Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis
Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Masters of Divinity Thesis | Concordia Seminary Scholarship

11-1-1971

An Autonomous Lutheran Church in Canada in a Time of Rising Nationalism

Roger Ellis
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, rellis45@teksavvy.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholar.csl.edu/mdiv

 Part of the Christian Denominations and Sects Commons, Christianity Commons, and the History of Christianity Commons

Recommended Citation
Ellis, Roger, "An Autonomous Lutheran Church in Canada in a Time of Rising Nationalism" (1971). *Masters of Divinity Thesis*. 54.
http://scholar.csl.edu/mdiv/54

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters of Divinity Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

A

AN AUTONOMOUS LUTHERAN CHURCH IN CANADA IN A TIME OF RISING NATIONALISM

A Research Paper Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for elective
E-200

---

by

Roger Charles Ellis

November 1971

Approved by: Arthur C. Repp
Advisor

3-20-92
Research Paper

93134

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Definition of Terms and Abbreviations[1]

ELCC - The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada, which became an autonomous church on January 1, 1967. Prior to that date it was the Canadian District of The American Lutheran Church.

LCA-CS - The Lutheran Church in America--Canada Section, a federation of the Eastern Canada Synod, the Central Canada Synod, and the Western Canada Synod of the Lutheran Church in America, organized in 1963.

LC-C - Lutheran Church--Canada a federation of the Ontario District, the Manitoba-Saskatchewan District, and the Alberta-British Columbia District of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, formed in 1958.

JCILR - The Joint Commission on Inter Lutheran Relationships, composed of official representatives of LC-C, LCA-CS, and the ELCC, a commission whose purpose is to promote unity among Lutherans in Canada. Its immediate concern is the establishment of altar and pulpit fellowship among all Lutheran churches in Canada.

LCIC - The Lutheran Council in Canada, an agency of LC-C, ELCC, and LCA-CS, for doing on behalf of these churches tasks delegated by them to it, constituted in 1966.

ALC - The American Lutheran Church, with headquarters at Minneapolis, Minnesota. The ELCC is affiliated with it.

LCA - The Lutheran Church in America, with headquarters at New York. The synods named previously as comprimising LCA-CS are Canadian synods of LCA.

LCMS - The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, with headquarters at St. Louis, Missouri. The districts that comprise LC-C are Canadian districts of LCMS.

LCUSA - The Lutheran Council in the United States of America, an agency of ALC, LCA, and LCMS. It is the counterpart of LCIC, also constituted in 1966.

Autonomy- means self-governing. The only Lutheran Church in Canada that is completely autonomous is ELCC. The Canadian Districts of the LCMS are currently discussing the question of autonomy under the umbrella of LC-C.

---

1. Resource Manual Area Discussions, Inter Lutheran Relationships in Canada, JCILR, Winnipeg, 1970; p.3.

Lutheran Unity - is not to be confused with union or merger. It signifies a common underlying oneness (consensus) in articles of the Christian faith and in their application which permits total cooperation for union, if desirable. Unity among Lutherans is sought on the basis of their commitment to the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions.

Lutheran Union - presupposes unity and implies dissolution of the Lutheran bodies as presently constituted to form a totally new united Lutheran Church in Canada.

Altar and Pulpit Fellowship - has not always been understood in the same way. For many it simply meant the exchange of pulpits and the communing of members across synodical lines. In the six point definition agreed upon by the LCMS and ALC, however, the requirements for fellowship are the same as for total merger. These six points have subsequently been accepted as a working definition for the discussions in Canada:

1. Congregations of the synods may hold joint worship services.
2. Pastors of one synod may preach from the pulpits of congregations in the other synod.
3. Members in good standing in one synod may commune as guests at the altar of congregations in the other synod.
4. Members may transfer their membership from congregations of one synod to congregations of the other synod.
*5. Congregations of one synod may call as their pastors those who are on the clergy roster of the other synod.
*6. Students may prepare for the holy ministry in the seminaries of either synod.

* - Points 5 and 6 have not been fully implemented by the ALC and the LCMS. Special guidelines have been prepared setting forth accepted procedure in both instances.

INTRODUCTION

> It is highly significant that the greatest difficulty in commencing church work on the basis of complete self support is usually found, not in newly established work, but in work that has long been established. Surely this shows the futility of a dependent policy. The dependence in which a Church is cradled tends to confine the Church to the cradle. The best bottle for an infant Church is independence. A dependent Church remains feeble. In this realization lies our real hope as missionaries. A new era in missions begins when this is understood, for the way is then cleared for unfettered advance.[1]

The first evidence of Christianity in Canada that is recorded in history is found in the log of Jacques Cariter, the Mariner of St. Malo, who described his first voyage into the Gulf of the St. Lawrence in 1534.

> On (Friday) the twenty-fourth of the said month (of July), we had a cross made thirty feet high, which was put together in the presence of a number of Indians on the point of the entrance to this harbour (Gaspé) . . . . We erected this cross on the point in their presence and they watched it being put together and set up. And when it had been raised in the air, we all knelt down with our hands joined, worshipping it before them . . . .[2]

Since that time the church has continued to plant the cross of Jesus Christ in the harbours of Canadian settlements across the land.

The Lutheran Church has been in mission to Canadian settlements for a longer period of time than Canada has been a constituted Dominion. It is the intent of this paper to focus in on the mission of the Lutheran Church to Canada during the years of 1940 to the present particulary the late 1950's to present. Specifically we will look at the attempts of the LCMS, the LCA-CS, and the ELCC to move towards fellowship and an independent Lutheran church in Canada. The majority of the historical material will be concerned with the LCMS because it is the more conservative doctrinally of the three bodies and is the only holdout to a Canadian Lutheran Union.

While this paper is concerned with the historical development of the fellowship discussions among the three church bodies it will be presented here in a cursory fashion for it is not the main intention of this paper to be a history. The LC-C has just commissioned the writing and publishing of a book on this very subject which is now available in paperback, written by the Rev. Albert Schwermann. What this paper will try to demonstrate and say is that the United States is a foreign country, different from Canada, and that in this time of rising nationalism in Canada it is certainly questionable whether an American based church, which cannot help but make American programs and decisions since most of its constituents are American, can best identify with and minister to the needs of Canada and Canadians which in terms of both distance and knowledge are for the most part foreign to it. Hopefully this paper will demonstrate that these thoughts and attitudes are not merely those of this writer, nor of just Canadian based pastors; but it will attempt to show through quoting some men in position of authority in the church and by citing resolutions of the Missouri Synod that these are also the thoughts and attitudes of that synod and that by so doing we may encourage not only the men in positions to bring about a truly Canadian Lutheran Church but also the Canadian laity to make a firm and responsible pledge to effect this independent and autonomous Canadian ministry to the Canadian people from inside Canada to the glory of God and the building of His kingdom.

---

1. Sidney J. W. Clark, Indigenous Fruits (London: World Dominion Press, 1933), p.27.
2. John S. Moir (ed.), The Cross in Canada (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1966), p.1.

CHAPTER I

FOUNDATIONS -- THE BEGINNINGS OF A CANADIAN LUTHERAN CHURCH

"Canada is a land of no one ideology, no single vision; it is a cultural freeport, a way station for travellers (who often move on soon to the other America), a no-man's-land even or at least no abiding city, a place not easily confused with paradise or the promised land."[1] Yet to this land in the early 19th century came Lutheran settlers to conquer the land and make it their home. It was soon after in the twenty years prior to Confederation that Lutheran pastors and the different Lutheran synods from the United States saw the need for ministry among these Lutheran settlers and came to stay and make their place in an organized way in the Canadian frontier. This was the historical beginnings of the Lutheran Church in Canada -- a motly crew of under trained clergy and a handful of European settlers. What the writer wants to underline here is that the divisions between Lutheran Churches in Canada grew out of and paralleled the main groupings of Lutherans in the United States because the pastors for the Canadian parishes came from there.

> . . . the weak congregations scattered over a vast territory were forced to seek aid from Lutheran bodies in the United States. Acceptance of subsidies and pastoral supplies brought them into the fold. Because the demarcations were transplanted extensions the barriers had little or no meaning to the pioneer and much less to the Canadian scene.[2]

Of course the advantages of belonging to strong American counterparts were that the Canadian missions slowly got on their feet and without such help in the formative years the Lutheran Church in Canada might not have come to be.[3]

With the different Lutheran groups at work in Canada sometimes at loggerheads with one another (the Missouri men who were not the first to arrive in Canada were called "foreigners

who really have no business in Canada"[4]), at a time when nationhood was politically foremost in the minds of Canadians, it was natural that with all the talks of union that inter-Lutheran discussions in Canada should begin to take place as they did in 1872. "These free conferences and consultations brought representatives of the Lutheran bodies of Canada face to face to discuss areas of doctrine and practice in which there was both agreement and disagreement."

While these free conferences continued spasmodically through the years, the seeds which resulted in LC-C and the serious consultations among the church bodies today were not sown until the 1940's. Pastor Maynard Pollex, Secretary of the LC-C wrote in the January 1967 Ontario District Edition of The Lutheran Witness

> Since the 1940's members of the Missouri Synod in Canada have felt the need of a Canada-wide organization to enable them to speak jointly on purely Canadian questions and to face special Canadian problems. Until the formation of the LC-C there was no agency or Canadian identity through which all Missouri Synod Lutherans could express themselves. There is evidence that as early as 1942 there were some people who felt that there ought to be some kind of organization or federation through which our Lutherans in Canada could speak with one voice on questions of common concern both in the realm of church or on occasion also in the area of civil government.

Since Pollex wrote such a clear and succinct article on the formation of LC-C, the writer will quote from it at length in order to move on quickly to pick out the important events in the formative years of LC-C and its relations with the other Lutheran bodies in Canada.

> After various meetings in the early 1950's the first formal meeting was held in Winnipeg in April, 1956. . . . "September 11-12, 1958, were important dates in the development of our church in Canada. The ABC District, the Man-Sask District, the Ontario District, and the Canadian conference of the English District sent representatives to Winnipeg to form a closer relationship between the Missouri Districts in Canada. Twenty-five representatives met at the Marborough Hotel to iron out the proposed constitution. The choosing of a name was a

major item on the agenda. The Lutheran Church in Canada was chosen but it was reduced by Parliament to "Lutheran Church in Canada." In April of 1959 the charter was granted and the proposed federation became officially known as "Lutheran Church--Canada."

