

Modernism and Unity

Father, we want to thank You for this beautiful day, for the glory of all You have made. We pray that You will be with us in this class and that You will teach us. As we think about how Schaeffer wrestled with the issues of 60 years ago, may they be a challenge to us as we wrestle with the issues of our day. We ask this for Jesus' sake. Amen.

Last time we discussed the article, “Modernism, Barthianism, and the Ecumenical Movement.” We were talking about the three phases of modernism. The first phase was “tolerate me.” The second phase was “the battle.” And the third phase was “control.” We had not quite finished discussing the third phase when we came to the end of the last lesson.

There were two points we made under this third phase of “control.” The first point was that the modernists were by that time, Schaeffer says, in control absolutely of many of the major denominations. However, they faced the problem of growth. Were they building new churches? Were there masses of people coming to their churches? No, the opposite was happening. Churches were dying, and the church was losing its impact. There was a tremendous drift among the young people away toward atheism. Thus the modernists realized that they needed a new, more vital religion. And second, under this third phase, I made the point from Schaeffer’s article that into that need for a more vital religion stepped Karl Barth with his tremendous idea. We discussed that idea last time, of the separation of objective truth or rational truth from religious truth. We also talked about the way this idea appeared to meet the need of the time.

Now, today I want to look at that in more detail from another article of Schaeffer’s. But let me first conclude what he says in this article, “Modernism, Barthianism, and the Ecumenical Movement.” The conclusion of Barth’s kind of thinking is that all religious traditions are equally valid. The ecumenical movement picked up on this idea. If there is no such thing as objective truth but rather truth is relative to the individual and religious truth is different than rational truth, then we may say that all traditions in the church are equally valid. In that way we may build a new church, united from all the previously separate traditions—Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox, old-line modernism, the new modernism, and even evangelical.

This brings us to the conclusion of Schaeffer’s article. He makes a point here about “control.” He says, “If evangelicals are prepared to stay in their denominations, to stay in the ecumenical movement and keep quiet, then everything will be fine. That is exactly what the churches and the ecumenical movement want the evangelical Christian to do, to simply stay inside, to simply see himself as part of this now immensely broad Christian movement—to stay inside and keep quiet.” But Schaeffer challenges evangelicals with two challenges. This is how his article ends. He gives this challenge: if we are going to be faithful to God’s Word and to the demand of God’s Word that we stand for the truth, we only really have two options. One is to stay in the denominations that are now perhaps dominated by modernism or the new modernism, but we must teach clearly what God’s Word says and try to show in practice through discipline Bible-believing Christianity is the only true Christianity. That is the one option for the evangelical if he or she is going to stay in a denomination that now has much modernistic or new modernistic teaching in it. If he stays, he must not only present the truth but also try to confute those who contradict it, as Paul requires of every elder in his letter to Titus. That will mean a commitment to try to discipline those who deny the faith, who reject the central truths of biblical Christianity. Schaeffer suggests that if evangelicals try to do this, if they try to stay and stand up for the truth and discipline those who stand against it, life will be made impossible for them. If this is the case, Schaeffer says the only alternative, then, is what he calls separation in reverse. That is, evangelicals will have to leave. That is how he finishes the article. He says this:

When we have tried to bring the modernists to trial as heretics and have failed, or when we realize that such a procedure has become impossible, then Bible-believing Christians have only one recourse: practice separation in reverse. Found new denominations and new councils that can be used to preach the Gospel unfettered and that will draw the line clearly on insisting that modernism is a false religion. This is what we have in our separated denominations and in the American Council, and God willing we will have an international council of Bible-believing churches. This is the separatist movement. Abraham Kuyper, Spurgeon, the leaders of the Free Church of Scotland, as well as Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, and Knox, have walked this road before us.

Thus he points out that many people in the past have had to do the same thing. This is basically what happened at the Reformation. When the church as a whole was dominated by a position that was in opposition to some of the central truths of the Gospel, the Reformers of the time had no alternative, basically, but to practice what Schaeffer calls separation in reverse. That is, to leave and found new churches. Schaeffer continues, “We are in just such a day today. This is what we have to do. Not to do one of these two things is to agree in practice with the modernists. It is to allow the unbeliever to speak for us and to control us. It is to deny the teaching of the Bible on the need of church purity. It is to say to the world, ‘There are many ways to salvation.’ It is to deny the holiness of God in our practice.” That is his challenge. He finishes up by saying, “We are outside instead of the heretic being outside. However, being outside by God’s grace and for His glory, ‘here we stand.’” He is, of course, quoting Luther there at the end. “Here we stand; we can do no other.”

