ecclesiastes, 7: 29). Materialism can take no account of what religion believes to be a higher law than the "survival" impulse, namely God's intention that "good shall be the final goal of ill" on earth, and His oft-exerted power to bring to naught any device of man which runs counter to that intention. On many occasions in human history, success, when almost within man's grasp, has been relentlessly withheld. To man's limited intelligence, the advance towards fulfilment of the Divine purpose may seem devious and slow, but it is incessant and sure, and will always outpace man's inventions.

Secondly, it is true that science is ameliorating the sorry conditions under which the majority of the world's population live; that it is battling disease, ignorance, fruitless toil and premature death. Biological engineering, combined with

new agricultural methods and scientific distribution of the world's productive effort may perhaps be able to solve technically the problem of humanity's food requirements, though man himself has already alarmingly depleted the nutrition resources of our planet. Science can also open brighter vistas for those who, while freed from grosser anxieties, yet know that "getting and spending they lay waste their powers", and resent the fetters which our social structure imposes on their freedom and happiness. Science can make their lives fuller, wider, healthier and richer in comforts, interests and leisure. But achievement so far has fallen lamentably short of design and hope, for the simple reason that the political, economic and cultural interplay of nations, races, societies and classes is not geared for the fruition of scientific efforts for the benefit of humanity. War represents a definite perversion of science; but the mournful outcome of U.N.O. efforts to quench hostilities during the past few years proves that the end of war is not in sight and, therefore, there is no hope that science will gain early release from its distasteful job of devising destruction. And apart from war, the obstacles to the achievement of plenty and happiness are not technical in the main, but deep-rooted in spirit. For many centuries past, the efforts and hopes of mankind have been directed to securing freedom, justice and prosperity for all, through abatement of ignorance, pride, avarice and superstition. But the success gained has been small. The ancient evils of feudalism, exploitation, racial discrimination, class-prejudice, materialism still stand; and they seem even to have been entrenched and buttressed by the advances in human knowledge and technique which should have purged them.

Thirdly, the analogy which the scientist tries to draw between "the human body's natural resistance to disease" and "man's natural capacity for cooperation" is misleading. The body's automatic striving to recover health is powerfully aided by medicine and therapy. Moral exhortation, though potent in particular cases, is of subsidiary efficacy. On the other hand, man's predisposition to love his neighbor—"the drive in every man's heart to cooperate with others"—can be fostered only through moral education, exhortation and discipline based on reverence for God. It is true that, by the development of human intelligence, skill and culture, the sources of crime may be bared, the reclamation of delinquents may be aided, and

the optimum conditions for equality of opportunity and general advance in social health and well-being may be provided. But measures of this nature are conducive and subsidiary, because the problem of crime and delinquency is not in essence comparable with the problem of bodily ailment. By claiming full authority to condition individual conduct and social intercourse, science impliedly sets up as the standard of behaviour that which is expedient in the common interest, a humanistic² conception lacking appeal for the ordinary individual. It is the old fallacy of "the greatest good of the greatest number," long ago proved to be incapable of liberating energy and fervour.

A protagonist³ of atheism, who regards the life of man as purposeless and meaningless because the motions of matter are seen to be governed (according to scientists), not by any purpose, but by blind forces and laws, has mourned the resultant ruin, not only of all moral principles, but of all values. Candidly admitting that "no civilization can live without ideals—without a firm faith in moral ideas" (which science can never prescribe), he fears that, because modern man's life is hollow at the centre, civilization may collapse before the peoples of the world are "sufficiently educated to combine high ideals with an absence of religion." He sees that, although men are gaining greater and greater control over their environment with the aid of science, technology, education and improved social conditions, yet they still fail to "move upwards, working out the brute," and become ever more cynical, restless and self-indulgent. In order to advance, men must harbour in their souls convictions that inspire purpose and restrain behaviour. By endorsing the basic value of ideals and moral ideas, and by confessing that pure science can scarcely hope to provide a substitute stimulus for their florescence in time to save the world, the writer who has been quoted seems to give away the whole atheistic position. In effect, he appears to admit that man's "natural capacity for cooperation" cannot be nurtured merely through scientific therapy and the gratification of materialistic ambitions, but must be cultivated by religious exhortation—in short, that the spiritual, not the material, world is the true reality.⁴ In any case, if, as the writer seems to say,

² In the sense of "any system of thought or action which is concerned with merely human interests as distinguished from divine".