Dr. Albert H. Schwermann was elected first president of the new federation; Rev. Arne Kristo, vice-president; Rev. Maynard Pollex, secretary; Clarence Kuhnke, treasurer; and David Appelt, member-at-large. The new federation consisted of 73,000 baptized members in 321 congregations in six Canadian provinces, served by 184 pastors.

The LC-C was and still is today what it was constituted, a simple federation of Canadian Districts of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. It was not independent or autonomous in fact or deed from the LCMS but it was recognized as being a special part of the Synod because it was in another land. It is important to say this, as the LC-C has repeatedly said, "The Federation did not arise out of Canadian nationalism nor out of an anti-American bias. Nor was it stirred by disatisfaction with the Missouri Synod. The question always was: "How can we serve our congregations in Canada better?"[7]

The limitations to still being an American based church inspite of the Federation or perhaps, to put it positively, the possibilities available to the church if it were independent stirred thoughts for further development of the status of the Lutherans in Canada. "A fact finding committee convened in January of 1961 gave impetus to the idea of establishing an indigenous Lutheran Church in Canada. The convention held in Kitchener, Ontario, May 23-25, 1961 passed several significant resolutions:

> That LC-C, through its Board of Directors make a progress report to the 1962 convention of the LCMS and submit such memorials as it may deem necessary. That the congregations be requested by their respective districts to reach a decision on the establishment of an independent LC-C at least six months prior to the 1965 Synodical convention; and that the secretary of LC-C solicit information on the action of the congregations in Canada and as soon as 66 2/3% approval of all the congregations (provided there is 66 2/3% in each District in Canada) has been reached then positive action by the LC-C shall be taken.

The Board of Directors prepared a submission to the Cleveland Convention of 1962 and this convention resolved "That LC-C be encouraged to proceed with its plans to build up a strong indigenous Lutheran Church in Canada (under-scoring added)."[8]

Here then is the second time where one can see the Missouri Synod encouraging the Lutheran Church in Canada to take the reins and direct its own future, the first being the granting of permission to form the LC-C. That the route taken in the quest for fellowship among Lutherans in Canada has been both arduous and deliberate we need only look at the fact that "since 1956 the Lutheran bodies of Canada have met regularly in fourteen consultations on a national level and no less than 44 papers (see appendix of Affirmation and Appeal put out by the JCILR, 1970, for titles, dates and authors) predominantly on doctrine and practice, were read and discussed."[9] These fourteen meetings which were held annually from 1956 to 1970 with the exception of 1967 on a pan-Lutheran basis were also supplemented by numerous interim meetings of sub-committees, steering committees, and the like.

To sum up what has been said so far, one must say that there were in effect three movements happening almost coterminously on the Canadian Lutheran scene from the Missouri Synod vantage point. First, there was a movement by the Canadian Districts of LCMS to form a federation so that they could have a united voice to speak to the Canadian scene. Second, almost at the same time discussions were being carried on with the other Lutheran bodies in Canada to discover if there could be fellowship among them. Third, developing the second point further, the Lutheran bodies were entertaining the possibilities for some kind of indigenous Lutheran Church in Canada tying together all the synods. It was this third point that received most of the attention from Lutheran men in Canada after the formation of the LC-C, and is to this day the area of most concern.

It is important for a more complete understanding of Canadian inter-Lutheran relations to now pick out some more important events from the 1950's to the present.

In 1951, the Synod of Western Canada of the United Lutheran Church, noting the fact that the Commission on Canadian Affairs of the American Lutheran Conference had suggested the consideration of a merger of the Canadian components of the Conference, moved to take action on it. March 29, 1955 representatives of the American Lutheran Conference, Evangelical Lutheran Church, Lutheran Free Church, United Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the Synod of Western Canada of the United Lutheran Church met to discuss the possibility of a "Western Canadian Lutheran Church."[10] Representatives from Missouri Synod joined in the discussions in 1956 at Kitchener, Ontario. At this meeting the vision ceased to be for only a western merger of the Lutheran bodies but became nationwide and all inclusive.[11] At this exploratory meeting the delegates said three things of importance which gave goals and direction for future consultations. First, they said unanimously that they intended to strive for one indigenous Lutheran Church in Canada. Second, it was time to alert pastors and congregations "to their opportunity and responsibility to contribute in their community toward the formation of one indigenous Lutheran Church in Canada." Three, there is need for adequate communication to bring the thoughts and decisions of the conference to the various synods that are involved.[12]

In 1960 the inter-Lutheran discussions took a new direction. "Until the completion of two pending mergers (ALC, ELC, UELC to form The American Lutheran Church, 1960; AELC, Augustana, Suomi, and ULCA to form the Lutheran Church in America, 1962), the quest for one Lutheran Church in Canada seemed unwieldly. Thus in the years that followed, these meetings were directed toward the goal of establishing altar and pulpit fellowship among Lutherans in Canada."[13]

From the very beginning the discussion in this series of meetings have been shaped by Article VII of the Augsburg Confession.[14] Before these meetings could become official rather than just "free conferences", as all the meetings up to this time had been, it was necessary for LC-C to take the step which it did in 1963 to establish a Committee on Relations with other Church Bodies. Now representatives at meetings could actually commit their respective church bodies to formal agreement made at conferences. The LCA-CS and the ALC had already, prior to this date, set up a similar committee in each of their synods.[15]

In 1964 with the three synods now meeting "officially", discussions were focused on answering the question of what was the basis for altar and pulpit fellowship among Lutherans in Canada. A poll was conducted among the Canadian Lutheran pastors to find out the areas of disagreement, which enabled the polling committee to put their finger on the real problems and sort out the myths. A study committee examined the responses, classified them, and came up with four areas of concern, which have not all been sufficiently answered to this day. They are: the lodge, unionism, Scripture and church ethics and piety.[16]

At the Detroit Convention the next year the LC-C opened a theological and constitutional "can of worms", the ramifications of which are still being hotly discussed and pursued today. They requested the LCMS to approve the joint action of the Canadian Districts to "coordinate and where feasible to conduct certain parts of their work under the charter of LC-C."[17] The convention adopted Report 4-08 for the Canadian Districts to operate as "an administrative unit in those areas of church work as mutually agreed upon by the LCMS and LC-C."[18]

Herbert Zorn writing in the May, 1969 Concordia Theological Monthly, in his article "Fellowship and the Younger Sister Churches", said,

> The 1965 Synod meeting in Detroit, by adopting Resolution 3-04, acknowledged that inter-church decisions must be made at the place where the people of God gather about the Word and Sacrament. She professed her confidence in

> the younger churches' ability to act responsibly in these matters and pledged her support to them as they acted.

While Canada is not constitutionally a sister church of the LCMS as is, say the Lutheran Church in England, she is through this resolution and other less official decrees (in private conversations with some synodical officials) being given by Mother Church the "go ahead" to make her own decisions as to the direction of the church in Canada. It is precisely this point of sister church status, to digress for a moment, that is the point of contention that is being discussed presently between LCMS and LC-C officials. "Is it necessary," they are asking "to become a sister church before establishing altar and pulpit fellowship with the LCA-CS on the road to an indigenous church in Canada; or can the Canadian Districts do it while still part of the LCMS?" This is the "can of worms" that the writer earlier alluded to, opened at the Detroit Convention in Resolution 4-08.

Going ahead with freedom to direct its own affairs where mutually agreeable with the LCMS, the LC-C representatives in the JCILR which had begun "official" talks on the relationships of altar and pulpit fellowship in 1964 enunciated the principle in 1965 that the basic requirements for altar and pulpit fellowship are the same as would be for merger. The commission adopted four resolutions in which it:

1. Recorded its hope for organic union "as soon as alleged differences in faith and practice can be resolved";
2. Instructed its four study committees on Scripture, the lodge, unionism, church ethics and piety, to present position papers "intended to be prepatory to the organic union which is our recorded goal";
3. Requested the three church bodies to "authorize this commission to initiate merger negotiations";
4. Proposed that when agreement sufficient for merger is achieved, pulpit and altar fellowship "be declared and practiced while arrangements for organic union are being worked out."[19]

At the International Inn in Winnipeg on the days of August 31 and September 1, 1966 an important constituting body met and brought into being another important inter-Lutheran agency called the Lutheran Council in Canada (LCIC). The organization of the Council is important because among other things its Division of Theological Studies is charged to engage in studies which are of relevance "for the attainment of a Lutheran consensus in Canada."[20] The Lutheran Witness, Ontario District Edition, November 1966 said about the formation of LCIC,

> A primary function will be theological studies to try to provide a consensus concerning Lutheran doctrine in Canada, and possibly to enter into dialogue with other churches. This agency will represent 99% of all Canada's Lutherans, some 297,000 baptized members.

This is Canada's only inter-Lutheran agency where the participating synods can work as a unit in other fields of endeavor outside of engaging in theological dialog. In this same year the American counterpart of LCIC, LCUSA was formed.

Lutherans in Canada could now work together in areas where there was agreement without having to wait for merger. Joint work was begun in campus ministry, chaplain programs for the armed services, and welfare and mission programs. To this day in some sense, it is LCIC that speaks with a united voice for Lutherans in Canada, and for the same reasons as its American counterpart, although perhaps to a lesser degree, comes under theological attack from different quarters.

At the New York Convention of the LCMS an important Resolution, 3-01, was passed by the delegates. Outlines for official procedure for a body seeking formal recognition as a sister church were added to the Synodical Handbook as an addition to chapter XVI, "Interchurch Relations."[21] This is important because if and when an indigenous Lutheran Church in Canada comes about it will in the words of the fifth convention of LC-C in 1962, "need support -- fraternal, financial, and otherwise -- from the LCMS."[22]

Centennial Year, 1967, besides being a landmark year for the Dominion of Canada as she celebrated her 100th birthday, was also a landmark year for the Lutheran tradition in Canada. The Canadian churches of the ALC formally became the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada (ELCC), on January 1.

The Canadian Lutheran, in October 1968, carried in its story about the ELCC's first convention in June, where the ELCC had overwhelmingly agreed in convention to ask for one Lutheran Church in Canada, these remarks: "Rev. F. A. Schole past-president of the LC-C agreed with Rev. Dr. C. H. Whitteker of the LCA-CS that it was appropriate for Canada's only autonomous Lutheran Church, the ELCC, to take such actions first."

