

VII. REPORT OF THE RACIAL STUDY COMMISSION

INTRODUCTION

The Council of the Diocese of Virginia that met in Richmond in January 1959 convened at a time of crisis. Racial problems that have been a part of Virginia's history since 1619 had been intensified by a decision reached in 1954 by the Supreme Court of the United States. By the end of 1958, these problems had reached such a stage, particularly in the field of public education, that they consumed the interest of most Virginians.

Problems of such magnitude become of necessity matters of concern to all Christians, and therefore to all members of our Diocese. The Council decided, however, that no racial problems within the Church were so pressing as to require precipitate action. Our Church deals with issues of the day in the light of truth as revealed in Christ, her Lord. The Council decided that, when it is to speak on questions of such complexity, it should speak only after prayer, search, deliberation and reconciliation. With the hope that it might assist the Church in this Diocese on matters pertaining to racial questions, the Council directed that this Commission be created.

The Council directed that this Commission:

“. . . be composed of not more than thirty communicants, including both races, men and women, distributed as evenly as possible among the geographical localities of the Diocese, and between clergy and laity, and among persons of differing opinions. . . .”

These criteria were met exactly in the members appointed. Eleven clergymen, four women and fifteen laymen from many parts of the Diocese were carefully selected to represent all points of view on the racial issue. Three of them were Negroes, a clergyman, a university professor and a leader in the Woman's Auxiliary of the Church. The Council stated that persons of differing opinions should be appointed and we alone know so well the measure of difference of opinion.

Our tasks were specified by the Council. We have sought to keep them before us at all times and repeat them here, for they must be borne in mind continuously in the review of this report. The resolution of the Council required us:

“a. To pray for and seek earnestly knowledge of the will of God concerning the relationship between members of different races, that it may lead this Diocese both to perceive and know what things we ought to do and to have grace and power faithfully to fulfill the same.

“b. To study and search for a definition of the area of the Church's concern in all aspects of the field of racial relationships.

“c. To provide leadership by finding areas of genuine agreement wherever possible.

"d. To study and reappraise all Diocesan policies concerning racial matters in the light of the current situation.

"e. To report results and recommendations as to all of its deliberations to the 1960 Council of the Diocese.

"f. To receive, consider and study all resolutions, petitions and communications pertaining to racial matters which may be referred to it by this Council of the Diocese, the Executive Committee or by any Diocesan organization, or any communicant with the purpose in mind of maintaining communications on this subject within the Diocesan family."

We have met on numerous occasions. These meetings have taken place every month since the Commission was appointed. On each occasion we have devoted a full day—and on some occasions part of a second—to our discussions. Committees of the Commission have met at intervals between sessions of the Commission.

We have sought first, guiding principles. We have then recognized that to understand the problems of today one must understand their source; we have, therefore, examined briefly the history of the racial question in our Diocese. Then we have considered these problems as we see them today, first in our Diocese and next in the world around us, and we have concluded with a few suggestions as to how, in our view, we, as members of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia, can best strive to find answers to these questions.

We cannot pass to the body of our report without a word or two of personal comment. We came to the Commission from varying backgrounds with many preconceptions. We submit our report with a realization of the infirmity of many of these preconceptions and a renewed respect and regard for the viewpoints of those with whom we differ. We have, we believe, approached our duties prayerfully and we believe also that, in our meetings, we have achieved a spirit of reconciliation that has far exceeded our expectations. In a word, even though our labors may have no effect throughout our Diocese, they have profoundly affected us as individuals and churchmen. Our rewards in working together have been many.

Yet it would not, of course, be correct to say that all who sign this report concur wholeheartedly in every statement that it contains. From diversity of viewpoint, we have sought, as we were directed, areas where most men of good will can agree. There are many of us who, as individuals, would change the emphasis in our discussion of some questions or highlight some conclusion when another is stressed, in the report that follows. But what we have to say here is our best judgment of what is right and should be said in our Diocese at this time, and we are in general agreement on the recommendations that this report contains.

GUIDING PRINCIPALS

"Hear what our Lord Jesus Christ saith.

'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it; Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets.'"

—The Book of Common Prayer.