³ Professor W.T. Stace author of "Man Against Darkness", in *THE ATLANTIC* September, 1948.

⁴ A renowned scientist, Dr. Du Noy, said: "To this day science has not succeeded in eliminating the hypothesis of an "anti-chance", which it is simpler to call God."—*THE ROAD TO REASON*. p. 221

the early death of our civilization is probable because the religious basis of our ideals has been undermined, then from a purely opportunist point of view humanity, being in a desperate strait, would be well advised forthwith to aim at recapturing belief in God. There is no ground for hope that any increase in human goodness will result directly from expansion of scientific knowledge.

When UNESCO, at the General Conference of 1946, proposed that philosophers should discuss the problem of finding ground for understanding between diverse philosophies and religions, it was definitely agreed "that UNESCO must not be committed to a dogmatic position in any field or to a philosophy which would exclude other basic philosophies directed to the human and humane ends to which UNESCO, by its Constitution, is devoted." The Constitution (adopted in 1945) declares that "the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual *and moral* solidarity of mankind."

The pundits who reported their conclusions to UNESCO at the Paris session of 1948, failed to achieve the objective set; and in the main favoured the idea that scientific research ought to be pursued in complete independence of ethics, because positive science is the supreme source and standard of truth.

Supporters of religion will regard such a message from the intelligentsia to humanity as a confession of frustration and bewilderment. The agnostic position was sharply challenged by one of the lecturers, Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, in a treatise on Indian Culture. "Indian tradition," he said, "gives the first place to spiritual experience and illumination. Any philosophical view that contradicts the testimony of religious experience is held to be unsound." He declared, therefore, that the culture and freedom for which UNESCO stands must be based upon religion, on the communion of man's spirit with God—on man's "Consciousness of the Divine." Again, in his address to the UNESCO Conference at Beirut in November, 1948, Dr. Radhakrishnan stressed that "the tree of civilization has its roots in spiritual values which some of us, afflicted with material pride, do not care to recognize. Without these roots, the leaves would soon have fallen and left the tree a lifeless stump." The standpoint of religion could hardly have been put more finely and forcefully on general grounds, though Christians would of course emphasize the

supreme importance of Christ's Advent and His sacrifice for humanity.

But as a matter of fact, the ratiocinations of philosophers and scientists, though often adduced as excuses for irreligion and lawlessness, hardly stir men's hearts. Other influences than "higher criticism" of the Bible or abstruse theories about the nature of matter are inclining them from God and atrophying their instinct for neighbourly cooperation. The most insidious and forceful assault is launched on the front of Communism.

It is now a matter of common knowledge that the Marxist-Leninist ideology, offspring of dialectical and historical materialism, advocates world revolution as the only sure means by which the forces of socialism can master the enemy, Capitalism. Communist policy and elaborate propaganda are unswervingly directed to this end. The strategy adopted does not include a frontal attack on religion, though Stalin confesses to propaganda against all and every *religious prejudice*. Reliance is placed, to use Stalin's words, 'upon such a social theory...as correctly reflects the needs of development of the material life of society and which is capable of setting in motion broad masses of the people and mobilizing them and organizing them into a great army...prepared to smash the reactionary forces and to clear the way for the advanced forces of society.' In practice the Marxist doctrine that "religion is opium for the people" is still propagated, religious teaching is discouraged, and prominent churchmen are persecuted if they are intransigent or subservient to external religious authority. Recent happenings indicate particular hostility to the Roman Catholic Church.

Stalin's theory offers a special challenge to orthodox religions because it appears to embody a rationalized, though heretical, version of Christianity. As Professor Arnold Toynbee has pointed out,⁵ "certain social precepts of Christianity have been taken from their context, exaggerated, and turned into a potent criticism of the Christian world in our time." The mistakes and shortcomings of Christian Churches have been exploited, their doctrines have been parodied to serve totalitarian ends,⁶ and the ideal of a benign world-government, under which "the lion shall lie down with the lamb" has been set before men's eyes. The spiritual challenge of Communism undoubtedly has power to magnetize the spirit of man, but Christianity and many other religions have a trenchant answer.