The JCILR began its 1968 meeting with a review of the recent and pending actions affecting relations between the churches. The LCMS at New York in 1967 took the first step towards declaring fellowship with the ALC and subsequently with the newly formed ELCC. In July 1968, the ELCC in convention declared fellowship with both the LCMS and the LCA. The LCA-CS responded by reiterating its open stance of fellowship with those who subscribe to the Lutheran Confessions.[23]

January 1969, The Canadian Lutheran carried a story on the JCILR. "The Lutheran Confessions", to which the ELCC, LC-C, and the LCA-CS all subscribe in their confessional statements, "define what a 'Lutheran is'", it was said by the Lutheran leaders of the JCILR. Many agreed that doctrinal agreement did in fact exist and that their discussions have helped many churchmen to see this. The "problem", as one representative expressed it, was a "crisis in confidence," -- "we don't trust each other."

1969 was a year of trust and mistrust for Lutherans. The Canadian Council, LCIC, set up a cooperative mission strategy for building missions in Canada. All of Canada was divided up and portioned out to the participating synods to cut down on duplication of work and services. Three Regional Committees

for Mission Planning were set up under the Division of Canadian Missions of the LCIC.[24] These followed basic geographical lines in Canada and were called the Eastern, Central, and Western RCMP. At Denver it was hard going as factions within the LCMS meeting in convention fought to forestall the final action towards fellowship with ALC, showing the years of bitterness and mistrust that had been stored up; but, the spirit of fellowship won out in the second convention battle, only to be renewed again at Milwaukee in 1971. The LC-C reported that this convention had authorized their Committee on Relations with Other Church Bodies to pursue in consultation with the LCMS's Commission on Theology and Church Relations, the quest for unity with the LCA-CS in Canada.[25] It seemed as if the convention spoke with two different minds. It took liberal steps and voted a conservative president into office.

In the meantime talks had been continuing in Canada among members of the JCILR and on December 10, 1970 the board announced that they had come to a consensus sufficient for fellowship. But just prior to this statement being made public a second blow was dealt to the attempts of the LC-C to become an indigenous church instead of just a federation of Canadian Districts of the LCMS. This happened when the second Canadian Missouri church poll was taken. For the second time both western districts voted overwhelmingly in favor of the proposal and again the Ontario District defeated it because they did not get the required 66 2/3% of the congregations in the District to vote in favor of it. The Canadian Lutheran in August 1970 printed the disheartening news, "Debate on the question suggested that LC-C was all the structure that was needed to administer Canadian affairs, and still maintain various forms of support of the LCMS."

Why were the congregations, especially in Ontario, holding on to the apron strings of Mother when most of Mother's actions demonstrated she wanted Canada to stand on its own

feet? Varying intelligent guesses have been suggested. From President George Rode of the ABC District and President Albin Stanfel of the Ontario District these responses were elicited. Some voted against an ingidenous LC-C because they thought it would hamper the formation of a new Lutheran Church in Canada with all three synods and that this intermediary step would either stop action in that direction or was thought not to be necessary at all. Some might have felt that voting for an indigenous LC-C was just the preliminary step to voting for merger with the LCA-CS and they were against that. And again some voted against an indigenous LC-C because they were either not willing to take the responsibility of trying to go it alone, although it would necessarily in the beginning have to be inter-dependent on the LCMS; or they were just plain afraid to take the step. President Stanfel who has been characterized as head of a stronghold of super conservatives indicated he was willing to go with an indigenous church in Canada back in the 1960's but he was not going to support a Canadian indigenous Church that would turn to Mother Synod for everything and not even attempt to go it alone.

In the wake of the August decision for the LC-C not to become an indigenous church, its second defeat, the LC-C streamlined its administration and cancelled annual conventions. The power of decision making was placed into the hands of a Board of Directors composed of the three Canadian District presidents, a secretary, and a treasurer. The work was focused down to the areas of inter-Lutheran relations, university and campus ministry, and higher education.[26] In the November 1970 issue of The Canadian Lutheran Rev. T. Ristine was quoted as saying, "It places the responsibility of the church in the hands of those most directly involved."

In the midst of the defeat of the Canadian poll and the seemingly weakening of the LC-C a happy note rang clear from the west. A mutual agreement was reached in November 1970

at a meeting at the Saskatoon Seminary, which is jointly run by the ELCC and the LCA-CS, by officials of the Board of Directors of the LC-C and the faculty and Board of Directors of the Saskatoon Seminary. This meeting agreed to the placement of an LC-C man on the faculty of the school so that Canadian students training for the holy ministry in the LCMS might receive their education in Canada, taught with the church in Canada in mind.[27] Formerly, students taking the option of training at this seminary would have had to enter into the colloquy program in the LCMS system before taking a Missouri pastorate. All that was needed to make this official was the approval of the LCMS convention at Milwaukee in 1971 and the implementation of the agreement. This agreement if approved by the Synod would be a major step in the right direction towards an indigenous church in Canada, at least from the Missouri vantage point, because LC-C pastors would be recruited and trained in Canada for the first time in the histroy of the work of the Missouri Synod in Canada.

Paralleling the glimmer of hope in the inter-LC-C movements, was the announcement in December 1970 by the JCILR that talks which had begun in May of that year had proceeded to a point where the officials on the JCILR had been able to sign a "Statement of Consensus." Quoting partially from their statement which was published in booklet form and distributed by the Commission, they said:

> We official representatives of the ELCC, LCA-CS, and LC-C -- persons to whom our churches have assigned responsibility for finding a way to Lutheran unity in our land -- do hereby solemnly affirm that our study of the Scriptures, the Lutheran Confessions, and the doctrinal articles in the constitutions of our churches convinces us that consensus sufficient for fellowship exists.[28]

The second half of their statement was an appeal to each of their respective churches, especially to the LCMS as it is the hold out preventing one church in Canada, to discover the fellowship that they have seen and then declare the fellowship found by the JCILR.

The booklet, Affirmation and Appeal, in which this statement of consensus was publically printed was probably the most "official-looking" document to come out of the Lutheran Council, specifically the JCILR, to this day. From the design of the cover to the layout of the text it was professionally done. It must have convinced many laymen who were not quite informed as to the power of this Commission, that they were on the brink of being in fellowship with the LCA-CS. It was not however in any position to make such sweeping decisions for the churches; and it must be said in fairness, they did not say they could, but the professional quality of their booklet carried more impact than they perhaps realized. It was indeed very pursuasive!

This brings us then to the current year, 1971. At the 49th Convention of the LCMS at Milwaukee the Synod passed by a narrow margin Resolution 6-20 in which the synod resolved to place a LCMS theological chair at Lutheran Theological Seminary in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.[29] At present, the Board for Higher Education of the LCMS in cooperation with LC-C is looking for an appropriate man to place at the Seminary. Several Canadian names have been suggested and turned down it was learned in discussion with the Canadian District Presidents. The Convention in Resolution 3-09 also reaffirmed its Denver action to encourage the pursuit of Lutheran unity in Canada with the LCA-CS on the basis of Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions.[30] It was reported to the Convention (WB 4-08) by the LC-C, "We are happy to say that this fellowship (ELCC and LC-C), is working well and has resulted in a joint mission to the deaf in London, Ontario, merger of congregations, realignment of parishes, joint chaplaincies in hospitals, etc."

A final note to round out the year of 1971 as far as Lutheran activities in Canada is concerned is a report in the November-December issue of Roundtable, put out by LCIC. It should be noted that at the JCILR meeting, which this report is about, was a representative from the CTCR of the LCMS.

The CTCR is supposed to study the Canadian situation as it progresses so that it can wisely advise Synod if and when the LC-C should make some recommendation to Synod about possible merger with the LCA-CS and the ELCC. Study has not revealed any other time in which a member of the CTCR took an active interest in the meetings of the Council and actually attended its meetings.

The report in Roundtable was by the JCILR which met in late November. It regretted that the consensus shared by the Joint Council was not shared by the pastors and laity of the Canadian churches. Twenty-nine area discussion groups had been set up across Canada to facilitate the discovery of fellowship. It was apparent from the reports of the Canadian District Presidents of the LCMS in December that these meetings had fallen down and that some had never gotten off the ground. As a result the call for fellowship in 1973 which the JCILR has urged, they "grudgingly" and with "disappointment" retracted and said that it might not now be possible until 1977 or later. In order not to completely give in to defeat the JCILR has hired a third of Rev. Norman Threinen's time from the Division of Theological Studies of LCIC to help implement and oversee the twenty-nine discussion groups again, so that the whole issue of fellowship will get to the grass roots and intelligently involve the laymen of Canada as well as the clergy. This the writer believes, the research has shown to be the point of failure in discussions both within the LC-C moving for an indigenous church and with the inter-Lutheran discussions towards fellowship. More will be said on this point in the next chapter.

CHAPTER I FOOTNOTES

1. William Kilbourn, The Making of the Nation, The Canadian Centennial Library, ed. Pierre Berton (Toronto: The Canadian Centennial Publishing Col. Ltd., 1965), p.122.

2. W. A. Mehlenbacher, "Canadian Lutheran Council," The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church, ed. J. H. Bodensiec, I (1965), p.361.

3. Ibid., p.361.

4. Frank Malinsky (ed.), Grace and Blessing, (Kitchener: By the author, 1954), p.13.

5. LC-MS, Convention Workbook, (1971), Report 4-08, p.212.

6. "Lutheran Church--Canada," The Lutheran Witness: Ontario District Edition, January, 1967, p.1.

7. "Leader's Guide," Lutheran Church--Canada, 1969.

8. The Lutheran Witness: Ontario District Edition, p.1.

9. LC-MS, Convention Workbook, p. 212.

10. Richard C. Wolf, Documents of Lutheran Unity in America, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), p.585.