Schaeffer insists that the Bible itself demands that we both teach and practice the purity of the church. He is thinking of passages like Galatians, 1 John 4, the letters to the churches in the early chapters of Revelation, and so on where there is an insistence on dealing with false doctrine. Later on in Schaeffer’s writings, and it is apparent in some of his letters, he regretted some of what was there in the separatist movement and some of what he had done himself. Is he referring to this stand that he makes so clearly in this particular article? We will come to this in more detail later when we discuss the spiritual crisis Schaeffer went through himself just a few years after this where he reexamined Christianity completely. But it is not really this he is referring to in his statements of regret. Here he is dealing with the fundamental issue of the purity of the church. What he came to regret later, and what he was already beginning to be concerned about by this time (you see it coming out here and there when you read this article) is the need for consistency in our lives as well as in our words. That is a theme that was already beginning to appear more and more in his teaching.

I think what he regretted later was the mentality among some of those who were separated. For example, the division that led to setting up Faith Seminary as distinct from Westminster Seminary, the two Bible-believing Presbyterian denominations splitting up over minor issues, some of the harsh things that were said at that time, some of the ugliness in the mentality. I think, though, it was not just that there was sometimes an ugly mentality among those who were trying to stand for the truth. I think another thing he regretted later and saw as being very distressing was the attitude toward those who stayed in the major denominations that were dominated by modernism. Rather than simply challenging them to try to stand for what is true and if at all possible to practice discipline, and then to consider leaving—rather than this, sometimes those who left went to a position of refusing to have anything to do with anyone who stayed inside.

You will remember I told the story a few lessons ago of when Schaeffer was with David Calhoun in 1972. He wept when he saw on the board the statement of the two groups, those forming the Presbyterian Church in America (PCA) and the evangelicals who stayed in the Southern Presbyterian Church (SPC). They were meeting together to pray. Schaeffer said, “We were not able to do that.” There he was thinking back to the mid 1930s when there had been a tremendously negative attitude toward the people who stayed inside. And I know there were things he regretted not only about what happened among others but also about some of the things he had said at the time. I would say perhaps the third area where he had some regrets later was perhaps the way in

which he expressed some of the things he said. You will see this quite clearly in the next article we look at, “The New Modernism: Neo-Orthodoxy and the Bible.” Some of the language he uses in that article you will not find him using later. He uses language like “cheating,” “dishonesty,” and the like when he talks about new modernism. And you do not find him using that kind of language later.

I think all through this time, because he was very much a central part of the separatist movement, he was not as able to see the problems with it. But when it began to go really sour, just a few years after this, he began to see that it was having a more and more negative thrust. And already he talks about that in some of these articles: “It is not enough for us to say no. We have to stand clearly for something. It is not enough to be against things; we have to stand for the truth and we have to live the truth consistently.” As you read through these articles, you will see how this comes out. He refers to this again and again, often at the end of an article, at the end of a lecture, he makes it clear that what is central is our own relationship to God, our own obedience to Him, and our own standing positively for the truth.

Now, as the next few years went by, that became a more and more important part of his teaching. Thus he began to give whole lectures on the necessity of speaking the truth in love. And he began to stress that having a negative attitude toward the ecumenical movement, toward the World Council of Churches, toward the National Council of Churches, toward liberals, toward Catholics, toward Communism—this is not enough. The American Council of Churches, which was the separatist body and the International Council of Christian Churches, could not have an identity just by being negative. They had to have positive identity.

Of course, that is always one of the dangers of separatism. You see it over and over again throughout church history. When you stand against something, that is a really good entrance place for the devil. Your whole life and mentality can begin to be defined by being against things. Therefore you spend all your time hunting for heretics rather than getting out there and actually doing the task God has given you to do, which is to live His Word, teach His Word, and to stand for something. Over the next few years after writing the article “The New Modernism: Neo-Orthodoxy and the Bible,” it became apparent to Schaeffer that the separatist movement that he and many others had many very positive desires for was becoming more and more negative in its thrust. Thus I am sure that later on he regretted the way he said some of the things he said. But I do not think he ever regretted his stand for the purity of the visible church. It is very clear that in *The Church before the Watching World*, written many years later, he always remained committed to the need for Christians to belong to churches that are biblically pure. Now, later on he was very, very careful not to criticize people who stayed within denominations that were dominated by modernism.