5 See "The Study of History", *INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS*, Oct. 48.

6 Exponents of Communism preach that 'service to the State is perfect freedom', because as the full harvest of liberty is gathered the State will become superfluous and wither away.

But, further, Communism has evolved a programme that appeals strongly to humanistic and materialistic susceptibilities in countries outside the Soviet Union. Communism charges that capitalist countries continue to dominate and exploit dependent peoples; that they tolerate and foster racial, social and economic inequalities; and that their governments make no genuine effort to improve the lot of the under-dog, or to bring cooperative brotherhood to birth. Communism accordingly offers encouragement and aid to subversive movements in countries which have not yet attained self-government; by kindling the dry tinder of discontent, by penetrating labour unions, and by stimulating nationalist sentiment. In all lands it plans to sweep away "the complicated network of conservatism, prejudice and vested interest" by the direct application of science to human welfare. Science is to ensure the optimum production and impartial distribution of the world's resources and to inspire a system of government serving the needs of all peoples. Mankind will thus achieve a uniform level of bodily efficiency and well-being, and will enjoy maximum facilities for intellectual and cultural development. The whole of social life will be subject to a coordinated and conscious control by the people's will expressed through a central bureau.

For all who believe in the principles of Western democracy, the Communist programme is condemned by the mere fact that totalitarian control is an intrinsic feature of the U.S.S.R. governmental system. There can be no development of individual freedom or cooperative brotherhood under such a system. Further, the time is not ripe for the creation of a world community under one authority. It is futile to dream of integrating all individual States by force; and even if it could be done, the administrative machinery and police force of a super-State might be seized by gangster elements. The major nations clearly have no intention of exchanging their individual sovereignties for a new universal regime, or of abandoning their ideologies in favour of a "social contract" conception. The Russians themselves have frequently indicated that they would never surrender their Veto power in the U. N. Security Council; and in other countries, both great and small, nationalist spirit has never been more vivid than it is to-day. With what pride and fervour men declare—"I am an American—a Canadian—an Englishman—an Indian—an Israeli!" Unification of communities can come about only when the system of law that is to be observed has the implicit consent of the people

because it embodies the majority's conception of justice; that is to say, when communities have reached the stage of acknowledging and adhering to the same moral standards. It is an illusion to suppose that a universal constitutional structure can be founded on community of interests—on fear of war or on hope of economic advantage and improved "way of living"—or, in short, on anything else than a common moral sense of what is right or wrong.

Communism is widespread, not only in countries demoralized by war, but also in those that boast high standards of democratic liberty and "way of living." The programme enlists, under one banner of revolt and new hope, much suffering and many resentments, jealousies and ambitions. Western democracies may derive from it some useful lessons and warnings about the conditions that are indispensable if brotherly love is to vanquish egotism and cupidity and apathy in their own and other countries. They may ponder over views, often expressed of late, that the situation that has favoured the spread of communism is ascribable in large part to the convulsions through which Western civilization has passed since the French revolution; to the loosening of the family bond; and to the failure of democracy to provide the steadying and integrating influence needed to fill the void. In fact, in order to account for the success of Communism, democracy must search its own record and note the deformities which democratic society has produced. Fresh hierarchies have arisen on the ruins of outworn privileges and vested interests. The resurgence of peoples against ancient servitudes has shattered the fabric of law and order in many lands, and loosed new miseries. Liberty is misconstrued as a warrant for licentiousness, and equality as emancipation from irksome obligation. Democratic government, designed to serve the people and to protect the dignity and freedom of the individual by providing equality of opportunity for all, is sometimes perverted from its course by the corruptive effect of power upon those who exercise it, by pressure-group intrigue for political or venal ends, or by the tendency of bureaucracy to expand, to invent vexatious regulations, to become indolent and despotic. Western democracies may also take note of the potency of hunger as a physiological motive force; of the special dangers to human relationships involved in bigoted adhesion to socialist or capitalist convictions; of the need for periodic revision of a democratic constitution so that it may fit changing conditions; and, in particular, of

