

The Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity

"RESPONSIBLE MILITANCY AND THE WAY AHEAD"

Report and Reflections

From

Executive Director

NOTE: My "report" will be in two parts: What I have been able to get down here prior to the Annual Meeting, firstly; and what I shall say at our dinner on Saturday evening. Please try to look through this before then. - JEM

INTRODUCTION

I determined that, in preparation for this year's Annual Meeting, I should prepare as comprehensive a report and evaluation of ESCRU as possible, together with reflections on its present status and future role in the Church. Some hard thinking on the future seemed in order. An effort to review the past would offer a more concrete basis for looking toward the future. Race relations in America at this point in history is part of the context of such considerations. There are other factors to be considered in pondering the present effectiveness and future role of ESCRU in the Episcopal Church. It would take a book and then some to do all of this justice. But the daily demands in the ESCRU office and some personal involvement in ameliorative efforts aimed at Georgia's unexpected political debacle have precluded my adequately organizing such a document. I must now apply my thoughts directly to the stencils for mimeographing and hope that what follows herein will be useful at the Annual Meeting and otherwise in the contemplation of future needs and plans for ESCRU.

October 26, 1966

- John B. Morris, Executive Director

BACKGROUND AND FOUNING OF ESCRU

In the early fall of 1958 some thirty or so Churchmen met to consider what we hoped the General Convention soon to meet in Miami would say regarding the racial crisis that was then four years old in its present dimensions, though still unrecognized by many. Convened at Eaton Centre, New Hampshire, by the Rev. Cornelius C. Tarplee of Executive Council, the group, preponderantly Southern, came up with certain suggestions of resolutions we hoped would pass General Convention.

In an informal discussion at Eaton Centre some of us asked: "In addition to proposing resolutions, what can be done to move the Church to a more relevant confrontation of the crisis?" Dr. Robert O. Kevin of the Virginia Theological Seminary, who had stopped to visit and join the discussion, said that concerned clergy and laity should form themselves into an association within the Church to press the issues facing us. No action was taken on this thought, but a number of those on hand began to mull it over.

In early 1959, in consultation with Neil Tarplee, I prepared a prospectus entitled: "A PROPOSAL: FORMATION IN THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF A CHURCH SOCIETY FOR RACIAL UNITY." Neil and I circulated this, first to a small number of clergy and laity we knew to be concerned, and eventually to approximately 500 persons around the country. It was immediately evident that there was a ripeness and readiness within the Church for the idea. Others had been wondering and worrying about the slow pace of the Church coming to grips with the racial crisis both in and out of its own life. Of the five hundred persons contacted, four hundred replied and three hundred of these were quite positive.

In late August of 1959 I met with Neil and the Rev. Arthur Walmsley of Executive Council and we put in motion plans for a conference that would give concrete consideration to the proposal. Three committees of concerned Churchmen were appointed to draft proposals for this conference on: 1) Name & Statement of Purpose; 2) Program; and 3) Organization. Approximately 100 of the 300 invited persons assembled on the campus of St. Augustine's College, Raleigh, North Carolina, on December 28th and spent three days in deliberations which gave birth to what was called "The Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity". Major addresses were delivered by the Rev. C. Kilmer Myers and Dr. Thomas F. Pettigrew, both of whom will speak to this year's Annual Meeting. The present Statement of Purpose was adopted. Program suggestions were outlined and a basic structure for the governing of the organization was stipulated, later to be finalized in By-laws adopted at the First Annual

Meeting a year later. The organization was launched. In the time before the Board of Directors was to have its first meeting in early February of 1960 I was asked to take the initial steps to report to the Church about the Society, recruit members, and otherwise coordinate what had been begun.

AN EARLY TENSION

The sessions at Raleigh were at times stormy, as others have been subsequently. There was the inevitable tension between constructing an organization which would work in strategic ways to effectively move the Church, as compared with a more purist or absolutist enunciation of what should be. In an editorial supportive of the founding of ESCRU, the LIVING CHURCH in early 1960 discussed the tension between seeking the "perfect" and the "possible" goals facing us. Obviously what any one person considers these to be will vary immensely. Some criticized what was done at Raleigh as being too far toward an unrealistic or overly idealistic position, although the majority seemed well satisfied with the agreed-upon formularies. In the early months of ESCRU's life others called for a yet more militant proclamation of our corporate failure. I circulated a reprint of the LIVING CHURCH editorial to all who were at Raleigh, and others who had joined, adding my own remarks about how I felt we must hold together a commitment to the "perfect" and a capacity to work at the possible.

We have lived with this tension ever since, sometimes erring one way or the other depending on the emotions and vantage point of the critic. Oftentimes there have been regional factors involved in the tension. Sometimes national staff has been in the position of trying to gain Board assent or general support for a more militant position or some specific action considered too far out by some persons. At times, we have been in the other role, counseling restraint where it was felt our effectiveness would be impaired. As I see it, ESCRU cannot decide in a vacuum what obedience and militancy will mean. We have evolved our understanding of this in certain public positions and actions which have each, in their turn, both lost us some support and gained some. I have sought to generate support for what I consider a militant spirit and approach to be, generally using the term "responsible militancy" in order to combat the impression that recklessness is a corollary of being militant.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Not that we need venerate it, but because I believe there is much in the way of basic principles and directions in the ESCRU Statement of Purpose, it would be well for Society members and local Chapters to look back often to this document adopted at Raleigh. Because it was essentially a linking together of two different statements at the founding conference, there is a slight redundancy present, but the subject matter bears repeating. As the Statement itself says, we did not presume at Raleigh to have discovered any new teaching. Rather, we determined to set forth and explicate what Christian teaching has always meant and what, in part, the Church has tried to say about contemporary issues. Perhaps we helped to uncover some areas of Christian truth which had been neglected. Not content with the minimal content of General Convention pronouncements, the Statement identified "separation" on the one hand, and "unity" on the other hand, as concerns facing the Church. It wasn't sufficient just to be against segregation. We stood for something. Also, instead of just looking at racial problems in the community, we said that there was something in the very nature of the Church which was at stake. Since then we have constantly in ESCRU pointed to the interrelatedness of race and renewal, fragmentation and integrity, and sought to say that our concerns were at the heart of the Church's being and mission.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PROGRAM

The founding conference accepted the report of the Raleigh program committee and referred it to the consideration of the newly formed ESCRU Board which, in turn, received it as an advisory document. Something of a summary in what might be done in the Church, it is probably less pertinent now in a day when more attention is paid to these matters. In other words, some of the concerns which then were not prominent at least receive lip service now if not more attention. Perhaps it will be of use, however, to list the major headings set forth as things ESCRU would try to do:

1. Foster fellowship among concerned Churchmen.
2. Focus on segregation problems in the Church.
3. Seek involvement of the Church in housing, employment, voting, etc., concerns.
4. Work for stronger CSR programming and adequate staff, budget, etc.
5. Public statements, especially where official spokesmen were silent.
6. Encourage Church cooperation with secular organizations.
7. Provide aids to parishes.
8. Support and confrontation in crisis situations.
9. Increased communications among concerned Churchmen via Newsletter, etc.
10. Original research.
11. Ministry of the laity.
12. In-service training for clergy.