11. Affirmation and Appeal, Joint Commission on Inter-Lutheran Relations report (Winnipeg: By the LCIC, 1970), p.4.

12. Wolf, p.590.

13. Affirmation and Appeal, p.4.

14. Ibid., p.4.

15. Resource Manual for Area Discussions, Inter-Lutheran Relationships in Canada (Winnipeg: JCILR and LCIC, 1970), p.5.

16. Affirmation and Appeal, p.5.

17. LC-MS, Convention Workbook, (Detroit, 1965), Report 4-08, p.157.

18. LC-MS, Proceedings, (Detroit, 1965), Resolution 4-28, p.118.

19. Resource Manual for Inter-Lutheran Relations, p.5.

20. Ibid., p.6.

21. LC-MS, Proceedings, (New York, 1967), Resolution 3-01, p.102.

22. LC-C, Prospectus for the 5th Convention, (Edmonton, 1962), p.2.

23. Affirmation and Appeal, p.6.

24. LC-C, 12th Annual Convention Workbook, (Edmondon, 1969) p.30.

25. Affirmation and Appeal, p.7.

26. The Canadian Lutheran, November, 1970, p.5.

27. LC-MS, Convention Workbook, (1971, Milwaukee), Report 4-08, p.212.

28. Affirmation and Appeal, p.1.

29. LC-MS, Proceedings, (Milwaukee, 1971), Resolution 6-20, p.176.

30. Ibid., Resolution 3-09, p.132.

PERSPECTIVE: A CONTEMPORARY VIEW FROM WITHIN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN CANADA

> Sir John A. MacDonald in a letter to Sir John Rose in 1870 --
>
> Bishop Tache has been here and has left for the Red River . . . . He is strongly opposed to the idea of an Imperial Commission, believing, as indeed we all do, that to send out an overwashed Englishman, utterly ignorant of the land and full of crochets, as all Englishmen are, would be a mistake.[1]

Sir John A. MacDonald's statement of some one hundred and one years ago speaks to this chapter in two ways. First of all, the best place to find out about the condition of the church in Canada is in Canada, from people who are there working with it day after day. Second, as I am sure it will be born out in the rest of this chapter by responses of clergy in Canada, this same principle is also true in administrative ways; that is, the best way to run the church in Canada is by Canadians based in Canada making truly Canadian decisions for a Canadian scene.

What follows in this chapter are responses from different quarters of the Lutheran Church in Canada on questions concerning LC-C and the inter-Lutheran talks leading toward an indigenous church in Canada. The responses come from LC-C and LCIC officials, District Presidents, the JCILR, Mission Executives, a parish pastor and the mission board's report in the LCMS Self Study published in 1971. A statement was also solicited from the President of the Lutheran Seminary in Saskatoon.

Our first perspective comes from the Rev. Norman Threinen who is the Executive Secretary for the Division of Theological Studies of LCIC and is also a staff member part time on the JCILR. I shall quote from his letter in part (this will also be the proceedure for the other letters that follow). It must be remembered in this chapter that while a man represents a board or commission his thoughts are to be considered his own and do not necessarily represent the whole board or commission. It may safely be assumed however that he will reflect in his

thinking a lot of what the board feels, unless it is stated to the contrary.

In Threinen's letter, dated November 1971, he first reflected on the LC-C.

> Until the Lutheran Church--Canada Convention in 1970, which delt with the last autonomy vote, I felt that it was a worthwhile, desirable, and necessary goal for the Missouri Synod districts in Canada to become an autonomous body for effective Canadian ministry in the seventies. My present opinion is that it still may be desirable and necessary as an interim goal en route to the formation of a united Lutheran church in Canada encompassing all synods. It is in the formation of a united Lutheran church in Canada that energies are being directed at the present time. Lutheran Church--Canada, a federation of the Missouri Synod districts, is presently only a skeleton and exists primarily as a public relations vehicle and as a convenient body through which the Missouri Synod districts can function in the area of inter-Lutheran relationships. I question, therefore, whether there is a movement from a federation of districts to an autonomous institution.

On the question of autonomy Threinen said,

> I feel that Canadian autonomy for the Lutheran church in Canada is worthwhile, desirable and necessary because autonomy would enable us to look at the specifically Canadian challenges which our context presents. This is particularly true when it comes to social issues. It is also true when it comes to relationships with non-Lutheran churches in Canada. I feel that it is bad psychologically for the Canadian church to be tied to the apron strings of the much bigger mother church south of the border. Educational emphases, if they are relevant to the American scene, are frequently not as relevant to the Canadian scene. Responsible and imaginative churchmanship is often stifled on the Canadian scene because the predominantly American church body finally makes the policy decisions on almost all issues. The present generation of Canadians feels a Canadian identity and often chaffs under the American domination which is evident in church programs.

In the area of inter-Lutheran relations which could help in leading toward one church in Canada, Threinen said that possibly the cooperative regional mission planning of the synods was one thingthat could be pointed to. The second thing he mentioned was the arrangement that LC-C was entering into with the Seminary in Saskatoon (ELCC and LCA-CS) whereby we could train

our Canadian men there.

When asked what he felt the most pressing need was in the Canadian church, he replied,

> The most pressing need of the church in any context is to be faithful to her Lord in the mission for which He has bought her with His precious blood. What specifically this mission involves is something which each generation has to struggle with. As far as resources to carry out this mission are concerned, I am certain that our church in Canada has been granted as much as the church in any other area of the world.

This next letter comes from the same quarter of the church as the former one did, the Lutheran Council in Canada. Rev. T. L. Ristine, President of LCIC, wrote in October of 1971 the following on the question of an indigenous Lutheran church in Canada:

> Yes, the Lutherans in Canada should become autonomous. Autonomy however, does not mean no more interchange and exchange from the U.S.A. Lutherans around the world should be inter-dependent and ready to draw on each others gifts. However, Lutherans in Canada should be self-governing because 1) the Holy Spirit equips the churches locally to meet each challenge and opportunity whether it be on a congregational, district or local level. The Holy Spirit does not equip by proxy. 2) Christians in local areas should work out the concerns with other Christians.

President Ristine also said that the LC-C should not be working to become autonomous for itself. He said that this step could be by-passed for a larger and more complete goal in Canada which he hoped would come about in ten years. The primary physical problems that he sees that will have to be overcome are "certainly education and perhaps leadership training."

When asked what he thought was the most pressing need in the Canadian church, he replied, "unity and joint efforts of mass media in the church by all Christendom in Canada."

This next response comes from the Secretary of LC-C and the President of the Ontario District, Rev. Albin Stanfel. In response to the question of the status of LC-C, President Stanfel wrote in his October 1971 letter,

> The status of Lutheran Church--Canada today, whether made up of the LCMS districts in Canada or all the synods and districts of the various Lutheran bodies in Canada, might be said to be in a state of flux. The Lutheran Church--Canada at its most recent Convention, held in conjunction with the Convention of the LCMS at Milwaukee, proposed a number of changes in its constitution. While this does not radically alter the structure of the LC-C, it does offer a cut-down version of the old structure. There are some questions as to whether or not this might signal the beginning of the end of the Lutheran Church--Canada as it has existed since 1959.

Rev. Stanfel sat on the JCILR when the Commission announced to the church that it felt that they had reached a level of discussion where they could announce that they felt consensus sufficient for fellowship existed. In the minutes of that meeting Pastor Stanfel and Pastor Roy Knoll both from Ontario were the only two recorded dissenting votes. In this letter, Pastor Stanfel said,

> Nothing has happened in the past year to warrant a change in my position. Obviously (because of felt theological differences with the LCA-CS), I am not ready to make such a statement and because of the view I hold I cannot conscientiously strive for, nor lead others into, pan Lutheranism in Canada at this time. I believe that a declaration of altar and pulpit fellowship across the boardwill lead to disruption among congregations of the Ontario District, and may lead to the withdrawal of several clergy and congregations. Though I cannot speak for the other Presidents in Canada, I think they would agree that a declaration of fellowship between the LCMS in Canada and the LCA-CS at too early a date will lead to great polarization in our midst.

He indicated that the greatest theological problem in inter-Lutheran relationships was the Word of God (what it is, its authority, and hermeneutical principles applied to it) and that the problem was just not differences inter-synodically always but at times intra-synodically.

In early December of 1971 in a taped meeting with President Stanfel and President Rode in St. Louis, Missouri, Pastor Stanfel said that it was not only Missouri which had problems in the fellowship discussions. He indicated that their were differences of opinion on the Confessions among LCA-CS brethern at talks in Kitchener. He also said that the LCA-CS in Eastern

Canada were guilty of practicing unionism. He brought up also the age old problem of the liberal LCA-CS Seminary at Waterloo, Ontario, with which even some of the LCA-CS men have trouble. Switching to the ELCC, Canada's only autonomous Lutheran body, President Stanfel said that they were experiencing great financial difficulties. He mentioned that the ELCC was having to cut back on some of its campus and deaf work committments which it had gone into with the LC-C. To paraphrase what Rev. Stanfel said about the situation, I would say, now that the honeymoon of autonomy is over the great zeal and committment is giving way to some very difficult days ahead.

At that December meeting in St. Louis, as was mentioned, was President George Rode of the Alberta-British Columbia District. In his October letter of 1971 he wrote the following, as he addressed himself to the issues of the LC-C and an autonomous church for Canada:

> I feel that Lutherans in general in Western Canada, specifically the laymen, would like to see the development of an indigenous Canadian Lutheran Church. It would identify itself much more with the Canadian scene, attack problems peculiar to Canada, and most important of all, develop among our people a sense of responsibility for the work in Canada.

About the LC-C he said,

> Efforts to form an autonomous LC-C comprising the present districts of the LCMS, have ground to a stop. Twice has the poll been taken across Canada and twice have the people of Ontario failed to give majority approval. I do not forsee an autonomous LC-C (LCMS only) in the near future.

Physical problems facing the formation of an indigenous church in Canada, President Rode said, "include the geography of Canada." In the personal taped session, Pastor Rode elaborated on this point. He said that the Rockies divide the men in his district and the great Canadian Shield separates Ontario from the rest of Canada. The natural travel lines in Canada are not East-West so that our men and congregations get to know one another, but they are North-South across the border into the U.S. Pastor Rode said that we would do well in Canada to have a nation wide conference of Lutheran pastors

every few years in order that our men may get to know one another and dispel some of the myths about individuals and areas in Canada. In his letter he said that our diversity and the relatively small size of our congregations suggest to him that we would do well to have one, indigenous church in Canada. "Separately we may not have the resources to carry on an effective ministry." He also indicated that our educational systems would have to be strengthened if we were to have an autonomous church.

"The most pressing need as I see it - in addition to the needs of the church everywhere -," Pastor Rode wrote, "is the development of a laity and clergy who feel truly responsible (underlining his) for the work in Canada. We need to stop waiting for someone else to make our plans and do our work."

