

The Impact of Jim Crow on Policy and Practice in the Diocese of North Carolina: 1901-1928

The Rev. Dr. N. Brooks Graebner

Historiographer, Diocese of North Carolina

April 24, 2020

I. The Effort to Retain the Racial Unity of Diocesan Convention in the Early 1900s

In 1901, the Annual Convention of the Diocese of North Carolina adopted a new canonical structure for the administration of its missionary work. This new structure called for the creation of three convocations: the Convocation of Raleigh, for white mission work in the eastern part of the diocese; the Convocation of Charlotte, for white mission work in the western part of the diocese, and the Convocation of the Colored People, for all black missionary efforts across the entire diocese. Each of these three convocations would have its own Archdeacon, and each would hold annual convocation meetings, to be attended by all the resident clergy and congregational treasurers of the convocation.¹

For the black congregations of the diocese, this structural change formalized a working relationship that had been in place for a decade. Since 1891, the diocese had employed an Archdeacon to oversee the development of black mission congregations and schools. The first Archdeacon was a white priest, the Ven. William Walker, under whose watch new black congregations and schools were opened in Louisburg, Littleton, Raleigh, Satterwhite, and Warrenton. Starting in 1898, the Archdeacon was a black priest, the Ven John H.M. Pollard, a Virginia native, who had been serving at St. Mark's, Charleston, SC at the time of his appointment. Under Pollard, black ministry continued to expand across the diocese, and in 1901, the Archdeacon launched an ambitious new enterprise in Littleton which included purchasing a 31-acre farm.² Under the terms of this new canon, Pollard was now being tasked with helping Diocesan Bishop Joseph Blount Cheshire, Jr. to conduct an annual gathering where all the convocation clergy, along with lay representatives, could report to one another about their particular ministries and discuss matters of shared concern.

But the language of this new canon did something more. It made explicit a strict racial segregation of diocesan mission efforts. The regional convocations of Raleigh and Charlotte were for white congregational development exclusively; the work with black congregations was consigned to a separate non-geographic, diocesan-wide convocation. This language, of course, was in keeping with the attitudes reflected in the Jim Crow legislation enacted here in North Carolina and across the South. Moreover, it brought the Diocese of North Carolina one step closer to adopting the same approach, and the same nomenclature, to black ministry that

¹ *Journal of the 85th Annual Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of North Carolina* (1901): 47-49. Hereinafter abbreviated *NCDJ*.

² Brooks Graebner, "Historically Black Episcopal Congregations in the Diocese of North Carolina: 1865-1959," 2018: 5-9. Archives of the Episcopal Diocese of North Carolina, Raleigh.

prevailed in neighboring dioceses, where, ever since the 1880s, black congregations had been organized into separate convocations, headed by their own archdeacons.

There remained one important difference between the convocation system in North Carolina and elsewhere in the South. In Virginia, for example, the provisions enacted under “Canon XIII” in the 1880s restricted black participation in annual council (convention) to representatives from the black congregations (two clergy, two lay), and permitted these representatives to vote only on matters directly related to their own ministry.³ Here in North Carolina, black clergy and black congregations were admitted into full union with diocesan convention on equal terms with whites. This practice was instituted during Bishop Atkinson’s episcopate and was a hallmark of Atkinson’s insistence upon an “Apostolic and Catholic” Church which embraced all members equally.⁴ The new canon of 1901 did nothing to alter this practice; black clergy were entitled to attend both their annual convocation meeting and the annual diocesan convention, and to participate fully in both.