Schaeffer went to England in the late 1960s, when there was a big division going on there between different evangelicals. There were those who were with Martin Lloyd-Jones who left the major denominations and formed the Independent Evangelical Church and other separatist churches, in the sense that they were churches committed to the purity of biblical doctrine. There he pled with Martin Lloyd-Jones and other men like him at the time not to be harsh, negative, or critical in their mentality toward people like John Stott who stayed within the Anglican church as committed evangelicals. He pled with them to carry on treating one another as brothers so that there would not be the same kind of unhappy division between those who stayed in and those who left that there was in the 1930s and still existed among many people in the 1940s. Some of that plea fell on deaf ears, and English evangelicals had to go through the same kind of struggle.

Thus even recently some friends of mine (who are Reformed Baptist and Reformed pastors in the Independent Evangelical Church) and I were involved together in a conference with R. C. Lucas, who is a very fine evangelical Anglican, the rector of Saint Helen’s Bishops’ Gate in the banking district in London. When Dick Lucas organized a conference for young preachers through his proclamation trust, he was reaching out both to young Anglican evangelicals and to evangelicals in what in England are called the “separated brethren”—non-

Anglican churches, Independents, Baptists, and so on. Dick Lucas organized a conference to which young men from both groups were invited. And some friends of mine who are pastors in the Reformed Baptist Church and in the Independent Evangelical Church, when they were involved with him in organizing that, there were articles written against them by others who were kind of radically and rigidly separatists, saying, "You must never do anything with an Anglican evangelical. These people are in mixed denominations. Therefore, if you do anything with them, you will become contaminated by their involvement." Thus it is not enough to separate yourself from those who are, say, liberal in their theology, but you have to separate yourself from evangelicals who are involved in denominations in which there are liberals. This is what is called "second-degree separation."

Schaeffer took a very strong stand against that later on. And when he went to England in the 1960s, that was the issue he pleaded with them about: "Do not make this same mistake. It is right for you to come out, if that is what you feel your calling is before God." Schaeffer was completely committed to the purity of the visible church. He would never have been a minister in a church that was mixed with liberals and evangelicals together. Schaeffer believed biblically and passionately that one ought to be a pastor in a pure church, one that really makes an effort to be faithful to Scripture and to discipline pastors who are not. But at the same time, he wished to respect the views of those who stayed in and not judge them harshly, which second-degree separation basically does. Second-degree separation says, "We can have nothing to do with you because you are contaminated by staying in." He certainly took a position against that. But that was expressed much later. At this time he is beginning to speak about the importance of really living the truth, of standing faithfully for the truth, of being consistent in your life, and of not only being negative but also positive. But at this time we do not have a clear expression from him of what he later came to call "speaking the truth with love."

Is it possible to have convictions about what you believe is right and not judge others who come to a different conclusion? It seems to me that Schaeffer would respond to this by appealing to Paul's statement in Romans 14:5b that "each one should be fully convinced in his own mind." You may disagree with what someone else has done. You may even think they are the weaker brother to make the choice they have made. But it is not your place to judge them, because they have to give an account to God. Our calling is to love one another. You can think of 1 Corinthians 8:1b where Paul says the same thing, "Knowledge puffs up, but love builds up." Our challenge is to love one another and respect one another, even if we think someone is making a wrong choice. That is the point Schaeffer was making.