At the St. Louis meeting when asked whether he thought that the LCMS was giving Canada the "go-ahead" to take care of her own situation, he replied, "Yes, but at the same time one cannot help but feel that every time you take a step in Canada it has to be approved by ten different boards and committees all the way down to '210' and back." He also said that while we were getting the green light for a truly Canadian church, the people of Canada were still in the cradle and relied on Synod to take care of them. He underlined again the fact that people in Canada need to take seriously their mission and develop more Canadian personnel to minister in Canada. For while American pastoral supplies in Canada have done an admirable job they eventually, for the most part, return home and someone has to pick up where they left off. Canadian men on the other hand most naturally tend to remain in Canada thus providing more continuity with the work.

Rev. William Hordern, President of Lutheran Theological Seminary in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, delivered an address in Ottawa during October of 1971 entitled, "Moving Towards Lutheran Unity." In his speech he said, "It is my firm belief that we are on the way to one Lutheran denomination in Canada. I believe

that it will be the most viable way for us to do the job that God has given us to do here." In his speech he indicated that on church fellowship, one institution for all the Lutheran bodies in Canada was not the only recourse to express Lutheran unity, but he saw it as the most sensible way.

A month later when he was asked, via the mail, what he felt about the LCMS' decision at Milwaukee to place a theological chair at Lutheran Seminary, he replied, "I think it is wonderful. Nothing can be more helpful to developing Lutheran unity than for pre-ministerial students having chances to rub shoulders and ideas."

Another perspective on the Canadian scene comes from a pastor in British Columbia, Rev. E. Lehman. He indicated in his letter that while he would have once voted in favor for an autonomous LC-C he does not now see it as a future reality. The primary problem facing the church in Canada he felt was, "an educational program that enables the people to see what the mission of the church really is." "God's people need to be genuinely aware of what it means to be Christians and what it means to be missionaries to the world."

The last two perspectives to be recorded here come from the missions quarter of the church. The English District of the LCMS has nine congregations in Canada, and in some sense is a microcosm of the LCMS in Canada in that it is primarily an American based district but it has congregations in Canada. Further, money comes to these congregations from the States-side of the border as do most of the decisions with regard to procedure or new mission speculation.

The Rev. William Woldt, Mission Counselor of the English District in Detroit, Michigan, replied to our inquiries about how the English District saw the church in Canada, in a letter dated on Luther's birthday, November 10, 1971.

> It has been the stance of The English District for some years now that an autonomous Lutheran Church--Canada, composed of members from all synods would be highly de-

> sirable. It seems to me that this would be most worthwhile, simply because of the great potential of the Canadian church. I do not believe that this potential can be realized in a church that is tied to a stateside body. Within the last few years especially, there has been a rising tide of nationalism in Canada; and therefore, an indigenous Lutheran Church seems to be the best answer. It seems to me that a unified Lutheran Church in Canada, perhaps with regional administrative divisions, would be a more effective tool for ministry than the present fragmentation.

Pastor Woldt answered the education problem that would be faced by an indigenous church by saying,

> I would hope that the Canadian Church would follow the same route as did The Lutheran Church of England in creating one or more houses of study at a secular university. In this way the men in training could receive all the benefits of a university education together with their theological education in the Lutheran tradition.
>
> As far as the pressing needs of the Church are concerned, it would appear to me that the recruitment of young men and women from Canada for service in the Canadian church would be most critical. Perhaps this is one of the greatest problems because until Canadians can be trained on Canadian soil, I'm sure that recruitment efforts will not be all that successful.

Woldt said further, that perhaps the creation of an indigenous, autonomous Canadian Church would serve to light a real fire under all the membership. Reflecting on the fact that the English District churches in Canada are heavily in debt, he said, "Subsidy sometimes has the tendency to immobilize progress because of the state of comfort that it provides."

The last perspective comes from a booklet entitled, Resource Management - Report and Recommendations, Board For Missions, LC-MS, printed in 1971. In it the board makes a statement on page 5, "The mission board staff sees a new mission church in an evolutionary process from mission to autonomous church." This coincides with the thoughts of Mr. James Cross who is a representative for Synod on the Mission Board of Synod, responsible to the church in Canada. In several conversations with him from September of 1971 through December, he has spoken of the mission in Canada that must be done by a Canadian Church.

He also shared the hope of several of the men in this chapter for one church in Canada. Much credit must be given him for the interest in Canadian missions that he has stirred up in Canadian seminarians in St. Louis. But at the same time, as much as Mr. Cross travels in Canada, the writer thinks he would say, with Rev. Woldt who is a Mission Counselor for Canadian churches, "these words are in some sense, from an outsider as far as the Canadian scene is concerned." The church in Canada needs Canadian men, Jim Cross has told me on more than one occasion; men, who in words of other perspectives beforethis one, are willing to take up the responsibility of the work in Canada and build the church there.

Vincent Massey recorded this conversation with Mackenzie King, a former Prime Minister of Canada for thirty years: "When I suggested that the Americans, although undoubtedly friendly, did not take us seriously enough as a nation, King said that Canadianswere looked upon by Americans as a lot of Eskimos. This was a striking observation made by a man who had been so often accused of being subservient to American policy."[2]

This quotation sums up two important thrusts of the perspectives in this chapter. First of all the men have said that the Synod in some ways is not taking Canada and the Canadian churches seriously enough. This is reflected in American programs that must always be adapted, and a lot of times disregarded, to fit the Canadian scene. It is also reflected in the thinking of President Rode when he said in conversation, "When I got to be District President, I thought I could direct my attention more to the Church in Canada; instead, I find my time being taken up with the concerns of Synod." Parenthetically he was saying that the concerns of Synod were not always the same as the concerns of the church that he new in Canada. He did not mean (nor does this paper meant to convey the thought), that he did not love or have concern for Synod. The fact is that the majority of Synod's concerns will be colored by the American scene; which to reiterate does not necessarily translate to the

Canadian scene without at times being an artificial or meaningless concern for Canadians and Canadian Lutherans.

Second, it points out which way a majority of Lutherans are looking. To be taken seriously one must be convincingly responsible for himself. In this case, as several men pointed out, both the Canadian clergy and the Canadian laity need to cut the apron strings with Mother Synod, get out of the cradle, and take the work to be done in Canada seriously and start doing it in a creative way using our collective head for once instead of being spoonfed. If we have not been regarded seriously or thought to be a bunch of "Eskimos" it is because we have allowed ourselves in Canada to be thought of that way. Instead of asserting a positive Canadian nationalism and pride we have been expressing ourselves in anti-American terms as we shall discover in the next chapter. We are a different country, and a different race of people but we of all people have failed to realize that we are different from Americans. We have assumed also in our church, the LCMS, that American policies and programs will work in Canada. They might have worked yesterday, but that day is soon coming to an end, as the writer believes will be seen in the next chapter on the rising nationalism in Canada and the Canadian--American relations. Woldt has already made some allusions to this point above, when he talked about the surge of nationalism in Canada in the past years.

To sum up, it appears that the LC-C is now something less that what it started out to be. It is a "skeleton", useful now mostly for public relations. Movements towards an indigenous, independent LC-C have "ground to a stop"; and it does not look like it will ever come into being. Inter-Lutheran relations have stopped making forward advances after the JCILR "grudgingly" removed its request for fellowship proceedings in 1973. Motion now is laterally, to encourage dialog at the grass roots level and iron out theological problems of pastors and laity. ELCC is floundering because of financial troubles.

A ray of hope is seen in the decision to place an LCMS chair at Saskatoon; and further encouragement is coming from joint endeavors in campus and chaplaincy work among the three synods. A strong need is felt for recruitment of Canadian workers for the church in Canada. Finally, only a Canadian church it is felt can perceive and speak to the peculiarly Canadian problems and Canadian scene; and with such a church, only, will the Lutherans be able to really identify with the Canadian people.

CHAPTER II FOOTNOTES

1. Claude Bissell (ed.), Great Canadian Writing, The Canadian Centennial Library, ed. Pierre Berton (Toronto: The Canadian Centennial Publishing Co. Ltd., 1965), p.60.

2. Ibid., p.80.

CHAPTER III

CANADA, CANADIANS, AND A TIME OF RISING NATIONALISM

A Nova Scotia version of the old Newfoundland anti-Confederate folk song:

Would you barter the rights that your fathers have won,
No! Let them descendfrom father to son,
For a few thousand dollars Canadian gold,
Don't let it be said that our birthright was sold.
Nova Scotia's face turns to Britain
Her back to the Gulf
Come near at your peril
Canadian wolf! [1]

The essence of this folk song which was sung by loyalist Nova Scotians who did not want to join in the Confederation of Canada also has application today in the general feelings nation wide about U.S.--Canada relations. That this feeling of animosity towards the United States is not somthing new, can be proven from a series of newspaper cartoons reprinted in the book The Making of The Nation by William Kilbourn, in the Canadian Centennial Library series. To encapsul the Canadian feeling about the U.S. let us describe just three of the cartoons. The first one is called "The Great Canadian Sellout" which was underway in 1903. Pictured in the cartoon is Auctioneer Johnny Canuck asking for bids on Canadian trade. The most prominent personnage among the bidders is Uncle Sam. The second cartoon drawn during the mid-1960's during the Bomarc Missle dispute in Canada. The

picture shows a Bomarc missle with a "made in USA" stamp on it, standing on a launch platform. Standing to the right of the missle are three dumbfounded Canadians, while to the left of the missle are four U.S. soldiers, one holding a U.S. flag standing at attention singing ". . . O Canada, we stand on guard for thee . . . O Canada . . . ." The third cartoon shows a Canadian carrying the new Canadian flag. All around him are outlines of buildings with names on them like: "Texas Gulf Sulphur, International Paper, Shell Oil Co, Ltd., USA Atomic Depot -- Keep Out, etc." The caption under the cartoon reads, "Now to find some Canadian soil on which to plant it (in reference to the flag) . . . ."

In this chapter we want to address ourselves to the questions: "What is Canada as a nation; and, who or what are Canadians?" ; "How are Canadian and U.S. relations and how might these relations be improved?" It would be impossible to completely and fully answer these questions, but we think that it will be obvious from some of the things mentioned in this paper, that it is necessary for both Canadians and Americans, especially within our Church to begin to consider some of the answers. If this is done, it is this author's opinion, that it will make not only better Canadians and better Americans, but it will improve the quality of human understanding and caring and thereby improve the mission of the Church to the whole man.

