"The Times They Were A-Changing"
The transformation of mission and ministry in the turbulent 1960s

Thursday Evening Presentation to the North Carolina Diocesan Convention
November 17, 2016
The Rev. Dr. N. Brooks Graebner, Historiographer

On April 6, 1959, the Rt. Rev. Edwin A. Penick died in office at the age of 72, having served as a bishop in North Carolina for over 36 years— and over 26 of those as Diocesan. The next month, the convention gathered to pay tribute, to take stock, and to make provisions to move ahead under their new bishop, Richard Henry Baker, who had been serving as bishop coadjutor since 1951.

How might we describe the diocese at this juncture? Here's a snapshot.

1. The 1950s had brought suburban growth to the towns and cities of North Carolina, and the diocese had kept pace—and in some places outpaced—the population growth. For the year 1958 alone, the church had increased in communicant strength by almost 4%. 1959 was the year that Holy Family, Chapel Hill and St. John's, Charlotte were admitted into union as parishes, and St. Stephen's, Durham, St. Alban's, Davidson, and St. Paul's, Cary, were admitted as organized missions. The State of the Church committee reported a clergy shortage and suggested the following remedies: recruiting more lay leadership in the work of evangelism, reviving the perpetual diaconate, and opening a diocesan training center for 2nd-vocation clergy.[1] Such was the tenor of the times.

2. But urban and suburban growth along the crescent between Raleigh and Charlotte was not the only noteworthy aspect of life c. 1959. This growth in the church was concentrated among white families in white neighborhoods. To nourish them in the faith, the diocese mailed in November 1959, and again in November 1960, an Advent Family Worship Book. This is how the diocesan news magazine, *The North Carolina Churchman*, described the project and its deeper intent:

> In the rubric before the service of Family Prayer [in the 1928 BCP], the Church directs that family prayer should be led by the head of the household. This is to say that family worship is the responsibility of the husband and father in each family. Men of our generation have abdicated this responsibility pretty generally. Prayer today is considered a feminine activity. Each man is a priest in his own home is a foreign concept in our culture. Yet, if the Church is ever to regain its vigor and vitality, it must do so on the strength of the dedication of its men to

[1] *Journal of the 143rd Annual Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of North Carolina* (1959): 148-160. Hereinafter abbreviated *NCDJ.*

> reclaim their religious responsibility to lead their families in worship, prayer and instruction. To assist in this emphasis, to initiate family worship in the homes of our Diocese, to call our men to their responsibilities as the Christian leaders of their families, to reclaim the Advent Season for its true purpose, the Department of Christian education dedicates its Advent Bible Reading and Family Worship Booklet.[2]

In light of his subsequent reputation, it is perhaps worth noting that the author of this stirring paean to the patriarchal family was none other than the Rev. John S. Spong, then the Rector of Calvary, Tarboro.

3. By contrast, Black congregations and institutions were languishing. Only one new Black priest was added to the clergy roles in the 1950s. There was no Black church where the priest had that one parish as his sole responsibility, and 3 historically Black congregations were without priests altogether in 1959. Moreover, institutions such as Good Samaritan Hospital, St. Agnes Hospital, and even St. Augustine's College were suffering revenue shortfalls and unaddressed infrastructure needs.[3]

4. One reason for this languishing was the 1954 Supreme Court decision, *Brown v. Board of Education*, which set the nation on a course toward desegregating public institutions—albeit without clear directives as to how this was to be achieved. With regard to desegregation, the Diocese of North Carolina had formally adopted Bishop Penick's position as its own. This is how Penick put the matter in his 1956 convention address:

> My own position . . . might fairly be described as a 'gradualist', a hateful word to many good people. But it seems to me that a human problem so vast in its dimensions, involving the welfare of millions of people . . . is far from simple, and cannot by its very nature, yield to a quick solution. To attempt a speedy answer, or even to expect it, seem to me unrealistic. . . . It does not take into account a massive psychological adjustment, affecting basic attitudes and traditions centuries old, that, for good or for evil, do actually, at the present time, make up the pattern of modern society. This is a mountain of fact and circumstance that only faith in Christ can remove. And with all my heart, I believe that this realistic mountain will be moved and cast into the sea. But the process, inevitably, must be slow.

