

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

5-3-2000

### Changes within the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America that Led to the Exit of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod

Mark Braun

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, [mark.braun@wlc.edu](mailto:mark.braun@wlc.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/phd>



Part of the [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), and the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Braun, Mark, "Changes within the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America that Led to the Exit of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod" (2000). *Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation*. 51. <https://scholar.csl.edu/phd/51>

This Dissertation 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 Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

**Changes within  
the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America  
that Led to the Exit  
of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod**

---

**A Dissertation presented to the faculty  
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,  
Department of Historical Theology  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy**

---

**by**

**Mark E. Braun**

**3 May 2000**

**Approved by** \_\_\_\_\_ **Advisor**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Reader**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Reader**

## Table of Contents

<i>List of abbreviations</i>	iii
<b>Introduction</b>	v
<b>Chapter 1: Sister Synods</b>	1
<i>Different foundings</i>	3
<i>Barely cousins</i>	10
<i>Right turn</i>	18
<i>When they were young</i>	23
<i>The certainty of their convictions</i>	32
<i>“Amalgamation would mean disbanding the Wisconsin Synod”</i>	38
<b>Chapter 2: The Gathering Storm</b>	53
<i>Church and ministry</i>	54
<i>“We must limit ourselves to externals only”</i>	62
<i>A parting of the ways</i>	68
<i>At war</i>	71
<i>Missouri’s chaplains</i>	77
<i>“Our Synod will take care of the spiritual needs of all our boys”</i>	80
<i>No cease fire</i>	83
<i>A religious element in Boy Scoutism</i>	90
<i>“Scouting should be left to the individual congregation to decide”</i>	94
<i>“We were shocked beyond measure”</i>	98
<i>Anti-Scouting = Anti-American?</i>	104
<b>Chapter 3: Fellowship Becomes THE Issue</b>	111
<i>The Brief Statement</i>	112
<i>The Brux case</i>	120
<i>Union overtures</i>	127
<i>Wisconsin and Lutheran Union</i>	131
<i>Wisconsin and the Union Resolutions</i>	136
<i>Why wasn’t Wisconsin invited?</i>	142
<i>The Missouri civil war</i>	148
<i>A different fellowship history?</i>	159
<i>Joint prayer and prayer fellowship</i>	164
<i>The Statement of the 44</i>	167
<i>Romans 16:17-18</i>	175
<i>Only application?</i>	178

<b>Chapter 4: “A Sterner kind of Admonition and Love”</b>	184
<i>Clarifying prayer fellowship</i>	186
<i>The unit concept</i>	194
<i>The war of words</i>	202
<i>To the brink of a break</i>	213
<i>CLC withdrawal</i>	226
<i>Gehrke and Jungkuntz</i>	234
<i>“I saw a problem in our emphasis on the unit concept”</i>	242
1961	250
<i>“What Will Sophie Think?”</i>	255
<b>Chapter 5: The Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures</b>	261
<i>Changes in St. Louis</i>	266
<i>“Scripture itself does not say that it is inerrant”</i>	272
<i>The Doctrinal Affirmation and the Common Confession</i>	277
<i>The Scharlemann papers</i>	285
<i>In the synod of Walther, Pieper, and Engelder</i>	292
<i>“The Grace That Has Spared Us”</i>	303
<b>Conclusions</b>	312
<i>A solitary bird warbling his little song</i>	313
<i>Betrayed and hurt</i>	317
<i>“The right thing to do”</i>	324
<b>Appendix</b>	334
<b>Bibliography</b>	
<i>Archival Materials</i>	337
<i>Interviews</i>	345
<i>Theses and Dissertations</i>	345
<i>Books</i>	348
<i>Periodicals</i>	363

### *List of Abbreviations*

<i>AL</i>	<i>The American Lutheran</i>
<i>ALC</i>	American Lutheran Church
<i>ALPB</i>	The American Lutheran Publicity Bureau
<i>CC</i>	<i>The Christian Century</i>
<i>CHI</i>	Concordia Historical Institute
<i>CHIQ</i>	<i>Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly</i>
<i>CJ</i>	<i>Concordia Journal</i>
<i>CL</i>	<i>The Confessional Lutheran</i>
<i>CLC</i>	Church of the Lutheran Confession
<i>CLPB</i>	Confessional Lutheran Publicity Bureau
<i>CN</i>	<i>Christian News</i>
<i>CPH</i>	Concordia Publishing House
<i>Cre</i>	<i>The Cresset</i>
<i>Cru</i>	<i>The Crucible</i>
<i>CTM</i>	<i>Concordia Theological Monthly</i>
<i>CTQ</i>	<i>Concordia Theological Quarterly</i>
<i>CUC</i>	Church Union Committee
<i>CuThM</i>	<i>Currents in Theology and Mission</i>
<i>DL</i>	<i>Der Lutheraner</i>
<i>ELCA</i>	Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
<i>ELS</i>	Evangelical Lutheran Synod
<i>Ev.</i>	Evangelical
<i>F–L</i>	<i>Faith–Life</i>
<i>GB</i>	<i>Gemeinde–Blatt</i>
<i>HWS</i>	<i>The History of the Wisconsin Synod</i>
<i>KJV</i>	<i>King James Version</i>
<i>LB</i>	<i>The Lutheran Beacon</i>
<i>LC</i>	<i>The Lutheran Companion</i>
<i>LCQ</i>	<i>Lutheran Church Quarterly</i>
<i>LCMS</i>	Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod
<i>LF</i>	<i>Lutheran Forum</i>
<i>LHC</i>	Lutheran Historical Conference
<i>LL</i>	<i>The Lutheran Layman</i>
<i>LN</i>	<i>Lutheran News</i>
<i>LO</i>	<i>The Lutheran Outlook</i>
<i>LQ</i>	<i>The Lutheran Quarterly</i>
<i>LS</i>	<i>The Lutheran Standard</i>
<i>LSQ</i>	<i>Lutheran Synodical Quarterly</i>
<i>Lu</i>	<i>The Lutheran</i>
<i>LuSen</i>	<i>The Lutheran Sentinel</i>
<i>LuW</i>	<i>Lehre und Wehre</i>
<i>LW</i>	<i>The Lutheran Witness</i>
<i>MJ</i>	<i>The Milwaukee Journal</i>
<i>ML</i>	<i>The Milwaukee Lutheran</i>
<i>MS</i>	<i>The Milwaukee Sentinel</i>
<i>NL</i>	<i>The Northwestern Lutheran</i>

NLC	National Lutheran Council
NPH	Northwestern Publishing House
<i>PTR</i>	<i>The Princeton–Times Republic</i>
<i>Qu</i>	<i>Theologische Quartalschrift</i>
<i>RSV</i>	<i>Revised Standard Version</i>
SC	Synodical Conference
<i>Sem</i>	<i>The Seminarian</i>
<i>StLG–D</i>	<i>St. Louis Globe–Democrat</i>
<i>StLP–D</i>	<i>St. Louis Post–Dispatch</i>
<i>TM</i>	<i>Theological Monthly</i>
<i>TQ</i>	<i>Theological Quarterly</i>
ULCA	United Lutheran Church of America
WELS	Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod
<i>WHIJ</i>	<i>WELS Historical Institute Journal</i>
<i>WLM</i>	<i>Walther League Messenger</i>
<i>WLQ</i>	<i>Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly</i>
WLS	Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary
<i>WSL</i>	<i>The Wisconsin Synod Lutherans</i>

## *Introduction*

On each generation a date is imprinted. That date and the events that occurred on it become embedded on a generation's consciousness and define its era.

Every American alive on 7 December 1941 remembers hearing that "Japanese warplanes brought sudden death and undisclosed destruction to the beautiful Hawaiian islands in their sudden raid" on Pearl Harbor<sup>1</sup>—a day President Franklin D. Roosevelt predicted would "live in infamy." No one old enough to remember 22 November 1963 can forget where he or she was when news came that "a gunman assassinated President John F. Kennedy with a high-powered rifle" from "the fifth floor of a textbook warehouse" in Dallas, Texas.<sup>2</sup> Millions more can tell where they were on 28 January 1986, when "the Challenger exploded in a boiling ball of flame about 75 seconds after blastoff from Cape Canaveral, Florida, killing teacher Christa McAuliffe and her six crewmates."<sup>3</sup>

Few Americans remember anything significant about Thursday, 17 August 1961. According to the morning newspaper published in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the next day, Communist rulers in East Berlin were preparing to fight to preserve their "barbed wire barricades," more than 89,000 guests visited the Wisconsin State Fair in West Allis, and a Whitefish Bay boy was killed playing "pirates" when he was crushed by falling sand and gravel in an 8-foot ditch.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "U. S. Islands Bombed as Japs Start War," *MS*, 8 December 1941, 1.

<sup>2</sup> "Kennedy Slain by an Assassin," *MS*, 23 November 1963, 1.

<sup>3</sup> "Disaster won't halt shuttles," *MS*, 29 January 1986, 1.

<sup>4</sup> "Allies, Reds, Gird for Berlin Fight," "Metro Area Makes 'Day' Good as 89,130 Jam Fair," "Dirt Slide Kills Playing Boy," all articles in *MS*, 18 August 1961, 1:1.

But the third headline on the front page of *The Milwaukee Sentinel* announced, “Wis. Synod, Missouri Split,”<sup>5</sup> and a front-page article in the afternoon paper, *The Milwaukee Journal*, heralded a most traumatic event for what was then the fourth largest Lutheran church body in the United States.

The Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod voted late Thursday to sever relations with the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.

The action was hailed as the “hour of decision” for the Wisconsin Synod. It was approved, 124 to 49, by delegates in the final session of their 36th convention which dragged on eight hours past expected adjournment at Wisconsin Lutheran High School. . . .

The Rev. Werner Franzmann, chairman of the floor committee that introduced the resolution, said the step was essential to avoid confused and troubled consciences in the synod.

“We have gone the long mile of Christian love with the Missouri Synod with the course and kind of admonition we have given until now,” he said. “Today a sterner kind of admonition and love is required.”<sup>6</sup>

Four decades later, Wisconsin’s decision to sever fellowship with the Missouri Synod remains highly significant. Church members old enough to remember refer to it simply as “the split.” Younger men and women with little knowledge of the issues involved and no personal recollection of the antagonism aroused nonetheless come to realize its gravity. For those who remember, wrote Edward Fredrich, “the loss of the battles and of the war will always remain the most significant and traumatic episode in their own personal version of their church body’s history.” Most of the synod’s pastors and teachers and many of its members felt particular losses in the disruption of cherished relationships. Painful as it was, the split “could have been tragic in the extreme,” as “dire prophecies

---

<sup>5</sup> James M. Johnson, “Wis. Synod, Missouri Split,” *MS*, 18 August 1961, 1:1.

<sup>6</sup> David A. Runge, “Wisconsin Synod Votes to Split With Missouri,” *MJ*, 18 August 1961, 1:1, 10.



from without and within” warned that breaking with Missouri would spell the demise of the Wisconsin Synod.<sup>7</sup>

Do LCMS members regard the break from Wisconsin and the dissolution of the Synodical Conference with an equal sense of regret and loss? Certainly during the quarter century before 1961, a powerful and vocal constituency within Missouri also detected changes occurring in their synod. This constituency regarded Wisconsin as a valued ally and lamented the loss, fearing Missouri’s “theological liberalism” would increase without the restraining effect of Wisconsin’s protests.<sup>8</sup>

The split appears to have had a much smaller impact on Missouri, however, than on Wisconsin. Few Missourians feared their synod could not survive without Wisconsin; indeed, members of both synods recall the caustic question some Missourians posed, “How long must the tail wag the dog?” Missouri’s President John W. Behnken wrote in 1964 that he found it “difficult to express in words the deep sadness” he felt over the break. Wisconsin’s action was, in his view, “certainly premature.”<sup>9</sup>

A more revealing indicator of Missouri’s reaction to the break, however—or lack of it—may be found in the first issue of the unofficial journal *Dialog*, which likened the Missouri Synod’s regret over the dissolution of fellowship with the Wisconsin Synod to the sadness one feels when a long-ill

---

<sup>7</sup> Edward C. Fredrich, *The Wisconsin Synod Lutherans: A History of the Single Synod, Federation, and Merger* (Milwaukee: NPH, 1992), 198. Fredrich’s history will be cited as *WSL*.

<sup>8</sup> In a letter read to Wisconsin’s 1961 convention, the Church of the Evangelical Lutheran Confession [in the Dispersion in Germany] expressed fears that “the once sturdily confessional Missouri Synod might consort with lax and compromising Lutheran bodies if she became separated from her confessional sister, the Wisconsin Synod.” Such fears, wrote Carleton Toppe, “imply that the Wisconsin Synod has been a confessional anchor in the Synodical Conference.” But Toppe added: “As long as God’s Word permitted its testimony to serve as a confessional anchor, our Synod was willing to be that anchor. But a dragged anchor we could not be.” The anxiety of that overseas church was also the dilemma of conservatives that remained in Missouri. “If a synod has drifted in spite of confessional moorings, what will be its course without them?” C[arleton] Toppe, “Drifting,” *NL* 48 (24 September 1961): 307.

<sup>9</sup> John W. Behnken, *This I Recall* (St. Louis: CPH, 1964), 178–9.

patient has finally died. Insisting that doctrinal unity in the Synodical Conference had been “a pious fiction” for some time, the *Dialog* editorialist added, “It was no secret that, among other things, the Wisconsin Synod had been a drag on Missouri’s moves toward ecumenical participation.”<sup>10</sup>

Just as indicative of Missouri’s seeming lack of regret at severed fellowship with Wisconsin was the way the LCMS communicated the split to its delegates at its 1962 synodical convention at Cleveland. Behnken referred to Wisconsin’s suspension of fellowship in his report to the synod, as did the convention’s Floor Committee No. 3 on Doctrinal and Intersynodical Matters. Delegates, however, were never presented with the text of Wisconsin’s resolution from the previous summer, which expressed “the hope and prayer to God” that the LCMS would “hear in this resolution an evangelical summons to ‘come to herself’ (Luke 15:17)” and “return to the side of the sister from whom she has estranged herself.”<sup>11</sup>

Perhaps the most blatant admission of Missouri disregard for the effects of its break with the Wisconsin Synod came from Missouri’s Richard Koenig in 1962. Responding to one of seven questions posed by E. Clifford Nelson regarding the future of inter-Lutheran relations following Wisconsin’s convention resolutions, Koenig wrote that Nelson “overestimates the influence of the Wisconsin Synod on Missouri. To be quite candid a good part of Missouri probably couldn’t care

---

<sup>10</sup> “Autopsy,” *Dialog* 1 (Winter 1962): 70. An *American Lutheran* editorialist in 1962 wrote that “deference to Wisconsin Synod objections” had “stood in the way of many a Missouri attempt to do something about the divided state of Lutheranism.” The editorialist questioned whether Missouri would continue to back away from union efforts “for the sake of our Wisconsin brethren” now that the synods were no longer in fellowship. “Cleveland and Lutheran Unity,” *AL* 45 (May 1962): 5. In 1963 another *American Lutheran* editorialist insisted that “for much too long” the LCMS had “allowed the objections of Wisconsin Synod members to determine its relation to other churches.” It was now “high time for Missouri to do what it ought to do” rather than what Wisconsin wanted it to do. “Will the Albatross Remain?” *AL* 46 (October 1963): 5.

<sup>11</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1961*, 198. There is a hint of Wisconsin’s hurt and frustration in the report of Frederic E. Blume of Wisconsin’s Commission on Doctrinal Matters, “Report on the Cleveland Convention of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, July 20–30, 1962,” *NL* 49 (26 August 1962): 262–5.

less about what the Wisconsin Synod did or did not do.” Wisconsin’s suspension of fellowship “hardly had the power to evoke ‘a profound sense of humility.’”<sup>12</sup>

Wisconsin’s only official account of the story frames the demise of the Synodical Conference as a purely doctrinal disagreement.<sup>13</sup> Wisconsin has insisted repeatedly that church fellowship doctrine and practice as carried out by the Synodical Conference was and remains correct, and Wisconsin maintains that it still practices what the Synodical Conference used to preach.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Richard Koenig, “‘Answers Seven’: A Reply to Dr. E. Clifford Nelson,” *AL* 45 (October 1962): 15. See E. Clifford Nelson, “Questions Seven: Concerning American Inter-Lutheran Relations,” *Lutheran World* 9 (May 1962): 167–9. Nelson’s “Question 3,” to which Koenig responded, seems not to have been balanced in the Wisconsin Synod’s favor. In full, Nelson’s “Question 3” was: “Has the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod—dynamic, vital, progressive, and powerful as it is—a profounder sense of humility as a result of the altercation within the Synodical Conference? Has the experience with Wisconsin taught Missouri to see itself as other Lutherans have seen it? Has its insistence on agreement in all details of doctrine and practice now become a Frankenstein which has turned itself back on Missouri? Wisconsin has treated Missouri with the same overbearing attitude that Missouri has been accustomed to demonstrate towards other Lutherans. Does Missouri realize now what it means to be charged with false doctrine when it knows itself as having sought to be evangelical and Lutheran? One of the Missouri leaders complained about the break with Wisconsin: ‘I have relatives and friends in the Wisconsin Synod with whom I no longer can be in fellowship.’ To this a NLC leader replied: ‘Now you know how we have felt all these years!’ It is to be hoped that this experience will cause Missouri to deal more understandingly and sympathetically with those who are eager to be her friends.”

<sup>13</sup> Edward Fredrich, “The Great Debate with Missouri,” *WLQ* 74 (April 1977): 157–73. Fredrich’s account of the split in chapter 18 of *WSL*, “Break with Missouri,” 198–208, is virtually identical.

<sup>14</sup> Wisconsin seminary Professor Joh. P. Meyer cited a statement by Otto Geiseman in *The American Lutheran* in 1962 to demonstrate that “we of the Wisconsin Synod are the ones who are preserving the position and spirit of the Synodical Conference, and thus are the genuine representatives of that church body.” [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Is Conservatism Traditionalism?” *WLQ* 59 (April 1962): 148. O[tto] A. Geiseman, “Spirit at Work,” *AL* 45 (March 1962): 6. See also C[arleton] Toppe, “Better, A Hallowed Memory,” *NL* 51 (12 January 1964): 3. For similar, more recent assessments, see E[dward] C. Fredrich, “Wisconsin’s Theological–Confessional History—Viewed Especially in the Light of its Fellowship Principles and Practices,” *LHC*, Essays and Reports, VI (1977), 105. Wilbert R. Gawrisch, “If ye continue in My Word,” *WLQ* 90 (Winter 1993): 4.

See also “A Dead End for the Synodical Conference.” *AL* 46 (October 1963): 5: “Missouri Synod members, of course, resent and reject the charge that their synod has departed from ‘the historical doctrinal position of the Conference.’” Citing agreement between the Synodical

Missouri protested at the time, sometimes in the face of mounting evidence to the contrary, that it had not changed.<sup>15</sup> Now, however, Missouri historians freely acknowledge the transformation their synod experienced.<sup>16</sup> History has confirmed the validity of Wisconsin's repeated charges that Missouri had changed.<sup>17</sup>

---

Conference constitution and the Missouri Synod constitution regarding the Holy Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions as the basis for its doctrinal position, *The American Lutheran* editorialist added, "Those faulting the Missouri Synod will be hard put to prove that the Synod as an organization or any of its members has departed from the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions."

<sup>15</sup> In a 1955 letter, Behnken wrote that it was his "honest conviction that the Missouri Synod has not changed its doctrinal position" during its efforts to establish doctrinal unity with the American Lutheran Church." John W. Behnken to "Taffy" (W. F. Klindwirth), 19 August 1955, in CHI, Behnken papers, Suppl. 1, Box 15, Folder 9; cited by Thomas A. Kuster, "The Fellowship Dispute in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod: A Rhetorical Study of Ecumenical Change" (Ph. D. diss., University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1969), 268.

<sup>16</sup> Reviewing Missouri's 1962 convention, Martin Marty stated flatly, "Missouri is changing and knows it." He suggested that Wisconsin's attacks on the Missouri Synod hurt "because they were reminders of a cozy world of a century and less ago when Missouri had held some of those positions." Martin E. Marty, "Head First But Not Headlong: Missouri's New Direction, 1962," *LS* 2 (14 August 1962): 5. See also "Changing Missouri and Its New Course," *CL* 23 (August-September 1962): 94–6, which cited the 24 June 1962 *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, the 21 August 1962 *Lutheran Witness*, the August 1962 *American Lutheran*, and the 18 July 1962 *Christian Century* on Missouri's new direction in 1962.

In 1964, LCMS First Vice President Roland Wiederanders admitted, "We have not dealt honestly and openly with our pastors and people. We have refused to state our changing theological position in open, honest, forthright, simple, and clear words. Over and over again we said that nothing was changing but all the while we were aware of the changes taking place." James E. Adams, *Preus of Missouri and the Great Lutheran Civil War* (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1977), 124.

In 1973, Richard John Neuhaus observed with greater insistence: "Leadership of recent decades kept telling the people there were no changes in the Missouri Synod, when any village idiot anywhere in the church knew there were changes." People felt "lied to and cheated." James E. Adams, "Missouri Synod Lutherans: Conservative Takeover," *CC* 110 (1–8 August 1973): 772. A year later, Leigh Jordahl wrote that whatever one may think of the doctrinal issues that divided the synods, it was "abundantly clear" that "Missouri had changed its position." Leigh Jordahl, "Old Missouri is Gone," *Dialog* 13 (Spring 1974): 86.

<sup>17</sup> See, for example, Edmund Reim, "Dr. Graebner and the *Lutheran Witness*," *Qu* 46 (April 1949): 130–2. "An Overture and a Reply," *Qu* 46 (July 1949): 207–10. "Who Has Changed?" *NL* 39 (14 December 1952): 396–7. Im[manuel] P. Frey, "The Voice of the C.U.C.: Joint Prayer and

The following study presents the stages of the intersynodical debate that led the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod to exit the Ev. Lutheran Synodical Conference during the thirty years, 1931–61. Official source material is abundant. The synod's theological journal has presented a consistent viewpoint regarding the Scouting movement, the military chaplaincy, applications of the synod's teachings regarding church fellowship, and the inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible, all of which played key roles in Wisconsin's exit.<sup>18</sup>

The synod's first magazine for lay readers, the *Ev. Lutheran Gemeinde-Blatt*, was launched in 1865<sup>19</sup> and continued publication until 1969.<sup>20</sup> Its English counterpart, *The Northwestern Lutheran*, appeared in 1914<sup>21</sup> and, paralleling the synod's transition from German to English

---

Church Fellowship," *NL* 43 (19 February 1956): 56–7. Irwin J. Habeck, "The Religious Press and Our Problem," *NL* 47 (18 December 1960): 410–1.

<sup>18</sup> The Wisconsin Synod's *Quarterly* is "the oldest surviving Lutheran theological journal in the world." Gawrisch, "If ye continue in My Word," 3. Having first appeared in 1904, it made, along with its synod, the gradual but inevitable transition to English. For 43 years under the title *Theologische Quartalschrift* it contained articles primarily in German. Beginning with the January 1947 issue it retained the name *Quartalschrift* but appended *Theological Quarterly*. In 1960, following the renaming of the synod to the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (WELS), the journal was also renamed as *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*, though it retained the subtitle *Theologische Quartalschrift*. Editor Paul Peters admitted that it was only after being "importuned by our own readers" that the seminary faculty decided to publish all articles in English and follow all German quotations with English translations. Yet Peters asked his readers to bear with the subtitle, fully expecting that "in our own circles the German name *Quartalschrift* will undoubtedly still and always be used in preference to any English name." P[aul] Peters, "Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly," *WLQ* 57 (January 1960): 72. Only eight years later, however, the German subtitle was dropped because "a bilingual title if the periodical is not bilingual can be confusing." Armin W. Schuetze, "Foreword for Volume 65: A Last Vestige Disappears," *WLQ* 65 (January 1968): 3.

<sup>19</sup> "Proceedings of the 15th Convention of the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Wisconsin and Other States held in the German Evangelical Lutheran Church of Watertown, Wis., June 22 to 28, 1865, Watertown," (printed by the power-press of the Weltburger office, 1865); trans. Arnold O. Lehmann, *WHIJ* 15 (April 1997): 15.

<sup>20</sup> H[einrich J.] Vogel, "Publication of *Gemeinde-Blatt* Ends," *WLQ* 67 (January 1970): 60–1.

<sup>21</sup> J[ohn] J[enny], "Introductory," *NL* 1 (7 January 1914): 1–2. See also James P. Schaefer, "From this corner," *NL* 72 (1 January 1985): 2. James P. Schaefer, "From this corner." *NL* 76 (1

following World War I, the circulation of *The Northwestern Lutheran* overtook that of the *Gemeinde-Blatt*.<sup>22</sup> Hoping to preserve intersynodical harmony, *The Northwestern Lutheran* seldom printed news articles regarding the controverted issues that arose between the synods beginning in the late 1930s. On 13 April 1947, however, a *Northwestern Lutheran* editor writer announced that the time had now come to speak, “not for the purpose of disrupting now the fellowship about which we were so concerned” but because “our members are surely entitled to know where our Wisconsin Synod stands, and why it stands as it does.”<sup>23</sup>

As turmoil increased, the Wisconsin Synod responded with additional publications: a series of eleven tracts in 1953 and 1954,<sup>24</sup> a point-counterpoint series of pamphlets—*A Fraternal Word on the questions in controversy between the Wisconsin Synod and the Missouri Synod* from the Missouri Synod in October 1953, “*A Fraternal Word*” Examined from Wisconsin in early 1954, and *A Fraternal Reply* in July 1954—as well as numerous study papers and conference essays. Many

---

January 1989): 19. Morton Schroeder, “The magazine debuts,” (15 March 1989): 108–9.

<sup>22</sup> The transition was not rapid, however. In 1938, two decades after the conclusion of the war, *Gemeinde-Blatt* subscribers still outnumbered *Northwestern Lutheran* subscribers, 5600 to 4400. The balance did not tip in *The Northwestern Lutheran*’s favor until 1940. E[lmer C.] Kiessling, *History of the Western Wisconsin District* (Watertown, Wis.: Northwestern College, 1970), 29.

<sup>23</sup> E[dmund] Reim, “A Time to Keep Silence, and a Time to Speak,” *NL* 34 (13 April 1947): 115. Reim’s subsequent series of *Northwestern Lutheran* articles was reprinted in 1950 by authority of Wisconsin’s Committee on Tracts under the title, *Where Do We Stand? An Outline of the Wisconsin Position*.

<sup>24</sup> All tracts were published by the Wisconsin Synod’s Conference of Presidents. The first 2 appeared in 1953, the remaining 9 in 1954: Number 1: *Lutheran Bodies in the U. S. A.* Number 2: *1938–1953*. Number 3: *Every Sinner Declared Righteous*. Number 4: *Not By My Own Reason or Strength*. Number 5: *If the Trumpet Give an Uncertain Sound*. Number 6: *Chosen by Grace From Eternity*. Number 7: *Our Position Against Scouting*. Number 8: *Cooperation in Externals*. Number 9: *Antichrist*. Number 10: *Prayer Fellowship*. Number 11: *The Chaplaincy Question*. See also E[dmund] Reim, “As We See It: Something to Read,” *NL* 41 (21 February 1954): 57. Edward Fredrich felt these tracts were “useful and necessary” because they “undoubtedly had the good effect of strengthening the members of the Wisconsin Synod in their difficult stand,” yet “very few, it seems, were persuaded to change views or sides.” Fredrich, “The Great Debate,” 163.

pastors who lived through that era have files bulging with yellowed copies of conference papers, folders filled with personal and professional correspondence, and homemade presentations developed to interpret the issues in dispute to their congregations. Pastors from that era also share rich memories of the issues, personalities, and events involved.

In addition to these many printed resources, this study is based on the results of a questionnaire addressed to 105 Wisconsin Synod pastors in April 1997.<sup>25</sup> These pastors graduated from the seminary as early as 1926, as recently as 1962. Many served on key district or synodical committees or were present or participated in emotionally charged Wisconsin Synod or Synodical Conference conventions. Eighty-two of the 105 pastors surveyed responded—78 percent, an extraordinary response—many within days of receiving the survey.<sup>26</sup> Respondents were especially generous in opening their personal files, forwarding conference essays, newspaper and magazine clippings, letters, study papers, and other artifacts, all of which serve to transport the reader back to those tense years.

The survey format offered respondents the choice of maintaining the anonymity of their comments, but more than 90 percent chose the option “You may use my name in connection with all of the comments on this survey.” There was a sense throughout that this “great debate with

---

<sup>25</sup> See the *Appendix* for a copy of the pastoral survey and cover letter.

<sup>26</sup> According to E. R. Babbie, *The Practice of Social Research*, 5th ed. (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1983), 242, and D. R. Monette, T. J. Sullivan, and C. R. De Jong, *Applied Social Research: Tools for the Human Services* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1986), 49, return rates are generally less than fifty percent, especially for surveys that contain no enclosed compensation or follow-up mailings. A return rate of fifty percent is often considered adequate, and rates exceeding seventy percent are regarded as unusually good. Besides such practical suggestions as enclosing a self-addressed, stamped envelope and attaching a cover letter, W. S. Martin, W. J. Duncan, T. L. Powers, and J. C. Sawyer, “Costs and Benefits of Selected Response Inducement Techniques in Mail Survey Research,” *Journal of Business Research* 19 (1989): 67–79, reported that respondents were more likely to answer surveys when “the importance and relevance of the survey [were] clear to the prospective respondent.” All of the above data was contained in Lee Ellis, *Research Methods in the Social Sciences* (Madison, Wis.: Brown and Benchmark, 1994), 183–5.

Missouri” constituted the weightiest battle of their lives, though in the 1940s and 1950s many were relatively young, inexperienced pastors. For this study the identity of all survey respondents has been kept confidential; they will be referenced by number, arranged chronologically in the order the surveys were returned.<sup>27</sup>

Some respondents apologized for “slipping memories,” yet their recollections contain numerous specific details fixed in their minds decades ago. The individual recollections of some respondents are contradicted by those of other respondents; occasionally, comments even questioned or challenged official synodical positions. Some differences may be attributed to regional variations as intersynodical debate unfolded. Most significantly, their memories reflect their perceptions of what happened, and it was on the basis of those perceptions that they served their congregations and their synod, and ultimately made the decision to break fellowship with the LCMS.<sup>28</sup>

Chapter 1 presents a brief review of pertinent details in the synods’ intertwined histories up to 1931. The Missouri and Wisconsin synods came to acknowledge each other’s orthodoxy in teaching and practice, yet they retained distinctive synodical personalities and resisted efforts to be joined into a single synodical organization.

---

<sup>27</sup> For a fuller discussion of survey results, see Mark Braun, “‘Those were trying years!’ Recollections of the ‘split,’” *WHIJ* 18 (April 2000): 21–66.

<sup>28</sup> Robert Preus, in a review of John Tietjen’s *Memoirs in Exile: Confessional Hope and Institutional Conflict* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), in *Logia* 1 (October 1992): 65, admitted that “there is a risk in writing memoirs” because “memory is often fragile and not always accurate, even in the most scrupulous of men.” Preus quoted Jeremy Campbell, who observed in his book *Grammatical Man* that “we construct meanings and remember our constructions.” Campbell added:

“There is evidence . . . to suggest that we reconstruct information when retrieving it from memory. Only the gist of the information is stored. The details are added at the time of the recollection, on the basis of what we expect to have been true. Reconstruction may seriously distort that original information, but the rememberer may be quite unaware of the distortion. If the material given to us is consistent with our knowledge or expectations, it is more likely to be recalled correctly, but if it is inconsistent, then there are likely to be systematic distortions.” Jeremy Campbell, *Grammatical Man: Information, Entropy, Language, and Life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1982), 226.



Chapter 2 traces the development of initial disturbances between the synods. Disagreements over the doctrine of church and ministry provoked meetings, theses, and spirited correspondence in the early 1930s, although observers then and since have not regarded those disagreements as divisive of fellowship between the two bodies. Changes in Missouri policy regarding participation in the United States government's military chaplaincy program and acceptance of the Boy and Girl Scout programs jeopardized the harmonious relation of the synods and provoked initial responses of hurt and betrayal by Wisconsin Synod spokespersons.

By the late 1940s the Wisconsin Synod recognized that the common denominator underlying its disagreements with the Missouri Synod was the doctrine of church fellowship—especially prayer fellowship. Changes in fellowship practice and teaching, in fact, had been brewing in Missouri since World War I. During the 1950s the LCMS moved toward a revised presentation of church fellowship that came to be expressed in *The Theology of Fellowship*, which was granted formal approval at its 1965 and 1967 synodical conventions. This story is told in chapter 3.

Chapter 4 concentrates on the Wisconsin Synod's response to these changes. Wisconsin refined and expanded its presentation of church and prayer fellowship, and by the late 1950s summarized its doctrine and practice of fellowship under the term *unit concept*. In 1960, Wisconsin declared that an "impasse" had been reached between the two synods, which led to the convention vote in 1961.

Beginning in the 1950s fears arose in both synods that some of Missouri's leading theologians were abandoning their synod's traditional teaching regarding the inerrancy and inspiration of Scripture. The doctrine of the Word of God was never the presenting issue in Wisconsin's determination to leave the Synodical Conference, yet chapter 5 shows that this issue nonetheless aggravated Wisconsin's misgivings about Missouri's theological position and contributed to the break.

**This study concludes with brief observations on WELS development since its formal exit from the Synodical Conference in 1963.**

## *Chapter 1: Sister Synods*

Milwaukee historian John Gurda has described the 1930s as “a decade of deepening darkness, a nightmarish descent into a totally unforeseen state of worry and want.” Neck bones and spareribs replaced more expensive cuts of meat at evening meals, and “one-meatball casseroles” became a popular staple. Many people deferred medical care as long as possible and ignored dental care entirely. More than 53 percent of Milwaukee’s 1932 property taxes went unpaid, and public works crews that had paved 52.7 miles of city streets in 1929 reduced their output to less than two-thirds of a mile in 1933. Some even suggested that the heavier eaters at the Washington Park Zoo be slaughtered for their nutritional value.<sup>1</sup>

Churches suffered along with the rest of the nation.<sup>2</sup> Researchers H. Paul Douglass and Edmund S. de Brunner reported that 20 of 35 “leading denominations” compared in 1934 had reduced their total expenditures by 30 to 50 percent, and five more than 50 percent.<sup>3</sup> From 1930 to 1935, Methodist, Congregational, and Presbyterian churches suffered a 38 percent decrease in giving, and the Episcopal Church experienced a 35 percent decline in receipts between 1929 and 1934. In

---

<sup>1</sup> John Gurda, *The Making of Milwaukee* (Milwaukee: Milwaukee County Historical Society, 1999), 278–80.

<sup>2</sup> Wisconsin Synod historian Edward Fredrich liked to point out, however, a bright spot in those difficult times: “In the depth of the Depression, in 1932, experts in economics tell us, the share of ‘total personal consumption expenditures’ spent for religious and welfare activities stood higher than it ever has been since.” While the figure was at .02 percent in the 1930s, it dropped below .01 percent in the more prosperous 1950s and in 1970 it was .014 percent. Fredrich concluded that people “seem to need an economic setback to put a brake on their selfishness and materialism.” E[dward] C. Fredrich, “Depression Nostalgia, *NL* 67 (20 July 1980): 227

<sup>3</sup> H. Paul Douglass and Edmund S. de Brunner, *The Protestant Church as a Social Institution* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1935), 208; cited by Robert T. Handy, “The American Religious Depression, 1925–1935,” *Church History* 29 (March 1960): 9.

the dollar equivalent of the time, contributions to missions in the Episcopal Church declined from \$2.25 per person in 1930 to \$.96 in 1940.<sup>4</sup>

In the two largest synods of the Ev. Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America, the Depression was also felt. At Missouri's 1932 convention, pleas to improve and expand colleges and seminaries in the synod's school system had to be rejected or postponed. Delegates proposed an "Emergency Collection" because they considered it "absolutely necessary" that a special effort be made to bring receipts up to budget requirements "by a Synod-wide self-denial offering."<sup>5</sup> In the Wisconsin Synod, only 38 new congregations were organized during the 1930s, the lowest total for any decade in the synod's history. Only half of its 1931 seminary graduating class received calls.<sup>6</sup> By 1933 synod President G. E. Bergemann reported that the salaries of professors had been reduced by 36 percent during the previous biennium, and those of missionaries by 28 percent.<sup>7</sup>

Yet the 25 September 1932 issue of *The Northwestern Lutheran* featured a glowing report of that summer's Synodical Conference convention, held at Mankato, Minnesota. Convention days were "pleasant and profitable." The "best hours of each session" were devoted to a paper presenting "Christ as our King," in which Wisconsin's Professor Joh. P. Meyer "drew beautiful word pictures" and his listeners were "stimulated anew to loyal service to such a King." Mission reports noted that

---

<sup>4</sup> Martin E. Marty, *Modern American Religion, Volume 2: The Noise of Conflict, 1919–1941* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 256. Robert Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith Since World War II* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1988), 25. David L. Holmes, *A Brief History of the Episcopal Church* (Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1993), 150. Thomas C. Reeves, *The Empty Church: The Suicide of Liberal Christianity* (New York: The Free Press, 1996), 115–6.

<sup>5</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1932*, 208–9. Paul M. Heerboth, "Leaning on the Lord during the Lean Years: The Lutheran Church during the Great Depression," *CHIQ* 70 (Winter 1997): 221–2.

<sup>6</sup> Robert C. Hartman, "The Growth of the WELS through the Years," *WHIJ* 9 (Spring 1991): 36.

<sup>7</sup> Edgar Hoenecke, "'Reflections' on the World Mission Development in the Wisconsin Synod," *WLQ* 75 (July 1978): 205–6.

joint efforts among the “colored people” were being richly blessed. The hospitality of the host congregation “cannot be too highly praised,” and delegates transported to Wisconsin’s Dr. Martin Luther College at New Ulm and the Norwegians’ Bethany Lutheran College in Mankato came away with “a most favorable impression.”

That summer also marked the sixtieth anniversary of the founding of the Synodical Conference. Missouri’s Ludwig Fuerbringer, Conference President, credited the grace of God for keeping the four constituent synods “still true to the original ideals and principles” the conference adopted at its founding.<sup>8</sup>

#### *Different foundings*

These sister synods had been established as part of the vast wave of German migration into North America during the previous century. Between 1820 and 1929 almost six million German settlers arrived in the United States, a million and a half before the Civil War. By 1900, German stock in the United States (immigrants and their children) numbered more than eight million. At the turn of the century, three-fourths of the foreign-born population of Cincinnati, two-thirds of that of Milwaukee, and more than half that of St. Louis were German. The numbers were even higher in rural areas: ninety percent of the foreign-born in Franklin County, Missouri, and eighty percent of the foreign-born in Jefferson County, Wisconsin, were German.<sup>9</sup>

Included in this wave of migration were pastors and mission workers, eager to gather or reclaim their countrymen for the faith. Serving these new arrivals was not for the faint of heart. A

---

<sup>8</sup> M[artin J.] W[e]h[ausen], “Convention of the Synodical Conference, Mankato, Minnesota, August 10 to 15, 1932,” *NL* 19 (25 September 1932): 310.

<sup>9</sup> E. P. Hutchinson, *Immigrants and Their Children* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1956), 5, 10, 333. U. S. Bureau of the Census, *U. S. Census Population*, 1900, Vol. I (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1901), Table 34. Both cited by Charles H. Anderson, *White Protestant Americans: From National Origins to Religious Group* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970), 80–1.

missionary visiting the Norwegian settlement at Dane County, Wisconsin, in 1850, remarked, “Such gross immorality I had never witnessed before.” A minister in the state of Missouri described the members of his church at Deep Water as “so unaccustomed to attend on the means of grace, their minds so little cultivated, their feelings so blunted,” that he sometimes felt himself in “a land of darkness and death.” Many who left the Old World wanted to leave the old faith behind. An Evangelical pastor at Belleville, Illinois, complained that Germans there were “most all infidels or rationalists” and disparaged the Bible as “an old rusted book.” An American pastor agreed that the German church in Belleville was “almost entirely made up of skeptics and loose moralists.”<sup>10</sup>

Coming from the European state church, German immigrants were unaccustomed to the bewildering array of denominations and the voluntarism of American religion. Many would join any church that wasn't Catholic.<sup>11</sup> An Iowa minister's eleven members included three who had been Congregationalists, two Associate Reformed Presbyterians, one Lutheran, two Methodists, two Cumberland Presbyterians, and “one person reared under Presbyterian influences.”<sup>12</sup> Pastors of both the Missouri and Wisconsin synods seem to have shared (with Lutherans in general) a particular distaste for Methodists, accusing them and other aggressive sects of sheep-stealing immigrant Lutherans.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Mark Wyman, *Immigrants in the Valley: Irish, Germans, and Americans in the Upper Mississippi Country, 1830–1860* (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1984), 54, 70, 107, 114.

<sup>11</sup> Eldon Weisheit, *The Zeal of His House: Five Generations of Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod History (1847–1972)* (St. Louis: CPH, 1973), 46.

<sup>12</sup> Wyman, *Immigrants in the Valley*, 114.

<sup>13</sup> Walther once wrote that “the Methodists are thieves who gladly break in when the shepherd is not there. They do not come except to steal, to seize, and to destroy.” C. F. W. Walther to E. J. M. Wege, 29 July 1844; in *Letters of C. F. W. Walther: A Selection*, ed. and trans. Carl S. Meyer (Philadelphia: Fortress Press), 68. Martin Marty remarked that Lutherans “never tired of telling stories like the one about a Methodist ‘spiritual vulture’ who conducted a communion service for immigrants in Michigan and boasted, ‘Look here at all the money the dumb Germans have given me for the little bread and wine I gave them!’ Methodists were ‘wolves and hucksters’ who ‘plied

Neither Johannes Muehlhaeuser, founder of the Wisconsin Synod, nor Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther, key figure in the formation and early development of the Missouri Synod,<sup>14</sup> could be regarded as faint of heart. Both conducted their ministries amid rugged circumstances on the western edge of the American frontier. Both brought to America fiercely held convictions regarding Lutheran teaching and practice. Both brought a zeal to serve souls with the gospel. Yet their differences, rather than their similarities, impacted their church bodies and set their respective synods on parallel but disparate courses.

It is impossible to overestimate the importance of Walther's theological acumen, evangelical spirit, and compelling personality to the development of the Missouri Synod. He has been called

---

their wares of false doctrine.'" *Righteous Empire: The Protestant Experience in America* (New York: The Dial Press, 1970), 174

<sup>14</sup> E. Theodore Bachmann, "The Rise of 'Missouri Lutheranism'" (Ph. D. diss., University of Chicago, 1946), 199, remarked, "The usual interpretation in the Missouri Synod has made Walther the guiding genius of the Synod. Sihler, Wyneken, and others are said to have read the early issues of *Der Lutheraner* and rejoiced, urging upon Walther a union of like-minded pastors. Indeed, the testimony of these men praise Walther." This one-sided emphasis was preserved in such standard works as W. H. T. Dau, ed., *Ebenezer: Reviews of the Work of the Missouri Synod during Three Quarters of a Century*, aug. ed., (St. Louis: CPH, 1922), 94ff; W. G. Polack, *The Building of a Great Church: A Brief History of the Lutheran Church in America with Special Reference to the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States* (St. Louis: CPH, 1941), 65ff; Carl Mauelshagen, *American Lutheranism Surrenders to Forces of Conservatism* (Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia, 1936), 113ff; and Carl S. Munding, "The Genesis of Decentralized Government in the Missouri Synod" (Ph. D. diss., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1942), 275ff. Jack Treon Robinson, "The Spirit of Triumphalism in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod" (Ph. D. diss., Vanderbilt University, Nashville, 1972), 21–3, added Martin Gunther, *Dr. C. F. W. Walther* (St. Louis: Lutherischer Concordia-Verlag, 1890); D. H. Steffens, *Doctor Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther* (Philadelphia: The Lutheran Publication Society, 1917), 78–9; and W. G. Polack, *The Story of C. F. W. Walther* (1st ed. St. Louis: CPH, 1935; 2nd ed., 1941). Robinson credited Bachmann's work with presenting a more balanced account of the roles other men played in Missouri's founding and early history. Bachmann influenced later accounts, such as Walter Baepler's "official" history prepared for the centennial celebration of the synod's founding, *A Century of Grace: A History of the Missouri Synod, 1847 to 1947* (St. Louis: CPH, 1947), and August R. Suelflow's chapter, "The Missouri Synod Organized," in Carl S. Meyer, ed., *Moving Frontiers: Readings in the History of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod* (St. Louis: CPH, 1964, 1986), 142–93.

“the American Luther,”<sup>15</sup> and his theology and career were shaped by a crisis of faith similar to that of the Great Reformer.<sup>16</sup> When he left the *Gymnasium* at age eighteen, Walther lamented that he had “never heard a sentence of the Word of God coming from a believing heart.”<sup>17</sup> He considered all but three of the members of the theological faculty he met at the University of Leipzig to be “coarse rationalists.” By his own estimate he spent more than eight years of his student life unconverted.<sup>18</sup>

Searching for theological certainty, Walther read the pietist classics. “The less a book invited to faith and the more legalistically it urged contrition of the heart and total mortification of the old man before conversion,” the better he held it to be. Yet by his own admission, “praying, sighing, weeping, fasting, struggling, was of no avail.” He found no peace of God.<sup>19</sup> It was through the correspondence and preaching of Dresden Pastor Martin Stephan that Walther was pointed away from himself to Christ. His exuberant spiritual relief echoed Luther’s joyful tower experience: “I felt as though I had been translated from hell to heaven. Tears of distress and sorrow were converted into tears of heavenly joy.” Stephan “applied the Gospel to my own soul.”<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> A recent biography by Arthur F. Drevlow, J[ohn] H. Drickamer, and G[lenn] E. Reichwald is entitled *C. F. W. Walther, The American Luther* (Mankato, Minn.: Walther Press, 1987).

<sup>16</sup> Preaching at Concordia Seminary on 14 May 1887, one week after Walther’s death, Rev. H. Birkner called him “this most gifted son of the great Reformer” and “the Luther of our American Church.” H. Birkner, “The Great Work of Our Missouri Synod at Fort Wayne, Ind., and its Great Sorrow at St. Louis, Mo.,” *LW* 6 (7 June 1887): 5.

<sup>17</sup> Ludwig Fischer, *Das falsche Maertyrertum oder die Wahrheit in der Sache der Stephanianer* (Leipzig, 1839), 7ff; cited by Baepler, *A Century of Grace*, 41–2.

<sup>18</sup> Walter O. Forster, *Zion on the Mississippi: The Settlement of the Saxon Lutherans in Missouri, 1839–1841* (St. Louis: CPH, 1953), 25.

<sup>19</sup> C. F. W. Walther, *Kurzer Lebenslauf . . . J. F. Buenger* (St. Louis: F. Dette, 1882), 17–8; English text in Polack, *The Story of C. F. W. Walther*, 15. Julius A. Friedrich, “Dr. C. F. W. Walther,” in Dau, ed., *Ebenezer*, 24.

<sup>20</sup> Friedrich, “Dr. C. F. W. Walther,” 24. Forster, *Zion on the Mississippi*, 25.



Understandably, Walther maintained a lifelong aversion to pietism. Among Lutherans in the New World he emphasized Luther's teaching on justification as expressed in the Lutheran Confessions. Pietists, Walther wrote in an 1846 letter, "emphasize repentance and crushing of the heart" and "identify so many signs of a truly penitent heart, which can then first dare to approach Christ." The result is that "Christ with His grace and mercy is pushed very much to the background," and Christianity becomes "a serious burden."<sup>21</sup> Remarking on Walther's forty-year career and influence on Missouri, his student and successor Franz Pieper wrote:

We believe that it is not saying too much when we declare that after Luther and Chemnitz no other teacher of our church has attested the doctrine of justification so impressively as did Walther. It was particularly in this doctrine that he followed Luther, and he united into one shining beam of light all other bright rays on this doctrine radiating from our later dogmaticians.<sup>22</sup>

Born eight years before Walther, Muehlhaeuser was trained at the Pilgermission in Basel, Switzerland, as a traveling missionary and distributor of evangelical tracts.<sup>23</sup> He acquired only a fundamental knowledge of the Bible and never possessed exegetical proficiency in the biblical languages. Muehlhaeuser's training did not include an understanding of the Lutheran Confessions as a clear exposition of scriptural teaching.<sup>24</sup> Indeed, Muehlhaeuser once dismissed the Lutheran

---

<sup>21</sup> C. F. W. Walther to L. E. F. Krause, 19 January 1846; in August R. Suelflow, ed., *Selected Letters of C. F. W. Walther* (St. Louis: CPH, 1981), 60. See also Walther's reminiscences, almost forty years later, of his experience with John Philip Fresenius' *Book on Confession and Communion*, in Walther's *The Proper Distinction Between Law and Gospel*, trans. W. H. T. Dau (St. Louis: CPH, n. d. [1928]), 140–50.

<sup>22</sup> Franz Pieper, "Dr. C. F. W. Walther as Theologian," *LuW* 36 (January 1890): 10–4; trans. John Theodore Mueller, *CTM* 26 (December 1955): 914.

<sup>23</sup> For a brief history of history of the Basel Mission Society, see James G. Kiecker, "A distant echo," *NL* 72 (15 May 1985): 164–5.

<sup>24</sup> Edwin A. Lehmann, "The Pastor Who Possessed an All-Consuming Love," *WHIJ* 1 (Spring 1983): 9–10.

Confessions as “paper fences” and appears to have resisted requiring a *quia* subscription to the Confessions in the articles of organization of the Wisconsin Synod.<sup>25</sup>

But Muehlhaeuser was “sound in regard to justification,” once criticizing a Lutheran pastor in New York for being “unclear and inexperienced in the main matter of the gospel, namely, the righteousness which is granted to men by grace through faith.” He modeled “a personal living faith, child-like trust in his Savior, and a burning zeal to build His kingdom and spend himself in the work.”<sup>26</sup> But Muehlhaeuser also practiced a “relaxed” brand of confessionalism. In the articles of incorporation of Grace congregation that he founded in Milwaukee in 1849, Muehlhaeuser included a provision that “never may or shall a preacher of the said congregation use the rite of the Old Lutheran Church, whether in Baptism or the Lord’s Supper.”<sup>27</sup> At the congregation’s cornerstone laying in 1851, six English-speaking preachers of various denominations, a German evangelical preacher, and a Methodist preacher were present to give addresses and offer the closing prayer.<sup>28</sup>

While Walther found theological assurance in the doctrinal tenets of “Old Lutheranism,” Muehlhaeuser disdained “Old Lutherans” he met in the Missouri and Buffalo Synods. As he saw it,

---

<sup>25</sup> John Philipp Koehler, *The History of the Wisconsin Synod* (St. Cloud, Minn.: Faith–Life, 1970), 41, 45. Koehler’s *History* is hereafter abbreviated *HWS*. The wording of the synod’s constitution according to the “original authentic manuscript” followed an old European Lutheran form prescribing that it be “based on the Scriptures, [the] Unaltered Augsburg Confession and the other Lutheran symbols.” But those terms had been crossed out, and in their place were inserted “*reines Bibel christentum*” or “*reines Bibelwort*” (true Bible Christianity or true Bible word). In the questions to the candidate for ordination, “the fundamental doctrines of holy Writ and the Articles of Faith of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession” were left undisturbed. Koehler was uncertain who made the insertions. Muehlhaeuser would have preferred a milder confessional statement in the constitution.

<sup>26</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 35, 72.

<sup>27</sup> *Kirchen-Ordnung der Deutschen Evangelische Lutherische Gnaden-Gemeinde in Milwaukee* (Milwaukee: Druck der Germania Publishing Co., 1851), 1; trans. Edwin Lehmann, “An All-Consuming Love,” 10.

<sup>28</sup> Edwin Lehmann, “An All-Consuming Love,” 13.

doctrinal controversies were often mere disputes over words, fomented by contentious spirits, that accomplished little but often hindered the work at hand. The real battle was against rationalism and unbelief.<sup>29</sup> Muehlhaeuser regarded as his ally any pastor who shared the message of “the righteousness which is granted to men by grace through faith,” regardless of denominational label. He urged his fledgling Wisconsin Synod at its very first convention to support a traveling missionary (*Reiseprediger*) and vigorously collected money for heathen mission work.<sup>30</sup> Grace congregation’s church minutes report that in the first dozen years of its existence the congregation was instrumental in helping to establish more than twenty other Lutheran congregations.<sup>31</sup>

In an oft-quoted letter from 1853, Muehlhaeuser voiced his theological leanings:

Just because I am not strictly or Old-Lutheran, I am in a position to offer every child of God and servant of Christ the hand of fellowship over the ecclesiastical fence. Have quite often been together with English preachers of the various denominations in ministerial conference and we respected and loved each other as brethren and deliberated on the general welfare of the church. So I am not, dear Methodist brother, withdrawing the hand of brotherhood from you if you are a Methodist in the spirit of the Methodist church's founder.

Yet Muehlhaeuser chided the recipient, a fellow Basel-trained missionary who had “defected” to Methodism.

As a non-theologian I am wondering how you, a theologian pledged to the confessional books, could take the step [to Methodism] without a struggle. You won’t expect me to believe that the teaching of the Methodist church, especially regarding the Sacraments, yes, even pertaining to justification and sanctification, is Lutheran?<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Armin Engel, “Our Presidents: Johannes Muehlhaeuser,” *NL* 63 (2 May 1976): 136.

<sup>30</sup> Armin W. Schuetze, “Muehlhaeuser, Founding Father of the Wisconsin Synod,” *WLQ* 72 (July 1975): 202–3.

<sup>31</sup> Edwin Lehmann, “An All-Consuming Love,” 14.

<sup>32</sup> Johannes Muehlhaeuser to Gotthilf Weitbrecht, November 1853; cited in J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 43–44. Commenting on the incident, Koehler called Weitbrecht “a sentimental tommy and easily moved to tears,” someone to whom “Methodism appealed.”

*Barely cousins*

Small wonder, then, as David Schmiel has remarked, that the casual observer in the 1850s “would hardly have imagined two more disparate groups of Lutherans than the Wisconsin and Missouri Synods.” Their differing theological positions shaped their development, as did circumstances that brought the two together. The Missouri Synod “stemmed from an unusual movement, a rebellion against the existing union of Lutherans and Reformed in Germany.”<sup>33</sup>

Schmiel’s reference is to the attempt by Prussian King Frederic Wilhelm III to unite Lutheran and Reformed believers into a single church. By inserting the phrase “*Our Lord Jesus says*” into the words of institution for Holy Communion, Frederic’s liturgy relinquished interpretation of the words to the individual worshiper. Lutherans could insist that Christ’s true body and blood were present in the Sacrament, but the Reformed were free to profess that the elements were something else or something less than Christ’s true body and blood.<sup>34</sup>

Instead of uniting Lutherans and Reformed, however, Frederic Wilhelm produced a third non-Catholic church: *uniert* (union) congregations. Seeing little hope of resolving their difficulties peacefully, yet refusing to abandon their religious convictions, some “dissident” pastors and congregants chose to leave Germany for America and Australia. Among those convinced of the impossibility of maintaining Lutheran convictions on German soil was Martin Stephan. “Will it not come to this that we must leave Babylon and Egypt and emigrate?” Stephan asked in 1833. “Everywhere there is great hatred and deprecation of the pure Lutheran doctrine.” Stephan was

---

<sup>33</sup> David Schmiel, “The History of the Relationship of the Wisconsin Synod to the Missouri Synod Until 1925,” (master’s thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1958), 1.

<sup>34</sup> [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Unionism,” *Qu* 42 (October 1945): 221–2. Kim DeVries, “The Prussian Union,” *CHIQ* 49 (Fall 1976): 136.

directed to North America “where there dwells not only political freedom, but love for the pure Lutheran religion as well.”<sup>35</sup>

Forming an emigration society in 1836, Stephan led a five-ship flotilla from Bremen for New Orleans in November 1838. Four of the ships, almost 700 passengers, and most of their supplies arrived in New Orleans in January 1839, then settled on a 10,000 acre parcel in Perry County, Missouri. Others journeyed farther north, settling in and around St. Louis. Among them was C. F. W. Walther.

Some aspects of the migration are distasteful to later readers,<sup>36</sup> and Stephan himself was later disgraced and deposed from the community.<sup>37</sup> Yet the Saxon immigration became a major piece of synod hagiography—“a romanticized type of Missouri Synod history, not always consistent with fact”<sup>38</sup>—which provided the young synod with important self-definition. Marking Missouri’s 75th anniversary in 1922, W. H. T. Dau placed a retelling of the Saxon migration at the head of a

---

<sup>35</sup> Martin Stephan to Benjamin Kurtz, March 1833, bound MSS, CHI; cited by Forster, *Zion on the Mississippi*, 87.

<sup>36</sup> Pastors even encouraged the separation of spouses who could not agree on leaving Saxony. They even helped several underage girls disguise themselves as boys, in effect smuggling them out of the country. Forster, *Zion on the Mississippi*, 151–3. J. F. Koesterling, *Auswanderung der saechischen Lutheraner im Jahre 1838*, 2nd ed. (St. Louis: Wiebusch and Son, 1867), 13–4; cited by Linda Schelbitzki Pickle, “Women of the Saxon Immigration and Their Church,” *CHIQ* 57 (Winter 1984): 146–7. One woman followed Walther to Missouri, leaving her husband and four children behind. Her husband eventually brought suit against Walther. Minutes of Trinity congregation, 14 March 1842; trans. Carl S. Mundinger, *Government in the Missouri Synod* (St. Louis: CPH, 1947), 41. Walther also was accused of kidnaping his orphaned niece and nephew. Forster, *Zion on the Mississippi*, 194–7. Mundinger, *Government in the Missouri Synod*, 112–3.

<sup>37</sup> On 5 May 1839, three young women confessed to their pastor, Gotthold Loeber, that Stephan made improper sexual advances toward them. On 30 May, Stephan was excommunicated and shipped across the Mississippi River to Kaskaskia, Illinois. One week later a fourth member of the colony, Stephan’s housemaid, signed a confession stating that she had illicit sexual relations with Stephan for a period of seven or eight years. Forster, *Zion on the Mississippi*, 393, 423–7. Carl E. Vehse, *Die Stephan’sche Auswanderung nach Amerika. Mit Actenstucken*, Dresden, 1840, 17, 144–5; trans. Mundinger, *Government in the Missouri Synod*, 82, 86–8.

<sup>38</sup> Robinson, “The Spirit of Triumphalism,” 22–3.

collection of celebratory pieces about the synod's history, doctrine, and growth. The author, Theodore Buenger, regarded the Saxons as one of the few groups united by common motives and glorious purpose:

This noble band came to America not to gain more of this world's goods than they were to acquire in the land of their birth, but to seek freedom of conscience; they did not come as hunters of fortune, but because "they desired a better country, that is, a heavenly one." Many gave up advantages that they could not hope to find here and severed connections that were dear to their hearts. The majority emigrated in the conviction that, if they remained at home, they would lose something greater and more valuable than anything that fatherland, prosperity, and a happy home could offer.<sup>39</sup>

Walther and Missouri's other founders articulated a distinctive self-awareness of their church body as the lone voice of true Lutheranism in a sea of rationalism and American Protestant subjectivism. *Der Lutheraner*, which began publication in 1844 (three years before the founding of the synod in 1847), seized upon any shift toward firmer confessionalism it detected among Lutherans in America and Germany. By 1850 it noted with pride that the seed of discord it was sowing within the "American Lutheran" camp was bearing abundant fruit.<sup>40</sup>

Walther insisted that all doctrinal issues had been settled long ago. Luther's understanding of the Word was correct and Missouri was in complete possession of it. *Der Lutheraner's* epigram reminded readers,

*Gottes Wort und Luthers Lehr'*  
*vergehet nun und nimmermehr.*<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Theo. Buenger, "The Saxon Immigrants of 1839," in Dau, ed., *Ebenezer*, 1–2.

<sup>40</sup> Mauelshagen, *American Lutheranism Surrenders to Forces of Conservatism*, 108.

<sup>41</sup> "God's Word and Luther's doctrine pure now and ever shall endure."

“Thus we say with St. Paul,” Walther wrote, quoting Luther, “in most certain and unmistakable terms, that all doctrine not agreeing with ours is damned and diabolical.”<sup>42</sup>

Marking Missouri’s silver jubilee in 1872, Walther and Vice President Theodore Brohm expounded the theme of Missouri’s doctrinal correctness and, as a consequence, its persecution. At its founding the synod occupied a solitary position, “looked at askance, or even despised by other church bodies,” Brohm wrote. As it testified to “the pure truth” Missourians had to “battle ceaselessly with old and new enemies of our Church,” Walther recalled, “who seem to have gathered here from all parts of the world into one vast army.”

I seem to hear all the enemies say sneeringly, “Yes, yes,” “*Reine Lehre*,” “pure doctrine,” “orthodoxy,”—that’s it, and that’s about all you glory in. Vainglory? But, my brethren, let them mock us if they will; by such mockery they reveal what manner of spirit they are.<sup>43</sup>

At Missouri’s 75th anniversary, a half century after Brohm and Walther’s sermons, Martin Walker observed:

We are deeply impressed with the sturdy orthodoxy of our fathers, their unswerving loyalty to the divine Word, and their holy determination to continue unto the end ‘to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints.’ In these documents we find much holy joy, but no sinful pride; much glorying in God, but no boasting in self. . . .

As Elijah’s mantle fell upon Elisha, so may the faith and love, the courage and confidence, the zeal and self-sacrifice of our fathers come upon us of the third and later generations!

“Faith of our fathers, holy faith,  
We will be true to Thee till death.”<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> “*Hat Dr. Luther das Werk der Reformation fuer unvollendet ansgeben?*” *DL* 2 (30 May 1846): 80, quoting from the Walch edition of *Luther’s Works*, 8:166; cited by Bachmann, “The Rise of ‘Missouri Lutheranism,’” 261.

<sup>43</sup> Brohm and Walther are both cited by Martin Walker, “The Jubilee of 1872,” in Dau, ed., *Ebenezer*, 310–2.

<sup>44</sup> Walker, “The Jubilee of 1872,” 320.

Everything that embodied Missouri from the start—“an internally homogeneous and compact group” united by convictions of pure Lutheran doctrine combined with freedom in church government, the “thorough academic education” of its pastors and pastoral candidates, the “fiery and dynamic leadership” of the “exceedingly able and unusually energetic” Walther, who “surpassed all the others intellectually, had good practical insight, and was a person to whom the rest at once deferred”—was utterly lacking in the “conglomeration of pastors” who formed the Wisconsin Synod in 1850 and the Minnesota and Michigan synods in 1860.<sup>45</sup>

J. P. Koehler attributed Wisconsin’s divergent character to the fact that the synod had not been shaped by the Prussian persecutions, nor molded by the Saxon migration. Because its founders hailed from locations in Germany where unionism was more commonly accepted, the Wisconsin Synod maintained ties to the Prussian church for most of its first two decades. Wisconsin’s leaders went about their task with what Koehler described as “Lutheran open-mindedness.”<sup>46</sup>

Unlike Missouri, wrote August Pieper, “Wisconsin was not of one mold.” At its beginning “it was a conglomeration of people of various confessional leanings,” unschooled in Lutheran doctrine and unknown to one another because they came from different parts of Europe. Upon arriving “they had no outstanding or even authoritative leader and no strong unifying force.” Though working faithfully with “whatever pastoral insight they had,” Wisconsin pastors and members “did not really know what they were, what they wanted to be or how to go about doing something useful.”

---

<sup>45</sup> August Pieper, “Anniversary Reflections: Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther, 1811–1887,” originally published under the title “*Jubilaumsnachgedanken*,” *Qu* 20 (January 1923): 1–18; (April 1923): 88–112; (July 1923): 161–77; (October 1923): 254–70; 21 (January 1924): 22–45; (April 1924): 104–11; trans. R. E. Wehrwein, in Curtis A. Jahn, comp. ed., *The Wauwatosa Theology*, 3 vols., (Milwaukee: NPH, 1997), 3:272.

<sup>46</sup> J. Ph. Koehler, “The Synodical Conference in the History Of The Lutheran Church in America,” originally published in *Qu* 19 (July 1922), trans. Paul Hensel, *F–L* 29 (May 1956): 3–4. See also E[mer C.] Kiessling, “The Tie That Binds,” *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1957*, 107–8. Kiessling’s entire essay, 106–18, is useful for understanding Wisconsin’s synodical personality.



Yet one thing they were sure of: “they wanted synodical independence and autonomy.” Thus Wisconsin’s personality stood in marked contrast to “the enormous synodical energy of the Missourians.”<sup>47</sup>

From its beginnings, the Wisconsin Synod was “a house divided” in its doctrine and practice. Eager to bring the gospel to one of the many little settlements sprouting up around the state, a Wisconsin pastor would find in a given location some Lutherans, some Catholics, and some Reformed. He knew where lines were to be drawn between Lutherans and Catholics, but demarcation between Lutherans and the Reformed was less clear.<sup>48</sup> Such a pastor learned he could increase his preaching opportunities by advertising, “*Kann auch Evangelisch predigen*” (“I can also preach Evangelical”).<sup>49</sup>

At first the Wisconsin Synod seems to have escaped Missouri’s notice, but because the two synods established congregations close to one another in locations such as Watertown and Milwaukee, “Wisconsin began to be looked upon as an opposition synod.” Disputes between the synods were often doctrinal: Muehlhaeuser considered the Missouri, Buffalo, and Iowa synods as “Romanizing sects,” and they regarded the Wisconsin Synod as “unionistic.” Yet Koehler remarked that “on the whole, the argumentation in the controversial cases seems to reveal that the real issue, then as later, was the territorial rights of the congregations concerned.”<sup>50</sup>

By the mid-1850s Buffalo and Missouri were well aware of Wisconsin’s existence, and their church papers—Buffalo’s *Das Informatorium* and Missouri’s *Der Lutheraner*— began sounding

---

<sup>47</sup> August Pieper, “Anniversary Reflections,” 272.

<sup>48</sup> Fredrich, *WSL*, 27.

<sup>49</sup> Clayton Krug, “Shifts of Fellowship Teachings in WELS, 1860–1996; a Personal View” (paper presented to the Winnebago Pastoral Conference, Northern Wisconsin District, Wisconsin Synod, 17 September 1996), 3.

<sup>50</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 79.

warnings and leveling accusations.<sup>51</sup> John Deindoerfer, pastor in Frankenhill, Michigan, castigated “the deceptive and lying nature of [this] union church,” later labeling the Wisconsin Synod “thoroughly unionistic.”<sup>52</sup>

In 1860 a young preacher published a heated attack in *Der Lutheraner* against the Wisconsin Synod pastor in Oshkosh, then recklessly applied his charges to the synod as a whole. In 1861 a Missouri writer criticized Wisconsin for receiving subsidies from Germany and Pennsylvania, commenting, “These gentlemen are bound to have their comfortable living assured, in order to missionize where the Gospel is already being preached.” The writer charged further that “the preachers of the Wisconsin Synod like to gather to themselves a crowd of all kinds of people; the worst of it is that they are not very scrupulous in the choice of means to augment their numbers.” Charges of “unionistic synod” and “exclusive Lutheranism” flew back and forth between the two synods.<sup>53</sup>

In 1862, Missouri’s J. N. Beyer reported that Wisconsin’s Johannes Conrad in Racine had sent mission offerings to seven other preaching fields, all of them unionistic. During an especially vexing dispute between Missouri and Wisconsin churches in Watertown, one Wisconsin Synod official was quoted in the *Lutherischer Kirchenbote* of 18 July as saying it was “high time that our Synod came to Watertown” because “Methodistic enthusiasm” was rampant on one hand and “the rigoristic exclusivism of the [Missouri] Old Lutherans” on the other. “The poor hungry souls didn’t

---

<sup>51</sup> *Kirchliche Mittheilungen aus und ueber Nord-America* (1854) I, col. 5; cited by Edward Fredrich, “By God’s Grace a Confessing Confessional Lutheran Church,” (paper presented to the Southeast Wisconsin Pastor–Teacher Conference, 11–12 June 1975), 4.

<sup>52</sup> Johannes Diendoerfer, “Die Wirksamkeit der evangelisch-Lutherischen Synode von Iowa in Staate Wisconsin,” *Kirchliches Mittheilungen aus und ueber Nord-Amerika* 19 (October 1861): 72–3; cited in Fredrich, *WSL*, 28, 272.

<sup>53</sup> Fr. Ruhland, “*Kirchliche Nachrichten aus dem noerdlichen Wisconsin*,” *DL* 17 (18 September 1860): 20–2. F. Steinbach, “*Neueste Praxis der Wisconsin Synode im Missioniren unter den Deutschen*,” *DL* 17 (5 March 1861): 116. J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 80.

know where to turn.” Missouri’s *Lehre und Wehre* responded that Wisconsin leveled such accusations because of Missouri’s “unrelenting adherence to Christian doctrine and practice.” Yet “when one knows what the congregational practice of such gentlemen is like,” *Lehre und Wehre* continued, it is not surprising that those lukewarm in doctrine or eager to avoid church discipline “find a refuge for their sensitive skin in such a congregation” under the pretense of still remaining Lutheran.<sup>54</sup>

While granting that even Missouri’s harshest critics acted in good faith, Koehler maintained that an unbiased reader can’t help feeling such strictures “overshot the mark.” It did not have “the right ring” when Missouri continued warning Wisconsin “not to fail to appreciate the love” contained in their sharp rebukes. “They were right about their protest against unionism, but the question keeps popping up whether they could not have rendered their testimony in a better manner, in view of the situation at the time.”<sup>55</sup> In an essay delivered to Wisconsin’s 1861 convention, Gottlieb Reim was clearly referring to Missourians when he chided “that loveless contentiousness” that believed “Christ resides only within its chambers, and indulges in hairsplitting and wars of words” to cast suspicion on other Lutheran synods. “The Wisconsin Synod does not know, nor does it want to know” that sort of Lutheranism.<sup>56</sup>

A century later, a Wisconsin Synod professor maintained that if Missouri had shown greater understanding for Wisconsin’s different background, and regarded them as weak brothers but

---

<sup>54</sup> J. N. Beyer, “Die Wisconsin Synode,” *DL* 18 (5 March 1862): 120. “Die Synode von Wisconsin,” *LuW* 8 (August 1862): 252–3. J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 83–6.

<sup>55</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 86. Koehler documented numerous other examples that occurred right up to 1868: *HWS*, 93, 97–8, 107–8, 115–7.

<sup>56</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1861*, 16; cited by Martin O. Westerhaus, “The Wauwatosa Theology: The Men and Their Message,” in Jahn, *The Wauwatosa Theology*, 1:18.

brothers and fellow Lutherans nonetheless, Wisconsin undoubtedly would have sought and accepted Missouri's help.

As it was, the almost contemptuous treatment [Wisconsin pastors] received at the hands of the Old Lutherans, the haughty condescension with which they were occasionally met caused hurt and confusion, and kept them away from the synods already at work in Wisconsin. These early Wisconsin men certainly did not lay claim to being perfect; they were no angels, but neither were the Old Lutherans.<sup>57</sup>

### *Right turn*

As Missouri attacked, it failed to notice that Wisconsin was undergoing a theological change. In less than two decades Wisconsin's doctrinal position came to coincide so completely with Missouri's that the two synods recognized one another's orthodoxy, called each other "sisters," and declared organic union that formed the basis of the Ev. Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America for more than 90 years.

While Muehlhaeuser preferred a milder confessional stance for his new Lutheran synod, Wisconsin's two other chief founders, Johannes Weinmann and especially William Wrede, insisted on clearer confessional statements. Quite likely they overruled Muehlhaeuser, causing the "Unaltered Augsburg Confession and the other Lutheran symbols" to prevail in Wisconsin's constitution.<sup>58</sup>

When the synod's 1854 convention resolved to allow a congregation at Schlesingerville to use both bread and wafers in the Sacrament, a Pastor Goldammer "violently opposed" this "double offering," calling it "contrary to the essence of the Lord's Supper, which should demonstrate the communion and oneness of the Lord's Supper guests."<sup>59</sup> At its 1856 convention, Wisconsin

---

<sup>57</sup> M[ax] Lehninger, "The Development of the Doctrinal Position of the Wisconsin Synod During the Century of its History," *Qu* 47 (January 1950): 12-3.

<sup>58</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 41.

<sup>59</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1854*, trans. Arnold O. Lehmann, *WHIJ* 10 (October 1992): 5.

“categorically rejected” Samuel Schmucker’s *Definite Platform*, maintaining that “the Unaltered Augsburg Confession is based on the Word of God” and warning that acceptance of the *Definite Platform* would amount to “nothing else but a definite suicide of the Lutheran Church.”<sup>60</sup>

Thus the seeds of a stronger confessionalism existed in Wisconsin from its beginning. New pastoral arrivals from Europe embraced a more vigorous confessional commitment. In 1853 Johannes Bading came from a mission school in Hermannsburg, where under Ludwig Harms he had received a more confessional training than had Muehlhaeuser.<sup>61</sup> Moving to Theresa, northwest of Milwaukee, in 1855, Bading soon met other like-minded pastors—Gottlieb Reim at Ashford, Philipp Koehler in West Bend, and Elias Sauer in Schlesingerville. Together they formed the “Northwestern Conference,” working where they could to bring about a more confessional Lutheranism in Wisconsin.<sup>62</sup>

The synod’s choice of Bading to succeed Muehlhaeuser as Wisconsin’s president in 1860 was in itself an indicator of Wisconsin’s growing confessional stand.<sup>63</sup> In his first two presidential addresses in 1861 and 1862, Bading stressed the importance of adhering to the Lutheran Confessions in practice, not just on paper. Also in 1862, in another incident involving the Schlesingerville

---

<sup>60</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1856*, trans. Arnold O. Lehmann, *WHIJ* 11 (April 1993): 6. Fredrich, “Wisconsin’s Theological–Confessional History,” 87, remarked that the resolution was “sandwiched between routine decisions that regulated convention preaching assignments and established a treasury for pastors’ widows.” The *Proceedings* provide no other clue why the Synod was moved to make such a resolution.

<sup>61</sup> Fredrich, *WSL*, 30. J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 45. See also Armin Engel, “Our President—Johannes Bading,” *NL* 63 (16 May 1976): 152–4.

<sup>62</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 49–51, 74. Wisconsin’s numerous *Northwestern* namings were granted to honor the confessional leadership of this conference: Northwestern Preparatory School and Northwestern College at Watertown, Wisconsin, 1865–1995; Northwestern Lutheran Academy in Mobridge, South Dakota, 1928–79; and the synod’s English magazine since 1914, *The Northwestern Lutheran*. Fredrich, *WSL*, 31–2.

<sup>63</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 74.

congregation, synod delegates censured its pastor for using both bread and wafers to please its Reformed communicants—thus reversing its 1854 admonition.<sup>64</sup>

Most significant was the service of Adolf Hoenecke, who arrived in 1863 and became Wisconsin's leading theological teacher until his death in 1908. Possessing neither the inner fire nor the outward energy of Walther, Hoenecke was blessed instead with "utter seriousness, genuine fear of God, firm stand on Scripture, sound Lutheranism, superior mind, theological perception and depth." Averse to any display of pomp or greatness, Hoenecke "wanted to work solely on people's hearts, persuading, winning and edifying them through God's Word, through the gospel, without using any outward force." Bading possessed gifts of natural leadership, but Hoenecke was "in the good sense the power behind the throne."<sup>65</sup>

Muehlhaeuser accepted Wisconsin's theological shift gracefully. August Pieper, who knew Muehlhaeuser only from the recollections of others, called him "an exceptionally fervent disciple of the Lord" who showed "great modesty, humility, a love for his fellowman, and a capacity for self-sacrifice."<sup>66</sup> Koehler, who knew Muehlhaeuser through his father, Philip, said Muehlhaeuser "did not resent correction on the part of the younger men, and even when of another opinion would lend his support."<sup>67</sup> For their part, these younger, more confessionally-minded pastors (Bading was more

---

<sup>64</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings*, 1861, 6; 1862, 13; cited in Fredrich, *WSL*, 30–1.

<sup>65</sup> August Pieper, "Anniversary Reflections," 272. August Pieper, "The Significance of Dr. Adolf Hoenecke for the Wisconsin Synod and American Lutheranism," originally published under the title, "*Dr. Hoeneckes Bedeutung fuer die Wisconsinssynode und die amerikanisch-lutherische Kirche.*" *Qu* 32 (July 1935): 161–74; (October 1935): 225–44; 33 (January 1936): 1–19; (April 1936): 81–101; trans. Werner Franzmann, in Jahn, ed., *The Wauwatosa Theology*, 3:374–5.

