

A Call to Faithfulness: an Invitation to a Committed Journey

Final Report of the Task Force on the Legacy of Slavery

Report to the 176th Annual convention

Diocese of Chicago

November 22-23, 2013

Members of the Task Force: Patricia Abrams
Lascelles Anderson
Alice Brown
The Rev. Shelley Forrester
John Larson (deceased)
Gerri Outlaw
The Rev. Primitivo Racimo
Newland Smith
Jewel Tomlinson (deceased)

Introduction

The Legacy of Slavery is only the most recent step being taken by The Episcopal Church to address the sin of racism. The Church named racism as an issue to be addressed in our Church at the 1988 General Convention and since then has adopted a number of resolutions that called every diocese to have a task force on racism, conduct racism audits, do anti-racism training and monitor the training that is done. The Diocese of Chicago at its October 1989 convention adopted a resolution affirming the General Convention resolution on racism, the first of several adopted at later conventions. In 1993 the Bishop's Advisory Commission to End Racism (BACTER) was formed. BACTER focused its work on implementing the General Convention resolutions on racism. In 1995 the Chicago Interreligious Coalition Against Racism (CHICAR) was formed by the leaders of the Diocese of Chicago and other Chicago religious leaders. The Lutheran and Episcopal participants in CHICAR began talking about how to continue anti-racism work after CHICAR had ended its work in December 1996 with the result that in January 1998 the joint Lutheran Episcopal anti-racism initiative, named ILEAP, Illinois Lutheran Episcopal Anti-Racism Project, was formed. Between May 1998 and February 1999 fifty people from the Diocese of Chicago and the three Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) synods in Illinois met three times for a total of ten days of training led by Crossroads Ministry. By the end of this training the twenty-five member team of the Diocese of Chicago had developed a twenty year anti-racism vision for the Diocese as well as strategic plans to work toward and accomplish that vision with a time line and five and two year goals. At the 1999 Diocesan Convention Eucharist the Episcopal ILEAP anti-racism team was commissioned. Bishop William Persell in his closing address noted the commissioning of the team whose mission "is to help us to eradicate institutional racism."

Almost twenty years ago the House of Bishops issued the pastoral letter, "The Sin of Racism," which was addressed "to all the baptized of the Episcopal Church." The bishops said "the essence of racism is prejudice coupled with power" and went on to note "the sin of racism is experienced daily in our society, in our church and its institutions, in the House of Bishops." This pastoral letter also addressed the issue of white privilege and concluded "the rooting out of racism requires intentional and deliberate decisions, prompted and sustained by the grace of God." In Mach 2006 the House of Bishops issued another pastoral letter, "The Sin of Racism: a Call to Covenant," in which the Bishops renewed their commitment to the 1994 pastoral letter and "with God's help ... advocate for continued response to the sinful legacy of slavery ...". Four months later the 75th General Convention adopted A123, "Slavery and Racial Reconciliation." This resolution called for every diocese "to collect and document during the next triennium detailed information in its community on (a) the complicity of The Episcopal Church in the institution of slavery and in the subsequent history of segregation and discrimination and (b) the economic benefits The Episcopal Church derived from the institution of slavery," and "to hold a Service of Repentance." The 2009 General Convention acted to extend this resolution through the triennium ending in 2015.

Since the 2006 General Convention adopted the resolution, "Slavery and Racial Reconciliation," a small number of dioceses have been engaged in this work. One evening during the 2009 General Convention

during a forum entitled, “A123 and A127: Facing Our Past to Shape Our Future,” Deputies, Bishops and guests heard progress reports from the following four dioceses that had begun to implement the resolution – Maryland, Mississippi, New York and North Carolina. The Diocese of Louisiana’s Anti-Racism Commission cooperated with a Tulane University graduate student who produced a 140-page master’s thesis, “The Gospel of the Rich as ‘the property of the poor’: the Slaveholding Elite of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Louisiana and Their Mission to the Slaves, 1805-1870.” It is the intention of the Anti-Racism Commission to find another graduate student to research its church’s involvement with Jim Crow during the years from the Civil War until 1954. Then a third graduate student is to complete the research from 1954 to the present.

Patricia Abrams and Newland Smith, two of Chicago’s Deputies, worked with the Anti-Racism Commission, the Chicago General Convention Deputation, and the Peace and Justice Committee to introduce Resolution F0172a, “The Legacy of Slavery since 1835 in the Episcopal Church in Illinois,” which was adopted at the November 2009 Diocesan Convention. This resolution mandated “the creation of a task force on the complicity of the Diocese of Chicago and its predecessor, the Diocese of Illinois, in the institution of slavery and in the subsequent history of segregation and discrimination and the current practices of segregation and discrimination.” It also “at the end of the Task Force’s research phase called for “the Diocese of Chicago ... [to] ... use the information gathered by the Task Force ‘as the foundation for truth telling’, and when necessary, ‘confession, apology, forgiveness, repentance and reconciliation.’ (General Convention 2009 Res. A143: Reconciliation: Extension of General Convention 2006 Res. A123 to General Convention 2012).” It is very important to note that a period of “truth telling” precede any “confession, apology, forgiveness, repentance and reconciliation.” This was not the case at the Day of Repentance at St. Thomas African Episcopal Church in Philadelphia on October 4, 2008 at which the Presiding Bishop preached. As Edward Rodman in his “Open Letter to Various Leaders in The Episcopal Church on the Evolving Implementation of the 2006 General Convention Resolution A123” said, “Many of us had great difficulty with this decision ... [to hold this service at an African American church] ... in as much as it created the curious dynamic of those seeking to apologize to those who had been aggrieved inviting themselves to the house of those who had been offended.” Rodman goes on to say, “The decision was made to begin the service with a litany which was neither historically correct nor appropriately structured to acknowledge that one group of people was apologizing to another group of people who for all of the history of slavery and most of the history of the Episcopal Church have been separate and unequal, and the people of color specifically excluded from the Councils of the Church.” It is the firm conviction of this Task Force that our Final Report to the Diocese of Chicago simply sets out the painful stories of this legacy so the baptized members of this Diocese might enter into a period of truth telling. As the theological section of this Final Report makes clear, any service of apology on the part of the offenders can come only after the hard work of truth telling occurs.

In addition to giving oversight to the research conducted by Dr. Johari Jabir, task force members, especially during the first year, spent considerable time at the monthly two to three hour long meetings wrestling with the legacy of slavery on a personal level. We engaged each other in conversation about race, white

privilege, reparations, restorative justice, apology, reconciliation, and the Baptismal Covenant. We also shared reading lists of books and journal articles and drew upon these texts for our conversations. Dr. Jabir in his report said, “Pursuant to the guidelines of my contract I have attended the monthly meetings of the task force and I have enjoyed the very rich conversations of the members.” More than once we acknowledged that we were modeling what we hoped would be similar conversations in each congregation of our Diocese.

The Church and Race in Historical Perspective: The Chicago Episcopal Diocese Experience

The archival report that was done for the Task Force on the Legacy of Slavery constituted the main external source of data that we collected in the process of our work. It will therefore serve as the principal source of information used by the Task Force in coming to conclusions about the legacy of slavery as it has been experienced in the Church since 1835 when the Diocese was formed as the Diocese of Illinois. We will however probe that report, using the broad discussions the Task Force engaged in during our monthly meetings as a way of coming to some supported understandings of what we regard as useful conclusions, and by implications of this effort, the kind of actions that the Episcopal Dioceses of Chicago and Quincy can agree on for the use by the Church as a whole as we go forward into the future. This part of the report takes a global view of the conflicted life of the church with the phenomenon of race in the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago, and is meant to provide a framework for properly locating specific individual details in the common enterprise of the life of this diocese as it struggles anew to be prophetic in its ministry to all people.