Christians are committed to a way of life and accept certain standards of conduct when they respond to God as revealed in Jesus Christ and become members of His church. These standards of conduct are summarized in the two great commandments that we should love God with our whole being and our neighbor as ourselves. These commandments are the basis of Christian morality. They are unqualified, timeless precepts with unchanging validity.

There are many times when the application of those precepts to any particular situation is not clear. This is notably true in attempting to find solutions to racial problems. This report seeks to help toward such solutions.

Christians do not cease to be Christians because they differ in their views and in their understanding of what the obligation of love for their neighbor now requires of them. As individuals and as groups, we Christians must wrestle with our own consciences, seeking God's transforming grace, guidance, and help to know and to do what His commandments of love require of us in the immediate situation. As we do this, we should penitently acknowledge before God that our efforts will be influenced by our individual backgrounds, experiences, fears, aspirations and color. We acknowledge that Christians do disagree with one another, but it should be done with honesty, mutual respect, charity and humility, under the judgment of Almighty God.

A HISTORY OF RACIAL MATTERS IN OUR DIOCESE

Official Diocesan Policy

Our Diocese must face and attempt to solve racial problems which began with the bringing of Negroes to Jamestown in 1619, for it was then that the concern and policies of the Diocese had a beginning. These have been described in a pamphlet written by our Historiographer and former Archdeacon of Colored Work, the Rev. G. MacLaren Brydon, D. D. This pamphlet is one among the many documents studied by this Commission; it includes the history prior to 1860 which we do not here discuss.

The Diocese of Virginia is governed by the Constitutions and Canons of the General Church and of the Diocese. Therefore any "official" policies are found only in these Constitutions and Canons as from time to time amended and interpreted.

202 165TH ANNUAL COUNCIL DIOCESE OF VIRGINIA (1960)

Before 1860 there was no "official" policy stated in the Constitution and Canons. Since that time there have been only three basic changes in policy, each one preceded by much concern, study and debate.

First, in 1860, a report recommending "the formation of people of color into separate and distinct congregations" was accepted by Council. This policy was affirmed by Council in 1866 and provision was made for such congregations to elect "Vestry, Warden and Ministers."

Second, in 1886, a Canon was adopted which combined Negro congregations into the Colored Missionary Jurisdiction and provided that there be an annual convocation of the colored members of the Church.

Third, in 1949, all references to "Negro" were eliminated from the Constitution and Canons. Initial action was taken in 1948 to remove such references from the Constitution.

These are the three major changes in the "official" policy of the Diocese in regard to its Negro members. Of course, there were many variations in the application of these policies during the periods indicated, but the policy since 1949 is that every Negro clergyman and lay person has the same "official" status as white clergymen and lay persons.

THE YEARS BEFORE 1900

Some developments during each of the periods seem worth noting. First is the fact that the Diocese took action to give Negroes status in the Church prior to the War Between the States. The Diocese knew then and thereafter that its Negro members would need financial and other assistance in order to secure buildings in which to worship and to obtain educational opportunities. The Council often called on white clergy and congregations to render such assistance. Such calls met with varying degrees of response.

The largest concentrations of Negro Episcopalians were in Petersburg and in Brunswick County, and in these two places the Church began educational institutions for Negroes. In 1878 The Bishop Payne Divinity School was started in Petersburg to train Negroes for the ministry. This was the only seminary solely for Negroes in our Church and from the beginning was operated as an arm of the Virginia Theological Seminary in Alexandria.

The Divinity School's Board of Trustees made determined efforts to increase Negro representation in the school's administration. In 1940 there was but one Negro trustee; in 1949 there were seven and Negroes filled three of the six-full-time faculty posts.

In 1882, the Rev. James Solomon Russell, one of the few Negro priests of the Diocese, started a school in Lawrenceville, Brunswick County. It began with 54 Negro students and today has grown into St. Paul's College, an accredited institution with an enrollment of about 400.

In 1892 the Diocese was divided geographically and both of these institutions, as well as most Negro communicants, were in the newly formed

Diocese of Southern Virginia. There remained only 148 Negro communicants in the Diocese of Virginia after the division. Nevertheless, the Diocese of Virginia continued to feel an official and moral responsibility to support these two educational institutions, and it did so.