Surprisingly, we have actually functioned in most of these areas in one way or another, either at the national level or through chapters. Some of what was included in the detailed report was, perhaps, grandiose. Other roles and functions of ESCRU were not discerned at the outset. A copy of this report may be had on request.

THE EVOLUTION OF ESCRU

What was started in Raleigh was invariably to become the product of not only the original blueprint, but, also, the result of an historical context and the sum total of various personalities - their strengths and weaknesses. Sometimes it has been an unexpected crisis which has molded both the image and outlook of ESCRU, or it has been some statement to which there has been strong reaction. National officers and staff have made their mark, as has the Board itself. Sometimes a Chapter has been the pace setter. The process still goes on - for good or ill, or both.

Certain things happened relatively early to ESCRU in what was regarded as a militant posture. Small as it seems now, ESCRU's Board endorsement of lunch-counter sit-ins in February of 1960 was a significant beginning when the context is recalled. No national religious body or agency had responded thusly. We did and got good press on the statement. Soon others were in it, and by the summer both national political parties had moved to commend the sit-ins. The ESCRU Board action was taken in concert with praise for a member, the Rev. John Teeter, a white priest in Virginia, who had just announced he would no longer take part in anything that was racially segregated. We weren't accustomed in those days to having people put their bodies on the line. Good intentions and spoken principles were being backed up with direct action. ESCRU had been formed just before this new phase broke and it self affected the course of history in a small way and was affected by it. We were beginning to realize who we were and who we were to be in the Church.

Later in 1960 I learned something of what was to become an oft-repeated role in the area of public statements. Bishop Carpenter had come out strongly against a "background paper" on civil disobedience which the national CSR Department had published. Traditions at "281" (now "815") did not permit staff to answer the bishop's charges. Identifying him as "a chaplain to the dying order of the Confederacy", I

went on to counter his position in a statement which received some currency. I guess some eyebrows were raised. Episcopal authority was not often challenged or criticized. We began to let it be known that the unofficial nature of ESCRU had certain advantages in the freedom we had to comment and act. The "gadfly" or "watchdog" role was emerging.

A time for the first sifting of the wheat and tares came in January of 1961 at the First Annual Meeting at Williamsburg, Virginia. Our outlook and posture was further molded by a number of things, including a statement on the subject of intermarriage. We simply said we didn't believe there were biological or theological barriers to racial intermarriage, and we called on the Bishops of the Church for their godly counsel on the subject. From the headlines it would have appeared that this was all we did in Williamsburg. Not only did Bishops not act on our suggestion, but a number of them pounced on us for disturbing their faithful. The Bishop of Virginia disparaged the interracial marriage statement and sought to disassociate us from the Church. My offer to debate him on the doctrinal aspects of the intermarriage topic was not accepted. Over in West Virginia the Bishop publicly labeled us Communist and I had to subsequently fly to Charleston to obtain a public retraction.

The reaction didn't stop there. A number of members resigned from ESCRU, including several Southern bishops. They termed the statement unfortunate, untimely, etc. Some others were unhappy, while, to the contrary, throughout the Church there was a ripple of relief in some quarters that here was a group not afraid to speak the truth. We lost some members and gained some new ones. Our role in defining or identifying issues, sharpening them up, etc., was emerging.

In May of 1961 the Freedom Rides started, constituting the next phase of direct action which had commenced with the lunch counter sit-ins - unless you go back to the Montgomery bus boycott. I was contacted in Richmond by someone in California who thought we should immediately have a freedom ride of Episcopal clergy. Conversation here and there, some mulling over, and by the middle of June we announced plans for a "Prayer Pilgrimage" which would travel from New Orleans to Detroit in September, stopping at segregated Church institutions in the South and going to Dearborn to look into the Church's place in fighting segregated housing. Enroute we stopped in Jackson, Mississippi, where fifteen of us were arrested for attempting to eat together in a racially segregated coffee shop at the bus station from whence we hoped to leave for Sewanee.

The Prayer Pilgrimage and its aftermath became our first major involvement in direct action. A case against police officials in Jackson brought by four of the clergy will be heard before the Supreme Court this fall. As the General Convention of 1961 opened in Detroit that September the fact that fifteen Episcopal priests were in jail in Mississippi became a matter of dominant interest. Presiding Bishop Lichtenberger said these were "brave men". The Church grew a little bit in its readiness to put itself on the line. ESCRU's dinner at the General Convention, with Archbishop de Blank of Capetown as our guest and speaker, further capped off our role of seeking to affect the Church at its sources of power and prestige. By then folks around the Church were beginning to know ESCRU existed. Most were beginning, also, to have some opinion about us.

Events moved rapidly and we were quickly into follow-up work at Sewanee, challenging a segregated restaurant-motel on campus which it was felt the University could require to integrate because it was University-owned, etc. We learned here that the Church much more readily approves a witness out in the world than within its own Household. Several return visits to Sewanee were required, and finally the situation began to move. The Church learned that ESCRU meant business about the possibility of sitting-in at and picketing Church institutions. Later in 1962 we faced a segregated room assignment situation at a Church hospital in Brooklyn.

I would have to make an exhaustive review of our files and my memory to recall all of the things that happened in the first several years which served to identify ESCRU to some and wild to others. All the while we sought to interpret our actions to the Church, with good coverage in the Church press and periodic mailings to all the clergy. Membership continued to rise, although with each confrontation there were some who dropped out. Our stance was conveyed in editorial comment, as well as in occasional action. At times some exposure seemed needed of things done or not done by official agencies in the Church, or by publications of the Church. We called the shots as we saw it and, gradually, I think some appreciation for this role for ESCRU developed even amongst those we might criticize at times.