The enabling legislations have been identified in the Introduction to this report, and will not be repeated here. Essentially we are responding to several years of consideration of this issue at the highest levels of the national church, finally responding to the task that we have been asked to accomplish at the local level. We were not able to dig as deeply as we wished (especially to the level of the individual congregation) and note that such an opportunity would have given us a much richer body of data for this report. Nevertheless, we hope that such analysis can still be accomplished as part of the continuing work of the Diocese in order to come to grips with its own complicity with the twin evils of slavery and racism. We believe this work is absolutely necessary, because these twin evils were so deeply embedded in the fabric of thought and action central to the life of this developing nation, and so decisively affected all its institutions especially formal legal and procedural ones, that it is our maintained hypothesis that the church, unless it was prophetic and resistant, in the face of everything that circled around it, could not have escaped demonstrating what we might call a deformed performativity in the early years of its existence.

Our work fits into a broad understanding of the supremely important place that the North played in the development and the persistence of slavery for as long as it did in the growth and early development of this nation, clearly countering the notion that slavery was, for all practical purposes, a uniquely southern phenomenon. It is true that the production of cotton in the South was the engine driving a whole series of institutional developments – even, one might say, the defining industrial activity – around which the sociality of the U.S. South was built and sustained even into the modern period of United States history. But it is well to remember, for example, that the Massachusetts Bay colony was the first American colony to give legal recognition to the institution of slavery. This happened in 1641, and Boston itself became a thriving port for trade in the awful business of selling and buying of human bodies. But Massachusetts was not alone among northern states to have supported the institution of slavery. Through various and complicated financial arrangements, the North was a major player in the funding of slaving activity, and this symbiotic relationship was key to the growth of the North's own budding finance and shipping industrial activity in these early days of the growth of American capitalism.

The overarching conclusion that emerged from the research work on the archives of the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago (and which is stated clearly in the report) is that the Episcopal Church, from the beginning and up until a relatively recent time (the end of the 19th Century) can be characterized as having adopted a stance of deafening silence on the major social issue of the institution of slavery that formed the foundational context of thinking and national and local state action during those early years. The period examined in the archival research was broken down into four sub-periods: 1835 - 1870; 1870 - 1960; 1960 - 1980; and 1980 to the present. Across those early periods (especially during the 1835 - 1870 period), as the records show, we observe at best a pallid response of the national church hierarchy to the conditions of blacks and their developing institutions, changing only slightly many years later when the overwhelming force of the Civil Rights movement – galvanizing as it did huge cross-sections of the country in challenging the dominant legal and social norms supporting the continuation of differential status for blacks based on their skin color – had to be faced on pain of having the church seem totally irrelevant to the huge moral issues which energized the debates and action that raged in the mid-1960's. Even then, the response from the national church to be sure was a very cautious one. Remember, for example, that the group of ministers that were communicating with Martin Luther King, Jr., in his Birmingham, Alabama campaign during the period when he was in jail, was recommending caution, to go more slowly on the demands he was making for jobs and for equality. King's vision was for the enactment of the Beloved Community, but the force of that vision and its exigent emergency were lost on the group. The spokesman for the group was C. C. J. Carpenter, Episcopal Bishop of Alabama, and the group regarded King's Birmingham campaign as “unwise and untimely.”

So one fundamental question that screams for answer is this: Why was the Church's response to the conditions of slavery, racial slavery, in the formative years of the Diocese of Chicago so tepid as to be non-existent? We proffer an answer here. Racial slavery was by this time a settled issue in the formative years of the American nation. Recall that as early as the early years of the 17th Century, in Virginia, the notion of personal whiteness had been boldly asserted and considered a settled matter. The concept of whiteness, of “race” represented through skin color, was invented (in the American context) to solve problems of social cohesion and gender concern among the elites. This was born out of a felt need for a decisive response to joint African and European uprisings against the brutal aspects of labor conditions that prevailed in Southern agriculture. To undermine and prevent such embarrassing worker movements, most importantly to secure allegiance from Europeans of all stripes, irrespective of their class status, distinctions began to be made between Africans and whites, to say nothing of Indians (who were to be exterminated and their lands forcibly taken from them). Personal whiteness, it was asserted, would be owned. Not only that, it would be used to distinguish those who were regarded “less than” in an ontological sense, from those for whom whiteness was an item of property, and would be so affirmed. “White” became a social and legal category, and as such, clearly a social construction, developed negatively to serve conditions of social solidarity among the elites in the early years of the nation's history. The declaration of this possessive character of whiteness was a deliberate and purposeful political act, one which has shown itself to be of profound and disastrous durability.

We believe that the durability of that settled arrangement would have placed severe demands on any bold testimony of the church to the contrary. Essentially, we posit that the church must have experienced severe cognitive dissonance in any attempt at articulating a different message than that coming from the dominant white group in the society, a prophetic message of unity and solidarity with all God's children, in a climate which was already suffused with odious racial distinctions that inhered in bodies, and more importantly could be owned by their bearers. It is reasonable to imagine that such cognitive dissonance, by itself, would have prevented the emergence of any countervailing posture, let alone a narrative from an institution that itself that was overwhelmingly constituted by the very elites who formed the leading edge of the revolutionary fervor that created the new nation.

We skip, but just for a moment, over the sharp time-lines used in the archival research to argue that the developing abolitionist movement in the new nation and in England must have had some resonance in the North. The Anglican Church was eventually dis-established and it is reasonable to assume that Episcopalians must have feared too close association with an English church that supported abolitionist thought. The silencing of the Wilberforce reproach to the national church addressed in the first part of the archival report makes abundant sense in that context. Silence is one sure way of keeping things “close to the chest,” particularly so if it was seen to be less dangerous than would have been the case if directly challenging the extant social arrangement was the only alternative. That, in and of itself, would have been a purely strategic move and need not reflect any deep philosophically different point of view. It could, on the contrary though, be demonstrative of a hugely different point of view about fundamental theological perspectives, and would have been foundational. In this connection, it is of considerable importance that, as the eminent historians Elizabeth and Eugene Genovese have pointed out, in the South, the sentiment and the arguments supporting slavery were supported by an ever-present assertion concerning a Christian character of slavery – racial slavery now in existence – even to the point of arguing that Negro slavery was not forbidden by the New Testament. Without much deeper analysis, it is impossible to make a choice between these two alternatives. For all practical purposes though, such a distinction need not detain us here, since we are concerned more with effects than with explicit causes.

To support a central finding from the study of the archives on the church's position during the first two sub-periods examined, it should be recalled that fully a hundred years before the formation of the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago in 1877, the Declaration of Independence had proclaimed that all men are created equal (although this was severely curtailed a mere ten years later at the Constitutional Convention); and that in 1777, blacks in Massachusetts and New Hampshire had put forward a petition for freedom (as a logical implication of the 1776 Declaration); that Massachusetts did finally outlaw slavery in 1783, but by 1788, had turned around and forbade all “foreign blacks” excepting those from Morocco, from living in the state for more than a two-month period of domicile; that slavery was abolished in the French Empire in 1794, but reinstated by Napoleon in 1802; and that the foreign slavery trade was finally ended in 1808. Add to this the Missouri Compromise which allowed Missouri to join the U.S. as a slave state; an 1830 Philadelphia meeting of African- American delegates from the states of New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware and Virginia where means were sought for improving the conditions of both free and enslaved blacks; the

1831 Nat Turner uprising and its aftermath in which he and more than seventy followers were hanged; the huge Denmark Vesey revolt in South Carolina in 1832; the beginning and ending of the Civil War; the Scott-Sandford decision of the Supreme Court in which it was ruled that blacks, not being citizens, could not have legal rights that were reserved for citizens, that blacks were property and could be owned by whites and transported to wherever whites wished to move them; the Civil Rights Act of 1866 which was designed to undermine the Black Codes which were instituted to contain the rights of freed African Americans following the end of the Civil War, itself being undermined by the continued frustrating joint actions of southern efforts reinforced by northern complicity in the tangled economics of slavery and southern agriculture. It was within this broader context, and with this history as background, into which the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago was formed. An aristocratic Episcopal church would hardly have had a chance to stand against the prevailing social structure and its embedded markers in the industrial processes that were emerging as American capitalism matured, unless it adopted a firm hermeneutic stance built on the centrality of divine creation with equality as a non-negotiable implicate, over against any other theological position.