THE FIRST HALF OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

An Archdeacon for Colored Work was appointed by the Diocese of Virginia in 1901 to guide its work among Negroes. This office was continued until 1930 when its function was made the responsibility of the Bishop Coadjutor. The Colored Convocation, authorized in 1886, was provided automatic representation in the Council.

During this period, where a Negro congregation found no school available for Negro children in its community, efforts were made to start a parochial day school. By the year 1921, there were in the Diocese eight Negro clergymen serving sixteen congregations with 347 communicants. In the same year there were eight parochial schools for Negro children with 231 pupils in attendance.

As public schools became more available in rural areas these parochial schools either closed or were consolidated. Three of them were brought together at Grace Church, Miller's Tavern, and by 1931 had become the John Moncure School with 104 pupils. This was expanded to include boarding students, both boys and girls.

After 1940, as transportation of children to public schools improved, the number of applicants declined. By 1949 there were insufficient applications for admission to John Moncure School to justify continuance of the school. Accordingly, the school was not reopened for the following year. Its assets were liquidated and invested with the Trustees of the Diocesan Missionary Society, and the income, supplemented by annual Diocesan appropriations, has been used to aid Negro Episcopal youth to attend Church-supported colleges. During the period 1950-59, sixty such scholarships have been granted.

CHANGES IN 1949

In retrospect, it is significant that the 1949 change of policy giving the Negro the same "official" status as white members of the Diocese was adopted five years before the Supreme Court ruled that public schools could not be segregated on the basis of race. The 1949 Council's committee to study and make recommendations as to changes in the Constitution and Canons reported in part:

" . . . we have become convinced that the great majority of the Negroes feel that our Constitution and Canons establish a form of segregation of Negro churchmen which they believe to be hurtful to themselves as a race and as members of the Protestant Episcopal

Church. We believe that if the great majority of our Negro communicants as brethren within our Church look upon our present Canons as hurtful in their development, or in any sense derogatory, it will be desirable to amend Constitution and Canons in such a way as to leave no suggestion of different status between the White and Negro members of our Diocese."

The Committee's recommendation was adopted by substantial majorities, the laymen voting 79 to 18 in favor, and the clergy 77 to 1. A result of this action was that Negroes lost their previously automatic representation, through their own convocation, on the Executive Committee of the Diocese and on its various boards and committees. Thereafter they would be considered along with white churchmen in election to these posts.

The feeling of the Negro about segregation within the life of the Church, as reported to the Council, was reflected in another event that also occurred in 1949. Because of a decline in the number of applicants and divergency of views as to the propriety of a segregated seminary, the Bishop Payne Divinity School was closed at the end of the 1949-50 session. As a result, the Church was left with no seminary in the South where it could train Negroes for the ministry. The Board of Trustees of the Virginia Theological Seminary in Alexandria decided that Negroes would be admitted to that institution. Since that time, the income from the Bishop Payne Divinity School funds has been used solely to aid education of Negroes for the ministry of our Church. From this background it will be seen that the admission of Negroes to the Virginia Theological Seminary was a necessary step to preserve and enlarge the work of the Church among Negroes.

THE HISTORY OF INTEGRATED YOUTH CONFERENCES

A matter of controversy in the Diocese has been the desegregation of youth conferences. No member of the Commission knew exactly how the summer youth conferences at Roslyn had been desegregated. It required a study of the minutes of the Department of Christian Education, of the Special Interracial Commission of 1954-55, of the Roslyn Trustees, and of the Council Journals in order to piece together the story. Since the action was of vital concern to so many members of the Diocese, it seems worthwhile to outline the information that we secured.

The question of desegregating youth conferences had been discussed in the Department of Christian Education at least as early as July 10, 1951, and it was discussed from time to time thereafter.

We could discover no record as to what groups or individuals made the initial decision to hold interracial conferences at Shrine Mont. The following is the recorded sequence of events with regard to Roslyn, with one reference to Shrine Mont.