Penick went on to say that he accepted the Brown decision as settled law and declared that all good citizens should obey the law of the land. He further stated that discrimination is wrong and that justice will prevail. As a practical measure, he called on convention to create "a standing committee, composed of members of both races, to make a continuing study of this issue, and to report annually to this Convention with

---

[2] John S. Spong,"Family Prayer – How Do You Go About It?" *The North Carolina Churchman* (Nov., 1960): 5.
[3] *NCDJ,* 143rd (1959): 155-158.

specific recommendations for such practical action as, in its judgment, may contribute constructively towards an ultimate solution of this major problem for the Church and State." And this the convention did.[4] Tellingly, a study committee "on work among Negroes" chaired by Bishop Coadjutor Baker reported to the same 1956 convention that "it appears certain that Negroes will not attend a segregated camp at the *present* time [italics added]."[5]

5. But race was not the only vexing issue clouding the otherwise robust prospects for the church on the eve of a new decade. There was also the matter of structure and organization. The diocese was still staffed and run much as it had been during the Great Depression, when Penick had assumed the reins of leadership. So when Thomas Smyth, then Rector of Good Shepherd, Rocky Mount, placed before the 1959 Convention a resolution which called on Bishop Baker to appoint a committee on Structure and Organization of the Diocese to study the present state of things and report to Council and Convention in 1960, the motion carried and Baker named six men to get to work.[6]

Everything in this 1959 snapshot would change in the course of the 1960s. It would not change all at once, and it would not change without conflict and controversy, gain and loss. Particular events and particular people galvanized this transformation. But the change would be profound and long-lasting. The diocese today looks much more like the church of 1969 than it does the church of 1959. And if we think that ours is a time of quickening change and pointed conflict, it helps to look at the 1960s for perspective.

This evening I want to trace two topics through the 1960s: the first is how the diocese equipped itself structurally and organizationally to meet the perceived demands for mission and ministry; the second is how the diocese transformed its way of thinking about and responding to racial disparities—in the parlance of this year's convention, lifting every voice and seeking to listen in a new way. And let me add at the outset: these are not two disparate strands. As we shall see, many of the same clergy and lay leaders who spearheaded the organizational changes were vitally interested in seeing the church tackle racial issues.

Structure And Organization

Work on the structure and organization of the diocese began in an intensive way, starting in the fall of 1960, with the appointing of a reconstituted committee under the chairmanship of D. Edward Hudgins of Greensboro. The seven-member committee did not proceed piecemeal. Instead it looked at diocesan structure & organization in its evolution and in its entirety, and at the convention of May, 1962, put forward a comprehensive series of recommendations, laid out in a highly-detailed 75-page report.[7] In the run-up to the 1962 convention, the committee's

---

[4] *NCDJ,* 140th (1956): 63-65.
[5] *NCDJ,* 140th (1956): 161.
[6] *NCDJ,* 143rd (1959): 43.
[7] *Report of the Committee on Structure and Organization to the One Hundred and Forty-Sixth Annual Convention, Diocese of North Carolina, May 1962.* The Committee members were: D.E. Hudgins, Chairman; George H. Esser, Jr., Secretary, the Rev. Thom W. Blair, the Rev. L. Bartine Sherman, the Rev. Huntington Williams, Jr., Thomas J. Pearsall, and Thomas B. Rice. The methodology of the Committee was first laid out in a six-page letter from George

secretary, George Esser, wrote a series of 3 articles for the *North Carolina Churchman* in which he both contextualized and summarized the report.

The committee—and the diocese—were blessed to have a man of Esser's ability working on such a project. At the time he was a parishioner of the Chapel of the Cross and a faculty member of the Institute of Government at the University of North Carolina. A native of Virginia and a graduate of Harvard Law School, Esser had taught in Chapel Hill since 1948 and was the resident expert on urban issues and municipal government. Indeed, he was about to be tapped by Terry Sanford to head up the North Carolina Fund—the premier anti-poverty program in America, which he directed from 1963 to 1968. But in 1962, he was lending his considerable analytical ability to the task of helping the diocese with a major overhaul of its institutional life.[8]