We will have more to say on this question later as we engage theological questions which must be raised in any exercise as this. At this point however, if we argue that the central condition and effect of racial slavery is in the essentializing of racial differences, either in persons or groups, a creationist ethic or moral position would have moved the church to take an uncompromising stance against the injustices of slavery which it could hardly have overlooked in the injustice besotted social landscape and context in which it operated. The archival report indicates clearly that it did not.

Recognizing also that white America developed out of a series of distinct accretions, distinctions between the immigrants and whites who were already here (which constituted dividing lines in the beginning encounters between the local and immigrating groups) dissolved in the face of the undermining power of the role that the need for social solidarity played as a control mechanism for maintaining a robust whiteness (as a unique personal property) in the evolving society and nation. Blacks remained essentially outsiders in all significant domains. So the notion of what has been called the “contagion of freedom” which gave substance to the reality and energy of the American Revolution and project found its limits at the boundaries defined by the social construct of race as inhering in bodies even after slavery was outlawed. Freedoms regarded as consistent with citizenship in the new nation were not seen to carry over to racialized bodies. The details of how this was accomplished are not only well known, but are also amply demonstrated in the literature, and need not detain us here.

Race, as a marker distinguishing between beneficiaries on the one hand and “outsiders” on the other, has proven to be hugely resilient at all the major moments of change in the history of the American nation, from the time of the earliest settlement up to, and including the present (Roediger). Racism has survived emancipation, mass immigration, and even what Roediger calls modern liberalism. It has accomplished this largely because of the ways in which it has been able to adjust, through law and custom to the changing circumstances in the growth of the nation. It is remarkable how these changes have continued to exhibit a

defining characteristic of resilience, namely an ability to maintain a persisting distinction between the insider and the outsider, keeping the so-called outsiders at the margin of national concern. Language often is the mechanism that has facilitated this ability to adjust. The archival research report is very clear on the ability on the part of the church to adjust. Terms like “domestic missions,” and “colored congregation” became part of the language used in the 1870-1960 period, identifying the ways in which the church distinguished its “normal” work from work among “outsider” populations. Congregations at the margin, those associated with outsider status were treated differently from mainline congregations, either through differential sponsorship, condescending descriptions or other distinguishing identifiers.

The 1960 - 1980 period constituted a moment of immense challenge to the integrity of the American project. This was particularly true in the area of race relations, given the presence of the prevailing essentializing nature of race, identified with and through bodies as a defining feature of the American social landscape. That period, beginning even during the late 1950's witnessed, or began to witness, frontal challenges to a whole range of institutional practices and domains sustained on racial foundations. Educational policy, housing policy, employment policy, public accommodation practices, all these and more, were directly confronted by the determined energy of the Civil Rights movement. Huge migrations from the South as a function of changes in economic activity had recently created massive pressures in Northern and Midwestern and Western cities. The effect of this, in the context of a thoroughgoing racial state was the crowding of blacks into clearly-defined enclaves in cities, the enforcement of strict and severe limitations to black education, restrictions on the movement of blacks outside of these enclaves, accompanied by the simultaneous development of suburbs and the positive feedback effect of growth of commerce in these new locations, difficult to reach by the urbanizing black population. As a result, job opportunities for blacks were limited, and developing labor unions, which under normal circumstances could have served as entry points for the acquisition of new industrial skills in a rapidly industrializing economy, became associated in larger number with those industries identified with the new immigrant populations. These new immigrant groups were able by this time, and over time, to be accommodated within the prevailing American racial structure.

The period of the 1960's on was not a non-inflected period even for the Civil Rights movement itself. Its own energy shifted from the early challenge represented by the work of Martin Luther King and the sit-in movement to the serious challenge to that stance from less patient groups and individuals. The early integrationist stance was more easily joined by leaders of established churches (including our own), but when the cutting-edge of the movement shifted to a black power stance, more strident and less in keeping with the mood of the white community, the church could be expected to be less involved, even to the point of raising questions about the legitimacy of the new position. How our own church managed that shift we have some data on, but it would be hugely instructive to confront that period on the Church's sensibilities with respect to this major and legitimate shift in focus of the march to equal status being undertaken by blacks during those important years.

From the archival reports, the Church did strongly support the Civil Rights Movement in its early phase up to the 1963 March on Washington, and also was quite forthright in its support of efforts to desegregate the public schools system in Chicago. There was a strong institutional presence exhibited by the Diocese in the early stages, those stages in which protest was framed in ethnicity terms (meaning that the thrust was organized around putting an end to inequality especially, even wholly, at the individual level). When the thrust of the movement changed to take on a more boldly social and political stance, especially evident in the Black Power movement, it appears that the Church's original stance was substantially weakened, likely out of fear of being caught-up in the new liberationist politics of the black social movement. The report also shows that ancillary activities were curtailed at a time when they were most strongly needed. This observation calls attention to a strong similarity between this late twentieth century strategy and the earlier demonstration of silence that marked the early years of the Church's life in the mid-nineteenth century on the questions of slavery and race.

The archival search also identified the emergence of a new language to characterize the presence of congregations of color. We meet terms like “colored congregation”, the term used for St. Thomas on the south side of Chicago; colored missions; domestic missions; model minority missions; the American Church Institute for Negroes. This is significant, since the emergence of a new narrative identifying a new presence in the diocese could be regarded as foregrounding a bifurcation, or at least some disunity in the church as a whole at the same time as the church was seemingly making an effort at addressing the spontaneous development among black Episcopalians in their strong show of presence.

If the Church was allowed to bifurcate, largely as a historical occurrence, that occurrence speaks largely about the place that a thoroughgoing creationist ethic and its implications for equality before God did or did not occupy in its ecclesial life. History matters and takes on its own logic, so that, contained in its processes at any one time, totally out of sight, and clearly beyond immediate understanding, new conditions would begin to emerge which only on hindsight would become recognizable as representing elements of continuity from an earlier state. So, the extent to which that appearance of disunity took shape inside the ecclesial life of the Church in an earlier period is to some degree responsible for the ways in which this disunity would take on a life of its own as the historical process unfolds.

Take for example the suburbanization of the Episcopal Church in the post-1970 years and perhaps even before the specific year of 1970. The quality of the broad church experience could be expected to reflect the huge demographic shifts that were taking place. Walled-off areas tucked away neatly from a racially diverse urban experience would likely be unreachable by any dialogue in the larger community concerning the effects of race as a general, even socially decisive matter. No challenges worth anything would arise in those circumstances; there would be no genuflection to the energetic cutting edges of the black religious and social experience; there would be no space limed out for liturgically giving expression to the black religious experience: in music, in liturgical dance, in remembrance of important holidays in the life of these communities of color. What more likely (and clearly what we have observed) has occurred is a deafening silence to issues of race, especially in those places where no racial minorities were in attendance, and even

in those where these “others” were few in number. Added to that, in the American experience, the fact that those “walled-off” areas would most likely be peopled with individuals identified with more politically conservative viewpoints means that such a protected social environment would be very likely to be isolated from the complexity of the urbanized racial experience of black populations in general and black Episcopalian church life in particular. To the extent that individual churches were left on their own without an overarching prophetic racially sensitive stance being echoed by the diocese as a whole, the black church experience would be totally ignored, clearly to the disadvantage of black Episcopalians in the local community. More importantly, the white community would be effectively shielded from real confrontation with the existential questions impacting their own social and spiritual development.