But would North Carolina continue its long-standing practice of regarding whites and blacks as equal members of diocesan convention into the 20th century? The matter was first put to the test in the form of a proposed resolution introduced in 1903 by the Rev. Cary Gamble, rector of St. Timothy’s, Wilson:

Resolved, That the colored work of the Diocese be formed into a Missionary District, and that said District shall annually hold a District Convocation, to be presided over by the Bishop, and that this Convocation shall elect three clergy and three lay delegates to the annual Convention of the Diocese.⁵

This resolution was referred to the Committee on Canons, which reported at convention the following year:

In regard to the resolution on page 39 of the Journal of the last Convention, referring to work among the colored people, the committee are of opinion that Chapter II, Canon I, in regard to Convocations, is sufficient for present purposes; therefore they recommend that further consideration of the subject be postponed for the present.⁶

For the present at least, the Diocese of North Carolina would continue its customary practice of allowing all black clergy and congregations into full union with convention.

That practice, however, was now to come under scrutiny from a very different source. The Conference of Church Workers Among Colored People (CCWACP or CCW), the national gathering of black clergy, put forward for consideration by the 1904 General Convention a

³ Edward L. Bond and Joan R. Gundersen, “The Episcopal Church in Virginia, 1607-2007,” *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* vol. 115, no. 2 (2007): 286-288

⁴ N. Brooks Graebner, “The Rt. Rev. Thomas Atkinson (1807-1881): Advocate for an Apostolic and Catholic Church,” *Anglican and Episcopal History* vol. 86, no. 2 (June 2017): 161-164.

⁵ *NCDJ*, 87th (1903) 39.

⁶ *NCDJ*, 88th (1904) 36.

resolution calling for the formation of black missionary districts, to be headed by black missionary bishops appointed by General Convention under the terms already in use for territorial missionary districts. This would mean that the black bishops so appointed would have seat and voice in the House of Bishops, and the black missionary districts would have representation in the House of Deputies. It would also mean General Convention ratifying the practice already prevalent in the South of consigning black ministry to separate black convocations.

In response to this proposal from the CCW, both Archdeacon Pollard and Bishop Cheshire stated their strong preference for maintaining the diocesan status quo. Addressing the 1904 diocesan convention, Cheshire offered up an admixture of racial paternalism and theological principle. He justified the development of separate black congregations as an appropriate reflection of the need to provide “worship and instruction of a special character for a people whose moral and intellectual development demanded some special recognition and provision.” But he categorically rejected the notion of different Churches for different classes or races of people. The Church, he insisted, must maintain “outward and visible Unity,” and to preserve that sacred principle, the Church in North Carolina has admitted the colored clergy and parishes into union with the Diocesan Convention, so that the annual legislative meetings of the diocese might display “an open and visible expression of the Oneness into which Christ, our Divine Redeemer, gathers together all the children of God, of every race and condition.”⁷

For Cheshire, then, the current arrangement of racially separate convocations and a unified, bi-racial convention represented the “best arrangement possible.”⁸ Archdeacon Pollard echoed Bishop Cheshire’s sentiments. He, too, did not want to see any further separation of the races, declaring “the unity of the Church of God is of far more vital importance than any temporary expediency.”⁹

Nevertheless, Cheshire saw merit in having the convention itself take up the matter. He noted that the question was one that concerned the entire church and not only the diocese, and so he proposed the appointment of a committee of our “wisest and most experienced clergymen and laymen, that they may consider the whole question of the relation of the Church to the work of christianizing and elevating the colored people, with power to correspond with other diocese with a view of maturing some general principles of action.” The convention acceded to the Bishop’s suggestion, and Cheshire named four clergy and three lay persons.¹⁰

The all-white committee of the seven “wisest and most experienced clergymen and laymen,” handpicked by Bishop Cheshire, offered their recommendations the following year. The result was clearly not what the Bishop had anticipated. The majority report, offered by four of the seven committee members, directed the Committee on Canons to prepared an amendment to the

⁷ *NCDJ, 88th* (1904) 69,70.

⁸ *NCDJ, 88th* (1904) 71 .

⁹ *NCDJ, 88th* (1904) 130.

¹⁰ *NCDJ, 88th* (1904) 72; 37.