The best place to begin an understanding of what Canada

is, is with some quick descriptions of it. Canada is a federation of ten provinces and two territories which comprises a land mass greater than that of continental United States. The land is sharply divided by its geography. The Rocky mountains divide the people of British Columbia on the west coast of Canada from the people on the fertile Canadian prairies. The Canadian Shield dips down from the Arctic and cuts Ontario off from the Manitobians. Language and culture rather than physical conditions separate the French-Canadians in Quebec from Ontario. The rugged and densely forested land as well as the pull of the Atlantic Ocean separate the Maritimes from the rest of Canada. Crowning the prairie provinces in the frigid sub-Arctic is The Northwest Territories and laying up against Alaska is the Canadian Yukon.

These physical divisions on the face of Canada's soil also prove to be demographical divisions as well. Because the physical lines of separation are so rugged, in most cases, travel by Canadians does not occur east and west in Canada but north and south into the United States. These two facts are at the very heart of the problem of trying to answer "What is Canada as a nation; and, who or what are Canadians?"

Tom Kelly in a book review in Canada Today had this to say,

> The most significant fact of Canada's existence is that it lies next to the most powerful nation in the world. The second most significant is what the table of contents calls fractionalization. Canada is not like the United States -- a melting pot, but a mosaic, a country that, perhaps through necessity, keeps and values its diversity. Canada has attained a population approaching 22 million, about one tenth that of the U.S. 43.8 per cent of Canad-

> ians trace their origins to the British Isles, 30.4 per cent to France, and 22.6 per cent to othercountries in Europe.[2]

From such matter of fact foundations Mr. Kelly goes on to say that the authors of the book Canadian Foreign Policy: Options and Perspectives, explain "with remarkable clarity how the country has come to regard the outside world and itself." Continuing his train of thought on the Canadian mosaic, Kelly said, "Canadians are easier to sum up in a table than in a phrase -- they are not simply bastard Englishmen who have become bastard Americans. They have things in common too with Tanzanians, Russians and Swedes." He indicated that Canada was at the moment, "a nation in search of herself, though not the only one."[3]

George Etienne Cartier described the type of national unity sought by the framers of Confederation as a "unity in diversity."[4] "If we unite we will form a political nationality independent of the national origin and religion of the individuals.... . ." Cartier continued,

> As to the objection that we cannot form a great nation because Lower Canada is chiefly French and Catholic, Upper Canada English and Protestant, and the Maritimes mixed, it is completely futile. . . . In our Confederation there will be Catholics and Protestants, English and French, Irish and Scot, and each by its efforts and successes will add to the prosperity, the might, and to the glory of the new federation.[5]

In this type of national unity there has been no great pressure towards conformity. At Confederation, Canada deliberately turned her back upon the philosophy of the "melting pot" in which racial distinctions would be fused and blended. The type of unity sought was one in which it would be possible

for various traditions to be perpetuated. Perhaps this is a partial explanation to the statement, "Unlike Americans, Canadians have rarely been indoctrinated with official appeals for patriotism,"[6] and is also at the crux of the dilemma to find a truly Canadian identity.

What is it to be a Canadian? A search for and an analysis of, national self awareness, produces several different findings.

> At the most elementary level one becomes aware that there is somthing distinctive about being a Canadian. A Canadian is different from an Englishman or a Scot, or a Frenchman or a landed immigrant, or at least has certain qualities in addition to whatever other national identity he claims. At a somewhat more advanced level, Canadian awareness expresses itself over against more particular forms of identification. The word "Canadian" has a context that is not exhausted when we have said "Ontarian" or "Nova Scotian" or even "French-Canadian." Beyond this again, it is possible to be aware of Canada, not in competition with rival sources of identity but rather in terms of national achievements and possibilities. Canadians have tended to neglect these positive elements of self awareness, if only because they have had so much difficulty in establishing the more negative ones. Englishmen and Frenchmen are able to take the distinctiveness and the unity of their countries for granted, concentrating instead on the memories of national glory.[7]

But such positive self assertions have not been the way with most Canadians down through the years. "No Truck or Trade with the Yankees," a political slogan of the opposition party in Canadian Government which helped overthrow the government in a General Election, helped discharge the suppressed resentments of a generation in the early 1900's.[8] Today the same slogan is again being flaunted in anti-American articles in Canadian newspapers as Canadians continue to try and convince the Americans and themselves that they are serious about being an

autonomous and independent country. One article which appeared in The Ottawa Citizen on November 8, 1971, indicates the level of frustration and animosity towards the United States that is currently being felt across Canada. Here are several quotations from that front page article which was originally written in The New York Times by a writer who had observed the Canadian sentiment to the U.S. "Canadians resent the way in which they are regularly ignored or taken for granted by the U.S." "Such long standing habits have become intolerable . . . ." "Prime Minister Trudeau has been moved by recent events to say of Americans, " I don't think they know much or care much really about Canada." He also warned that, if the U.S. intended as a permanent policy to "beggar its neighbours," Canada would be forced into a fundamental reassessment of its whole economy (America is Canada's biggest customer in manufactured trade goods and natural resources.

"Canadians have been accustomed to define themselves by what they are not."[9] They said "no" to the wooing of England to remain a colony, and they fearfully said "no" to the U.S. after the American Revolution. "While one Canadian political party could win popular support by identifying itself with the practice of saying "no" to the British, the other won elections by saying "no" to the Americans."[10] It was this practice of saying "no" that led historian, Frank Underhill, to comment that if they persisted in indulging themselves much longer in the practice they would certainly end up as nothing better

than the Ulster of North America.[11] In the book, They Can't Go Home Again, the authors emphatically underlined the fact that Canadian nationalism and independence were being descibed in terms of anti-American sentiment. They said that this was prevalent in all areas of the Canadian society, as the Canadians questioned the U.S. ownership of Canadian buisness and the takeover of whole departments in Canadian universities by American professors. This feeling was being demonstrated also in the concern for regulating the amount of American content and actors on Canadian radio and television; and, in the protection and conservation of Canadian resources and territory -- especially from the Americans. Prime Minister Trudeau's statement that living next to the United States is like sleeping with an elephant indicates the caution with which Canada and Canadians view American politics and business as it reflects especially upon them.[12]

> Among the various aspects of self awareness the most important . . . is that of ideological content. The question here is not simply how Canadians see themselves as different, what characteristics strike them as national rather than provincial or regional, or even what importance they attach to their existance as Canadians (although this too is important), but rather what they conceive Canada to stand for.[13]

It is precisely at this point that Canadians must start doing their homework. It is as they wrestle with this question about the meaning of the existance of their country which is bound up in the lives of all the pioneers in Canadian history from Cartier to Trudeau that some of the answers for what it means to be a Canadian are answered as well. And it is precisely

here, as we shall assert in the next chapter, that in these unsure times in Canadian history we as a church must address ourselves as we attempt to minister to the whole man and give him hope and meaning not only for the life beyond but also for the here and now.

If Canada's destiny is in its own hands, why is it then disturbed by fear and resentment of America? The answer to this question was hinted at in the beginning of this chapter with the folk song and the cartoons. W. L. Morton, a Canadian at the University of Wisconsin, gives one answer to this question in his book, The Canadian Identity.[14]

Morton says that Canada fears that the U.S. in attempting to maintain its world power will make constant demands on Canada, each reasonable in itself, "until the substance of independence is modified out of existence." He says that Canadians fear that the Americans may simply occupy Canada in defense of themselves and the North American continent and that once they have done this they may not retreat then to their own country. Morton points out further, that this fear is founded on a mature awareness by his countrymen, that while "Americans in their friendly way accept Canada as a neighbour, they are not in their heart of hearts convinced that Canadian nationhood is possessed of a moral significance comparable with that of their own great nation."

As "blacks" are different from "whites", so Americans by being Americans are precluded from understanding Canada and Canadians. Professor Morton says in borrowed terminology that

Americans are covenant people. By covenant he means to say: (a) there is need for uniformity (the melting pot) as the covenant is among the like-minded; (b) the covenant separates the covenanted from the uncovenanted; (c) the covenant contains a mission. While there is inherent in the covenant not only uniformity and isolation there is also, the notion that America is to be a messianic county which is to periodically carry the republic into other lands for the liberation of the Gentiles, the lesser breeds without the covenant.

> This fundamental American character, a barrier to understanding any nation, is particularly an obstacle to understanding Canada; for Canada, is not the creation of a covenant, or social contract embodied in a Declaration of Independence and written constitution. It is the product of treaty and statute . . . . The moral core of Canadian nationhood is found in the fact that Canada is a monarchy and in the nature of a monarchial allegiance. As America is united at the bottom by the covenant, Canada is a nation founded on allegiance and not on compact; there is no process of becoming Canadian akin to conversion, there is no pressure to uniformity, there is no one Canadian way of life. Any one French, Irish, Ukranian, or Eskimo can be subject of the Queen and a citizen of Canada without changing in any way or ceasing to be himself.
>
> Because Canada arrived at freedom through evolution in allegiance and not by revolutionary compact, it had not a mission to perform but a destiny to work out. That destiny has never been manifest, but always exceedingly obscure. It could not be defined for by definition it was always self defining. But it has been a destiny to create on the harsh northern half of a continent, a new nation, sprung from the ancient traditions of France, nourished by British freedom, and it must gladly be said, fortified by American example. It is not a nation which has sought a separate and equal existence, but an equal existence in free association, and in that principle of free and equal association it would wish to govern its relations with the world power of America.[15]

Hugh Hood speaks to this same point in an article entitled, "Moral Imagination: Canadian Thing", and brings up a new point

about the existence of Canada as a nation.