This was an era demanding criticism and protest and we provided our share. The crisis in Birmingham in the spring of 1963 became a watershed and soon even the official agencies of churches were out marching. Presiding Bishop Lichtenberger's Whitsunday Message of 1963 became a milestone in terms of the commitment of the Church's highest spokesmen. The present incumbent has not begun to approach this degree of leadership....perhaps it will come.

In the meanwhile, as official structures were beginning to send clergy South and otherwise join the battle, ESCRU began its arduous and long involvement in the Lovett School situation here in Atlanta. Our role in internal housekeeping matters was further confirmed, even as we continued to recruit clergy to go to Mississippi to Medgar Evers' funeral and to Hattiesburg in January of 1963 for what became the forerunner of the "Summer Project" of 1964 and the Delta Ministry.

In 1964 we again turned our sights onto the life of the Church in the ESCRU "Whitsunday Witness" call which sought to encourage parish transfers across racial lines. No one resigned, but it certainly shook some members around the country. There were some instances of transfers. The principle was highlighted, that much must be done to overcome the separation in our parish traditions. Later in 1964 we directed these concerns and others to the Church at the General Convention in St. Louis. "Silent signs" in front of Kiel Auditorium were later filled in with the meager accomplishments of that discouraging assembly which had begun on the high note of having Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., as our guest and speaker at a huge dinner. ESCRU, in other words, was again around to creatively haunt the Church, but the backlash of 1964 and the new right-wing racism politically was upon us.

Somehow there was a recovery in the mood of the country, or so it seemed, when the nation saw the violence at the bridge in Selma in early March of 1965. By coincidence, I was there and able to take the initial steps to mobilize Church people around the country for what then became a kind of mass baptism of priests, nuns and ministers (and lay folk, as well) on the battle lines of social change. The 1965 Civil Rights Bill was soon added to the 1964 legislative accomplishments which Birmingham had produced. ESCRU witnessed in Selma as everyone else, but we also looked into the local Church situation after an integrated group was denied entrance to St. Paul's, Selma. This interest was continued through the summer of 1965 in one way or another.

Jon Daniels died on August 20, 1965, and suddenly we knew intimately and closely what some of the commitments made way back at Raleigh could require. Jon's life and death has been a great teaching to many throughout the Church, and especially as they have had the opportunity to read his own words as to why he was in Selma. It remains, though, an appalling thing that the Church's top leaders seem not to have known how to respond to martyrdom in their midst. Some seemed a bit embarrassed that a seminarian would go down to Alabama and get shot, when really, perhaps, he should have stayed at home and tended to Church matters. But, perhaps this is harsh and we have yet to appreciate how the death of Jon has affected others.

From the death of Jon Daniels in August we moved the next month to ESCRU's Annual Meeting in Jackson, Mississippi, and the six priests who came directly there from the House of Bishops' meeting in Montana where some verbal commitments were made regarding clergy placement procedures. The meeting in Mississippi was to make something of a witness just by going. A presence is sometimes our role both in the Church, as in Montana, and elsewhere, as when my two clerical colleagues visited the meeting of the Fourth Province at Sewanee earlier this year.

I opened this section with some interpretative comments about various things which had been key in molding the role and outlook of ESCRU in the first years. Most of these more recent things fall into one of the previously established patterns or areas of concern. By no means have I included all the cases of action-involvement of national ESCRU, through staff or otherwise. The roster would include St. Augustine, Chicago, Girard College, Atlanta, Chicago and other places. Of such action has ESCRU evolved into being considered, if not actually being, a kind of action arm of the Episcopal Church. I consider this image and role salutary and needed, however true, in fact, it may be. At the same time, it tends to create the impression among some that we're simply/pseudo-ecclesiastical civil rights agency without any real roots or concern in the Church. It's kind of ironic that, while non-members are dismissing us for not being in and of the Church, some within the organization say we're too Churchy at the national level and ought to be more involved in the issues in the world. I think we maintain a fairly good balance, responding as the need arises to crises outside, with a special effort to seek out such crises within the Church because we know that no other agency will bother itself.

So much for a synopsis of nationally-instigated action, although I want to come back later to the issue of whether our focus is chiefly to be within the Church or within the community. Because headlines are made only over crises, some Churchmen and even some members mistakenly get the impression that this is all the national office does. Actually, except for certain intensive periods, it's the things we give the least time.

WHAT WE DO IN AND OUT OF THE ATLANTA OFFICE

1. Initiate, respond to, follow-up, etc., the kind of actions described above; including witness-action, public statements, planning and dispatch of meetings for the membership, planning and execution of things to affect national Church gatherings, etc.
2. Provide a center of unity for our 5000 or more members, entailing tremendous correspondence work, the maintenance of membership records and procedures, fund raising and administration of office and staff. (In the last analysis, being something of a clearinghouse for insight & information, and an emotional center of unity for concerned Churchmen, probably is our main role and an essential one. It was felt at Raleigh when ESCRU was started that there was merit in simply having such a fellowship. It strengthens and renews, sustains and encourages the minority of concerned folk in the Church. If we do this, program and action will ensue at the local level. A mood and outlook is upheld. It works its way out in the life of the Church in channels not necessarily always connected with ESCRU. We can't stop with this role, but it is extremely important.)

Ten days have passed since I started this and now it's Election Day and three days before we convene in NYC. The regular demands of the office have continued in spite of much absorption personally in our political situation, plus ESCRU sponsorship of a dinner here where we heard Bishop Crowther of Kimberley, South Africa, (He's an ESCRU member.) and involvement in a week-long tour de force ^{of ATLANTA} by our colleague, Malcolm Boyd. This by way of letting you know if the balance of this memo is hurried, etc. - JEM