Constitution limiting the membership of the Convention to “white clergy and white delegates from white Parishes and Missions.” This was put forward by M.M. Marshall, Rector of Christ Church, Raleigh and President of the Standing Committee; Francis J. Murdoch, Rector of St. Luke’s, Salisbury; Richard H. Lewis layman from Christ Church, Raleigh, and Kemp Plummer Battle, layman from Chapel of the Cross, Chapel Hill. The minority report, signed by the remaining three members of the committee, declared that they were not yet prepared to recommend changes in “the relations of the colored people to the Church in this Diocese.” The minority report was submitted by Walter J. Smith, Superintendent of the Thompson Orphanage, Charlotte; Julian Ingle, Rector of Holy Innocents, Henderson and Secretary of Convention, and John Wilkes, layman from St. Peter’s, Charlotte.¹¹

The convention first took up the minority report, which failed on a vote by orders, with the clergy voting *aye* and the parishes voting *nay*. Subsequently, the majority report failed on a vote by orders with an obverse result, namely, the parishes voting *aye* and the clergy voting *nay*. But a closer examination of the vote tallies makes crystal-clear the sentiments of the diocesan convention. Only two parishes voted to retain the status quo; thirteen voted in favor of a whites-only diocesan convention. The clergy vote favored the status quo, but the results were decidedly mixed among the white clergy, with 16 voting to retain the status quo and 11 voting to remove blacks from convention. It was only the fact that all six of the black clergy present voted with the bishop that created the appearance of strong clergy approbation for the status quo.¹² But the failure of convention to adopt either the majority or the minority report left the matter officially unresolved.

At the convention of 1906, no action on this matter was taken until the close of the second day of convention, when the Rev. Francis Murdoch renewed his motion of the previous year. A friendly amendment was proposed and accepted, which was intended to soften the resolution by “conferring on the colored Churchmen the greatest measure of self-government consistent with Catholic principles and retaining them as an integral part of the Church in this Diocese (that is, ‘integral’ but not ‘members of the convention itself’).” The next morning, however, Murdoch moved postponement of his resolution until the following year, in light of the bishop’s personal communication that the Convocation of the Colored People desired to take this matter into consideration.¹³ Clearly, Bishop Cheshire was buying time.

At the 1907 diocesan convention, however, Cheshire was prepared to tackle the issue head-on. He began by noting that the national organization of black clergy, the CCW, had been calling for a separate organization and that now “in our own Diocese arises a demand for a separation in our Diocesan councils, and a separate organization.” Cheshire frankly attributed this latter demand to a mixture of racial prejudice and a sincere desire to improve the church’s mission to African

¹¹ *NCDJ*, 89th (1905) 31,32.

¹² *NCDJ*, 89th (1905) 35,36.

¹³ *NCDJ*, 90th (1906) 40,41.

Americans. Faced with such demands, Cheshire was now prepared to change his position and accept a separate organization for black ministry.

In a highly personal and deeply-impassioned statement, Cheshire reiterated his heart's desire to "cling to the old ideal of a Church and a Diocese which in its annual gatherings should represent visibly the oneness of all races and colors in Christ." The Bishop rehearsed the bi-racial experiences of his boyhood in his father's parish in Tarboro and his experiences of a bi-racial diocesan convention under Bishop Atkinson. He added: "so far as I am concerned, it simply passes my comprehension to understand how any one should object to this." He then, for what might have been the last time, gave expression to his deepest convictions:

As a matter of sentiment the presence of our colored brethren in our Diocesan convention is a visible representation to me of one of the most gracious and essential elements of the Church as a divine and Catholic Body. Such I have known it; such I have loved it; such my beloved father in the flesh, and such my revered father in the Church had taught me to know it and to love it; and such I had hoped that it might always continue. Bear with me, brethren and fathers, in thus paying my tribute of respect and affection, to a day and a condition that are passed. Those of you who do not sympathize in these feelings, may at least believe that in some of us they are very deep and strong.