> The tendency of U.S. history has been to sink the minority in the mass . . . . In Canada, the minorities -- whether cultural, religious, ethnic, whether Bluenoses, Spud Islanders, Italians, Ukranians or God knows, French -- have always and utterly refused to assimilate. . . . This country offers an alternative life style to people who do not want to share in the benefits and deficiencies of mass society . . . .[16]

Canada is beyond a doubt a different kind of American society. It is as Hood says, an alternative way of life to that in the United States -- without denigrating either society. William Kilbourn in describing the life in Canada said that it has never been easy. The elements and a harsh land have made it a constant struggle for Canadians to carve out a living. This struggle has put a premium on some of the "sterner virtues -- frugality and caution, discipline and endurance." "Geography even more than religion has made us puritans, although ours is a puritanism tempered by orgy."[17]

Brian Moore said,

> If a Canadian's nationalism is tied to the land it is because at almost no point can a Canadian get into his car and drive one hundred and fifty miles north without coming face to face with the real Canada -- the wilderness.[18]

The best answer we have been able to arrive at for "why Canada?" seems to be because it is a desirable, alternative way of life to the American system -- desirable at least to 22 million people who are Canadian citizens. The question before us now, is how will Canadians express their choice of Canada and the Canadian way of life in the future? Will they continue to express it in terms of what they are not or will

they find a positive Canadian identity to hang their hats on? Brian Moore says,

> A new Canadian identity will not be found through attempts to de-Americanize the Canadian people. Achievement of this identity will depend not on pro- or anti-American stances, but on raising the standard of national taste, on promoting cultural excellence, and on inculcating in the average Canadian a respect for achievement in the arts, sciences, government and humanities that equals his present respect for those who accumulate great wealth.[19]

> What is surely required to avoid the proverbial well-informed malevolence of Canadians about the United States, and the benevolent ignorance of Americans about Canada is a recognition on both sides of the foreigness and the differences, as well as the friendliness and the similarities, that lie between their two societies.[20]

With all that has been said in this chapter about Canada, Canadian nationalism and pride, and Canadian-U.S. relations we close this chapter with two final notes -- one a challenge, the other a piece of poetic beauty to rival the Psalms (and to call forth a Canadian pride).

Finance Minister Mitchell Sharp observed that "as I see it, it is the task of the rising generation of Canadians to create a new confidence and a new sense of cultural and civic (and church!) identity in Canada."[21]

> In a world where independence often arrives with swift violence it may be good to have one nation where it has matured slowly; in a world of fierce national prides, to have a state about which it is hard to be solemn and religious without being ridiculous, and impossible to be dogmatic. In a world with tendencies to political division and cultural homogeneity, Canada is a country moving in the opposite direction -- towards political federation and cultural and regional variety. In a world that strives for absolute freedom and often gains only oppressive power, Canada presents a tradition that sees freedom in a subtle creative tension with authority; in a world of vast anonymous power elites, Canada is a society whose leaders number more than Aristotle's five thou-

sand and can know each other personally without being stifled or hopelessly paroachial. In a world haunted by fear of overpopulation, one is grateful for a place with room for more. In a world striving for moral victories, it is good to have a country where a sort of moral disarmament is possible. In a world of ideological battles it is good to have a place where the quantity and quality of potential being in a person means more than what he believes; in a masculine world of assertive will and the cutting edge of intellect, a certain tendency in Canada to the amorphous permissive feminine principle of openess and toleration and acceptance offers the possibility of healing.[22]

CHAPTER III FOOTNOTES

1. Mason Wade (ed.), Regionalism in the Canadian Community 1867-1967, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969), p.101.

2. Tom Kelly, Review of Canadian Foreign Policy: Options and Perspectives, by D. Thompson and R. Swanson, Canada Today, Vol. 2, No. 10 (November-December, 1971), 4.

3. Ibid., p.4.

4. Neil G. Smith, "Nationalism in the Canadian Churches," Canadian Journal of Theology, IX, No. 2 (1963), 113.

5. Ibid., 113.

6. Brian Moore, Canada, Life World Library, (New York: Time-Life Publishing, 1963), p.11.

7. John W. Grant, "The Church and Canada's Self Awareness," Canadian Journal of Theology, XIII, no. 3 (1967), 155.

8. W. L. Morton, The Canadian Identity, (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1965), p.69.

9. William Kilbourn, The Making of the Nation, The Canadian Centennial Library, ed. Pierre Berton (Toronto: The Canadian Centennial Publishing Co. Ltd., 1965), p.8.

10. Ibid., p.8.

11. Ibid., p.8.

12. R. L. Kilner, Robert S. Leckey, D. S. Wiley, They Can't Go Home Again, (Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1971), p.88.

13. Grant, p.163.

14. Morton, p.84.

15. Morton, p.84.

16. William Kilbourn (ed.), Canada, A Guide to the Peaceable Kingdom, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970), p.32.

17. Kilbourn, The Making of the Nation, p.120ff.

18. Moore, p.14.

19. Ibid., p.146

20. Kilbourn, The Making of the Nation, p.92.

21. Richard Leach (ed.), Contemporary Canada, (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1967), p.312.

22. Kilbourn, The Making of the Nation, p.124

IN RETROSPECT AND WITH AN EYE TO THE FUTURE
THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN CANADA

> Devoted missionaries brought the Gospel message to the pioneers in the Canadian forest, and they brought it in the denominational forms in which they had received it. Undoubtedly they expected to establish here the same institutions that had mediated the divine Spirit to them at home, and to see it repeat its former success. But you cannot transfer the spirit, the atmosphere, and the distinctive character of a religious community from one land to another. You may be able to plant the seed in the new soil, but the old form will break up whenever the new life germinates. The men who brought the message became different in the new environment; the men with whom they associated and toiled were different; the product of their joint effort must be different, too.[1]

John Webster Grant in addressing himself to the problem of successfully planting and growing a church body on Canadian soil scanned the religious history of Canada and made this insightful statement about foreign based churches and their attempts to develop missions on Canadian soil, "The slowest of all to develop, as in the past, is a sense of the possibilities inherent in the Canadian situation. The immigrant group tends to be preoccupied at first with its own concerns and internal tensions, only gradually relating itself to issues of nation building."[2] Nations are composed of men. If the church will build a nation or at least help in the process it must do so by building up the lives of men. This we believe is not contrary to the mission of the church -- either in Christ's days on earth, or in our own. It is precisely to this point that Pierre Berton, a self styled protagonist and prick on the Canadian conscience, calls the church to respond. "Though the Church has never been statistically fatter, its influence appears to be waning . . . only rarely does it seem to account for their social attitudes and opinions."[3]

Churches prior to the Confederation of Canada passed through three phases towards establishing a Canadian point of view in their church work. Neil Gregor Smith sums these up for us in an article in the Canadian Journal of Theology.[4] First, a deliberate attempt was made on the part of the Protestant churches to sever ties with the churches of the U.S. and strengthen ties with the churches of Great Britain. This he said was accelerated after the war of 1812. Because of their fear of the American melting pot, and to preserve their heritage the churches (also government) used Great Britain as a counter balance of power. "In having to face two ways the Canadian churches bear the marks of both the cherished European traditions and of cultural influences emanating from the United States."[5] The second phase was a growing resentment against colonial status in church affairs and a growing spirit of independence in the Canadian churches. Third, there was an erosion of the provincialism in the British churches. They were not about to be an exact replica of the Mother Church in England or Scotland.

Smith also said,

> The development in the British Churches of a Canadian point of view was aided by the heroic efforts of the churches to raise up and train a native ministry, and by their equally heroic efforts to maintain a periodical press to give information concerning their work and to give expression to a Canadian viewpoint on problems where their interests were involved.[6]

To support his point Mr. Smith quotes William Proudfoot, a prominent Canadian Presbyterian minister, who wrote to the deputies of his Church in Scotland, "Men trained here have more of the native character than imported preachers, and their habits are more Canadian."[7]

John Webster Grant summed up the strategies of both the Protestant and the Catholic churches in the past, in one sentence. "French-Canadian Catholicism has sought to give shape to society, while the dominant Protestant emphasis has been on the shaping of character. Not so clearly stressed on either side has been the formulation of national purpose."[8]

William Kilbourn took a different view by comparing church and state in America with that in Canada. He described it this way:

> There is a lingering aura of the European established church in Canada which is different from the American separation of church and state and its consequences -- the political religion of America that is increasingly prevalent in Washington and in the American intellectual establishment. The Canadian churches' influence and status can be a strain on some people's liberties but they are also a bastion against the more absolute dogma of an all-embracing spiritual patriotism. Canada is a land of no one ideology, no single vision.[9]

This then brings us to our own church, the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. We must soon face the fact that if we are to be "worth our salt" , we must examine our ministry in Canada and take stock of the content and style of ministry and the direction it is taking as well as consider the impact it is having on the Canadian people. Positively, it can be said and assumed that an autonomous Canadian church will have advantages in mission outreach. This writer believes that most of our Canadian leaders would agree with this. It would enable us to identify with the Canadian scene, Canadian life and culture, because the physical nature as well as the spirit of the church body would be Canadian. The history of the Canadian churches, the Roman Catholics excepted (although even they are changing through the efforts of such men as Cardinal Leger at Montreal), reveals that those churches which clung to foreign ties, whether they were in America, England, Scotland or wherever, did not progress as rapidly as those which became autonomous.[10]

Dr. Otto Olson Jr. in a paper entitled, "The Scope of Lutheran Unity in Canada," said that "in Canada the divided nature of Lutheranism has been a hindrace to the Gospel we proclaim." "A central theme of our Confessions is that the structure of the Church is significant only in relation to the function of the Church."[11] While we as Lutherans have quietly always believed this, we have tenaciously held on to old forms and old phrasing until we have almost reached the point of Mr. Berton's Comfortable Pew. Old structural loyalties must go by the boards if they harness and hamper the mission of the church.

The New Delhi World Council Assembly said,

> In large measure the shape of the church will be determined by the shape of the world. That is, even though its internal functions (the preaching of the Gospel and the administering of the sacraments in accord with the -- in this case -- Lutheran Symbols) will remain relatively constant, the external form, or the vehicle which it utilizes to express these functions will vary according to people's needs.[12]

With that in mind, the church's institutional structure must always be in response to the emerging shape of our society, so that its changeless message of God's redemptive activity can be related to a changing milieu.[13] In terms of Canada and the Lutheran Church, especially in these times of rising nationalism, and understanding the differences between the two nations cohabiting the North American continent; this writer believes, that a church which continues to organizationally and programmatically make decisions for both nations while being directed mostly by leaders of one nation cannot do otherwise than fail to "gain a sense of the possibilities inherent in the Canadian situation" and adequately make a response to them.