June 21, 1954—The Department of Christian Education unanimously adopted a resolution addressed to the Memorial Trustees of Roslyn re-

requesting them to allow integrated youth activities at Roslyn. They decided to ask the advice of the Special Interracial Commission of 1954-55 before sending the resolution to the Roslyn Trustees. (The later history reveals that this resolution was sent to the Roslyn Trustees in July 1954 before its consideration by the Special Interracial Commission.)

September 7, 1954—The Special Interracial Commission unanimously endorsed the proposal and “respectfully does suggest a quiet, tactful and gradual execution of the policy in the event the resolution is honored by the Trustees of Roslyn.”

January 31, 1955—The Department of Christian Education decided that the Family Conference to be held at Shrine Mont the following summer would be integrated. A letter was sent to all clergy asking them to explain this fact to all applicants.

May 25-26, 1955—A summary of these actions was contained in the annual report of the Department of Christian Education which was delivered orally and in writing to the Council. The report was received “with thanks.”

November 12, 1955—The Department of Christian Education adopted another statement addressed to the Roslyn Trustees. This communication reaffirmed the Department’s “conviction that the ministry of the Diocese of Virginia to its youth is impaired by regulations which separate the youth of our Church by color or by sex. . . .” The communication called to the attention of the Trustees what it termed “the policy statement” adopted by the Council the preceding May, quoting the resolution which had been adopted, which stated that it is the principle of the Christian ethic that the people of the Diocese make every effort to eliminate all barriers to free fellowship for people of different races in the Church’s life.

November 22, 1955—The Roslyn Trustees adopted the following resolution:

“That the Trustees will permit summer youth conferences (pre-college age) at Roslyn integrated by race and segregated by sex.”

They adopted another resolution as follows:

“That week-end conferences of representatives from parishes of Diocesan Young People’s Fellowships be permitted at Roslyn without racial restrictions.”

It should be noted that all decisions in regard to desegregating the conferences at Roslyn were made by white communicants of the Diocese. There is no record that the change of policy was discussed by either the Executive Committee or the Council.

The conferences at Roslyn were operated in the summer of 1956 on the basis permitted by the Trustees. In his report to the Department of Christian Education in September of that year, the Executive Secretary stated that: "The interracial factor was not the problem anticipated and it was felt by all that the grouping by sexes and age groups was much better than the old plan."

THE LAST SIX YEARS

In 1954 the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that public schools could not be segregated on the basis of race. The effects of this decision in the State of Virginia and within the area of our Diocese are known to all. Certain of these effects on the life of our Church in this Diocese require mention here.

We are acutely aware that every position taken by Church members in the political, legal and social struggle revolving around the public school issue is reflected within the life of our Diocese. We have tried to consider frankly the resulting fears, accusations and points of view. We believe that there are deep problems within the life of our Diocese. Primary among these is the deterioration of communication, not only between the races but also within the white race, where friends have ceased to discuss racial matters with other friends whom they know to take an opposing point of view.

"Lack of communication" is a hackneyed phrase but no other seems to do so well. By it we mean that often there exists an unwillingness or reluctance or inability to discuss. Lack of communication may also involve the conscious or unconscious lack of knowledge of facts. It likewise may be due to fear of scorn, ridicule or bitterness. We feel that lack of communication is a serious hindrance to the solution of many of our present difficulties in regard to racial matters.

Frequently, actions of the Council are not adequately communicated to the laity throughout the Diocese. As an illustration, many lay people were unaware that all distinctions of race were removed from the Constitution and Canons by the Council in 1949. In addition there has been division between laity and clergy, accentuated by resolutions and letters to newspapers. There have been assertions that the "authorities of the Diocese" are trying to lead us toward integration. There have been pronouncements and actions by the National Council which disturbed Church members in Virginia. Fear has been expressed by some white people that an effort was under way to abolish Negro congregations, leaving only white congregations with which the Negroes might worship. There has been a deep-seated fear that bringing whites and Negroes together will eventually lead to intermarriage.

We have examined, studied and discussed each of these and many other problems which have been brought to our attention. We have sought to understand what the Negro wants, his humiliation, his hurts, and his

struggles—as interpreted to us by the Negro members of this Commission. In the sections that follow we state a few of the conclusions that we have reached.