Cheshire wanted to make sure the diocese knew that he was not discarding his long-standing personal convictions about racial unity "lightly or unadvisedly."

The Bishop then proceeded matter-of-factly. He acknowledged that blacks and whites, for different reasons, desired to be in separate organizations, and the time for a genial (one might say, paternalistic) bi-racialism was past. Thus, the question before the Church was to frame the best solution. For Cheshire, it came down to adopting one of two plans: the consecration of black Suffragan Bishops or the consecration of black Missionary Bishops. Of these two options, Cheshire favored the latter, since this is what the black clergy themselves expressly preferred, given that a Missionary Bishop would be entitled to a seat in the House of Bishops and the missionary jurisdiction entitled to representation in the House of Deputies. Cheshire anticipated that the diocesan convention would concur in his recommendation.¹⁴

The convention committee tasked with responding to the bishop's address did as he asked. They issued a four-point resolution which read as follows:

1. That in our opinion the time has come when the welfare of both races in the Southern States requires that each race should have its own legislative assemblies, and that we urge that the General Convention take immediate action on this matter.
2. That this Convention is of [the] opinion that Missionary Bishops are preferable to Suffragan Bishops to have jurisdiction of colored Clergy and laity in these States.

¹⁴ *NCDJ*, 91st (1907) 71-74.

3. That our Deputies to the General Convention be directed to present to that body the two foregoing resolutions.
4. That the Committee on Canons be instructed to report on the first day of next Convention an amendment to the Constitution which shall limit the membership of the Convention to white clergy and white delegates from Parishes and Missions of white people, and that the said Committee shall prepare such amendments to the Canons as may be considered proper to put all the above resolutions into effect.

The first three of these points were directed at the 1907 General Convention, calling on that Convention to implement the Missionary Bishop plan and directing North Carolina deputies to act accordingly. The fourth point was directed internally, calling for changes in the diocesan constitution and canons to purge blacks from the annual convention beginning in 1908. The first three accorded with Bishop Cheshire's stated position as set forth in his address; the fourth went beyond the bishop's stated position and called for change in the racial composition of diocesan convention regardless of the actions of the 1907 General Convention.

In a decision of profound consequences for the racial history of the diocese, the convention adopted the first three resolutions but rejected the fourth. That is, the convention went on record supporting the Missionary Bishop Plan (more commonly called the Missionary District Plan), but the convention also left standing the North Carolina status quo with respect to a biracial convention: black clergy and black congregations would continue to have seat and vote. And this status quo would not again be directly challenged from the floor of diocesan convention.¹⁵

At the 1907 General Convention, Cheshire and the diocesan deputation were in a decided minority position with respect to black missionary bishops. Cheshire made his views known for all to see in a published minority report; the majority, especially in the South, favored the Suffragan Plan. But the issue was not resolved in 1907, and would not be resolved until the General Convention of 1916 definitively adopted the Suffragan Bishop plan. Yet, through four successive General Conventions, Bishop Cheshire and the North Carolina deputation stood steadfast for the Missionary District Plan.

North Carolina's support for the Missionary District Plan was especially gratifying to the black clergy. In 1913, and again in 1916, the diocesan black Convocation placed memorials (resolutions) before the diocesan convention supporting the Missionary District Plan, and in each instance those memorials were warmly received and voted on positively by the convention itself. The CCW also took note of North Carolina's commitment to the Missionary District Plan and warmly commended Bishop Cheshire for it. This approbation of Cheshire's position was doubtless genuine, but not at all surprising, given that the President of the CCW at the time was none other than the Ven. Henry B. Delany, Archdeacon for black ministry in the diocese.¹⁶

¹⁵ *NCDJ*, 91st (1907) 38,39.