the grave harm that may be caused by impulsive and indiscriminating encouragement of so-called "freedom" movements in dependent countries. These are often, in the main, but manifestations of the collapse of the economic and administrative systems as a result of the world war. The "great wind blowing" across South East Asia is not just the cleansing breath of patriotism purging out alien rule and exploitation (which are passing anyway), but in great part a turbulence of the underworld avid for loot and power, of brash youth excited by facile acquisition of lethal weapons. Communism thrives in the chaos that follows disorder in the countryside and dislocation of the delicate mechanism of industry and commerce. The fruitful outcome of long contact between Western and Eastern cultures and enterprise in such countries can mature but slowly and under peaceful conditions. Each side needs the other's support. If ancient partnerships are disrupted by violent expulsion of Europeans and Americans, and by the uprooting of Western culture and ideologies, the result might be unimaginably disastrous for world peace and would frustrate indefinitely hopes for the eradication of race antagonisms and for the cementing of brotherhood.

But the issue upon which the fate of man, and his brotherhood and his civilization must ultimately depend is whether he retains or discards belief in God. God is not mocked by science or by any other challenge. Belief in Him, as the source of justice, truth and love, is the world's sole hope for salvation in present perils. What can be done to strengthen and renew that belief? The vogue achieved by agnostic movements is held to be largely due to the erection by Christianity in the past of a false system of authority, which, by increasing the power and profit of the privileged and destroying liberty, created hostility to the whole priestly regime and to the idea of Divine purpose, as infringing human dignity and freedom. The proliferation of dogma, giving birth to sectarianism and pharisaism, and arraying churches against churches, is also charged to have weakened allegiance and to have contributed to a deep misunderstanding as to the true authority of God.

The Churches have long been studying these imputations, and are not oblivious of the fact that they themselves have contributed to the evils that they are tempted to blame wholly on the secularization of society. They appreciate that the teachings of communism are in part a reaction to the chequered record of a professedly Christian society; they know the vital

need for a solidarity of Churches; and they recognize that Christianity must aim at furthering the creation of a society in which "freedom is the freedom of men who acknowledge responsibility to justice and public order, and where those who hold political authority or economic power are responsible for its exercise to God and the people whose welfare is affected by it." Christianity to-day is valiantly engaged in the crusade to rekindle loyalty to the Cross and to witness for Christ before all peoples.

Christians are, however, but a minority, though a growing minority, of the earth's peoples to whom is vouchsafed a "Consciousness of the Divine." Because the religious world is being pushed back to its main defences, and because what Bertrand Russell calls "cosmic impiety" is spreading, we have to rescue and sustain not only the Christian revelation but the very idea of God and what it means to mankind. Wherever God is known to men, Christ's revelation will infallibly conquer in the long run. But if civilization casts out God, man loses his fight against the rulers of darkness of this world, and all that he has built may be destroyed down to the foundations. That is why it is now of supreme importance to array together all people who believe that the universe is created and ordered by God. Differences between creeds and faiths and philosophies, the source of so much bigotry, discord and strife in the past, seem to be of little moment in the present crisis when we desperately need to establish a brotherhood of mankind. If a man believes in God, and loves his neighbour, what does it matter whether his form of worship is primitive and animistic or whether, as the product of centuries of religious experience, it is ritualistic, latitudinarian, mystical or philosophical.

How can a new alliance be forged? The God-fearing nations and peoples have it in their power to take an important and practical step in defence of the concepts of goodness, justice and virtue; a step which will help to convince men that imponderable spiritual forces are the true reality, and that only through their aid will humanity achieve peace, liberty and ascension in nature.