<sup>66</sup> August Pieper, "The Significance of Dr. Adolf Hoenecke," 356.

<sup>67</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 73.

than twenty years Muehlhaeuser's junior, Hoenecke more than thirty) accorded Muehlhaeuser fatherly respect during his presidential tenure and to the end of his life in 1867.<sup>68</sup>

When some member bodies of the General Synod withdrew to form a more confessional body, the General Council, in 1866, Wisconsin was alert to the opportunity. It was represented at the Council's founding convention in Reading, Pennsylvania, and became, with 12,741 communicants, its second largest body.<sup>69</sup>

Delegates to the Council's convention in late fall, 1867, at Fort Wayne, Indiana, were faced with questions raised by the Ohio and Iowa synods regarding the "four points": 1) millennialism: acceptance of a physical thousand year reign of Christ; 2) pulpit fellowship: only Lutheran pastors for Lutheran pulpits; 3) altar fellowship: only Lutheran communicants at Lutheran altars; 4) lodge membership: church members belonging to secret or antichristian societies. Wisconsin's delegates considered the Council's reply to Ohio and Iowa evasive and ambiguous. Though President Bading hoped the General Council might offer more substantive answers to the "Four Points," the Council's 1868 resolutions still proved unsatisfactory. Wisconsin reaffirmed its withdrawal from the Council in 1869.<sup>70</sup>

After terminating its membership in the General Council and severing its relations with the Berlin mission society, Wisconsin expressed willingness in 1868 to meet with Missouri to seek a

---

<sup>68</sup> At the first synodical convention following Muehlhaeuser's death, Bading praised the "great self-denial" Muehlhaeuser showed and the "personal sacrifice" he made in establishing his congregation and the synod. "Most of us know with what love and patience he nurtured the synod and how faithfully he labored and prayed for it." *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1868*, 6; cited in Fredrich, *WSL*, 68–9.

<sup>69</sup> Fredrich, *WSL*, 41.

<sup>70</sup> Fredrich, *WSL*, 42–5. The General Council later charged Wisconsin with initiating a "hasty withdrawal" on grounds that were "obscure and dubious." *General Council Proceedings, 1869*, 32–4.

common understanding.<sup>71</sup> Walther and other Missouri representatives met with Wisconsin men in Milwaukee in October and were clearly pleased with the outcome: “We must admit that all our suspicions against the dear Wisconsin Synod have not merely disappeared but were also put to shame,” said Walther. “God be thanked for His unspeakable gift.”<sup>72</sup> By 1872 arrangements between Wisconsin, Missouri, and four other midwestern synods were approved, and the Ev. Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America was officially formed 10–16 July at St. John’s Church in Milwaukee.<sup>73</sup>

It has been persistently maintained that Missouri’s public attacks and private persuasion provided a key element in Wisconsin’s turn to the right.<sup>74</sup> The Missouri synod, Walther, *Lehre und Wehre*, and *Der Lutheraner* are frequently invoked as a blessing God gave Wisconsin when Wisconsin needed it most.<sup>75</sup> That said, Wisconsin historian Edward Fredrich has insisted, “It was much less the polemical writing in Missouri periodicals, often given to exaggeration and based on misinformation, and much more the personal and brotherly example and encouragement of a good Missouri neighbor” that helped move Wisconsin to the right.<sup>76</sup> Bading, Hoenecke, the Northwestern

---

<sup>71</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1868*, 28; cited by Walter D. Uhlig, “Eighteen Sixty-Eight—Year of Involvement,” *CHIQ* 41 (August 1968): 109.

<sup>72</sup> C. F. W. Walther, “Wieder eine Friedensbotschaft,” *DL* 25 (1 November 1868): 37–8; cited in Uhlig, “Eighteen Sixty-Eight,” 109.

<sup>73</sup> Fredrich, *WSL*, 50–5.

<sup>74</sup> That this reading of events has endured for a long time is illustrated in a comment made to the author in September 1996 by a third generation Wisconsin Synod member who lived all his life in east central Wisconsin. During his young adult years, in the 1930s and 1940s, it was still commonly repeated that Wisconsin owed Missouri a debt of gratitude because “in the early days, Missouri had to set Wisconsin straight.”

<sup>75</sup> See Edward C. Fredrich II, “Dr. C. F. W. Walther: ‘American Lutheranism has had no equal.’” *NL* 74 (15 May 1987): 189.

<sup>76</sup> For an outstanding example of Missouri’s “neighborliness,” see J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 45.



Conference pastors, and other factors brought about a change in Wisconsin long before Missouri ever noticed the existence of the Wisconsin Synod or directed “loving” criticisms its way. Over the intervening years “there has been a tendency to exaggerate the Missouri role in Wisconsin’s improvement.”<sup>77</sup>

*When they were young*

On the eve of the formation of the United Lutheran Church in America in 1918, *The Northwestern Lutheran* boasted that “the Synodical Conference still easily holds first place” as the “biggest Lutheran body in America.”<sup>78</sup> Wisconsin and Missouri comprised the largest share of Synodical Conference members until the demise of the conference in 1967.<sup>79</sup> After discovering their doctrinal agreement, they enjoyed nine decades of joint fellowship, harmonious working relationships, and shared ministries.

The most obvious feature of the two synods during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was their German-ness. Jay Dolan has traced the importance of the use of German by Roman Catholics for preserving the faith and for maintaining the old culture and keeping memories

---

<sup>77</sup> Edward C. Fredrich, “Wisconsin’s Interchurch Relations in the Early Years,” *WLQ* 73 (April 1976): 99. This was especially true in the 1950s, Fredrich added, “when Wisconsin admonitions to Missouri for liberal and unionistic tendencies were so often and so emphatically prefaced by the assertion that Wisconsin in 1955 was only trying to repay what Missouri had provided Wisconsin a century earlier. That approach was over played.” See, for example, Edmund Reim, “As We See It: A Bit of History,” *NL* 41 (24 January 1954): 23–4, who wrote that Wisconsin always recognized its “deep obligation to the Missouri Synod for its service in the early days of our Synod in leading us away from gross unionistic practice and showing us the way to honest Biblical teaching and practice.” Missouri’s criticisms were “bitter medicine, needlessly so,” yet they offered “a most valuable” service. “Missouri was upholding the idea of sound confessionalism, against unionism and indifference.”

<sup>78</sup> F[rederick R.] W[ebber], “The Synodical Conference Still the Largest Body in America,” *NL* 5 (14 July 1918): 110–1.

<sup>79</sup> According to 1927 statistics, the Missouri Synod, with 1,034,404 baptized members, was second in size only to the ULCA among American Lutheran bodies. The Wisconsin Synod had 229,242 baptized members, the Slovak Synod 14,759, and the Norwegian Synod 8,344. “The Latest Lutheran Statistics,” *AL* 11 (April 1928): 1.

of the past alive. It was all right to learn English, one priest counseled, because “in English you must count your dollars, but in German you speak with your children, your confessor, and your God.”<sup>80</sup>

German Lutherans encountered the same uncertainties, and in the familiar phrases of their faith they found a measure of reassurance they may not have yearned for as intensely in the old country. For some “the comforting assurances of religion took on deepened meaning in America.” Religious rites such as baptism, confirmation, communion, marriage, and burial “took on added value, especially when observed in old, familiar language.”<sup>81</sup>

In a 1939 festival address marking the 100th anniversary of the founding of Concordia Seminary, Theodore Buenger insisted it was never Missouri’s policy “to preach only in German.” The accusation that Missouri’s fathers had feared pure doctrine could not be preserved if preached in English was dismissed by Buenger as “one of the silliest slanders” he had ever heard.<sup>82</sup>

Early leaders in both synods advocated the transition to English. In a note to his brother Otto around 1840, C. F. W. Walther expressed the urgent need for translating excerpts of the Lutheran Confessions into English. In 1852 the Missouri Synod discussed establishing an English college at Fort Wayne, Indiana, because “it was self-evident that such an institution would be needed.” A year later *Der Lutheraner* advocated the establishment of English academies so that well-trained youth of the church “might exert a positive influence on the general public.”<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> *The Church of St. Joseph of Yorkville* (New York: n. p., 1932); cited by Jay P. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present* (Garden City, N. Y.: Image Books, 1987), 169.

<sup>81</sup> Alan Graebner, *Uncertain Saints: The Laity in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, 1900–1970* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1975), 10.

<sup>82</sup> Theo. Buenger, “Festival Address at the Academic Service Commemorating the Centennial of the Founding of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, June 3, 1939,” *CTM* 10 (August 1939): 611.

<sup>83</sup> Buenger, “Festival Address,” 611–2.

F. W. Foehlinger charged in 1865 that the argument that it was impossible to preach the gospel as fruitfully in English as in German “cannot be meant seriously” because the gospel was not originally preached in German. One might as well argue that “since the Holy Ghost on the first Pentecost did not preach in the German language, consequently also the Gospel could not be preached as well in the German language as, for instance, in the Greek language.”<sup>84</sup> In the first doctrinal paper presented to the Synodical Conference in 1872, Ohio professor Matthias Loy insisted that “without question” the Evangelical Lutheran Church had as its mission “to proclaim the great deeds of God in the English language in this country.” The Conference could not claim to be relieved of this obligation by ministering only to Germans and Scandinavians, or even by leaving the field to other Lutherans, because “they disseminate false doctrine with disdain.”<sup>85</sup>

An extended series in *The Lutheran Witness* in 1886 and 1887 pleaded:

If we wait till Americans are willing to learn German or Norwegian or Swedish, before we approach them with the pearl of great price, we may as well label our doctrine, our churches, our periodicals, our seminaries, our colleges, our normal schools with the motto: For Germans only and always. This would prove that we are German Levites and Priests, and not Lutheran Samaritans.<sup>86</sup>

Yet early leaders in both synods—Walther, Muehlhaeuser, Hoenecke, August and Franz Pieper, Koehler—worked almost exclusively in German, well into the 20th century. It was not uncommon for Missouri and Wisconsin churches to require worship and instruction be conducted “in

---

<sup>84</sup> F. W. Foehlinger, “*Bildung evang. Luth. Gemeinden unter unsern englisch redenden Nachkommen*,” *LuW* 11 (August 1865): 236–42; cited by H. B. Hemmeter, “The Missouri Synod and English Work,” *CTM* 17 (May 1946): 324–5.

<sup>85</sup> M[atthias] Loy, “Our Duty Toward the English-Speaking Population of our Country,” cited by A. W. Meyes, “The Organization of the Synodical Conference,” in Dau, ed., *Ebenezer*, 329–31.

<sup>86</sup> “The Rightful Claims,” *LW* 5 (21 January 1887): 132.

German forever.”<sup>87</sup> German pastors feared a “tricky translation” of pure Lutheran doctrine. English congregations that gained many new members were suspected of proselyting.<sup>88</sup>

As late as 1911, when 95 percent of communicants in the United Lutheran Synod of the South and 80 percent of General Synod churches used English exclusively in their worship, only 13 percent of churches in the Ohio Synod, 3 percent in the Synodical Conference, and 1 percent or less in Norwegian bodies used English.<sup>89</sup> A Missouri pastor wrote in 1914 that “the German language is here still the everyday language.” He repeated the argument that “experience demonstrated” that “the loss of the German language is frequently accompanied by the loss of true Lutheranism.”<sup>90</sup>

In the Wisconsin Synod, August Pieper granted that “dogmatic concepts can be expressed with clarity and precision in English just as well as German.” Yet he considered the *King James Version* more the product of Calvinism than Lutheranism and characterized English as “the language of a people whose prominent characteristic was a practical materialism, a desire to make money.”<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> F. Dean Lueking, *Mission in the Making: The Missionary Enterprise Among Missouri Synod Lutherans, 1846–1963* (St. Louis: CPH, 1964), 139. Lueking comments, 325, that this requirement was contained in the 1840 constitution of Trinity congregation in St. Louis, served by C. F. W. Walther’s brother Otto, only a year after the Saxon colony had come to America. The original constitution of Emanuel First Ev. Lutheran Church in Lansing, Michigan, in 1856, said that services “should forever be conducted” in German. “Emanuel—God With Us in His Word, 125,” *NL* 68 (18 January 1981): 27.

<sup>88</sup> Roger L. Sommer, “Martin Samuel Sommer (1869–1949),” *CHIQ* 23 (October 1950): 127–8.

<sup>89</sup> “Church News and Comment,” *LW* 30 (28 September 1911): 157.

<sup>90</sup> *Fuenfzehn Ansprachen an neuaufgenommene Glieder* (St. Louis: CPH, 1914), 7; cited by Alan Niehaus Graebner, “The Acculturation of an Immigrant Lutheran Church: The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, 1917–1929” (Ph. D. diss., Columbia University, New York, 1965), 12–3, 108.

<sup>91</sup> Schuetze, “Foreword for Volume 65,” 3–5.

Pieper was reported to have remarked, "*Ich will deutsch selig werden*" ("I want to be saved in German").<sup>92</sup>

Even after harsh anti-German sentiments of World War I, the transition to English came slowly in the Wisconsin Synod. In 1920 only 54 of 737 congregations held any English worship services and only 9 used English exclusively.<sup>93</sup> In Wisconsin's Dakota-Montana District, where pastors were willing to switch to English, congregational members would object, "*Der Heilige Geist kann kein Englisch*" ("The Holy Ghost cannot speak English").<sup>94</sup>

In 1932 seminary Professor August Zich wrote, "We are under necessity to present our faith, the most glorious faith on earth, to the masses of the American people in their language, clearly and faultlessly spoken and written." Zich urged that Luther's writings, doctrinal texts, and church history books be translated into English. Yet in that very 1932 volume of the seminary's *Theologische Quartalschrift*, only 75 of the volume's 304 pages contained any English writing; more than a third of those 75 pages were devoted to book reviews.<sup>95</sup> Old fears remained. "Why not translate all these German works into English?" asked Gustav Westerhaus in 1936. That would solve the problem "if such a translation were possible," but Westerhaus remained skeptical. Translators "clearly do not realize and see what a vast amount of time and effort it would require to translate only the most

---

<sup>92</sup> Kiessling, *History*, 29.

<sup>93</sup> Hartman, "The Growth of the WELS," 33–4.

<sup>94</sup> Herbert A. Birner, "The Saga of a Mission District: Dakota–Montana, the First Ninety Years, 1880–1970," (paper presented to the Dakota–Montana District convention, 14–16 June 1994), 32.

<sup>95</sup> Aug. F. Zich, "On The Need of More Lutheran Books in English," *Qu* 29 (October 1932): 252–6. See also E. E. Kowalke, "German to English," *NL* 49 (18 November 1962): 355, 363.

essential and valuable of these works into English.”<sup>96</sup> As late as 1940 many lectures at Wisconsin’s Thiensville seminary were still given in German.<sup>97</sup>

Many German immigrants came from a tradition of rural stability, with a strong desire to restore and conserve the “old” way of life they saw being destroyed at home.<sup>98</sup> “Ministers and synods of immigrant churches,” observed Marcus Lee Hansen, “have always been less liberal in theology and ecclesiastical practice than the brethren they left behind.”<sup>99</sup> With few exceptions, immigrants did not possess faith in human progress or optimism regarding human nature, as did their American-born neighbors. “Their European antecedents had taught them to be pessimistic, resigned, unhopeful of changing the existing order of things,” wrote Maldwyn Jones. Government was regarded primarily as an evil to be kept at arm’s length, rather than as a good to be embraced for social improvement.<sup>100</sup>

Missouri and Wisconsin synod churches and their leaders exhibited immigrant conservatism regarding the role of government, and on such subjects as dancing, the theater, worldliness, and the role of women in church and society. According to Frederick Luebke, it was only through maintaining its conservatism and emphasizing its differentness from the surrounding culture that

---

<sup>96</sup> G[ustav] A. Westerhaus, “Why Do We Still Stress the Study of German at our Synodical Institutions?” *NL* 23 (19 July 1936): 233. See also P. B., “The Fear of the Fathers,” *NL* 37 (1 January 1950): 9; (15 January 1950): 22.

<sup>97</sup> Birner, “The Saga of a Mission District,” 32.

<sup>98</sup> Carol K. Coburn, *Life at Four Corners. Religion, Gender, and Education in a German-Lutheran Community, 1868-1945* (Lawrence, Kans.: University of Kansas Press, 1992), 9.

<sup>99</sup> Marcus Lee Hansen, *The Immigrant in American History* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940), 82-3.

<sup>100</sup> Maldwyn Allen Jones, *American Immigration* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), 231.

Missourians believed they could preserve their religious identity.<sup>101</sup> August Graebner likened the Christian in the world to a passenger on a train that becomes unwillingly thrust into an impromptu race with another car on a parallel track. The passenger is unavoidably involved but not responsible for the outcome of the race or the catastrophe that may result from it. Likewise a Christian is present but not accountable for injustices that occur in the world.<sup>102</sup> A Wisconsin Synod critique of the social gospel accused “one of the strongest denominations in our country” of being, like Martha, “cumbered about much serving.” Busying oneself with tasks that did not serve the gospel only resulted in wasted time, diminished strength, and loss of standing in the community.<sup>103</sup>

To the social gospel’s slogan “The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man,” Missouri’s Theodore Graebner countered that there is a fatherhood of God through faith in Jesus and a brotherhood among believers, but “outside the invisible Christian church there is neither fatherhood nor spiritual brotherhood.”<sup>104</sup> Forsaking the church’s primary mission of saving souls, the social gospel seeks to make society better “by teaching the advantage of window screens, germless cess pools, and painless dehorners to the farmers, and to the city dwellers the necessity of wide-topped

---

<sup>101</sup> Frederick C. Luebke, “The Immigrant Condition as a Factor Contributing to the Conservatism of the Lutheran Church,” *CHIQ* 38 (April 1965): 27.

<sup>102</sup> A[ugust] L. Graebner, “*In der Welt, nicht von der Welt*,” *DL* 50 (14 August 1894): 135; cited by Alan Graebner, *Uncertain Saints*, 111.

<sup>103</sup> [Fred] G[raeber], “Be Ye Steadfast,” *NL* 2 (21 September 1915): 138. See also H[ans] K. M[oussa], “Render Unto Caesar,” *NL* 1 (21 April 1914): 57. J[ohn] B[renner], “Urges Lutherans to Political Activity,” *NL* 3 (21 September 1916): 138–9. H[ans] K. M[oussa], “Worth of Serious Consideration,” *NL* 8 (7 August 1921): 245–6. J[ohn] J[enny], “Pressing the Church into Politics,” *NL* 9 (5 February 1922): 35. [August F.] Z[ich], “Strange Gods,” *NL* 23 (1 March 1936): 68. I[mmanuel] P. F[rey], “Church Forums,” *NL* 25 (19 June 1938): 199–200. [August F.] Z[ich], “The Political Neutrality of the Church,” (25 September 1938): 309–10.

<sup>104</sup> Theodore Graebner, “The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man,” *LW* 36 (6 February 1917): 38–9.

nursing bottles for infants, playgrounds for the children, and properly chaperoned dances for the factory girls.”<sup>105</sup>

Quoting playwright Emile Zola, Missouri’s Martin Sommer charged that any discussion of innocence on the stage was “useless” because “it does not exist.” At the theater “modesty and purity are laughed at,” evil desires considered “but a jest,” and marriage employed as “merely a source of ridicule.”<sup>106</sup> A 1927 *Lutheran Witness* editorialist argued that “the chief motive for dancing, as a rule, is to satisfy the lust of the flesh.”<sup>107</sup> A Prof. Muenstenberg, whose book *Psychology and Sanity* contained chapters “dealing with the craze for dancing,” was cited as an authority that “license, eroticism, and imitativeness in high degree” were stirred up “by dancing movements.”<sup>108</sup>

Franz Pieper opposed women’s suffrage in 1913 as “contrary to the natural order,” warning that “wherever this order is perverted, His punishments are sure to follow.”<sup>109</sup> In 1925 Pieper cited the inauguration of a woman governor in Texas as proof “that even before its end the world has

---

<sup>105</sup> Theodore Graebner, “Reject the ‘Social’ Gospel,” *LW* 36 (12 June 1917): 182–3.

<sup>106</sup> [Martin] S[ommer], “Morality and the Stage,” *LW* 34 (27 July 1915): 235. See also H[ans] K. M[oussa], “Modern Dictators of Fashion,” *NL* 1 (7 January 1914): 6. [Fred] G[raeber], “Are You a Theater-Goer?” (21 January 1914): 9–10. H[ans] K. M[oussa], “The Age of Audacity,” *NL* 3 (21 January 1916): 9. J[ohn] B[renner], “The Vampire of Movieland,” (7 May 1916): 65–6. J[ohn] B[renner], “Waking Up?” (21 September 1916): 137–8. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Parents’ Duties,” *Qu* 18 (July 1921): 193–4. I[mmanuel] P. F[rey], “Boycotts and the Church,” *NL* 23 (29 March 1936): 104.

<sup>107</sup> “The Dance,” *LW* 46 (28 June 1927): 218–9.

<sup>108</sup> “The Dance,” *LW* 34 (6 April 1915): 110. See also [Fred] G[raeber], “Jazz and the Dance,” *NL* 8 (20 February 1921): 51. H[ans] K. M[oussa], “At Last! An Argument For Dancing,” *NL* 8 (27 November 1921): 374–5. O. Hensel, “The Christian Mother and the Dance of Her Children,” *NL* 11 (13 January 1924): 8–12; (27 January 1924): 25–7; (10 February 1924): 39–41.

<sup>109</sup> Franz Pieper, “The Layman’s Movement in the Light of God’s Word,” in *What is Christianity? and Other Essays*, trans. John Theodore Mueller (St. Louis: CPH, 1933), 157.



completely lost all common sense.”<sup>110</sup> A woman was to obey her husband, although her obedience was to be that of a wife, not a servant or a child.<sup>111</sup> Contraception made the marriage bed “far filthier than a pigsty.” Preventing conception was “the sin of the age.” Recalling how Onan had practiced conception prevention, only to be slain by the Lord,<sup>112</sup> the writer warned that although God “may not visit that dire punishment at once on such as perpetrate the same wrong today, still: ‘The soul that sinneth, it shall die.’”<sup>113</sup>

Missouri and Wisconsin Synod stands on dancing, the theater, and other social ills put them in good company with “Puritanical” Protestants. But Lutherans parted company with these Protestants on drinking and smoking. Early writings consistently warned against drunkenness,<sup>114</sup> but total abstinence was never considered a biblical command.<sup>115</sup> Pastors knew many of their

---

<sup>110</sup> F[rantz] P[ieper], “*Kirchliche-Zeitgeschichtliches: Texas hat einen weiblichen Gouverneur*,” *LuW* 71 (February 1925): 61.

<sup>111</sup> [Martin] S[ommer], “The Wife’s Obedience,” *LW* 34 (1 June 1915): 174. See also J[ohn] B[renner], “‘What’s in a Name?’” *NL* 9 (5 February 1922): 38–9.

<sup>112</sup> Genesis 38:8-10.

<sup>113</sup> Alan Graebner, “Birth Control and the Lutherans: The Missouri Synod as a Case Study,” Janet Wilson James, ed., *Women in American Religion* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980), 236. A. W. Meyer, “Marriage a Success,” *LW* 34 (6 April 1915): 100–2. See also W. H. T. Dau, “Regarding Birth Control,” *TM* 5 (February 1925): 51. [Martin] S[ommer], “Birth Control and Divorces,” *LW* 46 (11 January 1927): 8–9. J[ohn] B[renner], “Birth Control,” *NL* 3 (7 July 1916): 99. [Fred] G[raeber], “Birth Rate Regulation and Wars,” *NL* 7 (12 December 1920): 388–9. [August F.] Z[ich], “Birth Control,” *NL* 17 (21 December 1930): 406. [August F.] Z[ich], “The Falling Birthrate and Christianity,” *NL* 18 (30 August 1931): 275.

<sup>114</sup> See, for example, “*Luther ueber die Trunkenheit*,” *DL* 11 (19 March 1850): 109–10. “*Verhandlungen: Temperenz-Gesellschaft*,” *DL* 10 (6 December 1853): 62. “*Die alten Kirchenvaeter ueber die Suende der Trunkenheit*,” *DL* 11 (24 October 1854): 38–9. “*Mein Lieber Hans!*” *DL* 18 (13 November 1861): 49–51. “It Was Drink That Did It!” *LW* 17 (7 June 1889): 7. “What Drink Had Done For Him,” *LW* 20 (21 June 1901): 15–6. I[mmanuel] P. F[rey], “Liquor-Guzzling Girls,” *NL* 23 (5 January 1936): 7–8.

<sup>115</sup> See J[ohn] Schaller, review of *Religion and Drink* by E. A. Wasson, in *Qu* 12 (October 1915): 276–9. F. S., “Prohibition and the Saloon,” *NL* 4 (21 April 1917): 61–3; (7 May 1917): 68–9.

parishioners drank beer and wine in their homes and at restaurants and in beer gardens. They did point out that saloons abounded with temptations and Christians were wise to avoid them.<sup>116</sup> Richard Jensen called the Missouri Synod “the most thoroughly wet denomination in America, or in the world, for that matter.”<sup>117</sup> Smoking was a popular habit at Concordia Seminary.<sup>118</sup> When asked whether it was proper for a seminary student to smoke, Friederich Bente replied, “Don’t you smoke?” When the student answered, “No, sir,” Bente lit a cigar and told him, “You are not yet a real Missourian.”<sup>119</sup>

*The certainty of their convictions*

Real Missourians and Wisconsinites were known most for the certainty of their doctrinal convictions. They were convinced that they alone possessed the entire truth of Scripture, and they would practice church fellowship only with those churches that were in full agreement with them.

In an 1871 tract Walther defended the claim that the Evangelical Lutheran Church was “the true visible church on earth.”

---

<sup>116</sup> George Stoeckhardt, “*Der Saloon*,” *DL* 64 (7 April 1908): 106–8; (21 April 1908): 123–5; cited by Alan Graebner, *Uncertain Saints*, 13. *Northwest District Proceedings, 1875*, 48–61; *Eastern District Proceedings, 1883*, 45–9; Oswald F. Wagner, “Missouri in Montana,” *Montana District Proceedings, 1964*, 67; cited by Frederick C. Luebke, “Politics and Missouri Synod Lutherans: A Historiographical Review,” *CHIQ* 45 (May 1972): 152. M. Brueggemann, “Prohibition,” *LW* 35 (25 January 1916): 17.

<sup>117</sup> Richard Jensen, *The Winning of the Midwest: Social and Political Conflict, 1888–1896* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), 8.

<sup>118</sup> Hugo Hanser, a student during Walther’s time, wrote in his diary that seminary students smoked long *Studentenpfeifen* as they studied at their desks before classes. At five minutes before nine “the pipes were set in a corner, and all the windows were opened so as to clear the air for theological debate” when Walther arrived. Hugo Hanser, *Diary*, 1; trans. Roy A. Suelflow, “The History of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Part I,” *CHIQ* 24 (July 1951): 60.

<sup>119</sup> Eric C. Stumpf, “Memories of Graduates, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1910–1923,” *CHIQ* 59 (Spring 1986): 18. See also I[mmanuel] P. F[rey], “The Cigarette Shortage,” *NL* 32 (18 March 1945): 51. Herman Otten, in an undated clipping in *Christian News*, said he was told that “C. F. W. Walther smoked so much that his parrot couldn’t live in his study. Past theologians did not know what modern science has shown about the dangers of cigarette smoking.”

To be sure, our opponents are much offended by this statement and say: “Yes, we hold that the Lutheran Church is *a* church of Christ, but not *the* church.” This objection obviously rests upon the idea that there is not only one, but a number of true churches and therefore the Lutheran church has no right to claim this name. . . . But with this sweet dream of many true churches, whereby they quietly comfort themselves, they only soothe their consciences which cry out. Thus they openly testify of themselves that they are a sect and not the church of Christ.<sup>120</sup>

At Walther’s funeral sermon in 1887, George Stoeckhardt announced, “We are in possession of the truth—the entire, undiminished truth—because we know Christ crucified, and desire to know nothing beside Him.”<sup>121</sup> Ten years later, at the synod’s golden anniversary, Friederich Bente wrote that Missouri occupied “the very same doctrinal position as the Christians of the first century”—maybe better: what “the congregation in Rome or Corinth knew in the year of our Lord 97, or should have known, just that and not one whit more Trinity Church in St. Louis in 1897 knows.”<sup>122</sup> Franz Pieper insisted in 1905 that “as certainly as Holy Scripture is God’s Word—which it is—so certain is it that our doctrine is correct.” Therefore, “whoever contests our doctrinal position contends against the divine truth.”<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup> *Was ist ein Lutheran? oder warum nennst du dich “lutherisch?”* (published by the Deutsch-amerikanischen evangelisch-lutherischen Tractat Verein (St. Louis, n. d.), 11; cited by Lueking, *Mission in the Making*, 65.

<sup>121</sup> W. H. T. Dau, trans., “Dr. George Stoeckhardt,” *TQ* 17 (April 1913): 68. Stoeckhardt’s funeral sermon for Walther appeared originally as “*Rede gehalten bei der Ueberfuehring Leiche des sel. Dr. Walther aus dem Seminargebaeude in die Dreieinigkeitskirche*,” *DL* 43 (1 June 1887): 86.

<sup>122</sup> *Proceedings, Western District, 1897*, 31–2; quoted by Quentin F. Wesselschmidt, “Repristination Theology and the Doctrinal Position of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod,” in John W. Klotz, ed., *Light for Our World: Essays Commemorating the 150th Anniversary of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri* (St. Louis: CPH, 1989), 94.

<sup>123</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1905*, 17; cited by Fred W. Meuser, “Business as Usual—Almost, 1900–1917,” in E. Clifford Nelson, ed., *The Lutherans in North America* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 377. Meuser also cited Friederich Bente’s editorial marking the 50th anniversary of Missouri’s *Lehre und Wehre* in 1904, in which Bente insisted that *Lehre und Wehre* had been kept untarnished by false teaching and had therefore no cause to repent or seek forgiveness for what it taught because “that would be to accuse God Himself, indeed, to mock God, who has commanded that these very doctrines be taught.” F[riederich] B[ente], “Vorwort,” *Lehre und Wehre* 50 (January 1904): 1–20.

There was in Missouri “a deep-seated belief that it had never undergone theological change,”<sup>124</sup> coupled with an extremely high respect for the Synod’s fathers and “a heavy emphasis on *reine Lehre*.”<sup>125</sup> A pastor who entered the ministry in 1920 remarked how “it soon became evident that the doctrinal stance of the Synod rested quite heavily upon the opinion of the fathers.” Walther, Stoeckhardt, Pieper, and *Lehre und Wehre* were “constantly quoted as authorities in theological matters.” Anyone who quarreled with their stand or questioned their authority “was immediately labeled as ‘liberal’ and even ‘heretical.’”<sup>126</sup>

The Wisconsin Synod praised Missouri’s orthodoxy and sought to emulate it. *Northwestern Lutheran* editorialist John Jenny called it “a wonder of God before our eyes” that Missouri and Wisconsin as “separate synods” testified to “the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,” rejecting any compromise of their teachings to liberalism and “refusing to fraternize with any church body that will not accept our Evangelical Confession.”<sup>127</sup>

Wisconsin also demonstrated the certainty of its convictions. *The Lutheran*, magazine of the General Council, reported on a Pastor Beer who applied for a colloquium to the Wisconsin Synod in

---

In “The Twenties—Continued Change, at a Slower Pace,” Nelson, ed., *The Lutherans in North America*, 433, Meuser observed that the new Concordia Seminary in St. Louis dwarfed all other Lutheran seminaries in beauty, excellence and cost, calling it “a monument to the Missouri Synod’s reaffirmation of its heritage and confidence for its future.” Its 1926 dedication, widely covered by the press and attended by 75,000 people, was preserved on film for posterity to mark “a new stage in Missouri’s sense of permanence and mission.” Having built the best, the Missouri Synod “was determined to remain the best as far as strict Lutheranism was concerned.”

<sup>124</sup> James W. Albers, “The History of Attitudes Within the Missouri Synod Toward Life Insurance” (Th. D. diss., Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1972), 1.

<sup>125</sup> Robinson, “The Spirit of Triumphalism,” iii.

<sup>126</sup> Harold H. Engelbrecht, “Concerning ‘A Statement,’” *CHIQ* 43 (November 1970): 167.

<sup>127</sup> J[ohn] J[enny], “Golden Jubilee of the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America,” *NL* 9 (25 June 1922): 196. See also J[ohn] J[enny], “Diamond Anniversary of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States,” (28 May 1922): 174. [August F.] Z[ich], “Taking Heed Unto the Doctrine,” *NL* 23 (2 August 1936): 248.

1898 in order to become a professor at its college in Watertown. A member of the Wisconsin Synod commented:

We are somewhat at a loss to discover his unity in the faith with us, and have consigned him to the relay depot [*auf die Wartebank gesetzt*]. He does not want to become an Ohioan or Iowan, but neither does he want to become an out and out Missourian. . . .

Then we had private discussions with him in Watertown, which showed that B. did not occupy a correct position with regard to the power of the Word. At the second colloquium here in Milwaukee, B. changed his position in regard to the State to our satisfaction, but a yawning chasm between him and us remained in regard to the doctrine of the efficacy of the Word.

B. declared our position—that Scripture in all doctrines produces in us a divine conviction, or makes us infallibly certain, so that we can with infallible certainty state in regard to all doctrines: “So Scripture teaches,”— . . . to be deficient logic and a piece of Papism. Scripture doctrine, he held, is objectively certain, but as soon as it passes through the mind of man and is reproduced by man in the form of a doctrine, infallibility can no longer be predicated of it; we can, in that case, speak only of the conception of individuals. In short, Beer is an Erasmus; he refuses to come to any definite conclusion, as Luther says; he really has a different spirit from us. . . . His greatest material defect is this, that he does not draw his knowledge directly from Scripture, and his conscience is not yet in entire captivity to the Word of God, so as to cause him to know nothing but the Word.

*The Lutheran's* editor, G. F. Krotel, considered such declarations of “divine conviction” and “infallible certainty” to be “cut out of the same cloth as the doctrines of papal infallibility.”<sup>128</sup>

There was no practicing fellowship with other Christians, or even with non-Synodical Conference Lutherans. Complete doctrinal agreement was prerequisite for any expressions of church union. Article 4 of the Synodical Conference constitution rejected “all ecclesiastical union and cooperation that is not based upon the pure Lutheran faith,” including mixed congregations,

---

<sup>128</sup> “The Lutheran Witness,” *Lu 2* (30 June 1898): 616. Although *The Lutheran* cited this story from an account in Missouri’s *Lutheran Witness* and referred to alleged “anti-Missourian fervor,” it was clear to *The Lutheran's* editor that an identical doctrinal spirit existed in both synods: “The colloquium would have been the same, of course, if he had applied to Missouri.”

exchanging pulpits, open communion, and the formation of religious societies with sectarians.<sup>129</sup>

“Missouri and Wisconsin were not known for peculiar teachings about justification by faith,” Martin Marty has observed, “but for their refusal to pray with others.”<sup>130</sup>

The signal event that solidified Missouri’s narrow practice of prayer fellowship was the bitter rupture between Missouri and Ohio in the predestination controversy. After enduring charges of Calvinism from F. A. Schmidt in his publication *Neues und Altes*, Missouri resolved at its 1881 convention: “We can no longer walk together. We also cannot pray with one another any longer. For you [the Ohio Synod] will pray for our and we for your conversion.” Such joint prayer “is an abomination in the sight of God.” Missouri then instructed its delegates to the next year’s Synodical Conference convention neither to sit with nor to recognize any synod that had publicly accused the Missouri Synod of Calvinism.<sup>131</sup>

Two decades later, following the third of five free conferences held between the Iowa, and Ohio synods and the Synodical Conference in 1904 at Detroit, Friederich Bente explained why Missourians had so resolutely refused Ohioan and Iowan requests to open these free conferences with prayer. “The disagreements between the Synodical Conference and their detractors,” Bente wrote, “certainly cannot be classified as nitpicking, but as of great and evident doctrine, clearly revealed in God’s Word and of utmost importance to the welfare of the church.” Missouri would “consider it treason to the divine truth” to sit “with hands in lap” while Ohioans and Iowans forged ahead. Bente

---

<sup>129</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1890*, 34, trans. Edmund Stahlnecker; cited by Carl S. Meyer, “The Missouri Synod and Other Lutherans Before 1918,” in Carl S. Meyer, ed., *Moving Frontiers*, 267.

<sup>130</sup> Martin E. Marty, *Modern American Religion, Volume 1: The Irony of it All, 1893–1919* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 178.

<sup>131</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1881*, 30–1, 45; cited in *Fellowship Then and Now: Concerning the Impasse in the Intersynodical Discussions on Church Fellowship* (Milwaukee: WELS Commission on Doctrinal Matters, 1961), 14.

cited various doctrinal errors in these two “adversary” church bodies, along with chief scriptural references forbidding “all communion of faith and prayer under these circumstances.”<sup>132</sup>

Speaking specifically to prayer fellowship, Bente argued that Ohioans and Missourians could not pray together because “their teachings are as far apart as the earth’s poles” and so “their prayers drift apart and against one another.” Not even the Lord’s Prayer could be offered together “with the same implication.” Missourians could never join in worship with an Iowan or Ohioan because he “would pray publicly for God to dissuade [Missourians] from their ways and convert them to the Ohioan synergism.” Prayer union with “adversaries” in the Iowa and Ohio synods would inevitably involve “lies and deceit, controversy and inconsequence.”<sup>133</sup>

Bente also regarded the practice of joint prayer as a “slippery slope” that would inevitably lead to other expressions of fellowship:

It follows logically that the Synodical Conference could not have stopped at liturgical prayer services. The Conference would have had to push on inexorably, further even than the Ohioans and Iowans would have wanted to go. Those who say “A” and join the Ohioans and Iowans together in prayer and worship must also say “B” and institute joint preaching and the Lord’s Supper. Anyone who offers joint prayer with the Ohioans has granted them the deepest and most intimate fellowship a Christian can give; he cannot deny them any other form of brotherly harmony. There is no closer communion on earth than when people come together in the name of Jesus to pour out the common desires of their heart before God. . . . If we unite with the Ohioans in prayer, we must also invite them to our altars and bring them to our pulpits and recommend their churches, pulpits and altars to our pastors and lay people, and must silence all polemics.<sup>134</sup>

Wisconsin’s Adolf Hoenecke wrote in his *Ev. Lutheran Dogmatik* that “to refrain completely from all prayer fellowship and fellowship in worship with those who are of a different faith”

---

<sup>132</sup> Friederich Bente, “*Warum koennen wir keine gemeinsame Gottesdienste mit Ohioern und Iowaern veranstalten und abhalten?*” *LuW* 51 (March 1905): 99–104. An English translation of Bente’s article is in the WLS essay file, although the name of the translator is not indicated.

<sup>133</sup> Bente, “*Warum?*” 109–10.

<sup>134</sup> Bente, “*Warum?*” 110–1. Edward Fredrich suggested that Bente’s comments constitute “an argument for a ‘unit concept’ of fellowship even if that term is not used.” *WSL*, 280.

constituted the only proper course of action in agreement with God's Word. Prayer fellowship with errorists sets aside the duty to confess Christ, "and this confession includes everything that Scripture teaches about Him, His person, His office, His work." Citing injunctions in 1 Thessalonians 5:22 and 2 Corinthians 6:14 to "abstain from every form of evil" and to avoid being "unequally yoked" together with unbelievers, Hoenecke argued that unionism "opens the doors wide to indifferentism. . . .

All unionism is based on the assumption that the truth of Scripture will not be urged in earnest, especially not in so far as it condemns *all* errors, even the smallest, and warns against them as poison to the soul. For as soon as this would be done, such a union would collapse.<sup>135</sup>

*"Amalgamation would mean disbanding the Wisconsin Synod"*

With such similarities in culture and background, and with mutual admiration for one another's doctrinal purity, why did the two synods never become one?

Had Walther had his way, they would have. Following Missouri's recognition of Wisconsin's orthodoxy, Walther sought to persuade congregations belonging to the various member synods of the Synodical Conference to relinquish their synodical affiliation, in order to form united state bodies. Such a "state synod plan" was outlined at the 1873 Synodical Conference convention. Wisconsin initially expressed enthusiasm for such a plan, hoping it would aid in "the more powerful unfolding of the gifts and powers" given to the church; soon, however, Wisconsin objected to Missouri's presumption that such territorial division was "the one correct and normal method, and that every other one is *per se* disorderly." By 1875 Missouri claimed apostolic warrant for dividing

---

<sup>135</sup> Adolf Hoenecke, *Ev. Luth. Dogmatik*, III (Milwaukee: NPH, 1912), 441–2; cited in *Fellowship Then and Now*, 31; emphasis in the translation. See also H[ans] K. M[oussa], "Federation Plans," *NL* 2 (21 June 1915): 89. H[ans] K. M[oussa], "Conventions and Invocations," *NL* 3 (7 July 1916): 97–8. [Fred] G[raeber], "Prayers at Convention," *NL* 7 (22 July 1920): 210. [Fred] G[raeber], "Why Prayer At All?" *NL* 8 (6 February 1921): 36–7. H[ans] K. M[oussa], "At Last, Chicago Becomes Religious," *NL* 12 (22 February 1925): 53–4. [August F.] Z[ich], "Sobering Words," *NL* 23 (10 May 1936): 149–50. [August F.] Z[ich], "The Christian and Other Churches," (10 May 1936): 151–2. [August F.] Z[ich], "Narrowmindedness," *NL* 25 (22 May 1938): 165.



territories into geographic parishes. To have two church bodies in doctrinal agreement competing against each other, Missouri maintained, militated against love and gave offense.<sup>136</sup>

In essence, Wisconsin was being asked to “die a graceful death in favor of Missouri.”<sup>137</sup> If a “state synod of Wisconsin” were to be formed, and if Missouri Synod members in the state of Wisconsin were to join that state synod, and if that “state synod of Wisconsin” were then to vote in favor of joining the larger Missouri Synod, soon there would no longer be a Wisconsin Synod. Wisconsin remained unconvinced of the necessity and the advisability of forming one organizational body. “One should guard against the allegation that territorial division is the only true order, and everything else is disorder.” Wisconsin’s August Ernst advised, “Do not put too much stock in constitutional projects.”<sup>138</sup>

The showdown came at Wisconsin’s 1877 convention at Watertown. When Missouri’s District President Karl Strassen insisted that two church bodies inwardly united must necessarily form an outward union, and that Wisconsin’s unwillingness to do so revealed that “the Wisconsin Synod does not love the Missouri Synod,” Wisconsin’s Adolf Hoenecke was quick to respond:

It is no more necessary for two church bodies which agree in doctrine and practice, to desire to be united in one body, than it would be for two Christian persons who love each other to want to marry. We love each other as two church bodies, yet it is not necessary for us to be joined organically.<sup>139</sup>

---

<sup>136</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1871*, 28. *SC Proceedings, 1874*, 15; *1876*, 15–6. All cited by David Schmiel, “State Synods and Geographic Parishes: The Abortive Movement of the 1870’s,” *CHIQ* 38 (January 1966): 193.

<sup>137</sup> Roy Arthur Suelflow, “The History of the Missouri Synod during the Second Twenty-Five Years of its Existence” (Ph. D. diss., Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1946), 65.

<sup>138</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1874*, 15. August Ernst, “*Ein Wort ueber Staatensynoden*,” *GB* 12 (1 May 1877): 6. Both cited by Schmiel, “State Synods,” 194–5.

<sup>139</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1877*, 27; in Schmiel, “State Synods,” 195.

August Pieper, in attendance at that 1877 convention, recalled hearing one delegate remark, “We have a history of our own behind us, and we do not intend to deny that.”<sup>140</sup>

According to Roy Suelflow, Wisconsin’s “stubbornness” could be explained only by its fear of “losing prestige if it were to get too close to the larger and more important synods of Missouri and Ohio.”<sup>141</sup> Walther even accused the Wisconsin Synod of committing a *widergoettlich* (ungodly) trespass against Christian liberty.<sup>142</sup> According to Koehler, the intersynodical animosity occasioned by Wisconsin’s rejection of the state synod plan “did not abate in smaller Wisconsin and especially Minnesota circles for years.”<sup>143</sup> Wisconsin “acquired a not altogether deserved image of an isolationist and individualistic church body.”<sup>144</sup>

---

<sup>140</sup> “Reminiscences from Professor August Pieper,” *WHIJ* 1 (Fall 1983): 53.

<sup>141</sup> Roy Arthur Suelflow, “History of the Missouri Synod,” 55. While this observation appears justified, Suelflow’s continued discussion of the failure of the state synod plan turns unduly harsh. Suelflow recalled Walther’s repeated warnings at the first Synodical Conference convention against the dangers of seeking to win souls for the attainment of individual synodical honor. Citing no supporting evidence for his claim, Suelflow then wrote, 56–7, “Probably [Walther] knew *the character of the Wisconsin men quite well*, and tried to avoid just such a display of petty jealousies”; emphasis added. Schmiel, “History of the Relationship,” 56–7, though acknowledging that such an attitude “can be categorized as nothing other than sin,” charged that “it was to be found in individuals of both synods.” To blame one synod but not the other is “questionable historiography.” The original wording of the state synod plan indicated that the Missouri and Ohio synods were to remain intact, and each state synod to be organized could affiliate only with those two synods. “Wisconsin’s objections always pointed to this, and that the final formulation of the Synodical Conference recognized the validity of this objection by removing the offending stipulation, seems to be ample evidence that Wisconsin’s hesitation was justifiable.”

<sup>142</sup> Schmiel, “History of the Relationship,” 52.

<sup>143</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 160.

<sup>144</sup> Edward C. Fredrich, “Wisconsin’s First Federation Memberships,” *WLQ* 73 (October 1976): 278–9. Hans Moussa wrote in 1925 that “there was at all times a healthy opposition” in the Wisconsin Synod to anything like the state synod plan. Some might view such opposition as the application to the church of the axiom that “competition is the life of trade.” Others may emphasize the importance of allowing organizations to follow their historical traditions. Still others may warn against the dangers inherent in mere size and hugeness of organization. “It is debatable,” Moussa concluded, “whether desirable uniformity is not better served by having a number of independent units rather than by having a huge, unwieldy mass, that can be taught the goose-step—at the sacrifice

Admittedly, the Missouri Synod had grown more rapidly to become considerably larger than the Wisconsin Synod. Missouri grew 58 percent during its first three years, 343 percent during the 1850s, and another 154 percent during the 1860s, so that by its silver anniversary in 1872 it numbered 415 pastors serving 77,832 members in 26 states. During the next quarter century it grew more than 800 percent to 687,334 baptized members in 1,986 congregations and 683 additional preaching stations. By the turn of the century, Missouri had members in all but three states in the United States, plus 42 congregations in Canada.<sup>145</sup> Add to that the synod's burgeoning efforts in foreign missions, its extensive establishment of Christian day schools<sup>146</sup> and its system of Concordia colleges, and the prodigious output of its Concordia Publishing House<sup>147</sup>—all combined to produce what some observers called an extraordinary synodical *esprit de corps* and others labeled “triumphalism.”

---

of initiative and individualism.” H[ans] K. M[oussa], “Seventy-five Years of the Wisconsin Synod in Brief Survey,” *NL* 12 (1 November 1925): 344.

<sup>145</sup> Weisheit, *The Zeal of His House*, 43, 57. Baepler, *A Century of Grace*, 167, 217.

<sup>146</sup> Missouri writers admired Catholicism's commitment to parochial education. Noting the “surprisingly rapid progress” of the Catholic church in America, a *Lutheran Witness* observer remarked that “whenever parochial schools have been established, the church has grown.” The reason for “the unparalleled growth” of the Missouri Synod was “chiefly because the founders of our Synod have from the beginning seen the necessity and benefit of parochial schools wherever they were placed.” E. Heinemann, “Some Thoughts About Parochial Schools,” *LW* 1 (21 March 1883): 168. Christian Day Schools proved to be powerful missionary agencies. Through its schools Missouri churches contacted and then incorporated thousands of new immigrants. The pastor of St. James church in Chicago baptized 586 children in 1883 alone, and more than 13,000 during his twenty-seven year ministry. *Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of St. James Evangelical Lutheran Congregation, Chicago, Illinois, 1944*, 6–7; cited by Albert G. Merkens, “Early Lutheran Settlers and Schools in Northern Illinois,” *CHIQ* 21 (January 1949): 185.

<sup>147</sup> See E[dward] Seuel, “Publication Activity of the Missouri Synod,” in Dau, ed., *Ebenezer*, 293–5. Otto A. Dorn, “Early Printing in the Missouri Synod,” *CHIQ* 24 (April 1951): 1–23. Albert W. Galen, “Concordia Publishing House's One Hundred Years,” *CHIQ* 42 (November 1969): 158–67. CPH became the third largest Protestant publishing house in the United States. Adams, *Preus of Missouri*, 16.

Missouri's sense of *esprit de corps* stood "unsurpassed by any American denomination at any time in its history."<sup>148</sup> Reaching its peak in the 1930s, it was, in Leigh Jordahl's estimation, a synodical loyalty "not always indistinguishable from chauvinism."<sup>149</sup> August Pieper characterized Missouri's spirit as "remarkably intense," a "strongly pronounced synodical patriotism, a strong tendency to stick together, not only against all enemies, but also over against friendly synods." Though "essentially a Christian, spiritual thing," Pieper also recognized "quite a human element in all of this" and noted "some things that are offensive."<sup>150</sup>

Leigh Jordahl suggested that "a sharp motif of triumphalism" pervaded Missouri history.<sup>151</sup> Analogous to "Manifest Destiny" in American political history, Jack T. Robinson defined triumphalism as "that deep and abiding motivating force, unarticulated," coloring the life of the Missouri Synod, that "looked for the final conquest of all opponents" and "required perfect harmony among those who would conquer."<sup>152</sup>

Although Adolf Hoenecke held Walther in high personal regard and appreciated his doctrinal orthodoxy, he acquired a certain dislike for some of Missouri's methods and manners. Hoenecke felt

---

<sup>148</sup> Kuster, "Fellowship Dispute," 80.

<sup>149</sup> Jordahl, introduction to *HWS*, ix.

<sup>150</sup> August Pieper, "Anniversary Reflections," 245.

<sup>151</sup> Leigh D. Jordahl, review of *Moving Frontiers* by Carl S. Meyer, *Una Sancta* 22 (Pentecost 1965): 51–6.

<sup>152</sup> Robinson, "The Spirit of Triumphalism," 18. A more recent chronicler of Missouri history, Robert M. Hess, "Prayer Fellowship in the First Half of Synod's History" (master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1985), 31–2, criticized Robinson's selective research:

"While it may appear to Robinson from his very selective choice of material that Missouri came at fellowship with an overpowering spirit of conquest, the fact is that Missouri was quite aware of its shortcomings. . . . Robinson is guilty of the type of research which comes at research only to find material to support his presuppositions. This biased approach not only enables him to fit presuppositions and conclusions snugly together, but causes him to ignore material which might get in the way of his conclusions, or even cause him to alter them."

it better that Wisconsin carry on its own work according to its own inclinations in peace with Missouri.<sup>153</sup> In 1878 Hoenecke also remarked to J. P. Koehler, “There is something sectarian about Missouri.”<sup>154</sup>

Koehler sometimes directed harsh words at Missouri’s “cocksureness.” Synodical literature “since the very founding of the Synodical Conference” revealed that the relationship between the two synods “was not entirely as it appeared on the surface.” Missourians followed Walther’s lead on such ideas as the state synod plan because they were his “devoted disciples.” The desire for a large, uniform church organization “was the nature of such a well-disciplined, single-minded, large, successful body.” Wisconsin, Koehler said, felt just the opposite “because of an inferiority complex, superinduced by its continued insecurity.”<sup>155</sup>

August Pieper remarked on “the Missouri Spirit” that grew out of “the extreme narrowness” of its almost exclusive use of “dogmatic-practical education” learned from Walther. “It was psychologically inevitable that a bad attitude became entrenched in many in the synod.” Missourians boasted they were “the only ones who are completely orthodox and competent,” manifesting that attitude not only toward Lutheran bodies outside their fellowship “but also toward those which in the course of time were recognized as sufficiently Lutheran”—undoubtedly a reference to the Wisconsin Synod.<sup>156</sup>

---

<sup>153</sup> August Pieper, “The Significance of Dr. Adolf Hoenecke,” 378–9. August Pieper, “Anniversary Reflections,” 278.

<sup>154</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 251–2. Jordahl, xxiv, explained: “Neither Hoenecke in making the remark nor Koehler reflecting upon it intended to fault the doctrinal position of the Missourians, but both rather had reference to a certain mind set.”

<sup>155</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 166.

<sup>156</sup> August Pieper, “Anniversary Reflections,” 266–7. Nevertheless, Edward Fredrich remarked that as his seminary teacher Pieper “could wax eloquent when describing his debts” to his teacher Walther. E[dward] C. Fredrich, Review of *Editorials from “Lehre und Wehre,”* translated by J. A. Bouman, *WLQ* 79 (Winter 1982): 76.

Though Wisconsin grew more slowly than her big sister (Missouri was half again as large in 1897 as Wisconsin is more than a century later), its emergence from unpromising beginnings was nonetheless impressive. The 1915 statistics of the four synods that merged to become the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States<sup>157</sup> two years later show Wisconsin to be by far the largest of the bodies with 306 pastors, 150,000 baptized members, and 438 congregations and preaching stations. An additional 46,555 baptized members came from the Minnesota, Michigan, and Nebraska synods—Minnesota being twice as large as Michigan, and Michigan being almost five times as large as Nebraska.<sup>158</sup>

In contrast to Missouri's energetic world mission efforts, Wisconsin left a mixed legacy. Its mission policy, as enunciated by Johannes Bading in 1883, was to "stay close to home and establish a firm base." The flood of German Lutheran immigrants into Wisconsin each year, "filled with a preoccupation for physical advancement" but "neglecting their spiritual needs," provided the Synod with "a holy and important mission," which Bading felt the Synod "will not be able to finish in our whole lives."<sup>159</sup> Yet congregations celebrated mission festivals, as the *Gemeinde-Blatt* noted in 1884,

---

<sup>157</sup> James P. Schaefer, "From this corner," *NL* 75 (1 February 1988): 59, noted the changes in name the Wisconsin Synod has experienced: "The original name adopted in 1850 was the 'German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Wisconsin' (*Das Deutsche Evangelische Ministerium von Wisconsin*). In 1892 when the synods of Wisconsin, Minnesota and Michigan formed a federation, the name was changed to the 'General (*Allgemeinen*) Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, and Other States.' In 1917 when the three synods merged, the name was shortened to the 'Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States.' The final change to the 'Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod' was made in 1959."

<sup>158</sup> Hartman, "The Growth of the WELS," 34.

<sup>159</sup> Moussa, "Seventy-five Years," 346, wrote, "They were themselves missionaries but they established a treasury for foreign missions just the same. It is true, no very great sums were realized, but it was more than a mere gesture; it was an act of the same fibre as the widow's mite."

“not because God commands them but because we are driven to it by our love to the heathen and our thankfulness to God.”<sup>160</sup>

In view of such circumstances, Wisconsin’s mission endeavor among the Apache Indians in Arizona, begun in 1893, was truly remarkable. “The early men who stepped off the Southern Pacific [Railway] at San Carlos or the Santa Fe in Holbrook were absolutely *untrained* and unprepared for what they were about to undertake,” wrote Arthur Guenther, a veteran in the Apache mission work. “The only job description was simple: ‘We need a man in Arizona—will you go?’ No special training—no linguistic studies. No philosophy of Indian missions. Just, ‘Go, and, prayerfully, do the best you can.’” Some failed “and got back on the train as soon as the opportunity presented itself.” Others “tried, gave their best,” but still failed. Others “tried, failed, tried again, improved, gave of time, talent, love, patience, health, and even life, and succeeded.”<sup>161</sup>

But it was in that very context that some remarks made by Koehler caused a lasting impact on the synodical personality. “There are organizations, like people,” Koehler wrote, “that remain small in number” and are meant to do “intensive rather than extensive” work. “The Wisconsin Synod had a college that was off to a good start,” and to maintain and develop that “was mission

---

<sup>160</sup> Bading is quoted from *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1883*, 13-14. “B,” “*Unsre Missionfeste*,” *GB 19* (1 July 1884): 167-8. Both cited by Eric Hartzell, “Mission Zeal of the Infant Wisconsin Synod, 1850-1893,” senior church history paper, Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary (1976), 2, 7, 16. Hartzell provides, 24-5, some thought-provoking financial computations to illustrate his contention that the Wisconsin Synod was far more mission-minded than generally given credit for. In 1886 the annual salary of a *Reiseprediger* was listed at \$300 a year; a \$30,000 salary for a called worker today is one hundred times greater than the *Reiseprediger*’s salary. According to Wisconsin’s 1880 *Proceedings*, the synod’s outstanding debt on its institutions totaled \$19,662.91; a comparable synodical debt today would be one hundred times greater, \$1,966,291. Add to that the poverty of many of Wisconsin’s members in 1880, then add the far smaller number of members in the Synod, and Hartzell concluded, “In view of just that fact alone, who would dare or care to ask why there was not more flashy mission endeavor?”

<sup>161</sup> A[rthur] A. Guenther, “The Ministry among the Apaches after 100 Years” (paper presented to the Arizona Pastoral Conference, San Carlos, Ariz., 4-5 May 1993), 5; emphasis in the original.

enough for a while.” There was something “not entirely sound” about the Apache mission effort. The very notion that Wisconsin failed to live up to its obligations unless it did “foreign” mission work was to Koehler “dogmatism, with a streak of pietism.”<sup>162</sup> Despite the synod’s Apache work and its efforts to assist World War I refugees in Germany and Poland, Koehler’s comment remained “a formidable factor” for the next half century and was invoked even when the Wisconsin Synod became more aggressive about overseas missions following World War II.<sup>163</sup>

“Basically,” remarked W. F. Dorn, “the relationship [between the synods] was a good one.”<sup>164</sup> In several locations a “gentleman’s agreement” existed, under which each synod refrained from opening congregations in the other’s area, particularly in the cities.<sup>165</sup> By general consensus “Missouri did the towns and [Wisconsin] did the country.”<sup>166</sup> A recently retired Wisconsin pastor admitted that Wisconsin and Missouri Synod churches often lived “side by side in a love-hate relationship” and offered recollections of two anecdotal feuds, yet “you could write a book about all of the evidences of Christian love members of the two synods once felt among and displayed among themselves.

---

<sup>162</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 196, 198.

<sup>163</sup> E[dward] C. Fredrich, “The WELS Mission Enterprise Among the Apaches,” presented to the LHC (San Francisco, Calif., 6–9 November 1986), 15.

<sup>164</sup> W. F. Dorn, “The Thirty-Year Controversy Between Missouri and Wisconsin,” mimeograph commentary, 1983, 4. A copy of this document is in the possession of Prof. Wayne Schmidt of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. Cited by George J. Gude, “A Description and Evaluation of the Pressures and Difficulties within the Synodical Conference which led its Destruction” (master’s thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, May 1986), 1.

<sup>165</sup> This “agreement” may never have been as formal as such a comment makes it appear. According to respondent 39, the agreement regarding the division of labor between the states of Arizona and California may have occurred when Wisconsin Synod pastor E. Arnold Sitz met a Missouri Synod pastor from the area on board train and suggested that each synod work in the corresponding area.

<sup>166</sup> Birner, “The Saga of a Mission District,” 4, 38, 16.



Ministers met in mixed conferences, socialized, preached at each other's festivals, accepted calls interchangeably. As I remember, we got along well. The Missourians were cordial lovers of cigars and good humor. They looked and talked like good Christian men, as indeed they were. In 1929, I recall, some five thousand of us joined together in a service of praise at Oshkosh Fairgrounds, commemorating the 400th anniversary of Luther's Catechism. In Milwaukee members of the two synods got together to start Milwaukee Lutheran High School. One thing that bound us together powerfully in love and fellowship was the then-famous Lutheran Hour, and preacher Walter A. Maier. At two o'clock on every Sunday afternoon it was broadcast on countless radio stations across the country and beyond, including pricey first liners like WGN in Chicago. In its palmy days the program was called, "Bringing Christ to the Nations," and nobody laughed. Everyone we knew sat down and listened. . . .

When I was a member of Winnebago Academy choir in the early thirties we were proud to sing at a Lutheran Hour rally in an Oshkosh theater, and WAM, as he was known, was the preacher. . . . Missouri churches everywhere were happy to emblazon "Church of the Lutheran Hour" on their bulletin boards, to the envy of us of Wisconsin. Maybe the best part of every broadcast, though, was when the smooth as silk student choir of "Concordia Lutheran Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri" immediately opened the hour with the lovely strains of "Beautiful Savior, King of Creation, Son of God and Son of Man. . . ." In those days the Missouri Synod stood for something, and thanks to the Lutheran Hour everybody knew what that was.<sup>167</sup>

Another recently retired Wisconsin pastor remembered growing up in the Saginaw area, where a close harmony existed between the two synods. At Michigan Lutheran Seminary, a Wisconsin Synod school, many of his classmates came from Missouri Synod congregations. "I came and went in [the home of an area Missouri pastor] almost as though it were my own." Joint Sunday afternoon Lenten services held in the city auditorium regularly attracted up to 4,000 worshipers. "The farthest thing from anyone's mind was that this could all one day come to an end."<sup>168</sup>

Yet there was on both sides an innate understanding that the synods retained distinctive personalities. One Wisconsin Synod pastor recalled how his grandmother, born in a well-to-do Missouri family, used to remark about the spiritual house she left, "*Dieser Missourianer, sie hatten*

---

<sup>167</sup> Krug, "Shifts of Fellowship Teachings in WELS," 5-6.

<sup>168</sup> Theodore A. Sauer to Mark Braun, 18 April 1997; copy in possession of the author.

*schliff!*” (“These Missourians— they were polished!”).<sup>169</sup> By contrast, August Pieper was fond of saying, “*Wir sind in der Wisconsin Synode; wir machen kein ‘show’*” (“We are in the Wisconsin Synod; we don’t put on a show”).<sup>170</sup>

Wisconsin “was not so exposed to the rapid Americanization process” and “rooted more in traditionally Lutheran and even German areas.” Its membership was “still more inhibited by the habits of the German, often Pomeranian, farming communities, who are not inclined to move very fast.” In addition, Wisconsin’s comparative lack of modern synodical machinery may have slowed the growth of its missions.<sup>171</sup> And “some Wisconsin pastors were no great friends of Missouri.”<sup>172</sup> Philip von Rohr, pioneer Minnesota pastor, apparently empathized in 1875 with those in Wisconsin who “resented the pressure (real or inferred) that Missouri was applying” toward the formation of a single synod. Though he could have joined the Missouri Synod, von Rohr chose not to.<sup>173</sup>

---

<sup>169</sup> Paul Wendland to Mark Braun, 3 October 1996; copy in possession of the author.

<sup>170</sup> Martin Westerhaus, interview by author, Mequon, Wis., 10 February 1997.

<sup>171</sup> W[ilhelm] M. Oesch, *Memorandum Inter Nos: Presenting a Series of Observations on the Present State of American Lutheranism of the Synodical Conference and the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod* (Gross-Gerau, Hessen, West Germany: Druck-und Verlagshaus Phil. L. Fink, 1960), 21. According to 1926 statistics assembled in “Our Rural Field,” *AL* 9 (July 1926): 7, by Gerald Jenny, 67.3 percent of Wisconsin Synod members lived in rural areas or in towns with a population of 2,500 or less. That figure compared with 58.3 percent for all Lutherans in the United States and Canada. Seven Lutheran bodies had a still higher percentage of rural or small town residents, among them the Eielsen Synod (80 percent), the Finnish Apostolic Synod (86.4 percent), and the Icelandic Synod (93.4 percent). Missouri’s membership was also predominantly rural and small town, 59.3 percent. A half century later, the WELS continued to have “a small town or rural flavor.” Two-thirds of its membership lived in cities with a population of less than 50,000, in small towns, or on farms. Glenn R. Barnes and John R. Isch, “Who We Are,” *NL* 69 (1 Mat 1982): 139.

<sup>172</sup> Birner, “The Saga of a Mission District,” 38.

<sup>173</sup> Richard D. Balge, “Von Rohr: a Beloved Brother and Faithful Minister,” *WLQ* 72 (July 1975): 218. See also Philip von Rohr Sauer, “The Rev. Philip von Rohr: Devoted Pioneer Pastor and Leader of the Wisconsin Synod,” *WHIJ* 5 (Spring 1987): 12–3. Armin Engel, “Our President—Philipp von Rohr,” *NL* 63 (30 May 1976): 169–70.

In a particularly acerbic comment, Koehler lamented the parliamenteering tactics of some Wisconsin pastors at the 1908 Synodical Conference convention, yet he insisted the Wisconsin men “were still novices” at such practices. Wisconsin’s behavior “did not shock the Missourians out of their coma of orthodox infallibility; in four instances later, of the same rawness, the writer had occasion to observe their employing such tactics, no doubt with the firm conviction that it is best so for the church of God.”<sup>174</sup>

Two attempts early in the twentieth century to unite the synods into a single organization made little headway. A movement that came to be known as the *Laienbewegung* began when a layman from Racine, Wisconsin, convened a meeting of church members at the Wisconsin Conservatory of Music in Milwaukee. A committee of 12 appointed at that meeting submitted a written proposal for union to all congregations of both synods. On 9 March 1913, almost five hundred people met at St. John’s Church in Milwaukee, and despite objections from Wisconsin’s professor August Pieper (who later likened the movement to the Peasant’s Rebellion in 1525)<sup>175</sup> and President Bergemann, the group overwhelmingly supported union of the two synods.<sup>176</sup> Missouri’s 1914 and 1917 conventions reacted favorably,<sup>177</sup> but a previous proposal initiated in 1911 by the Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, and Nebraska Synods, federated since 1892, was already in process of implementation. The result was the formation of the Joint Ev. Lutheran Synod of Wisconsin and Other States.<sup>178</sup>

---

<sup>174</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 219.

<sup>175</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 241.

<sup>176</sup> John C. Wohlrabe, Jr., “The Missouri Synod’s Unity Attempts During the Pfothenhauer Presidency, 1911–1935,” (master’s thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1982), 66–9.

<sup>177</sup> *Missouri Proceedings*, 1914, 53; 1917, 75–6.

<sup>178</sup> Fredrich, *WSL*, 131. Schmiel, “The History of the Relationship,” 101–2, concluded that the Wisconsin Synod reacted favorably in 1915 only because the synod was “biding her time to see

In 1931, a Wisconsin Synod church in Oshkosh, Wisconsin, petitioned its convention to consider the question of merging the Synodical Conference bodies and to invite other member bodies of the conference to do the same. A committee was directed to consider the question.<sup>179</sup> Several Missouri Synod congregations presented a memorial to Missouri's 1932 convention calling for amalgamation of the synods; Missouri in turn appointed a "Committee on Organic Union," instructed to work with other synods to determine if such a union were possible.<sup>180</sup> Wisconsin's July 1932 *Quartalschrift* reported on the proposed merger,<sup>181</sup> and *The Northwestern Lutheran* noted conference papers and discussions in 1932 and 1933 regarding a possible merger of the synods.<sup>182</sup>

In 1935, however, Missouri reported that only the Norwegian Synod had appointed such a committee. The Norwegians and Slovaks both cited language differences as a barrier to possible merger,<sup>183</sup> and the report of Wisconsin's Committee on Amalgamation at its 1935 convention was

---

whether the plan to form the Joint Synod would be brought to completion." Once that plan was carried out, further considerations about joining with Missouri ceased. "The Wisconsin Synod," Schmiel remarked, "was building its own empire."

<sup>179</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1931*, 76–7.

<sup>180</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1932*, 164–6.

<sup>181</sup> Joh. P. Meyer noted without comment that the Missouri Synod "favors an amalgamation of the synods now federated in the Synodical Conference" and "has taken definite steps to open negotiations with the Wisconsin, the Norwegian, and the Slovak synods with a view to consolidation." [Joh. P.] M[eyer], "Organic Union Proposed," *Qu* 29 (July 1932): 230. The following April, in reviewing the *Proceedings* of the 1932 Synodical Conference convention, Meyer added: "A movement was begun by the Missouri Synod at its last convention, aiming at an amalgamation of the synods affiliated with [the] Synodical Conference. It would seem that the Conference, organized more than sixty years ago, and functioning smoothly since its inception, would be the logical instrument, should any closer union be desired." [Joh. P.] M[eyer], review of *Proceedings of the Thirty-third Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference of North America, Mankato, Minn., Aug. 10–15, 1932*, in *Qu* 30 (April 1933): 157.

<sup>182</sup> Pastoral conference listings in *The Northwestern Lutheran* included several conference papers or informal discussions scheduled regarding the possibility of this amalgamation; see: *NL* 19 (25 September 1932): 314; 20 (20 May 1933): 170; (8 October 1933): 333.

<sup>183</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1935*, 219.

tabled until the next convention.<sup>184</sup> The next summer various districts of the Wisconsin Synod accepted the determination of the synod's Conference of Presidents not to pursue the proposed synodical merger. "Amalgamation would mean disbanding the Wisconsin Synod," the presidents wrote, "something that would sadden us deeply. For our Synod has become very dear to us and has a deep meaning for us. It has its own history and has gone through some fiery struggles for the truth."<sup>185</sup> Fifty years later, retired Missouri President Jacob A. O. Preus remarked that "despite some pious statements and resolutions I don't think there was ever a serious intent on the part of anyone to merge the Synods."<sup>186</sup>

At the Wisconsin Synod's 75th anniversary in 1925, Hans Moussa admitted with some chagrin that "*synodical consciousness* was never strong in Wisconsin." Pastors who came from other Lutheran bodies "soon learn to bear this easy yoke of Wisconsin affiliation." Yet Moussa insisted that this "spirit of individuality" did not betray a lack of loyalty to the synod but revealed instead "a manner of asserting independence of all mass influences." It was "ordinarily enough" for Wisconsin Synod members "to say they were Lutherans," yet they were not indifferent to the service their synod provided in maintaining the purity of the gospel message. In what may have been an oblique jab at the Missouri Synod, Moussa concluded, "Provincial prejudices can hardly thrive in the soil of the Joint Synod [of Wisconsin and Other States]; the soil is not of that sort."<sup>187</sup>

Such differences of size, history, and personality allowed these sister synods to maintain separate identities, even as they worshiped and worked together, attended each other's schools,

---

<sup>184</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1935*, 111.

<sup>185</sup> Cited by Kiessling, *History*, 42.

<sup>186</sup> Jacob A. O. Preus to George J. Gude, 14 April 1985; cited in Gude, "Pressures and Difficulties," 12.

<sup>187</sup> Moussa, "Seventy-Five Years, 350; emphasis in the original.

intermarried, and formed lasting friendships. It would have been all but impossible to predict that the synods meeting together so congenially in Mankato in 1932 would soon be embroiled in argument and division. The catalysts of those divisions, however, were already at work.

## *Chapter 2: The Gathering Storm*

The glowing report of the 1932 Synodical Conference convention offers one of many indicators of the harmonious relationship that existed between the Missouri and Wisconsin Synods during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Yet Adolf Hoenecke's remark that there was "something sectarian" about the Missouri Synod<sup>1</sup> betrayed a difference in personality in the two bodies, which endured and perhaps even intensified in the early twentieth century. Leigh Jordahl has commented that "far into the 20th century and as late as the 1930s Wisconsin did not quite live up to the orthodox ideals of Missouri."<sup>2</sup>

That same summer, when several Missouri Synod congregations petitioned their synod to initiate efforts to unite the synods of the Conference, one of the considerations they listed was that "such a union would end much of the rivalry and friction now existing in some localities between members of sister synods."<sup>3</sup> Wisconsin's 1937 *Proceedings*, for example, noted that "every effort was made to settle the cases now pending between our Synod and the Synod of Missouri and to prevent trouble in the future," following principles of what was referred to as the "Wausau Agreement."<sup>4</sup> The *Proceedings* then listed difficulties occurring in Portland and Oconomowoc, Wisconsin; at the University of Wisconsin in Madison; at New Ulm, Minnesota; and in the Nebraska District.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 118.

<sup>2</sup> Jordahl, introduction to *HWS*, ix.

<sup>3</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1932*, 164–5. Wohlrabe, "The Missouri Synod's Unity Attempts," 145.

<sup>4</sup> Respondent 29, who began his service as a pastor at about this time, also mentioned that the "Wausau Agreement" was in effect between the synods. The agreement necessitated that "if either the Wisconsin or Missouri Synod was in one place, the other Synod would keep out."

<sup>5</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1937*, 17–8.

J. P. Koehler remarked that the failure of the *Lainenbewegung* two decades earlier “was probably just as well” because pursuing the matter further “might only have served to set off another doctrinal controversy, for which the tinder was already provided in the differences about the doctrines of the Church, the Ministry, and the Keys.”<sup>6</sup>

#### *Church and ministry*

This tinder had been smoldering since the beginning of the century.<sup>7</sup> A Missouri Synod member was excommunicated by his congregation in Cincinnati, apparently for choosing to withdraw his son from the congregation’s parochial school. District officials disavowed the congregation’s excommunication, and the congregation and its two pastors were suspended for a time from synodical membership. When the congregation and its pastors applied for admission to the Wisconsin Synod in 1903, Wisconsin became acquainted with the details of the case but refrained from taking sides. The case lingered for eight years. One pastor died; the other, together with the church council, was deposed by the congregation.<sup>8</sup>

This and similar cases compelled the Wisconsin Synod not only to reconsider the exercise of church discipline but also to revisit more basic questions regarding the nature of the church and its ministry. Before the Cincinnati case, both synods seem generally to have assumed that *church* meant the local gathering of believers in a congregation, and *ministry* referred to the congregation’s pastor. As the Cincinnati case was being discussed, an article written by Wisconsin pastor Adolph Toepel was published in the synod’s *Quartalschrift* in 1906.<sup>9</sup> According to Koehler, Toepel followed “the

---

<sup>6</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 241.

<sup>7</sup> August Pieper reviewed the actions of the two synods in the Cincinnati case, “*Menschenherrschaft in der Kirche*,” *Qu* 8 (January 1911): 30–44; (April 1911): 98–123.

<sup>8</sup> Fredrich, *WSL*, 107–8.

<sup>9</sup> A[dolf] Toepel, “*Wird durch Susspension der Synodalgemeinschaft die Glaubensgemeinschaft oder ‘Bruderschaft’ aufgehoben*,” *Qu* 3 (April 1906): 65–87.



traditional distinction” between “the local congregation and the synod, stating that the congregation is a matter of divine ordinance, while synodical organization is a matter of option.” Toepel did not realize that “the Savior employs the term ‘church’ differently from the Apostles [writing] later, who at one time use it to refer to the church as a whole, at another time to designate the local congregation.”<sup>10</sup>

Koehler, August Pieper, and John Schaller “set aside traditional thinking and dogmatical formulations” to “take a fresh look at what the Scriptures say about church and ministry.” They found that “there was not as much said about local congregations and the pastoral office as was frequently assumed.” What was said “never specified a single form or type of either.”<sup>11</sup>

Pieper insisted in 1912 that Walther’s method of quoting the Lutheran Confessions and the church fathers left much room for misunderstanding both and suggested that Walther himself may not always have understood them rightly. Pieper then presented his revised view of the teaching of church and ministry: any gathering of believers, whether congregation or synod, constituted church and thus possessed the authority of the church. The office of preaching in a local congregation represented one form—but not the exclusive form—of the public ministry.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 234.

<sup>11</sup> Fredrich, *WSL*, 109–10. This effort to de-emphasize dogmatic theology in favor of more exegetical and contextual study of Scripture has been called “The Wauwatosa Theology,” named for the location of the Wisconsin Synod’s seminary in a western suburb of Milwaukee, from 1893 to 1929. Koehler came to the Wauwatosa seminary in 1900, Pieper in 1902. Both worked there during the most productive years of their careers and wrote extensively in the synod’s new journal, the *Theologische Quartalschrift*. Both exercised significant influence on the Wisconsin ministerium for the next quarter century and beyond.

<sup>12</sup> August Pieper, “Zur Verstaendigung in der gegenwaertigen Diskussion ueber Kirche und Amt,” *Qu* 9 (July 1912): 182–208. John Wohlrabe, *Ministry in Missouri Until 1962: An Historical Analysis of the Doctrine of the Ministry in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod* (Th. D. diss., privately published, 1987), 21–2. Though disagreeing with August Pieper and the Wauwatosa faculty’s understanding of church and ministry, Wohlrabe offers a helpful summary and evaluation.