¹⁶ N. Brooks Graebner, "His Rightful Place in History: A Portrait of Bishop Henry Beard Delany (1858-1928)" 2020: 11-15. Archives of the Episcopal Diocese of North Carolina. Raleigh. See also, Gaines M. Foster, "Bishop

In the summer preceding the 1916 General Convention, Professor Charles Boyer of St. Augustine's School wrote a column for *The Carolina Churchman* in which he traced the recent diocesan history with respect to a separate organization for black ministry. Looking back to the pivotal 1907 diocesan convention, Boyer noted the growing calls for a whites-only diocesan convention here in North Carolina, as white clergy and laity pushed for adoption of the practices prevailing in Virginia and South Carolina, "which had already excluded their colored clergy and laity from the councils of the Church, given them a Council of their own, but without legislative authority." Moreover, Boyer noted the triumph of Jim Crow here in North Carolina, stating "It is not so much to be wondered at that, while the Church in the adjoining States was thus acting towards its negro members, and that this State had not long since passed through a serious political upheaval due to racial feeling—small wonder, I repeat, that this condition of unrest should have crept into the Convention of North Carolina." Then he added: "But better counsel prevailed, and the bond of Christian unity remained unbroken."

Boyer, in other words, had no illusion about the nature of church and society in North Carolina. He did not think that the Diocese of North Carolina was immune from the prevailing attitudes of Jim Crow. But he did credit the leadership of the diocese, the voice of "better counsel," for preventing that segregationist sentiment from becoming enshrined in diocesan practice. He then went on to describe how the black clergy and the diocese of North Carolina had united in support of the Missionary District Plan, and he concluded with these stirring words: "The Diocese of North Carolina has taken a brave stand for fairness and Christian equity in this matter. May its members this year draw new and staunch supporters to the cause, that it may succeed at the General Convention next October."¹⁷

In the event, Boyer's hopes for passage of the Missionary District Plan by the 1916 General Convention were not realized. But the protracted fight for passage of that plan, coupled with the continued participation of black clergy in the diocesan convention, enabled North Carolina to elect Henry Beard Delany as Suffragan Bishop in 1918 without that action becoming reduced to an exercise in white paternalism. The black clergy unanimously nominated Delany; the black clergy unanimously voted for him (in fact, the white clergy and delegates also voted for him unanimously). And Bishop Cheshire, in the spirit of the Missionary District Plan, granted Bishop Delany full authority to direct black ministry throughout the diocese.¹⁸

II. The Effort to Secure Financial Support for Black Ministry in the 1910s

As the foregoing narrative has shown, at the level of racial policy, The Diocese of North Carolina continued to be an exception to the prevailing practices across the South. Although the bi-racial composition of diocesan convention was repeatedly challenged in the first decade of the 20th century, Bishop Cheshire got his heartfelt wish, and the racial equality first instituted under

Cheshire and Black Participation in the Episcopal Church: The Limitations of Religious Paternalism," *The North Carolina Historical Review*, vol. LIV, no. 1 (January 1977) 49-65.

¹⁷ Charles H. Boyer "The Racial Episcopate," *The Carolina Churchman* (June-July, 1916) 15.

¹⁸ Graebner, "Bishop Delany," 17-20.

Bishop Atkinson in the 1860s was not rescinded. Blacks and whites remained members of the same diocesan convention and equally entitled to seat and vote.

But success in preserving this one aspect of racial unity in diocesan life did not guarantee a corresponding support for black ministry on the part of whites. And so, when the question of financial support for black ministry became the presenting issue, it revealed the diocese in a much different light.

The 1909 diocesan convention made no mention of black ministry in the Journal of Proceedings save for noting the death of Archdeacon Pollard and the naming of Archdeacon Delany as his successor. In 1910, however, the State of the Church report devoted considerable attention to the bright prospects for mission work among African Americans under Delany's leadership, and then offered this resolution:

Resolved, that the congregations in the Convocations of Raleigh and Charlotte be recommended to take up a collection each year for the benefit of the Convocation of the Colored People.