RACIAL MATTERS WITHIN THE DIOCESE OF VIRGINIA

Having reviewed the history of racial matters within the Diocese of Virginia, we now direct our attention to certain current problems in specific areas in our Church life. Here, reference is made to the Constitution and Canons of the Diocese; the status of resolutions; Negro parishes and Negro communicants; clergy-laity relationships; Church Schools and Church-related institutions; Diocesan camps and conferences. Before going into a discussion of these areas, though, we must speak briefly of the nature of our Church, her authority and discipline.

THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH

We have been guided by the principle stated in the Prayer Book that the Church is “the Body of which Jesus Christ is the Head and all baptized persons are the members”. The Church is described in the Creeds as “One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic”; words that are officially interpreted in the Offices of Instruction. There, our Church, speaking of the universality of The Church, declares that she holds the Faith for all time, in all countries, and for all people, and is sent to preach the Gospel to the whole world.

This can mean nothing less than that God, through Christ, has called all men to salvation, and that all believing, penitent, baptized Christians, regardless of color or race, are equally members of Christ’s Body, and that no member should be denied the privilege of worshipping God in fellowship with other members of the Church.

We have also borne in mind Article XX of the Articles of Religion of the Protestant Episcopal Church. This says: “The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies and authority in Controversies of Faith. . . .” The Preface of the Prayer Book declares that “what cannot be clearly determined to belong to Doctrine must be referred to Discipline; and therefore, by common consent and authority, may be altered . . . or otherwise disposed of, as may seem most convenient for the edification of the people, ‘according to the various exigency of times and occasions.’ ”

Our Church has exercised such regulatory discipline through the enactment of Canons. Whenever she has so done, laity as well as clergy are under obligation to abide by the disciplinary enactments contained in the Canons.

RESOLUTIONS

Some resolutions of the Council direct policy for Diocesan agencies which are under its authority. Other resolutions adopted by the Council have only moral, informative and persuasive force. Resolutions, whether

by General Convention or by Diocesan Council, do not have the same authority as the Constitution and Canons. Although resolutions represent only the opinion of the majority of those voting, it is the unquestioned right and responsibility of the Council to adopt resolutions on subjects on which it feels that it should speak. When the Council does adopt a resolution it should have moral, informative and persuasive force with the communicants of the Diocese. Minority opinions are not un-Christian merely because they are in dissent.

NEGRO PARISHES AND NEGRO COMMUNICANTS

With these principles in mind, we first consider our relationship with Negro parishes and Negro communicants. As we have already stated, the Canons of our Diocese do not contain the word "Negro". This was the result of changes made in 1949. It was done before the United States Supreme Court decision in 1954. The deletion of the word has provided for the full participation of members of all races in the corporate life of the Diocese. We see no need at this time for further canonical changes or constitutional amendments.

By action of the council, Negro communicants were given in 1860 the right, if they desired it, to establish their own congregations. This right was reaffirmed after the end of the War Between the States by a resolution of the Council adopted in May, 1866. It reads as follows:

"RESOLVED, That whenever the colored members of the Church in any parish desire to form a new and separate congregation, such action shall have the sanction of this Diocese. They shall be considered as under the care of this Council and their interest as represented in it by the Standing Committee on Colored Congregations."

From these actions it is apparent that it was the desire of the Diocese to give the colored members of the Church freedom to organize in separate congregations. The deletion of the word "Negro" from the Constitution and Canons in 1949, did not eliminate these Negro congregations. They still exist. They are rightful and canonical parts of the Diocesan structure, and as such are to be maintained and encouraged.

Members of our Church, regardless of their color, have always and everywhere had the right to worship God with any congregation. This right stems from the very nature of the Church. A priest would violate his ordination vows were he to refuse the sacraments and ministrations of the Church to anyone solely because of his color.

A corollary to one's right to worship is that no Christian, regardless of color, has the moral right to cause intentional harm to any other person or congregation.

THE ASSIGNMENT OF CLERGY

We were asked by the Department of Missions to express our views as to the advisability of using white clergymen to serve Negro congregations. We replied that, in our unanimous opinion, it should not be the policy of the Diocese to assign white clergymen to Negro churches. But we recognized the difficulty that the Department of Missions has met in securing Negro clergymen. As a practical matter, we stated that we saw nothing wrong in assigning a white clergyman to a Negro church until a Negro clergyman could be secured, if it is agreeable to the white clergyman and to the vestry of the Negro church.