Esser's first article in the *Churchman* was entitled "History Points the Way." He noted how simple diocesan organization was in the 19th century; how it had begun to expand in the first 3 decades of the 20th century, and how it had contracted in the 1930s. He closed that first article by summarizing the 3 main objects of the report: a new diocesan business manager, an overhauled diocesan convention, and a re-purposed Executive (now termed "Diocesan") Council. He asked his readers to consider the following questions: "Can the Diocese afford to manage its far-flung property holdings and a half-million-dollar budget without a full-time employee trained in business management? Can the Convention responsibly study and consider basic legislation according to a pattern worked out in the 19th Century for a leisurely gathering of clergy and laity lasting several days? Can the Executive Council meet the administrative requirements of the 60's with the same procedures and agencies that were adequate in the 20's?"[9]

In his follow-up articles, Esser laid out the case for a diocesan business manager, noting how the current system of overlapping committees with frequent turnover and attendant loss of institutional memory conspired to produce frustration, lack of information, inefficiency, and poor planning. Other recommendations included:

- Keeping a 2-day convention but starting at 10:00 a.m. on the first day, and moving convention from May to January. This calendar change was designed to better align convention with the fiscal year and the program year and improve budgeting.
- Creating a committee on the Convention and the Dispatch of Business to aid in planning the agenda, the collection and dissemination of information, and to serve as a steering committee for the Bishop at the convention.

Esser to Bishop Baker on October 18, 1960. Esser did not think himself well-enough known in the diocese to chair the committee, but he agreed to direct the work of the committee itself and to draft the report. George Esser to the Rt. Rev. Richard H. Baker, D.D. Baker Papers, Archives of the Episcopal Diocese of North Carolina. See also D. Edward Hudgins to Baker, November 1, 1960, Baker Papers, Archives of the Episcopal Diocese of North Carolina.

[8] Robert R. Korstad and James L. Leloudis, *To Right These Wrongs: The North Carolina Fund and the Battle to End Poverty and Inequality in 1960s America* (Chapel Hill, 2010), 64,65.

[9] *The North Carolina Churchman* (February, 1962): 10. Esser also authored "Rapid Growth and Financial Crisis, 1923-1941" in Lawrence F. London and Sarah M. Lemmon, eds., *The Episcopal Church in North Carolina, 1701-1959* (Raleigh, 1987), 346-385.

- Calling for the election of delegates at least two months before convention so that pre-convention material could be distributed in a timely fashion, including information about nominees for diocesan office.
- Making more explicit the long-range planning function of Council and providing Council with materials ahead of meetings.
- Designating by canon a new diocesan officer, the Registrar, to collect and preserve all diocesan records. (The Historiographer would continue to be responsible for preparing materials on the history of the Diocese.)
- Reconstituting convocations as a means to involve clergy and laity in the planning and formulation of diocesan programs and as a means of planning church extension in convocation areas. The committee proposed a canon that would authorize the bishop to appoint convocation presidents, provide for the calling of meetings, and set forth the clergy and lay representation at such meetings.[10]

Behind all these distinct recommendations were the following desirable outcomes:

i. Better informed and increased participation by delegates
ii. More thoughtful planning and better decision-making
iii. Better use of everyone's time and energy (efficiency)—especially the bishop's.
iv. A strengthening of the bonds between congregations and the diocese

The convention of 1962 found the report, its recommendations and its rationale, persuasive and proceeded to implement it. By 1963, the diocese had its first business manager, George Bason, who also served as Registrar; also its first Committee on the Dispatch of Business. By 1964, the canonical changes in the date of convention took effect, and in 1965, a new convocation system was unveiled. 1965 also saw the building of a new diocesan house along the Raleigh beltline and the creation of a new diocesan position: Program Director. Later in the decade, convention would move from Tuesday-Wednesday to Friday-Saturday (1968) and from parish venues to larger institutions (colleges and universities and soon thereafter convention centers) in 1969.[11] All in all, these changes represent a remarkable achievement—and certainly stand as the signal accomplishment of Baker's six years as Diocesan Bishop.[12]

[10] George Esser, "A Business Manager for the Diocese?" *The North Carolina Churchman* (March, 1962): 10ff; "Changes in Diocese Urged," *The North Carolina Churchman* (April, 1962): 5ff.
[11] See *NCDJ,* 1962-1970, passim.
[12] Baker himself noted, "I really feel as though I am participating in important history as I stand on the periphery of this momentous study of the Structure and Organization of the Diocese." Baker to D. E. Hudgins, April 16, 1962. Baker papers, Archives of the Episcopal Diocese of North Carolina.