Koehler elaborated that present distinctions between local congregation and synod have “no place in the Lord’s discourse at Matthew 18” regarding excommunication—the issue at hand in Cincinnati. The additional distinction that the local congregation has as its purpose spiritual edification, while the synod is devoted to outward business, “is a fallacy, notwithstanding what synodical constitutions and quotations from the fathers, early and later, may say.” Koehler did not object to use of the term *Ortsgemeinde* [local congregation] “rightly understood” for “the congregation of believers at a given time and place concerned with a given matter,” as long as the term could also be applied to a synod. “To assume that, in keeping with Jewish synagogue organization, the Lord in Matthew 18 anticipated the founding of local congregations” (and that this, in distinction to the synod, was of divine ordinance) was, for Koehler, “poor exegesis, to say the least.”<sup>13</sup>

In 1917 Pieper summarized Luther’s understanding of the teaching of church and ministry under six points:

1. There is one office in the church, the office of the spiritual priesthood. The public ministry is only another phase of this same priesthood.
2. This office, the command and authority to preach the gospel, is not an official rank which from the very beginning has been established by Christ for public dispensation, but rather it is the common possession of all Christians, who are reborn and ordained priests by God, yes, even so far as the use of practice is concerned.
3. The rights of the entire communion and the command to good order demand that within the congregation such functions of the ministry cannot be carried out by all at the same time without disorder and also such functions for which all Christians are not equally capable be relinquished and turned over to capable persons so that they may carry them out in the name of the congregation.
4. The Lord gives the church special gifts for the public administration of the ministry, that is, capable people, and it is only to such that this office should be entrusted.

---

<sup>13</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 236.

5. Whoever is called to the public ministry by a congregation of spiritual priests in a Christian way is called by God, and the faithful administrator of the office of the ministry should be granted the honor prescribed by God.

6. Not only one species, the local pastorate, but the public ministry of the Word in general is a divine institution. It takes its specific forms according to circumstances.<sup>14</sup>

This presentation by the Wauwatosa faculty was not easily embraced even within the Wisconsin Synod. Some, notably August Ernst, professor at the synod's Northwestern College in Watertown, never accepted it.<sup>15</sup> "Strongest and longest opposition came from the Synodical Conference brethren in the Missouri Synod," chiefly Franz Pieper.<sup>16</sup> Disagreement between what were coming to be understood as the "Missouri" and "Wisconsin" positions became most pronounced when the theses on church and ministry were drafted for the *Intersynodical Theses* in 1924. Among rank and file pastors in the two synods, however, little if any disagreement was noticeable.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> August Pieper, "Luthers Lehre von Kirche und Amt," *Qu* 14 (July 1917): 211–41; 15 (January 1918): 65–80; (April 1918): 101–26; trans. Harold R. Johne, "Luther's Doctrine of the Church and Ministry," *WLQ* 60 (January 1963): 13–47; (April 1963): 81–110; (October 1963): 247–265.

<sup>15</sup> Ernst authored 16 theses in disagreement with Koehler and August Pieper, entitled, *Saetze ueber Synode, Kirchengucht und Synodalzucht, gedruckt auf Beschluss der allgemeinen Pastoralconferenz der Synode von Wisconsin und den Gliedern derselben vorgelegt von August F. Ernst*. "Each of these theses," Koehler responded, "was implemented with more or less proof-texts from the Scriptures, the Confessions, Luther's, Hoenecke's, and Walther's writings." J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 237.

<sup>16</sup> Fredrich, *WSL*, 110. Koehler recalled two meetings in 1914 in Milwaukee between members of the St. Louis and Wauwatosa faculties that resulted in "no agreement, both in regard to the formulation of the doctrine and the method, as well, by which it is to be derived from Scripture." J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 238.

<sup>17</sup> Martin Scharlemann, interview, 14 December 1981; Lewis Spitz, interview, 15 December 1981; in Wohlrabe, "The Missouri Synod's Unity Attempts," 143.

The 1932 *Thiensville Theses* constituted another attempt to resolve church and ministry differences.<sup>18</sup> Koehler, who took no part in drafting the *Theses*,<sup>19</sup> criticized them as “an intersynodical *modus vivendi*, a compromise, whether intended or not, that leaves matters unclear and both sides free to put their own construction on them and to pursue the even tenor of their ways.”<sup>20</sup>

Apparently other members of the Wisconsin faculty had not been entirely satisfied with the theses either. In October 1932 Pieper restated the Wisconsin position more vigorously, effectively nullifying whatever agreement the participants at Thiensville believed they had arrived at.<sup>21</sup> Missouri’s President Frederick Pfothenauer called Pieper’s article “a crying shame” and lamented that “it will probably be necessary to negotiate with the Wisconsin Synod in Summer.”<sup>22</sup>

When a member of the St. Louis faculty wrote to him about his statement, August Pieper answered in a six-page letter, defending Wisconsin’s “peculiar” views on church and ministry. Pieper noted that Missouri still stood by its original position “that only the so-called local congregation is ordained by God,” and that only in that form are its members “capable and called to be stewards of the treasures of the kingdom of heaven.” The church in any other form (for example, synod or the Synodical Conference) “is not connected with the stewardship of the Word but is “*purely a human assembly and institution and contains only human rights and human duties.*” But,

---

<sup>18</sup> Theodore Graebner, “Agreement with Thiensville Faculty,” *LW* 51 (21 June 1932): 224; reprinted in *NL* 19 (11 September 1932): 301.

<sup>19</sup> Fredrich, *WSL*, 110.

<sup>20</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 239.

<sup>21</sup> See [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “*Logenbeschluesse der Missouri-Synode*,” *Qu* 29 (October 1932): 293–8.

<sup>22</sup> Frederick Pfothenauer to William Arndt, 9 January 1933. William Arndt papers, Supplement 1, Box 14, File 5, CHI, trans. Meta Wolhrabe; in Wolhrabe, “The Missouri Synod’s Unity Attempts,” 146–7.

Pieper argued, as soon as Missouri made the local congregation “*the only godly appointment*” and “*the only one called for the handling*” of the gospel, “*we will not go along with it!*”

If we agreed with this we would have to cross out Matt. 18:20 and demolish the freedom of the congregation of the saints (*der Heiligen*). The church, that is, the congregation of the sanctified, has all the freedom and godly right to come together in any means or number as long as the law of love is not hurt.

*The Church is nothing other than the congregation of saints.* God gives us all the right to recognition and the right to speak.<sup>23</sup>

W. F. Dorn, who received his training at St. Louis but served as a minister in the Wisconsin Synod, remembered the church and ministry debate as a “cause of discord” at many mixed pastoral conferences. “The heat generated by the papers presented at these conferences and the subsequent discussion of the papers was generally greater than the intensity of the light produced.” Discussion mostly focused “always fuzzily” on questions of practical application. “I know of no pastor whose position was altered as a result of these discussions,” Dorn recalled. At St. Louis, Theodore Graebner interrupted a class lecture to announce that he and a faculty committee had just returned from Thiensville where they had met with a Wisconsin committee on this vexing question. “He reported, not without a modicum of smugness, that Wisconsin had seen the light and accepted Missouri’s position as the correct one.” Dorn later learned that Wisconsin faculty members had told their students that “Missouri had capitulated and was now in Wisconsin’s camp.”<sup>24</sup>

The church and ministry disagreement persisted into the 1940s, though it was pushed into the background during World War II.<sup>25</sup> The 1946 Synodical Conference convention appointed an eight-member Interim Committee to study “matters relating to the doctrine of the call, the ministry, and the

---

<sup>23</sup> August Pieper to William Arndt, 2 March 1933. William Arndt papers, Supplement I, Box 14, File 5, CHI, trans. Meta Wohlrabe; emphases in the original. Cited by Wohlrabe, “The Missouri Synod’s Unity Attempts,” 147–8.

<sup>24</sup> Dorn, “The Thirty-Year Controversy,” 4.

<sup>25</sup> Fredrich, “Wisconsin’s Theological-Confessional History,” 99.

Church, where there has been disagreement, with the aim of achieving complete agreement.”<sup>26</sup> Two years later the committee presented majority and minority reports. The majority (including two of three Wisconsin members on the committee) concluded that “the congregation is the only divinely designated body or unit of the visible church,” but “synod is not a congregation” and “has and exercises only those rights and powers which are delegated to it by the constituent congregations.” Extending a call to ministers of the Word “is the obligation and sole right of the local congregation.” The minority (one dissenting Wisconsin pastor) insisted there were “marked differences” within the Synodical Conference over church and ministry. “No group of believers within the ‘visible church’ has been specifically and specially designated as ‘ekklesia, Matthew 18,’ with the sole right and privilege of all the functions of the Church, to the exclusion of all other gatherings.” Every believer “as a priest and member of the *Una Sancta*” may exercise all the functions of the church. The local congregation “cannot be taught as being the *only* form” of the church, established “of God by *special* divine institution.”<sup>27</sup>

Yet the minority report insisted these were “not differences in doctrine as such” but “differences in application.”<sup>28</sup> In 1952, recalling the *Thiensville Theses*, the Interim Committee feared that “a great deal of misunderstanding” had clouded the doctrine of church and ministry, “where unity of doctrine actually existed,” but there was no complete agreement within the Synodical Conference when these basic concepts were translated into the practical life of the church.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1946*, 61.

<sup>27</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1948*, 135–44.

<sup>28</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1948*, 140–1.

<sup>29</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1952*, 144.

These differences appear not to have been regarded by either synod as divisive of church fellowship, and they arose between church bodies already in fellowship.<sup>30</sup> Edward Fredrich has noted that “the dividing lines were by no means along strict synodical lines,” but “Missouri practiced what Wisconsin preached and Wisconsin practiced what Missouri preached.”<sup>31</sup> Had no other disturbances arisen between the synods, discussions probably would have continued and the issue may have been fully resolved. As it was, however, leading theologians on both sides perpetuated and promulgated what came to be regarded as the “Missouri” and “Wisconsin” positions on church and ministry.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> In 1940 Theodore Graebner remarked that for thirty years Wisconsin Synod theologians had asserted that “no Scripture proof can be adduced for the distinction which declares the local congregation to exist by divine right while Synods exist only by human right,” nor could scriptural validation be provided “for the doctrine that the local ministry as we have it in our congregations is specifically a divinely instituted office.” Graebner asked, “Have we treated this heavily emphasized doctrine of the Wisconsin Synod as a divisive error?” The answer to his rhetorical question was clearly “No.” Graebner used this example in an attempt to demonstrate that the Wisconsin and Norwegian synods were wrong to insist that church bodies must “speak the same thing” on all other nonfundamental doctrines in order to have a sufficient basis for church union. Theodore Graebner, “Not a Sect—Yet,” *AL* 23 (January 1940): 8.

In reply, Edmund Reim granted there were “marked differences of opinion” expressed regarding church and ministry, but maintained they were “due solely to a failure to understand the position of Wisconsin.” Reim believed there was “no difference in the doctrine” of church and ministry, but disagreement only on application. E[dmund] Reim. “The Debate on Union: Doctrinal Differences in the Synodical Conference?” *NL* 34 (3 August 1947): 245.

<sup>31</sup> Fredrich, “Wisconsin’s Theological-Confessional History,” 98.

<sup>32</sup> For the “Missouri” view on church and ministry, see Edward W. A. Koehler, *A Summary of Christian Doctrine: A Popular Presentation of the Teachings of the Bible* (St. Louis: CPH 1939, reprint 1971), 250–3, 266–7. Francis Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, Volume 3, trans. Walter W. F. Albrecht, (St. Louis: CPH, 1953), 420–2, 443–9. For the “Wisconsin” view, see Aug[ust] F. Zich, “The Doctrine of The Divine Call With Reference To Present Day Abuses,” *Qu* 35 (October 1938): 227–8, 237–8. Reim, “Doctrinal Differences in the Synodical Conference?” 245–6. Harold E. Wicke, “Is the Pastorate in the Congregation the Only God-ordained Office in the Church?” *WLQ* 68 (April 1971): 113–21.

Edward C. Fredrich, “Looking at the Religious World: Doctrine of the Ministry,” *NL* 51 (28 June 1964): 208, was “interested in and heartened by” the publication of A. C. Mueller’s *The Ministry of the Lutheran Teacher* (St. Louis: CPH, 1964). Mueller considered it “a misunderstanding

The gathering storm between the two synods gained greater impetus between 1932 and 1944 chiefly over the military chaplaincy and Scouting.

*“We must limit ourselves to externals only”*

According to Dale Griffin, the Missouri Synod provided chaplains for the armed forces throughout its history, particularly in times of war.<sup>33</sup> During the Civil War, C. F. W. Walther announced in *Der Lutheraner* that “our dear brother, F. W. Richmann of Schaumburg, Cook County, Illinois, has accepted a call to serve an Ohio regiment.” His service clearly extended beyond Missouri Lutherans. Although the 58th Ohio Volunteer Regiment was composed mostly of German-speaking soldiers, Richmann reported that already on his second day he had to bury a soldier who died suddenly, “and I had to speak English, since the deceased was an American.” He added that he would soon have to conduct services regularly in both languages “since between three and four hundred men (out of a thousand) are unfamiliar with the German language.” Citing complaints “throughout the country that chaplains in the main were neglecting their duty in a terrible manner,” Walther hoped Richmann would “belong to the few who realize the responsibility of their position.”<sup>34</sup>

Many young Lutheran men volunteered to serve in the Spanish–American war, and “since among the chaplains of these regiments there was none to whom the spiritual care of the Lutheran

---

of Walther’s theses on the ministry that the pastor is the one divinely instituted office or ministry and all other offices (teacher, professor, executive, writer) stem from it and are auxiliary to the pastorate.” Mueller concluded that “the teacher in our school, being in the parish ministry, is related to the pastor the way one elder is related to another.”

<sup>33</sup> Dale E. Griffin, “The Effects of the Participation of the Missouri Synod in the Military Chaplaincy during World War II on its Subsequent History” (master’s thesis, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, 1964), 7–8.

<sup>34</sup> “*Ein Kaplan aus der Missouri-Synode*,” *DL* 18 (28 May 1862): 167. K[arl] Kretzmann, “A Chaplain from the Missouri Synod (1862),” *LW* 63 (21 November 1944): 380. See also Paul L. Dannenfeldt, “Our Chaplains,” *LW* 60 (16 September 1941): 323.



young men could be entrusted, the thought arose in our synodical circles to send a Lutheran preacher as a chaplain into the camps who would serve these soldiers with the Word and Sacraments.”<sup>35</sup> The Wisconsin Synod’s 1898 convention resolved “with great enthusiasm” to send Pastor F. Eppling of Algoma, Wisconsin, who had previously expressed willingness to go. The convention also resolved that to support the costs of sending Eppling “the officers of the Synod should also make provision” and recommended a special offering be gathered from the congregations.<sup>36</sup> Neither Eppling nor the synod seem to have been opposed to accepting additional funds from the government. The synod’s resolution called for synodical financing “in case he would not receive any support from the state.” In his report to the synod, Eppling noted that after arriving in Madison, Wisconsin, “he had been granted free transportation from Gov. Scofield to the South.” He conducted his first worship service on 3 April 1898 in Jacksonville, Florida, “in the tent of the Y. M. C. A.” Eppling also reported that, were it not for a change in circumstances regarding several regiments returning from Puerto Rico, he “would have been appointed [the third regiment’s] chaplain by the government” and would have continued his service to the soldiers “without any cost to the Synod.”<sup>37</sup>

Despite these instances of past chaplaincy service, the Missouri and Wisconsin Synods both officially opposed involvement in the government’s military chaplaincy program during World War I.<sup>38</sup> When the Norwegian Synod’s J. A. Stub urged his synod to be “one and dissoluble behind our

---

<sup>35</sup> F. Eppling, “Appointment of a Chaplain in the Army by the Wisconsin Synod During the Spanish–American War,” *CHIQ* 19 (April 1946): 16.

<sup>36</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1898*, 84; cited in Eppling, “Appointment of a Chaplain,” 16.

<sup>37</sup> Eppling, “Appointment of a Chaplain,” 17.

<sup>38</sup> In a remark apparently intended to discount official Missouri opposition to the chaplaincy in World War I, Otto Geiseman remarked in 1949: “Both during the First as well as during the Second World War our church made strenuous efforts to provide as many chaplains as possible for the various branches of our national military service. These church-provided *and governmentally-appointed* chaplains ministered according to their respective abilities with the preaching of the Gospel *not only to the members of our own churches, but to all of the men who belonged to the*

boys,” suggesting that Lutherans “can return to our doctrinal, racial, or synodical differences after the war if we must,” *Lutheran Witness* editor Theodore Graebner called Stub’s comments “cheap talk.” Graebner insisted there was “no emergency imaginable that could move Missouri to deviate from its principles.” If Scripture required separation from churches that teach false doctrine during peacetime, “then these same words of Scripture certainly forbid our cooperation in the distinctly religious sphere with these same bodies in time of war.”<sup>39</sup> Graebner added, “We were glad to read in the *Northwestern Lutheran* a strong reply to Rev. Stub’s *malapropos* remarks.”<sup>40</sup>

More troublesome were remarks in *The Lutheran* of the General Council, announcing that because of the war “doctrinal fences are down.”

For the first time in American history, Lutherans from all synods were marshaled together for the fulfillment of a common task. It was a cheering sight. Nationalistic walls and doctrinal fences were down for once, and it does not seem that anyone was specially injured by rubbing his elbow against another who happened to differ with him on some points not exactly defined in the Confessions.<sup>41</sup>

Graebner called that assessment “simply not true.” The Synodical Conference had “not given up, either in confession or practice, one jot or tittle of [its] confessional convictions for the sake of aligning [its] work for army and navy with that of others.”<sup>42</sup>

President Pfothauer “drew a line through” a proposed arrangement for external cooperation between the Missouri Synod and non-Synodical Conference Lutherans in the National Lutheran Commission, announcing “a stand of absolute isolationism as the only Christian one for the

---

*particular military ‘outfits’ to which they happened to be assigned.”* O[tto] A. Geiseman, “While It Is Day: Chaplaincies,” *AL* 32 (May 1949): 5; emphasis added.

<sup>39</sup> [Theodore] G[raebner], “Misrepresentations Regarding Chaplain Service,” *LW* 37 (2 April 1918): 107–8.

<sup>40</sup> See J[ohn] B[renner], “Why Do We Not Cooperate?” *NL* 5 (24 February 1918): 31–2.

<sup>41</sup> “The Lutheran Church’s Response to the Call of the Nation,” *Lu* 22 (7 March 1918): 1.

<sup>42</sup> Theodore Graebner, “Misrepresentations,” 108.

Missouri Synod to take.”<sup>43</sup> Pfothenauer appointed the Lutheran Church Board for Army and Navy to oversee the spiritual care of Synodical Conference Lutherans in the Armed Forces.<sup>44</sup> The United States government had adopted a policy of dealing with all Protestants through the Federal Council of Churches and the YMCA.<sup>45</sup> In late 1917 Pfothenauer reminded the board that in any connections with the YMCA or other ecclesiastical agencies “we must limit ourselves to externals only.” If mixed service were demanded of Missouri pastors, “we may in no case join, even if we could then serve our boys very economically.” Pfothenauer did not want Missouri’s soldiers coming back from the camps “spiritually infected.”<sup>46</sup>

The Chicago-based Army and Navy Board resolved early in 1918 to sever all relations with the National Lutheran Commission, but Missouri’s New York Pastoral Conference adopted a contrary statement, urging cooperation with the NLC. “This war has shot more things to pieces than the Cathedral at Reims,” wrote one New York pastor. While the Chicago board protested, “We here in the East are working hand in hand with the National Lutheran Commission through our Eastern War Board.”<sup>47</sup>

After several months the Chicago board reversed its position, and in spring 1918 the Synodical Conference agreed to cooperate with the NLC’s newly formed Commission for Soldiers’

---

<sup>43</sup> Theodore Graebner, “For a Penitent Jubilee,” *CHIQ* 45 (February 1972): 8.

<sup>44</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1917*, 35. See also W[illiam] C. Kohn, “Lutheran Church Board for Army and Navy, U. S. A.,” *NL* 5 (2 June 1918): 84–5.

<sup>45</sup> For Wisconsin’s misgivings about this arrangements, see H[ans] K. M[oussa], “The Y. M. C. A. and the War,” *NL* 5 (6 October 1918): 156–7. H[ans] K. M[oussa], “Now Is the Time to Say It,” *NL* 6 (27 July 1919): 115.

<sup>46</sup> Frederick Pfothenauer to Theodore Graebner, 8 December 1917, TG MSS, 123; cited by Alan Graebner, “World War I and Lutheran Union: Documents from the Army and Navy Board, 1917 and 1918,” *CHIQ* 41 (May 1968): 54.

<sup>47</sup> Karl Kretzmann to Paul E. Kretzmann, 16 February 1918, Karl Kretzmann MSS, CHI; cited by Alan Graebner, “World War I and Lutheran Union,” 58.

and Sailors' Welfare, created by the Inner Mission Board of the General Synod, in the following five ways:

1. The Synodical Conference will cooperate with the National Commission in every way possible.
2. Pay their share of all general expenses.
3. Cooperate completely with this Commission or its representatives in dealing with the Government, camp and cantonment commandants, the Federal Council of Churches, the Y. M. C. A., etc.
4. Have their appointees as camp pastors sanctioned by the Commission.
5. But the Synodical Conference reserves the right to minister to the spiritual needs of men from their congregations through their own representatives wherever it is possible for them to do so.<sup>48</sup>

In its report to Missouri's 1920 convention, the Army and Navy Board acknowledged that the "greatest difficulty" in their work was caused by non-Synodical Conference Lutherans who sought to cooperate with the Army and Navy Board and deemed it unnecessary to duplicate the work of other denominations. The board "could not believe that the principles as laid down by the Word of God for times of peace could be any other for times of war." The board offered to cooperate "along external lines, whenever and wherever this was expedient" to serve their own soldiers of the Synodical Conference.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> "Relation of Synodical Conference to National Lutheran Commission," *LW* 37 (9 July 1918): 219; reprinted in *NL* 5 (8 September 1918): 144. For reports on the work of camp pastors, see F. C. Streufert, "News From Our 'Boys Under the Flag' as reported by Our Camp Pastors," *NL* 5 (13 January 1918): 10. Carl Kurth, "Synodical Conference Builds Hall for Soldier Boys at Army City, Kans.," (5 May 1918): 69–70. J[ohn] W. Behnken, "The Home Congregation and Her Boy Under the Flag," (19 May 1918): 78–9. H. F. Rohrman, "Our Lutheran Centers," (22 September 1918): 146–7.

<sup>49</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1920*, 104; trans. in Baepler, *A Century of Grace*, 264. The report regarded it as "a great source of pleasure and gratification to join hands with the War Committee of the Joint Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, and Other States."

Officially, Missouri's Army and Navy Board took the same view the Wisconsin Synod's Michigan District had taken two years earlier:

The "Lutheran Brotherhood" . . . and the "Lutheran Federation" . . . told us that if we Lutherans wanted to achieve these two things [erect barracks for worship and certify chaplains with the government], then we would have to stand before the government as a united Lutheran church, not as Missouri or Ohio, or Wisconsin or General Council. . . . Thus it appeared at the outset that we would be compelled to work outwardly with others, while at the same time also faithfully adhering to our doctrinal position. Very soon, however, it became apparent that it was not possible to maintain this separation of externals and doctrinal matters in joint practical work. For those people have a definite purpose in mind in this joint work. They want to erase the previously maintained boundaries and differences in doctrinal matters; they want to employ the prevailing circumstances to force a general union.<sup>50</sup>

Despite earnest attempts to maintain these doctrinal boundaries, however, the minutes of the Army and Navy Board "document the Board's struggles with [the] problem of relations with other Lutherans under the pressure of war" and give evidence of "an incipient break with Synodical tradition."<sup>51</sup> O. H. Pannkoke later observed that as members of opposition synods become acquainted, they see that "neither has horns or cloven hoofs; they become more friendly and respect each other, and so separatism becomes untenable." During time of war "it was difficult for a Missouri Synod camp pastor to consider a camp pastor from another Lutheran Synod as a traitor to God. A few extremists did. Most did not."<sup>52</sup> Although Pfothenhauer sought to limit Missouri's involvement to external matters, Pannkoke said that "experience has shown that in actual practice it

---

<sup>50</sup> *Michigan District Proceedings, Wisconsin Synod, 1918, 75-7*; trans. in Fredrich, *WSL*, 136-7. See also J[ohn] B[renner], "An Example," *NL* 5 (10 March 1918): 34. "Proceedings of the Michigan Dist. Synod Assembled at Scio, Mich., 1918," (28 July 1918): 115.

<sup>51</sup> Alan Graebner, "World War I and Lutheran Union," 52. See also Erwin L. Lueker, "The Stance of Missouri in 1917," *CHIQ* 40 (October 1967): 124.

<sup>52</sup> O. H. Pannkoke, *A Great Church Finds Itself: The Lutheran Church Between the Wars* (Quitman, Ga.: privately published, 1966), 91, 104.

is impossible to define the point where external cooperation ends and spiritual fellowship begins.” Such a distinction “may be made in logic,” but “it disappears in life.”<sup>53</sup>

*A parting of the ways*

War’s end postponed resolution of questions regarding the chaplaincy and inter-Lutheran cooperation, but by the mid-1930s threats from overseas dictators forced the issue to resurface. Delegates to Missouri’s 1935 convention instructed newly elected President John Behnken to appoint a committee to investigate whether calling men as chaplains into the army and navy could be done without violating scriptural principles, and if so, to appoint an Army and Navy Commission for Chaplains.<sup>54</sup>

Three years later, the five-man committee appointed by Behnken reported that in “reliable testimony” from pastors who had served as chaplains and from the army’s Chief of Chaplains it was emphasized “again and again” that “the chaplains are to function according to their respective creeds or conscientious practice in each case.” Though under authority of their commanding officers, chaplains received no “dictation as to their spiritual ministry,” and so “the conscientious Lutheran chaplain can avoid all unionistic practices.” The committee was also convinced that offering their pastors to become chaplains did not violate the Missouri Synod’s “accepted Scriptural position” on the separation of church and state. Although the government contributed “a stipulated allowance” toward maintaining the chaplaincy, individual chaplains remained free to perform their duties “in conformity with the teachings of denominational beliefs.” Men were appointed as chaplains by the government but called by their respective church bodies. “They represent us only as long as they conform to the principles and practices of our Synod as members in good standing.”<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> O. H. Pannkoke, “What Is Disturbing the Lutherans?” *CC* 61 (14 June 1944): 722.

<sup>54</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1935*, 133–4.

<sup>55</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1938*, 161.

Thus the arrangement concerning external cooperation with the National Lutheran Council, which President Pfothenhauer in 1918 “drew a line through,” became by 1941 the approved *modus operandi* for conducting chaplaincy work.<sup>56</sup>

“It can only be viewed as the Lord’s guidance,” Behnken later reflected, that the 1935 synodical convention passed this “seemingly minor resolution.” Working closely with government and military authorities, the Army and Navy Commission processed and called qualified pastors who filled the chaplaincy quota allowed to the synod, distributed them among the branches of the military, and built up a chaplains’ reserved corps. “Our church’s slogan, ‘They Shall Not March Alone,’ was more than a pretty slogan.” The service of more than 236 Missouri chaplains, cooperating with the NLC’s motto, “You serve your men, we serve ours,” moved Behnken to conclude, “I am convinced that our church body did as much, if not more, than any other church body to hold the war’s spiritual casualties to a minimum.”<sup>57</sup>

President John Brenner reported to Wisconsin’s 1937 convention that he and the synod’s district presidents had been asked for names of Wisconsin pastors to serve in the chaplaincy program. “My stand has been that we have no authority to do this,” Brenner replied, “as long as our Synod has not included such work in its program.” Faithfulness to the divine call would prevent a minister from looking for a new field of labor on his own initiative. Brenner referred the matter to a committee, charging it to answer three questions: 1. Was there need for this work? 2. Would such service

---

<sup>56</sup> Theodore Graebner, in a paper entitled, “The Burden of Infallibility: a Study in the History of Dogma,” published in *CHIQ* 38 (July 1965): 88–94, but written and circulated privately in 1948, wrote, 92, that during World War I Professor Edward Pardieck of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, “denounced chaplaincies with exactly the same arguments now employed by the Wisconsin Synod. We went ahead in World War II and called chaplains. We never admitted that in World War I our position had been a mistaken one.”

<sup>57</sup> Behnken, *This I Recall*, 42–3.

employed by the government be compatible with scriptural principles? 3. Should not the church body take on the obligation of paying its own missionaries?<sup>58</sup>

Wisconsin's 1937 *Proceedings* also included a brief report of the Committee on Chaplaincies. Acknowledging their inability to make a specific recommendation on the chaplaincy due to insufficient information, committee members nonetheless held that "any pastor entering into such service is doing so without the sanction of the Synod until the Synod has definitely decided in this matter."<sup>59</sup>

An expanded Committee on Chaplaincies reported more definitively to Wisconsin's 1939 convention. After thoroughly studying armed forces literature, it was "of the unanimous opinion that we do not commission pastors to function in this capacity according to governmental regulations." Answering President Brenner's three questions, the committee noted: 1. There was no need to call Wisconsin pastors specifically to that work, because "any ordained minister is at liberty to minister unto the men in service." 2. To submit to government regulations and to accept government remuneration would violate the separation of church and state. Despite official assurances that commissioned chaplains would be permitted to practice sound doctrine and confessional Lutheranism, the committee feared that "it will become a practical impossibility for them once in the service." 3. Feeling ill-equipped to offer definite cost proposals, the committee recommended that respective mission boards survey stateside army camps and navy zones to determine whether such action was needed.<sup>60</sup>

In 1941 the committee repeated its stand that "the commissioning of Army and Navy chaplains by our Synod would conflict with Scriptural principles and Lutheran practice." To

---

<sup>58</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1937*, 16.

<sup>59</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1937*, 55.

<sup>60</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1939*, 67–8.



participate in the government's chaplaincy program would "conflict with Wisconsin's understanding of the divinity of the pastoral call," create "a violation of the principle of the separation of Church and State," and expose pastors to "the spirit of doctrinal indifferentism" pervading the War Department's regulations.<sup>61</sup> Wisconsin's 1943 convention authorized publication and distribution of New Ulm Professor Carl Schweppe's paper on the chaplaincy to all pastors and teachers of the synod, as well as to all convention lay delegates, with the encouragement that the paper be studied "under the leadership of a member or a representative of the [synod's recently formed] Spiritual Welfare Commission."<sup>62</sup>

*At war*

After the outbreak of World War II, President Brenner reported, "We do not find that the present emergency demands a change in the character of true leadership in the Church or in the nature of its work." The work of the church remained "purely spiritual in nature," and its leadership had "*but one objective*, that of 'bringing every thought to the obedience of Christ.'"<sup>63</sup> But

---

<sup>61</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1941*, 43–4.

<sup>62</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1943*, 71. Schweppe concluded that by the government's chaplaincy regulations "we are bound and limited in our preaching over and beyond the bounds set for us by Scripture, and that is something that we can, under no condition, submit to." Regarding the call, Schweppe maintained that the government makes a chaplain "overseer over a definite flock," which was not as God intended it, and so "the Lutheran ministry and the chaplaincy are incompatible, not identical, and for us impossible." Carl Schweppe, *The Government Chaplaincy: An Appraisal* (published by resolution of the Ev. Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, convened at Watertown, Wis., 4–11 August 1943, for distribution to all delegates), 8, 18.

Missouri's Martin Graebner, in a paper entitled "Army Chaplains," (St. Paul, Minn.: n. p., n. d.), responded, 14, that while army chaplains "will have to wrestle with many problems and difficulties in order to comply with both the army regulations and the demands of God's Word," those difficulties and problems seemed no greater than those "which many of our ministers must face in their own parishes." While admitting that "the office of an army chaplain is connected with many temptations to sin," Graebner insisted that the chaplaincy "has not been shown that it is in itself a sinful work" that no Christian may undertake. "Therefore the general rule of the Bible must prevail: Preach the Gospel to every creature."

<sup>63</sup> John Brenner, "The Church and 'War Work,'" *NL* 29 (29 November 1942): 374–5.

Wisconsin's decision not to participate in the military chaplaincy program had now grown less theoretical and more unpopular. "The stand our Synod took on this question in 1939," Brenner remarked, "is not shared by other Lutherans, and, it seems, by some of our own members."<sup>64</sup>

Chaplains' ministries were highly regarded by members of other church bodies. Men were recruited energetically, and the chaplains' work was widely publicized in print and film. Between 1939 and 1945, nearly 10,000 men served as chaplains in the army, army air corps, navy, and air force.<sup>65</sup>

A widely circulated story "The Silver Cord," told the heroic account of four chaplains—Reformed and Methodist pastors, a Roman Catholic priest, and a Jewish rabbi—who died aboard the USS *Dorchester* after their ship suffered repeated torpedo fire from a German submarine. As panic swept the vessel, the chaplains remained on deck quieting the doomed men. Suddenly four young sailors appeared, all without life belts. After giving up their own belts, the chaplains knelt together in prayer and linked arms as the ship went down. Though they were "as far apart theologically as the poles are apart," wrote the author of the account that appeared in the *Christian Herald*, among them "ran that silver cord of the Spirit which binds true men of God together in that spiritual camaraderie which only they and God can ever understand.

They serve one Church, and one alone, the Church Christ wants upon this earth. In that wild moment on the deck they swept away those senseless barriers between "the churches," that make us purely, pitifully "denominational." They knew no creed here but the universal creed of faith unrationed, the common property of all men who believe, the mystic union which exists between Christ and the children of

---

<sup>64</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1941*, 13. Dorn, "The Thirty-Year Controversy," 10, wrote that with the outbreak of war the chaplaincy became "a prominent and highly emotional issue," and remained so throughout the war. "The patriotic fever of the day made the Wisconsin Synod position unpopular among its own members, particularly with those who had children in the military."

<sup>65</sup> Gerald L. Sittser, *A Cautious Patriotism: The American Churches and the Second World War* (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 156.

God whether they worship in Protestant meeting houses, Catholic cathedrals, or Jewish synagogues.<sup>66</sup>

The story illustrates the correctness of Wisconsin's contention that a spirit of unionism and doctrinal indifferentism pervaded the chaplaincy. Yet the cooperation of these four chaplains of differing beliefs only heightened the story's appeal for many readers.<sup>67</sup> Church leaders understood how influential the chaplaincy ministry was. By recruiting and dispatching chaplains, churches demonstrated their patriotism, kept their own servicemen attached to the church, and expanded their denomination's influence beyond its boundaries.

"Some veterans of World War II were turned off decidedly because of our stance," wrote one Wisconsin Synod pastor, who himself served in the army during the war. "It was the Baptists that honestly served us in the 101st Airborne and the 82nd." Wisconsin's doctrinal position was clear, but "in serving our men we did not do enough." Another remembered attending a Milwaukee area pastoral conference at which one of the older pastors "made quite an impassioned plea for sending chaplains, and criticized our pastors severely." Referring to Missouri, he thanked God "that there was a synod which provided chaplains for our boys."<sup>68</sup> Another pastor recalled stronger emotions. "Do not minimize the pain, even anger and disgust, caused to many of the lay people of the synod,

---

<sup>66</sup> "The Silver Cord," *Christian Herald* 66 (June 1943): 21.

<sup>67</sup> In 1942 the *Lutheran Companion* related a similar story about three soldiers—one instructed by a chaplain of the Norwegian Lutheran Church, the other two by an Augustana Synod minister—who received communion together for the first time at the Lutheran Service Center in Alexandria, Louisiana. Two of them subsequently joined a ULCA church, the other an ALC congregation. "The holy moment the soldiers experienced at the altar would have been lost" had Lutherans not been discussing and working toward union and had they not been working together in the military chaplaincy. "Dare we then endanger the welfare of souls by giving anything but our best effort in the cause of greater united Lutheran action?" N. Everett Hedeem, "A God-pleasing Fruit of Lutheran Unity," *LC* 50 (15 October 1942): 1172; cited by Fred H. Lindemann, "The Churchman's Digest," *AL* 25 (November 1942): 12–3.

<sup>68</sup> Responses 40, 4.

and the same to some of us younger ministers,” he wrote. “[Lay people said], ‘They take our boys to the battlefield to die while our preachers can stay safe at home!’”<sup>69</sup>

Wisconsin was not the only church body, however, that opposed the chaplaincy program for doctrinal reasons. Congregational, Presbyterian, and Disciples of Christ leaders were reluctant to subordinate their churches’ spiritual ministries to government control. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church USA urged chaplains to “strive to make their ministry distinctively spiritual so that it be kept from becoming an appendage to the military establishment.”<sup>70</sup> Other church leaders feared their spiritual integrity was being compromised to wartime exigencies. The Christian Reformed Church petitioned President Franklin Roosevelt to address the flagrant violations of the Sabbath that military and industrial defense work forced on soldiers as well as civilians. One editorialist warned that America could win the war militarily but still lose it spiritually if the Lord’s Day was not protected.<sup>71</sup>

Other religious leaders challenged the chaplaincy’s policy on open communion. When an anonymous writer in the Reformed *Banner* insisted that bringing the gospel to the men defending our country was “*more important* than maintaining the rule on closed communion,” *Banner* editor H. J. Kuiper countered that the sacrament would be profaned if it were distributed to unbelievers.<sup>72</sup> Because chaplains were unable to conduct church discipline in the military, Christian Reformed

---

<sup>69</sup> Krug, “Shifts of Fellowship Teachings,” 7.

<sup>70</sup> Steward M. Robinson, “The Box Butte Overture,” *Presbyterian* 110 (14 March 1940): 6.

<sup>71</sup> Chester M. Davis, “Are We Losing the War on the Spiritual Front?” *Presbyterian* 112 (2 April 1942): 7.

<sup>72</sup> H. J. Kuiper, “Should the Christian Reformed Church Administer Open Communion?” *Banner* 77 (2 October 1942): 876–7; emphasis in the original.

pastors could not in good conscience serve as chaplains unless they were allowed to administer closed communion according to the policy of their denomination.<sup>73</sup>

The Baptist *Watchman-Examiner* remarked in 1943 that “the meeting of all sorts of churches in war efforts is to be commended,” but churches “should not forget nor abandon the principles for which they have long stood and the doctrines which they have long advocated.” Wisconsin’s Joh. P. Meyer called it “gratifying” that the *Watchman* writer clearly discerned “the dangers of indiscriminate coordination of war efforts,” yet Meyer wondered what kind of war efforts the writer would commend. “If he is referring to strictly spiritual work, is any cooperation with other church bodies possible at all without denying the truth?”<sup>74</sup>

With more restrained approval Meyer cited another *Watchman-Examiner* report, involving a Baptist chaplain’s dismissal for “his extremely zealous evangelistic inclinations.” The *Watchman* concluded, “Baptist chaplains under such restraints are not free to fulfill what they believe to be the functions of a chaplain, and we are informed that many of them who have entered the chaplaincy have resigned.”<sup>75</sup>

Meyer cited disapprovingly an item in the *News Bulletin* of the NLC. Its editor praised the “regiment’s finest” Lutheran chaplain for accompanying a group of Jewish soldiers 150 miles to enable them to celebrate Passover in their own synagogue. “Brotherhood,” remarked the editor, “the companionship of all men, has and always will be the backbone of our Army.” The Lutheran chaplain, said the *News Bulletin*, “is *minister, father, and rabbi to all the men in this area.*” Is such

---

<sup>73</sup> H. J. Kuiper, “The Chaplaincy Question,” *Banner* 77 (6 November 1942): 996–7.

<sup>74</sup> [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Cooperation in War Efforts,” *Qu* 40 (July 1943): 210.

<sup>75</sup> Henry W. Tiffany, “One Reason for the Dearth of Baptist Chaplains,” *The Watchman-Examiner* 125 (8 July 1943): 648–9. J[oh. P.] M[eyer], “Why Some Baptist Chaplains Resign,” *NL* 30 (22 August 1943): 261.

an attitude of confessional indifference inherent in the army chaplain? Meyer asked.<sup>76</sup> According to *The Lutheran* of 14 July 1943, the chaplain “is a clergyman, priest, minister, or rabbi who, having been given the ecclesiastical endorsement of his own religious group,” conducts worship, offers spiritual leadership, and facilitates educational conferences to provide “*religious ministrations to men of faiths other than his own.*” This is not proselyting, Meyer concluded, but the demand that a chaplain practice “personal accommodation [in military life] to a religious confession which in civilian life he rejects.”<sup>77</sup>

Even the *Christian Century* warned that “the proverbial camel was poking his nose under the tent.”<sup>78</sup> C. Stanley Lowell wrote in 1944 that “denominational exclusiveness was out” because the chaplaincy program “cut across denominational lines.” While Roman Catholicism was allowed to maintain its distinctive practices and services, “the rest must work together as a unit.” A practice such as closed communion was “impossible,” according to Lowell. “Chaplains who feel they cannot administer communion to all Christians are properly dropped from the chaplaincy during the training period.”<sup>79</sup>

A paragraph from the *Presbyterian Guardian* warranted careful attention, Meyer advised, by anyone considering the chaplaincy:

The strange sight of a Roman Catholic chaplain conducting Protestant services, a Protestant chaplain conducting Jewish services, and a Jewish chaplain conducting both Romish and Protestant services, is not only *provided for in the rules*, but is frequently seen. . . . *A chaplain must be willing to conduct such a*

---

<sup>76</sup> [Joh. P.] M[eyer], ““Regiment’s Finest,”” *Qu* 40 (October 1943): 289–90; emphasis in Meyer’s quotation.

<sup>77</sup> “A Chaplain’s Duties,” *Lu* 25 (14 July 1943): 2. M[eyer], ““Regiment’s Finest,”” 290; emphasis in Meyer’s quotation.

<sup>78</sup> [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Re-Thinking the Chaplaincy,” *Qu* 41 (October 1944): 267.

<sup>79</sup> C. Stanley Lowell, “I Was a Chaplain,” *CC* 61 (28 June 1944): 773–4.

“*general service*,” reading from a book to fill the air with neutral though perhaps Biblical words. It cannot be called worship.<sup>80</sup>

### *Missouri's chaplains*

The effect of participating in the chaplaincy program on Missouri's 236 chaplains was profound, as it was on the Missouri Synod as a whole. Milwaukee pastor William Kohn recalled how his army chaplaincy experience, beginning in 1943, fostered an ecumenical vision:

My growth in attitude and outlook started. No longer were there just professors and pastors around. My experiences broadened. I became acquainted with chaplains of other denominations. I met young men in combat who were injured, and there was no place for asking them about denominational distinctions.

Kohn said he discovered that “not every Baptist is a jerk who doesn't really know about baptism,” that not every Catholic is “a full-blown heretic,” and that “there are a lot of good Christians about, and they weren't all Lutherans.” The Missouri Synod needed to get more fully involved with other Christians “with whom they were hardly acquainted.”<sup>81</sup>

Missouri took seriously Wisconsin's warning that participation in the chaplaincy would lead to diminished confessionalism and disloyalty to Lutheranism. In 1941, Missouri chaplain Arthur Carl Piepkorn charged that “the prophets of doom who have been forecasting the collapse of confessionalism in our circles would have been disappointed” if they had attended a chaplains' training conference. As numerous experiences were recounted, “it was plain that it is not only *possible* for a chaplain to be uncompromisingly Lutheran but that our chaplains *have been and are* unwaveringly loyal to our Church's confessional doctrines and Scriptural practices.”<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> Edwards S. Elliott, “Re-Thinking the Chaplaincy,” *Presbyterian Guardian* 13 (10 July 1944): 202. M[eyer], “Re-Thinking the Chaplaincy,” 267; emphasis in Meyer's quotation.

<sup>81</sup> Richard Kenyon, “A dream: church merger succeeds,” *MJ*, 18 September 1982, 5.

<sup>82</sup> A[rthur] C[arl] Piepkorn, “Chaplains' Training Conference,” *LW* 60 (18 February 1941): 56; emphases in the original. While *The Lutheran Witness* claimed that Missouri's chaplains upheld their synod's confessional practice, *The Confessional Lutheran*, an unofficial journal published by a conservative faction within the Missouri Synod, reported on lapses in practice by Missouri chaplains.

Articles in *The Lutheran Witness* throughout World War II headlined the virtues of Missouri's chaplaincy involvement. Pastors became more concerned about evangelism, and church literature contained more articles discussing the pastor's service as evangelist. Rather than provoking doctrinal compromise, the chaplain's duties provided opportunities to witness to non-Lutherans who appreciated solid doctrinal instruction.<sup>83</sup> A Baptist major told a Missouri Synod chaplain at Camp Robinson, Arkansas, "You Lutherans definitely have something on the ball!"<sup>84</sup> Others reported swelling church attendance at camp worship services<sup>85</sup> and exemplary work among German prisoners of war.<sup>86</sup> The chaplains' heroic deeds and promotions to positions of responsibility bolstered Missouri's public image.<sup>87</sup>

---

In one incident Missouri pastors joined ULCA, ALC, and Augustana Lutheran pastors and a Methodist chaplain in dedicating a military service center; in another, a Missouri chaplain officiated together with a Roman Catholic priest at the dedication of a new chapel. Yet *The Confessional Lutheran* reporter supported the view that it was possible for chaplains to maintain their confessional principles under the chaplaincy regulations. "No chaplain is compelled to do anything that is contrary to the recognized doctrine and practice of his denomination. If we hear of a Lutheran chaplain, a Congregationalist and a Jewish rabbi taking part in a joint service, it is a matter of their own arrangement," not something demanded by the government. "Beating The Devil 'Round The Bush," *CL* 6 (January 1945): 11–2. The development and significance of *The Confessional Lutheran* will be discussed in chapter 3.

<sup>83</sup> Victor C. Frank, "The Response of the Air Corps Soldier," *LW* 61 (18 August 1942): 291–2.

<sup>84</sup> W. J. Reiss, "Chaplain, You Lutherans," *LW* 60 (25 December 1941): 419–20.

<sup>85</sup> Ben. G. Hoffmann, "They Do Come to Church," *LW* 61 (17 February 1942): 60. L. E. Faasch, "Governor Stevenson Takes Notice of Service Center," *LW* 63 (23 May 1944): 174.

<sup>86</sup> Erwin R. Carter, "The Work of a Service Pastor," *LW* 63 (24 October 1944): 347.

<sup>87</sup> "Fifth Army Chaplain Is Interviewed," *LW* 64 (27 March 1945): 105. See also Theodore Graebner, "Marshaling Resources for Conquest," *LW* 62 (16 February 1943): 56. G[eorge] V. S[chick], "News," *LW* 63 (5 January 1944): 2. J. F. Wenchel, "Service Center at National Capital is Dedicated," (9 May 1944): 156. "Lutheran Service Center Opens in London," *LW* 64 (16 January 1945): 24. G[eorge] V. S[chick], "News," (9 October 1945): 330.



When the war was over, Martin Sommer wrote that the Lutheran Church in the United States had never received as much publicity as it had in the previous ten years. Along with Dr. Walter Maier's preaching on the *Lutheran Hour* and many more English publications from Concordia Publishing House, "the activity of our chaplains has been very effective in directing the eyes of many toward the Lutheran Church." Missouri chaplains were "now in key positions" and had "come in contact with important men. . . .

Those who have come in contact with these our clergymen, who have listened to their sermons, profited by their advice, submitted to their guidance, their influence will prove of immense value to the Church. As sure as God's Word does not return void, so sure we may be of the fruits of the chaplains' work.<sup>88</sup>

A survey of 198 Missouri clergymen who served as World War II chaplains, conducted by Dale Griffin in June 1963, confirmed the wide-ranging effects this service had on the men involved.<sup>89</sup> Almost half of the 118 respondents reported that their contacts with pastors of other denominations helped them gain greater understanding of those clergy, and 24 of 54 respondents reported having gained a greater appreciation of Lutheranism. "I had a narrow theological environment through youth," one respondent wrote. "[The chaplaincy] had [a] tremendous broadening effect without [causing me to lose] appreciation of doctrine." Said another, "I certainly received a broader outlook of the Christian Church as a whole and that in other churches there are just as devout and dedicated individuals—both lay and clergy—as our own."<sup>90</sup>

Regarding relations with other Christians, one respondent feared that "too often our people get the idea that the Presbyterians or Roman Catholics are to be shunned more than unbelievers." When these men returned to stateside ministries, the chaplaincy experience "has certainly helped to

---

<sup>88</sup> Martin Sommer, "Fruits of the Chaplains' Work," *LW* 65 (9 April 1946): 120.

<sup>89</sup> Griffin, "Effects of Participation," 133–64.

<sup>90</sup> Griffin, "Effects of Participation," 137, 155–6.

move the Missouri Synod into the mainstream of American church life.” Missouri had much to give, but much also to learn. “I do not believe that obedience to Scripture demands that we act as though other Christian churches do not exist.” Said another:

Our chaplains saw what was on the other side of the woods and [it] convinced them that one has to go over there and talk with the “other guys” to do any witnessing. It could have been the chaplaincy that changed our church’s position on relations with other churches, maybe not. But Wisconsin had no chaplains.<sup>91</sup>

At least some in Missouri were concerned, however, about the negative effect the chaplaincy might have. A 1945 editorial in the *Lutheran Herald* predicted that the chaplaincy experience would result in “the loosing of a progressive spirit in the church that we can well use.” These Lutheran chaplains considered it “simply ridiculous having so many groups as we have today working separately.” They were finding “a real harmony together” and declared, “So it should be at home; it will be if we half try.”<sup>92</sup> To this an observer in Missouri’s unofficial conservative journal *The Confessional Lutheran* responded that such a comment “substantiates the fears we have had” about Missouri’s chaplaincy participation. “If our chaplains returning from the war share the opinion that it is *simply ridiculous* to have church bodies working separately, then it will become increasingly to discuss the doctrinal differences which keep us apart.”<sup>93</sup>

*“Our Synod will take care of the spiritual needs of all our boys”*

While continuing to oppose participation in the military chaplaincy program on doctrinal grounds, the Wisconsin Synod was especially eager to demonstrate that it could minister to its

---

<sup>91</sup> Griffin, “Effects of Participation,” 157, 161.

<sup>92</sup> “A Chaplain Looks Ahead,” *Lutheran Herald* 29 (31 July 1945): 543. Robert Lee, *The Social Sources of Church Unity: An Interpretation of Unitive Movements in American Protestantism* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960), 127, later affirmed what the *Lutheran Herald* editorial suggested. Lee said there were “hints” that clergymen with chaplaincy experience felt “emancipated from denominational ties” and found it “difficult to return to a local denominational church setting.”

<sup>93</sup> “Lutheran Union News Digest,” *CL* 6 (October 1945): 123; emphasis added. See also P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “Prayer Fellowship,” *CL* 8 (August–September 1947): 93.

servicemen with its own resources and without compromising its convictions.<sup>94</sup> Almost no Wisconsin pastors entered the government chaplaincy program,<sup>95</sup> yet *Northwestern Lutheran* editor William Schaefer stated flatly, “Our Synod will take care of the spiritual needs of all our boys in the training camps of the land wherever they may be located.” Arrangements would be made for this to be done “with the least possible disturbance and consistent with the gravity of the situation.”<sup>96</sup>

By April 1941, Wisconsin’s Spiritual Welfare Commission, directed by Pastor Edward Blakewell of Milwaukee, was making regular reports to synod members via *The Northwestern Lutheran*.<sup>97</sup> “Your Church has appointed a Commission to provide for the spiritual care of those we are serving in the various units of our country’s defense forces,” Blakewell wrote in a letter addressed to 713 men in the armed forces. “The Commission is extremely conscious of its responsibilities.” With soldiers already scattered throughout more than one hundred camps and bases, “it is not an easy matter to find a church and pastor of our confession at or near each camp and base.” Wherever possible, men were being directed to Wisconsin Synod pastors and congregations.<sup>98</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> See I[mmanuel] P. F[rey], “The Impact of the War on Church,” *NL* 32 (27 May 1945): 107. E[dmund] R[eim], “Religion On The Battlefield—Sectarian Lines Vanish As Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish Chaplains Hold Services for Men and Women of All Faiths in Midst of War,” *Qu* 42 (July 1945): 204–5.

<sup>95</sup> Survey respondent 3, who entered the ministry in the 1940s, could recall only one Wisconsin pastor who entered the chaplaincy during World War II, a pastor from Detroit, who reportedly gave as his reason, “There are no Ladies Aids in the Navy.” Krug, “Shifts of Fellowship in WELS,” 7, estimated that “fewer than a handful of WELS clergy became chaplains, and those who did were dropped from our synod.”

<sup>96</sup> W[illiam] J. S[chaefer], “Our Soldier Boys,” *NL* 27 (17 November 1940): 356. See also W[illiam] J. S[chaefer], “This We Can Do,” *NL* 28 (9 February 1941): 37.

<sup>97</sup> Blakewell’s experience would seem to have made him an ideal candidate for this task. After completing three years of preministerial education at Northwestern College, Blakewell entered the United States Army on 4 September 1917, achieving the rank of second lieutenant of field artillery before being honorably discharged in December 1918. Luther Voss, “Pastor E. R. Blakewell,” *NL* 53 (21 February 1965): 60.

<sup>98</sup> E. R. Blakewell, *NL* 28 (20 April 1941): 123.

President Brenner urged readers to “send the names and addresses of all of your members in training to the Commission.”<sup>99</sup>

In 1942 the parish hall of Salem Church in Milwaukee was transformed into the SWC’s work center. Six full-time employees directed dozens of volunteers—almost all of them women—who answered routine mail, updated address changes, and prepared mailings that went out twice in each three-week period.<sup>100</sup>

Throughout the war the Spiritual Welfare Commission reported on its work and encouraged Wisconsin members to support its effort.<sup>101</sup> “Our Father wants us to recognize the present time of insecurity as one of great opportunity to direct the thoughts of men to spiritual activity,” wrote one author.<sup>102</sup> By 1944, more than 17,000 men and women were listed on SWC files, 9,000 of whom were stationed at over a thousand locations in the United States, the rest overseas.<sup>103</sup> Most were members of Wisconsin Synod congregations, but “there are also quite a few young men and women on our list who are not communicant members of any of our congregations.” In addition, “many of our servicemen have put forth much effort in sharing their spiritual literature with their comrades, by

---

<sup>99</sup> John Brenner, “The Spiritual Welfare Commission,” *NL* 28 (9 March 1941): 71.

<sup>100</sup> “Spiritual Welfare Commission: ‘1916 E. Thomas Avenue,’” *NL* 30 (7 February 1943): 38–40.

<sup>101</sup> See E. R. Blakewell, “Spiritual Welfare Commission: For Our Men in Military Service,” *NL* 28 (1 June 1941): 172; (14 December 1941): 391. E. Benj. Schleuter, “Spiritual Welfare Work More Necessary Than Ever,” *NL* 29 (22 February 1942): 53. E. Duemling, “My Country,” (8 March 1942): 72. E[rwin] E. Kowalke, “Mail for the Soldiers,” (19 April 1942): 118. E[rwin] E. Kowalke, “A Civilian Visits the Army Camps,” (14 June 1942): 183–4. E. Blakewell, “News and Notes,” (9 August 1942): 250. John G. Jeske, “The Work Expands,” (18 October 1942): 328. E[rwin] R. Scharf, (13 June 1943): 186–8. E. Benj. Schlueter, *NL* 31 (20 February 1944): 54. W[illiam] J. S[chaefer], “Our Sixteen Thousand Boys,” (19 March 1944): 66. E. Blakewell, “Your Church Serving More Than 20,000 Members in the Armed Forces,” (6 August 1944): 165.

<sup>102</sup> A. E. Frey, “Spiritual Welfare Commission,” *NL* 28 (4 May 1941): 138.

<sup>103</sup> “Our Contact Pastors,” *NL* 31 (16 April 1944): 88.

placing it in their rooms, and by sharing God's Word with others. In this manner we have received many requests from the unchurched to be placed on our mailing list." Pastors and laymen from other denominations, as well as war workers, wives, and other relatives, received Wisconsin's mailings.<sup>104</sup>

One serviceman wrote, "I have been receiving the 'Daily Devotional' booklets for some time now and I would like to thank you from the bottom of my heart. They are really the only attachment to the church that I have."<sup>105</sup> Wrote another in 1945, "Your last literature reached me in a hospital in England after following me all over France. You would be surprised how many of the fellows wanted me to give them the gospel literature after I was through with it."<sup>106</sup> By war's end the list contained more than 22,000 names, including hospitalized servicemen, soldiers honorably discharged, men listed as missing in action, even German and Japanese prisoners of war.<sup>107</sup>

*No cease fire*

The end of this war did not signal a cease fire in the chaplaincy dispute, but instead prompted calls for a resolution of the disagreements. An overture to the 1946 Synodical Conference convention urged that since the chaplaincy "appears to be a permanent institution in our nation," the problem "be studied thoroughly in an attempt to bring about mutual agreement" among the synods.<sup>108</sup> The eight-man Interim Committee appointed to study the chaplaincy question reported in 1948 that it found disagreement on nine questions, including the nature and divine institution of the local congregation, the doctrines of the call and the office of the public ministry, principles regarding

---

<sup>104</sup> J[ohn] R[aabe], "Spiritual Welfare Commission: The S. W. C. Mailing List," *NL* 31 (28 May 1944): 116.

<sup>105</sup> E. R. Blakewell, "Spiritual Welfare Commission: For Our Men in Military Service," *NL* 28 (19 October 1941): 328.

<sup>106</sup> "Spiritual Welfare Commission," *NL* 32 (18 March 1945): 56.

<sup>107</sup> E. R. B[lakewell], "Spiritual Welfare Commission," *NL* 32 (1 April 1945): 70.

<sup>108</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1946*, 60–1.

separation of church and state, and unionistic practices allegedly unavoidable in the chaplaincy.

Most of the 1948 report was then taken up with church and ministry issues.<sup>109</sup>

In 1950 the Interim Committee could report only that it was “convinced that definite progress has been made,” that it was “not deadlocked on any issue,” and that it was “nearer the goal than two years ago.”<sup>110</sup> In 1952 the Committee determined that the chaplaincy question belonged to “problems arising from the application” of church and ministry principles, and the question was referred to the faculties of the synods’ seminaries.<sup>111</sup> Thus, the stage was set for the most detailed and determinative studies of the chaplaincy, to be presented to the Synodical Conference convention in 1954.

In the meantime, Wisconsin Synod literature continued explaining and defending its chaplaincy position.<sup>112</sup> The Committee on Chaplaincies presented a lengthy report to the 1951 synodical convention, offering numerous citations from the *War Department Technical Manual* and *Army Regulations* and warning that Wisconsin’s doctrinal stance would be compromised:

Experience and knowledge of the interpretation nationally placed upon the concepts of common sense in religious matters and charitable regard for others warn us that a strictly Biblical exercise of either virtue does not commend itself to the latitudinarian religious ideals popular today and practiced in government as well as in many areas of American life dominated by the spirit of unionism and lodgery. . . .

The government’s expressed attitude toward cooperation in religious practice hardly conforms to the standard of confessionalism required by Romans 16:17-18 and other Scripture. To work conscientiously and without deviation from

---

<sup>109</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1948*, 135–44.

<sup>110</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1950*, 126–7.

<sup>111</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1952*, 145.

<sup>112</sup> G[ervasius] W. Fischer, “An Unwarranted Attack,” *NL* 34 (28 September 1947): 312–3. W[illiam] J. S[chaefter], “A Hybrid Arrangement,” *NL* 35 (18 January 1948): 19. I[mmanuel] P. F[rey], “Application of the Principle of the Separation of Church and State to the Chaplaincy,” (1 February 1948): 35–6. A[dalbert] Schaller, “Veterans of Foreign Wars,” *Qu* 46 (January 1949) 63–9. M[ax] Lehninger, Review of *A Handbook of Organizations*, by Theodore Graebner, in *Qu* 46 (April 1949): 150–2. W[illiam] J. S[chaefter], “We Are Not Alone,” *NL* 37 (12 March 1950): 84. Walter Pankow, “Government Chaplaincies,” *NL* 38 (20 May 1951): 146–8.

divine directives in such an environment might well be regarded by one who is under obedience to Christ as an ambition beyond the reasonable hope of attainment.<sup>113</sup>

Wisconsin seminary professor Edmund Reim reported on an agreement between representatives of the NLC and the Missouri Synod, also in 1951, “according to which their respective members in the military service are to be received for communion regardless of their synodical membership.” Considering it “a step of far-reaching importance,” Reim cited one of the agreement’s provisions: “While the pastor may deny communion to an applicant, e.g., for manifest impenitence, he may not bring up the question of the doctrinal issues which still separate Missouri from other Lutheran synods. “What was introduced as an ‘exception’ is now covered by a rule, a rule which even dares to speak with the mandatory ‘shall.’” Noting that this agreement was “officially sanctioned by the Praesidium of Missouri” without “even a semblance of consultation with its sister synods,” Reim asked, “Who is disrupting the Synodical Conference?”<sup>114</sup>

At the 1954 Synodical Conference in East Detroit, Michigan, Edward Fredrich of the Wisconsin Synod, a Detroit pastor, and Martin Scharlemann, Missouri professor at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, represented their respective synods’ positions.<sup>115</sup> Insisting this was not “a minor difficulty” arising from misunderstanding or lack of consultation but “a serious difference regarding

---

<sup>113</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1951*, 71.

<sup>114</sup> E[dmund] Reim, “Another ‘Agreement’: Communion,” *Qu* 48 (April 1951): 141–4. See also E[gbert] S[challer], “Has It Come To This?” *NL* 38 (25 March 1951): 84. E[gbert] S[challer], “Confused Policies,” (6 May 1951): 132. E[gbert] S[challer], “Is God’s Will ‘Expendable?’” (6 May 1951): 132. E[dmund] Reim, “Twenty-Five Army and Air Force Chaplains,” *Qu* 49 (January 1952): 61–2. For Missouri complaints about unionism in the chaplaincy, see “Unionism Marches On,” *CL* 13 (February 1952): 24. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “Concerning Unionism Among Chaplains of the Missouri Synod,” (April 1952): 38–9. A. V. Kuster, “The Armed Forces Communion Agreement,” (April 1952): 45–8. P[aul] Peters, “Dr. Behnken on the New Communion Agreement,” *Qu* 53 (January 1956): 72–5. P[aul] Peters, “The Voice of the C. U. C.: A New Communion Agreement,” *NL* 43 (22 January 1956): 24–5.

<sup>115</sup> Edward C. Fredrich, “The Military Chaplaincy and Scouting,” *SC Proceedings, 1954*, 57–79. M[artin H.] Scharlemann, “The Boy Scouts of America and the Military Chaplaincy,” *SC Proceedings, 1954*, 79–87.

either the application of Bible doctrines or the doctrines themselves,” Fredrich urged that differences over the chaplaincy “be given full and prompt attention and dealt with in all seriousness.”<sup>116</sup> He then offered a sober presentation around Wisconsin’s traditional three objections to the chaplaincy: disregard for the divinity of the call, violation of the separation of church and state, and involvement in religious unionism.

“Though the government is willing to say that the chaplain’s spiritual authority is imparted in ordination,” Fredrich wrote, “yet it jealously reserves for itself the right to say when and where, by whom and for whom this authority is exercised.” The church surrenders its rights to the government, as the government can set standards for chaplains, controls their recruitment by quota, transfer, promotion, or discharge, and enforces numerous specific regulations on them. The principle of the separation of church and state is violated when the state establishes by law the post of chaplain and maintains it by public funds. “No matter what good motive or under what extenuating circumstances or with what attempts at indiscrimination, the fact remains that in the chaplaincy system the State invades the realm of the Church.”<sup>117</sup>

Unionism was “the most serious charge” Wisconsin made against the chaplaincy. Chaplains were appointed spiritual leaders over certain groups with no regard for denominational boundaries. While Roman Catholic and Jewish churches were granted separate classifications, Lutherans were “lumped together” with all others under the heading “Protestant.” Fredrich cited particular incidents where, in Wisconsin’s view, participation in the chaplaincy program not only tolerated unionism but expanded it. “Many a chaplain may be able to report heart-warming experiences he has had,” and

---

<sup>116</sup> Fredrich, “The Military Chaplaincy,” 57.

<sup>117</sup> Fredrich, “The Military Chaplaincy,” 59, 61.



listeners could be “swayed by any listing of results or by any proofs that the chaplaincy system is more effective than a mailing program.”<sup>118</sup>

Fredrich seems to have anticipated Scharlemann’s presentation. “Much has been written and said on this subject, and it is not our purpose to repeat all the arguments pro and con.” With that, Scharlemann signaled that he had little intention of granting serious consideration to any of Wisconsin’s reasons for opposing the chaplaincy. Instead, he offered exactly what Fredrich had chosen to avoid. “My approach is a personal one, and has its source in more than a dozen years of service as a chaplain,” Scharlemann wrote. “This is a matter on which I speak from personal experience and, I might add, with very deep feeling.”<sup>119</sup>

The chaplaincy “presents the church with an unparalleled opportunity to carry out its primary mission” of preaching the gospel to all. He repeated and applied to the chaplaincy— though Wisconsin challenged its relevancy—<sup>120</sup> Peter’s declaration after his visit to Cornelius, “What was I, that I could withstand God?”<sup>121</sup> Each year more than 2,500 men were brought into the Missouri Synod through the ministry of its chaplains. Scharlemann’s assignments at Sampson Air Force Base in Geneva, New York, and at the Air Force Weather School in Chanute Field, Illinois, were but two examples of this extraordinary opportunity. To the question, “How about the general Protestant service that is to be held on every base each Sunday?” Scharlemann answered, “When a Lutheran has that service, he makes it a Lutheran service.”<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> Fredrich, “The Military Chaplaincy,” 64–7, 68.

<sup>119</sup> Scharlemann, “The Military Chaplaincy,” 84.

<sup>120</sup> Paul G. Bretscher, “. . . As I Saw It: The Dissolution of the Synodical Conference, 1954,” *CHIQ* 67 (Summer 1994): 72.

<sup>121</sup> Acts 11:17.

<sup>122</sup> Scharlemann, “The Military Chaplaincy,” 85.

At least approaching the church-state issue, Scharlemann reminded that “the primary concern of the First Amendment and the court decisions made on its basis is to keep any single or any group of church organizations from receiving state sanction and support.” The chaplaincy reflects the same interest in religion that undergirds American life as does reciting “under God” in the Pledge of Allegiance, displaying the flag on Flag Day, and inscribing “In God We Trust” on our coins.<sup>123</sup>

As promised, Scharlemann concluded with a deeply emotional recounting of communion services held in North Africa the night before a bombing raid on Romania. The many men numbered among the flight crews of the 70 planes that did not return, “now part of that ‘cloud of witnesses’ referred to in Hebrews chapter 12,” Scharlemann intoned,

must find it very strange indeed that someone should ever have raised the question of my right to be in Benghazi, Libya, as a military chaplain on the evening of July 31, 1943, with the means of grace to comfort men who knew that they would shortly leave this vale of tears to be with the saints of all ages in the presence of their Redeemer.<sup>124</sup>

Wisconsin delegates brushed aside Scharlemann’s presentation as unbiblical and an argument from sentiment. Some Missourians charged that Wisconsin’s view of the separation of church and state went beyond Scripture. Missouri chaplains pointed out that current government regulations honored church bodies that rejected unionism, to which Wisconsin responded that for a chaplain to summon a priest or rabbi to serve Jewish or Catholic servicemen would already constitute an act of unionism.<sup>125</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup> Scharlemann, “The Military Chaplaincy,” 86.

<sup>124</sup> Scharlemann, “The Military Chaplaincy,” 86–7.

<sup>125</sup> Bretscher, “As I Saw It,” 73. Wisconsin made a similar argument in the last of its 11 tracts, *The Chaplaincy Question*, issued by its Conference of Presidents in 1954. Missouri responded in *The Church’s Opportunities in The Military Chaplaincy: An Open Letter to the Conference of Presidents of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States*, issued by the Armed Services Commission of the LCMS in June 1955.

Reflecting on the 1954 Synodical Conference convention almost a year later, Edmund Reim commended Fredrich's presentation, and those of other Wisconsin men, for displaying "the evidence of careful and thorough preparation," "sober and factual argumentation," "constant reference to Scripture for guidance and light," "quiet and restrained wording of necessary criticism," and "the warm note of earnest appeal." Wisconsin's case was "never more ably and adequately presented than at these most recent meetings."

Why then did they not persuade the Missouri delegates? One important answer—"quite obvious even to 'neutral' observers"—was "the strong organizational loyalty of Missourians to their synod," combined with "a reluctance to believe that a position could possibly be wrong, and a willingness to defend such a position right down the line." Reim also recalled a remark Missouri's Vice President Arnold Grumm made earlier that year at a Lutheran Laymen's League rally in Milwaukee: "As a Lutheran Church we are in the stream of life—why must we always say no-no-no?" Reim believed Grumm's remark shed much light on the intersynodical debate. Reim considered it a dangerous thing "for a Church to find itself 'in the stream' and take pride and find satisfaction in that unaccustomed role."<sup>126</sup>

The chaplaincy question "is loaded with emotional factors," when "patriotism runs high" and men are sent on distant, dangerous missions and their families feel deep concern for their spiritual welfare. "It is even more of a problem," wrote Reim, "when one finds brethren in which one could once look for moral support now leading the chorus of disapproval." Wisconsin's stand was "admittedly unpopular," readily misunderstood, frequently misinterpreted—and, for the past two decades, painfully solitary.<sup>127</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> E[dmund] Reim, "As We See It: Two Necessary Questions," *NL* 42 (17 April 1955): 120.

<sup>127</sup> E[dmund] Reim, "As We See It: Another Report—Chaplaincy," *NL* 42 (20 March 1955): 87.

Wisconsin continued to present its case—sometimes as much to convince its own members as to persuade others.<sup>128</sup>

*A religious element in Boy Scoutism*

The very first issue of *The Northwestern Lutheran* in 1914 criticized America's "craze for organizations." In *Boy Scouting and the Camp Fire Girls* "we are confronted with a problem that Christian parents must take cognizance of." Both were "enjoying a high degree of popularity in our midst and are tolerated if not encouraged in our public schools."<sup>129</sup> Scouting embodied "an oath-bound order, invading the province of the church," comprising "a league where boys of all confessions and creeds are banded together on oath to 'do their duty to God'—unionism in its worst form." Scouting constituted "a movement for moral uplift in which laws are everything and the Gospel of Christ is at least totally disregarded if not despised."<sup>130</sup> There is "a religious element in Boy Scoutism," but not that of the Bible; reverence "to be inculcated, but not reverence for the Triune God"; character "to be developed, but without the Gospel of Jesus Christ."<sup>131</sup>

Although Scouting was undertaken "by good men of our country" who understood that the "ailment" troubling the American boy was the development of his character and moral nature, Hans Moussa insisted that "a Christian home that recognizes its responsibility toward its children will not

---

<sup>128</sup> E[dmund] Reim, "As We See It: A Serviceman Speaks," *NL* 42 (26 June 1955): 200. W[illiam] J. S[chaefer], "Chaplains Are Popular," (27 November 1955): 372. Gerhard L. Press, "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: The Military Chaplaincy," *NL* 43 (27 May 1956): 168–9. Norman A. Madson, "Chaplaincies: Pieper Right Also on Chaplaincy," *NL* 44 (3 February 1957): 39. I[mmanuel] P. F[rey], "Admitted Dangers of the Military Chaplaincy," (17 March 1957): 83. Carl Lawrenz, "Warning Against 'Armed Forces' Religion," *Qu* 54 (April 1957): 149–50. I[mmanuel] P. Frey, "Two Views of The Military Chaplaincy," *NL* 50 (14 July 1963): 211. P[aul] Peters, "Two Opponents of a Government-supported Military Chaplaincy," *WLQ* 62 (October 1965): 300–1.

<sup>129</sup> H[ans] K. M[oussa], "The Craze for Organizations," *NL* 1 (7 January 1914): 5.

<sup>130</sup> [Fred] G[raeber], "Boy Scouts," *NL* 1 (7 April 1914): 54.

<sup>131</sup> J[ohn] B[renner], "Boy Scouts and the Navy," *NL* 16 (31 March 1929): 100.

delegate its heaven-imposed duty to any irresponsible agency, including the Boy Scouts.” After the home, “a Christian school will mold the boy and girl by a steady and unremitting guidance into believers in Christ.” American boys do not need “‘Christian principles’ sugar coated by khaki uniforms and leather stocking jargon.”<sup>132</sup>

Observing that the April 1923 *Elks Magazine* announced that “as many as 200 troops of the Boy Scouts are being looked after by the Elk lodges,” John Brenner remarked, “We are not at all surprised.

When the Elks look after the Boy Scouts they are looking after their own, just as a father looks after his children. The Boy Scout movement is an offspring of the lodge. It has the same ‘undenominational’ religion, the same attempt to effect righteousness without Christ, the common brotherhood of man . . . , an oath, secret signs of recognition, and so forth.

Brenner then cited approvingly Theodore Graebner’s tract “*Y*” *Religion and Boy Scout Morality*, in which Graebner noted that Scouts were frequently required to attend the worship services and social functions of other churches.<sup>133</sup>

The most extensive discussion of Scouting in a Wisconsin Synod publication before 1944 appeared in *The Northwestern Lutheran* in 1929.<sup>134</sup> In seeking to build good moral and religious character, M. C. Schroeder charged that Scouting “has an altogether FALSE VIEW OF HUMAN NATURE” because *it claims that every boy has by nature within himself the essential qualities and power to be good or godly,*” and so was “not in accord with God’s Truth.” There is “absolutely no doubt about the fact that this is a religious movement,” since Scouting recognizes a “Supreme Being”

---

<sup>132</sup> H[ans] K. M[oussa], “Boy Scout Week,” *NL* 6 (15 June 1919): 91. See also H[ans] K. M[oussa], “The Cradle Snatcher,” *NL* 13 (19 September 1926): 294–5. J[ohn] B[renner], “Should Not Be Delegated,” *NL* 14 (17 April 1929): 117–8.

<sup>133</sup> J[ohn] B[renner], “‘Elks Look After Boy Scouts,’” *NL* 10 (20 May 1923): 147. See also J[ohn] B[renner], “Must Go,” *NL* 12 (19 April 1925): 114.

<sup>134</sup> M. C. Schroeder, “What Ought To Be Our Attitude in Respect to ‘The Boy Scouts of America?’” *NL* 16 (23 June 1929): 197–200; (7 July 1929): 215–8; emphases in the original.

from whom people earn rewards by their deeds. Thus Scouting “is the religion which is expressed in beliefs of the various lodge systems, especially that of Masonry.” Scouting’s recognition of the “Infinite Creator of the Universe” who “tolerates ALL religious views” must inevitably lead “to religious UNIONISM where people still want to be considered religious.”