What this means is that any direct or indirect benign othering of a people on the wholly insubstantial basis of color will eventually require the larger church to respond to this earlier othering by an energetic vigilance affirmed to protect the church, an intentional Christian community, from undermining the potentiality, indeed the very achievement of important church unity. That we are engaged in this activity at this present time, is welcome indication that the larger church has itself now come to the realization of the cardinal importance of this moment.

It is an interesting phenomenon of this process of “othering” that it will have hugely consequential and unexpected outcomes on both sides. Those who have been on the receiving end will develop individual and social responses to such exclusion, and will create mechanisms for achieving social solidarity to support political action designed to alter their current situation, at least to create alternative scenarios for the consummation of their own sense of noble personhood. The responses of black clergy and lay persons to a long series of slights and disparagements are referenced fully later in this report, and give specific content to the argument being made here. It is also possible that marginalized individuals and groups could likely view reality through lenses crafted out of the existential conditions of their day-to-day experience. The internal dynamics of this complex social evolution are difficult, even impossible to predict. On the other hand, those in the “in” group will experience their own kinds of alienation from the marginalized group and come to hold warped views of the broader social context. This symmetric distancing will ultimately lead to a total loss of community as between both groups. Significantly, groups that have been relegated to the margins can very likely develop responses ranging from a tendency to excessive inward-looking on the one hand, to a sense of resignation and an inability to muster the radical hope necessary to survival on the other. Those on the other side are likely to firmly believe their own stories, now represented in the shape and structure of institutions and projects which define their condition of exceptionalism, however distorted these might really be. This symmetric distancing and its attendant undermining of community is not sustainable, and definitely not desirable.

If a new future is urgently desired, what appears necessary in these conditions of sharply demarcated social lives is the creation of new opportunities for crafting of new mechanisms for the emergence of true community, the telling of stories coupled with unfolding of new opportunities for the liberating understanding of each other’s stories. Under ordinary circumstances in most of civic life, this crafting of

newness is often difficult. In the context of the church, the existence of a master narrative, a narrative fully expressed in our baptismal covenant, should make this task abundantly easier. Saying this in another way, the church already represents a formation organized around a usable story, one that can and must be re-appropriated as the basis of a new dispensation of togetherness, a new collective identity.

Going forward.

If we are to go forward into the future, a solidly united future, one in which our unity is understood only in terms of an essential unity in Christ's body and blood rather than in any essentiality of race as a defining characteristic (inhering either in bodies, or surviving in institutions deliberately so structured or occurring through organizational inertia, or just plain habit), the single non-negotiable strategic task before us is the opening up of spaces for the actualization of conversation. But the call to conversation has been honored more in the breach than in actuality. It has been an extremely difficult thing to accomplish. We must get beyond that without fail, if we are going to accomplish what this calls us to do. Quoting Robert Raboteau, "community, that which we now earnestly seek probably for the first time in our life together, is the source of identity for each person...because, within each of us, the inner law of life ineluctably searches for wholeness and fulfillment." We are really about whole-making. Raboteau was discussing Howard Thurman, that towering Black theologian who for the full length of his professional life was really about challenging the injustices of racism meted out to all who were not "white." Raboteau continues: "When discrimination and racism intervene to destroy community, they frustrate the very thrust of life itself ...we still face a confrontation insofar as we still fail to see each other face-to-face...Faces must be shown before interracial community is possible. This confrontation-without the mask of evasion, the mask of fear, the mask of discomfort, the mask of false civility- must occur between black and white, painful and difficult though this may be, if we are to continue the search for common ground, the search that is the very manifestation of Life within." This speaks to us very directly at this defining moment of our life together- a white church and a black church seeking to be one church in Christ. May we embrace this important moment with hope, with love and with resolve.

What does our faith require of us?

As we search for the theological foregrounding of our work of reconciliation in a church that is struggling with the residues of slavery and the baggage of racism, we can do no better than recall the Trinitarian foundation of our faith, that faith to which we attest each time we come together to worship, especially so when we approach the table that is set for our communal sharing in the Eucharistic feast, that mystery that stands at one and the same time, in this world, at that moment, but also represents that unique, inexplicable coming together of the divine and the human. This is the profoundest exemplification of the nature of the sacrament, binding as it does, all God's children in one act of sharing one body and one blood. A Trinitarian God stands at the center of our life of faith together.

The concept of the Trinity was not always available to the church. It is important for us to remember that it was consciously forged against sundry heretical doctrines which sought to separate Jesus' humanity from his divinity, in a struggle that stretched over a long period in the life of the early church. At its core is a doctrine concerning the oneness of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, an understanding that does not speak of three persons, separated in any bodily or extrinsic way, but of one true God, who is at one and the same time: God, the Father - creator; God, the Son - redeemer; and God, the Holy Spirit - comforter, bound together in a seamless, love-infused relationality, whose evident quality is that of unity, what theologians call perichoresis. For us at this time, it is our most urgent task to recover and exemplify that unity in the life of the church, a unity which has been eroded not so much by ecclesial decision, but by the absence of a deeply self-conscious adherence to the abiding principles of that Trinitarian faith. There are ethical implications as the processes of nation-building unfolded in all the major institutions of a developing America.

It is important for us to remember that this concept of the Trinitarian Godhead stands at the center of our liturgical life, as the basis on which we come together in our baptismal covenant in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit (Ephesians 5: 18-20).

A church that took seriously this perichoretic relationality could not have stood silently by as the brutalities that have been perpetrated by one group against another were unfolding in the broad daylight of the American experience of racial slavery and its progeny. That our church did not vigorously challenge these evils unfolding in its midst, and even now struggles with the disunity within itself that is the direct and indirect result of that sordid history, is the primary and inescapable reason for this present urgent call for truth-telling and change.

But the healing of itself is not the only reason for undertaking this effort. More importantly, if the church is true to its calling to be prophetic in a world riddled with injustices of one kind or another, it must in addition speak with conviction to the community outside its walls, and speak and act forcefully, with coherence, and with wisdom against all circumstances which undermine the sanctity of God's creation, especially those that support any essential, or induced, overlordship of one group or person over another.

The objective of our work is nothing short of a full-bodied push for the achievement of reconciliation and the embodiment of a spirit of forgiveness across the various domains of the life of the church, with a vow never again to let the lingering effects of the racialization of humanity contribute to any distancing between blacks and whites in the affairs of our church community. This implies also that as new groups become part of the church, we receive them joyfully and incorporate them without reserve as examples of the diverse richness of God's creative act. It is the under-achievement of unity in the presence of God, and enacted in His church, which for too long has been represented by a state of uneasy accommodation of two peoples in a condition riddled with suspicion, hurt, lack of trust, coupled with the inability to open-up to each other in robust conversation on the divisive issue of race which has given us a picture of an unreconciled relationship parading as family. We should be about the recovery of unity that comes from being children of a Trinitarian God, where differences are not elevated as some specific markers of substance, but alternatively seen as markers of a divinely ordered diversity that evidences the abundance of life as a gift from a Trinitarian God, freely, beautifully and bountifully given.

Silence and Invisibility

Beginning in the 17th Century, the construct of race has defined “white” as the primary and natural condition and non-white as “other”. This race construct is the basis of slavery and the underlying core of Jim Crow, the Black Codes and other discriminatory legislation, the systemic and racist policies and practices of the institutions and organizations of this nation. The silence and invisibility evident during the years of slavery and The Civil War continued as the nation and the church faced a changing society that included Africans in America no longer slaves. The ways in which the society responded to changing conditions did not lead to engaging the challenges of race and racism but did lead to changes in how the dominant culture (white) responded in modified silences.