So, here you have somebody, let us say it is Dick Lucas, whose evangelical credentials are absolutely unimpeachable, who is Reformed in his thinking and in his approach to the Gospel, who has carefully had nothing to do with the hierarchy, basically, of the Anglican church, who just says, "I do not agree with what they are doing. It is too late to discipline them now, because we are a minority as evangelicals in this church. But I will just try to do what I am sure is right before God." And he does. God has clearly blessed his commitment to preach the Word very, very faithfully. And he is delighted to work together with people who are not Anglican. Thus he has people on his staff who are Presbyterian, Baptist, and so on. (That is unusual). Schaeffer's response to someone like him would be to say, "I could not stay in like you are, in a denomination that is dominated by liberalism and by Anglo-Catholicism [evangelicals are approximately 20% of the Anglican Church, which makes them by far the largest group of evangelicals in England]. I could not do this; I could not do what you are doing. I feel that God's Word challenges me—and challenges you, too—to practice the purity of the visible church, to either try to discipline those who preach falsehood or to leave." Then if the man replied, as Dick Lucas would, "Well, yes, I understand what you are saying. And I agree that in Scripture there is an emphasis on the purity of the visible church. But I feel God is calling me to stay in here and to be faithful to Him here as I preach His word here without compromise. That is what I feel called to do." And Schaeffer's response would be to say, "I disagree with you, but I respect you. You are a brother in the Lord. We will pray together, we will work together, and we will have fellowship together."

Now, whether he could have said that at this time, I do not know. This comes much more clearly at a later point. I think as you read through these articles, you will see that he is moving toward that, in the sense of seeing the need for a consistency of life and doctrine and not just making negative statements about other people. But it gradually works itself out over the next five years where he begins to reexamine the whole separatist movement when he sees some of the ugliness in it. There was a whole group of churches that actually joined the separatist movement. It was not nebulous at all; it became a quite organized group of churches whose representatives would meet regularly in the United States. This was because it became first the American Council of Christian Churches, as it was formed first here in the United States. Carl MacIntyre was one of its leaders, of course, as he was in the Bible Presbyterian Church. But there were many other men involved in its leadership from the Presbyterian Church as well. Schaeffer was one of them. Though he was a younger man at this time, he was from early on one of its leaders and speakers. But there were quite a lot of separatist denominations. There were several conservative Baptist denominations, conservative Methodists, and so on. There were more than a dozen churches that joined together.

After Schaeffer's trip to Europe in 1947, many of these European pastors he visited then led their churches and denominations into the International Council of Christian Churches. Thus there were people in Sweden, Switzerland, and Holland, for example, who became part of the International Council of Christian Churches. This was sort of set up as an evangelical body standing over against the World Council of Churches. But in Schaeffer's mind, even from the beginning, it was never there just as a negative thing. For him there never was just, "The World Council of Churches is a large body that has much liberalism in it and so on. Therefore we need something else. So we will have something else that is started with a negative thrust."

That was never Schaeffer's mentality. If you read his little article, "The Need in Europe of the Present Time," he challenges American Christianity. He says that there are basically three needs in Europe at the present time. The one is material. There are people in tremendous poverty without enough food, and they need an enormous amount of help in trying to build their lives together again after the war. And he appeals to American evangelical Christians to really give financially, to help that reconstruction of peoples' lives in Europe.

He says the second need is a political need. I heard recently someone from Poland say on the radio, "For us it will be either the Marshall plan or martial law again." In other words, "Either you [appealing to the United States] help us get our act together here or we will be under martial law again if we do not get any help from outside. We simply do not have the resources." This is what one of the leaders of Poland was saying after their free elections. And that is the situation Europe was in after the second world war. They really needed help. Thus Schaeffer said, "We need political help in Europe from the United States." He really challenged people when he came back to America to see that America really was giving aid for the reestablishment of the economies of the democracies in Europe. This is because there was a time when there were quite a few European countries that could quite easily have become Communist, as the whole of Eastern Europe did as the Soviet Union took control of it.

Schaeffer saw the third need as being a spiritual need. And he saw that spiritual need as having two parts. First, there was a need for the widespread proclamation of the Gospel. This was because he could already see at that point how few Christians there were in Western Europe, how weak the evangelical church was, how all-pervasive modernism was, and how devastating an effect it had on the church. Thus he said there was a need for missionaries; there was a need to preach the Gospel. But he said there was also a need for unity, to get these separated and scattered groups together—churches and various evangelical mission bodies and other para-church organizations in Europe. There was a need to encourage them to get together and to support each other. Schaeffer said, "We will be happy to work with them and support them from the American Council of Christian Churches in the United States." Thus his commitment to the International Council of Churches was not simply,

“We need a body over against the WCC.” This was, if you like, a negative purpose that may have been the main purpose of some of the others involved. It certainly seems that way when you read some of the literature. But his purpose from the very beginning, because he was the one who encouraged many of these men in Europe to become part of the ICC, was a really positive one. “As a united body of evangelicals, let us really stand together. Let us pray for one another, let us encourage each other, let us support one another, let us help each other. If we do, this is only pleasing to God and upbuilding to us all.”