The suggestion that placing Lutheran Scout troops under Lutheran Scoutmasters would alleviate such objections was “pure folly.” Regardless what the individual troop does, “it is a unit of the national organization, supporting it financially and morally,” and thus strengthening “the religiously false, indifferent, unionistic, and humanistic stand of the organization as a whole.” The need for character building and moral guidance Scouting sought to fill should in fact be provided by Christian parents and the Christian Day School.<sup>135</sup>

Despite persistent official testimony, however, Wisconsin’s Scouting position was not universally accepted nor consistently observed within the synod. The Protestant journal *Faith–Life* charged in 1932 that Synodical Conference pastors formerly could be counted on to oppose the sanctioning of Scout troops in their congregations, “although in most instances their reasons were vague” and “based on either technicalities or generalities.” Now, however, pastors and church leaders had become so “contaminated with the spirit of worldly-mindedness,” so eager “not to offend the influential and prominent members of their respective congregations,” that they had grown “very

---

<sup>135</sup> For other Wisconsin Scouting statements prior to 1944, see J[ohn] B[renner], “Pastors Refuse to Ratify Scout Reorganization,” *NL* 7 (7 March 1920): 66–7. H[ans] K. M[oussa], “The Boy Scout Church,” *NL* 12 (22 February 1925): 51–2. H[ans] K. M[oussa], “Our Chronicle,” *NL* 14 (13 November 1927): 355. J[ohn] B[renner], “Boy Scouts Attacked,” *NL* 20 (4 June 1933): 182. [August F. Z[ich], “Lutheran Boy Scouts,” *NL* 24 (12 September 1937): 292–3. [August F.] Z[ich], “Lutheran Boy Scouts,” *NL* 25 (13 March 1938): 84. [August F.] Z[ich], “The Scientific Training,” (27 March 1938): 100–1. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Scouting,” *Qu* 38 (January 1941): 75–6. W[illiam] J. S[chaefer], “Boy Scout Issue,” *NL* 28 (1 June 1941): 170–1. E[dmund] R[eim], “Scouting Must Go On,” *Qu* 40 (July 1943): 213–4.

zealous in their endeavors to harmonize the principles of Scouting and other worldly organizations with the principles of Christianity.<sup>136</sup>

In George Gude's view, Synodical Conference churches were "very cautious" in their approach to Scouting. "There was not complete agreement, even within the synods, nor did they all follow the same approach" when explaining Scouting's objectionable features or correcting Scouting supporters in congregations.<sup>137</sup> W. F. Dorn noted a similar disparity, recalling that Wisconsin's membership, both lay and clergy, "was not in unanimous agreement" on the issue. While some districts and conferences passed resolutions opposing all participation in the Scout program, "the Minnesota District had no such resolution on its books, at least during the first years of the controversy." Dorn stated unequivocally, "There were Boy Scouts in the Wisconsin Synod."<sup>138</sup>

Scouting "was not a doctrinal problem for members, but a social convenience for their children," recalled one Wisconsin Synod pastor. Said another: "We were members of a Wisconsin Synod congregation with a Christian Day School, but also had a Scout troop at that time." His father would not let him join the Scouts because he had grown up in the Missouri Synod, and "that church was opposed to Scouting." This same pastor heard a presentation at Wisconsin's St. Croix Pastoral Conference in Minnesota in which the essayist praised the many good features of the Scouting program and was never criticized for his remarks.<sup>139</sup>

---

<sup>136</sup> Fred W. Krohn, "The Boy Scout Movement," *F-L* 5 (August 1932): 3. An editorial note, 7, explained that this article appeared to be a position paper written by a layman for his congregation, but the congregation's pastor approved the establishment of a Scout troop within the congregation "in the face of scruples of a considerable minority."

<sup>137</sup> Gude, "Pressures and Difficulties," 137-8.

<sup>138</sup> Dorn, "The Thirty-Year Controversy," 8.

<sup>139</sup> Survey responses 40, 50.

Some of the arguments employed against Scouting “were almost ridiculous,” said one respondent. “The Boy Scout issue was blown way out of proportion” and became “much too important an issue at the time.” Said another, “Many of us felt that ‘Scouting’ was raised to the level of the ‘shibbeloth’ of the Wisconsin Synod. It was a subject used by other Lutherans to make us look bad—and thus it was a deterrent to growth.” Two pastors recalled hearing district presidents suggest that “Scouting was not originally meant to have any religious aspects,” and that “the Confessions don’t mention Scouting, so we should not say anything.”<sup>140</sup>

*“Scouting should be left to the individual congregation to decide”*

Wisconsin appreciated the Missouri Synod’s early opposition to Scouting, but Missouri’s anti-Scouting position had already started to weaken in the 1920s.<sup>141</sup> Missouri’s Theodore Graebner was originally a determined opponent of Scouting, writing a series of anti-Scouting articles for *Der*

---

<sup>140</sup> Survey responses 21, 75, 20, 63. At the time, however, Wisconsin pastors appear to have been reluctant to speak out against Wisconsin’s Scouting position. William Schaefer reported that at Wisconsin’s 1947 convention, even “though men were urged and begged to express themselves if they were not in full agreement” with the synodical stand, “not one voice was raised in opposition” to it. “A few had misgivings in regard to policy,” Schaefer said, “but none expressed a variant view in regard to the subject matter.” W[illiam] J. S[chaefer], “The 1947 Convention of Joint Synod,” *NL* 34 (31 August 1947): 275.

<sup>141</sup> Carl Lawrenz, “The History of the Boy Scout Issue,” (paper presented to a special convention of the Michigan District, 28–29 June 1951), 3, agreed that the Wisconsin Synod “was strengthened in a firm stand by the warning reports of Missouri Synod committees and by pamphlets issued by some of its leading theologians.” In particular, Lawrenz cited Theodore Graebner’s “pamphlet on Boy Scout Morality, released around 1917 or 1918,” which Graebner referred to in *Secret Empire: A Handbook to Lodges* (St. Louis: CPH, 1927). Lawrenz also recalled the 1927 *Concordia Cyclopaedia*, which stated: “Considering that the Boy Scout movement seeks to develop character and virtue and love to God, the organization not only has a religious character, but seeks to do on the basis of natural religion what can only be done by means of the Gospel. Such effort is in line with the attempt made by many churches today to develop character without a thorough regeneration of the heart and without considering it necessary to be guided in spiritual matters only by the inspired Word of God.” L[udwig] Fuerbringer, Th[eodore] Engelder, and P[aul] E. Kretzmann, eds. in chief., *The Concordia Cyclopaedia: A Handbook of Religious Information with Special References to the History, Doctrine, Work, and Usages of the Lutheran Church* (St. Louis: CPH, 1927), 90.



*Lutheraner* in 1916.<sup>142</sup> Over the next three decades, however, Graebner “not only dropped his objections but adopted a rather positive attitude toward the organization.”<sup>143</sup>

Graebner’s original opposition lay in Scouting’s moral and religious purpose. Scouting ignored essential ingredients of genuine moral development: the recognition of man’s sinfulness and the need for repentance and spiritual regeneration. The Scout Law replaced genuine religious instruction. A daily Good Turn led to pharisaical work-righteousness.<sup>144</sup> Quoting the Scouts’ *Official Handbook* that there were “many ways of following” the one God, Graebner faulted Scouting for creating a false image of God and religion. Scouting regarded all religions as being on an equal plane. He feared Lutheran Scouts might feel obligated to attend unionistic services and compromise their faith by worshiping with Scouts of different denominations. Graebner considered the Scout oath frivolous, “exact[ing] of boys the common virtues of life which they should be expected to do as a matter of course.”<sup>145</sup> Graebner saw numerous parallels between the Scout movement and lodges and freemasonry, once labeling the Boy Scouts “a preparatory school for Freemasonry and for the lodges in general.”<sup>146</sup>

---

<sup>142</sup> [Theodore] G[raebner], “Was ist von der ‘Boy Scout’—Bewegung zu halten?” *DL* 72 (25 April 1916): 158–60; (9 May 1916): 178–80; (23 May 1916): 198–9.

<sup>143</sup> Jerald Kort Pfabe, “Theodore Graebner: Apologist for Missouri Synod Lutheranism” (Ph. D. diss., St. Louis University, 1972), 152. All the following documentation concerning Graebner’s change in attitude toward Scouting is derived from Pfabe’s study of Graebner’s career, pages 152–69.

<sup>144</sup> W. P. McGuire, ed. of *Boy’s Life and Scouting* to Theodore Graebner, 15 December 1915, TG 12, CHI.

<sup>145</sup> Theodore Graebner, “Y” *Religion and Boy Scout Morality* (St. Louis: CPH, n. d.), 11–5.

<sup>146</sup> “Was ist von der ‘Boy Scout’—Bewegung zu halten?” 198. Armin K. E. Keibel, “Why the Wisconsin Synod Suspended Fellowship with the Missouri Synod, (paper presented to the WELS Arizona-California District Pastors’ Conference, San Diego, 30 October 1996), 3, recalled that Graebner wrote somewhere that “Boy Scouts make Pharisees out of little boys.”

Instead of remaining a sideline critic, however, Graebner met with Scout officials and listened as they pleaded for understanding of the true nature of their organization.<sup>147</sup> Because a 1925 handbook *Scouting Under Protestant Leadership* still made the Scout troop committee advisory to the Scoutmaster, Graebner repeated previous criticisms of Scouting in his *Winning the Lodge-Man*.<sup>148</sup> Initially disappointed at Graebner's objections, Ray Wyland, Director of Relationships, praised Graebner's spirit of cooperation and promised that Scout officials would put total direction of a Scout troop under the local congregation.<sup>149</sup> By 1927 Graebner wrote,

Our former and principal objection to scouting falls. When a troop is organized within one of our congregations, that troop committee has entire control of the troop. In other words, the boys can no longer, on penalty of losing their good standing as Scouts, be expected to attend rallies in sectarian churches or unionistic Scout service. When in camp, the Lutheran boys are not expected to take part in the general religious service.<sup>150</sup>

In time Graebner abandoned other objections to Scouting. The Scout oath, he decided, was not strictly an oath, and its requirement of a Good Turn was not in itself wrong.<sup>151</sup> Scouting was purely a secular and civic organization, not a religious association. It merely recognized that developing good citizenship included a relationship to God; it did not impose religious standards.<sup>152</sup>

---

<sup>147</sup> L. A. Komjachy to Theodore Graebner, 2 July 1920; C. A. Edson to Theodore Graebner, 20 August 1920; W. Barclay, Director of Department of Education, Boy Scouts of America, to Theodore Graebner, 3 January 1921, TG 12, CHI.

<sup>148</sup> Theodore Graebner, *Winning the Lodge-Man* (St. Louis: CPH, 1925), 69–71.

<sup>149</sup> Ray O. Wyland to Theodore Graebner, 25 November 1925 and 12 December 1925, TG 11, CHI.

<sup>150</sup> Theodore Graebner, *Secret Empire*, 218–23.

<sup>151</sup> Manuscript, Theodore Graebner, "Memorandum on Scouting," 18 April 1929, TG, 12, CHI; "Report on Junior Organizations: Including the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Camp-Fire Girls, Hi-Y Societies, and Girl Reserves," submitted to the Pastors' and Teachers' Conference of the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States by the Board for Young People's Work, 1 September 1930, 5.

<sup>152</sup> Manuscript, "The Relationship of Scouting to the Church," paper prepared by the LCMS Bureau of Information on Secret Orders, Paul Bretscher, O. F. Engelbrecht, Theodore Graebner, E. L.

Graebner also reversed his objection to Scouting's character training. Since "*Christian* character can be trained only through the Christian religion," the false deduction is made that character cannot be trained by other means. But "there is such a thing as natural ethics," and "even the pagans possessed their share of it."<sup>153</sup>

Summarizing his transformed views on Scouting in 1946, Graebner concluded that "charges were made which can no longer be made today." While encouraging religious instruction as "an ingredient in good citizenship," Scouting "leaves the choice of church and religion to the Scout's parents exactly as the public school."<sup>154</sup>

Under Graebner's influence, Missouri's 1932 convention approved the report of its Board for Young People's Work, acknowledging the willingness of Boy Scout officials to remove objectionable features from its guidelines.<sup>155</sup> Conventions in 1935 and 1938 continued that trend, and the 1938 convention adopted a report concluding that "the national headquarters of the Boy Scout organization have so modified their position as to grant to the individual congregation complete control of its troop." Members of church groups were "in no wise required to take part in any activities which are contrary to our principles."<sup>156</sup>

Missouri's 1944 synodical convention adopted the following report of its Bureau of Information on Secret Societies:

---

Roschke, Board for Young People's Work, 19 March 1945, TG 12, CHI. [Theodore] G[raebner], "Notes on Scouting," *LW* 64 (3 July 1945): 212. Graebner to Rev. R. J. Lillie, 15 June 1946, TG 12, CHI.

<sup>153</sup> Theodore Graebner to Rev. R. J. Lillie, 30 January 1945, TG, 12, CHI.

<sup>154</sup> [Theodore] G[raebner], "Notes on Scouting," 212.

<sup>155</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1932*, 110.

<sup>156</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1935*, 106f.; *1938*, 341.

Your synodical committees obtained all the official handbooks both for scouts and scoutmasters, covering every phase of the work, and examined these for any ingredients of the program that would militate against a Lutheran scoutmaster's committing himself to this program. We were unable to find any factors which would violate our principles and have not been able to discover anything in the practices of scouting, as outlined in these handbooks, to which a Christian parent, scoutmaster, or pastor would take exception. Moreover, a Lutheran Committee on Scouting has issued a manual entitled *Scouting in the Lutheran Church*, which definitely claims for the pastors and congregations the sole and unrestricted right of the Lutheran church committee . . . to control everything of a religious nature that is to be superimposed upon the official scout program. . . . Accordingly, your Committee believes that the matter of scouting should be left to the individual congregation to decide and that under the circumstances Synod may consider her interests sufficiently protected.<sup>157</sup>

Graebner saw "much more at stake than the Boy Scout issue." He feared opposition to Scouting was symptomatic of an increasing affinity for quick, legalistic answers. "We are confronted with a churchmanship which operates with a mechanical use of Scripture and which stubbornly ignores the change which has taken place in the attitude of the Scout movement towards religion and the church." He wished Lutheran clergymen in the 1940s could recognize "as clearly as it was recognized by Dr. Pieper" that the "legalistic demand for uniformity where no Word of God can be quoted is just as far removed from sound Lutheranism as the indifferent, unionistic spirit." He and others "who have been trained in the free air of Luther's theology" would resist "being tyrannized in matters that can be construed as being sinful only by giving them an artificial and unnatural twist, as in the Boy Scout controversy."<sup>158</sup>

*"We were shocked beyond measure"*

Here, however—perhaps for the first time—Missouri made a decision, without regard to its sister synods of the Synodical Conference, which the Wisconsin and Norwegian synods could not readily excuse. Synodical Conference opposition to Scouting was difficult for many to understand,

---

<sup>157</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1944*, 102.

<sup>158</sup> Theodore Graebner to Philip Lange, 17 March 1945; 11 April 1945. TG 12, CHI.

but Wisconsin could at least take comfort that its big sister was also willing to wage this unpopular battle. Missouri's abandonment left Wisconsin with a sense of hurt and betrayal which, from the perspective of a disinterested observer, may seem out of proportion to the importance of the issue.

Initial reaction to Missouri's decision was restrained. John Brenner maintained at Wisconsin's 1945 convention that "the Scout program still contains elements of religion."<sup>159</sup> George Lillegard of the Norwegian Synod remarked, "The change in position regarding the Scouting movement was seen as a weakening of the Missouri Synod stand against unionism, which would ultimately cause it to lose its true conservative character."<sup>160</sup>

But *Northwestern Lutheran* editor William J. Schaefer, almost a year after the decision, in a rambling, emotional editorial, voiced the hurt he (and presumably many others) felt over Missouri's action:

We were shocked beyond measure to read in the *Lutheran Witness* that the Missouri Synod reports having 187 Boy Scout troops and 35 Cub packs—the third highest number among the Lutheran bodies.<sup>161</sup> We were more than shocked that the *Lutheran Witness*, the official publication of the Missouri Synod, would publish this fact, especially at a time when other sister synods in the Synodical Conference, the Wisconsin Synod in particular, are taking strong issue with the Missouri Synod on the question of Scouting. . . . To publish such a tabulation and commitment at this time on the part of the editors of the *Lutheran Witness*, when this movement is causing untold confusion and offense in certain localities, is most shocking. Is it an attempt to violate and force the consciences of these men and to create disruptions? We dare not permit ourselves to draw this conclusion. But—what conclusion is one to draw from this inexcusable publicity? It seems daring to us for the editors of the *Lutheran Witness* to flaunt this announcement into the face of their own brethren—and there are enough of them—who do not see eye to eye with them on Scouting. It does not seem to be a fair thing to do; it is not brotherly. . . . This action of the *Lutheran Witness* hurts beyond the ability of expressing it. Knowing the position of some of them [Missourians who still opposed Scouting] we at least had a right to believe that they would honor our sincere opposition and so say or write nothing that might embarrass us. Brotherly love demanded this. And the well known fact that

---

<sup>159</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1945*, 11.

<sup>160</sup> George O. Lillegard, "The Great Divide," *LuSen* 28 (27 September 1945): 273–5.

<sup>161</sup> G[eorge] V. S[chick], "News," *LW* 64 (8 May 1945): 146.

within the Missouri Synod there are many who disagree with their synod's policy in this matter, ought to have prompted the editors to use caution. We are sick at heart. We can't imagine the Missouri Synod doing such a thing under the rugged leadership of the godly and valiant men of a few decades ago. We deeply deplore the incident, sick at heart.<sup>162</sup>

Wisconsin also deplored what it saw as Missouri condescension. One pastor recalled a meeting with representatives of both synods, at which the Scouting issue was discussed. Wisconsin's Carl Lawrenz asked the LCMS contingent, "Since you now support the Scouts, who has changed? The Scouts, the Missouri Synod, or both?" The reply he received was, "No one has changed. We have become enlightened." This respondent also remembered that Theodore Graebner had written "an excellent brochure on the unscriptural stance of the Boy Scouts," but when the respondent tried to reorder the brochure from Concordia Publishing House in the late 1940s, he was told that "Prof. Graebner had disavowed everything he had previously written about the Scouts."<sup>163</sup>

Graebner may have argued that enlightenment was precisely what Wisconsin needed—on Scouting and other subjects. After several meetings with Wisconsin representatives proved fruitless, Graebner charged Wisconsin's pastors and professors with suffering from "a complete hardening of their doctrinal arteries."<sup>164</sup> On a manuscript critical of Scouting for its failure to mention the forgiveness of sins, Graebner penciled: "Exactly. Because it does not presume to give spiritual

---

<sup>162</sup> W[illiam] J. S[chaefer], "Boy Scouts And The Missouri Synod," *NL* 32 (10 June 1945): 122. Since the Missouri Synod could claim so many Scout troops and Cub packs within its congregations less than a year after its convention decision granting their approval, either many congregations had quite quickly organized local troops and packs, or many congregations had in fact maintained troops and packs prior to the decision. The latter explanation is far more likely. One lifelong Lutheran in the Milwaukee area told the author in April 2000 that he was certain that the LCMS congregation Sherman Park Lutheran Church in Milwaukee already had established Scout troops in the year he was confirmed—1938.

<sup>163</sup> Survey response 32.

<sup>164</sup> Theodore Graebner to E. J. A. Marxhausen, 13 September 1946; TG, 12, CHI.

guidance.”<sup>165</sup> To the objection that Lutherans compromised their faith by joining organizations such as the Scouts, uniting them with people of other faiths, Graebner replied that consistency would also require Lutherans to avoid courts of law because they permitted differing concepts of God when witnesses were placed under oath.<sup>166</sup>

Graebner criticized Wisconsin for refusing to accept the positive contributions made by civic righteousness and the natural knowledge of God. He once complained that the Wisconsin Synod wished “to have both the natural knowledge of God and the natural knowledge of the law hang suspended somewhere in a vacuum,” much as they “have accorded a space somewhere in the stratosphere to the doctrine of the *Una Sancta*.”<sup>167</sup>

All synods of the Synodical Conference were encouraged to restudy the Scout question. Unmoved in its opposition to Scouting, Wisconsin directed a memorial to Missouri’s 1947 convention:

We confess that we find it difficult to reconcile the Saginaw report [of Missouri’s 1944 convention] with the 1938 resolution of your synod on this subject, particularly paragraph 3 in which you speak of “naturalistic and unionistic tendencies still prevalent in the Boy Scout movement.” . . . That those unionistic features have not been eliminated, even now, is indicated, we believe, by the book *Scouting in the Lutheran Church*, which to us is a plain instance of unionism with Lutheran synods with whom we are not in fellowship.<sup>168</sup>

The presentation of this memorial and the ensuing discussion prompted little reaction from Missouri. In fact, the next day a Missouri delegate “expressed himself during the session concerning the

---

<sup>165</sup> Manuscript, “Boy Scouts of America” (by a Committee of the Concordia [Milwaukee] College, 1942, TG, 11, CHI.

<sup>166</sup> Theodore Graebner to A[dalbert] Schaller, 26 February 1945; TG, 12, CHI.

<sup>167</sup> Theodore Graebner to Alfred Fuerbringer, December 1947; Theodore Graebner to John F. Chiotz, 7 November 1949, TG, 12, CHI. Paul M. Bretscher and Theodore Graebner, “Report on Meeting with Intersynodical Relations Committee,” 14 February 1947, TG, 12, CHI.

<sup>168</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1947*, 105. The memorial was followed by “A study of Boy Scoutism,” answering chief questions regarding the Scouting movement.

impropriety that a member of the Wisconsin Synod should have spoken on the floor of the convention and influenced its action. His remarks were not rebuked by the chair.”<sup>169</sup>

Over the next decade, Wisconsin repeated and amplified its position against Scouting. Arthur Voss reviewed the history of the “Theses on Scouting in the Lutheran Church,” drafted by the Mixed (Missouri and Wisconsin) Pastoral Conference in the Milwaukee area beginning in 1930, to demonstrate that Missouri and Wisconsin had not only agreed in their opposition to Scouting but that “in 1934 a motion prevailed in the Mixed conference that the respective pastoral conferences of Milwaukee should deal with such congregations whose position with regard to Scouting differed from that of the Mixed Pastoral Conference.”<sup>170</sup> The same issue of *The Northwestern Lutheran* contained the full text of those theses, which were adapted into the tract *Scouting in the Light of Scripture*.<sup>171</sup>

Numerous detailed studies of Scouting were now widely circulated in the Wisconsin Synod, among them *What Should Be Our Attitude Toward Boy Scouts?* and *Scouting in the Light of Holy Scripture*.<sup>172</sup> Articles concerning Scouting appeared frequently in *The Northwestern Lutheran*.<sup>173</sup>

---

<sup>169</sup> Lawrenz, “History of the Boy Scout Issue,” 14. Lawrenz recalled this detail “to show the difficulty which confronted those who were to act in the name of our synod in bringing its convictions concerning the Boy Scout issue to the attention of our sister synod.”

<sup>170</sup> Arthur P. Voss, “History of the ‘Theses on Scouting in the Lutheran Church,’” *NL* 32 (19 August 1945): 170.

<sup>171</sup> “Theses on Scouting in the Lutheran Church,” *NL* 32 (19 August 1945): 172–4. A[dalbert] Schaller, review of *Scouting in the Light of Scripture*, in *Qu* 43 (July 1946): 221–2.

<sup>172</sup> W[ilmer] Vallesky, *What Should Be Our Attitude Toward Boy Scouts?* (Mimeographed, available from L. Hallauer, n. d.). Erhard C. Pankow, *Scouting in the Light of Holy Scripture* (Milwaukee: NPH, 1949).

<sup>173</sup> I[mmanuel] P. F[rey], “The God of the Boy Scouts,” *NL* 34 (2 March 1947): 67. E[dmund] Reim, “The Debate on Union: Scouting in the Lutheran Church,” (22 June 1947): 198–200; (6 July 1947): 218–9. [Joh.] P. M[eyer], “The Scout Oath,” (6 July 1947): 219–20. E[dmund] Reim, “Where Do We Stand? V. We Have a Problem: Scouting,” *NL* 36 (27 March 1949): 106–7. Norman Madson, “A Pastor on Scouting,” (27 March 1949): 107–8. [William] J.



Carleton Toppe's essay, "A Time-Honored Warning Against Present Dangers to the Church from Pharisaism," delivered in 1948 and reprinted in the 1951 *Quartalschrift*, contained a lengthy analysis of Scouting.<sup>174</sup> Wisconsin faulted the "Pro Deo et Patria Award," conferred by the Lutheran Church on Boy Scouts who "have fulfilled a prescribed course of spiritual improvement" and "given outstanding service to [their] local congregations."<sup>175</sup> A statement of the Christian Reformed Church, "discouraging" membership in the Boy Scouts because of the Scout oath and the "pagan religious influence" in Scouting ceremonies, caused Edmund Reim to call it "heartening to see another group taking a stand on this question and braving the opposition and ridicule they will no doubt encounter."<sup>176</sup>

By 1952, a report of the Synodical Conference Committee on Scouting concluded that differences between the synods had become entrenched. "Scouting is not agitating the Missouri Synod," the report declared, "nor is it a problem in the Slovak Lutheran Church." The eight Missouri

---

S[chaefer], "Read the Article," (22 May 1949): 163. G[ervasius] W. Fischer, "The Boy Scouts Teach a Boy To Go To Church," (22 May 1949): 169–70. A[rmin K. E.] Keibel, "Religion in Scouting," *NL* 40 (4 October 1953): 313–5. Carl Lawrenz, "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: The Missouri Synod's Position on Scouting," *NL* 43 (18 March 1956): 88–9. H[enry] A. Koch, "The Antichristian Religion of the Scouts," (30 September 1956): 314–5. John F. Brenner, "The Lord's Prayer—A 'Non-Denominational' Prayer?" *NL* 44 (4 August 1957): 248. C[arleton] Toppe, "They Want to Be, So They Say They Are," *NL* 45 (12 October 1958): 323.

<sup>174</sup> Toppe, "A Time-Honored Warning Against Present Dangers to the Church from Pharisaism," *Qu* 48 (July 1951): 186–91; (October 1951): 269–73.

<sup>175</sup> P[aul] Peters, "The 'Pro Deo et Patria Award,'" *Qu* 48 (July 1951): 208–9. Peters cited the entire news article from the NLC's *News Bureau* to show "how close the alliance between the American Federation of Lutheran Brotherhoods and the Boy Scouts of America really is." While maintaining that the award was "not a merit badge in Scouting but an award of the Church in recognition of spiritual achievement," the report acknowledged that it "is intended to stimulate a Boy Scout to more zealous fulfillment of the Scout Promise and the Twelfth Scout Law"—which, in Peters' view, constituted a distinction without a difference. See also E[dmund] Reim, "On Religious Awards," *NL* 42 (13 November 1955): 365–6. E[dmund] Reim, "New Lutheran Award Set For Scout Leaders," *Qu* 53 (January 1956): 70–1.

<sup>176</sup> E[dmund] Reim, ". . . and then there were three," *Qu* 48 (October 1951): 293–4.

and Slovak members of the committee considered Scouting “a secular boys’ organization designed to promote good citizenship” but maintained it “does not teach religion.” Scouting “does not promise spiritual blessings such as forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation.” The Scout oath “is not an oath in the religious sense.” In their view, objections stemmed from false views of Scouting principles, false scriptural applications regarding the natural knowledge of God, and “an apparent unwillingness to accept documented evidence in support of principles under which Scouting is now conducted in its relation to the churches.”

The seven Wisconsin and Norwegian members of the Committee on Scouting objected that “in some of the fundamental features of the Scout program there are religious elements with which a Christian cannot identify himself without offending against the Word of God.” Scouting’s objectionable features had “not been removed by any changes that have been made in the organization and program of Scouting.”<sup>177</sup>

*Anti-Scouting = Anti-American?*

It was not easy maintaining opposition to Scouting on the local level. During the early months of 1950, as the Boy Scouts celebrated their 40th anniversary, *The Princeton Times–Republic* in Princeton, Wisconsin, praised Scouting as “an American institution” in which “boys of all races and all creeds play and learn together, which is the American way. Now more than any time in our history,” the paper continued, “it is necessary to avoid all religious and racial discrimination, to the end that all will become fine American citizens with the great Democratic ideal that all men are brothers.”<sup>178</sup> The same issue of the local newspaper reported that Scouts had sold Liberty Bonds during World War I, distributed walnuts and fruit pits used in gas masks, and brought assistance to

---

<sup>177</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1952*, 145–7. See also Edmund Reim, “As We See It: A Report—Scouting,” *NL* 42 (6 March 1955): 70–1. Frederic E. Blume, “Dr. Behnken on Scouting,” *Qu* 52 (October 1955): 293–6.

<sup>178</sup> E. L. Hiestand, “Princeton Scouts Organized 35 Years,” *PTR*, 2 February 1950, 1.

flood and hurricane victims. “It is estimated that over four million men in the Armed Forces were once Boy Scouts or leaders.”<sup>179</sup>

During those same early months of 1950, however, Walter Stroschein, who only recently had become the pastor of the Wisconsin Synod church in Princeton,<sup>180</sup> was taking a hard line against Scouting. Stroschein’s—and the synod’s—position was challenged by a Princeton attorney, Philip Lehner, Jr., who was both president of Stroschein’s congregation and leader of a local Scout troop. Lehner rejected Stroschein’s demand to resign from the Scouts, claiming support from laymen, ministers of other denominations, and Scout executives in Princeton and nearby communities. A Lutheran minister from nearby Mt. Horeb, Wisconsin, in a letter to Lehner and Stroschein, charged that “God will be more lenient on Judgment Day than your congregation is now in condemning an American Scout.” The minister, whose synodical affiliation was not revealed, added, “All other Lutherans are becoming more and more ashamed that there are so-called Lutherans with attitudes such as prevail” in Princeton.<sup>181</sup>

The week before Memorial Day, a front page editorial in Princeton’s newspaper clearly placed itself in opposition to the synod’s Scouting position:

For the record the *Times–Republic* is wholeheartedly for scouting as an American institution. This newspaper is an American newspaper, ever struggling to protect and encourage the institutions, organizations, and the government that make this country great.

---

<sup>179</sup> “The Story Behind 40 Years of Scouting,” *PTR*, 2 February 1950, 1. A large ad, also on page 1 of the 2 February newspaper, announced, “Boy Scouts of Today Make Better Citizens of Tomorrow.” Additional stories in the local paper also praised the Scouts: “U[nited] B[rethren] Church Will Honor Boy Scouts,” *The Prince Times–Republic*, 9 February 1950, 1. “Camp Fire Girls Make World Their Back Yard for Good Work,” *PTR*, 27 April 1950, 3. “Large Crowd Attends Girl Scout Banquet,” *PTR*, 11 May 1950, 1.

<sup>180</sup> According to a *Northwestern Lutheran* biography, Stroschein had nineteen years of experience in the ministry when he accepted the call to be pastor in Princeton in November 1949. “St. John’s of Princeton Observes Stroschein’s Fiftieth.” *NL* 67 (9 September 1980): 368.

<sup>181</sup> “Pastor–Scout Issue Hotter,” *MS*, 13 May 1950, 1:3.

To put it bluntly, the Wisconsin Synod of the Lutheran Church has struck a low blow to the very heart of American Youth. They could hardly have done a more damaging act if they had boycotted the Congress of the United States. Congress, too, opens each session with a prayer.

Scouting was accorded “tolerance and support” throughout mainline denominations, in Russian Orthodox churches, Jewish synagogues, and among Mormons in Salt Lake City. While it flourished “from north to south, from coast to coast” under “the appreciative eyes” of 150 million Americans, “only in the eyes of some 192,000 Wis. Synod Lutherans is scouting boycotted— and they are divided. Can so many be wrong and so few be right?”

Calling it “NOT a church question” but a “civic question” open to public discussion, the *Times–Republic* said:

Here is a clear cut issue. You can’t straddle the fence. You are either for or against scouting. You must either uphold scouting and the American way of life or go back to the narrow teachings of the church and oppose American ideals as embodied by Scouting, the American Legion, Rotary, and many other organizations which continue to support the community, which encourage the mixing of nationalities, the melting of all our peoples into a strong and united America.

The Lutheran Church as represented by the Wisconsin Synod does not have the right to oppose these American organizations. It cannot do so and still enjoy the respect of the people in this country. With every right there is a responsibility.

There is an answer to this question of scouting and the church, and it can be answered by the laymen in the church. Ask yourselves as Lutherans, does scouting in any manner conflict with the teachings of Christ? Then ask yourself, does scouting encourage disrespect to the church, to the American way of life? Examine the issue fully and when you have your answers, instruct your leaders to take the action necessary to purge the church from its anti-American stand.<sup>182</sup>

The next week the *Times–Republic* reported that the editorial, reprinted in *The Milwaukee Journal*, had raised “a storm of comment from people throughout the state.” The newspaper in this tiny central Wisconsin town received so many letters that it was unable to publish them all, but exhibited them in its front office window for those along the sidewalk of the main street who wanted

---

<sup>182</sup> “There Must Be An Answer,” *PTR*, 18 May 1950, 1.

to read them. A Milwaukee man who signed his letter simply “An American” charged that any preacher or any man who thought the Boy Scouts’ oath represented false doctrine “does not belong in this country.” Because clergymen receive special protection and churches were exempt from taxes, “they should be among the first to support Americanism.”<sup>183</sup>

This unpleasant incident suggests a powerful reason why Wisconsin’s opposition to Scouting was so volatile at the midpoint of the twentieth century. With patriotism at an all-time high following the United States victory in World War II and with the rise of anti-Communist paranoia (kindled, ironically, by a Democratic senator from Wisconsin),<sup>184</sup> the synod’s rejection of what was widely considered a wholesome, patriotic group seemed clearly out of step.<sup>185</sup> Certainly it was no light matter, wrote Edmund Reim, for Wisconsin members “to read about themselves in news

---

<sup>183</sup> “Milwaukee Journal Prints ‘Editorial’ Story, Many Comments Received By Mail,” *PTR*, 25 May 1950, 1. See also “Pastor’s Ban on Scouting Splits Town,” *LO* 15 (July 1950): 216. “Paper Hits Synod Anti-Scout Stand,” *LO* 15 (July 1950): 216. W[illiam] J. S[chaefer], “The Princeton Issue,” *NL* 37 (4 June 1950): 180–1. In an ironic twist, the Wisconsin Synod’s Northern Wisconsin District at its district convention the next month elected Stroschein as district president, apparently for the strong stand he took. According to a *Milwaukee Journal* report on the conference, much of the opening session was devoted to “an examination of conscience, apparently pricked over the scouting issue.” Without referring directly to the scouting issue, outgoing district president Irwin Habeck remarked: “If ‘strict’ means enforcing man-made ecclesiastical laws, then we are wrong. But if it means being forthright and honest, then thank God we are strict.” “Princeton Minister Named District Chief,” *PTR*, 23 June 1950, 1.

<sup>184</sup> Mary Beth Norton, et. al., *A People and a Nation: A History of the United States*, fifth edition (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1998), 821: As McCarthyism spread with the “furious speeches” of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Hollywood personalities were blacklisted, and “schoolteachers and college professors were fired for expressing dissenting viewpoints.”

<sup>185</sup> As the Princeton story was unfolding, *The Milwaukee Sentinel* asked why any American would refuse to take an oath that he or she was not a member of the communist party. “Loyalty Oath Opposition,” *MS*, 14 April 1950, 1:16. An advice column for women by Dorothy Parnell instructed “How to Avoid Falling Into Communist Trap,” *MS*, 2 May 1950, 1:1. An editorial cartoon in *MS*, 11 May 1950, 1:18, entitled “Termites at Work Here,” depicted Uncle Sam lifting the lid off the United States capitol building while saying, “Seems to me there’s an odor some place!” while “U. S. Citizens” are shown shouting, “We, too, think it needs a *good cleaning* out!” According to yet another editorial page in *MS*, 20 May 1950, 1:10, Sunday, May 21 would be “I Am An American Day!”

reports” drawn from hostile sources and “to find themselves denounced as ‘un-American’ because in matters touching their faith they insist on the right of free judgment instead of bowing to the pressure of an uninformed but violent public opinion.”<sup>186</sup>

For others, the battle against Scouting seemed to summon misdirected energy and to kindle misplaced outrage. Weren’t there many other more dangerous evils confronting Lutheran young people?

I believe that in this day and age the Devil is going “all out” to win young people away from the church, what with so many distractions in the way of TV murders, smutty literature, sex-packed movies etc. Some times I wish the Lutheran church would speak out more emphatically on moral issues such as Birth control, divorce, adultery and the like and leave issues such as Boy Scouting and Masonry for secondary consideration, my own synod included.<sup>187</sup>

Did the Wisconsin Synod blow the Scouting issue out of proportion to its significance?

Reim admitted that opposition to Scouting could appear to others to be “almost trivial.” He asked, “Are we guilty of creating issues where by all the standards of Scriptures there are none? Are we permitting a side issue to throw us off the track?”<sup>188</sup>

---

<sup>186</sup> E[dmund] Reim, “As We See It: ‘Spoken . . . That Ye Should Not Be Offended,’” *NL* 37 (4 June 1950): 187. Wisconsin did garner some support for its right to take a religious—albeit unpopular—stand. *Milwaukee Sentinel* religion columnist Paul Gustafson declared, “Of all our possessions, religion is the one that is the most answerable to a man’s pride and conscience.” As Gustafson saw it, the Princeton incident came down to some from outside the church trying to “beat the rules.” The Wisconsin Synod’s stand against Scouting “has long been an established fact.” Were dissenters in the church there only to create an ugly situation? While admitting he did not know whether Stroschein was at least partly to blame for the Princeton trauma, Gustafson wrote, “I happen to like these men of the cloth who are interested enough in their work and the oaths they take to defend the doctrines of their church.” Paul E. Gustafson, “The Princeton Issue—the Church vs. the Scouts,” *MS*, 20 May 1950, 1:8.

<sup>187</sup> Herman Danner to Edward Borchert, 5 February 1961; copy in possession of the author.

<sup>188</sup> E[dmund] Reim, “As We See It: Why So Serious?” *NL* 40 (20 September 1953): 295.

Whatever negative press or public criticism Wisconsin suffered was dwarfed by the greater agony that came from the knowledge that its sister synod, once its ally on the Scouting issue, had now become its adversary.<sup>189</sup> Reim sought to view this disagreement in its larger perspective:

Time was when there was agreement in our Synodical Conference on this matter. It was generally recognized that neither the code of Scouting nor its method of character training fit into the pattern of Christian education. Where individual cases occurred nevertheless, they were handled by the pastors in conjunction with their congregations. The aim was to do this by patient instruction and evangelical persuasion. Many were the warnings against the mechanical application of “rules,” and other legalistic measures. Where differences of practice did occur, they were usually discussed privately between brethren.

Scouting became a controversial issue, however, when the theory was developed that the character training of Scouting can be fitted into our Christian education provided the group can be under the supervision and control of Lutheran leaders and congregations. This theory then received the official endorsement of the Missouri Synod, a view which we have found ourselves unable to share. . . .

We have unfortunately come to differ seriously with a sister synod over the question of whether to endorse or not to endorse a system of training which is so foreign to the Gospel as Scouting, and whether to accept or decline the integration of such methods into a system of Christian education that has done so well without this addition. It is not a matter of Wisconsin against some poor little Scout. It is Wisconsin standing for a certain principle of Christian education, holding out against a widely held modern opinion, against an almost universal popular trend.<sup>190</sup>

It is a serious matter, Reim wrote, “when sister synods which should stand shoulder to shoulder in these trials, each strengthening and encouraging the other, are found to be divided; when one condones what the other rejects.” Trivial as the issue may have appeared, the Wisconsin Synod saw this issue as a test of its theology. “On an issue as simple as this, and with answers that differ so widely, we cannot both be right. Someone is wrong!”<sup>191</sup>

---

<sup>189</sup> In 1947 Wisconsin President John Brenner remarked on “the many years in which our Synods were united in their stand against participation . . . in either the Boy or the Girl Scouts of America.” *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1947*, 104.

<sup>190</sup> E[dmund] Reim, “As We See It: Let’s Get This Straight,” *NL* 37 (19 November 1950): 376–7.

<sup>191</sup> Reim, “Why So Serious?” 295.

In many ways the Wisconsin Synod emerged from the Great Depression “relatively unharmed.” Between 1928 and 1944 synodical membership grew 37 percent. At the end of the 1940s the synod embarked on an ambitious mission program destined to transform the synod into an international church body.<sup>192</sup> But intersynodical difficulties that arose in the 1930s and escalated through the next two decades regarding the chaplaincy and Scouting would drive a wedge into the Synodical Conference, as it became clear that the common denominator causing the disturbance between the synods was the doctrine and practice of church fellowship.

---

<sup>192</sup> Kiessling, *History*, 27–8.



### *Chapter 3: Fellowship Becomes THE Issue*

“Gentlemen,” Edmund Reim told one of his seminary classes in the early 1950s, “the Boy Scouts will never break up the Synodical Conference.”<sup>1</sup> Resolutions adopted at Wisconsin’s 1953 convention “hit the nail on the head” in their recognition of unionism as “the root of all the tensions which have arisen between the Missouri Synod and us.”<sup>2</sup> Gerhard Press said in 1954, “Our most serious charge against the Military Chaplaincy has always been UNIONISM.”<sup>3</sup> Others thought it was not until the momentous synodical convention at Saginaw, Michigan, in 1955 “that our Synod began to see and discuss the problem as a whole in terms of the doctrine of fellowship and the sin of unionism. From then on the issue became clearer.”<sup>4</sup>

Changes in Missouri’s teaching and practice of church fellowship evolved over several decades prior to 1961, and came in increments. Missouri officials frequently objected that their synod was not changing, or that dissident viewpoints were being addressed.<sup>5</sup> This chapter traces the course of those changes.

---

<sup>1</sup> Reim’s remark was recalled by Wayne Schmidt at the proposal meeting for this dissertation, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 7 May 1999.

<sup>2</sup> Karl F. Krauss and Irwin J. Habeck, “Wisconsin–Missouri Presidents’ Conference,” *NL* 41 (7 February 1954): 42.

<sup>3</sup> G[erhard] A. Press, “The Military Chaplaincy” (paper presented to the Missouri-Wisconsin Synod Presidents’ Conference,” Milwaukee, 12–15 January 1954), 5.

<sup>4</sup> Edward C. Fredrich, “The Minnesota District’s First Fifty Years,” (paper presented to the Minnesota District Convention, Dr. Martin Luther College, New Ulm, Minn., 29 July–1 August 1968), 22.

<sup>5</sup> For example, *The Northwestern Lutheran* reported that even at the recessed convention of the Synodical Conference in May 1961 several of Missouri’s leaders insisted the Missouri position on fellowship “was that of Walther and the fathers” and “Missouri’s official position was still that of the *Brief Statement*.” See “The Recessed Convention of The Lutheran Synodical Conference, May 17–19, 1961,” *NL* 48 (18 June 1961): 199.

## *The Brief Statement*

According to Frank S. Mead, there were once 150 Lutheran church bodies in the United States, but “since 1910 there has been an almost constant effort toward the unification of Lutheran Churches and agencies.”<sup>6</sup> The Slovak Synod, formed in 1902, joined the Synodical Conference in 1911. The Norwegian Synod, the United Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, and the Hauge Synod negotiated the Madison Agreement, also known as the *Opgjoer*,<sup>7</sup> in 1912, leading to their merger as the Evangelical Lutheran Church in 1917. A segment of the Norwegian Synod rejected this merger, organized as the Evangelical Lutheran Synod, and joined the Synodical Conference in 1920. The Michigan, Minnesota, and Nebraska synods, already federated with the Wisconsin Synod, merged with Wisconsin into the Ev. Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States in 1917.<sup>8</sup> The General Synod, General Council, and General Synod of the South united to become the United Lutheran Church in America in 1918, creating the largest body of Lutherans in the United States.<sup>9</sup>

Merger was in the air in the Synodical Conference too. Between 1903 and 1906 five informal, unofficial free conferences were held among members of the Synodical Conference and the

---

<sup>6</sup> Frank S. Mead, *Handbook of Denominations in the United States*, new eighth ed., (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1985), 145–6. See also F. E. Mayer, *The Religious Bodies of America*, 4th ed., rev. by Arthur Carl Piepkorn (St. Louis: CPH, 1961), 182–92.

<sup>7</sup> Theodore Graebner characterized the *Opgjoer* as “a unionistic document, inasmuch as it gives both sides in the controversy on Conversion and Election an opportunity to say: ‘That is what we teach,’ yet without having in any point changed their former doctrinal stand.” Theodore Graebner, “The Norwegian Situation,” *LW* 34 (1 June 1915): 170.

<sup>8</sup> Fredrich, *WSL*, 130, said the union occurred due to “a realization that the limited joint efforts [of the separate synods] in publication, worker training, and missions were proving so beneficial that they ought to be enlarged.” Though the date coincided with “a major Reformation anniversary stressing Lutheran roots and togetherness,” the merger that created the Joint Synod was more in the nature of “a cataclysmic event” that “would have happened anyway.”

<sup>9</sup> Edward E. Busch, “Another Turning Point,” *CuThM* 2 (April 1975): 75. Kuster, “Fellowship Dispute,” 38–9.

Iowa and Ohio synods, hoping to reverse the split over the doctrine of election in the 1880s.<sup>10</sup> After the first meeting in Milwaukee in 1903, the *Lutheran Witness* reported that although “at times the speakers used strong language against their opponents,” on the final day “sentiment prevailed that good results had already been attained.”<sup>11</sup> After the second meeting in Watertown, Wisconsin, optimism ran so high that the New York *Independent* described the conference as “a religious convention that promises to be the beginning of one of the greatest church union or federation projects in the history of American Protestantism.”<sup>12</sup>

By the third meeting, however, in Detroit in 1904, the *Witness* admitted that “the lines seem to be rather sharply drawn,” with “the Synodical Conference on one side, and practically everybody else on the other,”<sup>13</sup> and after the fourth meeting the *Lutheran Standard* acknowledged that “the delegates were seemingly as wide apart as before the conference began.”<sup>14</sup> After the last conference, in Fort Wayne, Indiana, in 1906, F. W. Stellhorn complained: “Of course no unity was attained. Whoever wants to get in harmony with Missouri must adopt the Missouri position, shifting as it may

---

<sup>10</sup> According to Edward Busch, “The Predestinarian Controversy 100 Years Later,” *CuThM* 9 (June 1982): 138, Missouri insisted that participants attend the conferences as individuals, not as representatives of their church bodies, since they regarded it as improper for official representatives of church bodies to meet while still not in doctrinal agreement.

<sup>11</sup> H. Sieck, “Church News and Comment,” *LW* 22 (24 September 1903): 157–8.

<sup>12</sup> “The Watertown Lutheran Conference,” *LS* 61 (23 May 1903): 331.

<sup>13</sup> W., “Church News and Comment,” *LW* 23 (5 May 1904): 77. “W.” added: “A writer in the *Lutheran World* says that an organic union of anti-Missouri Lutherans would seem to be practicable, and thinks it would be a glorious thing. We have no objection to offer: if the various synods can stand it, we can. We want something a little more attractive than mere organic union, and there is no Synod which desires true unity more than Missouri.”

<sup>14</sup> “Free Inter-Synodical Conference,” *LS* 63 (26 August 1905): 532.

be.”<sup>15</sup> One Synodical Conference observer remembered that free conference participants “all more or less spoke with one eye to the galleries.”<sup>16</sup>

Pastors of the Missouri, Wisconsin, Ohio, and Minnesota synods worked to bring their church bodies together, beginning at a mixed pastoral conference in Sibley County, Minnesota, in May 1915. By 1917, the number of pastors from the four synods seeking union swelled to 545.<sup>17</sup> The document they signed, “*Zur Einigung*” (“Toward Unity”), also known as the *Sibley County Theses* or, later, the *St. Paul Theses*, represented a truly grass roots effort at achieving union. During these early discussions synodical officials and theological professors were not allowed to speak “because it was felt that they would be too concerned with technicalities” as had happened at the 1903–06 meetings. A close analysis of *Zur Einigung* reveals “problems and inconsistencies,” yet these meetings set in motion a decade-long effort to restore and enlarge the Synodical Conference.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> F. W. Stellhorn, “Meeting of the Intersynodical Conference at Ft. Wayne, Ind., October 24 and 25,” *LS* 64 (3 November 1906): 694. “J. F. W.,” in “Church News and Comments,” *LW* 25 (15 November 1906): 182, responded that if “such stuff” as was found in the *Standard* was “to come from our Ohio friends, no self-respecting man will lower himself to deal with them. Either these things must cease, or we cannot meet on common ground.”

<sup>16</sup> W[illiam] Bodamer, “Historical Survey of the Present Union Movement,” *Qu* 40 (January 1943): 11.

<sup>17</sup> J. P. Koehler, *HWS*, 253.

<sup>18</sup> John C. Wohlrabe, Jr., “*Zur Einigung*: The St. Paul Theses—A Document Study,” *CHIQ* 56 (Fall 1983): 133, 135, 139. John Buenger in a 1951 *Confessional Lutheran* article noted that the theses and antitheses of this document were introduced with the preamble, “From the very start the agreement was made to abstain in the discussions from everything historical,” thus guaranteeing that ensuing discussion would be limited, in Buenger’s words, “to that part of doctrine which was not in dispute.” Any member of the conference who referred to past statements that Missouri teachers had previously judged to be false “was ruled out as ‘historical.’” Buenger called the entire procedure “un-Lutheran” because “the real differences, as they existed at that time, were not touched at all.” Yet because “these men were sincere” and “acted in good faith,” and because their effort represented “the very first attempt at offering a basis for establishing fraternal relations with our opponents,” Buenger pronounced “*Zur Einigung*” to be “the *most harmless* of all union documents.” J[ohn] B[uenger], “A Brief History of the Various Union Documents,” *CL* 12 (September 1951): 98–9; emphasis in the original.

Missouri's 1917 convention praised the Sibley County effort as "laudable and worthy" and authorized a committee "to examine their union documents and offer appropriate advice."<sup>19</sup>

Missouri's 1920 convention declared itself ready to continue doctrinal discussions,<sup>20</sup> and a newly appointed joint Intersynodical Committee, making some use of "*Zur Einigung*," drafted theses on conversion in 1920, election in 1922, and other controverted doctrines such as the ministry, Antichrist, chiliasm, Sunday, and open questions, in 1925.<sup>21</sup> This new document was called the *Intersynodical Theses*, or the *Chicago Theses*.<sup>22</sup> According to one observer, every committee member from the participating synods was "convinced that in these theses the true and genuine doctrine was clearly and unambiguously presented and that all false doctrine was excluded."<sup>23</sup>

Missouri's 1923 convention resolved to continue Intersynodical Committee discussions and appointed its own Examining Committee to report to its next convention.<sup>24</sup> Theodore Graebner, a member of the Examining Committee from 1923 to 1926, fully subscribed to all the *Intersynodical*

---

<sup>19</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1917*, 77; in Carl Louis Bornkamm, "The Concepts of Unity, Fellowship, and Cooperation Among Various Lutheran Bodies in America" (master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1959), 122–3.

<sup>20</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1920*, 83; in Bornkamm, "The Concepts," 123.

<sup>21</sup> Baepler, *A Century of Grace*, 251.

<sup>22</sup> Edward Fredrich, "Wisconsin's Interchurch Relations in the First Third of This Century," *WLQ* 74 (January 1977): 39–40, explains the confusion in terminology regarding the name of this document: "'Chicago Theses' is the name generally used in Synodical Conference circles that were not involved in the post World War I discussions on Lutheran co-operation" that resulted in the formation of the American Lutheran Conference in 1930. This group "also produced a set of 'Chicago Theses' in 1919. Those for whom this 1919 document has significance understandably reserve the name 'Chicago Theses' for it and refer to the later [Synodical Conference] theses as 'Intersynodical Theses.'" For the full text of the *Intersynodical Theses*, see *Qu* 26 (October 1929): 250–73.

<sup>23</sup> Bodamer, "Historical Survey," 12.

<sup>24</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1923*, 83; in Charles F. Bunzel, "The Missouri Synod and the Chicago (Intersynodical) Theses" (master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1964), 29–30.

*Theses*’ statements and found no objections of a “material nature.”<sup>25</sup> But during those three years opposition arose from other members of the Examining Committee, and Committee 17 at Missouri’s 1926 convention reported that “the Lutheran doctrine has not yet in all points received such expression as is clear, precise, adequate, and exclusive of error.”<sup>26</sup>

In 1928 Missouri’s O. J. Buenger argued that all the old errors that had split the Synodical Conference in the 1880s still existed in the Iowa and Ohio synods, though in less obvious forms. Iowa subscribed to “a finer and more subtle form of a millennium” than the Augsburg Confession specifically rejected. Although it recognized the Pope as the Antichrist now, Iowa would not rule out the possible appearance of another enemy of the church, more destructive than the Pope, to fulfill the prophecy of 2 Thessalonians 2 more literally than the Papacy.<sup>27</sup> The real “bone of contention” regarding the doctrine of Sunday, Buenger explained, was whether Iowa’s position—that Sunday constituted a New Testament Sabbath day—would be granted equal rights “with the doctrine of Scripture and of the Lutheran Confessions” that there was no New Testament Sabbath day. Iowa was willing to do so, but Missouri was not.<sup>28</sup>

While the Holy Spirit can and ultimately does overcome people’s natural resistance to the gospel, according to Ohio and Iowa the Spirit cannot overcome willful resistance. In other words, Buenger wrote, Ohioans and Iowans regarded conversion as “on one hand entirely a work of the divine grace to which man offers nothing but opposition, and on the other hand [as though]

---

<sup>25</sup> Theodore Graebner to Theodore Engelder, 27 November 1925, CHI; in Bunzel, “The Intersynodical Theses,” 31.

<sup>26</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1926*, 140–1; in Bunzel, “The Intersynodical Theses,” 40–1.

<sup>27</sup> O. J. Buenger, *Missouri, Iowa, and Ohio: The Old and the New Differences* (n. p., n. d. [1928]), 36–7, 43.

<sup>28</sup> Buenger, *Missouri, Iowa, and Ohio*, 52. See also J[ohn] B[renner], “In Favor of Sunday Law,” *NL* 12 (8 March 1925): 67–8.

everything depends on the conduct of man over against the divine grace.” Though more subtle, “this is exactly the old doctrine of Ohio and Iowa in a new garb.”<sup>29</sup>

In August 1928 the *Intersynodical Theses* were presented to the participating church bodies for acceptance.<sup>30</sup> Missouri’s Intersynodical Committee favored the theses and urged their adoption at Missouri’s 1929 convention in River Forest, Illinois, but the Examining Committee submitted a less enthusiastic report. “All chapters and a number of paragraphs are inadequate. At times they do not touch the point of controversy.” Much in the *Intersynodical Theses* was “not sufficiently simple to be understood by laymen.” The Examining Committee considered it “a hopeless undertaking to make these theses unobjectionable from the view of pure doctrine,” and recommended the convention “disregard them as a failure.” The convention followed the Examining Committee’s recommendation and rejected the theses.<sup>31</sup>

Theodore Graebner remarked years later that “in 1929 we muffed our chance to unite with them.” The *Intersynodical Theses* were in his view “perfectly sound” but “due to the spirit of distrust pervading our Synod, we failed to accept them.”<sup>32</sup> John Behnken recalled that some of those men “who had worked painstakingly” to produce the theses were “rather deeply disappointed at the largely negative action taken” by the 1929 convention.<sup>33</sup> Richard Koenig has laid the blame on Franz Pieper, who showed little enthusiasm for the theses. “Given the Germanic tradition of almost

---

<sup>29</sup> Buenger, *Missouri, Iowa, and Ohio*, 67–8.

<sup>30</sup> The theses, here called the “*Chicago Theses*,” are reprinted in *Qu* 26 (October 1929): 250–72.

<sup>31</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1929*, 110.

<sup>32</sup> Graebner’s remarks were made at a 1946 meeting of the Concordia History Club; cited in “Potpourri,” *CHIQ* 42 (November 1969): 189.

<sup>33</sup> Behnken, *This I Recall*, 165.

unquestioning obedience to theological and administrative authority,” the synod’s action was not surprising.<sup>34</sup>

John Buenger, by contrast, considered the *Intersynodical Theses* “a real danger for [the Missouri] synod” because “the representatives of the Synodical Conference were surprised and finally deceived by language on the part of Ohio-Iowa for which they were not prepared.” A “gentlemen’s agreement” that “all polemics should cease to the publications of the participating synods for the duration of the conference” had the result, in Buenger’s view, that Missouri Synod men were never allowed to give Ohio-Iowa doctrinal views due consideration. For this reason, the next generation of Missouri pastors and laymen “was and still is almost completely in the dark as to the doctrinal differences between this church body and the Synodical Conference.” To Buenger, the danger to Missouri was averted by Franz Pieper and others at Missouri’s 1929 convention.<sup>35</sup>

Wisconsin’s convention, meeting later that summer, could do little more than declare its “willingness to continue this work with the other synods” so that “the result of ten years’ worth of work [may] be made the property of all.”<sup>36</sup> But in 1930 Ohio, Iowa, and Buffalo formed the American Lutheran Church, and the *Intersynodical Theses* received no mention at Wisconsin’s 1931 convention.

Although “*Zur Einigung*” and the *Intersynodical Theses* did not unite all midwestern Lutheran synods, the Wisconsin Synod “demonstrated a lively concern for Lutheran unity on the

---

<sup>34</sup> Richard Koenig, “What’s behind the showdown in the LCMS? Church and Tradition in collision,” *LF* 6 (November 1972): 17–9.

<sup>35</sup> Buenger, “Brief Review,” 99.

<sup>36</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1929*, 47; in Bunzel, “The Intersynodical Theses,” 65–6. Fredrich, *WSL*, 179.



larger scale.” To view Wisconsin as “always and only introverted and isolationist” misreads that history.<sup>37</sup>

Missouri’s 1929 convention approved a resolution calling for the formulation of a new set of theses presenting “the doctrine of the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions.” Working for more than a year, a five-man committee headed by Franz Pieper<sup>38</sup> produced a statement that appeared in German in May 1931<sup>39</sup> and was presented the next month in English translation as *A Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod*.<sup>40</sup> In view of the significant role the *Brief Statement* has played in the Missouri Synod since its appearance, it is surprising that the original intent of the 1929 resolution was not to produce a comprehensive synodical doctrinal statement but only to draft a document addressing the controverted issues of the failed union attempts of the 1920s.<sup>41</sup>

Regarding church fellowship, the *Brief Statement* said that since God “ordained that His Word *only*, without the admixture of human doctrine, be taught and believed in the Christian Church,” all Christians are “to discriminate between orthodox and heterodox church-bodies” and “to have church-fellowship only with orthodox church-bodies.” Citing Romans 16:17 as a command to separate from every heterodox church body,<sup>42</sup> the *Statement* repudiated *unionism*, which it defined as

---

<sup>37</sup> Fredrich, *WSL*, 179.

<sup>38</sup> Carl S. Meyer, “The Historical Background of ‘A Brief Statement,’” *CTM* 32 (September 1961): 539. The *Brief Statement* has been called Pieper’s “testament to the Missouri Synod and to the Lutheran Church” because it was adopted the year after his death. Theodore Graebner, *Dr. Francis Pieper: A Biographical Sketch* (St. Louis: CPH, 1931), 59.

<sup>39</sup> “*Thesen zur kurzen Darlegung der Lehrstellung der Missourisynode*,” *CTM* 2 (May 1931): 321–36.

<sup>40</sup> “Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod,” *CTM* 2 (June 1931): 401–16.

<sup>41</sup> Carl S. Meyer, “Historical Background,” 541.

<sup>42</sup> “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them” (*KJV*).

“church-fellowship with the adherents of false doctrine.” Fellowshiping with those who promote or tolerate false doctrine constitutes “disobedience to God’s command,” causing divisions in the church and exposing one to “the constant danger of losing the Word of God entirely.” The orthodoxy of a church is to be determined not only by its confessional statements but also “by the doctrine which is *actually* taught in its pulpits, in its theological seminaries, and in its publications.” Though granting that a church “does not forfeit its orthodox character through the casual intrusion of errors,” the *Statement* insisted that a church body must combat and remove such errors through doctrinal discipline.<sup>43</sup>

A copy of the *Brief Statement* was sent to every Missouri Synod pastor and was adopted with minor changes at Missouri’s 1932 convention.<sup>44</sup> It was later reaffirmed at Missouri’s 1947<sup>45</sup> and 1959 conventions.<sup>46</sup> In Thomas Kuster’s view the *Brief Statement* was “the last major synodical document embodying the traditional fellowship principle,” the last to successfully combine Missouri’s twin concerns of adherence to all its doctrines and the desire to establish fellowship with other bodies.<sup>47</sup>

#### *The Brux case*

Friederich Bente’s 1905 essay, “*Warum koennen wir keine gemeinsame Gottesdienste mit Ohioern und Iowaern veranstalten und abhalten?*” (“Why Can We Not Establish and Maintain

---

<sup>43</sup> “Brief Statement,” para. 28–9; 409; emphases in the original.

<sup>44</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1932*, 155.

<sup>45</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1947*, 476, 524. For further comment on the action of the 1947 convention, see A. T. K[retzmann], “Doctrinal Resolutions at the Centennial Convention,” *CL* 8 (August-September 1947): 87–9.

<sup>46</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1959*, 191–2. See Carl S. Meyer, “The Role of *A Brief Statement* Since 1932,” *CTM* 33 (April 1962): 199–209.

<sup>47</sup> Kuster, “Fellowship Dispute,” 45.

Common Prayer Services with the Ohioans and Iowans?") offered the most comprehensive Missouri condemnation of prayer fellowship among those not united in doctrine. Bente granted that "true children of God" existed in the Ohio and Iowa synods. Missouri would never deny "all communion of faith and prayer" to those "who err from weakness or lack of insight" but would patiently support "obviously weak" brothers. But Iowans and Ohioans refused to be considered "weakly brethren." As long as they persisted in their false ways, Missouri's arms were tied, and "we cannot embrace them as brothers." There can "never be any talk of joint prayer services between us and them." Bente repeatedly called them "adversaries," "opponents," "enemies," "dangerous heretics," and "false prophets."<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Bente, "Warum?" 110–5. Theodore Graebner observed in "The Cloak of the Cleric," a paper presented for private discussion within the Concordia Seminary faculty but printed after his death, *CHIQ* 44 (February 1971): 4, that "since 1905 (Bente's) synodical position was that prayer fellowship = church fellowship." Graebner's remark suggests that Bente's article served as an influential, oft-cited Missouri position statement opposing prayer fellowship with non-Synodical Conference Lutherans. Bente's paper, however, was not the only such statement. Franz Pieper said in a 1924 essay, "Unionism," that since God's Word forbids fellowship with false teachers, "to pray with them or to partake of the Lord's Supper with them would mean to consent to, and to become 'partakers of their evil works.'" *Oregon and Washington District Proceedings, 1924*, 8; cited in *Fellowship Then and Now*, 20.

Graebner himself in 1920 discussed how difficult it was to explain to Reformed church members that "joint prayers presume Christian fellowship." He lamented that "after an hour's patient effort" he still had not brought his listener one step closer to his understanding. His listener continued to insist, "We are in Christian fellowship with all who exalt Jesus Christ, whether Protestant or Catholic." To the suggestion that church conferences composed of groups not in doctrinal agreement could still be opened with "a tactful prayer," Graebner replied, "It ought to be clear to anyone who gives sincere thought to the matter that any prayer in which we are asked to join those who speak not from the same faith as we, or in which we are asked to withhold an expression of conviction, or by the participation in and utterance of which we are to treat as immaterial those articles of faith in which we differ, cannot be pleasing to God. For if joint prayer signifies anything, it signifies the spiritual unity of those who pray." [Theodore] G[raebner], "Letters to a Young Preacher: Joint Prayers," *Magazin fuer evang.-Luth. Homiletik und Pastoraltheologie* 44 (May 1920): 231–3.

The first test of Missouri's prayer fellowship practice came in the Brux case.<sup>49</sup> Following his graduation from Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, in 1917, Adolph Brux taught for two years at Concordia College, Milwaukee. Pursuing an interest in languages, Brux enrolled as a graduate student at the University of Chicago, and after completing his Ph. D. in Arabic and Hebrew studies, he was called as a missionary to Madras, India, in 1923. On his journey to India, stopping at Beirut and Bombay, Brux and his wife were house guests of Presbyterian missionaries, where they accepted their hosts' invitation to join them in table devotions consisting of Scripture readings and prayer. When his fellow Missouri missionaries questioned him, Brux maintained he had not been guilty of unionism in his actions.<sup>50</sup>

In a paper delivered to the North Arcot District missionary conference in 1924, Brux reconsidered the primary proof passages Missouri employed in support of its opposition to prayer fellowship with heterodox Christians. He concluded that Missouri's practice "goes beyond what a sound interpretation of these Bible passages warrants," even labeling its position "unscriptural."<sup>51</sup>

When he returned to the United States in 1931, Missouri's Board for Foreign Missions evaluated his paper. Assuming Brux was wrong because his interpretation disagreed with accepted synodical position, the Board appointed a review committee. Prof. Martin Sommer of Concordia

---

<sup>49</sup> Chief sources for the Brux story include his own writings, *An Appeal to Synod With History of Case Including Charges Against Board of Foreign Missions and Its General Secretary and Charges Against the President of Synod* (Racine, Wis., 1934). *Christian Prayer-Fellowship and Unionism: An Investigation Of Our Synodical Position With Respect to Prayer-Fellowship With Christians Of Other Denominations* (Racine, Wis., 1935). Also, John J. Marschausen, "Dr. Adolph A. Brux and Prayer Fellowship in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod" (research paper, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1970). Lueking, *Mission in the Making*, 270–6. Robinson, "The Spirit of Triumphalism," 126–52. Jack T. Robinson, "The Brux Case," *CuThM* 4 (June 1977): 143–50.

<sup>50</sup> Brux recalled that "he was watched very carefully by the other Missouri Synod missionaries and definitely felt as if he 'lived in a fish bowl.'" Robinson, "The Brux Case," 145.

<sup>51</sup> Brux, *Appeal*, 6.

Seminary, St. Louis, one committee member, reportedly stated: "I am not open to instruction in this matter. I ceased to be open to instruction from the day I took office in the ministry."<sup>52</sup> The Brux study was then presented before the entire Concordia faculty. Ludwig Fuerbringer subsequently confessed he had not read the paper at all. Theodore Graebner, after reading four or five pages, laid the paper aside as "unworthy of further study."

Continued discussions between Brux and the review committee centered on his interpretation of Romans 16:17-18.<sup>53</sup> Brux maintained that disagreement over the passage inevitably concerned larger issues of biblical interpretation and doctrinal formulations:

The point of controversy then is still the proper exegesis and application of the pertinent Bible passages. It must necessarily be so, even when the question is one of doctrine. **Exegesis and application of Bible passages are not dependent on doctrine, but doctrine is always dependent on the exegesis and application of a passage according to sound hermeneutical principles. How can there be doubt concerning "the full scope and application of some of these passages," and at the same time certainty in regard to the full scope and application of the doctrine derived from those passages?**<sup>54</sup>

In a final expanded and revised form of his paper, published in 1935, Brux concluded there was "not one Bible passage to uphold the Synod's negative position," and so Missouri's claim that Scripture forbids prayer fellowship with other Christians "falls to the ground." Prayer fellowship with other Christians becomes impossible "only when circumstances carry into the act such implications as will necessarily involve a violation of the confessional position and conscience and thereby give offense."<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Brux, *Appeal*, 7.

<sup>53</sup> Verse 18: "For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple" (*KJV*).

<sup>54</sup> Brux, *Appeal*, 19; emphasis in the original.

<sup>55</sup> Brux, *Christian Prayer-Fellowship*, 7, 100-1.

Despite failed appeals before Missouri's 1935 and 1938 conventions,<sup>56</sup> the Brux case exerted a lasting influence on the synod's teaching and practice of church fellowship. Richard Caemmerer called Brux "the man who for the first time charted a new course [and] faced up to his own conscience in the matter of prayer-fellowship."<sup>57</sup> Otto Geiseman credited Brux as "the man to whom we owe this thing getting started."<sup>58</sup> By 1960, Missouri's shifting fellowship doctrine, as presented in "The Theology of Fellowship," was taken by Brux as complete vindication of his position.<sup>59</sup> Missouri resolved at its 1965 convention that "The Theology of Fellowship," with slight revisions, be adopted as its official statement of policy and practice.<sup>60</sup> That occurred at the next convention in 1967.<sup>61</sup>

Theodore Graebner's dismissal of the Brux paper as "unworthy of further study" is highly ironic in view of the transformation regarding church fellowship he himself underwent. Graebner

---

<sup>56</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1935, 293; 1938, 317-24.*

<sup>57</sup> Richard R. Caemmerer, taped interview with John Marchhausen, 7 May 1970; in Marchhausen, "Dr. Adolph Brux," 52. A copy of the interview was placed on file with Dr. John Constable at Concordia Seminary.

<sup>58</sup> Caemmerer interview; Marchhausen, "Dr. Adolph Brux," 54. See also O[tto] A. Geiseman, "While It Is Day: Praying for Trouble," *AL* 44 (September 1961): 5.

<sup>59</sup> Brux interview; Marchhausen, "Dr. Adolph Brux," 57-8. Brux concluded in *Christian Prayer-Fellowship*, 48, "Our error lies in applying, or attempting to apply the injunctions to 'avoid' . . . to Christians and fellow members of the body of Christ, because these injunctions manifestly have reference only to reprobates and antichristian individuals, to either persons who never were Christians, or having been Christians, have apostasized. They do not fit the case of erring Christians, and hence they do not provide a Scriptural basis for our Synodical position on prayer-fellowship with Christians of other denominations." Missouri's "The Theology of Fellowship," Part Two, in *Four Statements on Fellowship* (St. Louis: CPH, 1960), 42, said, "The passages which command separation were written for situations which cannot simply be identified with those which we face today" and "must not be applied mechanically to fellow Christians in a confessional-organizational fellowship other than one's own."

<sup>60</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1965, 98.*

<sup>61</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1967, 91.*

recalled that the scriptural evidence for Missouri's definition of unionism broke down when Concordia's faculty "was called upon to pass judgment on the attitude of Missionary Brux on the text usually quoted as prohibiting such prayers [Romans 16:17, 18]." The faculty could not formulate an effective dissenting opinion, and the floor committee at Missouri's 1935 convention "had to acknowledge the validity of the Brux position"—but did not report that to convention delegates. "The relevancy of *the texts* [Romans 16:17, 18 and others] was not pronounced upon" in the floor committee's resolution, Graebner remarked, and so "the problem is still with us."<sup>62</sup>

In 1917,<sup>63</sup> 1923,<sup>64</sup> and 1931,<sup>65</sup> Graebner stated his opposition to prayer fellowship with heterodox Christians, citing Romans 16:17-18. As late as 1935, in *The Problem of Lutheran Unity and Other Essays*, Graebner charged the ULCA and the Norwegian Synod with permitting "errorists to speak in their Church and for their Church," calling it a "sin against the Word of God, which forbids alliance with error, Rom. 16, 17."<sup>66</sup>

By 1943, however, Graebner disavowed his previously stated understanding of the Romans passage. In *Toward Lutheran Union* he warned against "a mechanical and automatic application" of the Romans injunction to "avoid them." While this and other passages "of like tenor" help to establish fellowship principles, Graebner opposed "the unthinking, indiscriminate application" of such warnings to every Christian just because he or she does not belong to the orthodox church. Those texts "are aimed at false *teachers*," those "*who subvert the Gospel of Christ*."

---

<sup>62</sup> Theodore Graebner, "The Burden of Infallibility," 92; emphasis in the original.

<sup>63</sup> Theodore Graebner, "Joint Reformation Celebrations," *LW* 36 (18 September 1917): 292.

<sup>64</sup> Theodore Graebner, "Letters to a Masonic Friend," *LW* 42 (27 February 1923): 66–8.

<sup>65</sup> Theodore Graebner, "What is Unionism?" *CTM* 2 (August 1931): 565–82.

<sup>66</sup> Theodore Graebner, *The Problem of Lutheran Union and Other Essays* (St. Louis: CPH, 1935), 18.

There were not in St. Paul's day large bodies of Christians sharing the same belief to a very large extent, nor bodies of Lutherans with members the rank and file of whom believe practically the selfsame doctrines, although their leaders—it is a fact that the existing doctrinal differences are argued mainly by the leaders, the pastors—though their leaders differ on certain teachings. . . .

I do not see that such passages help us determine what our conduct must be in certain contacts with people belonging to heterodox communities—people who are not teachers at all, who are not at all trying to seduce us, and whose views we do not for a moment propose to share. The injunction to avoid them might still be urged as a warning not to be entangled in the error which their Church teaches and confesses. But with regard to the question: “What is unionism in the private life of a Christian?” they seem to me to be irrelevant.<sup>67</sup>

The roots of Graebner's change seem to lie in earlier experience. Already in 1925 Graebner noted Missouri's “main difficulty” in “treating all differences of opinion as destructive to fellowship.”<sup>68</sup> He recalled hearing a pastor in 1926 charge that the Missouri Synod had forfeited its doctrinal unity because “we have two contradictory attitudes on the question of church fairs and bazaars!”<sup>69</sup> A restudy of the scriptural principles was necessary, Graebner urged, because some in

---

<sup>67</sup> *Toward Lutheran Union* (St. Louis: CPH, 1943), 208–10; emphases in the original. The very first example Graebner then presented, 210–1, involved a case in which “*I am a guest in someone's house—someone not in communion with me—or he is a guest in my house.*” The circumstances Graebner then described were remarkably similar to those that occasioned the Brux case. It may be argued that sharing a devotion with a Presbyterian *missionary* would seem to go beyond Graebner's above reference to those “who are not teachers at all.” Yet Graebner went further still in discussing circumstances parallel to those Brux encountered: “In India [!] I have experienced such situations in the houses of non-Lutheran missionaries. Our ‘Missourian’ position was very well known to them all; it never for a moment entered into the head of my host that I was running counter to my principles and practicing church fellowship with his Church or that he was fellowshiping with me, in the technical sense of the term, because I sat at his table quietly and courteously while he, as the pater familias, conducted his customary devotion” (emphasis added). See also Theodore Graebner, “Obstacles to Lutheran Union,” *LW* 42 (6 July 1943): 225–6; (20 July 1943): 243–4; (3 August 1943): 259–60; (17 August 1943): 273–4. *Prayer Fellowship* (St. Louis: CPH, 1945), 3–10. For a Missourian repudiation of Graebner's changed views on fellowship, see Walter W. F. Albrecht, *Dr. Theo. Graebner's “Prayer Fellowship” In the Light of Scripture and the Faith of our Fathers* (Milwaukee: NPH, 1946).

<sup>68</sup> Theodore Graebner to F. P. Wilhelm, 7 January 1925. Theodore Graebner, to Karl Kretzmann, 9 March 1926. TG 55, CHI. Cited by Pfabe, “Theodore Graebner,” 164.

<sup>69</sup> *Speaking the Truth in Love: Essays Related to A Statement, Chicago, Nineteen forty-five* (Chicago: Willow Press, n. d. [1946]), 13.



Missouri seemed to possess “a rigidity which will not be satisfied with anything less than a complete cleavage” from all other Christians, all but refusing to recognize the universal priesthood of believers and the *Una Sancta*.<sup>70</sup>

#### *Union overtures*

Missouri’s Paul Kretzmann wrote in January 1933 that there were still “a few other questions” that would need to be resolved between Missouri and the ALC before fellowship could be declared, such as “the celebration of Sunday, which cannot be said to be divinely commanded; questions concerning marriage, divorce, and “particularly the validity of rightful betrothal”; the significance of John the Baptizer’s baptism; and “a number of other points, chiefly in the field of Christian ethics.”<sup>71</sup> This prompted the ALC’s president C. C. Hein to respond that if unity in the faith had to be based on agreement in such matters, “there is no hope whatsoever for the Lutherans of this country to get together.”<sup>72</sup>

Yet the ALC and ULCA both called for closer relations among American Lutherans. Both appointed committees at their 1934 conventions to confer with other Lutheran bodies, and both addressed communications to the Missouri Synod for formal consideration at Missouri’s 1935 convention.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> Theodore Graebner, *Toward Lutheran Union*, vi.

<sup>71</sup> P[aul] E. Kretzmann, “Foreword: Can the Lutheran Bodies of America Get Together?” *CTM* 4 (January 1933): 10.

<sup>72</sup> *ALC Minutes, 1934*, 25.

<sup>73</sup> *ALC Minutes, 1934*, 235. *ULCA Minutes, 1934*, 415–21, 483.

Though initial response was cool,<sup>74</sup> Missouri resolved in 1935 “that we declare our willingness to confer with other Lutheran bodies,” and authorized the appointment of a committee for that purpose, which came to be called the “Committee on Lutheran Church Union.”<sup>75</sup> It was understood that “if a true union in faith and doctrine cannot be obtained, the divisions within the Lutheran Church must naturally continue.”<sup>76</sup> Before Missouri’s 1938 convention the Committee on Lutheran Church Union met with representatives of the ULCA and the ALC six times. Concerning the ULCA, the committee declared it “impossible for the two parties to come to agreement” on the doctrine of inspiration and discontinued its meetings with that body.<sup>77</sup>

Results of meetings with the ALC were more favorable. ALC representatives “accepted the doctrinal contents” of the *Brief Statement*, but “in order to supplement and emphasize their position” offered another document of its own, the *Declaration of the Representatives of the American Lutheran Church*, also referred to as the Sandusky Resolutions.<sup>78</sup> The floor committee at Missouri’s 1938 convention acknowledged that unresolved questions remained, yet it recommended that the

---

<sup>74</sup> Martin Sommer charged that those who declared outward union without achieving inward unity “open Christ’s sheepfold to the wolves.” M[artin] S[ommer], “Demand for Lutheran Unity,” *LW* 53 (5 June 1934): 208–9. Theodore Graebner insisted that Missouri was not interested in a church union “formed as of furniture factories or tobacco plantations, where nothing counts but the reducing of overhead and increasing of dividends.” T[heodore] G[raebner], “The Disunited Lutheran Church,” (31 July 1934): 270.