When the United Nations Charter was hammered out, it was not endowed with a philosophy that could evoke spiritual enthusiasm and kindle noble emotions spurring men and nations to unanimity and brotherly love. The "Principles and Purposes" of the Charter make appeal mainly to men's materialistic ambitions—for the blessings of peace, for equality of opportunity, for "self-determination" and for other advantages

to which men believe they are entitled as of right. There was no invocation for God's blessing on the greatest enterprise that mankind had ever launched; no reference to ideals of goodness and virtue, or to traditional conventions of morality; but merely phrases which might, or might not, be construed as implying moral obligation. It is no wonder that the high hopes founded on the organization have dwindled. How can our civilization endure and go forward as a predominantly secular and God-less concern? The pacts of the League of Nations and of the United Nations were understandably, though regrettably, quarantined from religion, because religious and agnostic nations had to be associated by them in a common purpose. But the shunning of elementary moral ideas was less pardonable. When the North Atlantic Pact was made, between nations professedly religious, there was a diffident and tentative advance. The Treaty came nearer to being a manifesto of the values that alone can give inspiration for the survival of civilization. Its Preamble referred to "the principles of democracy, individual liberty and *the rule of law*; and in Article 2 there is mention of "strengthening . . . free institutions by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded." The pact definitely goes beyond the text of the Charter in its insistence upon political liberty and the rule of law. At the signature ceremonies, Mr. Acheson (U.S.A.) declared: "The reality is the unity of belief, of spirit, of interest of the community of nations represented here;" Count Sforza (Italy) boldly said: "We must pray to God that this pact will prove to be like the English Magna Carta;" and Dr. de Mata (Portugal) observed that Europe's "moral forces are now exerted, in an effort to correct her ills." The U.S.A. White Paper on the Pact said that, by "enabling its members to confront a potential aggressor with preponderant power—military, economic and *spiritual*—", the Pact would help to restore confidence and security. There is some reminder in all this of Abraham Lincoln's great utterance "that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

Individual nations, whether Christian or not, have no hesitation in confessing their dependence on God. President Truman, in honoring "Our Heroic Dead," said: "The people of our nation may appeal to Almighty God for help, in turning the steps of the world to the paths of permanent peace." India would never dream of disavowing God's help and protection.

Prime Minister Nehru recently said: "Unless there is a moral basis both in internal politics of a nation and in its external affairs, that nation will suffer, and the world will suffer." Pakistan means to frame its Constitution on the principle that the Islamic State derives its authority through the people from God; and the new State of Israel is of course imbued with the prophetic wisdom of Isaiah. It is very significant that when U. N. officials proposed that a "non-denominational prayer room" should be set apart in the new Manhattan headquarters, (the first official act of deference ever paid by the United Nations to the concept of a Divine Power), the mail brought a flood of enthusiastic letters from all parts of America and from other countries. The scheme failed, for the time being, but the Secretary-General, Mr. Trygvie Lie, then arranged that meetings of the U.N.O. should be opened with a period of silent prayer and meditation, so that members should have an opportunity to express in their own way their dedication to common ideas.

Primitive man struggled merely to secure foothold in creation. Modern man must fight for access to higher destiny. By virtue of his free-will endowment, he can select the right path if he seeks guidance not from his intellect or his animal cravings but from his subconscious vision of perfection. This is the true evolutive instinct, which directs man towards spiritual fulfilment instead of merely to domination over environment; which enables him to abandon the scaffolding of material development, to free himself from materialistic thralldom, and to ascend to the liberty befitting human dignity. Because the motives that stir men's hearts when vital issues have to be decided are ideological and not material, therefore man's relation to God is the basis of any valid claim to freedom, education, equality of opportunity, dignity of the individual, or any other "human rights." No political edifice or social mechanism will avail to maintain civilization unless it is firm-based in the moral and mental qualities of the people who compose it. As Mr. Churchill said at Boston, we must move forward "in the discharge of our duty and our mission, fearing God and nothing else."

That is why it is a matter of the highest practical importance, on psychological grounds, that in all agreements between nations and peoples who have not tried to side-track God, His protection and guidance should be invoked; that where the performance of any joint duty or undertaking under such agreements has its roots in moral obligation, that fact should be

proclaimed, not slurred over or concealed; and that morality should be exalted as the supreme purpose and principle of common action because man is created in God's image.

If the brotherhood of mankind is to be linked in the bond of peace, all men who search after God must be enrolled—in every land, of every colour, of every culture, and of every Faith.

What the world needs now is a catholic religious belief, tolerating and embracing in brotherhood all churches and all faiths and philosophies that are rooted in the knowledge of God.