Thus his purpose was really a positive one, to assist the proclamation of the Gospel in Europe. And at the same time he was encouraging the start of children’s works all over Europe. That is one of the things that Schaeffer then went back to do, to start Children for Christ classes and to encourage the starting of Children for Christ classes all over Europe. They did this so that the Gospel would be faithfully preached to children, rather than them having to hear the other teaching that was offered, which was not very biblical.

In Korea we have 25 denominations, and they reflect an infection from America: the division of the church. This is one of the sad commentaries we have to make on church history: that we export our divisions to other countries as well as having them at home. That is true from England, and it is true from the United States, that missionaries have done that. What is our attitude to be? Among some there is a desire for unity. What sort of steps can we practically take toward bringing this about? How high a priority should unity have for us?

Again, I commend to you Schaeffer’s little book, *The Church before the Watching World*. This was written much later, in the mid 1960s, 1968 or so. It seems to me that there are three things we have to work at. The first is that all of us are called on a personal and individual level to recognize true believers wherever we meet them, whatever denomination they belong to. Every individual Christian is challenged by God’s Word and by the Holy Spirit to practice ecumenism first of all on the individual level. For example, here at this seminary we have people from many different denominations. We need to really respect one another, learn from one another, pray together, fellowship together, encourage one another—to do everything that we can together to really recognize we are brothers in the Lord. And while at the moment we may belong to different denominations, when we stand before Christ we will all be one no matter what church we belong to now. Therefore we should practice already the reality of the unity in Christ of all true Christians. That is very important, and we have no business ever practicing second-degree separation—that is, separating ourselves from somebody else—even though we recognize they have genuine faith in Christ and they are saved—because they are in a denomination that is not pure. This is if we take the extreme path.

Think about this. In the United States there are many evangelical Christians within the Roman Catholic Church. Now, what is our attitude going to be? Will we say, “Because you are a member of the Roman Catholic Church that has doctrines that are explicitly against central biblical doctrines, I will not associate with you?” It is true that the Roman Catholic Church has doctrines that go against the Bible. You can think of the statements of the Council of Trent, that anyone who says justification is by faith alone is anathema, for example, and there are many other statements like that. Another is anyone who denies the real presence of Christ physically in the communion bread and wine is anathema. There are many others like that, and we can see what that has led to in much of the Roman Catholic Church. Now, I believe we are called by God’s Word to respect the faith of any Christian we meet, no matter what denomination they belong to, and to be prepared to fellowship with them, pray together, and really encourage one another. This is because people are not saved by the denomination they belong to. They are saved by faith in Christ. It is a denial of the Gospel to suggest anything else. When we stand before Christ, He will not say, “What church did you belong to?” That is not what will be His first question. It will be a question of “Do you trust in Me?” That is the Gospel. This is very important. That is the first level of true ecumenism: the practice of fellowship among all true believers. While we recognize that we may disagree on all sorts of issues, we have a commitment to the same Gospel at the heart.

Now, at the second level, I would say there ought to be a preparedness for groups of Christians and churches at the local level to start working together. Thus we can join together, let us say for an evangelistic crusade, or whatever it may happen to be. Perhaps we will have groups of ministers in a local area from different denominations who meet together to encourage one another, support one another, and pray together. I was involved in Britain, for example, with a group of ministers that met regularly. I was a Presbyterian pastor. There were also Anglican evangelical pastors, there were Reformed Baptist pastors, there were Independent Evangelical pastors, and so on. We would meet together regularly to read papers to each other and to encourage one another and really support one another in every way that we could. That, it seems to me, is tremendously important as well. We should make an attempt to practice the unity of the church. We know in a situation like that that I am not there to convince my Baptist friend to become a Presbyterian. I respect his Baptist convictions. I respect the fact that in his church it is required for members to be baptized by immersion. I may not agree with it, but I respect it because here is a brother in the Lord who is faithfully serving God in his situation. And I am happy to do all sorts of things together with him.