<sup>75</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1935*, 221.

<sup>76</sup> E. Eckhardt, “Lutheranism in America,” *LW* 55 (16 June 1936): 194.

<sup>77</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1938*, 227. The ULCA commissioners were unable to accept the *Brief Statement’s* insistence on scriptural infallibility “also in those parts which treat of historical, geographical, and other secular matters, John 10:35.” The attempt of ULCA men to use the word *inspiration* while denying *verbal inspiration* and *inerrancy* as “man-made theories” was dismissed by Theodore Engelder as “a clumsy form of sophistry.” [Theodore] E[ngelder], “‘Verbal’ Inspiration No ‘Theory,’” *CTM* 10 (January 1939): 65. See also J[ohn] H. C. Fritz, “Who Is To Blame For Lutheran Division,” *LW* 54 (12 March 1935): 90–1.

<sup>78</sup> *ALC Minutes, 1938*, 7–11; in Richard C. Wolf, *Documents of Lutheran Unity in America* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 394–8.

*Brief Statement*, together with the ALC's *Declaration*, "be regarded as the doctrinal basis for *future church-fellowship* between the Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church." This resolution, which came to be called the St. Louis Union Articles of 1938 or simply the Union Resolutions, was adopted.<sup>79</sup>

Concerning some "non-fundamental points" regarding Last Things, the *Declaration* asserted that "we are dealing here with the correct understanding of prophecy and fulfillment" and that "this understanding is not always easy." The ALC accepted "the historical judgment" that the Pope is the very Antichrist," but whether "in the *future that is still before us*" there might be "a special unfolding and personal concentration of the antichristian power already present now," a "still more comprehensive fulfillment of 2 Thess. 2," the *Declaration* said, "we leave to the Lord and Ruler of Church and world history."

Regarding the conversion of Israel, the *Declaration* cited the Milwaukee *Kolloquium* of 1867 and said, "We declare with Dr. Walther that to assume such a conversion 'must not be regarded as a cause for division.'" On the teaching of a physical resurrection of the martyrs prior to Judgment Day, the *Declaration* declared, "We are not ready to deny church-fellowship to any who would hold this view." Regarding the thousand years of Revelation 20 the *Declaration* again cited Walther that "it is not possible to say with absolute certainty either that the thousand years have already been fulfilled or that they lie in the future."<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1938*, 228–33; emphasis in the original. Two years later, *Lutheran Witness* editors remarked that extensive discussions of the doctrines separating Missouri from the ALC were unnecessary. The 1938 agreement was not the result of only three years' negotiations since 1935, but it "had been coming gradually for a long period of time." On some points, Graebner maintained, there had been agreement already in 1868, on others 25, 40, or 50 years earlier. [Theodore Graebner and Martin S. Sommer], "Lutheran Unity: A Discussion, II," *LW* 59 (11 June 1940): 201.

<sup>80</sup> *Declaration*, 397–8; emphases in the original.

Concerning whether it was “permissible to speak of a visible side of the Church,” the *Declaration* insisted that “to do so is not a false doctrine if by this visible side nothing else is meant than the use of the means of grace.”<sup>81</sup> Missouri’s *Brief Statement* said that “since it is by faith in the Gospel alone that men become members of the Christian church, and since this faith cannot be seen by men,” the church is invisible “and will remain invisible till Judgment Day.” The *Brief Statement* acknowledged that “some Lutherans speak of two sides of the Church, taking the means of grace to be its ‘visible side,’” but insisted that “the means of grace are not necessarily related to the Church” because “the Church in the proper sense of the word consists only of *believers*.”<sup>82</sup>

Missouri’s committee said its synodical fathers “had declared that a deviation in this doctrine [the Antichrist] need not be divisive of church-fellowship.”<sup>83</sup> Missouri conceded that the phrase “the visible side of the church,” left unexplained, “might give occasion for the fostering of false doctrine, such as the Romanizing teaching which represents the Church as an external or religious institution.” But because synodical fathers allowed that Word and Sacrament could “in a certain sense be considered as belonging to the essence of the Church,” these differences were also viewed as “not divisive to church-fellowship.”<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> *Declaration*, 396.

<sup>82</sup> *Brief Statement*, para. 25, 408; emphasis in the original.

<sup>83</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1938*, 229, cited D. R. “*Grundlage einer Lutherischen Kirchlichen Einigung in Deutschland*,” *LuW* 19 (October 1873): 290; and “*Curiosa*,” *LuW* 25 (January 1879): 25–6. A footnote added to the committee report by the synod in convention said that references to the synodical fathers “must not be understood in any way as if we were basing any doctrine on what the synodical fathers teach. We simply mention the fact that they considered some non-fundamental doctrines as not necessarily divisive of church-fellowship.”

<sup>84</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1938*, 231.

*Wisconsin and Lutheran Union*

Included among the nine resolutions adopted by Missouri's 1938 convention was 6c: "As far as the Missouri Synod is concerned, this whole matter must be submitted for approval to the other synods constituting the Synodical Conference."<sup>85</sup> The Wisconsin Synod, however, had shown little enthusiasm for the doctrinal positions of either of the other two large American Lutheran bodies.<sup>86</sup> Its rejection of the Union Resolutions could safely have been predicted.

In 1932 *The Northwestern Lutheran* conference schedule announced pastoral essays to be presented explaining differences between the Synodical Conference and the ALC and ULCA.<sup>87</sup> Karl Plocher's essay "Why can't we have fellowship with the U. L. C. and A. L. C.?" was subsequently published in August and September issues of *The Northwestern Lutheran*.<sup>88</sup> While they "may be

---

<sup>85</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1938, 232.*

<sup>86</sup> See J[ohn] B[renner], "Unity in the United Lutheran Church," *NL* 6 (16 November 1919): 178–9. [John] S[challer], "Lutheran Brotherhoods of America," *Qu* 17 (January 1920): 86. J[ohn] B[renner], "National Lutheran Council," *NL* 7 (8 February 1920): 38–9. J[ohn] B[renner], "The Relation of the Iowa Synod To Other Lutheran Bodies," (3 October 1920): 306–7. J[ohn] B[renner], "Intersynodical Organization," *NL* 8 (4 September 1921): 275. J[ohn] B[renner], "Necessity For A United Lutheranism," *NL* 10 (2 December 1923): 371–3. J[ohn] B[renner], "The Bit," *NL* 11 (4 May 1924): 133–4. J[ohn] B[renner], "Lutheran Loyalty' By a Non-Lutheran," (30 November 1924): 372–3. J[ohn] B[renner], "Fosdick Among Lutherans," *NL* 12 (28 June 1925): 198. H[ans] K. M[oussa], "Divided Lutherans," *NL* 13 (30 May 1926): 163–5. J[ohn] B[renner], "Not Competition—But Conservation," *NL* 14 (12 June 1927): 181–2. J[ohn] B[renner], "Why Do We Not Have Fellowship?" *NL* 15 (24 June 1928): 198. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], "Greatness," *Qu* 27 (April 1930): 152–3. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], "Disruption of the Lutheran Church in America," (October 1930): 275–7. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], "American Lutheran Church," (October 1930): 277–9. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], "The Galesburg Rule Repudiated," *Qu* 28 (April 1931): 140–3. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], "The Danger of Lutheran Brotherhoods," *Qu* 29 (January 1932): 70–1.

<sup>87</sup> "Why can't we have fellowship with the U. L. C. and the A. L. C.?" K. J. Plocher, Crow River Valley Conference, Buffalo, Minn., 7–9 June 1932; in *NL* 19 (8 May 1932): 157. Schaller, "Modernistic Tendencies in Lutheran Circles Outside of the Synodical Conference," New Ulm Pastoral Conference, New Ulm, Minn., 30 November 1932; in *NL* 19 (20 November 1932): 380. H. Kleinhans, "How far do we differ from the A. L. C. and the U. L. C. in doctrine and practice?" Mixed Winnebago Pastoral Conference, Manchester, Wis., 9–10 May 1933; in *NL* 20 (26 March 1933): 106.

<sup>88</sup> K[arl] J. Plocher, "Why can't we have fellowship with the U. L. C. and the A. L. C.?" *NL* 19 (28 August 1932): 278–9; (11 September 1932): 299–301.

saved in spite of their errors,” these other Lutherans were “erring brethren.” Joining such erring brothers in worship would “give testimony to the world that we are either agreed, or that the differences really make no difference.”<sup>89</sup> The ULCA’s “official sanction of pulpit and altar fellowship with non-Lutherans,” their “‘educative’ policy and practice with lodge members in their congregations,” and “the sabbatarian, Calvinistic, and chiliastic tendencies” that ran “rather rampant” in that body made fellowship with them impossible.<sup>90</sup>

Significantly closer to the doctrinal position of the Synodical Conference, the ALC nonetheless joined in “cooperative union” with the Norwegian Lutheran and Free churches, the Augustana Synod, and the Danish Lutheran Church, all members of the American Lutheran Conference. By its membership in this conference, the ALC became “more or less guilty of the un-Lutheran deeds of which we just accused the United Lutheran Church.” Since the ALC joined with these bodies, and since these bodies were all but united with the ULCA, the Wisconsin Synod, if it were to declare itself in fellowship with the ALC, would have “automatically been in fellowship with practically every other Lutheran body in the United States.” The Norwegian Lutheran Church in particular was still saddled with the compromising document the *Opgjoer* which spoke unclearly regarding conversion.<sup>91</sup>

Despite such stubborn disagreements, Plocher closed his essay on a surprisingly hopeful note:

I am still optimistic enough to hope and pray that the American Lutheran Church may yet some day be ONE in doctrine and practice. The obstacles even for an organic union are not insurmountable. . . .

---

<sup>89</sup> Plocher, “The U. L. C. and the A. L. C?” 278–9.

<sup>90</sup> Plocher, “The U. L. C. and the A. L. C?” 299.

<sup>91</sup> Plocher, “The U. L. C. and the A. L. C?” 299.

And I believe that we of the Synodical Conference can be of great service towards this end, and that just by uncompromisingly standing for a confessional Lutheranism in faith and practice. And it should be our aim that we—remaining loyal to our God-given convictions—will in no way hamper or hinder the coming of the day when, if God wills it, there will be not a United Lutheran Church, and an American Lutheran Conference, and a Synodical Conference, but a United American Lutheran Church of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession.<sup>92</sup>

Reporting in 1932 on the opening of a new ULCA church in Beaver Dam, Wisconsin, Pastor John Brenner noted that the most observable feature of ULCA churches was “a strong tendency toward unionism—and indifferentism” combined with the willingness to “engage in all kinds of endeavors, political, social, and economic.” The Wisconsin Synod regarded such efforts as “foreign to the mission of the Church.” Being genuinely Lutheran meant rejecting all teachings that contradicted the Scriptures, and “as far as religious fellowship is concerned, to avoid those who teach and profess them.”<sup>93</sup>

In 1933 *The Northwestern Lutheran* reprinted a long article by George Lillegard from the Norwegians’ *Lutheran Sentinel*, challenging the assumption that smaller churches, by not participating in merger movements, declined numerically and financially.<sup>94</sup> Seminary Professor August Zich cited with favor the comments of a layman in the *Lutheran Herald* that “we are not much interested in a great outward Lutheran unity.”<sup>95</sup> Zich disagreed with the declaration of a correspondent covering a convention of the Lutheran Brotherhoods the following year, that “these men have become impatient with the overlapping and the waste—they call it sinful waste—in our

---

<sup>92</sup> Plocher, “The U. L. C. and the A. L. C.?” 301.

<sup>93</sup> J[ohn] B[renner], “Introducing the U. L. C.,” *NL* 19 (3 July 1932): 211–2.

<sup>94</sup> J[ohn] B[renner], “Merging Churches,” *NL* 20 (2 July 1933): 214–6.

<sup>95</sup> [August F.] Z[ich], “Lutheran Unity,” *NL* 20 (8 October 1933): 324–5.

Church.”<sup>96</sup> Dismissing a call for union from St. Olaf College President L. W. Boe, Zich explained, “Pastors of the Synodical Conference do not yet interchange pulpits and partake of joint meetings with Methodist, Baptist, Congregational, and other sectarian pastors,” though instances of these practices in other Lutheran bodies “are by no means rare.”<sup>97</sup>

In 1935 Zich criticized the Lutheran Home Mission Council for urging the ULCA, ALC, and Synodical Conference to cooperate in establishing mission congregations by publicizing their plans so that other Lutheran bodies could eliminate duplication of efforts and unfair competition by avoiding the area. Such an agreement would “by its very nature” imply “a recognition of orthodoxy among participating church bodies.” Zich responded:

The trouble is exactly this, that the aforementioned church bodies do not agree in doctrine and practice with the Synodical Conference. Altar and pulpit fellowship between these branches has not existed and cannot be obtained under present conditions. That being the case, how are these bodies with their conflicting views on matters of doctrine and practice to agree on methods and practices in Home Missions? Are they to agree not to enter or encroach upon another’s fields? On what basis? On the basis that there is no real principle difference between them, or that these differences are to be ignored, or to be ironed out? We frankly do not understand, but are still of the opinion that the Greeks bearing gifts should be well scrutinized.<sup>98</sup>

While rebuking the ALC and the ULCA, Wisconsin sided faithfully with its Synodical Conference partners, Missouri and the Norwegian Synod, accepting as their own the derision

---

<sup>96</sup> [August F.] Z[ich], “The American Federation of Lutheran Brotherhoods,” *NL* 21 (21 January 1934): 19–20. The *Lutheran Herald* described the Federation of Lutheran Brotherhoods as being composed of “some of the most outstanding laymen in the Lutheran Church in America,” not belonging to the Synodical Conference.

<sup>97</sup> [August F.] Zich, “God’s Moment,” *NL* 21 (27 May 1934): 164.

<sup>98</sup> [August F.] Z[ich], “Home Missions and Union,” *NL* 22 (17 March 1935): 86. See also [August F.] Z[ich], “The Lutheran Men’s Alliance,” (13 May 1934): 148. [August F.] Z[ich], “The American Lutheran Conference,” (23 December 1934): 405–6. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “The Present Urge for Closer Union of the Lutheran Church Bodies,” *Qu* 32 (January 1935): 70. H. H. Spaude, “Our Synod: Twenty-Third Meeting of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, at New Ulm, Minnesota, August 7–14, 1935,” *NL* 22 (15 September 1935): 297–8. Minnesota Correspondent, “Among the Doctors,” (22 December 1935): 405–6.



directed at Missouri. “Since we of the Wisconsin Synod are united with [Missourians],” said Professor Joh. P. Meyer, “not only externally as members of the Synodical Conference, but, by the grace of God, in the unity of confession and the unity of spirit, the opprobrium heaped on our brethren must be shared by us.”<sup>99</sup>

Discussions initiated in 1935 between Missouri and the ALC provoked an immediately unfavorable reaction from Wisconsin theologians.<sup>100</sup> Although Synodical Conference members had negotiated with Ohio and Iowa on the *Intersynodical Theses* of the 1920s, Meyer noted a difference between those negotiations and the discussions of the 1930s:

To our way of looking at it, church fellowship will take care of itself once the unity of faith and confession is achieved; and to stress, even to mention, union as the aim to be achieved cannot but have detrimental repercussions. In this respect the present colloquies differ essentially from the discussions that preceded and led up to the “Chicago [Intersynodical] Theses.” Whenever during those meetings, either in official conference or in private conversations, the matter of church union was brought up it was in the form of a question: What will be the practical result if and when we come to an understanding concerning the controverted doctrines? And the answer invariably was: Those matters do not concern us, our sole aim must be to establish the Scripture truth in the doctrines before us and to present this truth in clear and unmistakable terms, as we believe it in our hearts and are willing to confess it before the church. With the emphasis shifted to church union it will become extremely difficult for the colloquists, so we fear, to retain an open mind.<sup>101</sup>

The Wisconsin Synod did not always show great enthusiasm for the merging of church bodies even when they were in agreement with doctrine. Adolf Hoenecke’s 1877 analogy, that just

---

<sup>99</sup> [Joh. P.] M[eyer], review of *The Problem of Lutheran Union and Other Essays*, by Theodore Graebner, *Qu* 32 (October 1935): 299.

<sup>100</sup> See E[dmund] Reim, “Another Merger Invitation,” *Qu* 53 (January 1956): 67–8.

<sup>101</sup> [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Noble Souls’ Knocking at Our Doors,” *Qu* 33 (July 1936): 202.

because two people love each other does not mean they have to get married,<sup>102</sup> found agreement among Wisconsin writers in the 1920s and 1930s.<sup>103</sup>

### *Wisconsin and the Union Resolutions*

With Missouri's acceptance of the 1938 Union Resolutions, the two synods entered a new and ultimately terminal stage of their relationship. Despite occasional personality conflicts, variances in the doctrine of church and ministry, and sporadic territorial disputes, the Missouri and Wisconsin synods had enjoyed a harmonious, productive relationship for 70 years. Not since 1868 had these sisters criticized each other in public or in print.<sup>104</sup> All that was about to change.

---

<sup>102</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1877*, 27; in Schmiel, "State Synods," 195.

<sup>103</sup> J[ohn] B[renner], "Mr. Boyer Appeals to Lutheran Laymen," *NL* 11 (13 January 1924): 5, wrote that even where there is doctrinal unity "it will always remain a question whether the welfare of the Church is served better by a number of smaller organizations or by one larger one. A half dozen smaller synods working in the true harmony of faith and love may render more efficient services than one large body could," and "three smaller colleges may profit the Church more than one large institution." Brenner knew of cases where one minister served several small congregations, but "to attempt to coerce them to consolidate" would "not be rendering the Church a service." See also J[ohn] B[renner], "Our Future," *NL* 12 (15 November 1925): 357–8. J[ohn] B[renner], "The Celebration is Over," (29 November 1925): 372. J[ohn] B[renner], "New Method?" (29 November 1925): 372. [August F.] Z[ich], "The World Council Again," *NL* 25 (31 July 1938): 244.

<sup>104</sup> That was *almost* true. In addition to the remarkably blunt criticisms Pieper penned in his "Anniversary Reflections" and Koehler in his *History of the Wisconsin Synod*, see Joh. P. Meyer's review of Concordia's *Theological Monthly*, in *Qu* 18 (January 1921): 77–8. See also Wisconsin criticisms of Missouri's growing efforts in advertising, publicity, and innovative worship: J[ohn] B[renner], "Proselyting Propaganda—Publicity Work," *NL* 12 (4 October 1925): 308–11. H[ans] K. M[oussa], "Our Chronicle," *NL* 13 (11 July 1926): 216. J[ohn] B[renner], "National Lutheran Publicity Week," *NL* 14 (20 February 1927): 51–3. J[ohn] B[renner], "The Vested Choir," *NL* 15 (1 April 1928): 99–100. J[ohn] B[renner], "A Slogan," (29 April 1928): 131. J[ohn] B[renner], "Our Slogan," (24 June 1928): 198–9. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], review of *Winning Souls for Jesus Through Personal Missionary Work*, by John Theodore Mueller, in *Qu* 26 (April 1929): 159. [August F.] Z[ich], "Liberalism and Lutheranism," *NL* 23 (27 September 1936): 310. I[mmanuel] P. F[rey], "'Days' and 'Daze,'" *NL* 25 (23 October 1938): 340. William J. Schaefer, "Siftings," *NL* 29 (29 November 1942): 377.

Wisconsin's July 1938 *Quartalschrift* announced the appearance of the ALC *Declaration*,<sup>105</sup> and the next *Quartalschrift* issue reprinted the text of Missouri's Union Resolutions, as reported in *The Lutheran Witness*.<sup>106</sup> Meyer commented only that Missouri's resolution contained "far-reaching consequences" that "cannot easily be overestimated."<sup>107</sup>

*The Northwestern Lutheran* noted in August 1938 that delegates to the ALC's eastern district convention voted in favor of pulpits and altar fellowship with both the Missouri Synod and the ULCA, and memorialized the full ALC upcoming convention at Sandusky in October to act on their resolution. August Zich was silent about Missouri's involvement but directed harsh criticism to one ALC representative. "Rarely have we seen a more typical and sneering ridicule of the solemn duty of the Church to watch over its doctrine" from any church leader, no less "from one who is regarded as a shining light in Lutheran church circles." This "spirit of unionism in Lutheran church circles" constituted "a betrayal of the Gospel as given us by Christ" and "received by our fathers."<sup>108</sup>

Later in 1938, noting that Lutheran merger efforts faced the danger that "differences in doctrine and practice are apt to be ignored," Zich predicted that union between Missouri and the ALC, "if it comes to pass" was to be "achieved upon the safe grounds of strict agreement in

---

<sup>105</sup> [Joh. P.] M[eyer], "The Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church," *Qu* 35 (July 1938): 208.

<sup>106</sup> "Report of the Twenty-Second Delegate Synod (Thirty-Seventh Regular Convention) of the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, Assembled at Saint Louis, Mo., June 15-24, 1938," *LW* 57 (12 July 1938): 233-4.

<sup>107</sup> [Joh. P.] M[eyer], "Resolutions on Church Union," *Qu* 35 (October 1938): 284-9.

<sup>108</sup> [August F.] Z[ich], "Words of Warning," *NL* 25 (28 August 1938): 277. Zich criticized ALC representative Oscar C. Mees, who was quoted as saying, "I am glad to see our Lutheran bodies stop waving the red flag of doctrinal bullfights about matters which try to explain God's miraculous plan of salvation. Today, when the Church is faced with a growing force of atheism as well as agnosticism, totalitarianism and meager spirituality, the Lutheran Church, which has something to offer to help solve the world's problems, needs to unite forces to meet the issues of the present hour." See also [August F.] Z[ich], "Strange Bedfellows," *NL* 25 (4 December 1938): 390.

doctrine.” Missouri and the ALC needed to resist the temptation to glory in the “large figures” such a merger would produce. “Let us never forget that the strength of the Church consists no in its large numbers but in the faithful adherence to the Word of God in its members.”<sup>109</sup>

Wisconsin seminary professor Max Lehninger presented a more thorough review in the April 1939 *Quartalschrift*,<sup>110</sup> insisting that “nothing in the ‘Brief Statement’ may be adduced as countermanding a statement of the ‘Declaration,’” but that “everything in the ‘Brief Statement,’ on the other hand, must rather be so construed as to be in harmony with the ‘Declaration.’” There was a “weakness inherent in the issuing of two separate statements,” one by each party, to demonstrate confessional agreement. Such a procedure aroused suspicions that Missouri and the ALC had found it impossible to arrive at “a confessional declaration to which both sides give hearty assent” and that “each side will be inclined to stress chiefly its own statement with its reservations and conditions, minimizing the importance of the other.”<sup>111</sup>

Citing the ALC statement that it was “neither necessary nor possible” to agree on nonfundamental doctrines, Lehninger replied that the *Brief Statement* did not regard the doctrines of church and ministry, Sunday, chiliasm, and the Antichrist as open questions. “We are not at liberty to bargain with anyone for toleration of teachings contrary to the doctrine which we have learned (Rom.16,17) and rejected by us on Biblical grounds.”<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> [August F.] Z[ich], “Lutheran Union Movements,” *NL* 25 (23 October 1938): 339. A resulting merger of Missouri and the ALC at that time would have resulted in a church body of almost 3 million members.

<sup>110</sup> M[ax] Lehninger, “The Brief Statement of the Missouri Synod and the Declaration of the A. L. C. as the Doctrinal Basis for Church-Fellowship,” *Qu* 36 (April 1939): 81–96.

<sup>111</sup> Lehninger, “The Brief Statement,” 86–7.

<sup>112</sup> Lehninger, “The Brief Statement,” 89–90.

Drawing a distinction destined to assume major significance for Wisconsin over the next two decades, Lehninger concluded, “It is one thing to bear with an erring brother, but quite another to sanction false teaching by tolerating it in our midst.” In addition,

It is one thing to sever the bond of fellowship with a person that is within the fold, belongs to our congregation or our synod. Only after having exhausted all means of convincing the erring brother, only after all efforts have failed to bring him to the acknowledgment and confession of the truth will we finally, in obedience to our Lord, exclude him from our communion.

But it is quite another thing when we deal with the question of receiving an outsider, one with whom we are not now in fellowship, especially a minister or public teacher of the Word, or a whole congregation or synod, into the fellowship of faith. In this case, church-fellowship should not be established until a full agreement in and clear understanding of all points at issue has been reached, be they fundamental or non-fundamental, so long as they are Scriptural—there is no room for other doctrines and opinions in the Church.<sup>113</sup>

An *ad hoc* committee appointed to report to Wisconsin’s 1939 convention charged that “the doctrinal basis established by the Missouri Synod and by the American Lutheran Church”—especially that Missouri’s *Brief Statement* was to be viewed “in the light of” the ALC’s *Declaration*—was unacceptable. “No two statements should be issued as a basis for agreement,” but “a single, joint statement, covering the contested doctrines thetically and antithetically, and accepted by both parties to the controversy, is imperative.” Such a statement “must be made in clear and unequivocal terms which do not require laborious additional explanations.”<sup>114</sup>

An extensive, incisive, occasionally sardonic appraisal of the ALC *Declaration* by Joh. P. Meyer appeared in the *Quartalschrift* in October 1939.<sup>115</sup> Meyer emphasized four points:

---

<sup>113</sup> Lehninger, “The Brief Statement,” 96.

<sup>114</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1939*, 60.

<sup>115</sup> [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Do the Recent Declarations of the A. L. C. Warrant the Establishment of Fraternal Relations?” *Qu* 36 (October 1939): 249–78.

1. Members of the church must all speak the same thing.
2. The speaking of the church is restricted to the Word of God.
3. Even a slight deviation from this norm is extremely dangerous.
4. Anyone who deviates in his teaching from the Word of God is a false prophet and must be avoided.

“Do they speak the same thing with us?” Meyer asked about the ALC. “They do not even speak the same thing among themselves. They admit that within their own ranks there are differences of opinion concerning the church, concerning a preliminary resurrection of martyrs,” and other doctrines.<sup>116</sup> Admittedly, full agreement in all nonfundamentals “has never been attained” in the church, due to human weakness and “the stubbornness of our Old Adam.” If the words “it is neither necessary nor possible to agree” in all nonfundamentals had been spoken “with blushing face, with a broken spirit and a contrite heart,” imploring forgiveness from a merciful God, they would be acceptable. But, said Meyer, the *Declaration* “does not read like a confession.”<sup>117</sup>

Meyer also delineated a distinction that foreshadowed future Wisconsin debate: “While it would be a violation of brotherly love to treat weak brethren as though they were deliberate errorists, it would be a denial of the truth to deal with deliberate errorists as though they were weak brethren.”<sup>118</sup>

In these initial reviews, Wisconsin theologians were careful to identify the ALC as the offending party, and directed scant criticism at Missouri. Lehninger and Meyer both viewed the Sandusky resolutions as exceeding the agreement reached between the ALC and Missouri in summer

---

<sup>116</sup> Meyer, “Recent Declarations,” 250–2.

<sup>117</sup> Meyer, “Recent Declarations,” 254.

<sup>118</sup> Meyer, “Recent Declarations,” 268.

1938.<sup>119</sup> Meyer also observed that Missouri and the ALC had operated with different instructions. Missouri representatives were told “to effect true unity,” while ALC representatives were instructed “to establish pulpit and altar fellowship”—which, Meyer objected, “should not be made an end itself” because confession and fellowship, “in order to be true, must rest on a common faith.”<sup>120</sup>

Yet Meyer revealed his disappointment with Missouri in the very same issue of the *Quartalschrift*, reviewing *The Historic Lutheran Position on Non-Fundamentals* by Theodore Graebner. “The purpose of this pamphlet is not hard to guess,” Meyer charged. “It is to justify certain resolutions adopted by the centennial convention of the Missouri Synod in 1938.”<sup>121</sup> Meyer also offered delicate criticism of a November 1939 *Lutheran Witness* article favorable to the union discussions,<sup>122</sup> as did Edmund Reim in a 1940 essay, “The Strength of Christian Unity”:

The Missouri Synod has come to its sister synods bearing an agreement negotiated between itself and a third church body. It has already given it substantial endorsement, is submitting it to us for our approval, and is now . . . trying to sell us on the agreement. . . . Now we have pointed out places “where error can hide,” not a vague, mysterious, undefined error, if you please, but the old familiar ones which in time past have played such an important part in the controversies. . . . Does not the burden of proof now clearly lie with those who have claimed that the agreement

---

<sup>119</sup> Lehniger, “The Brief Statement,” 93. Meyer, “Recent Declarations,” 272–3. Edmund Reim wrote that Wisconsin in 1939 “carefully refrained from condemning” its sister synod for involving itself in negotiations with the ALC, but confined itself “to evaluating the factual result of the St. Louis Agreement,” suspecting that “to the American Lutheran Church the Agreement of 1938 did not mean what many a conservative Missourian had assumed in 1938.” Even when Wisconsin’s warnings grew more emphatic following Missouri’s 1941 convention, Reim said, “It was never Missouri’s original purpose which was criticized, but rather its failure to heed the danger signals that were multiplying on every hand.” E[dmund] R[eim], “Let the Record Speak,” *Qu* 41 (July 1944): 201–2.

<sup>120</sup> Meyer, “Recent Declarations,” 270.

<sup>121</sup> [Joh. P.] M[eyer], review of *The Historic Lutheran Position in Non-Fundamentals*, by Theodore Graebner, *Qu* 36 (October 1939): 299.

<sup>122</sup> “Present Stage of the Church-Union Deliberations,” *LW* 58 (14 November 1939): 391–2. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Present Stage of the Church Union Deliberations,” *Qu* 37 (January 1940): 53–61.

constitutes “a settlement of the doctrinal controversies”? We are waiting, open to conviction.<sup>123</sup>

*Why wasn't Wisconsin invited?*

Wisconsin declined the 1935 invitation to enter negotiations with the ULCA, according to Reim, because those negotiations were “based upon the premise that no real difference existed between the various Lutheran bodies of America.” At its 1935 convention, however, Wisconsin “publicly mentioned the need of taking up the abandoned efforts toward inter-synodical agreement [with the former Ohio and Iowa synods] at the point where they were dropped, and stated a readiness for such a step at any time.”<sup>124</sup>

If Wisconsin declined only the ULCA invitation, why was it not involved in discussions with the ALC? “It was entirely without our fault” if Missouri and ALC committees resumed union discussions without Wisconsin representatives present. “Nor was any ALC invitation rejected by our Synod. None was received.” Reim added, “I know whereof I speak, having been in closest contact with the developments of that time.”<sup>125</sup>

Soon, however, Wisconsin learned more about its “non-invitation” to these meetings. “For years it seemed as though this had been an unintentional oversight, or perhaps the result of a letter being lost in the mails, and we took it as such.” But in “a passing remark” the ALC’s Michael Reu wondered in 1941 “whether perhaps our church did not have good reasons to refrain from extending an invitation to Missouri’s sister synods” in its union negotiations. “Perhaps even stronger reasons” existed in 1941 than in 1935 or 1938 to “make such an invitation even more difficult.”<sup>126</sup> Reu’s

---

<sup>123</sup> Edmund Reim, “The Strength of Christian Unity,” *Qu* 37 (October 1940): 267.

<sup>124</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1935*, 39, 41.

<sup>125</sup> Reim, “The Strength of Christian Unity,” 259.

<sup>126</sup> D. M[ichael] Reu, “*Muessen die Verhaendlungen mit Missouri nun aufhoeren?*” *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 65 (October 1941): 596; translated by the author. At a meeting in Milwaukee



remark suggested that Wisconsin's failure to be included in the union discussions "was not so innocent as we in our good nature had assumed."<sup>127</sup>

President Behnken, reflecting two decades later, termed it "extremely unfortunate" that the Wisconsin Synod received no invitation. Missouri's committee on Lutheran Union was "definitely under the impression during the 1935–1938 round of talks that such an invitation had been issued," and did not learn otherwise until 1938. Behnken was convinced "the whole situation both in the Synodical Conference and in the entire area of Lutheran union would be altogether different today if the Wisconsin Synod had taken part in the discussions from the outset."<sup>128</sup>

---

on 19 July 1954, attended by the ALC Committee on Union and Wisconsin's Standing Committee on Church Union, the ALC's Henry Schuh intimated that Wisconsin's opposition to Missouri–ALC negotiations was rooted in "hurt feelings" stirred by Reu's remark. ALC representative Bernard Holm volunteered his own understanding that Reu's remark was a reflection of his personal views, not an official statement of ALC policy. The Wisconsin Synod was right to understand Reu as saying he had deliberately withheld an invitation to Wisconsin in 1935. "Report on the meeting of the Committee on Union and Fellowship of the American Lutheran Church with the Standing Committee on Church Union of the Ev. Luth. Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, Milwaukee, 19 July 1954"; in Oscar Siegler File # 1, WELS Archives, WLS, Mequon, Wis.

<sup>127</sup> E[dmund] R[eim], "Let the Record Speak," *Qu* 41 (July 1944): 200–2. See also E[dmund] Reim, "The Debate on Union: How Did We Get Into It?" *NL* 34 (27 April 1947): 136–7, in which Reim charged that Reu subsequently admitted that the omission had occurred "perhaps not without purpose" ("vielleicht nicht ohne Absicht"). See also [Joh. P.] M[eyer], "A New Name for Open Questions?" *Qu* 41 (January 1944): 65–6, where Meyer recalled that Reu in the January 1940 *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* remarked on the trend of those in Wisconsin and some in Missouri of "wilfully obstructing any union endeavors" ("die 'Einigungsverhandlungen zu stoeren' suchen").

Edward Fendt, in his memoirs, *The Struggle for Lutheran Unity and Consolidation in the U. S. A. from the Late 1930s to the Early 1970s* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1980), 189, 191, remembered an "enlightening experience" when LCMS professor William Arndt was "anxious" for Fendt to become acquainted with Reim. When the three—Fendt, Arndt, and Reim—met in Chicago, Reim "readily admitted" that Wisconsin's criticism of the Missouri–ALC union negotiations "was not doctrinal, but in reality an expression of 'sour grapes.' Those were his words." Fendt recalled Reim's explaining that Wisconsin had been an active participant in the *Intersynodical Theses*, and he "didn't think it proper for the LCMS and ALC to try for a settlement by themselves." As Reim recounted the story of Reu's comment and its alleged meaning, "Dr. Arndt and I [Fendt] listened patiently to Reim's recital of how it felt to 'be left out.'"

<sup>128</sup> Behnken, *This I Recall*, 168–9.

Three meetings of Missouri and Wisconsin representatives between 1939 and 1941 produced no change. At the 1940 Synodical Conference convention the Wisconsin and Norwegian synods criticized Missouri's actions, asking Missouri to frame future agreements into a single document.<sup>129</sup> Missouri's 1941 convention subsequently requested that a single union document be drafted and that Wisconsin and other Conference bodies be granted an opportunity to consult before it appeared.<sup>130</sup> Wisconsin's 1941 convention urged Missouri to suspend negotiations with the ALC because continued negotiations under present conditions would "turn into 'dickering' in confessional matters," would "confirm the opponents in their 'unfirm attitude,'" and would "continue to cause confusion and disturbance in the Church."<sup>131</sup>

In 1943, Wisconsin declined a belated invitation to participate in Missouri-ALC negotiations. Wisconsin drafted a memorial for Missouri's 1944 convention, in which President John Brenner agreed with a *Lutheran Witness* article of 11 May 1943 that stated that the ALC's continued membership in the American Lutheran Conference constituted "a very real obstacle to the proposed union."<sup>132</sup> Brenner asked whether Missouri was in fact "definitely committed to the Resolutions of 1938 as a settlement of the doctrinal controversies between the two synods." In view of the "unionistic attitude" of the ALC, which was becoming "increasingly evident," would Missouri

---

<sup>129</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1940*, 81ff.

<sup>130</sup> Fredrich, "The Great Debate," 159. *Missouri Proceedings, 1941*, 74.

<sup>131</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1941*, 76-7. Wisconsin rejected Missouri's appeal to 1 Peter 3:15 ("Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you") as a basis for continued negotiations with the ALC. The passage, Wisconsin said, "does not refer to doctrinal discussion" but "speaks of the proper attitude of Christians in times of persecutions." Titus 3:10 and Romans 16:17 were quoted to demonstrate that "the obligation to discuss doctrine with others does not apply in every case," but "the cessation of verbal testimony is called for under certain circumstances." [Joh. P.] M[eyer], "Ft. Wayne Resolutions on the Union Matter," *Qu* 38 (October 1941): 301.

<sup>132</sup> "Report of Committee for Doctrinal Unity," *LW* 62 (11 May 1943): 162-3.

agree that “further negotiations for establishing church fellowship could only undermine the testimony that has been previously given [to the ALC], and should therefore be discontinued for the time being?”<sup>133</sup>

But Missouri–ALC fellowship was being cultivated on other levels. *The Lutheran* reported on a testimonial dinner for Missouri’s Lutheran Radio Hour speaker Walter A. Maier, sponsored by 225 Lutheran laymen and pastors “representing every one of the larger Lutheran groups and several of the smaller ones”—including the ULCA, ALC, Missouri, and the Augustana Synod. “Back of the purpose of the meeting,” *The Lutheran* said, “was the thought that if all the major Lutheran groups would cooperate, a long step forward would be taken in the further development of a more intimate fellowship among both laity and clergy.”<sup>134</sup> This group brought together Missourians who confessed the inerrancy of Scripture, ULCA members who did not, and ALC members who offered fellowship to Missouri but reserved its right to “supplement” the *Brief Statement*, prompting Joh. P. Meyer to remark, “Since the gathering was sponsored jointly by representatives of the various bodies as a ‘testimonial dinner,’ we cannot suppress within ourselves the anxious question, Who testified what?”<sup>135</sup>

*The Lutheran* reported that at the ULCA’s biennial convention in 1942 “it was a very pleasant surprise when President Knubel announced the presence of Dr. Theodore Graebner of the Missouri Synod.”<sup>136</sup> Another article in the same issue of *The Lutheran* hailed his appearance as signaling “a new day in Lutheranism.” Invited to address the convention, Graebner remarked that a

---

<sup>133</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1943*, 65–9.

<sup>134</sup> Arthur P. Black, “Lutheran Laymen’s Dinner, Washington, D. C.,” *Lu* 24 (26 November 1941): 20.

<sup>135</sup> [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Who Testified What?” *Qu* 39 (January 1942): 70–1; emphasis by Meyer.

<sup>136</sup> “Distinguished Visitors,” *Lu* 25 (28 October 1942): 31.

“cheerless attitude” regarding Missouri-ULCA fellowship was unwarranted because “we have found it possible to join our efforts with yours” through chaplaincies and other services. “Lutheran bodies must act together if they will make their contributions” to the world.<sup>137</sup>

The NLC proposed an All-Lutheran Federation and a National Lutheran Editors’ Association convention. Meyer felt both placed “the matter of Lutheran solidarity on an unsound basis, and for that reason we on our part must continue to raise a warning voice.”<sup>138</sup> *The American Lutheran* cited the *Lutheran Standard’s* editorial assertion that “a growing sense of togetherness” characterized the annual meeting of the Lutheran Editors’ Association in September 1943 at Blair, Nebraska—“not a forced togetherness nor a feigned togetherness but a genuine togetherness” that was “substantial and meaningful: because it recognized and grew out of “our minor peripheral differences as well as our major central agreement.” The editorial said further,

We prayed together. The Lutheran Editors’ Association has never lost any time in finely spun discussion of the propriety of joint prayer at our meetings. That is taken for granted—and acted upon. That such a practice has had much to do with our growing togetherness and with the full measure of Christian joy that crowns our meetings is beyond question. Moreover, the editors (representing the five synods in the American Lutheran Conference, the United Lutheran Church in America, and the Missouri Synod) are convinced that wide, fervent use of joint prayer will do much to promote togetherness throughout the Lutheran Church in America.<sup>139</sup>

*The Lutheran Companion* for 30 June 1943 reported on a three-day session of the Lutheran Theologians’ conference, at which 17 Lutheran seminaries from the United States and Canada were represented, but Wisconsin’s seminary at Thiensville was not. The conference was applauded for

---

<sup>137</sup> G. Elson Ruff, “The Church in Convention in Louisville,” *Lu* 25 (28 October 1942): 39. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Dr. Graebner at the Louisville, Ky., Convention,” *Qu* 40 (January 1943): 69.

<sup>138</sup> [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “An All-Lutheran Federation Proposed,” *Qu* 39 (April 1942): 149–50. “National Lutheran Editors’ Association and the Proposed Convention,” (April 1942): 150–2. “The Synodical Conference and the Proposed Convention,” (April 1942): 152–3. See also H[enry] A. Koch, “Dangerous, Eventually Fatal Steps,” (July 1942): 186–99.

<sup>139</sup> Fred H. Lindemann, “The Churchman’s Digest,” *AL* 26 (December 1943): 12.

providing evidence that “a new day of good will and understanding is dawning for the Lutheran Church.” A “spirit of tolerance” and “wide latitude” on the expression of individual opinions was also highlighted.<sup>140</sup> According to Missouri’s William Arndt, discussions among the professors made it “evident” that “the Lutheran Church of America is not yet united in doctrine and practice and that a good deal of earnest, prayerful work was still required” to remove doctrinal differences. Yet Arndt was also “filled with hope” at witnessing “the desire of all these representative men to be loyal to the Lutheran Church” and to Scripture. Meetings of various Lutheran faculties “with a frank exchange of views must be productive of much good.”<sup>141</sup>

Later in 1943, J. F. E. Nickelsburg contended that when Lutherans join in carrying out such “external matters” as conducting home and inner missions, not only is duplication avoided and misunderstanding removed; such efforts also “contribute much toward Lutheran unity.” Lutherans not in doctrinal fellowship nevertheless “receive strength and encouragement” as they “reason together with one another” over the common problems they faced. Nickelsburg acknowledged he was “an officer of an intersynodical welfare board which opens its sessions by a petition to our God” that he would grant the group his blessings. “As Lutheran Christians we pray for guidance and counsel.”<sup>142</sup>

---

<sup>140</sup> “Lutheran Theologians In Hopeful Meeting,” *LC* 51 (30 June 1943): 804. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Lutheran Theologians in Hopeful Meeting,” *Qu* 40 (October 1943): 288–9. Wisconsin received but did not accept an invitation to this conference. “In my estimation,” Meyer wrote to conference organizers, “the basic problem that we all have in common lies in the serious doctrinal differences that now separate the various Lutheran groups, and the resultant deplorable lack of unity.” If conference participants were prepared to recognize frankly and discuss those differences, with the intention of bringing about agreement in teaching at their seminaries, Meyer would be “glad to accept [their] invitation on behalf of our faculty.” Meyer received no reply.

<sup>141</sup> W[illiam] Arndt, “Conference of Professors at Lutheran Seminaries,” *AL* 26 (July 1943): 6. Such meetings continued to be held; see W. D. Loy, “A Memorable Meeting: Lutheran Faculties Meet at Valparaiso University,” *AL* 26 (November 1943): 16–7.

<sup>142</sup> J. F. E. Nickelsburg, “Concrete Examples of Intersynodical Cooperation,” *AL* 26 (October 1943): 7–8. Nickelsburg admitted he was “fully-conscious of [the] importance” of his closing

But such incidents also illustrated precisely what Wisconsin's president Brenner protested to the Synodical Conference on 1 August 1944: "We feel constrained to state at this time that we have been seriously perturbed by numerous instances of an anticipation of a union not yet existing, or, as it has been put, not yet declared."<sup>143</sup>

### *The Missouri civil war*

Missouri's official magazine, *The Lutheran Witness*, favored union with the ALC,<sup>144</sup> and still greater support was expressed in an unofficial Missouri publication, *The American Lutheran*.<sup>145</sup>

Published since 1918 as the voice of the American Lutheran Publicity Bureau,<sup>146</sup> *The American*

---

statement, well aware of "the challenge it may receive." See also H. R. Kunkle, "Common Ground for Lutherans," *AL* 26 (November 1943): 6–8. O[tto]. A. Geiseman, "While It Is Day: A Dangerous Fallacy," *AL* 28 (December 1945): 5.

<sup>143</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1945*, 74. For additional reports on intersynodical conferences, see O[tto] A. Geiseman, "While It Is Day: Lutheran Union and Intersynodical Conferences," *AL* 24 (November 1941): 5. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], "Communion Service That Makes History," *Qu* 41 (January 1944): 62–4. "Missouri's Open Door," *AL* 27 (March 1944): 3–4. "A Memorable Meeting," (March 1944): 5. Fred H. Lindemann, "The Churchman's Digest," (April 1944): 10. "The Problem of Lutheran Unity at Saginaw," (June 1944): 4. V. A. Bartelt to *The American Lutheran*, "Open Forum," (June 1944): 25–6. "The Church Cares," (August 1944): 4. See also numerous short items entitled "Lutherans Unite," *AL* 29 (December 1946): 21; *AL* 30 (January 1947): 23. President Behnken acknowledged in 1946 that "indescribable harm has been done the cause of Lutheran fellowship when men become guilty of unionistic services, whereby they create impressions that after all there is no difference" or that differences are "of little moment" to union. "Dr. Behnken at the American Lutheran Conference," *Qu* 44 (January 1947): 69.

<sup>144</sup> Kuster, "Fellowship Dispute," 86.

<sup>145</sup> "The American Lutheran's Position Regarding Lutheran Unity," *AL* 23 (December 1940): 4. Theodore Graebner, "The Importance of Lutheran Union," *AL* 27 (June 1944): 6–7.

<sup>146</sup> For the history and purpose of the American Lutheran Publicity Bureau and *The American Lutheran* magazine, see "Editorial," *AL* 1 (January 1918): 1. "Our Past," *AL* 2 (January 1919): 1. "Still Living," *AL* 3 (January 1920): 2. "Humble Beginnings," *AL* 10 (December 1927): 1–2. "Why I Should Join The American Lutheran Publicity Bureau," *AL* 11 (February 1928): 322. "The Editor Muses," *AL* 13 (January 1930): 1. "The History of the A-L-P-B," *AL* 15 (December 1932): 7–12. "The American Lutheran Publicity Bureau," *AL* 16 (June 1933): 4. "A Little History, 1917-1937," *AL* 20 (April 1937): 7. [Paul Lindemann], "A. L. P. B. Celebrates Twenty-Fifth Anniversary," *AL* 22 (January 1939): 3. "Volume XXV, Number 1," *AL* 25 (January 1942): 3. Arthur Brunn, "We Look Back," (February 1942): 10, 21. "Re-Statement of Editorial Policy," *AL* 37 (April 1954): 3. Alan

*Lutheran* soon became popular and was viewed as a great help both by those inside and outside the synod.<sup>147</sup> *Time* magazine praised *The American Lutheran* in 1934 for laboring “unceasingly to assist pastors with the problems of finance, publicity, sermonizing, church architecture, and decoration,” and noted that the magazine was “sympathetic with a liturgical movement which currently is exciting Lutherans almost as much as the Oxford Movement excited Anglicans a century ago.”<sup>148</sup> By 1920, in only its third year of publication, the magazine numbered more than three thousand subscribers. After World War II it was read by half the synod’s pastors.<sup>149</sup>

*The American Lutheran* was linked to Missourians in the east eager to present their synod in a more favorable light.<sup>150</sup> Carrying the slogan “A Changeless Christ for a Changing World,”<sup>151</sup> it

---

Graebner, “50 Years of the A. L. P. B.,” *AL* 46 (August 1963): 14–5; (September 1963): 14–5; (October 1963): 14–5; Alfred P. Klausler, (November 1963): 20–1, 28; (December 1963): 6–7, 25.

<sup>147</sup> Scharlemann, interview; Spitz, interview; in Wohlrabe, “The Missouri Synod’s Unity Attempts,” 157–8. Kuster, “Fellowship Dispute,” 86–8.

<sup>148</sup> “Lutheran Liturgists,” *Time*, 19 February 1934, 26.

<sup>149</sup> Theodore Whittrock, circulation and business manager of *The American Lutheran*, 1949–65, said in a telephone interview on 9 April 1980 that although circulation records had been destroyed in a fire, he was “certain” that about fifty percent of Missouri clergy received the magazine immediately after World War II, and that this percentage remained constant in the years following the war. Interview cited by J. Jeffrey Zetto, “Aspects of Theology in the Liturgical Movement in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, 1930–1960” (Th. D. diss., Christ Seminary—Seminex, St. Louis, May 1982), 13. In another interview, on 13 September 1994, Wittrock estimated the circulation of *The American Lutheran* in the 1950s to be between 7,000 and 8,000, 40 percent of which was non-Missouri Synod Lutheran. Interview cited by John R. Hannah, “The New York Role in the Missouri War” (paper presented to the LHC, Staten Island, N. Y., 31 October 1998), 5.

<sup>150</sup> “Handicapping the Word,” *AL* 9 (December 1926): 4. “Church Decorum,” *AL* 10 (March 1927): 2. “The Pioneers,” (December 1927): 2. “Pernicious Publicity,” *AL* 12 (September 1929): 4–5. “Yea and Amen,” (September 1929): 4–5. “The Compulsion of Orthodoxy,” *AL* 16 (April 1933): 4. “The Dark Ages or a Revival,” *AL* 18 (January 1935): 4. F. R. Webber, “Shall We Fold Up?” (February 1935): 16–7.

<sup>151</sup> Oscar E. Feucht, “Wanted—A Slogan,” *AL* 10 (November 1927): 6–7. “The Slogan Contest, Time Extended to April 15, 1928,” *AL* 11 (March 1928): 9. “A Changeless Christ for a Changing World,” (May 1928): 12.

offered practical suggestions on community outreach,<sup>152</sup> publicity,<sup>153</sup> use of the radio,<sup>154</sup> improved worship services,<sup>155</sup> and more efficient congregational and synodical administration.<sup>156</sup> According to Alan Graebner, *The American Lutheran* “introduced the Missouri Synod to the concept of a loyal opposition in an ecclesiastical organization.” Though experienced in confronting theological opposition, the synod was largely unaccustomed to discussion or resistance over theologically neutral ideas. At least at the beginning, the ALPB’s practical program was fairly neutral theologically. “By

---

<sup>152</sup> “A Common Case,” *AL* 1 (March 1918): 1–2. “The Old Complaint,” *AL* 7 (February 1924): 3. O[scar] E. Feucht, “How To Conduct a Missionary Canvass,” *AL* 11 (January 1928): 7–9. A. F. Boszin, “The Ministry of Tracts,” *AL* 13 (January 1930): 8–9. “Have We a Policy?” (April 1930): 7. “Is the Lutheran Church Evangelistically Minded?” (November 1930): 7. A[dolf] F. M[eyer], “Hot Dogs Versus Tracts,” *AL* 20 (November 1937): 6. J[ohn] W. Behnken, “Universal Approval of A-L-P-B Tracts,” *AL* 21 (January 1938): 14.

<sup>153</sup> “Publicity Needed,” *AL* 1 (July 1918): 2. John H. C. Fritz, “Publicity and Popularity,” *AL* 2 (September 1919): 3. “Poor Reasoning,” *AL* 3 (January 1920): 2. “Persistence in Advertising,” (March 1920): 2. “The Proper Place,” (March 1920): 2. O. H. Pannkoke, “What is Church Publicity?” *AL* 4 (October 1921): 4. “National Lutheran Publicity Week,” *AL* 6 (July 1923): 2. “The Secret of Successful Church Advertising,” (December 1923): 1. Lewis W. Spitz, “The Public Pulse,” *AL* 7 (March 1924): 4–5. Paul G. Prokopy, “Publish and Conceal Not,” (July 1924): 6–7. “Aggressiveness,” *AL* 8 (March 1925): 3. “Increasing Demand for Publicity,” *AL* 9 (June 1926): 4. J[ohn] H. C. Fritz, “The Case of Publicity,” *AL* 10 (December 1927): 5. “The Function of Church Publicity,” *AL* 21 (September 1938): 6.

<sup>154</sup> “Services By Radio,” *AL* 6 (January 1923): 2. G[eorge] C. K[oenig], “A Lutheran Broadcasting Station,” (April 1923): 3. “The Radio for Home Missions,” *AL* 8 (October 1925): 7. W. F. Behnken, “The Radio—A Missionary Agency,” *AL* 9 (February 1926): 7. “A Nation-Wide Broadcast,” *AL* 13 (August 1930): 3. Walter F. Troeger, “Does Religious Broadcasting Pay?” *AL* 14 (August 1931): 12. “The New Season of the Lutheran Hour,” *AL* 19 (September 1936): 22. Martin Daib, “The Lutheran Hour,” *AL* 20 (December 1937): 13.

<sup>155</sup> “Church Decorum,” *AL* 2 (February 1919): 2. “Pure Goods in Slovenly Packages,” *AL* 8 (January 1925): 3. “Lugubrious Churches,” *AL* 12 (January 1929): 5. “‘Popularizing’ the Service,” (March 1925): 2–3. Paul F. Arndt, “Understandest Thou What Thou Readest?” *AL* 18 (October 1935): 16–7. “The Liturgical Question,” (November 1935): 68. Howard R. Kunkel, “Form or Content?” *AL* 20 (November 1937): 13–4.

<sup>156</sup> “Planning Ahead,” *AL* 6 (December 1923): 1–2. “Surveying the Field,” *AL* 7 (October 1924): 2–3. “The New Year,” *AL* 8 (January 1925): 1. “Another Year,” *AL* 9 (January 1926): 1. “Efficiency in Church Management,” *AL* 11 (April 1928): 1. “Are Our Churches Undermanned?” (April 1928): 1–2. J. F. E. Nickelsburg, “The A. L. P. B. Office As A Clearing House,” *AL* 14 (March 1931): 17–8.



articulating previously vague or unpublicized feelings, and by presenting a vigorous reform program, the magazine not only represented, but enlarged the reform party” in Missouri. The existence of this unofficial voice served to hold inside the synod “the most discontented, the very group necessary” to force changes.<sup>157</sup>

*The American Lutheran* treated doctrinal matters primarily in a negative tone. The need for complete agreement, if not ignored entirely, was minimized.<sup>158</sup> Loyal Missourians “who are also friends of true Lutheran union” were “cheered” at the possibility of closer affiliation with the ALC. Impressive was “the impatience of the laymen who were anxious to cast their ballot in favor of” the 1938 Union Resolution.<sup>159</sup> News of the move “looking towards the elimination of doctrinal differences and eventual fellowship and union of the two great Lutheran church groups” was greeted with “sincere joy and deep gratitude.”<sup>160</sup>

Wrote Otto Geiseman, “Never before have we heard so many enthusiastic comments about a meeting of Synod as we have heard concerning the sessions held at St. Louis early this summer.” A new spirit was arising in Missouri, leading the synod between “both the Scylla and the Charybdis of dead traditionalism and hopeless liberalism.” The synod would enjoy “a growing appreciation of the meaning of love” and be guided “not by the principle, ‘Thus saith the Fathers,’ but by the principle, ‘Thus saith the Lord.’”<sup>161</sup> Clergy and lay members alike were “anxiously looking forward” to the union of “these two great organizations.”<sup>162</sup>

---

<sup>157</sup> Alan Graebner, “Acculturation,” 224–9.

<sup>158</sup> Kuster, “Fellowship Dispute,” 109.

<sup>159</sup> Adolf F. Meyer, “Convention Impressions,” *AL* 21 (July 1938): 6.

<sup>160</sup> “Progress Towards Lutheran Union,” *AL* 21 (September 1938): 5.

<sup>161</sup> O[tto] A. Geiseman, “While It Is Day: Synod,” *AL* 21 (October 1938): 8.

<sup>162</sup> “Can the Dream Become Reality?” *AL* 21 (December 1938): 6.

But *American Lutheran* editor Paul Lindemann knew the union movement faced opposition. Privately he criticized “the hidebound men who have entrenched themselves behind a very high wall of traditionalism,” which was “beginning to cause a rift in our church.” He had grown “so depressed by the legalistic and uncharitable attitude” of some pastors that he stopped attending pastoral conferences.<sup>163</sup> Publicly, Lindemann was convinced the devil was “opposed to any movement which may bring health and strength to the Church,” and that he would “make serious attempts to frustrate the plans that look toward a more unified campaign of the forces of light against the powers of darkness.” In particular, the devil might “utilize the fears and prejudices of those who have come to accept strife and division as the normal status of the Church” and regard any move toward peace with suspicion.<sup>164</sup>

A year later, and only months after Lindemann’s unexpected death, an unnamed *American Lutheran* editorialist identified “a number of influences in the Synodical Conference” that had begun trying “to destroy the spirit of the 1938 convention of the Missouri Synod.” The entire question of Lutheran unity “has been moved into an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust which is neither Lutheran nor Scriptural.” While there were no doctrinal differences within the Synodical Conference, the writer concluded, “there is, however, a very notable difference in attitudes.”<sup>165</sup>

First opposition came from Wilhelm Oesch, pastor of Immanuel Church, Kentish Town, London, who in early 1939 mailed to all Missouri Synod pastors the first issue of a self-published paper entitled *The Crucible*. In the only article in the first issue, Oesch wrote, “Plainly our Church is at the parting of the ways.” His aim was not polemics but “intelligent, Biblical, God-wrought unity.”

---

<sup>163</sup> Paul Lindemann to Theodore Graebner, 8 November 1936, CHI, MSS, Box 112; cited by Robinson, “The Spirit of Triumphalism,” 174.

<sup>164</sup> “Progress Towards Lutheran Union,” 5.

<sup>165</sup> “A Needed Voice,” *AL* 22 (December 1939): 1.

Calling ALC ties to the American Lutheran Conference “an insuperable obstacle to union,” Oesch wrote, “No church can say Yes and No at the same time.” The Augustana Synod, a member of the American Lutheran Conference, “harbors notorious Modernists and Liberalists,” but the ALC “seems neither willing to withdraw from the American Lutheran Conference nor to make the elimination of scandalous errorists a condition of its own further cooperation.” As long as this state of things continued, “there is no basis for honest pulpit- and altar-fellowship between Missouri and the ALC.”

Oesch acknowledged that the old Ohio and Iowa errors were probably no longer practiced in their present form. But the “greatest deadweight” pro-union advocates must carry is “the unionistic practice inherited from the Iowa Synod in the prolific germs of which the American Lutheran Conference was conceived and born.” If progress toward spiritual agreement has been achieved, it would show, Oesch argued, when the ALC removed every doctrinal ambiguity from the *Declaration* and demanded the same from its American Lutheran Conference partners.<sup>166</sup>

After receiving “a chorus of heartiest approval” for his first issue of *The Crucible*,<sup>167</sup> Oesch published two more issues. He cited with approval the Norwegian Synod’s essay, *Unity, Union, and Unionism*,<sup>168</sup> which described false teachers as “shrewd, cunning, crafty” and “bent on deceiving”—not only those who attack the foundations of Christian faith, but “all false teachers.” Scripture “does not distinguish between great and small error.”<sup>169</sup> In “The Great Illusion,” an unnamed author condemned the inadequacy of formulating Missouri–ALC union on the basis of two documents, the *Brief Statement* and the *Declaration*. As long as this was done, some portions of the

---

<sup>166</sup> W[ilhelm] M. Oesch, “*Quo Vadis, Ecclesia?*” *Cru* 1 (January–February 1939): 3–10; emphasis in the original.

<sup>167</sup> W[ilhelm] M. Oesch, “Foreword,” *Cru* 1 (March–April 1939): 3.

<sup>168</sup> *Unity, Union and Unionism*, (Mankato, Minn.: Luther Synod Book Company, Bethany College, 1938), 20.

<sup>169</sup> “Synodical Conference Essay,” *Cru* 1 (March–April 1939): 17–8.

truth would necessarily be confessed at the expense of others. To sit with, accede to, and pray with ALC representatives would not only create *de facto* agreement with the ALC, but would also open the door to other members of the American Lutheran Conference, and then the ULCA.<sup>170</sup>

Oesch promised to “yield the editorial pen to an abler writer” should a sufficiently complete organization be formed to combat Missouri–ALC union efforts.<sup>171</sup> In January 1940 the first issue of *The Confessional Lutheran* appeared. Published by the newly formed Confessional Lutheran Publicity Bureau, fashioned after the ALPB, its masthead proclaimed: “Now, I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and the same judgment” (1 Corinthians 1:10).<sup>172</sup> Editor Paul Burgdorf, pastor in Lake Falls, Minnesota, wrote that he “prayerfully and humbly” desired “to make a contribution to the cause of Confessional Lutheranism and to Lutheran Confessionalism.” Though admitting that subjects to be discussed in *The Confessional Lutheran* would “necessarily be largely of a controversial nature,” the editor promised they would be “dealt with in as wholly an objective way as at all possible.” He would “welcome criticisms and suggestions” and “give careful consideration to every deserving stricture that may possibly be made.”<sup>173</sup>

---

<sup>170</sup> “The Great Illusion,” *Cru* 1 (May–June 1939): 6–9.

<sup>171</sup> *Cru* 1 (January–February 1939): 2.

<sup>172</sup> *CL* 1 (January 1940): 1.

<sup>173</sup> [Paul H. Burgdorf], “The Confessional Lutheran,” *CL* 1 (January 1940): 1–2. For additional articles on the purpose and early history of the CLPB and *The Confessional Lutheran*, see J[ohn] B[uenger], “The Present Task of the ‘Confessional Lutheran,’” *CL* 2 (July 1941): 73–5. “The Confessional Lutheran Publicity Bureau,” *CL* 3 (March 1942): 36. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “Annual Meeting of the C. L. P. B.,” (December 1942): 136. “What Is The Difference Between The Various Lutherans?” *CL* 7 (April 1946): 48.

After only seven years *The Confessional Lutheran* reported that its more than one thousand subscribers included synodical officials, editors, professors, pastors, teachers, students, institutions, as well as doctors, lawyers, and university professors from among laymen and women. Subscribers lived in 46 states and territories of the United States, the District of Columbia, Canada, Australia, Europe, and Asia. Most were Missouri Synod members, a few from other church bodies.<sup>174</sup>

The monthly magazine was unequivocally opposed to union with the ALC.<sup>175</sup> Every issue of *The Confessional Lutheran* during its first two years of publication featured the slogan, “Acceptance of the St. Louis Union Article of 1938 must be rescinded.”<sup>176</sup> The Lutheran Church had “its prophets who prophesy out of their own hearts, and whose work, whether they know it and acknowledge it or not, [was] like that of cunning foxes” destroying the church’s “already partially ruined confessional walls.” The *Declaration* contained “neological subjective fantasies” in almost every statement, and there were those among Missouri all too ready to join in “seducing God’s people.”<sup>177</sup>

For *The Confessional Lutheran*, disagreement between church bodies, even over “minor” doctrines, was unacceptable.<sup>178</sup> Though some teachings “lie further from the center of the faith than

---

<sup>174</sup> P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “Who Subscribes To The ‘Confessional Lutheran’?” *CL* 7 (July 1946): 88.

<sup>175</sup> See J[ohn] B[uenger], “One Joint Document,” *CL* 1 (August 1940): 51. D. L. Pfeiffer, “Some Historical Errors Of The Union Articles Adopted By The Missouri Synod In 1938,” (August 1940): 53–4. A[rthur] E. B[eck], “Shall We Continue Negotiations?” (October–November 1940): 71–4. Harry H. Smith, “Let Us Be Charitable,” (December 1940): 76–7. J[ohn] Buenger, “NO MIRACLE,” *CL* 2 (January 1941): 1–2. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “Inter-Synodical Conference at Cedar Rapids, Iowa,” (January 1941): 2–4. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “A Resolution to Rescind the St. Louis Union Articles of 1938,” (February 1941): 13–4.

<sup>176</sup> For example, *CL* 1 (January 1940): 4; (February 1940): 10; (March 1940): 16; (May 1940): 34; (June 1940): 42. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “The 1938 Resolutions of the Missouri Synod on Lutheran Union,” *CL* 2 (July 1941): 75.

<sup>177</sup> “Lutheran Union? A Case of Sanity and Charity Plus—” *CL* 1 (March 1940): 14.

<sup>178</sup> “Dare A Church Declare Doctrinal Matters Non-Divisive?” *CL* 1 (May 1940): 34. “A Correction For The Theological Monthly,” (August 1940): 55. C. M. Gullerud, “A New Approach,”

others,” every doctrine belongs “within the compass of saving truth.” Agreement “in the whole sphere of doctrine” provided the only acceptable prerequisite of church fellowship.<sup>179</sup> Because “we do not encounter error in the abstract,” but in actual persons, and because error and truth both have their “apostles,” one can “disavow error in this world in no other way than by simultaneously disavowing those who proclaim error, those who teach error.” A situation in which one rejects error but fellowships with disseminators of error “does not exist.”<sup>180</sup>

The appearance of *The Confessional Lutheran* opposite *The American Lutheran* set the stage for a civil war in the Missouri Synod over the doctrine and practice of fellowship. *The Confessional Lutheran* became the vehicle for conservative, largely midwestern Missourians who opposed fellowship with other Lutherans unless founded upon their complete acceptance of the *Brief Statement*.<sup>181</sup> *The American Lutheran* served as the voice of Missouri’s “eastern element,”

---

(September 1940): 65–6. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “Mistaken Argumentation,” *CL* 2 (February 1941): 14–7. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “The Leavening Influence of Error—An Easter Meditation,” (March 1941): 37–8. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “Was The Term ‘Non-Fundamentals’ Used As Identical With The Term ‘Open Questions’ In The St. Louis Resolutions of 1938?” (October 1941): 97–8.

<sup>179</sup> George Stoeckhardt, “*Die Lehrdifferenzen zwischen Missouri und Ohio*,” *LuW* 50 (October 1904): 441; cited by P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “The Unalterable Prerequisite of Fellowship Among Confessional Lutherans,” *CL* 2 (February 1941): 13.

<sup>180</sup> Franz Pieper, “Lectures on the Church, 1890–91,” II, 95–7; cited by P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “The Question of ‘Personalities’ In Religious Controversy,” *CL* 2 (May 1941): 58.

<sup>181</sup> See J[ohn] Buenger, “The Dogmatical-Historical Background Of The Present Union Movement,” *CL* 1 (June 1940): 37–9; (July 1940): 44–7; (August 1940): 56–8; (September 1940): 59–64; (October–November 1940): 67–71; (December 1940): 79–86; 2 (January 1941): 7–12; (February 1941): 41–6; (June 1941): 69–71; (July 1941): 82–4; (August–September 1941): 93–5; 3 (February 1942): 15–20. A[rthur] E. B[eck], “The Attitude of Our Clergy as to the Question of Union with the A. L. C.,” *CL* 2 (March 1941): 34–5. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “Has The Missouri Synod A Doctrinal Platform With The American Lutheran Church?” *CL* 5 (January–February 1944): 3–4. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “Pastor Gockel’s ‘Basic Principles Of Lutheran Unity,’” *CL* 5 (May 1944): 25–7.

advocating fellowship without submission to every phrase of the *Brief Statement*.<sup>182</sup> *The Lutheran Witness* (and *Der Lutheraner*) expressed Missouri's official position, though many suspected the *Witness* was moving toward the *American Lutheran* position.<sup>183</sup>

*The American Lutheran* seldom reported differences in practice between Missouri and the ALC. Without explicitly stating it, *The American Lutheran* intimated that the two synods were already essentially united, and alleged differences between them were petty and meaningless.<sup>184</sup> Assuming the existence of a problem—a divided American Lutheranism hampered their witness and hindered their work—*The American Lutheran* proposed greater Lutheran union as a solution to the problem.<sup>185</sup>

The two periodicals used differing arguments to support their claims. *Confessional Lutheran* writers anchored their presentations on documented facts. Arranging their arguments in tight, logical sequence, they “appear to have been satisfied to leave their case utterly dependent upon its logical force to compel assent.” *American Lutheran* authors, however, showed no desire for debate. They

---

<sup>182</sup> See J. H. Gockel, “For a Re-Study of So-Called Non-Fundamentals,” *AL* 25 (June 1942): 6–8.

<sup>183</sup> Robinson, “The Spirit of Triumphalism,” 184–5. One indicator that *The Lutheran Witness* was moving closer to *The American Lutheran* came in a letter from *Witness* editor Theodore Graebner to Michael Reu. After *The Confessional Lutheran* denounced Reu as a “pseudo-Lutheran” in 1942, Graebner wrote to him: “Whatever can be done through the pages of the *Lutheran Witness* to bring our churches closer together during 1943 will certainly be done. You mention Rev. Burgdorf, the editor of the *Confessional Lutheran*. Possibly you overestimate the importance of his efforts.” Graebner did not believe Missouri would be “largely influenced by that kind of polemics.” Theodore Graebner to Michael Reu, 22 December 1942, Theodore Graebner papers, Box 106, CHI; cited by Robinson, “The Spirit of Triumphalism,” 190–1.

<sup>184</sup> See “Objection,” *AL* 22 (March 1939): 5–6. O. P. Kretzmann, “The State of Visible Christendom, VIII—Lutheranism in America—Cultural and Social Functions,” *AL* 23 (February 1940): 11–2. “Lutheran Collaboration at Saginaw,” *AL* 27 (August 1944): 3–4. Fred H. Lindemann, “Synod and Selective Fellowship,” *AL* 28 (September 1945): 9–12.

<sup>185</sup> Kuster, “Fellowship Dispute,” 117–8, 138–9, 142. See O[tto] A. Geiseman, “While It Is Day: The Ecumenical Outlook,” *AL* 24 (May 1941): 5.

refused to refer to *The Confessional Lutheran* by name and seldom responded directly to its attacks. By creating the appearance of objectivity and by providing an “open forum,” *The American Lutheran* sought to present itself as “middle of the road” Lutheranism.<sup>186</sup>

Distancing itself from the viewpoints of *Confessional Lutheran* authors,<sup>187</sup> *The American Lutheran* showcased writers from other synods, thus intimating agreement between Missouri and those who used to be their enemies.<sup>188</sup> Union advocates were more likely to turn to the ALC than to other member synods of the Synodical Conference for approval. Subtly, *we* became *they* and *they* became *we*.<sup>189</sup> Because the Synodical Conference and other conservative Lutheran elements regarded participation in union services as a compromise of the truth, “*they*, therefore, will have nothing to do with them.”<sup>190</sup> In another, more obvious example, an author wrote:

---

<sup>186</sup> Kuster, “Fellowship Dispute,” 168–9, 173–4, 203–5. “Open Forum,” *AL* 27 (March 1944): 4. P. E. Kretzmann, “Trying to Force the Issue,” (December 1944): 10–1. Paul Burgdorf rejected the notion that *The American Lutheran* offered an open forum. “Truth cannot be accorded merely an equal place alongside of error.” Conflicting opinions were no more necessary or beneficial for a church body than “for an individual to swallow pellets of poison with his food or to imbibe a bit of hydrochloric acid with every drink he takes.” [Paul Burgdorf], “An Open Forum?” *CL* 1 (January 1940): 4.

<sup>187</sup> See George O. Lillegard, “Lutheran Union (An Answer to Dr. Graebner).” *AL* 23 (March 1940): 10–1. “Imitate Their Faith,” (August 1940): 3–4. “What Good Comes of This?” *AL* 26 (August 1943): 4.

<sup>188</sup> See Edward C. Fendt, “American Lutheranism in 1940,” *AL* 23 (June 1940): 6–7. Fredrik A. Schiotz, “The Lutheran Church and Her Students,” (October 1940): 9–10. Bunde Skov, “Intersynodical Attitudes,” *AL* 24 (June 1941): 8–9. See also O. P. Kretzmann, “J. Michael Reu, Th. D., Litt. D., November 14, 1869–October 14, 1943,” *AL* 26 (November 1943): 4. O[tto] A. Geiseman, “While It Is Day: A Book You Will Like,” *AL* 28 (March 1945): 5.

<sup>189</sup> Kuster, “Fellowship Dispute,” 195–8. For its part, the ALC found much in common with *The American Lutheran* but criticized *The Confessional Lutheran’s* attack on other Lutherans. “We do not warm up to this latest evidence of bull-dogmatism,” said *The Lutheran Standard* in 1942. “This branding of those fellow-Christians and fellow-Lutherans who differ with us on points of theology as ‘false prophets’ and as those ‘who cause divisions and offenses’ leaves us cold.” The CLPB stood “in grave danger of becoming a sect” if it continued attacking they ought to regard as brothers. “What Would Luther Say?” *LS* 100 (18 April 1942): 7.

<sup>190</sup> “We Object and We Regret,” *AL* 23 (November 1940): 3; emphasis added.



*We* have grown extremely tired of a certain group of defenders of the faith. *They* are constantly being offended and other people are always giving offense. Perhaps *we* might take time out to declare that *we* are offended by *their* utterly loveless approach to the subject of union, by the atmosphere of suspicion in which God's will cannot be done. . . . What *we* need is to surround ourselves with the atmosphere of the Upper Room, where He who gave His followers the new commandment of love prayed so earnestly that "they all may be one."<sup>191</sup>

*A different fellowship history?*

To *Confessional Lutheran* writers and readers, the 1938 Union Resolutions and *American Lutheran* support for them revealed a changed understanding of the practice of prayer fellowship. Conservatives sought to demonstrate that their position—prayer fellowship based on full agreement in doctrine—was the position Walther, Pieper, Bente, and other Missouri fathers had championed since their synod was founded.<sup>192</sup>

Union proponents, however, questioned whether this prerequisite accurately reflected the spirit of Missouri's fathers, and whether the requirement was rooted in the right understanding of Scripture. An August 1940 *American Lutheran* editorialist described an incident that occurred at a recent intersynodical conference, demonstrating the growing misgivings of some in the synod regarding prayer fellowship.

A truly great theologian read an exegetical paper on some passages of Scripture which were frequently adduced against praying with pastors of another synod. He proved to the satisfaction of a number that the passages did not apply. At this point a brother, whose sincerity we doubt not for a moment, arose and made the plea that if all passages from Holy Writ are taken from under our feet, we have nothing left on which we base our position on prayer-fellowship. It may not have been intended to sound as it did, but it seemed to argue that we have a position to maintain and therefore we must not admit that certain passages from God's Word do not say what they must say if we are to maintain our position. Hereupon the fathers of the Missouri Synod were quoted, some rather recent fathers, and soon the

---

<sup>191</sup> "Unionism or Separatism," *AL* 23 (January 1940): 5; emphasis added.

<sup>192</sup> See J[ohn] B[uenger], "Prayer Fellowship," *CL* 3 (March 1942): 34–5. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], "For The First Time," (June 1942): 71–2. P[aul] E. Kretzmann, "Trying To Force The Issue," *CL* 4 (May–June 1943): 61–5. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], "Prayer Fellowship: The Position of the Missouri Synod," *CL* 7 (May 1946): 51.

discussion developed into an argument whether they said what was claimed. Next the statement was made that as good Lutherans we must base our position on the Holy Scriptures, that Lutherans always go back to the Bible. It was suggested that, for the time being and in this connection, we forget what the fathers said and endeavor to see clearly what the Scriptures say, for only if the words of the fathers are based upon the Scriptures can they have any value for Lutherans, and it is the duty of each generation to try and test the statements of the fathers in the light of the Bible.<sup>193</sup>

A November 1941 *American Lutheran* writer regarded prayer fellowship as “the greatest single source of misunderstanding.” Some Missouri–ALC conferences were opened with prayer, others not. ALC members took the refusal of prayer fellowship as “an unwarranted insult carrying the implication that they are not Christians or that they are not earnestly desirous of the guidance of God the Holy Ghost in such conferences.” Missouri “must be absolutely sure” that it was “scripturally (and not traditionally) right” before denying the ALC “that great privilege.”<sup>194</sup>

In February 1943 an *American Lutheran* editor argued that limiting prayer fellowship to those in complete doctrinal agreement was not, in fact, the practice of Missouri’s earliest fathers. “A constantly growing number of men in our Synod with a ripe Christian knowledge and experience” were concluding they could no longer agree with the position “that a prayer spoken with another Christian with whom they are not in complete doctrinal accord is wrong.” These men, “after careful and earnest study,” also were coming to reject the argument that standing alongside a heterodox Christian who spoke a prayer or benediction “justifiably raises the presumption that by doing so one approves of heterodoxy or readily compromises with error.”

The article noted the apparent inconsistency of Missouri’s early fathers before prayer fellowship had become a divisive issue. Pastors were never disciplined for praying with a dying member of a non-Lutheran denomination, nor was a Lutheran wife ever disciplined for joining in

---

<sup>193</sup> ““Imitate Their Faith,”” 3.