3. Publishing & Printing are not to be minimized, especially in a national operation where we depend on the printed word to move and direct others toward common goals. This was especially important in the early days when we were creating an outlook and approach. Thus, in the beginning we issued numerous reprints of significant articles. There are the pieces on ESCRU itself. Hopefully we can get out a new and comprehensive brochure on ESCRU this year. There is the Newsletter which, as limited as it is in frequency and space, provides a channel for reporting ESCRU's work, other developments in the Church, and editorial comment. We have issued several "Special Reports"; one reporting results of a survey of Church camps and conference desegregation, one on a problem at St. Paul's College in Virginia, the widely-used one on the Church and the Riots. A report on the state of the Church in Alabama is ready, but we are endeavoring to see if one of the Church's independent magazines will carry it. We should have had a follow-up report on the subject of clergy-placement to back up what the House of Bishops said on this subject in Montana last year, and may still be able to do this.
4. There are the "aids to witnessing": posters, placards, ESCRU pins and the BROTHERS pin, prayer cards, the General Convention cross cards, etc. And there are the tape recordings of various notable things: Bishop Myers' sermon at the consecration of Bishop Moore, Malcolm Boyd's plays (which we also handle in production kit form), and the tape of Dr. King's talk at St. Louis (which was subsequently turned into a disc recording in South Africa and only recently banned there by the government.)
5. There is the steady involvement with various other groups and organizations, both on a national level and here in Atlanta. The Team Ministry involvement by our Director of Southern Field Service has been very significant and is mentioned in his report in the Annual Meeting packet. Numerous Atlanta groups find ESCRU staff involved at various times, although we have not interpreted our role here in a field capacity primarily. Elsewhere, we've cooperated with the National Catholic Conference on Interracial Justice and other Church-related groups. I am on the advisory board for the NCCIJ's Project Equality program. ESCRU staff are in steady consultative contact with the staff of the NCC Commission on Religion and Race. Etc. Etc. With various governmental conferences thrown in, and back during the crisis days several "calls" to the White House to boot.
6. Assistance in distress cases: We've helped to relocate a number of clergy who have been pressured out of racially tense situations. Each case is unique. It has usually involved our sending a memo to key ESCRU people and member Bishops telling of a priest's plight and indicating something about his talents and availability. Similiar referral assistance has been done a number of times in the cases of parishes desirous of making a step forward in the field of clergy placement, racially speaking. Not many situations really move, but at least it keeps the subject alive, and every now and then we hear of a breakthrough.
7. Support of other groups such as the Delta Ministry and the Selma Interreligious Project (which we helped to start and which we assist by handling their finances). Also, from time to time we seek to encourage Churchmen to support groups such as SCLC, CORE, Etc. This is done through the Newsletter and/or through special memoranda to key members. At other times we encourage members to give to special efforts or needs. Recently the national office received contributions solicited by the Boston ESCRU Chapter to assist two former civil rights workers in the completion of their studies at Tuskegee. We have steadily advocated support of the Church & Race Fund, notwithstanding our concern at times when it has been slow to move in support of worthwhile projects and our feeling that much of what the Fund assists should be included within the Church's official budget.

8. Special task force efforts have looked into various problems, such as the planned perpetuation of segregated parishes on the same city block in Fernandina Beach, Fla. (now being happily resolved with the two congregations merging). Staff have visited various church gatherings, including provincial meetings, the House of Bishops, etc., where it seemed some ESCRU presence was in order.
10. All of the staff are involved in speaking and preaching around the Church, meeting with local Church and community leaders, etc. For the first three years or more I was the only one to handle all of this. Subsequently the Rev. Henri Stines came on the staff as Director of Southern Field Service (the only foundation supported ESCRU program), and then the Rev. Albert "Kim" Dreisbach. Now, the Rev. David Nickerson is here in the position Fr. Stines had. I have done less travelling than in the first years, finding that the demands here at the office have been more than sufficient

* * * * *

Apologies for the disorganization in this memorandum, but it seems better to prepare it in this form than not at all, and the crush here at the office now is too great to permit of a more properly arranged summary of our work. The above ten areas simply touch on aspects of our work and are not intended to be taken as a proper breakdown with any priority attachment. - JEM

* * * * *

LOCAL CHAPTERS

Background - At the time of the formation of ESCRU there were no local cells or groups of the emerging organization, unlike our sister group, the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice which was created nationally in 1960 out of a long tradition of local Catholic Interracial Councils. It was anticipated, however, that ESCRU members would want to band together locally for the achievement of the Society's goals and purposes. The By-laws that were adopted at the First Annual Meeting in Williamsburg, Va., January 8-11, 1961, stipulated that "Individual members of ESCRU shall be encouraged to form a unit of the Society to carry out...the purposes of the Society." provisions were outlined for groups of members to petition the national Board for certification as ESCRU Chapters. The first Chapter to get started was in the Diocese of New York. Subsequently some 27 others have been chartered.

The Significance of Local Mobilization - Perhaps one of the most important things about membership in ESCRU in the first years for individual Churchmen was the fact that this constituted a medium for taking a stand and becoming stronger in it. Joining ESCRU was, and in some quarters is still so considered, an act which required some greater than average degree of commitment to racial unity and justice. As the controversial image emerged this became even more so. The last seven years have been replete with personal contacts and correspondence where Churchmen have told me of their pilgrimage toward greater commitment and involvement. They were grateful for ESCRU as a catalyst of directing them into greater active participation in what they felt the demands of the Gospel to be. The same dynamic is, I believe, operative in the formation of ESCRU Chapters. A group of like-minded Churchmen pool their concerns for the renewal of the Church and racial justice, and constitute themselves as an ESCRU Chapter to deal with issues and opportunities in their own community and Diocese. In this very act occurs something which is both reality and myth. Strength in numbers does operate and the Church in that locale moves ahead a bit just by the factor of an ESCRU Chapter existing. The Church is also challenged to do and become more what it is essentially. At the same time, there is the beginning of the myth

that all is well because an ESCRU Chapter now exists and will deal with all wrongs in the Diocese.

The Positive Impact of Chapters - In addition to the challenge created by the formation of a chapter, ESCRU groups have proceeded to serve in many ways. Firstly, they are a rallying point for concerned folk who have despaired of the Church's slow response to the racial crisis. We have saved many a person from leaving the Church altogether, offering a channel for faithfulness and witness in ways the establishment often has not. Issues have been highlighted and defined by Chapters. A greater level of awareness in the Church has been created. Specific problems are focused upon. Various programs are launched within the diocese to build on this new commitment. Sometimes the Chapter criticizes the Bishop and others in the Church. Sometimes the Chapter serves in a supportive role, encouraging the official structures of the Church to take action. Churchmen active in ESCRU begin to take more of a role in official diocesan structures, raising the level of their involvement and understanding. The Chapter often becomes the vehicle by which Episcopalians are recognizably involved in other civil rights efforts in the community. Certainly we have encouraged such.