The Committee appended the following comment:

This work has been supported in this Diocese entirely by offerings from the colored people themselves, and from white people outside of the Diocese. . . . It seems, therefore, to your Committee best to recommend that the white congregations in the Diocese should voluntarily, if they see fit, contribute specially for the work of the colored people.

The call for voluntary contributions from white congregations for work in black congregations was duly introduced and ratified.¹⁹

But Bishop Cheshire thought more funding for black ministry was needed than could be realized through voluntary contributions. So, in 1911 the Bishop proposed that North Carolina adopt something like the practice implemented in South Carolina, where one half of the Easter Day Offering in every parish went to support work in the black convocation. This request for increased funding was made more urgent by a change in the formula the national Board of Missions would use in determining their own level of support for black ministry in the South. As Archdeacon Delany noted in his report to convention:

Allow me to call your attention to an action of the Board of Missions with regard to appropriations, that becomes effective in September next. It reads that their appropriations for other than schools will not be made in excess of \$2 for every \$1 raised for said work within the Diocese. These tidings give us great concern, for some of our new missions without schools and in debt. Some of our priests are pleading now for an increase of salary sufficient to meet actual necessities. In the light of the Church's vision

¹⁹ NCDJ, 94th (1910) 50, 51.

which has always been so full of optimism, we commend to you, again, the great opportunity that is offered to all of us to share in the work that lies just at our doors.

In other words, the black Convocation was facing a reduction in its funding from the national Church precisely because the white churches of the diocese itself were not contributing to this ministry.²⁰

So, given this new and urgent appeal from Archdeacon Delany, coupled with Bishop Cheshire's own proposal for a mandatory annual offering from all white churches comparable to the practice in South Carolina, how did the convention respond? The Committee on the State of the Church reported that the appeal for voluntary contributions had been a failure: "White churches last year gave only \$41.54 to our colored work, less than was given to the Jews (that is, to the Good Friday offering for the Holy Land)."²¹ To strengthen support, the convention committee tasked with responding to the Bishop's Address, offered the following two-part resolution:

Resolved, That the Convention recommends that on one Sunday in each year the rector of each Parish shall bring this work before his people.

Resolved, That one-third of the Easter offering of every Parish and Organized Mission be asked for the work of the Colored Convocation of the Diocese.

This resolution, while reducing the formula for the Easter Offering distribution from one-half to one-third, was at least in keeping with the spirit of the Bishop's suggestion. But Thomas H. Battle, a lay delegate from Good Shepherd, Rocky Mount, introduced an amendment that struck the second resolve and called instead for the taking up of a special offering at the time when the rector saw fit to bring the needs of black mission work before his congregation. This substitute was forthwith adopted.²²

The substitute effectively eviscerated the force of the resolution, with predictable results. For 1912, the State of the Church Committee reported that only seven parishes had bothered to comply with the resolution and that less than \$100 had been raised. Nevertheless, their proposed solution was to reissue the same resolution already in force, but with the added provision that Archdeacon Delany was now expected to supply all the rectors with materials pertaining to the needs of diocesan black ministry.²³

In 1913 Bishop Cheshire noted the widespread failure of white congregations to make the requisite annual offering and begged them all to remember this cause. Then he offered the following diagnosis and prescription:

²⁰ *NCDJ*, 95th (1911) 77;129.

²¹ *NCDJ*, 95th (1911), 47.

²² *NCDJ*, 95th (1911) 50,51. For Thomas Hall Battle, see his entry in the *Dictionary of North Carolina Biography*.

²³ *NCDJ*, 96th (1912) 42,43. To appreciate the profound funding disparities between white and black churches in 1911, note that in November, 1911, a new church building for Holy Comforter, Burlington was consecrated. Estimated cost: \$50,000.00. *The Carolina Churchman*, (January, 1912) 10.