CLERGY-LAITY RELATIONS

The clergyman is trained to be a spiritual leader. In his ordination he is charged to proclaim the word of God, to administer the sacraments, and to minister to the people committed to his care. For these purposes he is called by laymen to their parish.

The clergy rightly must feel that the will of God, as revealed in Christ, cannot be compromised. But no clergyman should claim to know the will of God perfectly or to consider that his guidance is always without flaw. At times laymen disagree with each other and with the clergy on the application of Christian principles. Both the clergyman and the layman have a right to expect from each other a sensitive understanding of their respective positions, especially when they disagree. The layman rightly asks that the clergyman preach with humility, that he approach controversial issues with care not to confuse his personal views with the will of God.

CHURCH SCHOOLS AND CHURCH-RELATED INSTITUTIONS

The Church Schools in the Diocese of Virginia were characterized by the Dean in his last report to the Council as "schools guided by laymen and clergy committed, though imperfectly, to the Christian Faith and to the Church and concerned to exercise their responsibilities as trustees for you and the Church." The Church Schools are governed by a Board of Trustees, nominations to which are made by the Council. In addition, each school has its own local board. Although the Council has no immediate technical jurisdiction over the schools, these are indeed "our schools" and annual reports on the policies and performance of the schools are made to the Council.

Without endowment and in some instances with meager material resources, the schools have grown in number and in service over a period of forty years. They are almost entirely self-supporting. In order to acquire properties and to make capital additions, bonds have been issued by the Church School System. Additionally, substantial capital funds have been

contributed by patrons and friends of the individual schools. The outstanding bonds of the System now amount to more than \$1,100,000. These bonds are being retired by periodic payments from the income of the schools. The schools are striving to establish and maintain faculty salaries at just and attractive levels.

They are striving, within the limits of their income, to keep a balance between obligations to teachers and obligations to parents, students, bondholders and the Diocese. Any action taken by the Trustees must be weighed against this total responsibility.

On April 26, 1955, the Board of Trustees of the Church School System stated the policy for admission to the schools as follows:

"The criterion for each admission of a student to the Church Schools in the Diocese of Virginia is: 'Will the admission be best for this child and for the school?' Whenever a positive answer can be given, and there is a vacancy, the child is admitted. The Board is keenly aware of its responsibility to deal impartially with the entire constituency of the Diocese in relation to the Church Schools."

This is the policy established by the Board of Trustees, and each application for admission to a given school is considered by those responsible in the light of their total responsibility.

The other so-called "Diocesan-Related Institutions" are related to the Diocese in a wide variety of ways. Some were created by action of the Diocesan Council. The Bishop is president of some of the boards. Some receive Diocesan funds from the operating budget of the Diocese; some solicit funds from many parishes and communities. Most of these institutions have boards made up solely of communicants of the Diocese. Some are related to the Departments of Christian Social Relations and Christian Stewardship. These institutions, like the Church Schools, were established in response to specific needs of people in the Diocese. In many instances, they have faced material and administrative problems similar to those of the Church Schools.

That the Boards of these institutions are striving to meet their responsibilities to all the people of the Diocese is evidenced by two recent actions. A Negro applicant was admitted to St. Anne's Home, in Greene County, but, for reasons over which the Board of the Home had no control, the applicant did not enter the Home. The trustees of the Virginia Diocesan Home, in Richmond, declined a contribution in a substantial amount which was conditioned upon the maintenance of the Home as a segregated institution.

We are confident that the boards and trustees of the Church Schools and the other Diocesan-related institutions are seeking solutions to problems arising from race in the context of the many factors which they must necessarily consider. We deem it inappropriate to make any specific recom-

mendations to these boards and trustees. However, we commend this report and the spirit in which we reached our conclusions to them with the hope that they will be aided in the solution of the problems with which they are confronted.