The Evolution of A Chapter - Some local groups have gone through various phases of mobilization, expansion, success, frustration, falling-apart and failure. Others have experienced some aspects of this cycle, but have bounced back to meaningful service. A few have been steadily effective. The key seems to reside with the caliber of leadership. Under expert guidance, some chapters have recovered from a slump. On the other hand, I think there are changing circumstances in terms of the degree of commitment and involvement by official Church structures, changes in the needs in the community, the backlash, etc., which affect the destinies of ESCRU Chapters. We will be talking together about Chapters and see if any corporate wisdom to govern the future emerges.

ESCRU AND THE FUTURE

At our Dinner in the Crown Room of John Jay Hall at Columbia on Saturday evening we will consider the future. I'll endeavor to briefly summarize this document and then offer some thoughts and alternatives for the future - both for Chapters and the national organization. We'll hear from others also, and, indeed, from everyone.

In a nutshell, I think that we must look ahead to continued work by national ESCRU in the areas already serviced, but with a concern as to how we will more creatively affect the sources of power in the Episcopal Church: Executive Council, synodical meetings, Episcopal leadership, etc. I don't think we have nearly exhausted our focus on all of those things to which we have been trying to point the Church. In some areas, we'll need new, and perhaps, dramatic means for illuminating our point.

This is without a doubt a time when nearly everyone is wondering what the future holds. Reverses at the national level in support for racial unity and justice is cause for discouragement. The fact that in some areas the Church's official structures have moved closer to what might be termed "the ESCRU outlook" rightly raises questions about our role. Perhaps we should begin to think of having ESCRU go out of business, with some eye to what will replace it as a reform movement within the Episcopal Church. Perhaps, our historical context simply calls for some recognition that further gains are going to come slower and require our retooling of former methods. Let us pray for the guidance of the Holy Spirit as we try in this Annual Meeting to do that which is most faithful, whatever the future holds.

- John Morris

Responsible Militancy and the Way Ahead - Part IIIntroduction

In preparation for the 6th Annual Meeting of ESCRU in New York, November 10-13, 1966, I prepared a document which might now be considered Part I of this present effort to look ahead. Single copies of this earlier paper may be had on request. In this instance I shall try to elaborate on reasons why I submitted my resignation as Executive Director at the Board meeting in New York which followed the Annual Meeting. The reader's patience is invited insofar as the form and structure of these remarks is concerned. To cover the issues in the time available I must leave somewhat their organization to the reader. A continuing session of the New York Board meeting will convene in Chicago January 6th and it is chiefly to participants there that I am directing this.

The times we are in are filled with frustration and apprehension about where we go from here. Some believe entirely new departures are in order. Others see a continuation of existing efforts, with retooling for effective work in what is emerging as a different era. It is a time not altogether unlike the period in which ESCRU was formed. Whatever can be said, it is certainly a time for renewing our understanding of who we are and what our goals are, as well as how we try to realize them. We can do some basic work in Chicago in assessing the present status and future of ESCRU in terms of the demands of faithfulness today. It may be that another time will be necessary, or that others should be included in some plenary-type meetings if basic changes are to be made. I have no definite ideas about procedures. I do have some firmly-held concepts about the role of national ESCRU, etc., to which I'll speak here. I came to the conclusion that the best way I could be heard, and at the same time create an openness and freedom for the spirit to move us whatever way is best, was in stepping aside - which resignation I suggested should become effective March 1st or at least by the time of the General Convention in Seattle and our various activities there.

Leadership, Images & ESCRU

ESCRU is at one and the same time as strong as its national leadership and as weak as its national leadership; although, thankfully, this has been a steadily diminishing factor over the years as a more corporate image and posture has been replacing the personal image or reputation of a few leaders. Is this the evolution of a movement with charismatic-like leaders, moving toward a more traditional organizational structure and outlook? I would prefer to think that whatever word of prophecy ESCRU has embodied has been, rather, diffused and catalytic in evoking much more prophetic utterance from within the life of the Church. Still, the limitations of leaders remain to show themselves partly in the weaknesses of the whole body. No one leader can discern all that must pertain to the work of a group such as ESCRU. Indeed, we have always moved into new areas as a result of group leadership and consensus. Because, however, we have had (and required, I believe) a "strong mayor" type of leadership, the weaknesses or limitations of one person should be at some appropriate time compensated for by new leadership and new images. In other words, I determined at the New York Board meeting that it is time for a change: time for someone with different strengths and weaknesses to make their mark and continue what we have begun, with whatever modifications are right for another person and another time. If there is anyone in the Church who still thinks that "the ESCRU approach" will be eliminated if I can be relegated to some niche, let them know that the ferment we represent is more widespread than they have yet understood.

I offer a thought along these lines, pursuant to the selection of my successor, which is that - to a large degree - in the field of human relations and intergroup tensions you look as much for the right man as you do for the right job description. With essential points of agreement as to role and task, we must be prepared to let those to whom we entrust leadership positions develop the position - glad for their

special talents and respectfully aware of their weak points. In other words, we are dealing in so many intangibles that it is impossible to fit the man to the job. Get someone you trust, who is committed to the same things and shows ability, and let the job evolve. This has been my approach, I believe, in relationship to other ESCRU staff and for most of ESCRU's six years it has marked the nature of ESCRU Board-Staff relationships. Board and staff must maintain a constant dialogue, with one alternately prodding or leading the other, but neither can ultimately go beyond the capacity of both.

Black Leadership: A Tactical Advantage

Many of us have acknowledged for some time that the more color visible at the helm of ESCRU, the better. With ten out of 23 Directors being Negro, and seven of 23 Chapter Chairmen, we actually show a much higher proportion of Negro leadership than is found elsewhere in the Episcopal Church, which is overwhelmingly white. Accepting, as I do, that our chief role is to cause the whole Church to move some, I am not compulsively concerned - and, indeed, welcome, white leadership. At the same time, I have been long persuaded that it would be ^{advantageous} tactically or strategically for ESCRU's Executive Director to be black. White bishops can't respond to a Negro and write him off as being some sort of guilt-ridden grandson of a slave owner.

Another side of the same coin is the degree to which, in my estimation, the Episcopal Church has suffered because of the paucity of angry Negro leadership within it. Traditions have operated extremely well to require that Negro Churchmen keep their peace with the white establishment, both secular and ecclesiastical. Imagine what might happen if an ever larger group of priests of Negro ancestry were to go each year to the House of Bishops wanting to know if they had simply been ordained as "Negro priests"!