I wish our white clergy and people might show more personal interest than they usually do in this work, and make a rule to visit our colored churches and schools from time to time. If they would acquaint themselves with our colored work and our colored workers, they could not fail to feel a greater interest in both, and their own inclinations would lead them to help on the good work. I would especially direct the attention of our people to our very important institutions for the benefit of the colored people, St. Augustine's School, with its fine and spacious St. Agnes Hospital, the largest and best equipped hospital for colored people in the whole country south of Washington City . . . You, my brethren, do not sufficiently know and appreciate these institutions and the good work which they are doing.²⁴

Cheshire could see the corrosive impact of racial segregation on diocesan ministry. White clergy did not know—and evidently did not care to know—of the good work being done in black congregations, schools, and hospitals. From 1912 onward, Archdeacon Delany would dutifully issue materials to white rectors, informing them of the needs of his convocation. But as he himself noted, this made no substantial difference to the vast majority of his white colleagues. They simply ignored his appeals.²⁵ Again in 1914, the Committee on the State of the Church called it “a disgrace to the Diocese,” when the black people themselves raised \$4,748.56 in support of their ministry and whites contributed a paltry \$72.48. Cheshire continued to bemoan the lack of personal sympathy and interest manifest in the meager sums collected.²⁶

After Delany became Suffragan Bishop in 1918, the financial problem facing black ministry in North Carolina only deepened. By 1921, Delany was trying to make do with a budget of \$10,000.00 when he had requested \$18,200.00. As result, the bishop could only offer his clergy an annual salary of \$650, whereas in South Carolina, black clergy were making almost twice as much. One priest in the diocese, the Rev. John Small of St. Titus' in Durham, left for the Diocese of Maryland, where his new salary would be \$1,600.00.²⁷

There is a cruel irony in these numbers. The Diocese of North Carolina was a leader in supporting black ministry in many ways, beginning in the aftermath of the Civil War and continuing into the 20th century. First Bishop Atkinson, and later Bishop Cheshire, were applauded by black leaders for insisting upon equal treatment for black clergy and congregations in the councils of the Church. But when it came to a willingness to fund black clergy, congregations, and institutions, the Diocese of North Carolina was greatly outspent by her neighbor to the South: there the commitment of 50% of the Easter offerings was routinely

²⁴ *NCDJ*, 97th (1913) 75,76.

²⁵ “I have kept our columns filled with appeals in behalf of the Colored Convocation, as painful as it has been to me. Warrenton, Greensboro, Salisbury, and our needs in their behalf, have been repeatedly presented to you, until we began to feel that there was little to hope for thru appeals.” Henry B. Delany, *The Carolina Churchman* (April, 1917) 14.

²⁶ *NCDJ*, 98th (1914) 46; *NCDJ*, 99th (1915) 72.

²⁷ *The Carolina Churchman*, (May-June, 1921) 15.

designated for black ministry—even though the South Carolina annual convention itself was lily-white.

At the beginning of the 20th century, Bishop Cheshire still operated with the genial, paternalistic assumptions of his upbringing. If he did not think blacks were his equal, he nevertheless regarded them with sympathy and respect, and he was committed to the catholic principle of a bi-racial church, where blacks and whites could sit and deliberate together. By 1907, he had come to see that his worldview was no longer reflective of reality. A stricter segregation of the races was the new norm. And under these new conditions, he thought it best to accord black Episcopalians the privilege of the greatest possible autonomy and provide them at least some stake in the legislative leadership of the church at the national level. Thus, he worked to see the Missionary District Plan implemented. Cheshire even proved able to postpone indefinitely the day when the Diocese of North Carolina would segregate its annual convention. What he could not do, however, was to persuade white clergy and congregations actually to care about the black clergy themselves, or to support the ministries, the facilities, and the institutions under their charge. He could not entice them to do what he himself had done: to go visit and see for themselves the remarkable loyalty and commitment demonstrated by black Episcopalians. In this way, the Jim Crow era left its indelible, disfiguring stamp on the Diocese of North Carolina.