<sup>194</sup> “Tragic Misunderstandings,” *AL* 24 (November 1941): 3. See also “A Letter,” *AL* 25 (July 1942): 11. “The Letter of Simplicissimus,” (August 1942): 3–4.

table prayers with her Presbyterian husband. Believing many had “drifted from the early position of the fathers of our Synod,” the author felt compelled “to reaffirm and make known the position of our fathers.”<sup>195</sup>

In August 1943 came their documentation.<sup>196</sup> At Missouri’s free conferences in the 1850s and on three occasions in the 1860s, Walther and other Missouri leaders prayed with Lutherans who had not professed agreement with Missouri on certain doctrinal issues. The 1856 conference at Columbus, Ohio, was opened “by the pastor of the church with hymn, prayer, and confession of the Apostolic Creed.” Conference minutes recorded that participants recognized their sad doctrinal divisions, acknowledged their “sacred duty to do whatever we can by the grace of God that the breach be healed,” and came together “to humble ourselves jointly before the Lord” and “implore Him jointly for forgiveness.” Subsequent sessions of the conference “were opened with hymn and prayer” and “closed with prayer and Benediction.”

Similar references to opening and closing with prayer, hymn, and benediction were recorded at the free conferences at Pittsburgh in 1857 and Cleveland in 1858.<sup>197</sup> The *American Lutheran* author pointed out that “though the line of demarcation between the synods of the participating members” was clearly drawn, “joint prayer was thought perfectly proper and self-evident.” No one, including Walther, felt it necessary to justify or explain the prayer fellowship practiced there.<sup>198</sup>

---

<sup>195</sup> “The Problem of Lutheran Unity: V. c. Prayer Fellowship and Unionism,” *AL* 26 (February 1943): 6.

<sup>196</sup> “The Problem of Lutheran Unity: I. Our Fathers and Prayer Fellowship,” *AL* 26 (August 1943): 6–8.

<sup>197</sup> *Verhandlungen der Freien Ev. Luth. Konferenz* (New York: H. Ludwig, 1858), 4, 19, 21, 36, 38, 54.

<sup>198</sup> See also W. G. Polack, “Walther’s Attitude Toward Lutheran Unity and His Part in the First Free Conference,” *AL* 32 (July 1949): 6–7.

Representatives from 13 Lutheran synods attended the preliminary meeting for the formulation of the General Council in 1866, among them men from the Missouri and Norwegian synods, a pastor from Albany “afterwards prominent in the Wisconsin Synod,” and Wisconsin’s Wilhelm Streissguth. The convention was opened with divine worship and closed with the hymn “Now Thank We All Our God” and “prayer upon the knees.”<sup>199</sup>

After a bitter controversy with Walther extending more than a quarter century, Buffalo Synod founder J. A. A. Grabau formally excommunicated all two hundred Missouri Synod congregations. Yet after representatives of the two synods met in November 1866, Walther himself reported in *Der Lutheraner* that each of the six days of the colloquy session opened with a hymn, the reading of Scripture, and prayer. The participants never arrived at complete doctrinal agreement, yet Walther and his Missouri colleagues evidently joined the Buffalo Synod men in prayer.<sup>200</sup>

At Milwaukee in 1867 representatives of the Missouri and Iowa synods met at Trinity Church. Despite their bitter past relationship, the synods opened their discussions with joint prayer. Trinity’s pastor Fredrick Lochner conducted an opening liturgical service the first afternoon, and following sessions were all opened with the reading of a portion of the 119th Psalm.<sup>201</sup>

---

<sup>199</sup> S. E. Ochsenford, *Documentary History of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America* (Philadelphia: General Council Publication House, 1912), 131. “Die Convention zu Reading zum Zweck der Bildung einer neuen General Synode,” *DL* 23 (1 January 1872): 71.

<sup>200</sup> C. F. T. Ruhland, Chr. Hochstetter, and M. C. Barthel, “Das Buffaloer Colloquium,” *DL* 23 (15 December 1866): 57–8.

<sup>201</sup> Although the *American Lutheran* cited no references for this incident, it is described in a letter, C. F. W. Walther to F. Lochner, 15 October 1867; in Ludwig Fuerbringer, *Briefe von C. F. W. Walther* (St. Louis: CPH, 1916): 2:112. J. P. Beyer, *Stenographische Aufgezeichnetes Colloquium der Vortreter der Synode von Illinois [sic for Iowa] und der Missouri, Ohio, u. a. St., gehalten vom 13–19 November in Milwaukee, Wis.* (Chicago: Gedrukt in der Office der Chicago Union, 1868): 1.

Comparing these incidents of joint prayer among disagreeing Lutherans of a century before,<sup>202</sup> the *American Lutheran* article concluded:

After years of friendly discussion of the doctrines formerly had in controversy, various Lutheran groups in the United States have arrived at what seems to be a common level, it seems that a return to the custom of the fathers, namely to jointly ask the Holy Spirit's guidance in and blessing upon intersynodical doctrinal discussions, especially upon such as have the avowed purpose of arriving at doctrinal unity, should not be construed as a departure from the faith or the practices of the Missouri Synod.<sup>203</sup>

In a follow-up article the next month, *American Lutheran* editors called themselves “the last persons in the world to base their theological opinions on the writings of the ‘fathers’” or to appeal “to policies and practices once current in the Lutheran Church.” But they felt it necessary to examine and discuss what the synodical fathers had done in Missouri's early history because the present generation was being told that incorporating prayer in such contexts was “something shockingly new and decidedly un-Lutheran,” and they were being branded “‘neo-Missourians’ who have strayed from the old paths” who were “now leading others into dangerously unionistic practices.”<sup>204</sup>

Since 1905, the Bente explanation—that prayer with erring Christians constituted a public confession of being in full agreement with their errors—had been “dinned in [their] ears.”<sup>205</sup> In

---

<sup>202</sup> These and other examples of Missouri's earlier prayer fellowship practice were later documented by Arthur C. Repp, “Changes in the Missouri Synod,” *CTM* 38 (July–August): 468–75; and Hess, “Prayer Fellowship in the First Half of Synod's History,” 39–70.

<sup>203</sup> “Our Fathers and Prayer Fellowship,” 8. Theodore Graebner also insisted in 1948 in *The Burden of Infallibility*, 91, that the conferences had changed “so radically” that there was “no resemblance between the meetings of our decade and those of the first decade of the century.” In the past Ohio and Iowa “met with us to disseminate and defend their errors,” but the ALC “meet to gain an understanding of our position and to accept whatever the Word of God demands.”

<sup>204</sup> “The Problem of Lutheran Unity: 2. Why Did They Pray Together?” *AL* 26 (September 1943): 6.

<sup>205</sup> Arthur C. Repp, “Editorial,” *CHIQ* 43 (November 1970): 147, said simply that “the Synod's former stand on prayer fellowship” had been “born about 1905.”

actually examining the fathers, however, proponents for union found Walther declaring that “he could conceive of nothing more God-pleasing than that Lutherans should meet ‘with a hearty invocation of God’ to iron out their differences.”<sup>206</sup>

*Joint prayer and prayer fellowship*

The ALC’s Sandusky resolution to accept the *Brief Statement* “viewed in the light of our *Declaration*” aroused the suspicion of many in Missouri and throughout the Synodical Conference.<sup>207</sup> Union opponents flooded Missouri’s 1941 Fort Wayne convention with 52 memorials addressing the union proposal.<sup>208</sup>

Yet for union proponents, a breakthrough came at that very convention in a floor discussion of the Committee on Lutheran Church Union. Already in 1935, regarding the Brux case, the floor committee of Missouri’s Cleveland convention was unable to declare that prayer fellowship necessarily constituted church fellowship.<sup>209</sup> One committee member granted that although prayer fellowship generally involved church fellowship, there may be cases “where the question whether common prayer means fellowship belongs in the field of casuistry.”<sup>210</sup> Following the 1941

---

<sup>206</sup> An *American Lutheran* editor remembered that at the 1906 free conference at Fort Wayne, not only had the sessions been opened without prayer; but Synodical Conference participants formally objected even to allowing a moment for silent prayer. When the conference ended after “vehement altercations, sharp judgments, and veiled evidences of bitterness,” an aged attender “told us with tears in his eyes” that this was not the way to build God’s kingdom. “‘Pray For and With One Another?’” *AL* 41 (December 1958): 4. Perplexed at what appeared to be the evolution of a new, more legalistic spirit regarding fellowship, a young pastor in the 1920s asked one of the “theological luminaries” of his time why this change was occurring. He received the answer, “We have been quietly making a few corrections in the theology of the fathers.” O[tto] A. Geiseman, “While It Is Day: Hallelujah Convention!” *AL* 45 (August 1962): 7.

<sup>207</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1940*, 81–9.

<sup>208</sup> *Missouri Reports and Memorials, 1941*, 188–205. Behnken, *This I Recall*, 168–70.

<sup>209</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1935*, 293. For an interpretation of the *Proceedings* statement, see “Prayer Fellowship,” *AL* 26 (April 1943): 4.

<sup>210</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1941*, 283.

convention, Otto Geiseman remarked that “the understanding and viewpoint of a very large number” of Missouri pastors had “changed appreciably” regarding prayer fellowship.<sup>211</sup>

Additionally, on 20 January 1941, in what was hailed as a historic first, President Behnken attended the first All-Lutheran Conference in Columbus, Ohio.<sup>212</sup> Though issuing a statement repeating Missouri’s opposition to unionism and voicing hesitancy about his very attendance at that meeting, Behnken committed Missouri to “coordinating” its efforts with other Lutheran bodies for relief and refugee assistance in Europe. More significantly, he “participated in prayer for the first time with Lutherans of every stripe.” By attending and by praying with other participants, Behnken “helped bring the issue [of prayer fellowship] to a head.”<sup>213</sup>

A memorial to Missouri’s 1944 convention called for clarification of the Prayer Fellowship Resolution passed in 1941.<sup>214</sup> In response, and because of growing uncertainty whether Missourians

---

<sup>211</sup> O[tto] A. Geiseman, “While It Is Day: The Convention at Fort Wayne,” *AL* 24 (August 1941): 5. Geiseman added, however, that “failure frankly to acknowledge” this change, coupled with “an effort on the part of some to put through a resolution which might even have made it appear to be sinful to open Intersynodical Conferences with prayer” constituted for him “the low point of the convention.”

<sup>212</sup> E. E. Ryden, “Lutherans Grapple with War Problems,” *LC* 49 (6 February 1941): 163–4. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “The Columbus Conference,” *Qu* 38 (April 1941): 135.

<sup>213</sup> Busch, “Another Turning Point,” 76–80. Busch’s entire sentence reads: “The president of the Missouri Synod had participated in prayer for the first time with Lutherans of every stripe, *and no lightning from heaven had struck*” (emphasis added). George Schick, in his report “The Columbus Conference and its Repercussions, I,” *LW* 55 (13 May 1941): 168, was careful to distinguish that Missouri would *coordinate* its efforts with other Lutherans but would not *cooperate* with them. To the Wisconsin Synod this appeared to be a distinction without a difference. Its *Quartalschrift* condemned the conference, questioned its participants’ motives, and criticized Behnken for joining in prayer and pledging Missouri’s participation. “All of which fills us with deep concern. Is the Missouri Synod, the staunch champion of confessional Lutheranism in the past, really veering in its course?” [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Is the Missouri Synod Veering?” *Qu* 38 (July 1941): 229–30. Theodore Graebner criticized Wisconsin’s objection: “Keeping those exposed to starvation supplied with food and clothing bears no relation to confessionalism. If the Priest and the Levite had assisted the Samaritan in his act of mercy, that would not have been ‘unionism.’” Theodore Graebner, “Cooperation in Externals, II,” *AL* 25 (February 1942): 7.

<sup>214</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1944*, 245–6.

were permitted to pray at intersynodical meetings convened to discuss doctrinal differences, the 1944 convention formally differentiated between joint prayer and prayer fellowship:

Joint prayer at intersynodical conferences, asking God for His guidance and blessing upon the deliberations and discussions of His Word, does not militate against the resolution of the Fort Wayne Convention, provided that such prayer does not imply denial of truth or support of error. Local conditions will determine the advisability of such prayer. Above all, the conscience of a brother must not be violated nor offense be given.<sup>215</sup>

This distinction, reaffirmed at Missouri conventions in 1947<sup>216</sup> and 1953,<sup>217</sup> remained unpopular among many Missouri members and pastors.<sup>218</sup> Memorials to Missouri's 1950 convention regarded the distinction as false.<sup>219</sup> Aiming to restore synodical unanimity, pastoral conferences were requested to restudy the matter "in order that the issues may be clarified and the term 'prayer fellowship' be more accurately defined."<sup>220</sup>

---

<sup>215</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1944*, 251–2. Regarding the "denial of truth" and "support of error," see the definition of unionism in "What Is Unionism," *AL* 35 (January 1952): 4. Union is "cooperation in matters of religion with heterodox Christians, whereby the truth of God is denied or anti-Biblical error is approved." The writer continued, "Unfortunately, it has occurred too often in the past that every cooperation in matters of religion with other Christians who differed in some points of doctrine has been designated as 'unionism,' without the slightest evidence that any truth has been denied or that approval had been given to any error."

<sup>216</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1947*, 517–8.

<sup>217</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1953*, 551–2.

<sup>218</sup> See L[udwig] Fuerbringer, "Gemeinschaftliches Gebet in gemischten Versammlungen," *DL* 101 (29 May 1945): 164–5; trans. A[rthur] C. Dahms, "Joint Prayer in Mixed Assemblies," *CL* 6 (August 1945): 98–100. William Arndt, "Joint Prayer," *CL* 7 (February 1946): 13–6. Theo. Dierks, "The Doctrine Of The Church With Special Reference To Altar Fellowship And Prayer Fellowship," (February 1946): 17–23.

<sup>219</sup> *Missouri Reports and Memorials, 1950*, 510–2.

<sup>220</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1953*, 552.



*The Statement of the 44*

Missouri pastors throughout the United States were surprised, opening their mail in late September 1945, to find an unsolicited proclamation deploring traditionalism and legalism that purportedly had overtaken their synod.<sup>221</sup>

While the *Statement of the 44* appeared without warning, the concerns that occasioned it had been simmering for almost two decades. The gathering of pastors and professors in Chicago to formulate *A Statement* was actually the fifth such “round table” meeting; groups met previously in 1926, 1937, 1940, and 1941. At the 1937 meeting, also in Chicago, Theodore Graebner warned that the more “these yokes” were hung upon Missouri pastors, “the more we shall produce a reaction of liberalism and radicalism.” He was “as much against the 105% Missourian” as “the 95% Missourian.” Where the Bible had not spoken a decisive word “there must be utter freedom of expression and action.”<sup>222</sup> In 1941 Graebner charged that Missouri’s synodical and pastoral practice was “verging towards a legalism which to a sound Lutheran is just as objectionable as doctrinal laxity.”<sup>223</sup> Missouri’s traditionalism “was placing human authority above that of the Word of God,”

---

<sup>221</sup> For a more thorough discussion of the *Statement of the 44*, see Robinson, “The Spirit of Triumphalism,” 200–321. *CHIQ* devoted a major portion of the November 1970 issue, Vol. 43, to *A Statement* on the 25th anniversary of its appearance. Articles include; E. J. Friederich, “Foreword,” 153–5; Richard R. Caemmerer, “Recollections of ‘A Statement,’” 156–8; Thomas Coates, “A Statement—Some Reminiscences,” 159–64; Herbert Lindemann, “Personal Reflections on the Twenty-Fifty Anniversary of the Publication of ‘A Statement,’” 164–6; Harold Engelbrecht, “Concerning ‘A Statement,’” 167–70; Walter Bauer, “To Recall As Well As I Can,” 171–3; L. H. Deffner, “‘A Statement Was a Turning Point,’” 178; John W. Behnken, “A Letter from the President,” 182–4; and E. W. A. Koehler, “An Agreement,” 184–7. In the next issue of *CHIQ*, Wisconsin Synod Pastor Philip Press complained the magazine’s retrospective of *A Statement* was “not history but propaganda.” Philip K. Press, letter, *CHIQ* 44 (February 1971): 31.

<sup>222</sup> Theodore Graebner, “When Principles Usurp the Place of Doctrine,” St. Louis, 1938, typescript, 8; Graebner papers, Box 118, CHI. Cited by Robinson, “The Spirit of Triumphalism,” 188.

<sup>223</sup> Theodore Graebner to Adolph Wismar, 26 May 1941, Graebner collection CHI; in Zetto, “The Liturgical Movement,” 29.

made fellowship dependent on “acceptance of every terminological detail in ecclesiastical dogma,” treated the New Testament “as a code of laws” instead of a “body of saving doctrine,” and “paid lip service to the *Sola Scriptura*” while “actually operating with synodical resolutions.” Such traditionalism “throttled theological discussion” and “discouraged exegetical research, since the body of interpretation was (not in theory but in practice) regarded as fixed.”<sup>224</sup>

E. J. Friedrich, Otto Geiseman, and O. P. Kretzmann arranged this fifth roundtable meeting for 6–7 September 1945 in Chicago. Forty-nine copies of the invitation letter were mailed to select Missouri pastors and professors who shared common concerns about the synod’s alleged legalism and traditionalism, a group also characterized as having an “Eastern spirit.”<sup>225</sup> Friedrich’s invitation remarked that in recent years “a strange and pernicious spirit, utterly at variance with the fundamental concepts of the Gospel and the genius of the Lutheran Church,” was lifting “its ugly head.” That spirit came from “a wrong approach to the Holy Scriptures,” manifesting itself in “barren, negative attitudes, unevangelical techniques . . . , unsympathetic legalistic principles, a self-complacent and separatistic narrowness, and an utter disregard for the fundamental law of Christian love.” If not confronted, Friedrich predicted that spiritual life would be “blighted,” the church’s organism “paralyzed,” and “ecclesiastical persecution will occur with increasing frequency. . . .

During the past year this alarming phenomenon in our synodical life has been the topic of many discussions. In every case the conviction prevailed that it is our sacred

---

<sup>224</sup> Theodore Graebner, “The Cloak of the Cleric,” 5–6. While Graebner cited legalistic causes in his own synod, he also blamed “the morbid attitude of our Norwegian brethren” for “infiltrating” Missouri minds, particularly in the Minnesota District. Graebner also attributed some Synodical Conference woes to the “doctrinal hardening of the arteries in the theologians of Wisconsin.” Theodore Graebner to Martin Graebner, 26 May 1939; Graebner papers, Box 119, CHI; in Robinson, “The Spirit of Triumphalism,” 189.

<sup>225</sup> Hannah, “The New York Role in the Missouri War,” 3–4, noted that an “inordinate number of New Yorkers” were included among the 44. Among them were Oswald Hoffmann, later to become a preacher on the Lutheran Radio Hour, and Karl Kretzmann and sons A. R. and O. P. Kretzmann.

obligation to do everything within our power to preserve our precious evangelical Lutheran heritage. But invariably the question arose, What can be done?

The first step was “a meeting of kindred minds to study the situation.”<sup>226</sup>

Forty-two clergymen and one layman assembled to hear and respond to four essays.<sup>227</sup> The roster of the 44 was “not an assemblage of ‘young Turks’ or fire-breathing dragons,” but “theological professors, editors of church periodicals, New Testament scholars, concerned pastors.”<sup>228</sup> Another recalled them as “earnest and dedicated men” who loved their church and in discussions were “constantly harking back to the teachings of the founding fathers, both of the Lutheran Church in the sixteenth century and of the Missouri Synod.”<sup>229</sup> They came not to express their convictions as an academic exercise but “to stimulate the Missouri Synod to re-examine its theological heritage, to reinvigorate its evangelical spirit, and to exert a restraining force upon the legalistic tendencies” they witnessed in their synod.<sup>230</sup>

Out of discussion of the essays grew a set of 12 affirmative statements, 9 of which were followed by statements deploring a synodical attitude or practice. Statements FIVE, EIGHT, NINE, and ELEVEN touched on fellowship:

FIVE: We affirm our conviction that sound exegetical procedure is the basis for sound Lutheran theology.

---

<sup>226</sup> The Committee to Missouri Synod pastors, 20 September 1945; *AL* 28 (November 1945): 4.

<sup>227</sup> The four essays were: William Arndt, “Application of the Law of Love.” Richard R. Caemmerer, “Doctrines and Life and Their Application to Synodical Attitudes.” O. P. Kretzmann, “Organization and Church.” O[tto] A. Geiseman, “Protest and Appeal.” Robinson, “Triumphalism,” 222–34.

<sup>228</sup> Herbert Lindemann, “Personal Reflections,” 164.

<sup>229</sup> Bauer, “To Recall,” 171–2.

<sup>230</sup> Coates, “A Statement,” 159–60.

We therefore deplore the fact that Romans 16:17, and 18 has been applied to all Christians who differ from us in certain points of doctrine. It is our conviction, based on sound exegetical and hermeneutical principles, that this text does not apply to the present situation in the Lutheran Church in America.

We furthermore deplore the misuse of First Thessalonians 5:22 in the translation “avoid every appearance of evil.” This text should be used only in its true meaning, “avoid evil in every form.”

**EIGHT:** We affirm our conviction that any two or more Christians may pray together to the Triune God in the name of Jesus Christ if the purpose for which they meet and pray is right according to the Word of God. This obviously includes meetings of groups called for the purpose of discussing doctrinal differences.

We therefore deplore the tendency to decide the question of prayer fellowship on any other basis beyond the clear words of Scripture.

**NINE:** We believe that the term “unionism” should be applied only to acts in which a clear and unmistakable denial of Scriptural truth or approval of error is involved.

We therefore deplore the tendency to apply this non-Biblical term to any and every contact between Christians of different denominations.

**ELEVEN:** We affirm our conviction that in keeping with the historic Lutheran tradition and in harmony with the Synodical resolution adopted in 1938 regarding Church fellowship, such fellowship is possible without complete agreement in details of doctrine and practice which have never been considered divisive in the Lutheran Church.<sup>231</sup>

Those associated with *A Statement* considered it a memorable and important effort.<sup>232</sup> An atmosphere of “fraternal good will and mutual understanding” prevailed at the meeting, which led to the production of a document demonstrating a “warm, evangelical spirit” and a “deep concern for the well-being” of their church and synod.<sup>233</sup> One attendee said he had “never been as sure of anything”

---

<sup>231</sup> “A Statement,” *AL* 28 (November 1945): 4.

<sup>232</sup> O[tto] A. Geiseman, “While It Is Day: A Memorable Meeting,” *AL* 28 (November 1945): 5.

<sup>233</sup> Coates, “A Statement,” 159.

as of attaching his name to the document.<sup>234</sup> Another participant hoped *A Statement* would result in “study, discussion, and self-examination” not only for Missouri but for “earnest Christians in other church bodies.”<sup>235</sup>

But Behnken feared that *A Statement* “would spell trouble with a capital T.” It was mailed to all pastors of the Missouri Synod despite his and the synod’s vice presidents’ vigorous protests. Though he was assured that dissemination of *A Statement* would serve the synod’s welfare and “provide an antidote” to the “ultracritical approach” of *The Confessional Lutheran* and others, Behnken wondered:

Why, I have asked myself a hundred times, why did they not talk their differences over in a spirit of brotherly love? Both sides spoke glowingly of their love of truth and the need to speak the truth in love—why then did they not “speak to” rather than direct printed barrages “against” each other? As it was, a pro-and-anti-charged atmosphere quickly developed, and a rather bitter controversy resulted.<sup>236</sup>

Negative reaction came swiftly. Illinois pastor A. T. Kretzmann was “distinctly shocked” that any group would take such “unbrotherly” action of labeling a “pernicious spirit” in the synod while failing “to reveal the identity of the men who supposedly have shown this anti-Christian spirit” or “to give proof so that these men might defend themselves.” Kretzmann could not remember a time when “men of such high standing in Synod have so utterly disregarded the law of Christian love in dealing with offenses allegedly committed by brethren in the faith.”<sup>237</sup> Milwaukee pastor Martin

---

<sup>234</sup> Lindemann, “Personal Reflections,” 166.

<sup>235</sup> O[tto] A. Geiseman, “While It Is Day: ‘A Statement,’” *AL* 29 (February 1946): 5.

<sup>236</sup> Behnken, *This I Recall*, 191.

<sup>237</sup> A. T. Kretzmann to E. J. Friedrich, 12 October 1945. Thomas Coates file, number 45, CHI; cited by Robinson, “The Spirit of Triumphalism,” 257.

Stransen urged the *Statement's* signers “to repent, to withdraw from your unscriptural position,” and to return to the faith.<sup>238</sup>

The Northern Illinois District, which included Concordia College, River Forest, and Chicago area congregations, powerfully opposed *A Statement*. District president Ernest T. Lams deplored “more than words can express” that Theodore Graebner had allied himself “with the Liberals.” Lams warned the signers that they could soon expect “an almighty reaction” and charged that they had “*de facto* severed their fellowship with the Synod.”<sup>239</sup> A motion to the district’s pastoral conference calling for discipline of its four members who signed *A Statement* was eventually tabled by a vote of 55-35.<sup>240</sup>

The faculty of Concordia Seminary, Springfield, Illinois, also responded, charging the signers of *A Statement* with approving selective fellowship, “which ignores the brethren in your own Synod,” and accepting prayer fellowship between bodies not agreed in doctrine.<sup>241</sup> Springfield’s faculty directed its concluding paragraph chiefly against signers of *A Statement* from Concordia, St. Louis: “What a pity that leaders in our church are strengthening the laity and the young in our Synod in this trend instead of restraining them from following the ruinous inclination of their old Adam!”<sup>242</sup>

---

<sup>238</sup> Martin W. Stransen to the 44 signers of “A Statement,” 2 November 1945. Thomas Coates file, number 45, CHI; cited by Robinson, “The Spirit of Triumphalism,” 259.

<sup>239</sup> Ernest T. Lams to Theodore Graebner, 11 October 1945, Graebner papers, box 118, CHI; cited by Robinson, “The Spirit of Triumphalism,” 260.

<sup>240</sup> Coates, “A Statement,” 161.

<sup>241</sup> See W[illiam], Arndt, “Selective Fellowship,” *CTM* 17 (June 1946): 455–7.

<sup>242</sup> F. [S.] Wenger, faculty secretary, to E. J. Friedrich, 26 October 1945 (carbon copy): Thomas Coates file, number 33, CHI; cited by Robinson, “The Spirit of Triumphalism,” 265–9. Robinson remarked, 265, that any previous disagreements between the two seminary faculties “must have been minor” compared to those *A Statement* occasioned. During the following decades a growing distinction arose between the “liberal” and “conservative” seminaries, “although it did not find its way into print in any official statement.” Meeting of the Praesidium, the District Presidents, and the Signers of the Statement, 14–15 February 1946, St. Louis, mimeographed minutes, Otto

A detailed objection to *A Statement* came from E. W. A. Koehler of Concordia College, River Forest. Koehler did not object “to calling attention to the ever-present danger of doing one or another of the things mentioned in the Statement,” or “to making specific charges against any brother guilty of doing such things,” but he resented such charges being made “publicly and indiscriminately against an unnamed group of our pastors without proof and evidence.” Noting that point FIVE of *A Statement* was virtually identical to Adolph Brux’s interpretation of Romans 16:17, Koehler offered extensive argumentation supporting Missouri’s traditional view that the passage excludes fellowship with all heterodox teachers. Regarding point NINE, Koehler insisted, “We do not apply the word ‘unionism’ to any and every contact between Christians of different denominations,” nor did Missouri conservatives regard “everybody outside of our church who holds to erroneous doctrines to be a manifestly impenitent sinner.” When all efforts to convince an errorist fail, however, “we must part company and avoid him and reject him.”<sup>243</sup>

In February 1946 President Behnken called a plenary meeting of Missouri’s district presidents and the 44. In preparation for this meeting, the 44 drafted 12 papers, one on each of *A Statement*’s theses, subsequently published as *Speaking the Truth in Love*. Only 2 of the 12 papers were presented, provoking lengthy and emotional debates. It was decided that the issues raised in *A Statement* be examined by a joint committee composed of ten of the signers and ten appointed by Behnken to represent “the other side.” The meetings of this “Ten and Ten” group did not reach a

---

Hoyer, secretary, A. W. Brustat, assistant secretary, 1; cited by Robinson, “The Spirit of Triumphalism,” 279.

<sup>243</sup> E[dward] W. A. Koehler, *An Analysis of “A Statement,”* (Elizabeth, Ill.: privately published, n. d. ) pages unnumbered. The document was “available from Rev. E. Wiedbusch”; WLS essay file.

satisfactory solution, and Behnken later remarked, “If I had to do it over again, I would never accept such an assignment.”<sup>244</sup>

Early in 1947 the signers agreed to “withdraw *A Statement* as a basis for further discussion.” In a letter to all Missouri Synod pastors on 18 January 1947, Behnken explained that withdrawal “shall not be interpreted as a retraction,” nor would it mean “the issues involved shall now be glossed over or ignored,” but that they would become the topics of study and prayer.<sup>245</sup> Missouri pastors “were given some very excellent and meaty material” to study the issues of *A Statement*, which “should have sent them deeply into the Scriptures and evoked many a profitable discussion.”<sup>246</sup>

The decision to withdraw *A Statement* pleased neither side. “As long as the ‘Statement’ stands,” Koehler wrote, “it will continue to be a barrier between the Signers and the rest of us,” an “iniquitous leaven” that would continue to work.<sup>247</sup> A correspondent to *The Lutheran Witness* argued that *A Statement* “cannot be withdrawn as a basis for discussion.” Pastors who refused to speak out “would be as dumb dogs unable to bark.”<sup>248</sup> By contrast, Coates thought the 44 made a “strategic mistake” by withdrawing *A Statement*. Although the content of the statement was not retracted, the signers emerged “unscathed, still members in good standing of the Missouri Synod.” Coates considered the entire effort “just a bit too Machiavellian.”<sup>249</sup>

---

<sup>244</sup> Behnken, *This I Recall*, 192.

<sup>245</sup> Behnken, “A Letter from the President,” 182–4.

<sup>246</sup> Behnken, *This I Recall*, 192–3.

<sup>247</sup> Edward W. A. Koehler, “An Agreement,” 187.

<sup>248</sup> M. H. Gils [or Eils] to *LW*, 22 February 1947, Graebner papers, box 114, CHI; cited by Robinson, “The Spirit of Triumphalism,” 308. Robinson remarked that the letter was “written on stationery from Concordia Seminary, Springfield, Illinois, probably by a student, but it has the ring of a more experienced hand like that of W. W. F. Albrecht.”

<sup>249</sup> Coates, “A Statement,” 163. For *Confessional Lutheran* reaction and ongoing discussion of *A Statement*, see: A. T. Kretzmann and H. J. Wundelich, “The Forty-Four and Romans 16, 17, 18,”



As fellowship questions grew increasingly contentious, the proper interpretation and application of Romans 16:17-18 came under greater debate.<sup>250</sup> Missouri's *Brief Statement* had applied the passage to all heterodox Christians, including non-Synodical Conference Lutherans, even over such nonfundamental doctrines as millennialism, election, and conversion.<sup>251</sup>

E. W. A. Koehler's monograph *Romans 16:17-20* offered a defense of Missouri's traditional interpretation. Paul told us "to mark those who, by teaching what is not in agreement with the

---

CL 7 (April 1946): 40–3. A[rthur] C. D[ahms], "The Word Of God in Romans 16:17-18 And 'Interpretations' by The 44," (June 1946): 64–7. J[ohn] B[uenger], "What Is True And What Is False In The Statement Of The 'Forty-Four'?" (August 1946): 90–4. E. W. A. Koehler, "Speaking the Truth in Love," (September 1946): 103–4. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], "What Is at Issue in the Statementarian Controversy?" CL 8 (March 1947): 28–30. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], "Is 'Withdrawal' of a Confessional Statement 'As a Basis of Discussion' the Proper Way Toward Settlement of Its Issues?" (March 1947): 30–2. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], "Lessons From the Life of 'Bad' Bishop Brown," CL 9 (January 1948): 1–12. "A Pastor in Nebraska Pours Out His Heart," (March 1948): 35–6. Theo. Dierks, "The False Arrgumentation and Rationalism of the Statementarians," (December 1948): 147–9. Wallace H. McLaughlin and H. O. Mensing, "The Statement Controversy Up To Date," CL 10 (November 1949): 131–4. A. V. K[uster], "'A Statement' Revived Again," CL 12 (April 1951): 44. A. V. Kuster, "The Koch–Friedrich Incident at Milwaukee, 1950, and Its Significance," (June 1951): 73–83.

<sup>250</sup> For quotations of Missouri's interpretation of Romans 16:17-18 earlier in its history, see "Rom. 16, 17," CL 1 (April 1940): 35. Martin S. Sommer, "Avoid Them!" CL 7 (August 1946): 100. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], "We Know—Romans 16, 17," CL 8 (May 1947): 50. F[ranz] Pieper, "Division and Offense According to Romans 16:17," (August–September 1947): 96. "Luther and Romans 16:17, 18," CL 9 (July 1948): 87. "Luther Used Romans 16:17, 18," CL 12 (April 1951): 44–5. A. T. K[retzmann], "Thesis V of A STATEMENT to the LUTHERAN WITNESS," CL 13 (February 1952): 20–2.

<sup>251</sup> *Brief Statement*, para. 28, 409. Missouri's citation of the passage against non-Synodical Conference Lutherans provoked spirited rejoinder from some of those Lutherans. Edward Schramm, editor of *The Lutheran Standard*, asked, "How in the name of common sense and of truth and of Jesus Christ, who bids us love another, can any group of intelligent, God-fearing Christians take a passage that warns against fellowship with idolaters and lying deceivers and apply it to fellow believers in Christ, indeed, to fellow Lutherans?" Schramm wished Missouri would "quit prostituting the Word of God to bolster up their scholastic argumentation," adding, "It's that kind of manhandling of the Word of God that gets a church body the unlovely separatism that marks the Wisconsin Synod—a separatism which many in the Missouri Synod now recognize in the Wisconsin Synod, but which Missouri seems unable to recognize in itself." [E]dward S. S[chramm], "News Jottings," LS 108 29 July 1950): 10.

doctrines of the Bible, are causing divisions and offenses in the church.” We must avoid them because “they are not serving our Lord Jesus Christ, but themselves.” Koehler took *belly* in verse 18 to refer to “the mental faculties, [one’s] mind and heart.” False teachings “do not stem from the words of Christ” but proceed “from the errorists’ own mind and heart.” Every errorist, whether intending to deceive or not, “uses good words and plausible arguments to prove his point.” Regardless of his intentions “we should avoid him.”<sup>252</sup>

Adolph Brux had charged that the passages Missouri employed to require separation from Christians of other denominations actually referred “to persons who either never were Christians, or, having been believers, have suffered shipwreck in the faith, and therefore can no longer be called Christians.” Missouri’s present understanding of verse 17, referring to “every and any minute deviation in Christian doctrine on the part of erring Christians,” was “not warranted by the context, but is in violation of it.” It was “plain from verse 18 that the causers of divisions and offenses” were not regarded by Paul as Christians at all and were to be avoided “for their decidedly dishonest and anti-Christian character.” Brux assumed the “causers of divisions and offenses” were Judaizers, although he made no specific attempt to demonstrate that from the text. He further assumed those causing the “offenses” were fully aware of the deadly nature of their actions, acting purposefully, calculatedly, and consciously. Because they were people who “make it their business to create divisions and set traps,” they “cannot be regarded as Christians.” Is this passage rightly applied to other church bodies that “stand on the same foundation, Christ, but differ in some doctrines that do not overthrow the foundation”?<sup>253</sup>

---

<sup>252</sup> E. W. A. Koehler, *Romans 16:17-20* (n. p., 1946): 3, 6, 13, 14. See Paul Burgdorf’s review of Koehler’s tract in *CL* 7 (November 1946): 134–5.

<sup>253</sup> Brux, *Prayer-Fellowship*, 5, 7, 10–1, 19, 17, 24.

In an essay accompanying Thesis FIVE of *A Statement*, in *Speaking the Truth in Love*, the essayist argued for an alternate understanding of verse 17: “Those who, contrary to the teaching which you have learned, are creating divisions and offenses.” Thus, not the men’s doctrines but their divisive and contentious behavior contradicted the teaching the Romans had learned. Paul would then not have been referring to weak Christians but to “disturbers” who “are creating notorious divisions” by “hypocritical smoothness and flattering speech.” Because “the application of the passage requires that we do not give it a narrower or a broader meaning than it originally had in the situation for which it was intended,” the passage cannot be applied “indiscriminately to the situation within the Lutheran Church today.” While there may be some in Lutheran and other churches to whom the passage applies, the essayist was “not personally acquainted with them, for they are not Christians,” but people “intent on fomenting strife in order that they may indulge in good living.”<sup>254</sup>

At the direction of the 1947 synodical convention, Behnken submitted to pastors and congregations study materials on the questions raised concerning the passage and its meaning.<sup>255</sup> The study document, entitled *Exegesis on Romans 16:17ff*, was distributed with an attached letter on 11 May 1950. Its author considered the warning of verse 17 general and inclusive, applicable to anyone causing doctrinal divisions or offenses. Those “who served their own bellies” were thought to be gluttons or guilty of sensual sins. The passage did not provide enough information for later exegetes to determine precisely the persons against whom Paul sounded this warning. The essayist concluded that “the interpretation traditional in our circles is essentially sound.”

The essayist charged that the Missouri Synod tended to rely too heavily on this single passage in its discussion of fellowship. “The whole of that teaching should be brought to bear on any given situation.” The traditional understanding of the passage “does not, by any means, mean an

---

<sup>254</sup> [Oswald C. J. Hoffmann,] “Thesis V,” in *Speaking the Truth in Love*, 40–1, 44.

<sup>255</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1947*, 423.

easy way out for the Church.” Arguing against a quick, unthinking separation from all who did not immediately agree with every synodical statement, the essayist suggested that the warning of Romans 16 “both in its breadth and in its severity lays upon the Church a solemn obligation which can be met only by long, intensive, and loving theological *work*.” The Church “should not be startled to find that the decision on error is not always easy or the question of fellowship always simple.” The passage “is to be applied to ourselves, too, in constant self-scrutiny and self-judgment.” Any church that “deems itself above the possibility of belly service is already dangerously close to serving its belly.”<sup>256</sup>

*Only application?*

In 1905, Friederich Bente wrote that Ohioans and Missourians “cannot appear jointly in prayer before the throne of God’s mercy” because “their teachings are as far apart as the earth’s poles.” Bente further insisted that “it follows logically” that “if we [Missourians] unite with the Ohioans in prayer, we must also invite them to our altars and bring them to our pulpits.”<sup>257</sup> By 1949, however, Henry Wind presented Bente’s position as though it were a minority viewpoint:

There are those who sincerely believe that prayer-fellowship without complete unity in every doctrine, even in those teachings which do not touch the essential truths concerning man’s sin and God’s grace in Christ Jesus, is contrary to specific teachings of God’s Word. When therefore they refuse to practice prayer-fellowship with Lutherans not in full doctrinal agreement with them, they are doing so for reasons of conscience. Right or wrong, for these Lutherans the problem constitutes a formidable obstacle which certainly must be removed before progress toward Lutheran unity can be hoped for.<sup>258</sup>

---

<sup>256</sup> [Martin H. Franzmann], *Exegesis on Romans 16:17ff*, (n. p., 1950): 3, 9–10; emphasis in the original. The essay was reprinted in *CJ* 7 (January 1981): 13–20.

<sup>257</sup> Bente, “*Warum?*” 109–11.

<sup>258</sup> Henry F. Wind, “Stumbling Blocks to the Realization of Lutheran Unity,” *AL* 32 (September 1949): 7–8. That Wind regarded this as a minority viewpoint is evident by the longer, more positive summary he offered for those who supported prayer-fellowship without complete doctrinal agreement.

In “The Theology of Fellowship” in 1960, Missouri theologians wrote, “The matter of joint prayer between Christians not in the same confessional-organizational fellowship cannot be determined by a flat universal rule.” It would be “a dangerous oversimplification to say that any one of the manifestations of fellowship, such as joint prayer, always necessarily presupposes and involves every other manifestation, such as pulpit and altar fellowship.”<sup>259</sup>

This chapter has traced the tumultuous journey made the Missouri Synod made from the *Brief Statement* to the Brux case to the 1944 resolution on prayer fellowship to the *Statement of the 44*.<sup>260</sup>

In view of that history, it seems astonishing—and more than a bit disingenuous—that John Behnken could assert, as he did in 1964, that the differences between the synods lay “almost entirely in the area of practice rather than doctrine, in the application of Scriptural principles rather than in the principles themselves.”<sup>261</sup> This appraisal was repeated by George Gude in 1986, who concluded

---

<sup>259</sup> “The Theology of Fellowship,” 45. See “Does ‘The Theology of Fellowship’ Represent a Change in Position?” *CL* 22 (November 1961): 171–2. For an analysis of the disparity in prayer fellowship practice among Missouri Synod pastors and members, see Edward Lind and Richard Luecke, “The ‘Test Your Alertness’ Questionnaire,” *AL* 42 (February 1959): 15–6.

<sup>260</sup> See “‘New Approach’ to Fellowship Within Missouri Credited to 1945 Statementarianism,” *CL* 23 (January 1962): 9–10.

<sup>261</sup> Behnken, *This I Recall*, 178–9. Behnken’s statement is all the more remarkable in view of Otto Geiseman’s remarks in *The American Lutheran* less than a year later: “*This change in our theology of fellowship* became more and more pronounced with the passing of the decades. Some men of our synod quite apparently saw, many years ago, how *erroneous views on the subject of Christian fellowship* were tightening their grip on our synod, *its teachings* and its practices.” Geiseman referred to the 1920s through the 1950s, when “a great rash of *spurious exegetical studies*” were done, in which “*basic principles of interpretation were ignored*,” all to “*undergird a legalistic theology of fellowship based on a growing tradition and on human deductions*.” Missouri’s 1962 convention delegates at Cleveland “quickly caught the difference between a *legalistic approach to the problems of fellowship based on traditions and human deductions* and the simple evangelistic scriptural approach of Christian love.” Geiseman, “Hallelujah Convention!” 7–8; emphases added. Whether or not one agrees with Geiseman’s characterization of Missouri’s history, it is clear Geiseman believed that what occurred in the synod was a change in its fellowship doctrine, not merely its practice of fellowship.

that the intersynodical dispute “was over application and practice rather than a denial of doctrine.”<sup>262</sup>

Missouri’s distinction between prayer fellowship and joint prayer was something that had not been said before.” Yet Gude insisted this “was not a new position. . . .

When the Norwegian and Wisconsin Synods agreed in certain specific, past instances that these prayers at the time of doctrinal discussion had been proper, in effect they were allowing in practice what the Missouri Synod was trying to allow in theory. Therefore, when the Missouri Synod stated that prayer is appropriate in certain circumstances between those seeking doctrinal unity, since it could point to what had been the practice in the past, it hardly stands to reason that this could be construed as a new position. If anything, it is a change back to their original practice.<sup>263</sup>

During the 1950s the Wisconsin Synod would repeat and clarify its teaching that weak Christians are to be dealt with in patience and love until they reveal themselves as “persistent errorists.” In 1954 a Wisconsin author would grant that “there are those Christians who may be caught in an error, not willingly, but because their understanding of Scripture is insufficient,” and would urge that praying with such Christians “may well be in place and Godpleasing” so that “God will help [them] to grow in knowledge and strength.”<sup>264</sup> But the Wisconsin Synod would find it impossible to regard an entire church body as a “weak brother.” To continue offering joint prayer with a synod after it had revealed itself to be a persistently erring church body was viewed by Wisconsin as a change in understanding of the doctrine of church fellowship itself, not merely a change of application in doubtful or difficult circumstances.

---

<sup>262</sup> Gude, “Pressures and Difficulties,” 163.

<sup>263</sup> Gude, “Pressures and Difficulties,” 157. Gude cited an interview with Wisconsin seminary professors Edward Fredrich and Martin O. Westerhaus, 17 July 1985, who “did not fully agree with this assessment,” but “viewed this distinction as a doctrinal change in the sense that by formalizing an exception to the practice of prayer fellowship, in effect this becomes a doctrinal change.”

<sup>264</sup> Tract Number 10: *Prayer Fellowship*, 7–8.

Also frustrating at the time and perplexing a half century later was Missouri's repeated insistence that nothing had changed. O. H. Pannkoke was quoted already in 1943 that the Missouri Synod had "undergone a radical change."<sup>265</sup> *The American Lutheran* remarked in 1949 on how formerly it had been a "favorite indoor sport," wherever Lutherans assembled, "to tell jokes about the isolationist tendencies of the 'Missouri brethren.'" Missouri pastors or professors offering any ecclesiastical suggestions were "twitted unmercifully by those who feign stunned astonishment that a Missourian would dare to come out from behind the Iron Curtain," and toastmasters could be expected to tell stories demonstrating "the unbelievable isolationism of some Missouri brother." To the great relief of an *American Lutheran* writer, all that was changing. Audiences increasingly considered such jokes more ridiculous than true because "the real rank and file of the great body which is truly The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod is not 'like that.' . . .

Recent events force every Lutheran in America to admit that calling the Missouri Synod "isolationist" today is a joke. Doctor Geiseman, in his *While It Is Day* column in the May issue of this magazine,<sup>266</sup> gave many detailed examples of how Missouri is ready at any time and at any place to sit down and discuss with any person in the best American tradition all points at issue in American Lutheranism. We believe that Dr. Geiseman also proved rather conclusively that Missouri has been willing to cooperate with other groups in general fields not only when called upon, but in many instances it has been Missouri which has taken the initiative.<sup>267</sup>

Oddly, perhaps, Wisconsin found validation of its charge in the favorable impressions other Lutheran bodies voiced at Missouri changes. The *Lutheran Outlook* of the American Lutheran Conference likened Missouri to "a powerful ship surging forward—but anchored fast." The forward

---

<sup>265</sup> H[enry] A. Koch, "As Others See Us," *Qu* 40 (January 1943): 73.

<sup>266</sup> O[tto] A. Geiseman, "While It Is Day," *AL* 32 (May 1949): 5.

<sup>267</sup> "Who are the Isolationists?" *AL* 32 (July 1949): 4–5. If the tone and content of the article didn't signal a transformation in Missouri's practice and personality, the editor's note appended to the end of it did: "The position taken in the above editorials is predicated upon the assumption that all free conferences be opened with prayer. Without the blessing of God all plans for Lutheran unity must remain futile. Therefore *The American Lutheran* cannot support any plan which does not include the asking of Divine guidance and blessings."

surge was apparent in Missouri's increased willingness to cooperate with the National Council bodies and in its acceptance of a joint Missouri–ALC doctrinal statement. Missouri's chief anchor was the Wisconsin Synod.<sup>268</sup>

Elson Ruff, editor of the ULCA's *Lutheran*, called it "the pleasantest thing in our church life" that Missouri was demonstrating a "gradual increase of friendliness" toward other Lutheran bodies. Some Missourians, perhaps, still "duck across the street to avoid saying 'Good Morning' to the ULC pastor," but it was becoming more common for Missourians "to attend pastoral association meetings with other Lutherans" and even "unite with neighboring congregations in special services."<sup>269</sup>

Edmund Reim called it was "a matter of strong conviction" in Wisconsin that the position it sought to defend and uphold was that of the Synodical Conference, and that "it is therefore not we but Missouri which has changed." The *Lutheran Outlook* was "obviously not partial to our cause," Reim admitted, yet it charged Missouri, not Wisconsin, with "moving, or desiring to move" in the direction of the NLC and the ALC. The *Lutheran*, even less partial to Wisconsin, also saw "a very pronounced change" in Missouri and regarded Wisconsin "as a symbol of the past. . . .

Now there is no virtue in holding fast to a position simply because it has acquired the halo of age and tradition. A position is worth holding only if it is right. We believe that the old doctrinal position of the Synodical Conference *was* right. And we further believe that the practice of the Synodical Conference was soundly Scriptural, especially in the matter of church fellowship. Therefore we further believe and teach that both this doctrine and this practice are still right today.<sup>270</sup>

As Wisconsin's Immanuel Frey saw it, the Missouri Synod "departed from its former position" on fellowship and in its place "has taken a stand very similar to that which the Iowa Synod

---

<sup>268</sup> "Missouri's Dilemma," *LO* 17 (October 1952) 291–2.

<sup>269</sup> Elson Ruff, "In Conclusion . . .," *Lu* 34 (3 September 1952): 50.

<sup>270</sup> Edmund Reim, "As We See It: Who Has Changed?" *NL* 39 (14 December 1952): 396–7.



held and which the American Lutheran Church still holds.” Missouri’s withholding of prayer fellowship from other Lutherans “in the olden days” could be extensively documented. Even Missouri’s *American Lutheran* acknowledged that prayer fellowship was an issue “on which the understanding and viewpoint of a large number of [its] pastors has changed appreciably in recent years.”<sup>271</sup> Such an admission, Frey insisted, was “at least commendable candor.”<sup>272</sup>

---

<sup>271</sup> Geiseman, “Convention at Fort Wayne,” 5.

<sup>272</sup> I[mmanuel] P. Frey, “The Voice of the C. U. C.: Joint Prayer and Church Fellowship,” *NL* 43 (19 February 1956): 56–7.

#### *Chapter 4: "A Sterner kind of Admonition and Love"*

On 6 August 1945 *The Milwaukee Journal* reported that "an atomic bomb, hailed as the most terrible destructive force in history and the greatest achievement of organized science" was loosed by American B-29 bombers on Japan. The city of Hiroshima was covered with "an impenetrable cloud of dust and smoke" by a weapon "containing more power than 20,000 tons of TNT and producing more than 2,000 times the blast of the most powerful bomb" ever previously dropped on any target. President Harry Truman warned grimly that if Japan continued its refusal to surrender it could expect "a rain of ruin from the air the like of which has never been seen on this earth."<sup>1</sup> Two days later Tokyo radio acknowledged that "practically all living things" in Hiroshima "were literally seared to death by the tremendous heat and pressure" of the blast.<sup>2</sup>

As America's victory over Japan grew imminent, Milwaukee civil officials announced that a portion of the city's downtown area would be fenced off for a V-J day "playground." Churches were to leave their doors open for prayer, but retail stores, banks, and drug stores would be asked to close. Milwaukee's fire and police chiefs admitted their plans had been formulated "anticipating that there will be no restraining the people."<sup>3</sup> By the next day, the executive committee of Milwaukee County's Council of Defense recommended, "Let 'er go, Milwaukee," but "be reasonable in your celebrating the war's end, and don't tear down the county." Not surprisingly, Tony Santz, secretary of the Wisconsin Tavern Keeper's Association, announced that the city's taverns would remain open.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "Atomic Bomb Loosed on Japan; One Equals 20,000 Tons of TNT," *MJ*, 6 August 1945, 1:1.

<sup>2</sup> "Hiroshima Two-thirds Destroyed," *MJ*, 8 August 1945, 1:1.

<sup>3</sup> "City Will Fence Off Downtown as a Playground for V-J Day," *MJ*, 9 August 1945, 1.

<sup>4</sup> "All Is in Readiness Here for V-J Day Celebration," *MJ*, 10 August 1945, 2:1.

That same day Japan announced it was prepared to surrender under the Potsdam declaration,<sup>5</sup> and on 14 August, a Tuesday, the *Journal* headline read simply, “War Ended!”<sup>6</sup>

The final day of the Wisconsin Synod’s biennial synodical convention, held in New Ulm, Minnesota, also took place on 6 August 1945. Though the peaceful convention setting at Dr. Martin Luther College was far removed from the Pacific theater of the world war, Wisconsin Synod President John Brenner noted that the “political, economic, and social upheaval” of the war had impacted religious thought and life.

Religious leaders are alarmed over the increasing *liberalism* in doctrine and morals and the outspoken antagonism to the church, or, as it is often put, to organized religion, and are urging a *united front* of all churches against the forces of evil. On the other hand they are looking forward with eager hopes to what they call “*tremendous opportunities*” and are girding themselves to meet the challenge of the post-war days.

Brenner urged synod members to be “prayerfully careful,” however, that theirs would not become “a zeal that is not according to knowledge.” He warned that “being energetically active is not always an acceptable service to the Lord that furthers His purpose for His Church.”<sup>7</sup>

Brenner recognized that the Wisconsin Synod was being drawn more and more into a civil war that had erupted in the Missouri Synod and was spilling over to the other member synods of the Synodical Conference. Disagreements over participation in the military chaplaincy program and acceptance of Scouting had found a common denominator in the practice and understanding of church fellowship, particularly prayer fellowship. The convention’s floor committee on church union reported that debate centered on whether altar and pulpit fellowship between Missouri and the ALC could be established “now or later without compromising the truth of God’s inspired Word.”

---

<sup>5</sup> “Japs Offer to Surrender if Hirohito Keeps Throne,” *MJ* 10 August 1945, 1:1.

<sup>6</sup> “War Ended! Truman Tells Nation,” *MJ*, 14 August 1945, 1:1.

<sup>7</sup> A[rthur] P. Voss, “The Convention Proceedings,” *NL* 32 (2 September 1945): 181; emphases in the original.

The church union question had grown more difficult, the committee reported, “because of a number of incidents which anticipate a union between the Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church which does not yet exist.”<sup>8</sup>

As evidence mounted that the Missouri Synod was undergoing changes in its understanding and practice of church fellowship, the Wisconsin Synod would be compelled to further define and defend its own fellowship teaching during the next two decades. Arthur Voss admitted, “While our pastors generally are familiar with church union matters, the laymen may not be too well informed.”<sup>9</sup> The steps the Wisconsin Synod took beginning in 1945 led to the declaration in 1960 that an impasse had been reached between the two synods regarding fellowship. Wisconsin’s decision to sever fellowship relations with Missouri came the next year.

#### *Clarifying prayer fellowship*

Before the early 1940s, Wisconsin’s official publications contained almost no presentations or discussions of prayer fellowship. Criticisms of the ALC centered on the old Ohio and Iowa Synod errors regarding election, conversion, and open questions.<sup>10</sup> Criticisms of the ULCA were directed

---

<sup>8</sup> Voss, “The Convention Proceedings,” 182.

<sup>9</sup> Voss, “The Convention Proceedings,” 184.

<sup>10</sup> For example: J[ohn] Schaller, review of *Election and Conversion: A Frank Discussion of Dr. F. Pieper’s Book on “Conversion and Election,”* by Leander S. Keyser, in *Qu* 11 (April 1914): 140–1. [Fred] G[raeber], review of *Missouri, Iowa, and Ohio—The Old and the New Differences*, by J[ohn] Buenger, in *NL* 15 (9 December 1928): 398. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Pulpit and Altar Fellowship Declared,” *Qu* 26 (January 1929): 57–8. [August F.] Z[ich], “Breaking Down the Lines,” *NL* 21 (18 March 1934): 83–4. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], review of *The Interpretation of St. John’s Gospel*, by R. C. H. Lenski, *Qu* 29 (April 1932): 153–8. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “The ‘Lutheran Standard’ on Acts 13, 48,” (October 1932): 291–2. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], review of *The Interpretation of St. Mark’s and St. Luke’s Gospels*, by R. C. H. Lenski, *Qu* 31 (April 1934): 145–9. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], review of *The Historical Open Question among American Lutherans*, by Theo. Hanssen, *Qu* 33 (July 1936): 216–21. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Dr. Dell on Inspiration,” *Qu* 36 (July 1939): 219–20. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Objective Justification,” *Qu* 37 (January 1940): 31–41; (April 1940): 107–22. Edmund Reim, “The Strength of Christian Unity,” 1940): 257–65.

primarily against perceived modernism tolerated or endorsed by that body.<sup>11</sup> Since the Missouri Synod had now entered ongoing union discussions with the ALC, however, and since it became increasingly clear that some in Missouri “have held unionistic services, have conducted joint prayers, have conducted joint church work, and have united in other brotherly associations with its members,”<sup>12</sup> Wisconsin was compelled to address more directly the question of prayer among those not agreed in doctrine.

Joh. P. Meyer’s 1947 *Northwestern Lutheran* article “Prayer Fellowship” presented mostly a defense of the assertion that prayer must be offered only in Jesus’ name. Members of lodges and other fraternal organizations formulated their prayers to appear “non-sectarian,” seeking to avoid offending certain members by removing every reference to Jesus Christ, the Son of God, or the Redeemer. “Can a Christian join such prayers?” Meyer asked. “The question answers itself. It would violate a Christian’s most sacred faith. He cannot but abhor and shun it.”<sup>13</sup>

Similarly, Henry Koch, in “Joint Prayer at Public Meetings” in 1948, citing Matthew 18:19-20, wrote that joint prayer can occur “only where two or more are agreed as to what they are praying

---

<sup>11</sup> For example: E[dmund] C. Reim, “Church Fellowship and Its Implications,” *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1935*, 36–46. [August F.] Z[ich], “Lutheran-Episcopalian Church Union,” *NL* 23 (2 February 1936): 39. [August F.] Z[ich], “Church Conventions,” (22 November 1936): 373. [August F.] Z[ich], “Lutherans and Social Welfare,” *NL* 24 (3 January 1937): 4. Aug. F. Zich, “Lutheran Solidarity,” *Qu* 34 (January 1937): 26–40. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “What is Ecumenical?” (April 1937): 146. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Lutheran Solidarity,” (April 1937): 146–7. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Cooperation with non-Lutheran Church Bodies,” (April 1937): 147–8. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Can We Stand on the Following Platform?” (April 1937): 148–9. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “The U. L. C. A. on Peace,” (April 1937): 149. [August F.] Z[ich], “‘Activistic’ Lutherans,” *NL* 24 (29 August 1937): 276–7. [August F.] Z[ich], “Lutherans and the Line,” *NL* 25 (28 August 1938): 277–8. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “President Knubel on Growing Unity among Lutherans,” *Qu* 36 (January 1939): 59–61. [August F.] Z[ich], “Lutheran Follies,” *NL* 26 (12 March 1939): 59–60. [August F.] Z[ich], “Is There No Escape?” (7 May 1939): 150–1. [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Lutheran Pastors on Social Problems,” *Qu* 37 (July 1940): 198–201.

<sup>12</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1948*, 148.

<sup>13</sup> [Joh.] P. Meyer, “Prayer Fellowship,” *NL* 34 (26 October 1947): 346–7.

for.” There can be “no agreement in prayer among those who are disagreed as to their various religions.” Thus “only Christians can pray together as we do in public worship.” Then Koch narrowed the focus: “This also excludes prayer fellowship with other Christian denominations as well as among conservative and liberal Lutherans and Lutheran church bodies.” Though we should pray privately for them “to see the error of their ways,” we can “only pray with them after a truly scriptural agreement between them and us has been reached.”<sup>14</sup>

The most extensive Wisconsin treatment of prayer fellowship, which drew decidedly clearer lines between the two synods in both doctrine and practice, came from Meyer in a six-part series, “Prayer Fellowship,” extending from July 1949 through October 1950 in the *Quartalschrift*.<sup>15</sup> Joint prayer “presupposes a common faith, believing in the same God and approaching him on the same premises,” and so prayer fellowship “presupposes church fellowship, established by a common confession of a common faith.” Wherever church fellowship is impossible because no common faith exists, “there also joint prayer will be impossible because there is no common approach to God.” Joint prayer conducted in spite of ongoing disunity in faith and confession “becomes a sham, simulating a harmony that does not exist.”<sup>16</sup>

Prayer fellowship always “stands in close relation to the unity of the Church, either strengthening that unity as a heartfelt expression of it, or by simulating a unity that does not exist.”

---

<sup>14</sup> Henry Koch, “Joint Prayer at Public Meetings,” *NL* 35 (23 May 1948): 165–7. Edmund Reim acknowledged that “working for true unity is a slow and toilsome process, with many setbacks and disappointments” while “efforts at outward union promise quick and dazzling results.” E[dmund] Reim, “Union, Unity, Unionism,” *NL* 34 (13 April 1947): 119.

<sup>15</sup> [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Prayer Fellowship,” *Qu* 46 (July 1949): 184–95; (October 1949): 244–59; 47 (January 1950): 33–45; (April 1950): 124–36; (July 1950): 196–207; (October 1950): 288–98.

<sup>16</sup> Meyer, “Prayer Fellowship,” *Qu*, 184–5. See also G[ervasius] W. Fischer, “An Unwarranted Attack,” *NL* 34 (28 September 1947): 313: “Prayer fellowship with those who have not the truth is a sham love, just as opening a meeting with prayer to ‘impress upon those present the solemnity of the meeting’ is blasphemy.”

Since prayer is a fruit of faith, joint prayer must be a fruit of joint faith. If one person “bases his prayer on the statements and promises of God” but the other rejects “even the least important or seemingly unimportant truth of God,” such joint prayer would not be “harmonious” to the ears of God.<sup>17</sup>

Neither sin nor weakness of faith disrupts the unity of the church, because the church is composed of “convalescents, under the care of the Great Physician,” and because all sins have been washed away in the blood of Jesus. “But a refusal to accept the testimony of the Church, given in the name and spirit of Jesus,” does disrupt the church’s unity. “If we in any way supplement the Word of God with our own wisdom”—altering even nonfundamental doctrines “to suit our own taste” or considering them not divisive to church fellowship—the unity of the faith is also disrupted.<sup>18</sup>

There are some who make a distinction between church fellowship as it appears in the form of pulpit and altar fellowship, on the one hand, and prayer fellowship, on the other. They will concede that a joint Communion or a joint service is out of the question under certain circumstances; they will condemn them as unionistic; but they will contend that joint prayer under virtually the same circumstances may be harmless, yes, God-pleasing, because they say, joint prayer is not co-extensive with church fellowship. Jesus does not make such a distinction.

Meyer also rejected Missouri’s differentiation between “an occasional joint prayer” and “regular prayer fellowship,” asking: “Can the number of times, or the habitual performing of an act, affect its ethical nature? Can something be God-pleasing when committed only occasionally, and become an offense to God when repeated regularly?”<sup>19</sup>

Meyer granted that “we are now assuming ordinary circumstances.” In exceptional cases, when “the separation of a different confession has fallen” because “there are just you and the dying person before the face of God,” a person may “send a prayer up to God for him” and also “ask him to

---

<sup>17</sup> Meyer, “Prayer Fellowship,” *Qu*, 259.

<sup>18</sup> Meyer, “Prayer Fellowship,” *Qu*, 33, 45, 127, 205–6.

<sup>19</sup> Meyer, “Prayer Fellowship,” *Qu*, 294.

join you in a prayer committing his spirit into the hand of God. Such a case would not constitute unionism because “God Himself removed all thought of confessional differences by the accident which brought you and the dying man face to face.” Such exceptional cases, however, should not be employed to change the principle regarding regular relations.<sup>20</sup>

Every scriptural admonition against departing from the Word of God also warns against practicing joint prayer with those who depart from it. “By joining in prayer with a person who openly deviates from the Word of God we would make ourselves partakers of his error.” Does not such an action demonstrate a deplorable lack of love? “It would be dissimulation, hypocrisy, to connive, or to give the appearance of conniving, at error by joining the errorist in prayer.” If we love the truth and abhor error, “how can we give the impression of indifference by entangling with the errorist in joint prayer?” And how could we hope to win the errorist “if we show such lack of seriousness and of real concern for the saving truth?”<sup>21</sup>

Wisconsin repeated this line of argumentation in *Prayer Fellowship*, Tract 10 published in 1954. The author seemed to go further than Meyer in demonstrating how the Wisconsin stand was to be tempered with a loving concern for weaker Christians:

We know that there are devout children of God in all synods who unfortunately are not yet informed regarding the matters in controversy and are not aware of their involvement in error through membership in a heterodox synod. I may have an ALC grandmother who has always manifested a simple, childlike faith in her Lord and Savior, but who nevertheless is unaware of the intersynodical differences and their implications. When I visit her in the privacy of her home, it might be a grave mistake were I to assert the principle of refusing to pray with her under such circumstances. What would the Lord have me do? Should I trouble her simple faith in these matters which are apparently beyond her grasp? Or is it not my plain duty to

---

<sup>20</sup> Meyer, “Prayer Fellowship,” *Qu*, 294–5.

<sup>21</sup> Meyer, “Prayer Fellowship,” *Qu*, 295–8. See also E[gbert] Schaller, “Concerning Christian Brotherhood and Christian Fellowship: Their Relation and Certain Practical Questions Involved,” *Qu* 45 (April 1948): 97: “Show us an errorist and we swing into action as exhorters and convincers, if we can; and if we cannot, we suspend judgment concerning the Christianity of the errorist while refusing to fellowship with him.”



support her and build up her faith by praying with her and otherwise expressing my own faith. . . .

We dare not forget that there are those Christians who may be caught in an error, not willingly, but because their understanding of Scripture is insufficient. They are willing to bow to Scripture, but as yet, through human weakness, do not see clearly how the truth of Scripture necessarily rules out their error. What does God say to us concerning such weak Christians? He tells us: “Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations” (Rom. 14:1). *Receive*, He says, *receive* such a weak brother and tenderly help him overcome his weakness. ‘Receiving’ such a weak Christian means that praying with him may well be in place and Godpleasing, and we trust that God will help him to grow in knowledge and strength.

But *Prayer Fellowship* also demonstrated that Wisconsin’s “all or nothing” view of fellowship meant that even in private circumstances one was advised not to pray with a family member who persisted in a doctrinal error:

If, however, my cousin is not only aware of the synodical differences, but defends his church’s errors, I cannot pray with him—not even in the privacy of his home. In order to make clear to him that the error he defends destroys the unity of our faith, I must refuse to join him in prayer. In cases of this kind it matters not how close the other person may be to me as a relative or friend; here the word of Jesus applies: “He that loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me” (Matt. 10:37).

Even prayer with a weak Christian friend or relative “could not be done publicly without offense.”

And if a weak friend or relative “were to defend the error, even privately, then prayer with him would again be a denial of the Lord.”<sup>22</sup>

As Wisconsin sharpened its fellowship formulations, Missouri voiced its objections more distinctly. “We think when we discuss ‘fellowship’ we are discussing a Scriptural concept. That is not necessarily the case,” said a 1952 *American Lutheran* editorial. Too often “we turn it into a

---

<sup>22</sup> Tract Number 10: *Prayer Fellowship*, 7–8; emphasis in the original. In “Unionism,” 219–20, Meyer acknowledged that “a fundamental agreement is all the church can ever hope to attain here on earth.” He warned, however, that “once we have accustomed ourselves to a faulty or an inadequate expression,” it is difficult to “unlearn the particular phrase” and acquire the proper understanding of a particular doctrinal point. Yet “where there is an unconditional willingness to hear what God has to say in His Word, there is fundamental agreement.”

highly technical, narrowly defined Church term. Then we further qualify and refine the term with such noun-modifiers as ‘pulpit,’ ‘altar,’ and ‘prayer,’” until the term “has only tangential contacts with the Scriptural concept.” Common participation in the gospel and the sacraments “makes every baptized user of the Means of Grace a brother and a member of every other baptized user of the Means of Grace, regardless of color, race, or denomination.”<sup>23</sup>

Two years later, an *American Lutheran* writer remained convinced that most differences between the synods could be discussed “in an atmosphere of mutual respect,” and the church bodies could “live together amicably.” But he rejected the rationale Wisconsin’s *Prayer Fellowship* tract as “man-made rather than God-made theology” that twisted the intent of the purported scriptural proof, “a preconceived notion with a vengeance, that forces Scripture to deny itself.”<sup>24</sup>

Wisconsin’s reasoning in the pamphlet constituted a misunderstanding of the intent of the passage, wrote Missouri’s Richard Koenig. Citing the RSV translation of the passage,<sup>25</sup> Koenig insisted that the verse spoke about “agreement on the *petition* which Christians intend to bring,” not their agreement on all questions of doctrine. Both “on the basis of a plain reading of the text” and in

---

<sup>23</sup> “Fellowship With Other Christians,” *AL* 35 (October 1952): 3–4. In an extensive rebuttal, John Buenger charged the *American Lutheran* editorialist with doing the “greatest injustice to Lutherans who deny church fellowship to those who disagree with them in doctrine.” Buenger contended that the word *fellowship* (*koinonia*) “has more than one use in the Scriptures”—sometimes referring to “the spiritual unity which the Holy Ghost works in the hearts of all believers,” other times meaning “the company which a person keeps with other persons or things.” Buenger charged, “It is seen from this what a superficial and arbitrary method it is [on the part of the *American Lutheran* editorialist] to call one of the two senses in which Scripture uses the word *koinonia* ‘the Bible term,’ to distinguish from this ‘the Church term,’ and to accuse all those who use the word ‘fellowship’ in a sense which is wholly Biblical of twisting a Bible term into their own sense of the word.” J[ohn] B[uenger], “A Modernist Editorial,” *CL* 15 (September 1953): 104.

<sup>24</sup> “‘Prayer Fellowship,’” *AL* 37 (August 1954): 3–4.

<sup>25</sup> “Again I say to you, if two of you agree on earth about anything they ask, it will be done for them by my Father in heaven” (*RSV*).

view of the “great commentators” on that verse, the verse “has nothing whatever to say on the subject of prerequisites for prayer fellowship.”

Koenig concluded,

It is obvious that the Wisconsin Synod stand on prayer-fellowship differs from that of the Missouri Synod, as expressed in its synodical resolutions and in the parish practice of its pastors and lay people. We venture the opinion that it is at variance, too, with the practice of its pastors and lay people. In themselves, these considerations would be of little consequence, if the Wisconsin Synod position were supported by Scripture. It is most emphatically not supported by the Scripture cited in the recent Wisconsin Synod pamphlet on the subject.<sup>26</sup>

Missouri also had a great concern for doctrinal purity, extending “even to calling the attention of our friends to an excess of zeal which leads them to go beyond the Scriptures in endeavoring to reach a common objective.” The Wisconsin Synod was succumbing to the very “theology of the fathers” Missouri sought to resist. The obligation rested on both synods “of letting Scripture talk to us, rather than of attempting to read our preconceived ideas into the Scriptures.”<sup>27</sup>

In 1955, Missouri President John Behnken defended Missouri’s view that intersynodical meetings may be opened with prayer:

Are not these intersynodical meetings conducted for the purpose of reaching doctrinal unity? Is this not a frank admission that doctrinal unity on the basis of God’s Word and our Lutheran Confessions is necessary before there can be *church* fellowship? Is this not a frank admission that we are not in *church* fellowship because our churches are not in doctrinal agreement? . . .

How may doctrinal differences be settled? How can doctrinal unity be achieved? It is not man’s accomplishment. It is not the result of human reasoning. It is not a matter of each yielding a little. . . . The removal of doctrinal differences and the establishment of true unity only the Holy Spirit can accomplish. He does this by means of God’s Word.

Everyone, I am sure, is agreed that we should pray for the gift of the Holy Spirit, yes, a rich measure of the Holy Spirit, that true unity be achieved. The question is whether this may be done jointly. Is that kind of joint prayer unionism?

---

<sup>26</sup> Richard Koenig, “Use of Scripture (Matthew 18, 19),” *AL* 37 (August 1954): 6.

<sup>27</sup> “Prayer Fellowship,” *AL*, 4.

Is any truth of God's Word violated or denied? Is any error condoned? Do the representatives of the church bodies declare that by such joint prayer they are now in *church* fellowship? . . .

It will be well for all members of our Synod, whether clergymen or laymen, to consider what Synod's resolutions say concerning joint prayer. Synod did not say that any and every type of meeting with Lutherans who are not in *church* fellowship with us may be opened with joint prayer.<sup>28</sup>

### *The unit concept*

Although the term *unit concept* did not appear in Wisconsin writing until 1959,<sup>29</sup> seeds of this expression were evident in Wisconsin's presentation on fellowship at least a dozen years earlier. "Jesus does not make such a distinction" between pulpit, altar, and prayer fellowship, Meyer insisted.<sup>30</sup> "We shall continue to speak of *one* fellowship," wrote Edmund Reim, "one *koinonia*, which manifests itself in many ways." Prayer, altar, and pulpit fellowship "are not so many different fellowships, but outstanding ways in which this one great fellowship manifests itself among Christians."<sup>31</sup>

By 1950 Wisconsin members of the Synodical Conference Committee on Intersynodical Relations expressed their conviction that the term "church fellowship" was employed in Scripture "as a unit thought, without any distinction being drawn as to its various forms of expression in common worship and Church work."<sup>32</sup> In 1957 Reim wrote that there is "one single fellowship which is at

---

<sup>28</sup> John W. Behnken, "Your Synod," *LW* 74 (11 October 1955): 74; emphases in the original. P[aul] Peters, "Dr. Behnken on Joint Prayer," *Qu* 53 (July 1956): 216–8.

<sup>29</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1959*, 165. See *Fellowship Then and Now*, 6: "Should church fellowship be treated as a unit concept covering every joint expression, manifestation, and demonstration of a common faith? . . . To this question we answer *yes*, and the Missouri Synod answers *no*."

<sup>30</sup> Meyer, "Prayer Fellowship," *Qu*, 294.

<sup>31</sup> E[dmund] Reim, "Fellowships—or Fellowship?" *Qu* 43 (April 1946): 147.

<sup>32</sup> "Report of the Synodical Conference Committee on Intersynodical Relations," *SC Proceedings, 1950*, 128–9.

work” in various manifestations. Fellowship “is all of one piece, like the seamless robe of Christ.” Reim lamented the “havoc” created “when this great unit of the truth concerning the fellowship of believers is divided and subdivided into countless fractions,” and each “is then treated as an isolated subject, for separate treatment and consideration.”<sup>33</sup>

Grounded in previous studies, articles, and presentations, Wisconsin’s doctrinal position on church fellowship assumed its basic form and language in Carl Lawrenz’s essay, “The Scriptural Principles Concerning Church Fellowship” in 1954. “With Church Fellowship we mean every outward expression and demonstration of Christian fellowship,” Lawrenz wrote, including prayer. “We stand before [God] not merely as individual believers but as believers who are intimately joined together with all other believers here on earth and in heaven above.” Thus “all of our prayers are joint prayers.” Whatever ways believers may act in expression of their common faith, “they do not become so many different kinds of fellowship,” but are “all expressions of one and the same fellowship of faith.”<sup>34</sup>

Fellowship is based in principle on all of Scripture: “You will not be able to stop short of including the entire Word of God.” Those who confess saving faith in Christ “embrace and accept His entire Word. With them, but only with them, we can express fellowship of faith in all its manifestations.” While this is true in principle, however, every Christian’s faith is plagued by weakness, and “weakness of faith is not in itself a barrier for Christian fellowship,” but “an inducement for exercising our fellowship for the purpose of helping our brethren overcome their

---

<sup>33</sup> E[dmund] Reim, “The Problem of Scriptural Proof,” *Qu* 54 (January 1957): 6–7.

<sup>34</sup> Carl Lawrenz, “The Scriptural Principles Concerning Church Fellowship,” *Qu* 51 (October 1954): 258, 273–4.

weakness.” Weak Christians may be differentiated from “scoffers and unbelievers” by “their willingness to receive spiritual help and instruction.”<sup>35</sup>

When a fellow Christian continues in unrepentant sin despite earnest admonition, we can no longer treat him as a brother. Just as clearly “we can no longer recognize and treat those as brethren who in spite of earnest admonition persistently cling to an error in doctrine” or who “demand recognition and toleration for their error and make propaganda for it.” With such a person, Christian fellowship in any form becomes impossible. Faith is endangered when any portion of the Word of God is altered, omitted, added to, or compromised. The Lord frequently spares false prophets and their followers from fatally losing their faith, but false doctrine always “undermines, breaks down, and destroys spiritual life.”<sup>36</sup>

Wisconsin’s identification of “persistent errorists” was dependent on its understanding of Romans 16:17. Already in 1941 Walter Schumann cited with approval R. C. H. Lenski’s interpretation that the Romans passage warns against “not only the exact duplicates of the errorists of Paul’s day,” but any new errors that could arise.<sup>37</sup> The phrase *those who cause divisions and offenses*, though not necessarily implying intent, emphasized that the errorists “habitually deviated from the doctrine of the Church.”<sup>38</sup> The action was “a characteristic trait of the subject.” Paul was “not thinking of anyone who might casually make an erroneous doctrinal statement,” but instead referred to those who “cling to their error and with it create division.”<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Lawrenz, “Scriptural Principles,” 276–9.

<sup>36</sup> Lawrenz, “Scriptural Principles,” 284–7.

<sup>37</sup> Walter A. Schumann, “Romans 16:17-18,” *Qu* 38 (October 1941): 270–1. R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1936), 918.

<sup>38</sup> Meyer, “Prayer Fellowship,” *Qu*, 131.

<sup>39</sup> Lawrenz, “Scriptural Principles,” 288.