Finally, in this area of concern, I recall with respect how the national Director of CORE stepped down several years ago when James Farmer (who has addressed two ESCRU Annual Meetings) then took the helm, representing a change in color at the top. This was even more necessary for CORE than it is for ESCRU, but it could help increase our impact on the Episcopal Church if suitable leadership is secured.

Differing Roles for National & Local ESCRU

We are often saying that ESCRU must be doing such and such, failing at times to make any differentiation in the various levels at which we function. There is the individual member who is citizen and Churchman and more. In assessing the impact of ESCRU since 1959 we will generally overlook that the biggest difference we have made is in the support, encouragement, challenge and nourishment we have provided our members individually in ways much too intangible and numerous to attempt a catalogue. To say that the chief responsibility of the individual member is to work for reform and renewal in the Church is clearly irresponsible and denying of God's love of His world via His servants. He is a whole person and must live in the world and help God love it back together. It may well be that, having initially been led toward a greater commitment in ESCRU, the individual member will work in the world almost entirely through secular groups (which often do God's work better than those which open with prayer!) Hopefully, if ESCRU has really gotten through to him, he will also turn more actively toward efforts aimed at Church renewal as well. He may or may not do this in the name of ESCRU. It's just as well if he does it in the name of Christ and lets the other labels go.

Now come the Chapters - the banding together of several ESCRU members to pool their concerns and talents. (See my earlier paper for comments on the ups and downs of local ESCRU groups.) Do they look inward or outward; at injustices in the community or at distortions within the Household? The answer, of course, is both. From Atlanta we watch chapters from time to time tending to answer the question in simple either-or terms. Generally there is a balance; a steady recognition that that which is sacred and secular cannot, really, be divided. It is easy to become unbalanced, however. The depth of the community's sickness is so great that it is easier to

have no part of it and, instead, drink tea in the parish house and talk only about Church matters. On the other hand, the excitement and drama of the civil rights movement has its allure oftentimes to the detriment of any concern for internal matters. The air is alive with change and confrontation in the nation and in local communities. Some seem to be saying that they can't be bothered by "Churchy" matters. Go where the action (already) is! Let ESCRU become great among the civil rights organizations! Forget the Church. It isn't important. All of which at times is a disguise for the fact that we've lost heart, and possibly, faith. In tackling the demons of injustice outside, we've forgotten from whence we've come and why we got started in the first place.

Now let's speak of the role of national ESCRU; and what a responsibility it is to symbolically represent the whole spectrum of commitment which we must encompass as individuals and groups banded together in the Church! Obviously it is our role to sustain the constant dual commitment of individual members and Chapters which must never leave either the Church or the world alone. We do this in a myriad of ways. Look over some past Newsletters to see the balance of emphasis. Recall the major public engagements: the Lovetts and Selmas, for instance. But there is only so much time and so much money, and sometimes we speak in terms of priorities for national ESCRU. When I have to delineate such priorities I speak of our primary focus on internal matters within the Episcopal Church. Herein, perhaps, lies one of the points of ideological tension to which I was attempting to address myself in the Board meeting in New York. Quite obviously we have some honest differences as to where we put our primary attention in ESCRU. Because it speaks of our most urgent concerns, we speak in terms at times that might be heard as categorical or in the unfortunate absolutist either/or sense. I must speak in such terms for a moment now, though I do it in the context of what is above.

I don't look at ESCRU as a civil rights organization. I do think that God has and is working mightily through the civil rights groups of our country: that He is alive in sources which may even deny Him. I see national ESCRU, however, and in a sense, therefore, ESCRU at all levels, as being that band of faithful servants who believe that renewal and the recovery of integrity within the Church is our primary task - qua ESCRU. Theologically this is our mandate just because it is. If symbols were to communicate this, look to the Capetown placard (something we used to look at a lot, and I still do) with its barbed wire fence dismembering Our Lord. Then look to our hallmark scene where Christ blesses the two figures kneeling in harmony before Him. I look at these symbols and say that this is our imperative: to do what we can to move from the one to the other - especially within the life of the Church. That this same life is often made manifest and realized in confrontations in the world is clear, but in the very statement of that I hear increasing sounds within our ranks which essentially are abandoning the faith dimension of our thrust. When I do anything worthwhile in ESCRU, it is for Christ's sake - and not for the cause of civil rights or, indeed, to "help the Negro".

I rejoice in the competence of manifold secular agencies to tackle the demons of our time categorized as problems in housing, employment, poverty and ghetto conditions, etc. ESCRU has and will add its small strength to these efforts wherever possible. Hopefully, and there is some evidence for this, we have been a recruiting station for soldiers in these areas of wider conflict. Indeed, we'll try where needed to identify some of the not-yet-widely-recognized issues such as American participation in southern Africa's apartheid. But I don't see ESCRU as being as competent in these areas as we are in the area of internal reform. We must call on the experts when we're out of our field. Some of us are them, at one and the same time we are in ESCRU. But, beware of the lure of being an expert in the fields which the world acclaims, if it means that as ESCRU we are to be seduced away from vigorous efforts at reform within the Church.

If this is being "Churchy", then I would like to be known as the most Churchy! Apart from our own obedience, I am convinced that the peace of the world, and certainly any possibility for domestic and dynamic peace within our country will be a direct corollary of what the Churches of our land do in their own precincts. Thus

it is that I am persuaded that issues having to do with clergy placement, segregated and separated parishes, the public and private attitudes of the Church on caste and class, etc., are those paramount in the agenda of national ESCRU. This is what I am competent to move on and where, in some context, I will move. There is no other agency which sees its primary task as being renewal in the Church vis-a-vis cultural and racial unity. There are other opinion makers which will, and rightly so, continue to recall us to our involvement in the world, in the ghetto, in the crises which will come again and again and to which we'll respond. We'll go again and again into tomorrow's Selmas and into tomorrow's Watts or Chicagos, following whatever leadership says come. But we had best not forget to create the crises or opportunities in Christ's Church which will induce some change of its own within. If we forget, the day will come when we must give account for our stewardship of the Household of Faith, and I believe that the record there is as important (and more important to ESCRU) as what we can show has been done elsewhere. Perhaps God is destroying His Church, His special people, because of our infidelity. I believe it may be so. But so long as I choose, as I do, a berth on this ship, I must do what I can in its behalf (and I speak not here of the Episcopal Church, but simply of the Church.)