CAMPS AND CONFERENCES

We have given thorough consideration to the development of the policy of racial desegregation at the Camps and Conferences conducted under the auspices of the Department of Christian Education in our Diocese. We find that there is wide disagreement on what is best for the total life of the Diocese in the matter. While the authority for determining how the facilities at Shrine Mont and Roslyn may be used, rests in autonomous bodies, the Council does determine policy as to Diocesan Camps and Conferences. Therefore, we respectfully submit the following recommendation to the Council:

We have found with great sorrow that at this time there are deep differences among us about the desegregation of Diocesan Camps and Conferences. Some of us feel that desegregation was a step forward, others that it was a step backward. Still others feel that the change was made in a way that evoked deep and serious misunderstandings which have injured the unity of the Diocese. In the solidarity of Christian brotherhood, therefore, and with real suffering on all sides, we recommend that both segregated and desegregated Camps and Conferences be provided at this time. We are aware of the difficulties of administration that such a policy presents, but we believe it can be done on an alternating basis if necessary. This recommendation is motivated by a genuine concern for all of the children of the Diocese.

ISSUES IN THE WORLD AROUND US

When we come together in Diocesan Council or at Divine Worship, we look at the world around us from the point of view of the people of God, gathered in the name of Christ. It is often easier to apply Christian principles to issues that arise in the life of the Church than to issues in the world around us. But as Christians we know that we are the sent people of God, as well as His gathered people, and we are sent as missionaries to the world. The racial question with which we are here concerned cannot be solved just for Virginia; it must be seen as a part of a web of relationships throughout the world. "No man is an island," nor is any Diocese.

Our challenge is as old as the Church itself. It did not arise with the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court. Since the first Council of Jerusalem wrestled with the problems of including both Jews and Gentiles in one Church (Acts 15), the Church has sought to reconcile within itself all sorts of conflicts. The Supreme Court decision posed the old problem in a new and immediate form, but integration in the schools is not the only facet of the problem. The decision and its enforcement have created tensions

and conflicts which are the concern of all Christian people. No man can judge the motives of another; yet the motives of every man are always under the judgment of God.

We have discussed at great length problems in the world around us that are of concern to Christian people, such as public schools, housing facilities, and the use of public places. We have felt, however, that we should concentrate our attention first on problems within the life of the Church in the Diocese. Because of this primary concern, we have not had time to reach definite conclusions on the problems of the world around us and are not prepared to present to the Council any recommendations on these problems.

CONCLUSION

The problems that we have considered in this report will ultimately be met by reasonable men. No one can require a person to change his views, especially if they have been reached in a conscientiously Christian manner. In our deliberations there have been honest disagreements upon particular issues, and we individually do not necessarily endorse each proposal which this report contains. If we as members of a Commission which has met monthly for a year cannot agree completely, we cannot expect complete agreement among other Christians of the Diocese. We can only urge all Christians to reach their conclusions in the light of the Person and teaching of Christ, remembering that the same Gospel which commands us also gives us strength to obey.

Therefore, in the recognition that we can be transformed by Christ to the end that we may obey the Father, we are reassured by the hope that these problems which plague our times will be abated in the future.

B. POWELL HARRISON, JR., *Chairman*
RICHARD R. BAKER III
LEONARD A. BLACKBURN
PAUL D. BROWN
MRS. LESLIE CHEEK, JR.
GEORGE J. CLEAVELAND
E. A. DEBORDENAVE
EDMUND T. DEJARNETTE
THEODORE H. EVANS
CHURCHILL J. GIBSON, SR.
J. CHISMAN HANES
GEORGE R. HUMRICKHOUSE
EPPA HUNTON IV
JAMES KEITH
GORDON LEWIS

BOYD R. HOWARTH
EDWARD MORGAN III
GILBERT C. MCKOWN
EDWARD L. MERROW
HENRY B. MITCHELL
A. T. MOLLEGEN
WILLIAM P. MOORE, JR.
MRS. E. WILSON MORRISON
BARTON PALMER
JOHN GARLAND POLLARD, JR.
JOHN W. RIELY
TINSLEY L. SPRAGGINS
MRS. ELRIC G. STEWART
MRS. IRVING V. TIER
FREDERICK G. WEBER

“Report of the Racial Study Commission”, Journal of the 165th Annual Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia, 1960, Richmond, Virginia, pp. 199-212.