The Transformation of Racial Policies and Programs:
From Gradualism to the Urgency of the "Urban Crisis"

Whereas Bishop Baker embraced change in diocesan structure and organization, he was content to perpetuate the practices of his predecessor when it came to race relations. Like Penick before him, Baker was a committed "gradualist," that is, he upheld the principle of desegregation while he pursued a deliberate pace for its implementation. In keeping with this policy, Council in 1962 adopted a timetable for the desegregation of summer camps over a 4-year period. By 1965, all diocesan-affiliated institutions had adopted racially-inclusive policies, and the Committee on Racial Subjects, first convened in 1956 to oversee gradualism, declared its work complete.[13]

Viewed from a distance of more than 50 years, gradualism appears tepid: upholding principles of justice and equality while curtailing their implementation; letting the sensibilities of reluctant whites speak louder than the long-suppressed aspirations of Blacks. But even this gradualist policy was met with intransigent opposition from a handful of clergy and congregations committed to preserving lily-white policies and practices. The matter was contested at diocesan conventions throughout the early 1960s, and one ardently segregationist priest, Jimmy Dees in Statesville, went so far as to leave the Episcopal Church and found his own denomination, The Anglican Orthodox Church, in 1963.[14]

Baker stepped down as Diocesan Bishop in July, 1965, after serving for six years. He was succeeded by Thomas A. Fraser, Coadjutor under Baker since 1960. Fraser's approach to societal issues and the church's mission was markedly different from Baker's, something that was already apparent during the time the two men served together. Whereas Baker was largely content to enumerate growth and change within the life of the church, Fraser highlighted the changes in society at large and called on the church to keep pace. In his 1963 convention address, Fraser noted the "tremendous progress being made in the Diocese . . . both in Structure and Organization and in Program," but then added: "we still bear the image in the eyes of many people that we consider ourselves the best church for the best people rather than God's Church for all people. This image which we have earned in the past must be destroyed."[15] A year later, Fraser challenged his convention audience to prepare for profound demographic shifts in North Carolina that would require fresh approaches to clergy deployment and building programs.[16] And in 1965, as he prepared to assume the mantle of Diocesan Bishop, Fraser announced that change, profound societal change, was a given. And the church must change with it.[17]

---

[13] "The Bishop [Baker] stated that his position on matters of race coincides with that of the late Bishop Penick—that of gradualism." *Minutes of the December 6, 1961 Meeting of the Committee on Race.* Baker Papers. Archives of the Episcopal Diocese of North Carolina. The multi-year timetable for integrating diocesan summer camps was announced to the Diocese in the "Bishop's Letter" in the *North Carolina Churchman* (November, 1962): 11. "The Report of the Commission on Race" *NCDJ* 149th (1965): 134.

[14] Gardiner H. Shattuck, Jr., *Episcopalians & Race: Civil War to Civil Rights* (Lexington, Ky.: 2000), 118. On contesting the desegregation of diocesan camps, see for example: *NCDJ* 144th (1960): 149.

[15] *NCDJ* 147th (1963): 83.

[16] *NCDJ* 148th (1964): 79.

[17] *NCDJ* 149th (1965): 85.

Indeed, the signs of change—and of growing restlessness with regard to the pace of racial progress—were already evident, both here in North Carolina and across the nation. At the February 1964 convention, the delegates narrowly defeated a proposal to deny diocesan financial support to any institution or agency which did not open all accommodations and services to all members of the church. A month later, the laymen of the diocese invited noted civil rights activist William Stringfellow to speak about the racial situation in northern urban areas. And in its May 1964 issue, *The North Carolina Churchman* ran two opposing pieces, one by a Chapel Hill physician and the other by a Raleigh attorney, on whether the church should be involved in public protests on behalf of civil rights. Gradualism would not bridge the widening divide.[18]