What does all of this have to do with the role of ESCRU? Well it's a point of view and deeply related to what I have seen as national ESCRU's role since we got started. I think it is widely shared within our ranks and, indeed, on the Board as well. But, then, others can share the viewpoint in essence, but still see some different role for ESCRU in the future. I don't contemplate a new emphasis or role for ESCRU, but, rather, a re-tooling and strengthening of work in behalf of long-held commitments. It is important that I try to communicate this viewpoint, at least so that others may be guided, and perhaps wisely so, in making decisions for the future - which may or may not emanate from the same foundations. I fight vigorously for what I feel is right, but never disrespectful of the possibility that I may be wrong. Truth is too complex to put it in a box, but too important to ignore as one sees it.

All of this leads me to the conclusion, somewhat tentatively but increasingly, that, as official structures in the Church mobilize more and more for tackling the issues the Church faces in the world, ESCRU's ever more primary responsibility is to turn the spotlights up on what remains amiss within. Let us utilize the talent there to serve the Church at "815" and elsewhere in facing the Church's mission and ministry in the ghetto. The Church will be redeemed in part as She tackles this. It is not so much busy work apart from Faith. But, who will open the slutters on the Church's own failures? Not the establishment, however earnest it is generally. It hurts too much. It is more difficult, I suggest, to picket a Lovett than it is to go to Selma. I see that as our role, however, with a constant across-the-board involvement as well.

Frustration, Failure and the Future

One thing upon which all might agree pertaining to our Annual Meeting and the Board session which followed this year is that we all brought with us a great sense of frustration and fear as regards the long haul for race relations in this country. This obviously had something to do with the dynamics of our readiness and need to witness at "815". It had something to do with the mood of the Board meeting, as it has had before. I felt I heard in the Board meeting, as I had before, an even greater sense of what I must label an idolatrous view of ESCRU. I mean to describe here the mood which, rejoicing in what we have accomplished and our freedom to act, believes that in ESCRU we can be saved from the threat of fear and failure both within our national life and within the Church. Surely, this mood seems to be saying, we can initiate new programming or policies which will set in motion sure solutions. We can move the office to the North, and the local Chapters will cease floundering. We can adopt a program for the ghettos, and soon the Episcopal Church will save the day there. Etc. Etc. Forgive me if I make light of these frustrations, and, indeed, of a perfectly valid need and demand for doing what we can - e.g. the Special Report on

the Church and the Riots. I cannot intellectually eschew these concerns, nor do I, but too often in Board meetings we have had an unrealistic concept of just how much difference we could make. We have spun our wheels in a catharsis of frustration not calculated to support the expenditure of \$2000. for a Board meeting we can ill afford to waste. When I feel that I hear people thinking of ESCRU in what I feel, right or wrong, are idolatrous terms, I find it difficult to think constructively about programming the future....Such was my mood that Sunday night in New York, and it was as if I had just come from at least one other memorable Board session marked by the same mood - for me at least. (For the record, let me affirm my satisfaction with the Board meetings in Jackson and in Brooklyn. While some of the same was present, we were prepared to tackle specific projects intended to contribute their bit, without requiring that the future be within our grasp.)

To those Directors who were new to the Board, I apologize for the manner in which I have thrust you into this arena which is chiefly substantive and ideological. There is more beneath the surface, but it really isn't nearly so important as these issues and other objective considerations.

For what it's worth, let me suggest this description of the dynamics of Board meetings over the years. In the first years, it is my recollection that often I was in the position of encouraging the Board to sanction greater militancy, or the Board was, in fact, reviewing something of that order which staff had done or initiated. We generally found actions and statements undertaken in the fast moving days of the "movement" to be satisfactory. During the middle period of our six years, Board and staff worked together more co-equally to determine new thrusts, as, say, in the emergence of the "Witsunday Witness" call which came out of an Atlanta Board meeting or in the decision to go into the Lovett protest. This same dynamic was operative in Jackson and in Brooklyn, and much was accomplished. In the last year or so, however, a new element has been introduced, and it is based on some concept of staff executing the wishes of the Board per se, without necessarily being fully a part of the development of new program. This is good and healthy in that it reveals a working and committed Board. No longer is it up to staff to set the pace alone. At the same time there emerges a frustration for me....which is my capacity to integrate into our life-style and realistic appraisal of what we can do, all of the hopes and aspirations of the Board. Frustration meets frustration, then, I guess, and I get weary of it all. Thus, the determination that it was time to step aside and open the situation for new beginnings, new leadership, new talents, etc.

What I intended to say in the immediately preceding section isn't very clear, nor do I presume to understand it very well either, but it has to do with something important, so I'll let it stand. Now for some observations on other issues....

NORTH-SOUTH TRICKBAG!

Directors present will recall that, after the Board invited me/following over an hour in executive session, it was said that some felt we needed to concentrate more in the North, presumably indicating that we had been, in fact, concentrated in the South. The very question originates from an understanding of ESCRU, its levels of involvement (members, Chapters, national office, etc.), which is not my approach to the matter. I think we have amply divided our national thrust between the regions, with more emphasis via the chapters and publications on the North. It is an expression of the frustration of Northerners that they want to do more in the North, finding now that the issues are as acute, if not moreso, as in the South. I respect the concern. Reports, publications, etc., can be fashioned to accommodate this and should be - with Board involvement in the actual preparation and work as was evidenced in the "riot report". At the same time, I have earlier in this report indicated my own conviction that we need to concentrate more on the Church - ecumenically and otherwise. There was some suggestion that we should move the office to the North. How did I feel about that? Well, as was quite obvious, I felt rather negative about the idea, not seeing any substantial evidence as to how this would

substantially improve our work in terms of what the national office can, in fact, do. If anything, I would say that we should move the national office to Sewanee, a place which probably has more effect on more clergy than any single other place other than Executive Council (but I don't know how much effect we could have there!). In other words, I reacted most negatively to what I felt was a rushing off here and there to find means of alleviating the frustration. It would, of course, help to have an office in the North, and very possibly the national office should be there...but not because it would make as much difference as some might think. I don't view the national office as being nursemaid to chapters or as being the fountainhead of all action or program. With the limitations of money and personnel, it is all we can do to keep abreast of servicing the fellowship by bulk mail, if you will, along with the initiatives we take from time to time on new frontiers. Perhaps the desire for the office being in the North is that it would be more of a field office for the nearby constituency. This would only partially be true. Ultimately local groups are going to make it or not because of factors over which we have little control. An office at "815" might have some real effect in terms of being more of a watchdog there, but the extent to which we would get a foot in the door is questionable and the factor of gradually domesticating us is another consideration.