Illinois attained statehood in 1818 with a constitution that provided that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall hereafter be introduced into that state. The slaves then living in the state were not affected by this. (The first slave in Illinois arrived in 1719 with French settlers.) However, “Black Laws” passed in Illinois stripped blacks of any rights even if “free”. The Episcopal Diocese of Illinois was founded in 1835 during which time the most contested political issue was slavery. Yet the records of the Diocese of Illinois and papers of the first bishop Philander Chase reveal no mention and/or engagement with the political issue of slavery.

Historians of the Episcopal Church argue that the church’s neutrality on the issue of slavery was a failure to reconcile two opposites: the ethical position that understood the gospel to be anti-slavery and, on the other hand, a reluctance to challenge the southern aristocratic church. A document in the records of the church, A Reproof of the American Church by British abolitionist Samuel Wilberforce, A.M. was extracted from his “History of the Protestant Episcopal Church” published 1844. Wilberforce described slavery as an evil which must be rebuked. The “Reproof” was published in the United States in 1846 with “An Introduction by an American Churchman.” (See Archive document A) In the lengthy introduction, the American churchman made clear that Wilberforce’s history intentionally was not printed and distributed in the United State but rather suppressed by the church. This document was never circulated among American Episcopal clergy, suggesting an unwillingness to engage the subject of slavery from the perspective of the gospel. The choice of silence on issues of racial injustice renders the oppressed invisible in the eyes of the institution.

One exception to silence and invisibility with regard to race and justice was Henry Whipple who was a strong advocate for justice in the nineteenth century. During his brief time in Chicago he was rector of a Southside mission, the Church of the Holy Communion. He was very outspoken on injustices toward “Indian” or native peoples and also directed his ministry toward several populations on the margins of Chicago. His more public ministry was in Minnesota where he served as Bishop.

Migrations of African Americans from the slave states began before the Civil War, increasing in numbers after the war. By the late nineteenth century, the archives of the Diocese reveal the presence of several

“colored missions” as documented in conference journals. Missions to African Americans and “Indians”, or Native Americans, were categorized under the work of “domestic missions”. The domestic missions were written about separately regarding them in a similar manner as foreign missions. Though the colored participants of the Diocese of Chicago were active through their designated missions and active in financial support, they were not described as fellow members but relegated to the status of outsiders, domestic aliens.

One African American church that appears prominently in the diocesan archives is St. Thomas in Chicago. It continues today as a vibrant African American congregation. It was founded in 1878 primarily by those who had arrived via the Underground Railroad and were dispersed from Quinn Chapel AME Church, the oldest African American church in Chicago. Although St. Thomas grew in size and financial resources and received national coverage, it did not attain official “parish” status until 1940. The highlighting of St. Thomas as the example of an African American parish contrasts with the lack of information in the archives about other African American parishes in the diocese. The general descriptions of African Americans (and “Indians”) in diocesan periodicals of the time rely on racial difference even when attempting to “deal” with race. This was enabled by racial stereotypes allowing whites to continue to regard the separate and unequal circumstances of African Americans (and other non-white peoples) as natural.

During the first decades of the 20th century, at the national level a few official committees on race and equality were being established in attempts by the institution to address issues of race. The records show little funding and support for these efforts as well as leadership that was primarily white. The Episcopal Church established The American Church Institute for Negroes (ACIN) of twelve churchmen (white) who established one school in each of the Southern states for the “religiously inspired education of practical workers of the world – farmers, industrial workers, homemakers, etc.” Those thus educated would return to their communities to raise the standards of living. One of the schools “adopted” was Bishop Payne Divinity School aimed at providing opportunities in theological education for African American clergy who would serve the church’s black members. While the ACIN board was white, the general agent and field agents were black. Along with the black congregations, North and South, the ACIN worked to keep black Episcopalians separate and unequal, reflecting the larger society. In the view of the Episcopal Church, these efforts were seen as successful in maintaining racial harmony – and in maintaining invisibility.

These efforts coincided with social service programs of the Diocese of Chicago. Charitable agencies (such as boys’ homes, educational institutions and summer camps) were part of a larger societal trend to confront the so-called “Negro problem” in the first half of the 20th century. For the most part they were well-funded and well-supported by clergy (white) at the top of the organized but did not challenge the segregationist policies of Chicago. Social services and committees became the external centers for the church’s work on race.

To its credit, the church took an unapologetic position on race and inequality during the Civil Rights movement. The Diocese of Chicago was forthright on behalf of the efforts to desegregate the Chicago Public School system. It was actively involved in local boycotts and strongly encouraged participation in

the “1963 March on Washington.” Special events were organized to support members interested in traveling to the March on Washington, although there is no information in the archives as to who participated. The Civil Rights movement was very popular in monthly periodicals. What is missing in the records is engagement or lack of engagement by congregations of the diocese. The lack of such records points to continued silence and invisibility. At the same time, significant contributions were made to major secular Civil Rights organizations ignoring the role that Black Episcopalians could play.

During and following the Civil Rights movement, a new institutional language emerged. The phrase “urban church” was a code for referencing and categorizing churches located in the “inner city” of metropolitan spaces like Chicago. Location of churches is only one aspect, as inner city churches also were dealing with changing racial demographics brought about by the elimination of redlining and other legal practices of racial discrimination. The phrase “white flight” is used to describe the exodus of white people from city neighborhoods to suburban areas as African Americans moved into those neighborhoods referred to as “changing neighborhoods.” From the experience of those parishes that survived this demographic change, being in a “changing” or a “changed” neighborhood is to be invisible. Between 1945 and 2013, 24 Chicago Diocesan Parishes and Missions were closed or merged, 14 in neighborhoods that became African American. Between 1944 and 2013, 22 Chicago Diocesan suburban congregations were founded. The Diocese of Chicago lost an opportunity to engage efforts to integrate those parishes that had been considered “urban congregations.”

The racial violence, loss of critical figures in American political and religious leadership, the rise of Black Power resulted in many institutions withdrawing from institutional stances on race relations and inequality. This was true for the Diocese as well. The years following saw a backlash against the gains of the Civil Rights movement. Beginning with the Reagan administration, changes in economic policies, the “war on drugs” and severe budget cuts hit poor communities of color most severely. The social programming of the Diocese declined during a time when charitable and social programs were needed. The archival file of Metropolitan Affairs does not indicate why. Nor does the archival history of the diocese reveal a vision for empowering and/or enabling congregations to deal with issues of race, power, and inequality. More research is needed in these areas.

White Privilege as It Reflects the Legacy of Slavery

Dr. Johari Jabir, in his research on the Legacy of Slavery in the Diocese of Chicago, indicated how white privilege has manifested itself and continues to do so in this Diocese. Dr. Jabir wrote in his report, “The construction of race has meant that non-white people have been signified upon (Long, 1992) in a way that has rendered whiteness as “natural” or unmarked” category when in actuality, a critical dimension in the legacy of slavery means that each of us inhabits the psychic and material realities of race. Race therefore determined rights and privileges, with peoples of color being considered “less than”.

Peggy McIntosh stated in her “Unpacking the Knapsack of White Privilege” article that she was taught that racism put others at a disadvantage but never that it put her as a white person at an advantage. She is able to put the advantages of white males in this country in the same context or perspective as gender inequality and thus started her personal journey into racism and the inequalities of it. While white men have been sympathetic to the causes of females, they do so but not at the expense of giving up what are considered the privilege of men in this country. As whites, they are taught that they are normal.

