

the Supreme Court has spoken. We must obey the law of the land." Of course we must; but in conscience we must decide not the legal issue which has been decided, but the moral question as to whether the result of the decision is good or bad for Christians and for Jews.

Do we want religiosity or religion? Outward piety or commitment? Outward slogans and symbols, or a deep inner response?

Public school teachers should not be selected for their ability to lead prayer. Meaningful prayer takes place within a context, in an atmosphere—not as classroom routine along with the salute to the flag. Leading children in prayer requires the creation of a response within human hearts, and government has neither the facilities nor the rights to attempt this. This is why it is wrong to have prayers in a public school even

when Jews, Protestants, and Catholics may agree on the least-common-denominator prayer which shall be used.

There are in America today over sixty million Protestants, over one hundred million Christians, and we want the government to help us propagate our faith!

Instead of deploring the Supreme Court's decision, should not our churches and synagogues gird themselves to measure up to it by preparing a bold advance to help families pray at home, to show parents how to lead children in prayer before they go to school in the morning, to share such vital, contagious, honest faith that religion cannot perish from the nation?

Do you and I really believe that the only thing holding the spiritual fabric of our nation together is a little twenty-two-word sub-Christian prayer?

To an assembly of the student bodies on the third day of our stay he said, "The main point that I want to make is that we can not let just anybody set himself up as the voice of the church"—a curious statement in the light of the General Convention's forthright call for the elimination of all discrimination in the church. Dr. McCrady points out—what should be obvious to everyone—that the immediate way by which the church speaks to Sewanee is through the bishops, priests, and laymen of the Board of Trustees; he does not seem to allow for any valid means of public dissent from university policy, even when the part of the church which Sewanee represents does not manifest the will of the whole church. Those who attempt to express such dissent he labels self-appointed spokesmen for the church.

He went on to say, "If we do submit to dictation by any group that comes up and makes demands, then it would seem that we would be subject to a group from the other side to come up and demand complete segregation."—surely an irrelevant statement if the university's hands are in fact tied with respect to the restaurant.

Dr. McCrady did not appear at the restaurant while we were there. By contrast the Rt. Rev. Frank A. Juhan, retired bishop of Florida and presently director of development for the university, was very much in evidence. When we arrived Mrs. Shoemate, the proprietress, was away but after only a few minutes Bishop Juhan came in to us and several times asked us to "move on in order to avoid contention." He admitted that it was because some of us were Negroes that we would not be served and when a Negro clergyman asked why there was this discrimination against him in his own church the bishop replied that Mrs. Shoemate would soon arrive and he should ask that question of her.

PERHAPS the bishop did not intend so bold an evasion of the question of the church's guilt; but he did express a common misconception of the intent behind non-violent demonstrations. By sitting-in we did not seek to create or increase tension. But any realistic view of such action recognizes that contention may result from it and that it cannot be avoided for its own sake. The Sewanee student who shouted to us, "Blessed are the peacemakers," and the Jackson, Miss., policeman who arrested some of our number last

Sewanee and a Sit-in

One Who Was There Recalls What Happened and Why

By ROBERT T. FORTNA

LAST April nine other Episcopal clergymen and I, four Negro and six white, members of the Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity (ESCRU), engaged in a sit-in at the Claramont Restaurant, a public dining room on the Sewanee domain, built and owned by the University of the South. Although the trustees of the university announced the previous year that they were eliminating the final racial barrier in admissions policy. In August, 1961, two Negro clergymen, students of the summer graduate school of theology, were refused service at the restaurant even though they were accompanied by Dr. Massey H. Shepherd, director of the graduate school, and Dr. William G. Pollard, a university trustee.

The restaurant, which is listed in AAA and Duncan Hines guide books and advertises on highway signs its "Tradition of Hospitality on the Mountain," had never served a Negro and has in fact refused to serve a Negro Episcopal bishop.

The reason for our special concern, aside from indignation over any infringement of American rights, is that the university is a church college, owned and run by twenty-one dioceses of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The only explanation offered by the university is a legal one: while it owns the land "for miles around" and the buildings used by this and all other businesses as Sewanee, the enterprises

are in many cases given over by the university to a lessee, and so long as the terms of the contract are maintained the university cannot interfere. There is nothing in the Claramont contract forbidding or even alluding to segregation. The only possibly relevant clause is that the restaurant must be run "in the best interests of the university"; in view of the publicity the university has received over its practice of discrimination and in view of its continually protesting the bad reputation it has thereby acquired, it is puzzling why continued segregation at the restaurant is considered by the trustees to be in the university's best interests. More significant is the absence of any integration clause in the Claramont contract.

The restaurant was built less than six years ago—well after eight of the nine members of the theological faculty resigned in protest of continued segregation, after the summer graduate school was integrated, after the Supreme Court decision of 1954, after one Negro seminarian had been admitted. It is odd that the issue of integration did not even occur—as at least the vice-chancellor, Dr. Edward McCrady, claims in his own case—to the signers of that 1957 contract.

In the light of the administration's disclaimer of any ability to make policy for the restaurant, the vice-chancellor's statements in reaction to our arrival seemed oddly defensive.

The Rev. Mr. Fortna is a tutor at the Union Theological Seminary, New York, and assistant at St. Mary's Episcopal Church, Manhattanville, New York.