National ESCRU: A National Fellowship and National Impact

We have served well these six years in creating a national fellowship which has made its mark through countless persons and groups and in creating a national bloc to which the Episcopal Church in its various national seats of authority pays some attention - whether in crises we create or jump into or in the simple ongoing role of being a "haunt" for the sake of what we stand for. To project an extensive program, beyond the publications and actions of a handful of national staff, is an unrealistic assumption of what we are capable of either monetarily or otherwise. Instead, we should be constantly pressuring the national Church to invest itself of staff and funds to accomplish the kind of extensive programming some folks seem to think ESCRU is capable of.

New Levels for Initiative

Perhaps some thought should be given to regional structures for ESCRU which would take in hand planning and programming: Chapters in areas should have more contact with each other, or just members in that area should be drawn together more. The initiative for this in the beginning might come from the national office and the Board, with lots of Board time spent on implementation, but the follow-through would be in the hands of those involved.

Finances

It is ironic that, at a time when we want to be doing more, there is a sharp cut-back in income which is felt universally among groups such as ESCRU which are voluntarily supported. We simply will not have the income to sustain the present professional staff into next spring. Last spring we cut back from two secretaries to one, and now we do our own typing and these stencils are cut by yours truly. Our bookkeeper-office manager, June Crowley, is always swamped keeping up with the heavy burden required to maintain the membership files. Indeed, I make bold to suggest that ESCRU could get some sort of award for the amount and volume of what we turn out and have to handle here, commensurate with the amount of money spent. Grand ideas of the national office becoming more competent in other areas are unrealistic just in terms of what we have to carry operations, let alone considerations of present staff talents and what our focus should be. Aren't we meaning "The Church should be doing such and such..." often when we say that "ESCRU should be such and such...", which isn't to say that we shouldn't be improving and expanding where possible? There is every sign now, though, that ESCRU can only support one full-time professional staff person, with, hopefully, the two clerical persons we now have to meet the demand of administrative things we carry. So, who is ESCRU and how will we meet the demands and opportunities which constantly arise?

Ecumenical Considerations

There was some talk at the Board meeting about ESCRU merging with other groups similarly situated in other denominations. Except for our need to affect power in our own Household with such power as we have, I think this must be explored, ^{and} it is already being discussed. Earlier this year I was invited to the staff meeting of the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, with which we have ^{had} close ties for years. We discussed possibly cooperating on some programming, at least in the realm of publications. It does not seem fruitful at this time to talk about mergers of national groups, of which there are virtually none except ESCRU, the NCCIJ, and the Lutheran organization. (Others are being considered in some church bodies.) However, it may well be that at the local level we should be encouraging some of our chapters to look toward this possibility.

Chapters

From a peak of 29 chapters we are now down to 23 and there are presently no new groups forming to my knowledge. (See my earlier paper for something on chapters.) In all likelihood other chapters will soon crest and their members feel that they have done what they could through a local ESCRU structure. Sometimes they find that official diocesan structures start to loosen up and ESCRU members rightly get involved at that level. In other instances there are, in fact, ecumenical commissions on religion and race which do good work and which our people support. All this may beg the question of whether a local group of Episcopalsians is needed to focus on internal matters in the diocese. It may be, though, that there simply isn't a capacity or felt need for ESCRU at this level. Perhaps we are all simply in a slump right now, and things will pick up, with the revival of some chapters in the near future. My guess is that new guidelines for local activity are needed.

ESCRU National Structure

We began six years ago without any local structure, and chapters still do not have an integral place in our polity, except as they obviously produce the leadership which comes up through chapters to the national Board. At this stage in the life of the chapters I would not suggest any change upon which national structure would be altered vis-a-vis chapters. The local group is too indefinite a thing as a structure and permanent thing. Thanks be for those chapters which by their lively witness refute this, but I speak here with some view of the whole, I think.

Some kind of regional banding together of ESCRU members on an annual or semi-annual basis, with a regional board, might have merit, with this group sending representatives to a national Board. In such a case, would we have an Annual Meeting, or would it be limited to once every three years at the time of General Convention?

Notwithstanding these reflections, let's beware of thinking of structural changes (and no one has raised the subject but me!) as some sort of panacea for our ills. Such a move should come about, if at all, as a result of a "re-founding" conference which would go into all of the issues I've projected in this paper regarding the role and future of ESCRU.

A Personal Footnote

I said earlier that I was weary - and who isn't - but I am also wedded to the concerns and commitments expressed herein and in the work of ESCRU these past six years. If I've said that we might entertain the thought of folding up ESCRU, which I have, it is because I don't think we'll do what we must if we're not bold enough to contemplate dying in our present form. Such a move might be very creative, if we have confidence that the forces of ferment within the Church will regroup and create another ESCRU. But I got a letter yesterday from a young person who urged us not to think of such a possibility in a day when she and others were looking for leadership and guidance in the areas to which we've addressed ourselves. There are, it would appear, no new "younger turks" waiting to create a new mechanism such as ESCRU has been (though it's never been the only such, thanks be!) Talk of folding,

then, must be met with a counsel of patience and a plea for faithfulness. I often recall the legend of St. Francis working in his garden and being asked what he would do if he knew he was to die tomorrow. He said he would complete the work in the garden he had planned to do that day. This is our responsibility in the face of many fears and frustrations. It is my counsel to myself.

While I am persuaded that it is better to err on the side of leaving a leadership position too soon, rather than at a time when good judgement avers it was later than it should be, I have more than a little interest, personal and otherwise, in seeing ESCRU take the steps ahead it should to better serve Our Lord and His Church. I shall do whatever in the judgement of the Board I can to effect a transition which will make us stronger for the future.

Together, whatever our new roles and obligations, we will seek "that condition of harmony among peoples which is the benefit of a mutual recognition of the Lordship of Jesus Christ, so that brothers may dwell together in unity and see Him so lifted up that He will draw all men unto Him."

- John Morris