White privilege is still very much alive in the Diocese. For example, too often it is the practice to have one person of color appointed or elected to diocesan committees and boards while the decision making remains with the white members. This predominately white Diocese has yet to accept its black brothers and sisters as equals in Christ. The color line was and still is apparent in the ways the Church situates its work with non-white members within the overall diocesan structure. Blacks and Native Americans were categorized under the work of “domestic missions”. Instead of being described as fellow members of the Church they were seen as outsiders within a structure that regarded them in the same way this structure saw people of color in the foreign mission field.

One concrete example of white privilege can be seen in the diocesan decisions to commit its funds for church planting in areas the Diocesan leadership thought would be the next place of growth by whites. As a result the Diocese has plowed thousands of dollars into areas like Huntley and Orland Park for church planting while urban church development on the south and west sides of Chicago where the racial wealth gap is very evident has received minimal funding from the Diocese.

Black Response to Legacy of Slavery

From the beginning of the slave trade and slavery in this nation, enslaved Africans resisted their captivity. The economic and political conditions following the end of slavery left the former slaves impoverished in a racially hostile environment. The migration of African Americans from the South began before the Civil War and increased in numbers following the end of slavery as one way to resist the violence and oppression of the conditions in the former slave states. When they arrived in the cities and towns of the North, they encountered segregation and racial hostility. In these circumstances, within the areas they could live, African Americans built communities in cities across the country. In the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, these became viable communities that also were a place of refuge.

In Chicago the African American community on the Southside and the Westside became a fully developed community in the years before the Depression. A directory of that community lists a wide range of businesses, including small manufacturing businesses, and later an aviation school, professionals, schools, restaurants and clubs, theatres, social and benevolent associations, and churches. The religious institutions in particular were places of refuge in a hostile society that relegated African Americans to the margins. The black churches also played an important role in supporting the institutions within the community. The racial restrictions of Chicago meant that there were limitations, financial and otherwise, with the result that many of the people in the community had limited employment opportunities and limited incomes.

In the archival records of the Diocese of Illinois and subsequently the Diocese of Chicago, the “colored missions” that emerged in the late 19th century were treated as separate domestic missions. There is very little in the archives that documents non-white congregations. The exception is St. Thomas, founded in 1878, for which there is considerable documentation. The founding members of St. Thomas were attempting to create a religious institution that would harbor them from the racial hostilities of Chicago. They also were trying to create a community of African American professionals who might use their social status to uplift the profile of the race. Affiliation with the Episcopal Church represented a sense of respectability and citizenship. This served the function of creating their own institution as a safe space in a racially hostile society and affiliating with the prestige of a church that could place them on a path to a version of equality that required respectability. It was their way of negotiating a racist society.

There is little documentation in the archives of the Diocese of Illinois and the Diocese of Chicago regarding African American resistance to the legacy of slavery within the church. Objections to the marginalized status of African Americans within the Episcopal Church are evident in the history of the Conference of Church Workers among Colored People beginning in 1883. In the years following the Civil War, there were a growing numbers of black Episcopalians, black parishes and black clergy even though many black Episcopalians, including former slaves, left the Episcopal Church in the thousands after the Civil War. (See Harold T. Lewis, *Yet with a Steady Beat*, Trinity Press International, for a detailed accounting of black resistance.)

There is also the issue of black bishops. One proposal was to have suffragan bishops for colored work. Another proposal was creation of special missionary districts for different races with each having a bishop of that race. In 1883, a group of Southern churchmen met at the University of the South to resolve the controversy. They prepared a proposal to be enacted at the next General Convention. They proposed “In any Diocese containing a large number of persons of colour, it shall be lawful for the Bishop and Convention of the same to constitute such population into a special Missionary Organization under the charge of the Bishop.” Black Episcopalians recognized this would disenfranchise black Episcopalians. In response Alexander Crummell, rector of St. Luke’s, Washington, D.C., organized black clergy and founded the Conference of Church Workers Among Colored People (CCWACP). They sent a delegation to the General Convention to protest the proposed canon. The General Convention rejected the proposed canon, but did not result in a victory for black Episcopalians. Southern dioceses began a systematic separation of Blacks. This move was consistent with the implementation of enforced legal segregation throughout the South. Other protestant denominations were proceeding along similar lines as well.

The CCWACP continued to press for social justice until the founding of the Union of Black Clergy and Laity in 1968. In its 1919 memorial, the CCWACP stated that one of its goals was “to take such steps as will greatly aid in bringing about social justice to the Colored People of the United State and securing for them Christian treatment as full citizens of this Republic.” The many memorials that the CCWACP presented to General Conventions were not granted. The Church saw its role as providing sacraments and pastoral ministry within the context of segregation. As such it was perceived as providing for blacks the same as was provided to whites. The CCWACP was seeking to improve conditions for blacks in the church and in the society. In addition to challenging the institutional church, the CCWACP also served to provide a means for black Episcopalians to come together. By 1940 there began to be a gradual shift in the Church’s racial policy. This was seen in the establishment of the office of Secretary for Negro Work by the General Convention that year. Nevertheless, Negro work was still seen as separate and distinct, consistent with the racial climate of the time.

The CCWACP continued until the mid-1960s. In 1957 the Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity (ESCRU) was founded primarily by white churchmen desiring the Church to do no less than the nation in terms of racial relations. However with the rise of the Black Power movement, tensions developed because of the concern by the black membership that the organization was reflective of white liberal theology. Furthermore, a white dominated organization could not work for empowerment of black Episcopalians and the bringing together of other black groups in combating racism. In 1968 the Union of Black Clergy and Laity (UBCL) was formed in the belief it could better work as a united voice for change for black Episcopalians.

At the General Convention of 1967, black Episcopalians endorsed the establishment of the General Convention Special Program which was designed to address the problems of blacks and other minorities in inner cities. But they were ignored by the Church leadership when it gave money directly to secular groups, some of whom were hostile to religious institutions. In so doing the Church failed to recognize that black

Episcopalians whose churches mainly were in the areas of cities that were being affected by violence and unrest could be important in addressing the problems in their communities.

In addition, the Church demonstrated its marginalization of black Episcopalians by removing the Rev. Dr. Tollie Caution from his position as Secretary of the Division of Racial Minorities. In response the Rev. Quintin E. Primo, rector of a parish in Wilmington, Delaware at the time, convened the Ad Hoc Committee of Negro Clergy about this incident. This event precipitated the formation of the UBCL. Subsequent events led to the reorganizing the UBCL as the Union of Black Episcopalians (UBE) in 1970. Rev. Quintin Primo, later Suffragan Bishop of Chicago, was a founder and first president of UBE. Mattie Hopkins of Trinity Church, Chicago and a member of the Chicago Board of Education was an important and active leader in the national UBE organization until her untimely death in 1988. Ms. Hopkins earlier in 1963 was a leader in the participation of the Diocese of Chicago in the boycott of the segregated Chicago Public School System. In the years since UBE has continued to work with deputies to General Convention, within dioceses around conditions of racism in the Episcopal Church and in society, desiring a church and a society more reflective of the Gospel. The UBE Chicago Chapter was among the founding chapters. The chapter has served the Diocese of Chicago as national organization has served the Church in pressing for racial justice. More research needs to be done on the role of UBE in the Diocese of Chicago. UBE is an outward and visible sign of black resistance in the Episcopal Church.

Economics of the Legacy of Slavery

In addressing the economics of the legacy of slavery, one must acknowledge that slavery persisted after the Civil War and still persists today though under different names. It is well known that one major legacy of slavery is the economic gap between black and white. A research and policy brief issued by the Institute on Assets and Social Policy in February 2013, “The Roots of the Widening Racial Wealth Gap: Explaining the Black-White Economic Divide,” cites a 2009 “representative survey of American households revealed that the median wealth of white families was \$113,149 compared with \$6,325 for Latino families and \$5,677 for black families.” This research and policy brief goes on to identify the following five “major drivers of the racial wealth gap ... homeownership, income, college education, inheritance, and unemployment.”