The Church is not an amorphous corporation which operates in a mechanized way. Rather, the Church is where a group of individuals gather around the Word of God to worship Him. The emphasis here is on individuals, not on institutions. Morris Anderson in a paper delivered to the JCILR in 1969 said, "The recovery of the laos of God consciousness (which the Christians in the early church had) with the rediscovery of the role of the laity in the life and mission of the Church, is at the heart of church renewal in our time."[14] This recovery, the author believes, can only be achieved by a church that identifies with the people and that makes national decisions in terms of the cultural and social climate of the society it is in, advised by the educated voice of the people it serves. In this way one can instill not only a pride and due recognition of the church into the hearts of the people but one can also help them to live out the Christianity they profess in the context of their every day lives; not only in terms of their community and region, but also in terms of their country which ultimately they serve as well as their God.

To facilitate this, the Lutherans must not only have a Canadian based church, but they must also be about recruiting Canada's sons for the ministry -- for who can better speak to Canadians? John Grant wrote,

> The provision of clergy raised and trained in Canada was early recognized as a necessary condition of effective adaptation to local circumstances. Immigrant priests and ministers rendered heroic service, but so long as the church depended on them it would never become deeply rooted in the soil.[15]

Dr. Paul Scaer, professor of Systematics at Concordia Seminary in Springfield Illinois, in addressing a Canadian Thanksgiving banquet of Canadian Lutheran seminary students, commented on an independent Canadian Lutheran Church. He said, "If the church fully wants to serve Canadians, it must be fully Canadian."[16]

The Lutheran Witness is one of the chief organs of communication in the LCMS with the laity. President Rode in a conversation in December, 1971, said that less than 50 per cent of his people subscribed to this paper because it did not speak to them and "their church." They read The Canadian Lutheran instead which is published by the western districts of the LCMS in Canada. The time is overripe for the church in Canada to speak clearly as a truly Canadian church to the people in Canada. Dr. Olson said, "The top priority of one Lutheran Church in Canada is not to consolidate structures, but to make disciples. One Lutheran Church in Canada is not a nationalistic movement but an obvious pattern of organization (to accomplish the mission).[17]

> The Church has often been a hindrance to the development of distinctively Canadian ways, particularly to the development of self consciously Canadian ways. Ecclesiastical institutions have been notoriously resistant to change, and in this new land, this conservatism has been reinforced by the desire of nostalgic immigrants to preserve religion practices associated with the homeland. Thus in a country dominated by North American building styles, Anglican churches are rivaled in their unrepentant "Englishness" only by china shops.[18]

In a day in Canada when most signs of the Queen of England are being removed from provincial and national symbols, in order to give those symbols truly Canadian identities; how does it help, the people or the country, to confuse these attempts with English, French, or American overlays?

> The image of Christian Canada -- church going, moral and devoutly partisan -- strikes believers and unbelievers today as somewhat archaic . . . . By making Canada aware of its faithful presence, however, it can have an effective influence on national life. It can shape distinctive Canadianism where this has always been shaped, on the ever shifting frontier. It can foster an inclusive Canadianism by engaging in creative dialogue both within its own ranks and with those outside. It can contribute to Canada's stature in the area where Canada has already come closest to greatness, that of the concern for the peace and welfare of all men.[19]

If the church really has faith in the truth and power of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, it does not take a passive and demuring stand in the world; but rather, goes into every quarter, into every sector of society, confident in its mission as it witnesses to that Gospel, and in the context of it, ministers to the needs of man both perceived and unperceived in the best possible way.

In the context of the Lutheran Church in Canada, this means in the words of G.O. Evenson "getting on with the task of altar and pulpit fellowship where such has been officially established."[20] It means promoting efforts for the establishment of an independent Canadian Lutheran Church, especially promoting any efforts which will get the laity engaged in education and dialogue so that they develop that sense of responsibility for the mission which is theirs! In 1968, Oliver Harms supported these views in an article in Concordia Theological Monthly.[21]

With a Canadian Lutheran Church, we can answer in both words and actions the questions and situations posed by the Canadian people not only in a Christian but also truly Canadian way.

> Canada has never been a unified nation. Perhaps it never will be. Its disunity, goes deeper than the ordinary factional and regional rivalry by which almost every other nation is beset, because it is based on language as well as origin, on religion as well as economics. Canada is a nation which has been forced to put up with diversity, indeed forced to cherish it. Whether it can become a great and stable nation depends on how it can reconcile that diversity with justice to all.[22]

"The record of one hundred years of Confederation gives us good reason for optimism about the progress we can make in our

second century. As we look back with pride, so we can look forward with hope and confidence."[24] What will be the distinctive Canadian, Christian, and Lutheran input into this message will depend on how far the Church is willing to risk itself in bridging the gap between the sacred and the secular in the ministry to the whole man. It will also depend on how much it can encourage the Canadian laity to take charge of their responsibility in the mission. It is questionable how much progress can be made by the current structure of our Lutheran Church in its ministry to Canada. The ministry must come from within our land! And ultimately the extent of the progress we make within the Lutheran mission in Canada will depend on the grace of our God. It is to the glory of His Church universal and especially to that part of it in Canada that this paper and this writer are dedicated.

SOLI DEO GLORIA

\+ + +

CHAPTER IV FOOTNOTES

1. John W. Grant (ed.), The Churches and the Canadian Experience, (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1963), p.134.

2. John W. Grant, "The Church and Canada's Self Awareness," Canadian Journal of Theology, XIII, No. 3 (1967), 163.

3. Claude Bissell (ed.), Great Canadian Writing, The Canadian Centennial Library, ed. Pierre Berton (Toronto: The Canadian Centennial Publishing Co. Ltd., 1965), p.109.

4. Neil G. Smith, "Nationalism in the Canadian Churches," Canadian Journal of Theology, IX, No. 2 (1963), 114.

5. Ibid., p.114

6. Ibid., p.124.

7. Ibid., p.124.

8. Grant, The Church and Canada's Self Awareness, p.164.

9. William Kilbourn, The Making of the Nation, The Canadian Centennial Library, ed. Pierre Berton (Toronto: The Canadian Centennial Publishing Co. Ltd., 1965), p.122.

10. "Leader's Guide," Lutheran Church-Canada, 1969.

11. Resource Manual for Area Discussions, Inter-Lutheran Relationships in Canada (Winnipeg: JCILR and LCIC, 1970), p.24.

12. Ecumenical Designs (New York: National Consultation on Church Union, 1967), p.4.

13. Ibid., p.40.

14. Resource Manual, p.33.

15. Grant, The Church and Canada's Self Awareness, p.156.

16. The Canadian Lutheran, December, 1968, p.4.

17. Resource Manual, p.19.

18. Grant, The Church and Canada's Self Awareness, p.155.

19. Ibid., p.164.

20. Resource Manual, p.8.

21. Oliver Harms, "Moving Toward Lutheran Unity," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXXIX, (March 1968), 135.

22. Miriam Chapin, Contemporary Canada, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), p.5.

23. Richard Leach (ed.), Contemporary Canada, (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1961), p.318.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Bissell, Claude (ed.). Great Canadian Writing. The Canadian Centennial Library. Edited by Pierre Berton. Toronto: The Canadian Centennial Publishing Co. Ltd., 1965.

Chapin, Miriam. Contemporary Canada. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Clark, Sidney J. W. Indigenous Fruits. London: World Dominion Press, 1933.

Grant, John W. (ed.). The Churches and the Canadian Experience. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1963.

Kilbourn, William (ed.). Canada, A Guide to the Peaceable Kingdom. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970.

Kilbourn, William. The Making of the Nation. The Canadian Centennial Library. Edited by Pierre Berton. Toronto: The Canadian Centennial Publishing Co. Ltd., 1965.

Kilner, R. L., Leckey, R. S., Wiley, D. S. They Can't Go Home Again. Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1971.

Leach, Richard. Contemporary Canada. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1967.

Malinsky, Frank (ed.). Grace and Blessing. Kitchener: By the author, 1954.

Mehlenbacher, W. A. "Canadian Lutheran Council." The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church. Edited by J. H. Bodensiec. Vol. I, 1965.

Moir, John S. The Cross In Canada. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1965.

Morton, W. L. The Canadian Identity. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press,1965.

Moore, Brian. Canada. Life World Library. New York: Time-Life Publishing, 1963.

Wade, Mason (ed.). Regionalism in the Canadian Community 1867-1967. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.

Wolf, Richard C. Documents of Lutheran Unity in America. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

_____. Ecumenical Designs. New York: National Consultation on the Church in Community Life, 1967.

JOURNALS

Grant, John W. "The Church and Canada's Self Awareness," Canadian Journal of Theology, XIII, No. 3 (1967), 155.

Harms, Oliver. "Moving Toward Lutheran Unity," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXXIX, (March 1968), 135ff.

Kelly, Tom. Review of Canadian Foreign Policy: Options and Perspectives by D. Thompson and R. Swanson in Canada Today, Vol. 2, No. 10, (November-December, 1971). 4.

Smith, Neil G. "Nationalism in the Canadian Churches," Canadian Journal of Theology, IX, No. 2 (1963), 113ff.

REPORTS AND OTHER SOURCES

The Lutheran Witness: Ontario District Edition. August 1970.

Lutheran Church--Canada. A pamphlet issued by the Board of Internal Information, 1964.

Leaders Guide. Committee on Internal Information and Promotion 1963.

Insight. Lutheran Church--Canada News, June 1, 1960.

Lutheran Witness Reporter. Articles on the LC-C, May 3, 1960; June 28, 1960; October 7, 1958; November 4, 1958.

Handbook for the 2nd Convention of LC-C. 1959.

Prospectus for the 3rd Convention of LC-C. 1960.

Prospectus for the 5th Convention of LC-C. 1962.

"Profile of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod in the Dominion of Canada." O. H. Reinboth, November 1964, unpublished.

New Horizons. Newsletter about Canadian Lutheranism. Relevant articles in the September 1966; Winter 1966; Winter 1965; Summer 1961 issues.

Affirmation and Appeal. Published by the JCILR in 1970 at Winnipeg, under the auspices of LCIC.

Resource Manual For Area Discussions, Inter-Lutheran Relationships In Canada. Printed by the JCILR and LCIC at Winnipeg in 1970, to assist the twenty-nine area groups across Canada.

LC-MS Convention Workbook, Milwaukee 1971.

Proceedings, Milwaukee 1971.

LC-MS Workbook, Detroit 1965.

Proceedings, Detroit 1965.

Proceedings, New York, 1967.

LC-C, 12th Convention Workbook, 1969.

Roundtable. Published by LCIC, the November-December 1971 issue.

The Canadian Lutheran. Published by the Western Districts of LC-C, the November 1970 issue; and the December 1968 issue.