As Fraser surveyed what was happening in early 1965, he felt that the diocese and the state were being afforded a "second chance" to learn from the mistakes of other American cities with respect to urbanization and race relations. Later that year, in the wake of the Los Angeles riots, he elaborated: in the Bishop's eyes, Watts was vulnerable to arson and death because nothing had been done to plan for housing, jobs, utilities, schools, churches, and recreation. Here is this section of America, he noted, we enjoy a sense of community, a share religious commitment, and undeveloped land. "This means that we have a 'breathing space' in which to plan and prepare for the population growth that can bring us the advantages of large city life, or we can foolishly betray ourselves into believing that we are 'safe.' . . . . We are responsible to God and to one another to use this 'breathing space' immediately and constructively so that we may 'sing' about our cities and not 'weep' over them."[19]

For the ensuing year, Fraser and others in the diocese continued to look for lessons in the experiences of urban America outside North Carolina. Thomas Smith, serving at St. Stephen's, Winston-Salem, spent 15 weeks in training through the Urban Training Center in Chicago. He spent a week living in dereliction on the streets of Chicago; he spent three weeks in his own parish undertaking an analysis of economic power in Winston-Salem, and four weeks touring programs in Memphis TN, Lafayette LA, Columbus OH, and Washington DC. For his part, the Bishop lamented another summer of riots and the rise of extremist groups, and he condemned both the Klan and Black Power for their recourse to violence.[20]

But the time for observation and "second chances" was quickly drawing to an end. In September 1967, General Convention focused its attention on what was happening in America's cities and created the General Convention Special Program (GCSP) fund: a nine-million-dollar grant program over three years to fund projects targeting Black empowerment in the poorest neighborhoods. Moreover, the church elected to bypass its traditional leadership structures—white and Black—in order to establish a more direct pipeline to grassroots organizations working in communities of greatest need.[21]

---

[18] *North Carolina Churchman* (February, 1964): 7; *North Carolina Churchman* (March, 1964): 12; *North Carolina Churchman* (May, 1964): 8,9.
[19] *North Carolina Churchman* (October, 1965): 12.
[20] *North Carolina Churchman* (November, 1966): 5; *North Carolina Churchman* (September, 1966): 2.
[21] Gardiner H. Shattuck, Jr., *Episcopalians & Race: Civil War to Civil Rights* (Lexington, Ky.: 2000), 177-181. A lengthy article explaining the GCSP ran in the *North Carolina Churchman* (December, 1967): 5-7; 10,11.

The diocese followed suit. When convention gathered in early February of 1968, the Rev. Thomas Smyth, now serving in Greensboro, offered this resolution:

> Whereas: The crisis in our society has been recognized as the urgent priority for the mission of the Church, and
>
> Whereas: The General Convention has called upon the Dioceses to become involved in this crisis in American life, and
>
> Whereas: The Diocesan Council set before us a position paper which generated widespread interest and focused our attention for action on this matter in this Convention, and
>
> Whereas: The urban population of the State of North Carolina is chiefly our pastoral responsibility
>
> Therefore be it resolved:
>
> That the 152nd Annual Convention of the Diocese of North Carolina direct the Diocesan Council to adopt this crisis as their chief priority during 1968 by designating an appropriate structure to explore the needs within our own Diocese: to determine available resources; and to develop on the local, area and diocesan levels programs, such as:
>
> 1. Providing scholarships for the poor to attend existing parish nurseries and kindergartens.
> 2. Establishing pre-school educational opportunities for the poor.
> 3. Encouraging churchmen to provide leadership and support for the disadvantaged to be heard in city councils, by housing authorities, and other decision-making groups.
> 4. Supporting efforts on the part of industry and education to enable the unemployed and under-employed to improve themselves through advanced training and to find better opportunities to improve their economic status.
> 5. Sponsoring low-cost housing for the poor.
> 6. Increasing the opportunities for the young to benefit from Diocesan camping and educational facilities.

This motion passed and was adopted.[22]

"Breathing space" was over. The time for engagement was here and now. The assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. in early April served to underscore the urgency. Bishop Fraser was called upon to preach at a Raleigh memorial service for King on Sunday, April 7. His words were printed in the May edition of *The North Carolina Churchman* which bore the cover, "'Urban Crisis' Comes to North Carolina." Fraser noted:

---

[22] *NCDJ* 152nd (1968): 56,57.