Immediately after the Civil War, hopes for African Americans to become landowners – “forty acres and a mule” – were dashed. Many African Americans in the former Confederate states were then forced to become either tenants or sharecroppers or even worse industrial slaves. In January 1865 General William T. Sherman issued Special Field order No. 15 setting aside land south of Charleston, South Carolina for black settlement with the provision that each family would receive forty acres of land. Even though Sherman meant such provision to be only temporary, by June, 40,000 Blacks had settled on 400,000 acres of “Sherman land.” (Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America’s Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877*. New York, 1988 : 71) General Oliver Otis Howard, Commissioner of the Freedman’s Bureau, also issued Circular 13 instructing Bureau agents to “set aside” forty-acre tracts for the freedmen as rapidly as possible.” (Foner: 159) Yet President Johnson ordered Howard to rescind his order with the result Howard had to order “the restoration to pardoned owners of all land except the small amount that had already been sold under a court decree.” (Foner: 159) Johnson’s action put an abrupt end to the idea of the Freedman’s Bureau actively promoting black land ownership. So between 1865 and 1877 the industrial leaders of the North as well as Southern landowners forced the freedmen into the status of day laborer or sharecropper, neither of which advanced the economic well being of the freedman. For most white Episcopalians the issue of slavery was not an issue for the Church. Even though Episcopalians in the eleven Southern states that succeeded from the Union and formed the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Confederate States of America, after the war most leaders in the North at the 1865 General Convention welcomed back their Southern brethren and adopted a statement “thanking God for the return of peace and for the restoration of unity within the church.” (Gardiner H. Shattuck. *Episcopalians and Race: Civil War to Civil Rights*. University Press of Kentucky, 2000: 10) Because the issue of slavery was not named as a moral issue for leaders of the Episcopal Church, members of this Church would be at peace with their wealth contrasted with the lack of economic well being of the freedman.

Another form of slavery that had a devastating economic impact on Blacks was industrial slavery. Douglas A. Blackman in his book, *Slavery by another Name: the re-enslavement of Black Americans from the Civil War to World War II* (New York, 2009), estimates between 100,000 and 200,000 blacks in the former Confederate states were force into industrial slavery. They were arrested and sentenced for the slightest of

offenses and sent to prison because they were unable to pay the fines. Then as convicts they were leased to mine owners and local farmers where they were underfed and overworked in inhumane conditions. This extensive system of forced labor did not come to an end until the beginning of the Second World War. Blackman tells the frightful story of forced black convict labor in the coal mines, the Pratt Mines near Birmingham Alabama being a prime example. Eric Foner in his "Epilogue" of his book on Reconstruction sounds a very somber note on the failure of Reconstruction with these words, words that speak directly to the black-white economic divide: "If racism contributed to the undoing of Reconstruction, by the same token Reconstruction's demise and the emergence of blacks as a disenfranchised class of dependent laborers greatly facilitated racism's further spread, until by the early twentieth century it had become more deeply embedded in the nation's culture and politics than at any time since the beginning of the antislavery crusade and perhaps in our entire history." (p. 604)

But what has been the economics of the legacy of slavery in the Diocese of Illinois/Chicago? There is a wealth gap between many of the white parishes in contrast to the few black congregations. As late as 1930 the four Black congregations were all missions (St. Andrews, Chicago, St. Andrews, Evanston, St. Edmunds, Chicago, and St. Thomas, Chicago). After the Second World War, the Diocese bought land in the growing suburbs and helped to plant mission congregations. Since 1944 twenty-one congregations were established in the suburbs while nineteen congregations in Chicago were closed and two congregations merged with other congregations.* Did the diocesan leadership simply follow the movement of White people to the fast growing suburbs while accepting the closing of congregations in the changing demographics of the south and west sides of Chicago? Financial support of the annual diocesan budget did come from the wealthy white congregations most of which were in the suburbs. It is worth investigating the connections between the movement of companies from Chicago to the suburbs, the construction of the expressways in the 1950s and urban renewal as a backdrop to the diocesan commitment of funds to purchase land for new suburban congregations. Did the diocese follow the money to the suburbs where its white members attended church? Further research is needed in order to answer these questions.

One example of the founding of a suburban congregation can be cited: the congregation of St. David, Glenview a Chicago suburb. In 1946 Bishop Conkling purchased a one acre plot of land in Glenview. The mission that was quickly formed took out a mortgage of \$20,000 to build a chapel which opened for services Christmas Eve 1947. Three years later this mission had paid off the mortgage and was admitted as a parish. A year later the church purchased another five and a half acres of property for \$15,000. In 1957-1959 the church funded the construction of a new church building by taking out a mortgage of \$100,000 from a local bank. The building cost \$180,000. Then in 1963/64 the church built a two story education building and in 1966 a new rectory with four bedroom "in keeping with the level of attractive single-family structures being built in Glenview at that time." By 1984 the final payment was made on the mortgage. In 2006 was able to purchase a new pipe organ at a cost of \$430,000 from a specific endowment. Today St. David has an endowment of \$1.5 million.

In contrast to St. David, Glenview the minutes of the Diocesan Commission on Metropolitan Affairs during the early 1980s document the painful financial situation at St. Thomas, Chicago which had a number of unpaid bills including payment on the apportionment. Because of the failure to pay its apportionment in 1981 St. Thomas was not seated at the 1981 Diocesan Convention. Only because Bishop Primo interceded on their behalf were they seated in 1982. The December 13, 1982 minutes of the Commission cite “progress being made by St. Thomas in the reduction of the debt” and instructed St. Thomas that “apportionment payment for 1983 be a priority.” The January 10, 1983 minutes note that there were still outstanding debts by St. Thomas in the amount of \$23,200.

* Chicago Diocesan Parishes and Missions closed or merged between 1945 and 2013:

All Angels (for the Deaf) 6336 Kenwood; All Saints (Indiana and 111th St.); Christ Church (6451 S. Woodlawn); Church of the Epiphany (201 S. Ashland Blvd.); Church of the Holy Trinity (4716 s. Union); Church of the Mediator (10961 s. Horne); Church of the Incarnation (102nd and Parnell); Church of the Redeemer (merged with St. Paul); Holy Cross-Immanuel (5843 S. Morgan); St. Ann (2016 N. Kimball); St. Barnabas (4241 W. Washington Blvd.); St. Bartholomew (6720 S. Stewart); St. Cyprian (6501 W. Belmont Ave.); St. George (847 76th) merged with St. Matthias; St. Joseph (121st and Eggleston); St. Luke (741 S. Western); St. Mark (4427 S. Drexel); St. Matthew (1738 W. Marquette); St. Richard of Chichester (5101 W. Devon Ave.); St. Elizabeth (62nd St. and St. Louis); St. Francis (2514 W. Thorndale Ave.); St. Philip (2114 W. 36th); St. Stephen (3533 N. Alban); St. Timothy (3555 W. Huron)

Chicago Diocesan Suburban Congregations founded between 1944 and 2013:

Arlington Heights, St. Simon; Aurora, St. David; Barrington Hills, St. Mark; Bloomingdale, Church of the Incarnation, Bolingbrook, Church of St. Benedict; Burr Ridge, St. Helena; Clarendon Hills, Church of the Holy Nativity; Deerfield, St. Gregory; Des Plaines, St. Martin, Elgin, St. Hugh of Lincoln; Elk Grove Village, St. Nicholas; Glenview, St. David; Glen Ellyn, St. Barnabas; Gurnee, Church of the Annunciation; Northbrook, St. Giles Northfield, St. James the Less; Palatine, St. Philip; Palos Park, Church of the Transfiguration; Park Forest, Church of the Holy Family; Prospect Heights, One in Christ Church; St. Charles, St. Charles; Waukegan, Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe; West Dundee, St. James

A Call to Faithfulness: An Invitation to a Committed Journey

The findings of the Task Force on the Legacy of Slavery brought out the following issues as discussed above: Silence and Invisibility; White Privilege; Black Responses; Economy and Class; Diocesan Structures and Programs; and Race and Change in the Congregational Profiles.