Wisconsin theologians thus rejected what they regarded as erroneous interpretations of Romans 16:17-18 that had arisen in the Missouri Synod. The “divisions and offenses” were not restricted to the great doctrines of Christianity, as Brux and others had proposed, but included any teaching that proved to be “contrary to the doctrine.” All doctrine “taught by the Apostles and Prophets” was “the Word of the Lord of Heaven and Earth Himself,” and “every part of it is as much His word as any other part,” whether “fundamental” or “nonfundamental.”<sup>40</sup> The 1957 *Quartalschrift* reprinted Franz Pieper’s opening sermon for the 1912 Synodical Conference convention, based on Romans 16. All the doctrine is God’s Word, Pieper said, and therefore division even among Christians involved false doctrine. “When men arise within the Christian Church teaching something other than Christ’s Word and refusing to submit to correction, the Christians are not to associate with them, but should isolate them, have no fellowship with them, avoid them.”<sup>41</sup>

Regarding verse 18, Paul was not saying *whom* they were to avoid but *why* they were to avoid them. By not submitting to every revealed Word of God, these persistent errorists demonstrated they were “belly-servers.”<sup>42</sup> Admittedly “we start back in horror when we think of applying that [phrase] to teachers in other denominations, to say nothing of such who call themselves Lutherans,” wrote E. Arnold Sitz. But “belly,” which “to us moderns means all the gross appetites,” was for biblical writers the seat of one’s virtues and emotions, even the “stirring of thought, of high thought, the fruit of intellect and reason” and “the mind of the flesh.” All false doctrine “derives from men’s minds” and is “the product of men’s thinking, and the mind of the flesh.” Therefore

---

<sup>40</sup> Frederic E. Blume, “The Voice of the C. U. C.: Does Romans 16:18 Limit the Application of the ‘Avoid’ of Verse 17?” *NL* 42 (27 November 1955): 374–5.

<sup>41</sup> F[rantz] Pieper, “From the Proceedings of the 24th Convention of the Ev. Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America at Saginaw, Michigan, August 14–19, 1912,” trans. E[lgbert] Schaller,” *Qu* 54 (July 1957): 173.

<sup>42</sup> Blume, “Romans 16:18,” 374–5.

“they that cause divisions contrary to the doctrine of the Word serve their own thoughts, the inventions of their own minds.”<sup>43</sup>

Wisconsin rejected “selective fellowship,” which Meyer defined as the practice by which individual pastors and congregations of one synod share pulpit or altar fellowship with pastors and congregations of another synod with which their own synod is unable to establish doctrinal agreement, “across synodical boundary lines, where the respective synods themselves cannot do it or sanction it.”<sup>44</sup> Practicing selective fellowship requires one to ignore that “a synod is a church, a body of believers held together, not by some man-made set of rules, but by a common confession of faith and a common practice expressive of the faith so confessed.”<sup>45</sup> Selective fellowship “simply champions the alleged right of one Christian to recognize another by some signal other than his confession.” It is “nothing but an attempt to blow hot and cold at the same time.” Once selective fellowship is granted between “doctrinally divergent Lutheran bodies,” there is nothing to prevent it from occurring also with Methodists, Baptists, and “other sectarians whose Churches rate as Christian bodies.”<sup>46</sup>

Edmund Reim charged that portions of *A Statement of the 44* militated against the Synodical Conference practice of prayer fellowship. *A Statement* “undeniably contains many things that are sound and true,” and “the spirit of uncharitableness, legalism, intellectualism, and traditionalism has always constituted a dangerous pitfall for those who undertake to defend an established doctrinal position.” Yet *A Statement*’s conclusions pointed “toward closer understanding, cooperation, and the

---

<sup>43</sup> E. Arnold Sitz, “Observations on Ecumenicity,” *Qu* 51 (January 1954): 12–3.

<sup>44</sup> Meyer, “Unionism,” 14. See also E[dmund] Reim, “A New Approach to Lutheran Union,” *NL* 33 (24 November 1946): 371.

<sup>45</sup> [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Selective Fellowship Favored by Committee on Fellowship,” *Qu* 43 (January 1946): 65.

<sup>46</sup> Egbert Schaller, “Christian Brotherhood,” 93–4.



beginnings of fellowship with those from whom we have been separated in the past.”<sup>47</sup> *A Statement* revealed itself to be “a partisan document,” representing “a single school of thought” regarding prayer fellowship, nonfundamental doctrines, offense, unionism, and the meaning of Romans 16:17 and its applicability to questions of Lutheran union.<sup>48</sup>

Wisconsin acknowledged “without a moment’s hesitation” that there were “externals in which a Christian may without offense cooperate” with those not united in a common confession of faith.<sup>49</sup> “We do not claim that Synodical Conference Lutherans may have no contact with Lutherans of other bodies,” Reim maintained, “nor do we claim that there be no such contact between the several synods.” In making use of a common agency for transmitting and distributing relief to war sufferers, one’s confessional stand is not compromised.

But externals in which churches may properly cooperate were “far more limited than is usually thought.” By definition, cooperation is a “working together,” involving “business” of a “spiritual nature.”<sup>50</sup> William Schaefer argued that actions labeled “external” often proved to be more of a “spiritual nature” than advertised. History had amply demonstrated that “cooperation in externals” too often turned out to be “a pretty wood-pile from which the dusky face of unionism sooner or later emerges.”<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> E[dmund] R[eim], “A Statement,” *Qu* 43 (January 1946): 56, 61–2.

<sup>48</sup> E[dmund] Reim, “‘A Statement’ Withdrawn,” *Qu* 44 (April 1947): 135.

<sup>49</sup> E[dmund] Reim, “The Debate on Union: The Intersynodical Movement,” *NL* 34 (20 July 1947): 233.

<sup>50</sup> E[dmund] Reim, “Where Do We Stand? Still More Problems: Co-operation,” *NL* 36 (24 April 1949): 133–4. See also [August F.] Z[ich], “On Christian Fellowship,” *NL* 25 (9 October 1938): 325–6.

<sup>51</sup> W[illiam] J. Schaefer, “Siftings: National Lutheran Council,” *NL* 34 (30 March 1947): 104. President Brenner expressed “deep concern” in 1949 over “an increasing number of incidents of joint worship and work under conditions which are contrary to Scripture.” Brenner was dismayed at “the growing frequency and boldness of these incidents” and disappointed that efforts to deal with

Schaefer also questioned “whether there is any work in the church which is purely ‘external’”—a theme Meyer also expounded. Although granting the term “cooperation in externals,” Meyer all but denied their actual existence:

Is church work, cooperation in church work, coordination of church work merely a matter of logical definition? Is it not the expression of a life, a new life, a life created by the special act of the Holy Ghost? . . . Fine drawn distinctions according to the laws of logic may dull the spiritual sensitivities to such an extent that a person will confuse doctrinal indifference with evangelical methods and will condemn as legalistic a holy awe before the truth. That is the spirit of unionism.

Meyer questioned whether Lutheran charities, orphanages, “old people’s homes,” hospitals, and other agencies could ever be regarded as “merely secular agencies for the physical relief of suffering.” Collaboration with secular institutions or organizations from other church bodies “can hardly be regarded as cooperation in externals.” Meyer appealed to the example of the apostles at Jerusalem, who “evidently” did not view their work of caring for widows and the needy as “secular” work. Organized joint work in ministries of mercy “is a form in which Christians practice their love as a fruit of the spirit. It definitely is a phase of their sanctification.”<sup>52</sup>

Responding to the contention of some Missourians that their synod had exercised a more open practice of prayer fellowship in its early history, Wisconsin’s Immanuel Frey argued that “those were the formative years when lines had not yet been clearly drawn.” Walther and his associates regarded the representatives of other Lutheran bodies at that time as “weak brethren.” To consider Walther “an advocate of joint prayer with those who he knew as persistent errorists is to slander and

---

such situations privately or through official channels “have met with little success.” *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1949*, 110–3.

<sup>52</sup> Meyer, “Unionism,” 11, 13. See also [Joh. P.] M[eyer], “Dr. Arndt and the Second Columbus Conference,” *Qu* 40 (January 1943): 66–7. For lists of externals that Wisconsin and the ELS did not consider to be true externals, see E[dmund] Reim, “As We See It: The Fact Remains. . .,” *NL* 42 (3 April 1955): 103–4. E[dmund] Reim, “The Voice of the C. U. C.: Cooperation in Externals,” *NL* 48 (15 April 1956): 120–1. Geo[rge] O. Lillegard, “Modern Ecumenism and Cooperation in Externals,” *Qu* 56 (October 1959): 244–9; *WLQ* 57 (January 1960): 14–33.

misrepresent him.” After lines between the Lutheran synods were more clearly drawn following the Election Controversy, joint prayer was discontinued because “it had become plainly evident” that these Lutherans “were not weak brethren but persistent errorists. The documentary evidence is unassailable.”<sup>53</sup>

This understanding of Missouri’s pre-1881 practice was repeated and expanded in the first of a series of articles in *The Northwestern Lutheran* early in 1961 and reprinted in the tract *Fellowship Then and Now*. Calling the years before the founding of the Synodical Conference “the Period of Groping,” the authors noted that Walther’s invitation to the free conferences in the 1850s “was based on a wholehearted acceptance of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession” and a rejection of S. S. Schmucker’s *Definite Platform*. As Walther put it in *Der Lutheraner*, “Only such persons would be recognized as members who subscribe to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession without reservation.”<sup>54</sup>

At these conferences men were recognized “as brethren as long as they [testified] with vigor against the prevailing errors and for the truth.” Fellowship at the free conferences was not established with the General Synod as such but only with those who offered a positive confession of the truth and “would continue membership in their respective bodies as long as there still [was] a basis for hope of improvement.”<sup>55</sup> In this and in subsequent colloquies with the Buffalo and Iowa Synods “the question was not: Can unity be attained? But: Can unity, threatened by error, be

---

<sup>53</sup> Im[manuel] P. Frey, “Joint Prayer” (paper presented to the Missouri–Wisconsin Synods’ Presidents’ Conference, Milwaukee, 12–15 January 1954), 3–4; copy in possession of the author.

<sup>54</sup> “*Auszug aus den Verhandlungen der freien evangelisch-Lutherischen Conferenz waehrend der zweiten Versammlung derselben zu Pittsburg, Pa., vom 29. October bis zum 4. November 1857,*” *DL* 14 (12 January 1858): 84; emphasis in the citation.

<sup>55</sup> “*Auszug aus den Verhandlungen der freien evangelisch-Lutherischen Conferenz, versammelt zu Columbus, Ohio, vom 1. bis 7. October 1856,*” *DL* 13 (18 November 1856): 50.

preserved?” Thus at the opening sessions at such meetings “joint prayer was in place. This was hardly joint prayer with representatives of bodies who were persistently adhering to an error.”<sup>56</sup>

With the founding of the Synodical Conference and the predestination controversy, the “period of groping” came to an end. “The confessional lines of the Lutheran bodies in American had been clearly drawn.” No joint prayers were offered at the free conferences of 1903–1906 or at meetings for the *Intersynodical Theses* of the 1920s “until the last meetings, at which the conferees believed they had reached full doctrinal agreement. Quite correctly they then conducted the meetings with joint prayer.”<sup>57</sup>

### *The war of words*

Open disagreement, sharp accusations, and point-counterpoint argumentation between the sister synods had now become commonplace. On 13 April 1947 Edmund Reim announced a change in the editorial policy of *The Northwestern Lutheran*. While intersynodical disagreements had crowded the pages of Wisconsin’s *Quartalschrift* for almost a decade, and debate over the controverted issues dominated many pastoral conferences, *The Northwestern Lutheran* (and the *Gemeinde-Blatt*) had remained largely silent on these issues. But now “a time to speak” had come—“not for the purpose of disrupting now the fellowship about which we were so concerned before” but “because the situation is no longer the same. Time is passing. Issues must eventually be decided.” Church members were “surely entitled to know where our Wisconsin Stands, and why it stands as it does.”<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> “The Period of Groping,” *NL* 48 (26 February 1961): 74–5. *Fellowship Then and Now*, 7–9, 11.

<sup>57</sup> “The Time After Confessional Lines Had Been Clearly Drawn,” *NL* 48 (26 March 1961): 101. *Fellowship Then and Now*, 16–7.

<sup>58</sup> Reim, “A Time to Speak,” 115.

Even earlier, however, in 1940, Theodore Graebner had asked: “How far will our critics of the Wisconsin and Norwegian Synods press the Scriptural demand for ‘speaking the same thing,’ I Cor. 1, 10? If this is urged (as a condition of fellowship) regarding any expression of human origin, no matter how orthodox, it is the essence of sectarianism.” Alluding to the Wisconsin and Norwegian Synods, Graebner concluded “I am not ready to admit that an orthodoxy which offends against the law of love in judging of the words of opponents (and of fellow-Christians) is sound Lutheran theology.”<sup>59</sup>

In 1942 *The American Lutheran* quoted approvingly an article from the *Lutheran Companion* critical of Wisconsin’s opposition to the Missouri–ALC union discussions. The *Companion* characterized these discussions as “friendly negotiations” designed “to come to a better understanding regarding questions on which they have differed for several decades,” and charged that the Wisconsin Synod “obviously does not desire to reach an agreement with anybody.” Recalling that while condemned men were being shot in Moscow’s public square during the October Revolution, clergy of the Orthodox church were “debating the question of the proper vestments that should be worn on certain church festivals,” the *Companion* asked:

Is the Lutheran Church of America awake to its opportunity and responsibility today? Does it understand that this is a time to cease needless bickerings and to close its ranks and go forward together in the great task of witnessing for Christ in this solemn day of visitation and judgment? Instead of continuing our endless strife and divisions, perhaps it were better for all Lutheran

---

<sup>59</sup> Theodore Graebner, “Not a Sect—Yet,” 8–9. Although Theodore Graebner’s father August L. Graebner was teaching at the Wisconsin Synod’s Northwestern College when he was born in 1876, and although he was well acquainted with the Wisconsin Synod, Theodore Graebner is recorded to have said some harsh things about Wisconsin. In addition to his comment, cited earlier, that Wisconsin’s pastors suffered from “a complete hardening of their doctrinal arteries” [Theodore Graebner to E. J. A. Marxhausen, 13 September 1946; in Pfabe, “Theodore Graebner,” 166], Graebner also made passing reference in a letter to Herman Harms on 28 March [1949?] to a “neurosis, the same kind with which we have had such unpleasant contacts with the Norwegian Synod, and Wisconsin and their representatives in Missouri.” Edward A. Engelbrecht, “Lutheran Confessional Optimism after World War II: Hanns Lilje and Theodore Graebner,” *Logia* 5 (Epiphany 1996): 38.

synods as well as all Lutheran pastors and people to get down on our knees and to ask God for mercy on us.<sup>60</sup>

In 1943 *The American Lutheran* expressed dismay at a *Christian Century* critique of Lutheran isolation.<sup>61</sup> “A careful analysis will reveal that the paralysis of extreme isolation is even now developing in our church.” It was not surprising that “certain elements would frustrate every attempt at a closer approach” to other Lutherans.<sup>62</sup> In a companion editorial, *The American Lutheran* found it “puzzling” that the *Century*’s “tremendous indictment of the Lutheran churches” went all but ignored in Wisconsin’s *Northwestern Lutheran*. “One would expect a little self-examination. Is there not even a little truth in the accusation of *The Christian Century*?”<sup>63</sup>

In part, *The Northwestern Lutheran* had responded, “We hope and pray that the movement toward Lutheranism will continue until Protestant churches will be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.”<sup>64</sup> *The American Lutheran* replied:

When we hope and pray sincerely for something, we want it earnestly. Before we were confirmed our pastor explained this in connection with the Fourth Petition. We shall not pray for our bread in idleness but do something about getting it. That holds true also with the movement toward Lutheranism. To quote *The Lutheran Witness*: “It was a matter of surprise when the Wisconsin Synod voted in two conventions that a continuation of our meetings with other Lutherans for the

---

<sup>60</sup> “Wisconsin Synod Quotes Luther,” *AL* 25 (May 1942): 10.

<sup>61</sup> “Lutheran Isolation,” *CC* 59 (4 November 1942): 1342–3. The *Century* called it “unlikely” that the Missouri and Wisconsin synods would “in the near future consider union with other Lutherans on any basis whatever.” The *Century* attributed the synods’ isolation to their being numbered among “more recent waves of immigration” and predicted it might take “another generation or two before they become sufficiently indigenous to American culture” to “trust themselves in the warmth of fellowship which American Christianity affords.”

<sup>62</sup> “A Grave Indictment,” *AL* 26 (January 1943): 3–4.

<sup>63</sup> “We Are Puzzled,” *AL* 26 (January 1943): 4–5.

<sup>64</sup> W[illiam] J. S[chaefer], “Lutheran Isolation,” *NL* 25 (15 November 1942): 356–7.

establishment of fellowship involves ‘a denial of the truth.’”<sup>65</sup> God wishes to use us as agencies to make our prayer come true and realize our hope.<sup>66</sup>

Wisconsin took aim in 1949 at *The Lutheran Witness*, particularly its editor Theodore Graebner. During his editorship (along with Martin Sommer) the *Witness* had achieved the largest circulation of any religious magazine in the United States. Graebner’s many reports and editorials “were not only brilliantly written by widely read, far beyond the confines of his own synod. . . .

Time was when the *Witness* was an outstanding exponent of conservative Lutheranism. Nowhere did one find a more searching criticism of the theology and the current activities of other Lutheran bodies, nowhere a more unsparing exposing of the errors which were thereby discovered, nowhere a sharper denunciation of unionism. . . ; nowhere was there a sterner application of the classical passages against unionism, particularly Romans 16:17 with its “avoid them.”

What happened?

The *Witness* became newsier. And the news came to be more and more of one color. Gone was the stern reproof with which the *Witness* of former years would have greeted many of these modern developments. . . . Nor would one gather from current issues of the *Witness* that there are today large groups of Missourians, pastors

---

<sup>65</sup> [Richard] Caemmerer, [Theodore] Graebner, [William G.] Polack, and [Martin S.] Sommer, “The Quest for Lutheran Union Continues,” *LW* 61 (10 November 1942): 388.

<sup>66</sup> “We Are Puzzled,” 5. See also “We Contend for God’s Word,” (January 1943): 5–6. “We Speak for Participation,” (January 1943): 6. “We Contend for God’s Word—Again,” (February 1943): 3–4. President Behnken said in 1946: “It is true that some doctrinal discussions have revealed a decided lack of doctrinal unity. What shall be done then? Instead of growing weary of doctrinal discussions those who desire a genuine Lutheran fellowship should realize that this necessitates a deeper study of Biblical doctrine and the Lutheran Confessions and a frank but friendly discussion of the doctrinal differences which have been keeping us apart so that with God’s help and under His blessings doctrinal unity might be reached. See “Dr. Behnken at the American Lutheran Conference,” 67. But see E[dmund] Reim, “The Voice of Missouri—Which Is It?” *Qu* 44 (January 1947): 70–1.

Wisconsin responded that the Holy Christian Church already enjoys perfect unity because the oneness that exists between all believers is fashioned after the oneness of the Holy Trinity. See E[dmund] Reim, “As We See It: That They All May Be One,” *NL* 41 (4 April 1954): 108: “To speak as though this oneness for which the Savior prayed is either to be achieved or restored by human planning and organization constitutes a serious misuse” of Jesus’ words in John 17:21. “Why not accept the wonderful fact that these words *are* fulfilled, and that its blessings are with us every day? For the Church of Christ *is* one.” See also G[erald O.] Hoenecke, “The Voice Of The C. U. C.: Church Fellowship.” *NL* 43 (8 July 1956): 216.

and congregations, who are thoroughly alarmed over this modern trend toward cooperation, who still call it unionism when this cooperation involves work of a spiritual nature. . . . Although these groups of “Old Missourians” have also been quite active, their doings have seemingly had no “news value” for the *Witness*—or they did not fit into the policy.<sup>67</sup>

There was “a Missouri with which we would be glad to stand shoulder to shoulder,” Reim wrote, the Missouri “trying manfully to counteract the modern trend in its own midst,” the Missouri “of Walther, of Stoeckhardt, of Pieper,” which we have known in the past.” But the new Missouri was “very much in the public eye” and knew “how to make itself heard,” while it was now “obscuring the line of demarcation between the Synodical Conference and other Lutheran bodies.” This was “a different Missouri, one with which we could not make common cause, but which we would emphatically have to contradict.”<sup>68</sup>

*The Northwestern Lutheran* in 1949 reported on a celebratory worship service at Milwaukee’s downtown auditorium, marking the synod’s 100th anniversary, attended by more than 7,000 worshipers. But this “pleasant experience” was clearly meant for members only. Milwaukee area congregations canceled their regularly scheduled Sunday morning services, and the worship was conducted “within the confines of our own synod churches.” William Schaefer emphasized that “nothing was done” to publicize the event beyond the synod’s borders. “There was no advertising in the newspapers of the city, no screaming headlines, no pictures of the great and near great that would participate, nothing of all that.” Worship was conducted “quietly” and “a churchly decorum was manifested by all who attended.” The service was “orderly and serious,” “simple,” “sober and dignified.” It featured “no praising of the men who blazed the trail for our synod, it was no harangue on the wickedness of the world, no indictment of the existing evils, no recounting of the great power of our enemies.” The 500-voice choir “made no attempt at rendering something to awe the

---

<sup>67</sup> E[dmund] Reim, “Dr. Graebner and the Lutheran Witness,” 130–1.

<sup>68</sup> E[dmund] Reim, “An Overture and a Reply,” 209.



congregation, rather it sang two simple compositions and sang them beautifully.” All this “certainly ought to teach us one thing: that with the right appeal and without making great splurges in public, Christians can be interested in a service that should serve no other purpose than to worship God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.”<sup>69</sup>

Whatever Schaefer’s intentions, *The American Lutheran* reprinted the article in full and charged that “criticisms in the article, implied and otherwise, directed at we know not whom,” merited comment. Quoting Jeremiah’s injunction to “publish and not conceal” and the encouragement of Jesus “What ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops,”<sup>70</sup> *The American Lutheran* responded:

We have often wondered why the Wisconsin Synod, after 100 years of work in the United States, should have a membership of 285,000, and the Missouri Synod, after a similar period, 1,600,000. Perhaps this is the answer.

There is no virtue in size. Nor is there a particular virtue in smallness. There certainly is no virtue in smallness if we put a halo around that concept, and even, God forbid, point the finger at others not so virtuously small.

In all kindness and Christian charity, we suggest to our Wisconsin Synod brethren in Milwaukee, who evidently were responsible for this undertaking, that the next time they let people know, before and after, what is going on, through the usual channels employed in these days to circulate information. It might have been valuable in this case to the numbers of visitors who must have appeared at Wisconsin Synod churches that morning without prior knowledge that they would be closed.<sup>71</sup>

Later in 1949 *The American Lutheran* cited Wisconsin professor Max Lehninger’s remarks in a summer convention essay that it was “no secret” that some Missourians looked favorably on the ALC invitation to church union. Incidents reported in the secular press showed “Missouri men in

---

<sup>69</sup> W[illiam] J. S[chaefer], “A Pleasant Experience,” *NL* 36 (28 August 1949): 275.

<sup>70</sup> Jeremiah 50:2; Matthew 10:27 (*KJV*).

<sup>71</sup> “A Pleasant Experience,” *AL* 32 (October 1949): 5. Edmund Reim responded to this charge, though at a later time and a bit indirectly: “As We See It: A Little Strength,” *NL* 40 (4 October 1953): 310.

actual fellowship with Lutherans from whom Missouri has been separated for doctrinal reasons for a period of fifty to seventy-five years and longer.” Wisconsin protests against such practices went “seemingly in vain.”<sup>72</sup> Lehninger gave two reasons why Wisconsin editors and professors declined invitations to intersynodical conferences: 1) they feared their acceptance would have been misinterpreted “as signifying that former doctrinal differences are not in existence anymore,” and 2) they were concerned such “friendly” gatherings “might tend to dull their testimony and to dim their eyes of perception against the lurking danger of a compromise.

The promoters of these meetings want to serve the cause of Christ thereby; of this there can be no doubt. But do they? The press reports are usually full of praise for the cordiality of the participants, of the brotherly spirit in which the meetings were conducted. The probable effect such reports make on our brethren with whom we are one in confession will be that they are not strengthened but weakened in their convictions regarding pure doctrine on one side and false doctrine on the other.<sup>73</sup>

This, *The American Lutheran* countered, was “a perfect example of the sin of separatism, a sin certainly no less deadly and destructive of true unity than the sin of ‘unionism.’” The marks of the sin of separatism—“an unyielding insistence” on one’s viewpoint as “the only scriptural position” down to the most minute detail, “unsparing denunciation” of any who differed with the single approved position, refusal even to meet with any who held differing views—all were evident in Lehninger’s defense. “We cannot understand this attitude of our Wisconsin brethren. We are concerned about them and their seemingly growing spirit of separatism.”<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> Lehninger, “Development of the Doctrinal Position,” 14–5.

<sup>73</sup> Lehninger, “Development of the Doctrinal Position,” 91–2.

<sup>74</sup> “The Sin of Separation,” *AL* 32 (December 1949): 4. For Wisconsin’s response, see Edmund Reim, “As Others See Us: Separation or Separatism?” *NL* 37 (12 February 1950): 57–8. Reim acknowledged that “separatism is indeed a sin” and that “just at such times as when we are taking a stand against unionism we are in particular danger of falling into the opposite extreme.” But Reim insisted that “God’s Word itself calls for separation” when circumstances “make a dangerous fraternizing out of something which is advocated as a mere friendly get-together.”

In 1950 *The American Lutheran* charged that a *Northwestern Lutheran* editorial by Paul Kretzmann, formerly a St. Louis professor who left the Missouri Synod, “provides an illuminating confusion of thought and terminology which may explain why the Missouri Synod has little regard for this type of argumentation.” Rejecting Kretzmann’s distinction between a *schismatic* and a *separatist*,<sup>75</sup> the editor concurred with Kretzmann that “schism or separation without a just cause” was “an abomination” before God. “Starting out with that premise, we believe that there is no room within the Missouri Synod for the spirit of the editorial in *The Northwestern Lutheran*.”<sup>76</sup>

Reacting to newspaper reports of an acrimonious meeting in Milwaukee between Missouri and Wisconsin representatives regarding the entanglement of the Boy Scout issue in proposed plans to construct a new joint Lutheran high school, *The American Lutheran* wrote:

It seems to us that our brethren in the Wisconsin Synod could certainly have handled this in a far more charitable and brotherly manner than these clippings indicate. There was no reason for permitting this controversy to be dragged into the fierce light of publicity and holding up the entire Lutheran Church to ridicule from those outside the walls of our communion who do not know what the shooting is all about. . . . The situation in Milwaukee is a crying shame and disgrace, and we place the blame for the present situation directly on the shoulders of our brethren of the Wisconsin Synod who, it seems to us, have violated the laws of charity and brotherliness.<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> P[aul] E. Kretzmann, “When Separation Becomes a God-given Duty,” *NL* 37 (2 July 1950): 212.

<sup>76</sup> “A False Emphasis,” *AL* 33 (September 1950): 3–4. In the very next editorial, criticizing an item from *The Lutheran*, magazine of the ULCA, *The American Lutheran* suggested that “the two wings of Lutheranism” both used “journalistic tricks to put their ideas across.” The editor of *The Lutheran* displayed “his addiction to this practice which puts him in a class with *The Northwestern Lutheran*” when he saw only one side of an issue and portrayed it as the only side. “What’s Wrong?” *AL* 33 (September 1950): 4.

<sup>77</sup> “A Crying Shame,” *AL* 34 (December 1951): 4–5. Since 1947 considerable debate centered on the future of the Lutheran high school in Milwaukee. Although expanded facilities were desperately needed, doubts regarding the synods’ future unity, if not openly discussed, remained on everyone’s minds. The reluctance of Wisconsin Synod congregations to commit to a costly building project while intersynodical differences persisted helped to create what principal E. H. Buerger called “a most unhappy and painful situation” within the joint high school conference. “After numerous heart-trying discussions arriving at no solution of the problem,” Missouri congregations

A May 1951 editorial in *The Milwaukee Lutheran*, an intersynodical laymen's magazine, criticized what it called "wooden shoe" Lutheranism.<sup>78</sup> Pressed for a definition, *The Milwaukee Lutheran* said "wooden shoe" Lutheranism was practiced by "those Missouri Synod churches"—but the characteristics seemed to identify many Wisconsin churches as well—that

insist on preaching and teaching that Scouting is contrary to the church's doctrine. . . . Those who oppose the use of radio and television for the broadcasting of church services. . . . those who condemn the use of advertising for church events, and disdain newspaper publicity for church functions . . . those who insist that the choir processional is showmanship unbecoming to the church, and robed choirs are not to be . . . those who condemn the chaplaincy . . . such thinking, which prevails in Milwaukee to a larger degree than in any other city of its size in the country, defines the term.<sup>79</sup>

Reporting on a proposed merger of the ALC, the Evangelical Lutheran Church (Norwegian), and the United Evangelical Lutheran Church (Danish) in 1953, *The American Lutheran* noted that the Wisconsin and Norwegian synods "quite naturally have expressed hostility to the proposed

---

recommended that the joint high school conference be divided into two separate associations. "It was difficult for many in the Missouri Synod and especially also in the Wisconsin Synod to sever this bond of friendship and brotherly cooperation," but no other solution seemed suitable. E. H. Buerger, "The History of the Lutheran High School in Milwaukee, Wisconsin," *CHIQ* 34 (April 1961), 12–3.

The decision to create separate associations and to build two high schools was in Edmund Reim's view "the only practical choice" available. "If it should prove impossible to preserve our Synodical Conference intact, if the tragedy of a break should actually come to pass, it will be fortunate if among the many subsequent problems there will not be this one of untangling the affairs of a newly enlarged joint school." Reim rejected the charge that the high school decision would somehow cause the two synods to split: "As before, so now, these matters still await the upcoming convention of the Synodical Conference. Being issues that are before the synods, they remain for the synods to decide." E[dmund] Reim, "As We See It: The Lutheran High School Problem in Milwaukee," *NL* 39 (13 January 1952): 10.

<sup>78</sup> "Lutheranism—As You Like It," *ML* 5 (May 1952): 3.

<sup>79</sup> "Wooden Shoe Lutheranism Defined," *ML* 5 (June 1952): 4. Both *Milwaukee Lutheran* articles were cited without comment in "Wooden Shoe Lutheranism Defined," *AL* 35 (September 1952): 10.

arrangement.”<sup>80</sup> After Missouri’s 1953 convention, *The American Lutheran* maintained that it could never recall hearing an official sister synod representative accuse the Missouri Synod “at such great length and so vehemently” of being “out of step with the church body that he represented.”

Wisconsin demands that Missouri renounce its position on Boy Scouts, withdraw its chaplains from the armed forces, reverse its acceptance of joint prayer, and suspend discussions with the ALC were urged so strongly by Wisconsin’s representative to Missouri’s convention that the Wisconsin official “felt compelled to assert repeatedly that his remarks did not constitute a ‘threat’ [presumably that Wisconsin would withdraw from the Synodical Conference].”<sup>81</sup>

Also reflecting on Missouri’s 1953 convention, Otto Geiseman suggested that attacks by “some of its own sister churches” have caused “a small number of individuals” within the Missouri Synod “to join in the attack.” Missouri “listened with considerable patience” but ultimately “clung to the spirit of biblical Lutheranism.” While some in the church “have tried to develop doctrine by processes of derivation and deduction,” Missouri “was not ready to give up its position on the principle ‘The Scriptures Alone.’”<sup>82</sup>

Some of the observations Geiseman offered on the intersynodical dispute, with the appearance of fairness and dispassionate reflection, may have been received by Wisconsin men as scarcely concealed criticism and condescension. “We should remember,” Geiseman wrote in October 1953,

---

<sup>80</sup> “The Prospect for Lutheranism,” *AL* 36 (January 1953): 5.

<sup>81</sup> “The Houston Convention,” *AL* 36 (August 1953): 4.

<sup>82</sup> O[tto] A. Geiseman, “While It Is Day: Matters of Doctrine,” *AL* 36 (August 1953): 5. For other instances of *American Lutheran* criticism of “derived” doctrine, see O[tto] A. Geiseman, “While It Is Day: Bible Interpretation,” *AL* 23 (May 1940): 6. “We Contend for God’s Word,” 5–6. “We Contend for God’s Word—Again,” 3–4. “The New Scholasticism,” (February 1943): 4. “Put Off Thy Shoes,” *AL* 34 (January 1951): 4. O[tto] A. Geiseman, “While It Is Day: Study,” *AL* 44 (July 1961): 6–7.

that there are many fine evangelical pastors within the Wisconsin Synod who can hardly be happy or proud of some of the positions held and attitudes manifested by some men within their own synod. Perhaps it would be better if we allowed these men to wield the sword of the Word for the cause of historical Lutheranism. . . .

It seems to me that the Wisconsin Synod must still pass through the period of transition through which our people began to pass during and immediately after the first world war. Even where its churches have been located in urban communities it does not seem to have become conscious in any lively and aggressive way, generally speaking, of the unchurched, non-Lutheran elements about it. It has remained in the position of social isolation in which our synod found itself but a few decades ago.

. . . The temptation . . . lies near to elevate the entire problem into one of theological significance and to make it appear as though the old ways and the old methods were divine and the new ways and the new methods demonic.<sup>83</sup>

Wisconsin's criticisms demonstrated that "historical and organizational considerations play a very large part" in intersynodical tensions. "It by no stretch of the imagination can honestly and logically be regarded as a matter of theology."<sup>84</sup> Taking issue with the tone and content of Wisconsin's series of 1953 and 1954 tracts, Geiseman wrote, "Our heart goes out to individuals who have become lost in such an emotional fog as to produce this type of theological criticism under the illusion that this is a service to God and to His church."<sup>85</sup> Those in the Wisconsin Synod "to whom the Spirit of God gives a fuller measure of light have a prior obligation to help their church body and they also have by far the better opportunity of working with success."<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> O[tto] A. Geiseman, "While It Is Day: What are We to Do?" *AL* 36 (October 1953): 7. See also O[tto] A. Geiseman, "While It Is Day: Synodical Conference Meetings," *AL* 38 (January 1956): 6–7. For Wisconsin's response, see E[dmund] Reim, "As We See It: A Grain of Truth," *NL* 41 (10 January 1954): 7–8.

<sup>84</sup> O[tto] A. Geiseman, "While It Is Day: Inescapable," *AL* 36 (October 1953): 7–8.

<sup>85</sup> O[tto] A. Geiseman, "While It Is Day: Strange Tracts," *AL* 37 (June 1954): 5.

<sup>86</sup> Geiseman, "Synodical Conference Meetings," 7. See also O[tto] Geiseman, "While It Is Day: The Synodical Conference," *AL* 32 (May 1949): 6.

Sometimes it was impossible to determine who *some* or *some Lutherans* or *they* were, whom Geiseman and others referred to. But it is understandable that Wisconsin Synod readers might have assumed they were the ones being obliquely criticized.

There are some Lutherans who are absolutely sure that they can do no better than to bury the talent or the pound which has been entrusted to them. They think of the Lord of the Church as someone who is exceedingly severe, and that He will be much angered if they should even so much as talk about theology with people who do not possess the truths of God in the same rich and full measure in which they think they possess them. These Lutherans are obviously elevating their own fears, their attitudes of aloofness and provincialism, into a divine dogma. They don't want to say: "We're afraid!" so they say "God forbids!"<sup>87</sup>

*To the brink of a break*

Understandably, when representatives of the disagreeing synods met at Synodical Conference conventions, tensions arose.<sup>88</sup> In his opening address to the 1946 convention, President E. Benjamin Schlueter acknowledged that "confusion and strife" had entered the conference, threatening to "undermine its stability."<sup>89</sup> In 1950, the Norwegian Synod's S. C. Ylvisaker, substituting for Schlueter, delivered a vigorous opening sermon in which he issued stinging rebukes of unionism, joint prayer, and disagreements over church and ministry, the chaplaincy, and Scouting. "These difficulties are real, and they dare not be put aside as if they do not belong within the realm of

---

<sup>87</sup> O[tto] A. Geiseman, "While It Is Day: A Parable and Lutheranism," *AL* 39 (July 1956): 5. See also O[tto] A. Geiseman, "While It Is Day: Accusation a Confession," *AL* 33 (April 1950): 5. O[tto] A. Geiseman, "While It Is Day: Meanness," (July 1950): 6. "Put Off Thy Shoes!" 4. O[tto] A. Geiseman, "While It Is Day: What to Do?" *AL* 35 (May 1952): 5.

<sup>88</sup> Prior to the 1952 Synodical Conference convention at St. Paul, Minn., Edmund Reim explained that the Synodical Conference was "only an advisory body," not a "super-synod." It was not in a position to dictate a solution to the problems between conference members or enforce final decisions. Rather than regarding this as a flaw in the organization, "this is precisely as the founders planned it." Member synods "joined themselves together as brethren, firmly resolved that the highest authority rest only in the Word of God. And this is the only way" the conference could still function." E[dmund] Reim, "As We See It: We Go To St. Paul," *NL* 39 (27 July 1952): 226. See also Carl Lawrenz, "Synodical Conference Convention," *Qu* 54 (January 1957): 59–60. Fredrich, "The Great Debate," 165–6.

<sup>89</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1946*, 8.

a doctrinal debate.” Ylvisaker asked, “Will you let the Word decide and let the Word govern, or must convenience, sloth, emotions, reason, prevail to the further loss” of God’s precious gifts to the Conference?

Following Ylvisaker’s address as published in the *Synodical Conference Proceedings* is the note:

Dr. Ylvisaker declared before the convention that the above address had not been submitted to the other officials of the Synodical Conference for approval, but that it presented his individual concerns. On recommendation by the standing Committee on Intersynodical Relations the convention resolved to attach the following statement to the Presidential Address: “Missouri Synod members of the Committee on Intersynodical Relations are not in agreement with some of the opinions in the Presidential Address.”<sup>90</sup>

Synodical Conference conventions at Fort Wayne, Indiana, in 1950 and the Twin Cities in 1952 “reached new lows in strife,” as conference sessions degenerated into bitterly divided reports and bloc voting.<sup>91</sup> One Wisconsin pastor remembered John Brenner “being treated shabbily on the floor of the convention and being hooted down when he tried to bring some brotherly admonition to Missouri.”<sup>92</sup>

Wisconsin delegates to the 1952 Synodical Conference convention declared themselves *in statu confessionis* (a state of protesting fellowship) with the Missouri Synod.<sup>93</sup> “We suddenly find ourselves confronted with a situation wherein nothing is as it formerly was,” Frederic Blume explained. “The brother with whom we have walked in peace, shoulder to shoulder, has broken

---

<sup>90</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1950*, 6–11. Edward Fredrich recalled, “Those at Fort Wayne for that convention in 1950 will never forget the man and the address.” E[dward] C. Fredrich, Review of *Sigurd Christian Ylvisaker: 1884–1959*, ed. Peter T. Harstad, *WLQ* 82 (Summer 1985): 233.

<sup>91</sup> Fredrich, *WSL*, 202.

<sup>92</sup> Survey response 38.

<sup>93</sup> “A Report by the Wisconsin Synod Committee on Church Union,” *NL* 13 (7 November 1952): 281–2. E[dmund] Reim, “As We See It: A State Of Confession,” *NL* 39 (7 September 1952): 282–3.



rank.” Wisconsin felt an obligation to point out publicly Missouri’s “defection from rank,” yet “we are to continue our efforts to make that brother see himself as we see him,” not by regarding or treating Missouri as an enemy “but by continuing to ‘admonish’ him as that which he still is, our brother.”<sup>94</sup> The next summer, Wisconsin’s synodical convention approved the action, making the *in statu confessionis* its own.<sup>95</sup>

Less than a month after the conclusion of the 1953 convention, Wisconsin’s Egbert Schaller, pastor at Nicollet, Minnesota, addressed a long letter to the synod’s Committee on Church Union.<sup>96</sup> “I see no honest or God-pleasing way by which we can approach the question of our future course in its relation to the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod,” Schaller wrote,

other than we determine, at the outset, the actual present character of that church body. When we talk about the Missouri Synod, are we talking about an orthodox church body, an erring church body, or a heterodox church body? This must be settled unequivocally, and it cannot be decided by emotional reflections on what the Missouri Synod once was, or meant to us, or by hopeful expressions of what she may one day again mean to us. We are facing, not an idealization, but a real church body standing before us in a framework of its declared position in doctrine and practice.

Schaller defined an orthodox church body as “one which consistently, through official declaration and confession, teaches the Word of God in its truth and purity,” and one in which its practice “is in full accord with that doctrine.” An erring church body has been “overtaken in a fault” by following corrupt leadership “but is taking energetic steps to restore its orthodox character by vigorous discipline.” A heterodox church “persistently, by official pronouncement and resolution,

---

<sup>94</sup> Frederic E. Blume, “A State of Confession: A Study of Its Implications on the basis of II Thess. 3:14-15.” *NL* 39 (2 November 1952): 345. See also E[dmund] Reim, “As We See It: Questions and Answers,” *NL* 39 (16 November 1952): 360.

<sup>95</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1953*, 104–5. See also E[dmund] Reim, “As We See It: Special Convention Of The Joint Synod Of Wisconsin Held in Milwaukee October 8–9.” *NL* 40 (1 November 1953): 344–5.

<sup>96</sup> Egbert Schaller to the Committee on Church Union, 10 September 1953; in Oscar Siegler, File # 1, WELS Archives, WLS, Mequon, Wis.

advocates and justifies a corruption or an ambiguous form of any doctrine of God’s Word and tolerates unscriptural practice.”

If Missouri were still an orthodox church, “all the admonition directed against her by our Synod would have to be classified as a disgraceful clamor of words.” But after 15 years of “fruitless appeal for correction and the most patient admonition on our part,” Missouri’s aberrations and offenses had increased, not diminished. It would be unrealistic to consider the Missouri Synod an involuntarily erring church body. A church body must be considered heterodox when heterodoxy “has become its fixed characteristic.” Though “the Lord in that body still has thousands of faithful,” it “does not change the verdict upon the church body as such.” Schaller then reviewed the past quarter-century of intersynodical history, offering “compelling evidence that the Missouri Synod, once an orthodox body, has become a heterodox body.”<sup>97</sup>

Edmund Reim—seminary professor, member of Wisconsin’s Church Union Committee, chief commentator on church fellowship and intersynodical developments for *The Northwestern Lutheran* and the *Quartalschrift* since 1940, highly regarded as a “stalwart leader” and a “kind, deep thinker, never radical”<sup>98</sup>—grew increasingly frustrated over Missouri’s seeming dismissal of Wisconsin’s concerns, coupled with growing uncertainty over the sturdiness of his own synod’s convictions. “The real danger,” Reim wrote in 1954, is that the Wisconsin Synod would “continue to hold [its] convictions—but only in theory,” to “view with alarm, to deplore, to criticize—and let it go at that. . . .

The danger in this period is that we become soft in our purpose, indifferent to the same false teaching and practice that we once sensed very clearly and against which we have earnestly warned. For it is entirely possible that during this interval we consult with flesh and blood and thus get to the point where we not only condone,

---

<sup>97</sup> Schaller cited various unionistic activities, a false doctrine of prayer fellowship, failure to identify the Papacy as the Antichrist, and divergence from the *Brief Statement*.

<sup>98</sup> Survey responses 72, 4.

but—even though not as a synod, yet as individuals—actually participate in the very things which we know to be wrong.<sup>99</sup>

At the close of a Church Union Committee meeting in May 1955, Reim warned that failure to break with Missouri at Wisconsin's upcoming convention "would raise grave doubts that Wisconsin can ever take a stand." The synod "would fail others outside our body who have taken a stand with us and now look to us as the major body still left upholding Scriptural principles." Not breaking would disappoint some in Missouri and many in the Norwegian Synod. "Not to take a stand this year would mean telling others who already have suffered, [that] they were wrong [and] should go back to Missouri."<sup>100</sup>

Reim's concerns escalated on 24 June 1955 when the Norwegian Synod resolved to break fellowship with the LCMS because "to continue the arguments by word and pen will be more likely to further aggravate than to resolve our difference." Reim praised the Norwegians' action.

No one can fail to detect the note of sadness in these words over the loss of a precious and historic relationship. But also, no one can fail to recognize the sturdy conviction, the bold determination, the simple sincerity of this confession. The Norwegians are a small group, but they have met a major test magnificently. They have measured up! God grant that we do as well when the time for our decision comes!<sup>101</sup>

Wisconsin delegates to the 1955 convention recognized how momentous this convention would be.<sup>102</sup> Synod President Oscar Naumann, chosen in 1953 to succeed John Brenner, stated that

---

<sup>99</sup> E[dmund] Reim, "As We See It: Lest, when I have preached to others . . .," *NL* 41 (18 April 1954): 124.

<sup>100</sup> Oscar Siegler, handwritten notes of the Union Committee meeting, 9 May 1955. Oscar Siegler, File # 1, WELS Archives, WLS, Mequon, Wis.

<sup>101</sup> E[dmund] Reim, "As We See It . . . The Norwegian Action," *NL* 42 (10 July 1955): 216.

<sup>102</sup> Fredrich, "The Great Debate," 167, wrote that "one would have to go back as far as 1868," when the fledgling Wisconsin Synod voted to discontinue its membership in the General Council and to sever its financial connection to unionistic German mission societies, "for a synodical convention equal to that of 1955 in significance for the interchurch relations field."

synodical leadership had “reached the conviction” that the Missouri Synod was guilty of causing the divisions and offenses Romans 16:17 spoke of. “For those of us who have been closest to these problems” it seemed “quite definite” that the Wisconsin Synod must now obey the command of the passage to “avoid them.”

Yet Naumann also urged delegates to “implore the Holy Spirit to guide and direct us” as the synod had to decide whether now was the proper time to apply that command or “whether we still have an unpaid debt of love to those whose fellowship we cherished so many years.”<sup>103</sup> The ambivalence Naumann expressed was manifest in the actions Wisconsin conventions took in 1955, 1956, and 1957. Wisconsin’s seeming inability to act decisively aggravated tensions already simmering within the synod and precipitated an internal struggle that led to the departure of dozens of congregations from the synod when it postponed breaking with Missouri.

The Standing Committee on Church Union recommended to the 1955 convention that “with deepest sorrow” the Wisconsin Synod must terminate its fellowship with the Missouri Synod. The Standing Committee was “aware of the tremendous consequences which this contemplated separation entails, for those projects in which our synods have been jointly engaged.” The convention’s floor committee agreed with the Standing Committee’s judgment that Missouri had “created divisions and offenses by its official resolutions, policies and practices.” Yet it felt “constrained” to offer a resolution that action be delayed until a recessed session in 1956 because of “the far reaching spiritual consequences” of the resolution. Deferring action for one year would enable Wisconsin to “heed the Scriptural exhortations to patience and forbearance in love by giving the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod opportunity to express itself in its 1956 convention.”<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1955*, 13–4.

<sup>104</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1955*, 79, 86.

Asked whether Romans 16:17 applied now or only in 1956, the floor committee chair answered: “Divisions and offenses are sufficient for cessation of fellowship. Most of the committee feels that it shouldn’t apply now. Others don’t agree. I think we agree that we aren’t ready to agree on its application.” Pressed further, the chairman added, “We feel [Romans 16:17] *is* applicable now, but feel that for other reasons we should defer.” Some on the convention floor suggested that the Romans passage called for “an avoiding that is progressive—a gradual leaning away; or that it could also be understood to refer to the inward avoiding of the error within our hearts.” One pastor rose to say:

I want to express my concern about all this talk of the applicability of Romans 16:17. Some divide the delegates into two groups, those who want to sever now, and those (including me) who don’t feel bound in conscience to sever yet. But I do feel that Romans 16:17 applies *now*, in fact we have been applying it. . . . I want to go on record as believing that we are practicing Romans 16:17, but don’t want to be accused of violating that word. I don’t say that we’re violating or rejecting Romans 16:17. I just don’t feel that this is the time to take the final step.<sup>105</sup>

Seven members of the 22 members of the floor committee registered a dissenting vote, saying they were “of the conviction that the reasons stated for delay do not warrant postponement of action upon the resolution.” Convention delegates unanimously adopted the preamble of the resolution, recognizing Missouri as a “persistently erring” church body. The resolution itself, calling for postponement of terminating fellowship until 1956, was adopted by a standing vote of 94 to 47.<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>105</sup> Egbert Schaller, “The ‘Status Controversiae’ (The Principle Question in the Controversy) Within the Synodical Conference” (essay presented to the Dakota-Montana District Conference, Wisconsin Synod, 1958), 16–8; emphases in the original. Schaller indicated that these exchanges “took place as noted down in writing at the time,” and “according to notes taken at that session.” His notes were “as literal a reproduction of the speaker’s expression as was possible under the circumstances.” Schaller claimed to retain “a vivid recollection” of the convention events, and the wording in his notes “reproduces correctly both the substance and the flavor of what was said.”

<sup>106</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1955*, 86–8.

What should have been done at the 1955 convention “is still being debated,” Edward Fredrich has admitted, “and even what was done is still on occasion in dispute.”<sup>107</sup> One member of the floor committee recalled that although he had come to the personal conviction that Wisconsin should break from Missouri, he feared many synod members had not been adequately informed to make a decision. If the resolution had passed by only a slim margin, greater harm than good may have resulted. But one convention delegate expressed the opposite view. “For me it was very disappointing to have the ’55 convention clearly recognize the situation it was facing with the LCMS, also say clearly what God’s Word asks of one in [such a] situation,” but not carry it through. “Many people at the convention felt sad and burdened. Many signed their names, protesting the failure to act.”<sup>108</sup>

During the next two years numerous protests were filed with the synod “for not immediately putting Romans 16:17 into force and breaking with Missouri.” Bible passages “flew back and forth.”<sup>109</sup> The Rhinelander Delegate Conference in northern Wisconsin “deeply regretted” the delay. Gilbert Sydow, pastor in Ellensburg, Washington, told President Naumann he would not be upholding the Synod’s 1955 decision and had informed his congregation he believed there was an “ungodly separating” of “mark” and “avoid” in the Romans passage.<sup>110</sup> Pastor V. E. Greve and Withrow Ev. Lutheran Church in Washington also protested the synod’s actions as “a mutilation of Scripture. . . .

The Wisconsin Synod has become guilty of being only “sounding brass and tinkling cymbal.” Since 1939 it has spoken well, it has witnessed a good confession,

---

<sup>107</sup> Fredrich, “The Great Debate,” 167.

<sup>108</sup> Survey responses 4, 20.

<sup>109</sup> Birner, “The Saga of a Mission District,” 55–6.

<sup>110</sup> Notes of the Union Committee meeting, 17 October 1955. Oscar Siegler, File # 2, WELS Archives, WLS, Mequon, Wis.

it has drawn nigh with its lips, but as a body it lacks courage to carry out its professed convictions. The Wisconsin Synod has reached the point that its sincerity is not in evidence. It has not proven itself, to others, and above all to God, that it meant what it said. . . . The Wisconsin Synod has failed to acquit itself as men in standing up for the truth of Scripture, but has come to a disregard for God's command; to a mutilating of Scripture.<sup>111</sup>

But Wisconsin's leaders did not view their decision to delay breaking with Missouri as a lack of courage, but as an exercise in patience and love.

Bonds of fellowship, which the Lord by His Holy Spirit had established, are not easily loosed. We will admonish longer, have greater patience, put forth more efforts of love to restore and re-establish through His Word a fellowship once given by God through which He has richly blessed us, than we will put forth in attempting to establish a new fellowship. We are not dealing with a strange church body whose doctrines have been examined and found wanting and whom we must deny the hand of fellowship from the outset. We are dealing with those who have been our brethren for many years and whose keeper we must be as they have been ours. We are not dealing with an individual soul, but with a large church body. Dealing with an individual can more readily be brought to a definite conclusion. But even there Jesus admonishes us to put forth every effort of love and patience in order to win the brother who has trespassed.<sup>112</sup>

Missouri's 1956 convention took into account Wisconsin's 1955 memorial.<sup>113</sup> The entire Wisconsin Union Committee attended Missouri's convention and found "a ray of hope" in Missouri's actions. Regarding intersynodical relations, the Union Committee was "heartened by the frankness with which [Missouri] acknowledged that strained relations exist between our Synods because there are very obvious differences of interpretation and practice" regarding fellowship.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup> Withrow Ev. Lutheran Church, V. E. Greve, Pastor to O[scar] J. Naumann, n. d.; Oscar Siegler, File # 2, WELS Archives, WLS, Mequon, Wis.

<sup>112</sup> Oscar J. Naumann, "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: 1956—A Year Of Decision," *NL* 43 (8 January 1956): 8–9.

<sup>113</sup> See Karl F. Krauss, "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: On the Credit Side of the Ledger," *NL* 43 (13 May 1956): 152–3.

<sup>114</sup> Oscar J. Naumann and Oscar J. Siegler, "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: Report of the Standing Committee on Matters of Church Union to the Nine Districts of the Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States," *NL* 43 (22 July 1956): 234–5. *The Confessional Lutheran* was not as optimistic about Missouri's 1956 convention, saying it was "difficult to analyze" the doctrinal

Wisconsin's Union Committee report to a special 1956 synodical convention urged delegates to "hold the judgment of our Saginaw convention in abeyance."<sup>115</sup> The convention approved the motion by a margin of more than 5-1. The convention also endorsed Wisconsin participation in "the suggested conclave of theologians and take immediate steps to arrange such a gathering of theologians," bringing pastors from overseas to become involved in a discussion of unresolved issues.<sup>116</sup>

For those aware of the serious tensions rising between the synods, the decision of the 1956 convention must have come "as a surprise, regardless of their personal stand on the issues." The decision revealed "a deep desire to do all that can be humanly done for the preservation of the fellowship of our Synodical Conference," and "a profound concern lest some favorable factor in the intersynodical picture be overlooked."<sup>117</sup>

E. E. Kowalke, professor at Northwestern College, delivered the 1956 convention essay, based on Romans 16:17-18. Most of his essay addressed disagreements between the synods over

---

resolutions delegates passed. "In some instances there seemed to be progress shown in the direction of a more conservative stand, while in many other instances the Synod either refused to take a stand, or took a stand which is unacceptable to those who hold to the Old Missouri position." After an extensive review, the author concluded, "There is really no justification for being more than mildly hopeful at the very most" of a Missouri change in direction. "A Report and Appraisal of the Convention of the Missouri Synod at St. Paul, 1956," *CL* 18 (February 1957): 17, 21.

<sup>115</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1956*, 52-61.

<sup>116</sup> E[dward] C. Fredrich, "Fellowship to Continue: Report of Recessed Convention," *NL* 43 (18 September 1956): 294-5.

<sup>117</sup> E[dmund] Reim, "The Wisconsin Reaction," *Qu* 53 (October 1956): 299. Armin Keibel, "Why the Wisconsin Synod suspended fellowship with the Missouri Synod," 9, recalled that Reim told the 1956 convention: "It was like a surgeon ready to sew up his inert patient when he detects a heartbeat. The flame of life needed to be fanned." In private, Keibel asked Reim whether he thought Missouri was shedding "alligator tears." Reim feared that was the case, yet maintained that Wisconsin was obliged to respond to Missouri's official actions.



interpretation of the passage. But Kowalke directed his last remarks to the growing question within the Wisconsin Synod over *when* Romans 16:17 was to be carried out:

Is human judgment involved here? Of course it is, just as human Christian judgment must be employed in following Christ's precepts as given in Matthew 18. Christian judgment determines when to cease from single personal admonition and when to call in others to help in winning the erring brother. Again, Christian judgment must be employed in choosing the two or three who are to join in admonishing the sinner. The alternative to Christian judgment in the practical application of this and all similar precepts is the legalistic form of application. In the case of Matthew 18 the legalist counts the number of admonitions, and when he gets to three the man is out, with no time wasted. . . .

If admonition proves to be fruitless and it becomes clear that our two bodies are no longer walking the same path, then of course a separation must be publicly declared as having taken place.

Kowalke also addressed the contentious spirit marking some calls for an immediate break with Missouri:

If it becomes necessary to declare the break as having taken place, then will come a time of great danger and temptation for the Wisconsin Synod. The first danger will be the temptation to be complacent and self-righteous for having taken a firm stand. There will be a tendency to look upon drastic action and vehement denunciation as evidence of orthodoxy. There will be the temptation to brand the weak, and the moderate too, as rank unionists. There will be those who will gauge a man's Christianity by his rigidity over against Missouri. Even now certain pastors are being called disloyal and dishonest because they expressed the hope that a break would be avoided. Here I could furnish exact quotes.<sup>118</sup>

Wisconsin's 1957 convention at New Ulm was, by one estimate, "a repeat of 1955," with the difference that "our union committee wanted to continue dealing with Missouri and our floor committee on union brought in a memorial to break."<sup>119</sup> In his preconvention report to the synod, First Vice President Irwin Habeck noted that "many individuals, several conferences, and one entire District" were convinced the synod was guilty of disobedience to the Word of God for not applying

---

<sup>118</sup> E[rwin] E. Kowalke, "Romans 16:17-18" (essay delivered at the pastoral conference of the Minnesota District, April 1956, repeated at the Wisconsin convention, August 1956), 11-2.

<sup>119</sup> Birner, "The Saga of a Mission District," 56.

Romans 16:17-18 to the Missouri Synod. Others were persuaded that doctrinal discussions being conducted by the two synods would be “the one means by which we can testify of our convictions.”<sup>120</sup>

In the convention essay, Elmer Kiessling, professor at Northwestern College, after reviewing both the admirable and ignoble features of the synod’s individualism and cohesiveness, urged, “Desirable as our individualism is, the need of the present hour is for cohesiveness.” Delegates needed to “remain united” if they were to take a positive stand on such important questions: “The trumpet must not only give a certain sound, but a single sound and one that is in tune.”

If the spirit of [synodical] harmony is momentarily lacking, it would seem better to wait and mark time, prayerfully, until God in his mercy restores it. In the meanwhile there are a thousand things to do in the Church of God that are not quite so spectacular as smashing the tie that binds but perhaps more important in the long run. There is the ever present need to do mission work, to nurture the gifts of the Spirit within congregations and to encourage the work of Christian scholarship in the schools. Let these things be done well and we don’t have to feel that we are remiss in our duties or in danger of losing our heritage.<sup>121</sup>

Convention delegates appeared evenly divided. One side insisted the break must be made because things had not improved in Missouri. The other side maintained that since little had changed between 1956 and 1957 it would be inconsistent to do at this convention what had not been done the year before.<sup>122</sup> The floor committee by a 4 to 1 margin favored a split.<sup>123</sup> One member of that floor committee recalled that a majority favored recommending a split, but three were opposed, hoping that Missouri would “clean up its act.”<sup>124</sup> Debate grew long and strenuous, though no speaker

---

<sup>120</sup> Irwin J. Habeck, “The Intersynodical Situation,” *NL* 44 (21 July 1957): 233. *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1957*, 15.

<sup>121</sup> Kiessling, “The Tie That Binds,” 117.

<sup>122</sup> Fredrich, *WSL*, 205.

<sup>123</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1957*, 130–6.

<sup>124</sup> Survey response 50.

defended Missouri's practices. Debate centered around the word *when*.<sup>125</sup> One delegate, initially in favor of the break, reconsidered after a layman shared with him that "members of the congregation didn't yet understand why we should be breaking. There needed to be more instruction."<sup>126</sup>

Memorable at this convention was that, during the debate, Professor Joh. P. Meyer, at 84 years of age, delivered "*ex temporalis* a brilliant exegesis on Romans 16:17-18." Previous speakers had been limited to five minutes, but when Meyer spoke, Vice President Habeck advised, "No limit on this speaker!"<sup>127</sup>

When the vote was called, delegates "decided that it would be proper for the Joint Union Committee to complete its agenda" and continue with its proposed Conclave of Theologians as well as carrying out the 1956 Synodical Conference recommendation that its joint union committee produce a common doctrinal statement to reflect the Conference's position on fellowship.<sup>128</sup> The final vote was 61 in support of the floor committee's recommendation to break fellowship, 77 against, and Wisconsin maintained its vigorously protesting fellowship with Missouri.<sup>129</sup>

In the view of seminary President Carl Lawrenz, Wisconsin's delegates in 1957 were not expressing a division over "the validity of the charges which the Wisconsin Synod has raised against the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, nor on the divisive nature of the issues involved." By voting as they did, they announced that they had not yet arrived at the conviction—as had the convention's floor committee—that "the time for suspending relations had come." They wanted recently

---

<sup>125</sup> Carleton Toppe, "Your Convention: Union Matters," *NL* 44 (1 September 1957): 283.

<sup>126</sup> Survey response 63.

<sup>127</sup> Reginald E. Pope, "The C. L. C. in South Dakota: 'The Turbulent Years'" (paper presented to the Eastern Pastor Conference, Dakota-Montana District, Wisconsin Synod, 26–27 October 1987), 6.

<sup>128</sup> Pope, "The C. L. C. in South Dakota," 6. Fredrich, *WSL*, 205.

<sup>129</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1957*, 144.

inaugurated discussions between the union committees of the involved synods to continue “so that the group might have an opportunity to come to grip with the actual controversial issues.”<sup>130</sup>

*CLC withdrawal*

But by voting as they did, delegates could no longer preserve the synod’s own fragile fellowship. As the convention came to its conclusion, Paul Albrecht, District President of the Dakota-Montana District, rose to the floor and said:

I know the Bible passage, “Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head and honor the face of the old man.” Prof. Meyer knows that I have loved and honored him since the day that I first met him. But I must disagree with him now; for I cannot operate with Scripture as he did last night. To heed his advice would lead straight down the path of unionism.

I agree with him when he says that it would be sinful to say, “I am THROUGH with the Wisconsin Synod.” I shall never be through with the Wisconsin Synod as little as I can ever be through with any member of my own family.

BUT I cannot follow the course which the Synod has now chosen. . . . This decision I shall oppose with all my might because it is a rejection of a clear Word of God.

Under these circumstances, I will, of course, not be able to serve the Synod on its Union Committee, nor in any other way which would mean support of the Synod’s decision to reject the [floor committee’s report] and its use of Romans 16:17,18.

While I do not refuse the hand of fellowship to all members of the Synod, I cannot fellowship with those who have advocated the position which the Synod made its own last night. II Thes. 3:6, 11, 14, 15. (It is self-evident that fellowship with those who now or in the future support and advocate the Synod’s present position is impossible.)

I am fully aware of the implication of this statement as far as my District is concerned.<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>130</sup> Carl Lawrenz, “Resolutions on the Intersynodical Issues,” *Qu* 54 (October 1957): 292–3. See also Irwin J. Habeck, “Disobedient to God’s Word?” *NL* 45 (27 April 1958): 135–6.

<sup>131</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1957*, 145–6; emphases in the original.

The front page story of *The Milwaukee Journal* on Monday 19 August 1957 announced that Edmund Reim resigned as president of Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary and as a member of the synod “as a result of the refusal by the Wisconsin synod to break off relations with the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.”<sup>132</sup> If he were a congregational pastor, Reim said, he might have continued serving while protesting Wisconsin’s continued affiliation with Missouri. But “because of his position at the seminary—a position in which he was guiding theological students—he was resigning.” The same story reported that Pacific Northwest District President Maynard Witt also resigned from the synod, and that Albrecht resigned his position on the synod’s church union committee.<sup>133</sup>

To Paul Nolting, pastor in Sleepy Eye, Minnesota, the convention resolution maintaining its “vigorously protesting fellowship” was “an artificial and unconvincing ‘official interpretation,’” necessitated “to make this obvious disobedience appear to be obedience.”<sup>134</sup> That a majority of delegates could reject a floor committee report “completely and entirely in accord with the Scriptures” signaled “something terribly wrong.” Comments made on the convention floor “that should have been corrected immediately but were not” strengthened one letter writer’s perception

---

<sup>132</sup> Already in 1955, Reim had said from the convention floor, “I can continue in fellowship with my Synod only under clear and public protest.” He resigned his position as secretary of the synod’s Standing Committee on Church Union and, insisting that he could not change his stand and teaching “in order to conform to the synodical policy,” also offered his resignation as president and professor at the seminary. *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1955*, 87–8. The seminary’s board of control subsequently voted not to accept Reim’s resignation. In 1957, Reim cited his 1955 statement that the convention’s action not only failed to remove the occasion for his protest, but “increases and confirms it.” Since his “clear and strong” protest to the synod had been “disregarded,” Reim found himself “compelled to discontinue [his] fellowship with the Synod,” adding: “I trust that you will realize that I take this step, not in anger, but in deepest sorrow, and because I am constrained by the Word of God.” *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1957*, 144–5.

<sup>133</sup> “Head of School Quits in Lutheran Dispute,” *MJ*, 19 August 1957, 1:1.

<sup>134</sup> Paul F. Nolting, “*Mark . . . Avoid*”: *Origin of the CLC* (Coordinating Council of the Church of the Lutheran Confession, West Columbia, S. C.: Office of the Secretary, 1970), 8.

that “the Wisconsin Synod is a very sick synod.”<sup>135</sup> Now being suggested was the possibility “of forming a small synod” for the “continuance of orthodoxy.” To do so might notify “the liberals among us that we will not have them take over synod and its doctrinal policy” and that “they might find themselves outside of Synod unless they confess Scripture-wise with us.”<sup>136</sup>

By October 1957 at least 25 protests were lodged against the convention’s action to remain in fellowship with Missouri. Pastor Robert Reim of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, protested synod’s resolution. Martin Galstad, professor at Dr. Martin Luther College in New Ulm, could not support synod’s position. Pastor Gilbert Sydow suspended membership with the synod while maintaining an organizational tie (Sydow called it “holding membership in abeyance for the time being”). Pastor Paul Knickelbein in Milwaukee protested the synod’s disobedience to the Word, noting that more than 200 Wisconsin Synod members belonged to the unionistic group Lutheran Men of America. Pastor Marvin Radtke of Ann Arbor, Michigan, could not accept synod’s action as being in conformity with Romans 16:17 and believed discussions with Missouri should continue only outside the framework of fellowship. Pastor William Wiedenmeyer in Phoenix issued a vehement protest against the synod’s action and promised to do everything possible to persuade his congregation to suspend synodical membership and withdraw its financial support. Pastor George Barthels in Red Wing, Minnesota, protested and disavowed the synod’s actions, and Pastor Edwin Bonieck of Flint, Michigan, registered his support of the Floor Committee’s resolution. Twelve pastors from the Colorado Pastoral Conference disavowed the synod’s actions as a violation of the Word; they, eight pastors of the Lake Superior Pastoral Conference and the entire Winnebago Pastoral Conference asked for a special synod convention. Pastor John Lau of Onalaska, Wisconsin, and six members of

---

<sup>135</sup> Philip R. Janke to The Protest Committee, 30 August 1957; copy in possession of the author.

<sup>136</sup> Armin C. Keibel to Joel Gerlach, 29 August 1957; copy in possession of the author.

his church council protested. Pastors Robert Dommer of Spokane and Leonnard Bernthal in Clarkston, Washington, suspended fellowship with Wisconsin as a persistently erring body.<sup>137</sup> In Japan, missionary Fred Tiefel resigned from the synod.<sup>138</sup>

At a meeting of the New Ulm pastoral conference at Sleepy Eye on 25 September 1957 Paul Nolting presented a detailed study that solidified the interpretation of the words *mark* and *avoid* in Romans 16:17 among those protesting the synod's decision. Nolting's paper became the declaratory statement defining their differences with the synod, not as a matter of timing but of doctrinal disagreement.<sup>139</sup>

Since the admonition to *mark* was given "in the interest of self-protection against the errorists," Nolting rejected the addition of any concept of admonition to the word: "The simultaneous physical and practical effect of the marking upon the marker is the avoiding," with no time lapse. "The avoiding is simultaneous with the marking. . . .

The action of the verb is directed at anyone and everyone who persistently disobeys the Truth in doctrine and practice, thus causing divisions and offenses. We reject any argument that this passage calls for admonition, while granting the admonitory effect of the "avoiding." . . . This passage is dealing with people who, as far as our generation is concerned, always have been disobedient to the Truth or people who were once obedient but who, despite all admonition, have become persistently disobedient. The latter situation concerns us at the moment. Romans 16,17 PRESUPPOSES loving admonition. It comes after such admonition has failed, for it has to do with people who are persistently disobedient, and are thus

---

<sup>137</sup> Oscar Siegler, File # 2: WELS Archives, WLS, Mequon, Wis.

<sup>138</sup> Open letter, Fred G. Tiefel, 24 October 1957; copy in possession of the author.

<sup>139</sup> Survey response 4. Lyle Lange went so far as to say that Nolting's paper "gave rise to the CLC." Lyle Lange, "The Doctrinal Differences Between the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod and the Church of the Lutheran Confession, the Concordia Lutheran Conference, and the Lutheran Churches of the Reformation" (paper presented to the Minnesota District Pastoral Conference, Wisconsin Synod, St. James, Minn., April 1985), 10.

causing divisions and offenses. This passage is the end of the trail. Its only admonition is the possible admonitory effect of the “avoiding.”<sup>140</sup>

Rejecting the plea that Missouri “had not yet been convincingly proven to be persistent in causing divisions and offenses,” he insisted that Wisconsin had been “patiently and lovingly admonishing the Missouri Synod” to no avail since 1939. He rejected as “sophistry” the argument that *avoiding* must be “deferred until all hope of regaining the erring is extinguished,” and asked, “Where in God’s Word does God give us the right to disobey NOW because of the possibility of a change in the FUTURE?” Had God spoken that way, “the time for avoiding would never come, for His people would be weakened by constant contact with the erring to the point of inability to act.”<sup>141</sup>

On 22 October 1957 a special convention of the Dakota-Montana District met at Aberdeen, South Dakota, to address the synod convention’s resolutions. District President Albrecht may have returned from the New Ulm convention believing he could win his entire district to his point of view. Other members of the district became convinced, however, that Albrecht had been selective in the information he had shared with them regarding the direction of Wisconsin’s leadership.<sup>142</sup> The thinking of the “Albrecht group”—though, admittedly, “no more than talk”—was to make Northwestern Lutheran Academy at Mobridge, South Dakota, the college for a new Dakota-Montana Synod, with the recently completed education building at Albrecht’s Bowdle, South Dakota, congregation serving as the new synod’s seminary. When a district floor committee rejected Albrecht’s report and endorsed the synod’s continued negotiations with Missouri, Albrecht offered his resignation as district president, which was debated and rejected.<sup>143</sup>

---

<sup>140</sup> Paul Nolting, “Romans 16:17” (essay presented at the New Ulm Pastoral Conference, Sleepy Eye, Minn., Wisconsin Synod, 25 September 1957), 4, 7, 8–9.

<sup>141</sup> Nolting, “Romans 16:17,” 13–5.

<sup>142</sup> Birner, “The Saga of a Mission District,” 57.

<sup>143</sup> Pope, “The C. L. C. in South Dakota,” 10–1.



One participant in those meetings suggested that Albrecht's "fall from grace" was "not entirely a disagreement with his theological position" but partly a reaction to "his dictatorial relationship" with candidates moving into his district. "Many were looking for a way to stick it to him."<sup>144</sup>

After additional meetings and a certain amount of intrigue, the district at its regular 1958 convention urged the Wisconsin Synod to continue its negotiations with Missouri and elected Walter Schumann, Jr., president in Albrecht's place. Ultimately five congregations with seven pastors and eight hundred communicants left the Dakota-Montana District.<sup>145</sup>

The grief of the 1950s was still evident in President Schumann's report to the 1960 district convention. More recently, Schumann reflected:

Many, many are the times I have relived [those turbulent years], wondering what actions we could have taken along the way to minimize the district's losses. I have come to the conclusion that in reality there were none. The initiative always seemed to rest with the opposition. The "colored" reports brought back from Milwaukee, the secret meetings to which only a select few were invited, the declarations of suspended fellowship, the exclusive communion services, the establishment of a separate conference, the attempts to lead entire congregations out of the Synod, the efforts to gain control of physical property—all were instigated by the opposition. It seemed we were always on the defensive, reacting to challenges from the other side. I must confess that I don't know what else we could have done to prevent the losses that the district experienced.<sup>146</sup>

Those who lived through it maintain differing recollections. "Some of [the pastors] did not really want to leave," said one who stayed, "but after the big power shift in the district, they were

---

<sup>144</sup> Survey response 65.

<sup>145</sup> Herbert Birner described twelve letters Albrecht claimed to have received protesting the district's action in rejecting his report; these letters, it turned out, were written at a "semi-secret meeting" orchestrated by Albrecht himself. Birner, "The Saga of a Mission District," 58.

<sup>146</sup> Walter Schumann to Herbert Birner, in Birner, "The Saga of a Mission District," 63–4. Birner noted the date of Schumann's letter as 8 July 1994, but the letter must have been written earlier because Birner delivered his essay 14–16 June 1994.

disfellowshipped. Those were scary days. It was three strikes and you were out.”<sup>147</sup> According to a member of the post-1958 praesidium, however, “Each and every one who made it known that he was a part of the ‘minority’ were visited in their studies in a spirit of reconciliation,” and if that effort failed, “a personal letter was sent to them explaining their personal situation concerning their membership in the District and the Synod. No one was ever ‘written off.’” While many pastors in the “minority” eventually returned to the district, “the praesidium did have to recognize a confessional stand when they were given it.” Those “who sincerely and confessionally found it impossible to return were some of the prominent formulators of the Church of the Lutheran Confession.”<sup>148</sup>

In other regions of the synod, movements also began developing to form a new church body. Immanuel at Mankato, Minnesota, one of the largest Wisconsin Synod congregations in its Minnesota District, had withdrawn from the synod already in 1956.<sup>149</sup> A free conference at Immanuel on 4–5 December 1957 was attended by other pastors and congregations that had withdrawn from the synod. The minutes of that meeting record that the purpose of the conference

---

<sup>147</sup> Survey response 65.

<sup>148</sup> Pope, “The C. L. C. in South Dakota,” 21.

<sup>149</sup> “Head of School Quits in Lutheran Dispute,” 1:8. To illustrate Immanuel Pastor Gervasius Fischer’s displeasure with both synods, two items appeared in the congregational newsletter for January 1958. The first, entitled, “Missouri in Public Relations,” criticized how far the synod would go “to bring its hollow worldly glory to the world” by having Lutheran Hour speaker Oswald Hoffmann appear in the Rose Bowl parade on a float with the motto, “Where Dreams Come True.” Commented Fischer: “Was the motto and float symbolic of Jeremiah 23:27f.?” The second article, “We Nominate,” accused the Wisconsin Synod church in Mankato of “having reached the lowest possible point in church publicity” by placing an ad that said, “SORRY! WE RAN PLUM OUT OF CHOW AT OUR HARVEST SUPPER AND BAZAAR OCTOBER 3. We’ll plan for much more next year! Thank you for coming over and please plan to stop in on us next time. THANK YOU.” Copy in possession of the author.

was “to begin working toward the goal of organizing [a new church body] but not to fully organize at this time.”<sup>150</sup>

Similar exploratory meetings were held at Trinity Church, Spokane, Washington, 18–19 November 1957, and Gethsemane Church, Opportunity, Washington, 23–24 January 1958. At a free conference at Redeemer Church, Cheyenne, Wyoming, 6–8 May 1958, *The Lutheran Spokesman* was begun; its first issue appeared in June 1958 and was published bi-monthly thereafter. At the first full convention of the CLC in 1960 the *Spokesman* was designated the official organ of the church body.<sup>151</sup>

The record of an Interim Conference in Mankato, 13–15 January 1959, showed 21 pastors, 7 teachers, 16 lay people, and 4 seminary students registered as participants. The group expressed interest in forming a school for training pastors and teachers. Another Interim Committee Meeting<sup>152</sup> convened at Red Wing, Minnesota, 18–21 August 1959, only a week after the synod’s convention met in Saginaw. On 9–12 August 1960, meeting in Watertown, South Dakota, delegates selected “Church of the Lutheran Confession” from among nine proposed names. Delegates also conducted their first colloquy, declaring a recent graduate from Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary as a candidate for the CLC ministry. On 23 December 1960 articles of incorporation for the CLC were filed with the

---

<sup>150</sup> “Report of the Conference Held at Immanuel Lutheran Church, Mankato, Minnesota. December 4th–5th, 1957,” copy in possession of the author.

<sup>151</sup> Carl M. Gullerud, “History of the Church of the Lutheran Confession” (mimeographed essay, n. d., WLS essay file, Mequon, Wis., n. d.), I:5.