> The assassination of this leader of social justice must mark the beginning of action *now* to eradicate the injustices he has so often struggled to bring to our attention. If this is not the case, this day of national mourning will be transformed into a day of national failure to take advantage of another opportunity to correct the evils and wrongs of our society. . . We must continue to dream of a great America for all people, but we must *Act* to make that dream a reality. People so often say that it is a matter of proper timing, but Dr. King's death says, "that time is now!" ….
>
> We are here today because we did not seize our God-given opportunities in the past to change our ways. Too many of us felt that change involved risk of personal loss that we could avoid if we only held out a little longer. Now we have held out too long and risk of personal loss has turned into danger of national chaos that can only be avoided by openness, honesty, and a sincere desire to change regardless of the cost. . . . .
>
> The untimely and shameful murder in Memphis has vindicated and validated Dr. King's gospel. It is our responsibility to make certain that no life given in the cause of justice, truth, and righteousness shall be given in vain.[23]

Throughout the rest of 1968, the diocese struggled to translate the words of Smyth's resolution and Fraser's sermon into credible action. Parishes were encouraged to undertake programs that aligned with the urban crisis initiative as Council looked for the appropriate structure and staffing to engage this work.

What the diocese began to learn was sobering. At its May 1968 meeting, Council heard from Herbert Callender of the GCSP field evaluation unit. Mr. Callender proceeded to question the sincerity of Council members and their ability to design an effective means of speaking to the present crisis. This is what ensued as reported in the Council minutes: "Some discussion of the 'problem' took place. It was pointed out by Mr. Callender and the other Black persons in the room that white people and white racism are the problem. Mr. Callender indicated that the approach of some white people in the room was unrealistic." In Callender's judgment, the approach Council was prepared to take "might be satisfactory to salve white guilt, but it would not accomplish anything among poor people." In the end, Bishop Fraser stepped in to suggest that one Black person be added to diocesan staff as soon as possible and that the $20,000.00 earmarked for the 'Urban Crisis' be used to hire a team to look at the 39 counties comprising the diocese and develop a fact-based program.[24]

In September, Fraser invited George Esser to address clergy conference on the subject of "Urban Problems in North Carolina." Esser was in the latter stages of wrapping up his five-year term as Executive Director of the North Carolina Fund. Looking back on his recent work and looking ahead to what American society might look like in the year 2000, he did not picture utopia. Rather, he warned: "we can expect society, as it approaches the year 2000, to be 'more fragile, more susceptible to hostilities and to polarization along many different lines.'" The problems

---

[23] Thomas A. Fraser, "Whither Now, America?" *North Carolina Churchman* (May, 1968): 2.

[24] Minutes of the Meeting of the Diocesan Council, May 31, 1968. Fraser Papers. Archives of the Episcopal Diocese of North Carolina.

were rooted in our racial history which produced and perpetuated extreme disparities in opportunities for Blacks and whites. But most troubling, he said, was the gap between white and Black attitudes and perceptions. He explained:

> Almost ¾ of all persons polled in North Carolina in a special survey this spring thought that poor people were poor primarily because of lack of education. Negros rated lack of job training, racial discrimination, and the unavailability of jobs as the next most important reasons. But almost 70% of the whites believed that laziness was a major cause of poverty. Whites agreed that job training was important but discounted racial discrimination as a cause of poverty.
>
> The same disagreement extended to the causes of unemployment and reasons why people were on welfare. An astonishing 72% of all whites felt that laziness was the major reason behind unemployment . . . Negroes on the other hand emphasized lack of education, lack of job training and race. . . .
>
> It is not surprising then, in view of the persistent myths, that whites and Negros disagree so violently about the existence of opportunity in North Carolina. 60% of all whites in this state believe that Negroes have access to equal opportunity for jobs and education and housing. Only 6% of Negroes agree. But most whites go even further. They believe that the Negro is an inferior person, that he should not receive equality until he proves that he deserves it . . . . The Negro, understandably, vehemently disagrees.
>
> And so we reap the harvest of more than two centuries of slavery and discrimination.
>
> No one deplores the current trend to polarization of attitudes more than I, but in my judgement it is the white man, the white political leader, the white business man, the white teacher and welfare worker, who must first re-examine his attitude and prepare to sit down with the Black man and begin to solve problems. We cannot hope to change attitudes as a pre-requisite to action; we must hope they will change as a result of action.
>
> Today's cry for 'law and order' is an effort to escape back into a simpler world. It takes no account of two centuries of discrimination and injustice. It takes no account of the principles on which this nation was built. It takes no account of God's will. But it is there; it is real; and it is one of the basic issues in our coming election.
>
> But even when we pass this November, the problem will still be there. Don't believe it can be dealt with paternalistically, for paternalism went out with Uncle Tom. More likely we will have to deal with hostility . . . and, yes, even more possibilities of riots until we begin to provide effectively and constructively for jobs and education and housing and for social justice. . . .
>
> These are messages we must hear. We must participate, we must take responsibility for our society. And what sort of society results in God's eyes, will be "as we will." What is