That brings us then to the third level, which is the level of actually joining churches together in a formal union. Now, wherever possible, I think our challenge is to do that. Christ Himself prayed in His high priestly prayer in John 17 that His church would be one. And where there are divisions between churches that can be dealt with, that can be set aside, we ought to work at that. For example, in our own situation here, several of the Bible-believing Presbyterian denominations have rejoined. After some of the very sad splits of the 1930s, some of those denominations have joined together again. It is my prayer and my hope that the remaining evangelical, Bible-believing denominations will join together. I cannot imagine that it is pleasing to God that we are not joined. Where we really are sharing in our understanding, there must be a commitment to church unity wherever we can practice it in the sense of the formal unity of a church. However, I think we have to add a qualifier here. We have to recognize that historically there have been divisions between Bible-believing Christians, which, while they are not fundamental to the Gospel, do make quite a difference in practice. At that point we have to respect one another and be prepared to love one another and help one another, but we need to recognize that we may very well have different denominations until the Second Coming.

For example, take the issue of baptism. Many Baptist churches and whole denominations are sincerely convinced before God that baptism by immersion is the only valid form of baptism. They also believe it is wrong for the children of believers to be baptized, and they will not accept someone as a member of their church who is not baptized by immersion or who has been baptized as a baby, as a child of the covenant, and therefore requires them to be baptized again. As soon as a church takes a stand like that—which we must respect because they are convinced as they understand Scripture that this is what is right—this will mean that those who, like myself, believe it is right biblically to practice the baptism of our children, but baptism by immersion is not necessary, and baptism can be done by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion (that is my own position on this, that all these are valid baptisms by God). As soon as you have two different views here, you have to accept that you will have two separate denominations. What is important, then, is how we treat one another, how we love one another, how we are prepared to treat one another. We must not stand as antagonists, hating each other, tearing one another's work down, criticizing one another, but we must really respect and support and encourage one another. And there are, of course, other divisions—divisions on church government, divisions in understanding the Lord's Supper, for example between Lutherans and the Reformed church. And we recognize that those differences will be there until the Second Coming.

Now, I suppose it would be possible in theory to suggest we could have one denomination where every individual congregation is allowed its freedom. Many Presbyterians would not like that because they would say that part of biblical church government is that we have a presbyterian church polity rather than simply separate churches, because that would basically be congregationalism. People have tried things like that at various points in history. There was a point during the time of Cromwell in England when there was much diversity among the

churches there. They tried to form a group of churches where some were Presbyterian and some were Congregational. Some were more Episcopalian. It did not last very long. Sadly, one has to say something like that is unlikely to last very long. But in a way, I do not think it matters, actually. What is more important is really the way we regard one another, the way we treat one another, the respect we have for one another, and how prepared we are to do things together. This is true both on the individual level and on the church level, as pastors, as bodies of churches, and so on. And where we can, we work toward formal unity. But if we try to be perfectionists in this area, we will never have anything. We will not have anything if we insist either we become one totally or else we will give up. We do not have perfection in any area. We will have to wait until we stand before the Lord, and then it will become clear who was right and who was wrong about all the issues that divide us at the present time. And we will all find that we made many mistakes at that point.

That should warn us now, and I think this is the most important thing, to have humility before Christian brothers and sisters. Thus we will say, “Here is what is central. This defines the Gospel. We will hold to this really firmly. There are these other things that we regard as important. We will hold them firmly, but they are not a basis for judging fellowship. And we are prepared to be humble before our brothers about these issues and be prepared to be corrected.” We should always be open to correction by the Word of God and by fellow believers. That humility, it seems to me, is the most important thing if we want to work toward any kind of true ecumenism. But certainly, many of the divisions, especially in situations where missionaries have gone, are unnecessary. You will have Presbyterian churches from England, Presbyterian churches from America, Reformed churches that are basically Presbyterian from Holland, and then they are all there in Australia. Well, I mean, really they all believe the same thing. Their practice is even the same. The differences are primarily cultural. Some of them have Dutch traditions, some of them have Scottish traditions, some of them have English traditions, some of them have Irish traditions, and some of them have American traditions—but that is no basis on which to have separate denominations. And what we have to work toward and pray toward is the joining of those who really share the same faith and the same practice, the same view of the church. We must seek to overcome those cultural divisions, to know that in Christ there is no Dutch and Irish, no Scottish and English, no American and Canadian. Really, we ought to all be one in the Lord.