The findings challenge our faith and discipleship. This calls us to reflect from our faith perspective.

It must be said from the beginning that the legacy of slavery was, and still is, a disruption of the goodness of creation. Let us capture the first story of creation. There was chaos, void and nothingness. God put things in order. And it was GOOD.

On Silence and Invisibility

Silence and invisibility in the midst of grueling slavery and deadly racism is an abdication of the church's prophetic ministry. The story of the rich man and the poor man named Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31) speak eloquently of this. The rich man saw Lazarus everyday at his gate. He did not drive away Lazarus. He did not say anything about Lazarus. He saw Lazarus as a common fixture of the society. Lazarus is invisible to him.

When silence and invisibility becomes a norm for the church it becomes an active participant in the construct of the legacy of slavery. The Prophet Amos reminds us, "I, the Lord, hate and despise your religious celebrations and your times of worship. I won't accept your offerings of animal sacrifices – not even your very best. No more of your noisy songs! I won't listen when you play your harps. But let justice and fairness flow like a river that never runs dry." (Amos 5:21-24, Contemporary English Version)

On White Privilege

Privilege is a gift of God to all. It was not given to just one race or ethnic group. We are all privileged to be God's stewards of His Creation and to one another. However, in the construct of the legacy of slavery, that gift of common privilege was appropriated by members of the white race for themselves. Whites made the white race superior and the black race inferior. Such a privilege gave them control over the means of production and labor.

Theologically privilege does not mean to rule or dominate, it means to affirm the goodness of creation.

On Black Response to Legacy of Slavery

As mentioned in the sections "The Church and Race in Historical Perspective" and "Black Response to the Legacy of Slavery", the forms of resistance ranged from the Nat Turner rebellion to the Great Migration and to the Civil Rights Movement. However, documentation is lacking as to what are the responses of black Episcopalians in the Diocese of Illinois and the Diocese of Chicago.

The study and understanding of the black response is a missional question for the Diocese. This is so because the forms of resistance used become the central question in the struggle against the legacy of slavery instead of the principal issue of dismantling the legacy of slavery, i.e., racism.

What does our faith instruct us? Archbishop Oscar Romero of El Salvador once said, “In spite of us, despite us, with or without us, the people are going to rise up.”

On the Economics of the Legacy of Slavery

The faith issue here is access to the bounty of God’s creation. When there is a concentration of wealth to one race or group the economic construct denies poor people the enjoyment of the many gifts of God. In the United States of America black people are the primary bearers of this condition.

As such black congregations mirror this economic gap. They become recipients of aid instead of partners in mission. There is a need for a deeper, wider and better understanding of the way we share and give. The church in the Book of Acts (2:43-47) may be a point to start.

On Diocesan Institutions, Structures and Programs

The Task Force did not initially look into the issue of diocesan institutions, structures and programs but these kept coming out in discussions. Something must be said about these because they reflect who we are.

Where are we? Why are we this way?

Institutions, structures and programs reflect the vision of the particular organization – in other words, to preserve the status quo. Any rocking of the boat is a threat to the status quo. And it is dealt with accordingly.

It is well to reiterate that the church is called to serve. As the cliché goes it is always reforming never reformed. Institutions, structures and programs must always discern the rustling of the Spirit and the cry of the people, particularly, in the context of the legacy of slavery. When this is missed, the temptation to make the church as a tower of Babel will always be lurking.

On Race and Change in the Congregational Profiles

The above issue is the title of the last section of Dr. Johari Jabir’s final report to the Task Force. One of his three further research recommendations states: “Oral History Projects on ethnic parishes/members of the diocese who have been mentioned but not fully documented in official diocese records. A fuller investigation into these congregations is important to the conversation of race. Interviews and ethnographies might help to move these persons from the margins of ministry to the center of the diocese.” This came about as a result of the Task Force’s conversations on multi-ethnic, multi-racial and multi-cultural congregations. The changing face of America is reflected by these congregations. What can they offer to us? Are they reminding us about the Pentecost gathering in the Book of Acts?

While we welcome the changing face of America the basis of the construct of the legacy of slavery is still black and white. All are still put into a box(es) that the construct created.

What Is Required of Us

Again, we affirm the goodness of Creation. That God is the Creator. We confess that we have disrupted the goodness of Creation. We are called to amend broken relationships between God and us, and among us. This is all about reconciliation and reparation.

What are the specifics? In the last part of this report are the recommendations of the Task Force on the Legacy of Slavery. **We invite you to a committed journey to work out the recommendations. God creates all things new. Let us be part of that new creation.**

Conclusion

The primary impact of the legacy of slavery, segregation and discrimination in the Diocese of Chicago and its predecessor Diocese of Illinois and the resulting in white privilege has been the construction of an invisible wall of separation between the white members of the diocese and African Americans who sought “refuge in the Master’s House.” The House of Bishops in its 1994 Pastoral Letter, “The Sin of Racism,” asks, “How can the church offer all people the ‘supreme advantage of knowing Christ,’ when too often it is itself a bastion of separation? How can the Episcopal Church, which reflects the dominant culture, be a factor in changing destructive racial attitudes and behaviors? Are we ready to find new common ground on which all may stand together? Will we trust the grace of God to enable us to bridge our many unhappy divisions.” These “unhappy divisions” have been documented not only in the research conducted by Dr. Johari Jabir but also by the African American Clergy Focus Group and further work conducted by Task Force members. Dr. Jabir captured this wall of separation in the following four categorical timelines: 1) Silence and Invisibility: 1835-1870; 2) Acts of Agency, Seeking Refuge in the Master’s House: 1870-1960; 3) An Active Social Theology in Conflict: A Church’s Engagement with the Civil Rights Movement – Maintaining Institutional Segregation: 1960-1980; and 4) Race and the Change in Congregational Profiles: 1980 – Present. Two of the themes that emerged during the African American Clergy Focus Group were the lack of power, influence and agency by African American clergy in the diocese and racial division – white privilege. This invisible wall of separation is further documented in the Task Force’s Final Report in each of its sections from the theological to Church and Race in Historical Perspective: the Chicago Episcopal Diocese Experience, white privilege, silence and invisibility, black Episcopalian responses to the expressions of silence and invisibility and the economics of the legacy of slavery.

Recommendations

That each congregation in light of the findings of this Final Report including its appendices spend the following year in a series of conversations on the impact of the legacy of slavery and segregation and discrimination in its local context. Toward the end of this period it is suggested each Deanery meet for a day to receive and discuss reports from member congregations.

That each congregation in the diocese conducts oral history projects. Interviews with members of congregations will shed light on the historical dynamics of a given congregation in terms of race and class. This would prove to be critical for churches whose racial demographics have changed in concert with social phenomenon such as “urban renewal.”

That the Diocese conduct oral history projects on Latino/Hispanic and Asian American congregations/members of the diocese who have been mentioned but not fully documented in official diocesan records. A fuller investigation into these congregations is important to the conversation on race. Interviews and ethnographies might help to move these persons from the margins of ministry to the center of the diocese.

That the Diocese produce maps of the Diocese of Chicago and of its predecessor Diocese of Illinois in ten year periods locating the congregations and the demographics by ethnicity of the areas covered by these dioceses.