> our will in North Carolina and how will the Church and Churchmen contribute to determining that will?"[25]

How the clergy heard this stinging rebuke to North Carolina white society is worth pondering.

In any event, the Diocese proceeded to shape its urban crisis response by designating St. Titus', Durham, an Urban Ministry Center and asking its Priest in Charge, the Rev. E. Nathaniel Porter, to serve as Director of the Urban Crisis Program. The idea behind the center was to use St. Titus' as a model and a training center from which other programs might grow.[26]

But the work at St. Titus' was soon eclipsed by another Durham-based program: The Malcolm X Liberation University. This fledgling institution was under the leadership of a community organizer named Howard Fuller, who had come to Durham to work for the North Carolina Fund. It grew out of unsuccessful efforts by African Americans to establish a Black studies curriculum at Duke. Fuller applied for, and received, two grants totaling $45,000 from the GCSP Fund. Bishop Fraser and the Diocesan Urban Crisis Committee were asked to provide some evaluative input into the grant assessment, but the decision to award the grants belonged to the GCSP administrators.

As news of the grants became known throughout the diocese, there was a firestorm of criticism, directed in part at Bishop Fraser but chiefly against the National Church and the GCSP. Fraser tried, unsuccessfully, to gain assurances from the GCSP administrators that they would consult with diocesan bishops before making grants. Parishes took recourse in stripping support for the national church from their diocesan financial commitments. The result was a 1970 shortfall in the diocesan budget of $165,000.00. Ironically, the Malcolm X Liberation University closed its doors in Durham the same year and moved to Greensboro.[27]

A closing snapshot

We started with a snapshot of the diocese in 1959. Where had we come in a decade? The 1970 report to convention from the State of the Church committee offers an interesting perspective.

The report started from the now-familiar premise that rapid change defined the context, the times, in which the church was seeking to fulfill its mission. The committee identified four areas of concern which demanded significant change from the Diocese: racial divisions in church and society, leadership training and support, listening to youth, and grassroots distrust of diocesan/national leadership.

In speaking to these issues, the Committee on the State of the Church recommended the following: 1. full funding and better utilization for the diocesan urban crisis program; 2. more effort to achieve *de facto* integration of diocesan institutions; 3. more attention to lay training and clergy continuing education; 4. continued encouragement of youth participation in convention

---

[25] George H. Esser, Jr. "Urban Problems in North Carolina, Clergy Conference, Diocese of North Carolina, September 8, 1968." Pp 12. Unpublished ms. in Fraser Papers, Archives of the Episcopal Diocese of North Carolina.
[26] Mason P. Thomas, Jr., "Diocese's Urban Crisis Committee Reports on Activities Since '68," *North Carolina Churchman* (June, 1969): 7; 10-13.
[27] Shattuck, *Episcopalians & Race*, 199,200. See also *The North Carolina Churchman* (November, 1969): 1-10.

and on parish vestries, and 5. initiatives to promote understanding between vestries and diocesan house staff and to foster openness and flexibility in the face of polarization.[28]

Gone, then, were the days of gradualism. Rapid change and vigorous response were the order of the day. Deeply entrenched problems like racial inequality remained, but they were deemed worth the struggle. Clergy and laity alike needed support and training to meet changing demands and expectations. The voice of youth needed to be heard, and the voice of disaffected parishes should be heard as well. The 60s had left their indelible mark on the mission and ministry of the Diocese of North Carolina.

[28] Report of the Committee on the State of the Church, *NCDJ 154th* (1970): 117-127.