<sup>152</sup> *This is Your Church: Church of the Lutheran Confession* (CLC Book House, 1985), 15, explained, “When it became apparent in which direction things were going, the group called itself ‘The Interim Conference.’” The name “had reference to the time between the withdrawing from one synodical organization and participating in the formation of another.”

state of Minnesota. A recessed convention in Sleepy Eye, Minnesota, 24–26 January 1961, launched the *Journal of Theology* as the CLC’s official doctrinal publication.<sup>153</sup>

Statistics for 1960 showed 7,120 baptized members and 4,740 communicants in 44 congregations, and 276 Christian day school students in 7 schools taught by 15 teachers. By 1975 the numbers had risen to 9,790 souls, 7,105 communicants in 72 congregations, and 443 students in 15 Christian day schools with 45 teachers. In addition, the CLC has maintained Immanuel College and Seminary in Eau Claire, Wisconsin, since 1963.<sup>154</sup>

### *Gehrke and Jungkuntz*

Not all the synodical turmoil was fomented by those who disagreed with the synod’s 1955 convention decision or among those who considered it sinful to allow time to pass between the *marking* and *avoiding* of Romans 16:17. For some, the differences with synodical brethren were not over when the *marking* and *avoiding* should take place but over the very notion of applying that passage to the Missouri Synod at all. This minority argued that *avoid them* could refer only to non-Christians or to the willfully deceptive, not to professed Christians who disagreed over doctrines that were not central to the faith.<sup>155</sup>

Some of that disagreement came from two professors at Northwestern College, Ralph Gehrke and Richard Jungkuntz.<sup>156</sup> Both are remembered as popular, gifted professors, as was their predecessor Martin Franzmann, who also taught at Northwestern before moving to Concordia

---

<sup>153</sup> Gullerud, “History of the Church of the Lutheran Confession,” I:2, 11–3, 25–6; II:5.

<sup>154</sup> *This is Your Church*, 26–30. *The Northwestern Lutheran* reported almost none of the developments concerning the establishment of the CLC, but other Lutheran publications did. See the ULCA’s *The Lutheran*, “Wisconsin Dissenters Open School,” 42 (25 November 1959): 7–8. “Wisconsin Synod Rift Widens,” (3 February 1960): 7–8. “Wisconsin Split Hardens,” (2 March 1960): 7–8.

<sup>155</sup> Kiessling, *History*, 35. Survey response 49.

<sup>156</sup> Survey response 30.

Seminary, St. Louis, in 1946.<sup>157</sup> One student recalled Gehrke's courses in ancient history and the history of the Greeks as the most thorough he ever had on those subjects.<sup>158</sup>

Following the 1955 convention, the synod's Union Committee received a letter from Gehrke, different from the many letters protesting the convention action. Attached to his letter was a list of concerns he had addressed to the convention's floor committee. Wisconsin had no right to apply Romans 16 to heretics, Gehrke insisted, because it had not defined Missouri's false doctrine clearly enough to make the charge stick. Romans 16 was meant to excommunicate or "anathematize," but Wisconsin could not do that to Missouri now.<sup>159</sup>

The synod had to be very clear on what it would mean to break with Missouri over church fellowship. Altar and pulpit fellowship; congregational transfers of memberships; joint work in parochial schools, missions, and Bethesda Lutheran Home in Watertown, Wisconsin—all would be discontinued. Church fellowship was "fellowship in the means of grace," Gehrke contended, and "if we use Romans 16 in this connection, we are bound to [the] above results." Gehrke opposed the termination of all fellowship with Missouri because in Romans 16 "Paul does not refer to [a] theological stand or application," but "to [the] Gospel." Did Missouri's stand "rest on the same level with great soul-destroying heresies? No, a thousand times, no." The most that could be said at this time was that "we cannot continue operating with Missouri."

A second option, precipitated by intersynodical difficulties, was that Wisconsin could suspend joint work with Missouri simply as a practical matter, without resorting to Romans 16 or

---

<sup>157</sup> Erwin E. Kowalke, *Centennial Story: Northwestern College, 1865–1965* (Watertown, Wis.: Northwestern College, 1965), 191.

<sup>158</sup> James Kiecker, interview by author, Milwaukee, Wis., 28 April 1997.

<sup>159</sup> Oscar Siegler, File # 2, WELS Archives, WLS, Mequon, Wis. Gehrke's letters are not included in the file, but the notes of the Union Committee meeting of Monday 17 October 1955 contain, in Siegler's handwriting, a summary of Gehrke's letter. Quotations are, therefore, direct quotes of Siegler's notes, not necessarily Gehrke's own words.

Titus 3<sup>160</sup> for proof. This option Gehrke also rejected: “Here too we have to clearly define where Missouri violates Scriptures and [the] Confessions.” A third alternative would require Wisconsin to “continue present discussions inside [the] framework [of fellowship] at present.” If a break became unavoidable, Wisconsin must first “clearly give confession” and “point out Missouri’s error.” Many Wisconsin members “had not come to grips” with what a break in fellowship would mean. “To force [the] issue now [would] disturb thousands of consciences.” Gehrke saw “some glimpses of hope that Missouri will not go down the road to liberalism.” Wisconsin “should still follow Galatians 6” and regard Missouri as “overtaken in a fault.”<sup>161</sup> Gehrke himself was “ready to appear personally before [the] committee if requested.”

The Union Committee referred Gehrke’s letter to the synod’s Conference of Presidents and to the Northwestern Board of Control. Thus Northwestern President E. E. Kowalke must have been aware of Gehrke’s position. Kowalke’s essay at the recessed convention in 1956 at Watertown—an exegesis of the Romans passage—seems clearly to have been a response to the Gehrke letter. Gehrke’s position bore obvious similarities to the positions of Adolph Brux and Hermann Sasse. By criticizing the view of Brux and Sasse, Kowalke was also refuting Gehrke.

Dr. Brux insists that Paul refers only to fundamental doctrines that touch the very person of Christ and that the contrary doctrines are those that remove the very foundation from under the Christian Church. Dr. Sasse too believes that the contrary doctrine here refers to the heresies that destroyed the Gospel of Christ, the great heresies of ancient times and the heresies of the grosser sects of modern times. Luther’s interpretation had much broader coverage. He includes all human doctrine as apart from and in addition to the teaching of Christ.<sup>162</sup>

---

<sup>160</sup> “A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth; being condemned of himself” (Titus 3:10; *KJV*).

<sup>161</sup> “Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted. Bear ye one another’s burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ” (Galatians 6:1–2; *KJV*).

<sup>162</sup> Kowalke, “Romans 16:17–18,” 5.

Kowalke also clearly regarded Missouri's errors as being in violation of the Romans passage:

Paul is warning all Christians who create such *divisions* and scandals as were happening in Rome. What is it that has caused the rift in the Synodical Conference? Is it not minding of earthly things, the exaltation of human doctrines? What is the religion of Scouting but a scheme set alongside the Gospel as a rival road to perfection? What is the official religion as recommended for the armed forces but an amalgamation of all religions, on the assumption that all are equally good and true? Is that not a doctrine and a thing of the flesh? What is the publicity hunger but a worship of an earthly thing? Is that not serving the belly? . . . What are we fighting about? Is it not that we are no longer traveling the same road? We no longer think the same way or speak the same language or judge by the same principles. The Union Negotiations, the Chaplaincy, the Scouting Alliance, the numerous cases of joint prayer at public functions with representatives of denominations not in fellowship with us are all cases in point.<sup>163</sup>

In 1958 Gehrke was assigned the doctrinal essay at the Western Wisconsin District convention, held, ironically, at Northwestern College, where Kowalke delivered his essay on Romans 16 in 1956 and where both professors taught. The official convention report, authored by yet another Northwestern professor, Carleton Toppe, noted only that Gehrke "identified the boundaries of church fellowship as those of communion fellowship and pointed out that our relations with other Lutherans must be based on the principles set forth in Article VII of the Augsburg Confession."<sup>164</sup> Toppe's description appears straightforward, even benign, but a clear understanding of the issues and a close parsing of Toppe's carefully chosen words hint at how controversial Gehrke's paper was.

"We cannot afford to imagine that these principles [of church fellowship] are clear in our midst or that everything is settled when it is not," Gehrke began. "Much clarification must take place." Citing Acts 2:41-42 and the Lutheran Confessions, Gehrke repeated the statement he made in his 1955 letter:

Our Augsburg Confession describes the Church . . . in its famous 7th article, saying, "The Church is the congregation of saints in which the Gospel is rightly

---

<sup>163</sup> Kowalke, "Romans 16:17-18," 10; emphasis in the original.

<sup>164</sup> C[arleton] Toppe, "Western Wisconsin District Convention," *NL* 45 (3 August 1958): 248.

taught and the Sacraments are rightly administered. And to the true unity of the Church it is enough to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments.” So according to both our Lutheran confessions and the Scripture Church Fellowship is participation in the means of grace.<sup>165</sup>

*Church Fellowship* was the same thing as *Communion Fellowship*, and “genuine church fellowship arises from our partaking of and union with Christ through the means of grace.”

Where, then, are the boundaries of communion fellowship? Citing early church tradition, Luther, and the New Testament, including Romans 16, Gehrke argued that so many American Lutherans had given up the old principles regarding church fellowship because “they have really lost the old Lutheran understanding of the Sacrament.” Article VII of the Augsburg Confession never identified the Lutheran Church as “the only holy, universal Christian church, as the Roman church claims of itself.” People come to faith wherever the Gospel is preached and the sacraments are rightly administered. A church need not have “an explicitly historic confessional statement” to be a true church, but the Lutheran church must bear the “essential mark” of the historic Lutheran Confessions.<sup>166</sup>

Gehrke lamented that “an erroneous idea of the unity of the Lutheran Church, and therefore also of church fellowship” had arisen even in some Wisconsin Synod writings. These writings insisted that agreement must be based not only on “the doctrine of the Gospel and of the administration of the Sacraments” but on “all so-called ‘doctrinal statements’ that can be directly or indirectly drawn from the Holy Scripture.” They demanded “uniformity in the interpretation of all passages in the Bible that have ‘doctrinal’ import,” which were derived “by means of their doctrinal system of theories and theological opinions.” But the clarity of Scripture “does *not* guarantee that

---

<sup>165</sup> Ralph Gehrke, “Church Fellowship” (essay delivered to the twenty-first biennial convention of the Western Wisconsin District, Northwestern College, Watertown, Wis., 15 July 1958), 1–2.

<sup>166</sup> Gehrke, “Church Fellowship,” 4–11, 12–3.



the full exhaustive meaning of a Bible passage must immediately be grasped by every well-meaning Christian reader.” Remarking on “the call of these Orthodox Lutheran people” to go “back to the *Brief Statement*,” Gehrke asserted, “We just can’t put the temporary consensus of such little theological schools and trends in thinking in place of that consensus of the Church which overspans the ages and which we have in our Lutheran Confessions.”

The practical upshot of Gehrke’s paper was that “we cannot put all church bodies with which we now have no church-fellowship on the same level, simply labeling them all ‘heterodox.’” The Wisconsin Synod “should not close [its mind] to the possibility and often even [the] advisability” of serious doctrinal discussions with non-Lutheran bodies. Lutherans could join with non-Lutherans to protect their religious rights under the constitution, to oppose legislation harmful to their parochial schools, or even to learn native languages and customs in foreign mission settings.<sup>167</sup>

Regarding Wisconsin-Missouri relations, Gehrke said, “If Missouri is in agreement with us in the doctrine of the Gospel and in the administration of the Sacraments, then our fellowship with Missouri must be upheld.” Repeating the practical ramifications of a resolution to break fellowship that he had voiced to the Union Committee three years before, Gehrke concluded:

I personally consider the Missouri Synod, despite individual aberrations in her midst and despite her own dangerous tendencies in some areas like Scouting and Chaplaincy, to be as a Synod an orthodox body. That goes for her leadership and for her congregations in general. Rather than prematurely breaking off fellowship, as some want, we should use every means to strengthen the existing fellowship, especially through the present negotiations.<sup>168</sup>

Significant differences stood between Gehrke’s paper and the Union Committee’s presentation on church fellowship, presented to delegates at Wisconsin’s 1959 convention. Gehrke’s definition that “church fellowship is participation in the means of grace” excludes prayer fellowship,

---

<sup>167</sup> Gehrke, “Church Fellowship,” 14–8; emphasis in the original.

<sup>168</sup> Gehrke, “Church Fellowship,” 20–1.

since prayer is not a means of grace. By contrast, the Union Committee defined church fellowship as “every joint expression, manifestation, and demonstration of the common faith in which Christians are united with one another.” The Committee statement refused to distinguish “means of grace” fellowship from other Christian activity, but regarded “pulpit fellowship, altar fellowship, prayer fellowship, fellowship in worship, fellowship in church work, in missions, in Christian education, in Christian charity” as “all essentially one and the same thing,” and “all properly covered by a common designation, namely church fellowship.”

Gehrke did not believe fellowship required uniformity in the interpretation of all passages in the Bible, achieved “by means of their doctrinal system of theories and theological opinions.” By contrast, the Union Committee statement said that fellowship is no longer to be practiced with “those who in spite of patient admonition persistently adhere to an error in doctrine or practice, demand recognition for their error, and make propaganda for it.” To further define “an error in doctrine,” the Union Committee added, “A Christian confession of faith is in principle always a confession of the entire Word of God,” finding it “an untenable position” to “designate certain nonfundamental doctrines as not being divisive of church fellowship by their very nature.”<sup>169</sup>

Kowalke, Northwestern’s president through 1959, remarked that “it was understood that the controversy would not be carried into the classroom unless the subject under discussion there naturally required reference to the synodical troubles.”<sup>170</sup> Faculty members avoided debating the issues at their official meetings, and “discussions were instead carried on in private,” confined to “person to person argument.” The son of another Watertown professor remembered that “Dad was close-mouthed about things going on in the faculty when I was an NWC student and even later.”<sup>171</sup>

---

<sup>169</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1959*, 205–8.

<sup>170</sup> Kowalke, *Centennial Story*, 270.

<sup>171</sup> Survey responses 9, 56.

As “very gifted, widely read, good teachers,” Gehrke and Jungkuntz both had helped produce some of the tracts designed to educate Wisconsin members on synodical differences.<sup>172</sup> Jungkuntz authored an especially clear exposition on the doctrine of justification, a part of which criticized the inadequacy of the *Common Confession*’s treatment of that doctrine.<sup>173</sup>

In summer 1961 one of the two (Kowalke does not say which) announced simply, “I share the Missouri position.”<sup>174</sup> During that convention Jungkuntz accepted a call to Missouri’s Concordia Seminary in Springfield,<sup>175</sup> Gehrke to Concordia College, River Forest.<sup>176</sup> Northwestern’s Board of Control refused to grant them a peaceful release of their calls, citing their “public rejection of the Synod’s position regarding the principles of church fellowship.”<sup>177</sup> Gehrke charged that synod

---

<sup>172</sup> Kiecker, interview.

<sup>173</sup> Richard Jungkuntz, “The Ministry of Reconciliation,” *Qu* 52 (January 1955): 21–36. The *Common Confession* will be discussed in chapter 5.

<sup>174</sup> Kowalke, *Centennial Story*, 270.

<sup>175</sup> Jungkuntz had already been scheduled to serve as a guest lecturer for the 1961 summer session at Concordia Springfield. J. F. E. Nickelsburg, “News Briefly Told,” *AL* 44 (February 1961): 24.

<sup>176</sup> According to a study based on Wisconsin Synod *Statistical Reports*, 82 pastors, 8 professors, 12 teachers, and 8,065 communicants left the synod between 1957 and 1964. Numbers for communicant members were admittedly incomplete and somewhat unreliable because in some places only a few members withdrew from a congregation with their pastor, while others may have left one Wisconsin Synod congregation to join a neighboring church or to form a new congregation. Mark Krueger, “The Cost in Pastors, Professors, Teachers, and Communicants in Connection with our Severance of Fellowship with the Missouri Synod” (Senior church history paper, 30 April 1974), 8; WLS library essay file. Krueger concluded that as a general rule, those who left before 1961 joined the CLC, while those who left after 1961 were more likely to join the Missouri Synod or remain independent.

<sup>177</sup> Kowalke, *Centennial Story*, 270.

leadership “harassed us, claiming that our criticism was not just a criticism of the committee but of the historic stand of the Wisconsin Synod.”<sup>178</sup>

*“I saw a problem in our emphasis on the unit concept”*

While the union committees of the various synods made progress during 1958 through 1960 over other controverted issues,<sup>179</sup> the 1960 Synodical Conference had to report that differences over prayer fellowship between Missouri and Wisconsin had come to the point that “an impasse has been reached.”<sup>180</sup> Irwin Habeck sought to explain the differences in understanding of the two synods regarding prayer fellowship:

[In Missouri] it is contended that joint prayer with those who are not in complete doctrinal agreement may not be ruled out in advance, but that each case must be judged by the situation (with whom we are praying), the character of the prayer (what is said in it), the purpose which we have in mind, and the effect upon others. The arguments which are usually raised against such joint prayer are questioned, namely: 1. that praying together means indicating that there are no differences or that the differences are unimportant; 2. that refusal to pray together is

---

<sup>178</sup> Runge, “Faculty Member Quits in Lutheran Dispute,” *MJ*, 10 August 1961, 2:1. In a 1978 interview, Gehrke reminisced on having been raised in “the ultra-conservative Wisconsin Synod,” where he was “brought up straight-laced.” In college his professors “claimed black people were cursed because ‘Ham awoke from his drunkenness . . . and cursed them all,’” and their comments about Jewish people “shouldn’t be repeated.” Clara Phillips, “What’s Behind the Lutheran Split: Power struggle or Bible dispute?” *Everett (Washington) Herald*, 27 May 1978; cited in *CN* 11 (5 June 1978): 7.

<sup>179</sup> See Karl F. Krauss, “Report Of The Meeting Of The Joint Union Committees Of The Synodical Conference,” *NL* 44 (17 March 1957): 89–90. Karl F. Krauss, “The Voice Of The C. U. C.: A Progress Report,” *NL* 45 (22 June 1958): 204. N[orman] Berg, “A Report on the Synodical Conference Convention August 5–8, 1958,” (31 August 1958): 281–3. Karl F. Krauss, “A Progress Report, Joint Doctrinal Committee,” (21 December 1958): 410. Irwin Habeck, “The Voice of the Church Union Committee: The Antichrist,” *NL* 46 (4 January 1959): 8–10. Irwin J. Habeck, “The Voice of the Church Union Committee: Statement on Scripture Adopted by the Joint Committee of the Synodical Conference,” (15 February 1959): 59–60. Karl F. Krauss, “The Voice Of The Church Union Committee,” (1 March 1959): 75. Irwin J. Habeck, “The Convention and Intersynodical Relations,” (19 July 1959): 232. “The Oakland Conference of Theologians,” (30 August 1959): 281. E[dward] C. Fredrich, “The Convention Comes to You: Union Matters,” (13 September 1959): 300–1. Irwin J. Habeck, “The Commission on Doctrinal Matters Reports,” *NL* 47 (28 February 1960): 70, 75.

<sup>180</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1960*, 45–6.

merely showing that no full agreement exists; and 3. that those not in agreement will pray against each other. From the same viewpoint, with restrictions, prayer in civic occasions is found to be justifiable.<sup>181</sup>

Missouri's Martin Franzmann said Lutherans could pray with one another and even join in "public prayer at civic functions" because such joint prayer can serve as a "public witness of the church's intercession on the behalf of man."<sup>182</sup> Certainly a "compromise prayer," in which Muslims, Hindus, or pious agnostics may join, "is always and everywhere an abomination on the lips of a Christian," Franzmann explained, and a prayer "which is the product of a blind sentimental, enthusiasm and therefore conceals or smooths over differences in themselves divisive, is indefensible." But Franzmann warned against closing the door entirely on joint prayer. "May we not, by too facile and too simple a ruling concerning joint prayer, become guilty of crushing the bruised reed and quenching the smoldering wick by making the names 'Confessional' and 'Orthodox' names which smell of lovelessness?"<sup>183</sup>

Here, Habeck countered, is "that we go apart.

We believe, indeed, that the first reaction of a Christian when he meets with one who confesses Jesus as his Lord is to have fellowship with him. But we also believe that the Lord has commanded us to avoid those between whom and us there are differences in teaching. We believe, too, that prayer is first of all worship, and that we may not go before the throne of God together with those whom He tells us not to be together. We recognize, indeed, that we are to be very patient with those who err out of weakness and not to break with them quickly, but we also believe that fellowship with those who are set in their error is ruled out, and by fellowship we mean every form of worship or spiritual work.<sup>184</sup>

---

<sup>181</sup> Irwin J. Habeck, "The Commission on Doctrinal Matters Reports," *NL* 47 (19 June 1960): 197.

<sup>182</sup> "'Conservative' theologians differ," *Lu* 42 (17 August 1960): 5-6.

<sup>183</sup> "To Pray or Not to Pray," *Time*, 8 August 1960, 63.

<sup>184</sup> Habeck, "The Commission Reports," 197.

The Overseas Committee meeting with the Joint Doctrinal Committee of Synodical Conference synods had preferred a view of church fellowship focused more on the marks of the church, similar to the views of Hermann Sasse and Ralph Gehrke, rather than Wisconsin's "unit concept."<sup>185</sup>

As it grew clear that church fellowship would be the issue ultimately to separate the synods, E. H. Wendland, pastor in Benton Harbor, Michigan, recalled, "This worried me, not because I disagreed with the importance of the issue itself, but because I saw a problem in our emphasis on the unit concept."<sup>186</sup>

At a meeting of the Southwestern Conference of the Michigan District in January 1961, attended also by the synod's Commission on Doctrinal Unity, Wendland presented a paper entitled "Church Fellowship—A Unit Concept?" Acknowledging that "sooner or later it had to come to this" because for years Wisconsin had summarized its objections with Missouri as "unionism," the situation now facing the synod was that "the general consensus of our Districts seems to be this that

---

<sup>185</sup> For the statement, "Fellowship in its Necessary Context of the Doctrine of the Church," see Kurt E. Marquart, *Anatomy of an Explosion: Missouri in Lutheran Perspective* (Fort Wayne, Ind.: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 1977), 145–50. Point 13 said, "Prayer is not one of the marks of the church and should not be coordinated with Word and Sacrament, as though it were essentially of the same nature as they. As a response to the divine Word, it is an expression of faith and a fruit of faith, and when spoken before others, a profession of faith. As a profession of faith it must be in harmony with and under the control of the marks of the church."

<sup>186</sup> E[rnst] H. Wendland to Mark Braun, 7 April 1997; copy in possession of the author. Wendland had been a key participant on intersynodical issues for almost a decade. He presented the essay on "Justification" at Wisconsin's 1951 convention in New Ulm, evaluating the *Common Confession's* presentation of that doctrine; see E[rnst H.] Wendland, "An Investigation Of The Common Confession's Statement on 'Justification,'" *NL* 38 (7 October 1951): 311–2. In 1953 he authored *Every Sinner Declared Righteous*, the third of Wisconsin's eleven tracts concerning controverted issues between the synods. At the 1954 Synodical Conference convention he presented an essay, "The Inadequacy of the 'Common Confession' as a Settlement of Past Differences," *SC Proceedings, 1954*, 17–38. Along with Joh. P. Meyer, he was appointed to a committee assigned to pursue further doctrinal discussions with Missouri representatives. From 1955 through 1959, he was among those who noted encouraging signs in Missouri's withdrawal of the *Common Confession*, its statement on the doctrine of Scripture, and its apparent agreement on the teaching of the Antichrist in 1959. Thus Wendland could not be numbered either among those protesting Wisconsin reluctance to break with Missouri or with those who refused to apply Romans 16 to Missouri.

our commission's presentation on Church Fellowship is Scriptural, and if Missouri does not agree with it, it can only mean a final break in church relations."

Citing the major premise of the Commission's fellowship statement, "*Church fellowship is every joint expression, manifestation, and demonstration of the common faith in which Christians on the basis of their confession find themselves to be united with one another,*" Wendland admitted he found it "difficult at first reading to comprehend the full significance of everything included." The more one reads the statement, he wrote, "the more we come to the conclusion that its basic concept is man's *faith-activity*. *Faith in its joint activity on the basis of a united confession is church fellowship defined.*"<sup>187</sup>

This premise was then clarified through six logical steps designed to demonstrate "how Scripture leads us to this concept of church fellowship." Understanding the logic of this progression of steps was key to embracing the legitimacy of the premise. "1. Faith in Christ makes us God's children" and "2. Faith in Christ unites us with all other believers" affirmed Wisconsin's recognition of the *Una Sancta*, the one Holy Christian Church. The remaining four steps led the reader from the *Una Sancta* to the premise statement:

3. Faith invariably expresses itself outwardly.

4. This outward expression of faith, too, is God's work in us.

5. Through the common bond of faith the Holy Spirit leads us to express our faith jointly with fellow Christians.

6. Every joint expression of faith is what we designate as church fellowship.<sup>188</sup>

---

<sup>187</sup> E[rnst] H. Wendland, "Church Fellowship—A Unit Concept?" (paper presented to the Southwestern Conference, Michigan District), January 1961, 1–2; emphases in the original.

<sup>188</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1959*, 205.

Following the trail of this logical progression convinced Wendland even more that “the whole emphasis in this fellowship concept [was] on man’s faith,” which left Wendland “strangely uneasy, to say the least.” The problem lay not so much in what Wisconsin’s fellowship statement said as in what it left unsaid.

We would like to point out that our Lutheran church on the basis of Scripture has always emphasized *God’s* activity in us and through us as basic to the understanding of that fellowship (*koinonia*) which we have with Him and also with one another. And how do we know or recognize that all fellowship is God-created and God-centered? Certainly we do not look to man’s faith-activity for the final answer. We may observe the fruits of faith in action. Frequently the Scriptures encourage us to do so. Our basic assurance of fellowship, however, rests with God. . . . Our Lutheran Confessions have always emphasized the Means of Grace as the distinguishing marks or characteristics of the church of Jesus Christ rather than the faith-activity of man.<sup>189</sup>

Wendland considered the absence of any mention of the means of grace the “basic weakness” of the Commission’s presentation. Though it contained “many statements which no doubt can be understood correctly,” the emphasis on man’s faith-activity instead of God’s action in Word and Sacrament had the potential for “various dangers.” First was “a forced use of Scripture passages as proof texts.” Wendland cited an unnamed commentator “who has distinguished himself in the field of exegetical studies”:

One should not search the Bible from the standpoint of fixed alternatives, for through the inadequate formulation of questions the expressions of Scripture do not receive their immediate value, but are rather incorrectly prognosticated and broken up as rays through a prism. Exegesis must let the Scriptures themselves speak and explain their contents in such a way that they address themselves directly to our concrete situation. Toward the upholding of this principle exegesis must constantly strive, but it happens again and again that the declarations of the Bible are distorted through formulated questions which are foreign to the text.<sup>190</sup>

A second danger was that the synodical presentation suffered in the use of terms it did not clarify. The opening sentence of the statement’s summary paragraph—“In the matter of the outward

---

<sup>189</sup> Wendland, “Church Fellowship—A Unit Concept?” 3–4; emphasis in the original.

<sup>190</sup> Wendland, “A Unit Concept?” 5–7.



expression of Christian fellowship, the exercise of church fellowship, particularly two principles need to direct us”—seemed to create a distinction between fellowship with the Holy Christian Church (“Christian fellowship”) and the outward expression of that fellowship in faith-based activities of men (“church fellowship”). In a later portion of the statement, however, excommunication, based on Matthew 18:17 and 1 Corinthians 5:1-6,<sup>191</sup> was called “termination of church fellowship.” Was it correct to regard excommunication and suspension of fellowship as identical forms of “termination of church fellowship”?

The final danger concerned the practical application of the unit concept.

What do we mean by “furthering the cause of the Gospel” as one of the expressions of faith included in our unit concept of fellowship? Distributing God’s Word is certainly furthering the cause of the Gospel. This would mean that our congregation could no longer contribute to the work of the American Bible Society, since this work is also supported by those not in confessional agreement with us. Any joint expression of faith in the matter of “Christian education” is an activity to be included under church fellowship. One would hardly feel free, then, in joining with people of heterodox church bodies in linguistic studies, editing and publishing works of Luther, or participating jointly in any undertaking involving the gifts God has given us for the furtherance of His work. If some of these applications sound rather forced and legalistic it is not because we feel that they should be included under the concept of church fellowship. We feel, however, that our Commission’s definition of the term as it stands and as it proceeds from “every” expression of man’s faith activity forces this conclusion upon us.<sup>192</sup>

---

<sup>191</sup> “And if he shall neglect to hear them [two or three witnesses], tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican” (*KJV*).

“It is reported among you that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father’s wife. And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you. For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?” (*KJV*).

<sup>192</sup> Wendland, “A Unit Concept?” 7–8.

In a second paper, written the next month, Wendland repeated the concerns he had already expressed, adding that throughout the Lutheran Confessions the Church “is basically the assembly of believers around Word and sacraments,” as it was for Luther. “Church was Church because Jesus was there through the Holy Spirit with all His gifts,” not because it depended on any qualities of men. The church “was not to be defined as an assembly of saints in which faith or good works became manifest, or in which good people developed properly in works of sanctification.”

Wendland even offered an alternative statement: *“Church Fellowship is the expression of our membership in the Church, the Body of Christ, through joint use of the Means of Grace.”* Wendland’s subparts to this statement emphasized the church as the body of Christ, the means of grace through which the Holy Ghost unites people into a believing fellowship, and church fellowship to be expressed wherever the means of grace were rightly used.

And Wendland voiced a practical concern that has proved to be prophetic:

The fact that Church Fellowship is a joint use of the Means of Grace our people will understand. They will also understand that this use will have to be practiced according to principles defined by the Word of God. But that “Church Fellowship is every joint expression, manifestation, and demonstration of the common faith in which Christians on the basis of their confession find themselves to be united with one another” will result in legalistic misunderstandings and misapplications which we do not wish to be responsible for.<sup>193</sup>

The Statement of the Overseas Committee strengthened Wendland’s conviction that “a few of us in the Southwestern corner of Michigan are not alone in this,” because it “put the finger” on what Wendland regarded as the greatest weakness of the Wisconsin Fellowship Theses. “Many of those overseas who do not agree with [the synodical theses] are conservative men.” Insisting on its formulation would place the Wisconsin Synod “into the theological isolation of a ‘unit concept’ of

---

<sup>193</sup> Ernst H. Wendland. “The Biblical Concept of Church Fellowship,” paper written to answer questions related to the Wisconsin Synod’s Doctrinal Committee on matters relating to its Fellowship Theses,” (February 1961), 6–9; emphasis in the original.

Church Fellowship which many of us do not fully understand and few of us can adequately defend.”<sup>194</sup>

In the Missouri Synod, *The American Lutheran's* Otto Geiseman regarded the impending synodical split optimistically. “Under calmer circumstances” and absent any conflict caused by “personalities, long-standing prejudices, and organizational interests,” the departure of the Wisconsin and Norwegian Synods from the Synodical Conference could provide an opportunity for “continued discussions with that large number of pastors and congregations in these synods, who I confidently believe, see more clearly the difference between human opinions and God’s eternal truths” than some of the synods’ leaders did. Looking beyond the present members of the Synodical Conference, Geiseman also hoped that dissolution would “serve the purpose of more closely uniting many of the Christians now in opposing camps than they have been united in decades.”<sup>195</sup>

As 1960 had been a year of decision for American voters, electing for the first time a Roman Catholic as president, 1961 would be a year of decision in the Synodical Conference. “There are indications,” wrote an *American Lutheran* editorialist, “that internal tensions within [the Wisconsin and Norwegian Synods] may force them to take this step, though reluctantly.” Pastors and members of the Missouri and Slovak Synods “continue to hope that withdrawal, if it should occur, will not mean a complete and abrupt termination of such relations as do exist in certain areas.”<sup>196</sup>

---

<sup>194</sup> Ernst H. Wendland to the Committee on Doctrinal Matters, Michigan District Pastor–Teacher Conference, 2 June 1961; copy in possession of the author.

<sup>195</sup> Otto A. Geiseman, “While It Is Day: Darkest Before Dawn,” *AL* 43 (October 1960): 6. Following the 1961 vote, and after reading “a friendly letter from a brother in the Wisconsin Synod,” Geiseman again expressed his conviction that “the rank and file of pastors and lay members of the Wisconsin Synod are as evangelical in spirit as we would like to be in our ministries and that they are no more ready than we to substitute tradition and human deductions for the simple Word of God.” Otto A. Geiseman, “While It Is Day: Spirit at Work,” *AL* 45 (March 1962): 6.

<sup>196</sup> “A Year of Decision,” *AL* 44 (January 1961): 4.

Edward A. Beyersdorf, editor of the *Milwaukee Lutheran*, recommended that the Synodical Conference be dissolved because its members had become “incompatible.” Their continued partnership “under armed guard” could do nothing but bring harm to both synods. “Bitterness has been growing between the clergy of both groups.” The conference had become “unbeneficial” and a “burden on the backs of all concerned.”<sup>197</sup>

1961

At the 1961 convention it became clear that Wendland was not alone in his contention that the synod’s theses on church fellowship were unclear. Henry Koch, pastor in Greenleaf, Wisconsin, concurred with a letter received from the Overseas Commission charging Wisconsin’s fellowship theses with being “unscriptural.”<sup>198</sup> Norman Berg, Plymouth, Michigan pastor, suggested that confusion among delegates might indicate the synod’s presentation was inadequate.<sup>199</sup> Milwaukee pastor Luther Voss doubted that all avenues of negotiation with the LCMS had been exhausted.<sup>200</sup> But synod First Vice President Habeck responded that further discussions would be fruitless. “You reach the point eventually where you don’t edify. You begin to aggravate by continuing to discuss.”<sup>201</sup>

---

<sup>197</sup> Ed[ward A.] Beyersdorf, “Typing Our Thinking,” *ML* 12 (May 1961): 8.

<sup>198</sup> “Lutheran Unity Impasse Cited,” *MS*, 10 August 1961, 2:1. Following the convention, Koch faulted both synods for the break. He criticized Wisconsin for not giving greater regard to the Statement of the Overseas Commission and “particularly deplored the fact that the Wisconsin Synod’s committee refused to await further studies and their outcome but seemingly was determined to vote for a break with Missouri.” Koch even charged that what Wisconsin’s union committee taught about the church and church fellowship “does not agree” with what Wisconsin’s Adolf Hoenecke taught earlier in the synod’s history. “Wisconsin Synod Publication ‘Faults’ Both Missouri and Wisconsin Synods,” *LW* 81 (20 February 1962): 88–9.

<sup>199</sup> James Johnson, “Lutheran Split Theses Rapped As ‘Unclear,’” *MS*, 17 August 1961, 1:3.

<sup>200</sup> David A. Runge, “Sharp Debate Erupts at Lutheran Meeting,” *MJ*, 17 August 1961, 2:15.

<sup>201</sup> David A. Runge, “Delegates Divided on Synod’s Stand,” *MJ*, 10 August 1961, 2:1.

Those who attended the convention remembered that “debate was lengthy and emotions ran high.”<sup>202</sup> Floor Committee # 2 on Doctrinal Matters handed their resolution to delegates on Tuesday afternoon, 15 August. Floor debate continued throughout the afternoon and evening, and was resumed at Wednesday morning’s session.<sup>203</sup> On Wednesday morning, Martin Franzmann, Missouri’s representative to the convention, was asked if Missouri’s current document, “The Theology of Fellowship,” represented a continuation of the historic Synodical Conference position. “Missouri has an out-going impulse to seek others—above all Lutherans.” Joint prayer with other Lutherans—even those not in fellowship with the Synodical Conference—“was not in principle ruled out.” Wisconsin’s Carl Lawrenz responded, “Prayer fellowship is ruled out with those who are persistent errorists. We find Walther in harmony with our principles.” Franzmann was then asked, “Does the Missouri Synod maintain that it may pray with persistent errorists?” Franzmann answered, “No. But we will meet and pray with anyone who is ready to be bound by the Word of God.”

As debate continued on Wednesday afternoon, other Wisconsin pastors challenged their synod’s fellowship position statement. “I question the clearness of the presentation,” said one, and another asked, “Did Missouri know what we meant by our Theses?” Yet another asked, “How can we ever pray with others if every prayer is church fellowship?” Lawrenz replied that joint prayer was ruled out “only with persistent errorists.”

John Daniel, representative of the Slovak Synod, said, “It is not a question as to whether you have adopted or will adopt these theses. Rather, the question is, how were the theses used?”

---

<sup>202</sup> Survey response 26.

<sup>203</sup> The following four paragraphs, containing an account of the three days of convention debate regarding Wisconsin’s vote to suspend fellowship, are taken from notes by Wisconsin pastor Victor H. Prange and transcribed in an unpublished paper, “Report and Reaction (Wisconsin Synod convention 1961),” 1–2; copy in possession of the author. Prange cited the substance of each speaker’s statement in quotation marks, although speakers may not have used the exact words in every case, and some statements were summaries of their remarks.

Wisconsin had presented them to other members of the Synodical Conference as “the final, complete, scriptural, authoritative word.” Wisconsin said, “Either accept this principle or show us where we are wrong.” Daniel saw Wisconsin’s theses as “inflexible” and “intimidating,” because “they were presented as the final word.” At this, one observer recalled that President Naumann protested Daniel’s interpretation of Wisconsin’s theses and “lectured Daniel about abusing the privilege of the floor.”

Debate on Thursday began about 1:45 P.M. “We chose to use the word *suspend* rather than *terminate*,” explained Werner Franzmann, chairman of Floor Committee # 2, “because we wanted to use the less harsh term, hoping that Missouri will return. This is a real *suspension*.” Martin Franzmann was asked whether Wisconsin’s *unit concept* went beyond the Synodical Conference position. Martin Franzmann replied he felt Wisconsin’s position was “too pointed” and “too one-sided.” As the vote drew closer, a lay delegate protested, “Pure doctrine is being over-stressed at the point of preaching the Gospel. Which is the worse sin—to convey an impression of religious snobbery or to join in communal prayer with others who are more than likely better Christians than we are?”

In “an 11th hour motion,” Milwaukee Pastor James Schaefer urged that the vote to break fellowship be submitted to a referendum, but his motion was tabled.<sup>204</sup> In a prepared statement, Schaefer said he had listened “to the contradictory counsel” offered by “men of equal stature, of equal acumen, of equal scholarship, equally devoted to the Holy Scriptures and to the Lutheran Confessions.” But after reviewing the decisions of Wisconsin conventions back to 1953, Schaefer insisted:

There is nothing in the past history of this controversy that would tend to indicate to me that today, 4:30 P.M., August 17, 1961, and no other day, we must

---

<sup>204</sup> Runge, “Wisconsin Synod Votes to Split With Missouri,” 1:10.

break fellowship with the Missouri Synod. The case today is no more hopeless, no more hopeful—than it ever was before.

One thing keeps going through my mind at this historic moment. The words of a man to his colleagues who also stood at a crossroads. He said: “I beseech you, brethren, by the bowels of Jesus Christ, bethink that you may be mistaken.” . . .

What I say next is a word spoken to me alone, but I share it with you for what it is worth. It is not an indictment of one single pastor, teacher or layman in our Synod. I speak against the resolution because I hear my Lord Jesus say to me as emphatically as he said it to the first century Pharisees: “Go and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice.” He said it once, He said it twice (Matt. 9:13; and 12:7). . . . Because I hear my Lord say to me, “With what judgment you judge, you shall be judged; and with what measure you measure, it shall be measured to you again.”

Schaefer proposed that one more effort be made: Several professors from the synod’s seminary and two colleges, as well as several parish pastors, should be called together to “forget historic positions” and “all dogmatic presuppositions” to study the doctrine of church fellowship once more, and to “freely air their study” in the synod’s conferences and districts “until we are all persuaded by the blessed word that this is our answer to the ecumenical call.”<sup>205</sup>

But no additional committees were appointed, and no further studies were conducted. A 72 percent majority voted to suspend fellowship with Missouri. “Many were still on the list to speak when debate was cut off,” recalled one observer, and “many of those were against the break. The vote would perhaps have been closer if this resolution had been debated longer.” While Lawrenz, Naumann, and Werner Franzmann appeared to be in favor the split, “the majority of advisory delegates would perhaps have voted against the suspension” and “the World Mission Board was solidly against [it] and registered their dissent.” One pastor in favor of the break urged, “Don’t be afraid of the consequences. Are we going to do what God’s Word says?” A layman responded, “Do

---

<sup>205</sup> James P. Schaefer, “Statement to the WELS Convention, August 17, 1961,” typed manuscript; copy in possession of the author.

we only have those paragons of interpreters who are only right? Our people are against it.”<sup>206</sup> Two Wisconsin Synod pastors were even reported as announcing that some congregations might continue fellowship with Missouri “on an individual basis.”<sup>207</sup>

A particularly painful memory for many, long after the convention was past and the vote taken, was the sight of Martin Franzmann, raised in the Wisconsin Synod but now a professor at Concordia Seminary, upholding Missouri’s position, urging Wisconsin to be more patient, and finally giving “a lengthy, impassioned good-bye speech” to the delegates.<sup>208</sup> It was easier for a small church body like the Wisconsin Synod to take a firm stand, Martin said, but difficult, if not impossible, to do the same when a synod became the size of Missouri.<sup>209</sup> At the other microphone was Martin’s brother Werner Franzmann, chairman of Floor Committee # 2, responding that Wisconsin had “gone

---

<sup>206</sup> Prange, “Report and Reaction,” 3.

<sup>207</sup> David A. Runge, “Lutherans Sever Relations,” *CC* 78 (20 September 1961): 1124. Zion Church in Hartland, Wisconsin, was reported as having voted to “remain in church fellowship” with the Missouri Synod even as it planned to continue to “fully support the mission program of the Wisconsin Synod.” A spokesman for the congregation maintained that “an action as far-reaching as this should have been put to a referendum of the Wisconsin Synod’s congregations” because it was “a matter of fellowship rather than a doctrinal disagreement or dispute.” Notes and Quotes, *LW* 80 (17 October 1961): 511. St. Peter’s Church in Surgeon Bay, Wisconsin, voted to “ignore” the synod’s resolution, according to an Associated Press report in the *Wisconsin State Journal*. The congregation urged the synod to reconsider its position and to “remain in the Synodical Conference to help preserve conservative Lutheranism.” Notes and Quotes, *LW* 80 (14 November 1961): 563.

<sup>208</sup> Franzmann was remembered as having said at Missouri’s 1956 convention, “To be always right is not the ultimate grace.” Whether said in reference to his present or his former synod, the comment revealed Franzmann’s distress at attitudes that were manifested during the intersynodical disagreements. “Building a New Unity in the Synodical Conference,” *AL* 39 (October 1956): 4.

<sup>209</sup> ALC union proponent E. C. Fendt remarked that “the man who suffered more pain and anguish than any other in my acquaintance” over the intersynodical strife was Martin Franzmann. Finding himself out of synodical fellowship with most of his family members, classmates, and associates “weighed heavily on his mind and heart.” Franzmann told Fendt about his son, still attending a Wisconsin Synod college, who would no longer have prayer fellowship with his father when he came home from school. As tears fell from his eyes, Franzmann said, “There must be something wrong with the synodical resolutions when they destroy prayer fellowship in the family.” Fendt, *The Struggle for Lutheran Unity*, 191–2, 317.



the long mile of Christian love” with Missouri but “today a sterner kind of admonition and love is required.” A third brother, Gerhard, remembered, “Since I loved and admired both [my] brothers, it was a very wrenching experience. I was opposed to severing the ties and said so openly on the floor,” a position that “was not fully shared by my colleagues” at Northwestern College.<sup>210</sup>

More than thirty-five years later, Wendland reflected, “Although I still can’t agree with the *reason* given in 1961 for the split of the Synodical Conference, I can see the justification for it as having been inevitable.” In 1962 Wendland was called to be a missionary to Africa, where he remained 16 years until accepting a call to teach at Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary. There he was a colleague of Carl Lawrenz. “I have the highest respect for [Lawrenz’s] theological acumen. He is *not* a legalist by any means. In this particular matter we just don’t see things the same way.”<sup>211</sup>

*“What Will Sophie Think?”*

In the first issue of *The Northwestern Lutheran* following the convention resolution, Carleton Toppe predicted that the synod’s decision “has been and will continue to be regarded as hopelessly reactionary by the great majority of Americans.

The public press and most of the religious press will deplore the action as an expression of a “traditionalism” that cannot face up to living in the present. It will come as no surprise if liberal Lutheran periodicals label our Scripture-based theology and practice Neanderthal and Cro-Magnon to characterize it as belonging to the dim past, but impossible and ridiculous in the “enlightened” present.<sup>212</sup>

Although *Neanderthal* and *Cro-Magnon* never surfaced, Toppe’s prediction proved to be accurate.

---

<sup>210</sup> Survey responses 3, 15. Runge, “Wisconsin Synod Votes to Split With Missouri,” 1:10. Respondent 66, in a follow-up interview, recalled that after these floor deliberations, he bumped into Martin Franzmann, his former professor at Watertown, in a hallway outside the convention sessions. “How can you do what you’re doing,” the pastor asked, “and take the stand you take?” He clearly remembered Franzmann’s answer: “You can’t play with coal without getting your hands dirty.”

<sup>211</sup> E[rnst] H. Wendland to Mark Braun, 7 April 1997.; emphases in the original.

<sup>212</sup> C[arleton] Toppe, “Progressive Traditionalists?” *NL* 48 (10 September 1961): 291.

*The Lutheran Beacon*, official publication of the Slovak Synod, called 17 August “a sad day for the Synodical Conference.” Although the Slovaks’ relationship with Missouri would remain unaffected, the *Beacon* was “dismayed” at Wisconsin’s decision. “We cannot impugn the sincerity of the Wisconsin delegates and officials” who voted to suspend fellowship, *Beacon* editor J. J. Vajda wrote, but “we cannot see that this decision was the best one.” There were “sins to be repented of in both camps.”<sup>213</sup>

Missouri President Behnken called Wisconsin’s decision “regrettable” because of the repercussions it would cause among other Lutheran groups and because it came despite so much doctrinal agreement that existed between the synods. On the day after the vote, Behnken maintained, “Our disagreements are in the practical field, the application of principles,”<sup>214</sup> a viewpoint he repeated the next month. “We are honestly convinced that we and the Wisconsin Synod are agreed in practically every doctrine of Holy Writ. Our disagreements lie in the practical application of the principles rather than in the principles themselves.”<sup>215</sup>

While Wisconsin had broken relations with Missouri, Behnken announced, “Our Synod has not suspended fellowship” with Wisconsin. “We do not wish to sever relations, but continue to work toward agreement also in the theology of fellowship.”<sup>216</sup> Added Missouri’s First Vice President Oliver Harms, “Whoever withdraws from the Synodical Conference would no longer be in the

---

<sup>213</sup> [J. J. Vajda], “A Sad Day for the Synodical Conference,” *LB* 18 (September 1961): 130.

<sup>214</sup> “Split Regretted by Synod Leaders,” *MJ*, 19 August 1961, 1:7.

<sup>215</sup> John W. Behnken, “Reactions to Wisconsin Synod Resolutions,” *LW* 80 (19 September 1961): 460.

<sup>216</sup> John W. Behnken, “Fellowship with Missouri Synod Suspended,” *LW* 80 (5 September 1961): 436.

Conference. We, however, have not withdrawn. We have done all within our power to keep the Conference in tact.”<sup>217</sup>

A more emotional reaction came in an editorial “What Will Sophie Think?” in *The Lutheran Witness*. Told that the suspension was based on those who “cause divisions and offenses,”

Sophie will ask herself, “Just who is causing what divisions?” She will remember from Bible class that offense is not only given but also taken. Who decides these things? Who determines when “they” and “their” and “them” in the Romans passage have identified the same antecedents today—with our 250-plus denominations, our various brands of Lutheranism, our synods? . . .

Perhaps Sophie will pick up hope when she reads that the Wisconsin Synod “stands ready to resume discussions” with the Missouri Synod “with the aim of restoring fellowship relations.” But then she will find this readiness tightly restricted by the Wisconsin view of fellowship: “these discussions to be conducted outside the framework of fellowship.” Sophie won’t believe her eyes.

“You mean to tell me,” she will probably say to her husband, “that when members of two synods meet to study God’s Word, they can’t pray together?”<sup>218</sup>

Missouri’s *American Lutheran* struck a similar tone, calling it “disturbing” that practical issues such as prayer fellowship, Boy Scouts, and relationships with other Lutherans “should bring about a break between two synods so closely united in doctrine.”<sup>219</sup>

But Missouri’s *Confessional Lutheran* charged that the *Lutheran Witness* “ostensibly bewails but actually revels” in “Sophie’s” confusion. If she was confused, it may be because her information about the intersynodical conflict was “limited to the ‘nice’ versions” of it provided by the *Witness*. The editorial in question would hardly remove her confusion but would confirm her conviction “that her uninformed resentments are quite justified.” The *Witness* article implied that “those Wisconsin flint-hearts are cruel indeed” to apply Romans 16:17 “to ‘our’ oh-so-very-modern darlings.” By its

---

<sup>217</sup> “Wisconsin Suspension Action Calls for Adjustments in Joint Conference Work,” *LW* 80 (19 September 1961): 456.

<sup>218</sup> “What Will Sophie Think?” *LW* 80 (19 September 1961): 435.

<sup>219</sup> “Wisconsin Suspends Fellowship,” *AL* 44 (October 1961): 4.

“soggy logic,” the *Witness* couldn’t even apply that verse to Roman Catholics, and finally it can be applied to no one.

“The *Witness* has a perfect right to appeal to Scripture and sound logic in support of its honest convictions,” the *Confessional Lutheran* author concluded. “But it has no right to foment and exploit popular sentiment and prejudice by the presentation of stultifying emotional balderdash.”<sup>220</sup>

*Christianity Today* introduced its report on Wisconsin’s severance of fellowship with Missouri with the sentence, “Creeping liberalism within the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod constituency was dealt a dramatic rebuke this month by a sister synod with which it has cooperated for nearly 90 years.”<sup>221</sup> A reader responded in the letters’ column that it was not “creeping liberalism” in Missouri but “creeping Christianity” in Wisconsin that caused the split. While Wisconsin objected to Scouting and the chaplaincy, “Missouri refuses to ‘creep’ along. The King’s business requires haste.”<sup>222</sup>

To M. A. Zimmermann, writing in the Protestant journal *Faith–Life*, the break in fellowship was “a fleshly, unholy break,” born out of “the Wisconsin Synod’s legalism, which is always the product of false orthodoxy.” Zimmerman was critical of all the synods involved. Wisconsin’s “destiny under the judgment of God” was “to misuse the Word of God and to choose the wrong course in every crisis” and thus “hasten its own spiritual integration.” Missouri was “paralyzed by its own spiritual disintegration” and “lacked the moral strength” to come to its sister synod’s aid to maintain the unity of the Spirit. Even those “who seceded from the Wisconsin Synod or will yet

---

<sup>220</sup> “Poor Sophie!” *CL* 22 (December 1961): 193–5. See also “Missouri’s Plight,” *CL* 22 (October 1961): 155. “How One Congregation Reacted to What ‘Sophie’ Thinks,” (November 1961): 183–4.

<sup>221</sup> “Wisconsin Lutherans Break With Missouri Synod,” *CT* 5 (28 August 1961): 989.

<sup>222</sup> Herman Bielenberg, letter, *CT* 6 (13 October 1961): 44. For Wisconsin’s response, see Im[manuel] P. Frey, “A Rebuke,” *NL* 49 (14 January 1962): 3.

secede in protest,” the CLC and others, refuse to recognize God’s judgment and “fritter away their remaining strength in the pursuit of their pet dogmas.”

Zimmermann painted a lamentable picture of future intersynodical relations:

Henceforth no mother of the Missouri Synod can be sponsor of her own grandchild born in the Wisconsin Synod. In one family a Missouri Synod brother can henceforth no longer commune at the Lord’s Table with his own brother, who happens to belong to the Wisconsin Synod. When the married children of a family who have joined the Missouri Synod because of the convenience of proximity, return home to the table of their parents, who belong to the Wisconsin Synod, they must now by your decree refrain from prayer fellowship with their own parents, who led them into the way of faith. Or will you not expect your own people to observe the separation you have so solemnly declared?<sup>223</sup>

For *The Milwaukee Lutheran*, Wisconsin’s 1961 convention proceedings “were not always a pretty sight.” While some delegates said, “They continue to practice fellowship with persistent errorists,” and “I know we are right because, now, more than ever before, we have more from Missouri on the side of the Wisconsin position,” others said, “We’re hypocrites . . . self-righteous . . . for saying only we have the pure doctrine,” and, “The case is no more hopeless, or hopeful, than ever before.” Delegates in favor of suspending fellowship “often spoke of love in impassioned tones—love for God, the Scriptures, and Missouri,” but “their tone, manner, and gesticulations gave the impression of anything but love.

Eloquent oratory couldn’t hide the intense feeling and bitterness obviously felt by many of the delegates. Many played their role of righteous defenders of the

---

<sup>223</sup> M. A. Zimmermann, “This Thing Is from Me, Saith the Lord,” *F-L* 34 (October 1961): 13–5. Zimmermann’s characterization overstated and misrepresented the Wisconsin position; see Armin Schuetze, “May We Pray At Table With People Not of the Wisconsin Synod?” *NL* 48 (22 October 1961): 342, 350.

By his own admission, Zimmermann’s remarks must be understood in the context of the grievances against the Wisconsin Synod on the part of the Protestant Conference, which had “for more than thirty years been made to suffer such indecencies and immoral practices at the hands of the body.” The Wisconsin Synod “in its day of visitation was a city set on a hill” when J. P. Koehler and Wisconsin’s *Quartalschrift* gave light to both synods. But when Koehler was ousted and the Protestants expelled, Missouri “took the stand-offish attitude” and refused to become involved. Thus the deserved judgment of God fell on both synods.

maligned Scriptures to the hilt; others took them to task sharply (and justly, we believe) for setting themselves up as judges.

The contradictory end result . . . left the impression that, once again, Milwaukee has been the scene of a convention of which Lutherans could not be proud.<sup>224</sup>

Two years later, after Wisconsin resolved to leave the Synodical Conference, *Time* magazine reported, “The break with Missouri leaves the nation’s fourth largest Lutheran Church as isolated as when it began,” and called Wisconsin “the most rigidly fundamentalist of all Lutheran groups.” Insisting “we aren’t ogres,” James Schaefer nonetheless replied that until a change came in Missouri, “We cannot pray with them, we cannot work with them, we cannot worship with them and, by extension, with anyone else who does.”<sup>225</sup>

---

<sup>224</sup> Jerry Beyersdorff, “They Day They Split,” *ML* 14 (September 1961): 14. See also Ed. Beyersdorff, “Typing Our Thinking,” *ML* 14 (September 1961): 6, 17.

<sup>225</sup> “The Isolated Synod.” *Time*, 23 August 1963, 49.

### *Chapter 5: The Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures*

On the front page of the 3 March 1969 issue of *Christian News*, Herman Otten, editor and publisher of the unofficial LCMS weekly journal, reviewed sociologist Jeffrey Hadden's new book, *The Gathering Storm in the Churches*. "Many clergymen and laymen within the major Protestant denominations reject central doctrines of historic Christianity," Otten wrote. "Large percentages of clergymen within six major Protestant bodies denied basic doctrines of the Christian faith, such as the historicity of Adam and Eve, the inerrancy of the Bible, the virgin birth of Christ, and the physical resurrection of Christ."<sup>1</sup>

Hadden's data regarding The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod seemed relatively tame compared to that of some other church bodies. The 895 LCMS clergymen included in Hadden's research were revealed to be considerably more doctrinally conservative than, for example, the 908 pastors surveyed from among the ALC. Ninety percent of Missouri's pastors believed Adam and Eve were "individual historical persons." Seventy-six percent professed agreement with the statement that the Scriptures are inspired and inerrant "also in historical, geographical, and other secular matters." Ninety-five percent regarded the virgin birth of Jesus as "a biological miracle." Ninety-three percent accepted the physical resurrection of Jesus "as an objective historical fact in the same sense that Lincoln's physical death was an historical fact." Missouri Synod Lutherans, Hadden concluded, "remain consistently the most conservative or literalist denomination."

Yet those who remembered the synod's early motto "God's Word and Luther's doctrine pure now and ever shall endure" might still have had cause for alarm. Only 63 percent of Missouri

---

<sup>1</sup> "Surveys Reveal Doctrinal Crisis," *CN* 2 (3 March 1969): 1.

clergymen under the age 35 accepted the inerrancy of the Bible; only 72 percent accepted the “historic Christian interpretation” that the Bible is to be understood “literally or nearly literally.”<sup>2</sup>

Otten’s front-page citation of Hadden’s book constituted the opening salvo in a huge special issue of *Christian News*, featuring in bold print an analysis of “**Lutheranism Today.**” On more than 64 pages of tiny text cribbed into every available corner of his paper, Otten documented the doctrinal decline of American Lutheranism. He devoted most of this special issue to the theological drift occurring in the ALC and the LCA. At Luther College in Decorah, Iowa, “the entire religion department appears to be committed to a denial of the verbal inspiration and truthfulness of Scripture.” At Luther Theological Seminary in St. Paul, Minnesota, one professor wrote that biblical references to science or geography “are not essential” to Christianity, “not relevant,” and in some places “not even correct.”<sup>3</sup> ALC President Fredrick Schioltz maintained that “Scripture’s teaching of inspiration does not require a commitment to textual inerrancy” and that inerrancy “does not apply to the texts but to the truths revealed for our faith, doctrine, and life.”<sup>4</sup> To the question, “Are there mistakes in the Bible?” the LCA’s Elson Ruff replied simply, “Of course.”<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Jeffrey K. Hadden, *The Gathering Storm in the Churches* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1969), 42, 48, 51, 251. See also Jeffrey K. Hadden, “A Protestant Paradox—Divided They Merge,” *TRANS-ACTION* (July–August 1967): 63–9; reproduced in *CN* 2 (3 March 1969): 17–9.

<sup>3</sup> Robert D. Preus, “Fellowship Concerns: A Study of Some of the Issues in the Questioning of Joining with the American Lutheran Church in Pulpit and Altar Fellowship” (essay delivered to the Missouri District of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, 24–28 June 1968); reproduced in *CN* 2 (3 March 1969): 14. The professor Preus cited from Luther Seminary in St. Paul was Charles Anderson, *The Reformation, Then and Now* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1966), 104.

<sup>4</sup> Fredrick A. Schioltz, “The Church’s Confessional Stand Relative to the Scriptures” (prepared for distribution by the Office of Public Relations of The American Lutheran Church), 4, 7; reproduced in *CN* 2 (3 March 1969): 27.

<sup>5</sup> Elson Ruff, “In Conclusion,” *Lu* 44 (13 June 1962): 50; reproduced in *CN* 2 (3 March 1969): 45. See also “Liberal Lutherans Deny Christ Is Only Way to Heaven,” *CN* 1 (30 December 1968); reproduced (3 March 1969): 34. “Canadians Say New Lutheran Curriculum Undermines Bible,” *LN* 5 (5 September 1966); reproduced (3 March 1969): 35. “LCA Officials Silent on Denial of Deity of Christ,” *CN* 1 (10 February 1968); reproduced (3 March 1969): 47. “Lutherans And the



But also included was evidence of theological change in Missouri. On 20 February 1969 the Associated Press reported on a three-day student strike at Concordia Seminary, in which students protested what they considered “grievances” on the St. Louis campus. Students were being urged “to concentrate less on preaching the doctrinal content of the church and to engage in community activities more.” Concordia was becoming more and more like other seminaries in which the trend “has been away from teaching orthodox doctrine and sound Biblical studies.”<sup>6</sup>

In a six-page article, “The Doctrinal Situation in The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod,” Otten maintained that during the previous two decades “theological liberalism has infiltrated the Missouri Synod.”

There are professors at Concordia Seminary who reject the inerrancy of the Bible, the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, the real messianic interpretation of various Old Testament messianic prophecies, and the Christian doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Two years ago an honest liberal teacher, who is a member of the Missouri Synod, told us at a meeting at Concordia Seminary in St. Louis that what we were saying about Concordia Seminary in CHRISTIAN NEWS was correct. He readily admitted that professors, who formerly maintained the inerrancy of the Bible and rejected such critical views of the Bible as the J-E-D-P documentary source hypothesis,<sup>7</sup> had changed and no longer affirmed these doctrines of Holy Scripture still affirmed by the Missouri Synod. He said that the administration of the seminary was not being quite honest when it tells the officials of the Missouri Synod that all professors at the seminary still affirm the inspiration and inerrancy of Holy Scripture. This liberal teacher, of course, thought it was wonderful that the seminary was changing. According to him, the president of the Missouri Synod was rather naive because he never asked the seminary administration just what seminary

---

Holy Trinity,” *LN* 6 (26 June 1967); reproduced (3 March 1969): 50, 53.

<sup>6</sup> “St. Louis Student Strike,” *CN* 2 (3 March 1969): 2.

<sup>7</sup> JEDP is shorthand for a theory of authorship of the first five books of the Old Testament. The theory, also referred to as “source criticism” or the “multiple source” theory of authorship, suggests that Genesis-Deuteronomy was not written by Moses but that four separate sources, often referred to by the initials of their assumed authors, J (Yahweh), E (Elohim), D (Deuteronomist), and P (Priestly), were woven by later editors into the present books of Genesis-Deuteronomy. Those who espouse the JEDP theory of authorship of the Pentateuch believe that little if any of the content of these books was written by Moses. For a summary of the JEDP theory, see Horace D. Hummel, *The Word Becoming Flesh: An Introduction to the Origin, Purpose, and Meaning of the Old Testament* (St. Louis: CPH, 1979), 32–61.

professors mean when they say they believe the “inerrancy of the Bible.” If such a question were asked, he said, the president would soon discover that many on the seminary faculty reject the real inerrancy of the Bible.<sup>8</sup>

Valparaiso University Professor John Strietelmeier acknowledged that “for something like 25 years” following World War II, the LCMS “was controlled by a coalition of Liberals and Moderates.”<sup>9</sup> All that was now about to change. One year after Richard Nixon mobilized the “silent majority” of Americans who opposed political liberalism, racial unrest, and campus protests against the Vietnam War to elect him as president, a comparable “silent majority” of LCMS delegates at Denver in 1969 elected Jacob A. O. Preus as synod president. As Strietelmeier put it, the years of “liberal ascendancy ended suddenly and decisively.” Preus interpreted his election as a mandate to investigate rumors of the denial of Missouri’s doctrine of Scripture at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. By 1973, “against a background of robust hymn-singing and fervent preaching” as ironic as the baptism/execution scene in the movie *The Godfather*, Missouri Lutherans were engaged in “the deadliest politico-theological struggle in contemporary American Protestantism.”<sup>10</sup> In 1974 the actions of Preus and Concordia’s Board of Control resulted in the “walkout” of a majority of students and faculty.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> “The Doctrinal Situation in The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod,” *CN* 2 (3 March 1969): 58.

<sup>9</sup> John Strietelmeier, “Reflections of a Loyal Oppositionist,” *Cre* 34 (April 1971): 27.

<sup>10</sup> James E. Adams, “The Missourian Dilemma: What Price Preus?” *CC* 90 (23 May 1973): 591.

<sup>11</sup> See James E. Adams, “Majority at Concordia Suspend Themselves,” *StLP-D*, 22 January 1974; reproduced in *CN* 7 (28 January 1974): 5. Bill Bryan, “Seminarists attack ‘theological power play,’” *StLG-D*, 22 January 1974; reproduced in *CN* 7 (28 January 1974): 7. Andrew Wilson, “Striking Students Shut Concordia, Back Tietjen,” *StLG-D*, 22 January 1974; reproduced in *CN* 7 (28 January 1974): 9. Andrew Wilson, “Uproar at Concordia,” *StLG-D*, 22 January 1974; reproduced in *CN* 7 (28 January 1974): 9. Andrew S. Wilson, “Concordia Staff Vows Showdown on Doctrine,” *StLP-D*, 23 January 1974; reproduced in *CN* 7 (28 January 1974): 7. Andrew Wilson, “Concordia classes ordered open,” *StLG-D*, 24 January 1974; reproduced in *CN* 7 (28 January 1974): 9. Robert Teuscher, “‘No compromise,’ says Dr. Preus,” *StLG-D*, 29 January 1974; reproduced in

Because the fallout associated with the change in the doctrine of Scripture in the Missouri Synod occurred well after 1961, the obvious assumption would be that this dramatic transformation in the LCMS played little if any role in the exit of the Wisconsin Synod from the Synodical Conference.<sup>12</sup> The Wisconsin Synod's resolution to sever relations with Missouri on 17 August 1961 cited the doctrine and practice of church fellowship as the reason for the break.<sup>13</sup>

Yet many in both synods believed that the change regarding the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures was a significant, if sometimes unspoken, factor in the breakup of the synods.<sup>14</sup> Former Concordia Seminary President John Tietjen acknowledged in his *Memoirs in Exile* in 1990 that since the early 1950s Concordia had been "undergoing a quiet revolution." Biblical studies enjoyed greater attention and some faculty members helped the seminary and the synod "come to terms with

---

*CN* 7 (4 February 1974): 7. Robert H. Teuscher, "Preus charges Tietjen fueling Concordia split," *StLG-D*, 29 January 1974; reproduced in *CN* 7 (28 January 1974): 9. Velma Clyde, "Most feel Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod will split up," *The Oregonian*, 2 February 1974; reproduced in *CN* 7 (18 February 1974): 14. "Discord at Concordia," *Time*, 4 February 1974, 54. James E. Adams, "Concordia Students Vote to Join 'Seminary in Exile,'" *StLP-D*, 19 February 1974; reproduced in *CN* 7 (25 February 1974): 8. Andrew Wilson, "'Seminary in Exile,' classes dwarf Concordia enrollment," *StLG-D*, 19 February 1974; reproduced in *CN* 7 (25 February 1974): 10. Andrew Wilson, "45 fired in Concordia dispute," *StLG-D*, 19 February 1974; reproduced in *CN* 7 (25 February 1974): 10. Andrew Wilson, "Hymn is marching tune as students go into exile," *StLG-D*, 20 February 1974; reproduced in *CN* 7 (25 February 1974): 8. Margaret M. Carlan, "The Missouri Synod: Still the Church Militant," *Commonweal* 100 (3 May 1974): 208–12.

<sup>12</sup> The Wisconsin Synod did, however, express genuine regret at Missouri's plight in the 1970s. Harold Wicke, editor of *The Northwestern Lutheran*, wrote in 1972 that "with aching heart and conscious prayer we of the Wisconsin Synod observe the battle raging in our former sister synod." [Harold E. Wicke], "Briefs by the Editor," *NL* 59 (23 April 1972): 134. See also Siegbert W. Becker, "'Faithful to our Calling—Faithful to our Lord,'" *WLQ* 70 (April 1973): 130–2. Joel C. Gerlach, "Looking at the Religious World: The Battle of New Orleans—II," *NL* 60 (17 June 1973): 185–6. Carleton Toppe, "Reversing Time and Tide," (26 August 1973): 263. Joel C. Gerlach, "Looking at the Religious World: Phoenix in St. Louis," *NL* 61 (7 April 1974): 106–7. Edward C. Fredrich, "Looking at the Religious World: Prediction and Response." *NL* 62 (9 February 1975): 46.

<sup>13</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1961*, 198–9.

<sup>14</sup> *The Lutheran*, reporting on Wisconsin's convention decision to sever fellowship, noted that synod president Oscar Naumann accused Missouri's theological faculties of "undermining the authority of Scripture." See "Wisconsin splits conference," *Lu* 43 (30 August 1961): 6–7.

contemporary issues of biblical criticism.” Tietjen recalled a conversation he had as a student in 1953 with Professor Jaroslav Pelikan in which Pelikan predicted serious conflict would occur as LCMS members “came to terms with the results of biblical research.” Though comfortable within the “protective shell” of his Missourian environment, Tietjen nonetheless realized he “was already experiencing the tension between traditional LCMS views on the inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible and historical criticism.” He was forced to confront this tension in his exegetical studies.<sup>15</sup>

Tietjen’s admissions prompted *Northwestern Lutheran* editor James P. Schaefer of the Wisconsin Synod to remark, in effect, that “we knew it all along.”

The basic issue . . . was opposing views of the Bible. The liberals were convinced, beyond any doubting, that they were moving “away from the legalisms of the past to a full appreciation of the centrality and sufficiency of the gospel.” In promoting this view, extensive use was made of the “historical-critical” method. The conservatives in Missouri charged that the method was a full-scaled assault on the plenary inspiration of the inerrant Scriptures, a radical departure from Missouri’s past. This issue was the centerpiece of Missouri’s civil war.<sup>16</sup>

This “basic issue,” though not the presenting issue over which Wisconsin exited the Synodical Conference, nonetheless played a key role in the turmoil between the two synods.

#### *Changes in St. Louis*

In a letter to *The American Lutheran* in 1920, a college student complained that “the clergy and the laymen of the Lutheran Church have long been antagonistic towards our universities.” An *American Lutheran* editor replied that whatever antagonism existed in the Lutheran Church was directed not so much at the universities themselves but at “the unwholesome spiritual atmosphere that so often pervades them.” Christian parents feared the faith of their sons and daughters would be

---

<sup>15</sup> John H. Tietjen, *Memoirs in Exile: Confessional Hope and Institutional Conflict* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 6, 8. Pelikan, author of *From Luther to Kierkegaard*, observed just after World War II that “Missouri has never passed through the higher critical question.” Warren R. Rubel, “Pathos and Polemic in Missouri: Tacit Dimensions,” *Cre* 39 (April 1976): 22.

<sup>16</sup> James P. Schaefer, “From this corner,” *NL* 78 (1 February 1991): 59.

attacked by agnostics, evolutionists, and “the rankest kind of materialists” frequently to be found on university campuses. Though conceding that such fears were “by no means unfounded,” the editor defended the Missouri Synod against charges of widespread antagonism toward higher education. The growing tendency for young people to receive university training was being “generally encouraged,” and rightly so, because “a large force of intelligent, university-trained men and women must be of inestimable value to the Church.”<sup>17</sup>

That same year, 1920, Walter Maier received his M. A. from the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and had completed most of the residency requirements for his Ph. D.<sup>18</sup> Maier’s St. Louis colleagues marked his progress with a jubilant academic celebration, attended by faculty members, students, and area pastors.<sup>19</sup> When Maier requested a leave of absence during the 1926–27 school year to complete his doctoral dissertation, the Concordia Seminary board, in granting the request, believed Maier’s studies would “redound to the welfare of Concordia,” and his doctorate would be useful in promoting the seminary to those outside the synod. J. T. Mueller and P. E. Kretzmann also earned advanced degrees in the 1920s, Mueller from Xenia Presbyterian Seminary, Kretzmann at Chicago Lutheran Seminary.<sup>20</sup>

Privately, however, opposition mounted over the pursuit of terminal degrees by Missouri pastors and professors. Martin Graebner, president of Concordia College, St. Paul, Minnesota, in a

---

<sup>17</sup> “University Training,” *AL* 3 (July 1920): 2.

<sup>18</sup> Paul L. Maier, *A Man Spoke, A World Listened: The Story of Walter A. Maier* (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1963), 24–5. According to Theodore Graebner, however, in *Concordia Seminary: Its History, Architecture, and Symbolism* (St. Louis: CPH, n. d. [1926]), 5, Maier did not join Concordia’s faculty until 1922.

<sup>19</sup> Maier, *A Man Spoke, A World Listened*, 95.

<sup>20</sup> Concordia Seminary Board of Control Minutes, 18 January 1926, 2; Theo. Graebner papers, CHI, Box 24; cited by Carl S. Meyer, *Log Cabin to Luther Tower: Concordia Seminary During One Hundred and Twenty-five Years Toward a More Excellent Ministry, 1839–1964* (St. Louis: CPH, 1965), 191.

strongly-worded letter to synod president Frederick Pfothenauer in 1927, chastised the “ungodly degrees” of Mueller and Kretzmann. In Graebner’s view these men were “no longer useful to the Church.” He urged them to resign their calls immediately, or at least “return their titles to the heretics who conferred them, and make public apology.”<sup>21</sup> Two months later, writing to Kretzmann, Martin Graebner called his and Mueller’s pursuit of academic degrees “the beginning of the end of our orthodoxy.

When the future church historian will trace the downfall of Missouri Lutheranism he will point to you two. You are breaking down the dividing line between truth and error. It is not possible for you consistently to tell your students that all false doctrine is an abomination before the Lord, a thing they should avoid even to the extent of never attending a Sectarian church service. Our young men will get the impression that the St. Louis seminary is all right in its way, but that for real efficiency one must attend other schools of theology. Even now many of our young ministers are gathering much of their sermon material from other sources than our own, and the St. Louis faculty at this time has no more important work than to combat this tendency by precept and example.<sup>22</sup>

Replying to his brother, Theodore Graebner admitted “intense misgiving” over the entire matter of terminal degrees because Concordia professors were expected to be not only teachers but “examples of consecrated and efficient workers in Christ’s vineyard.” If students were to conclude that university degrees guaranteed greater success in the church, Graebner feared some students would lose their faith, become “warped” in their religious views and consider service to their synod “uncongenial.” (Graebner knew of “five or six cases on record now.”) Others would “absorb Modernism” and “gather disciples about them,” thus making modernism an issue in the synod.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Martin Graebner to Theodore Graebner, 4 October 1927. Theo. Graebner papers, CHI, Box 24; cited by Carl S. Meyer, *Log Cabin to Luther Tower*, 191.

<sup>22</sup> Martin Graebner to P. E. Kretzmann, 28 December 1927. Theo. Graebner papers, CHI, Box 24; cited by Carl S. Meyer, *Log Cabin to Luther Tower*, 192.

<sup>23</sup> Theodore Graebner to Martin Graebner, 10 December 1927, copies to P. E. Kretzmann and J. T. Mueller; Theo. Graebner papers, CHI, Box 24; cited by Carl S. Meyer, *Log Cabin to Luther Tower*, 110.

Still, the practice continued. George Schick and Paul Bretscher arrived at Concordia with doctor's degrees. William Arndt and Richard Caemmerer completed them while on the faculty. Between 1921 and 1941, only 6 of 16 men called to the faculty had degrees or earned them during their service; from 1941 to 1954, 13 of 23 possessed or completed doctorates.<sup>24</sup> The widening educational experience of Missouri professors, as well as the synod's broadened mission program, occasioned more frequent contact with non-Missouri doctrine and practice. This trend "had the effect of introducing exegetical and theological challenges to Missouri's doctrinal system."<sup>25</sup> Ironically, the same P. E. Kretzmann, two decades later, criticized the change in position of Concordia's professors:

How would you feel, as an instructor in our CONCORDIA SEMINARY, if you have to be on the defensive on the doctrine of the Antichrist, on the length of a creation day, on evolutionism, on the sanctioning of the modern dance, and other doctrinal and practical questions, when students blandly inform you that other men on the faculty hold more advanced views? I formerly kept a list of the questions on which opinions in our faculty differ widely from the straightforward teaching of a generation ago, but the subject was too painful.

Kretzmann charged one faculty colleague with being "committed to compromise, expediency, Melancthonianism," and called another "erratic to a very extreme degree, eager for the applause of the multitude."<sup>26</sup>

Officially, Missouri maintained its traditional doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. The first two volumes of the three-volume anthology *The Abiding Word*, published in 1946 and 1947, contained

---

<sup>24</sup> Carl S. Meyer, *Log Cabin to Luther Tower*, 193.

<sup>25</sup> Jeffrey S. Nelson, *The Theology of Inexpedience: Two Case Studies in "Moderate" Congregational Dissent in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod* (New York: University Press of America, Inc., 1998), 22.

<sup>26</sup> Paul E. Kretzmann to Paul Burgdorf, 19 February 1940; copy in the papers of Curtis Peterson; cited by Joel Pless, "Cancer at Concordia: An examination of how the historical-critical method of Biblical interpretation was introduced to the classroom teaching at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri, and what were the subsequent effects" (senior church history paper, 27 May 1986), 17; WLS library essay file.

articles that employed such words as *inspiration, verbal inspiration, infallible, inner perfection, perfect and complete agreement and harmony, and inerrant* to describe the Bible.<sup>27</sup> Edward Koehler's *Summary of Christian Doctrine*, published in 1939 and reprinted in 1952, insisted that "every possibility of error" in Scripture, "not only in the presentation of the fundamental doctrines, but also in such references as pertain to nature and history, was eliminated from the outset."<sup>28</sup> In the early 1950s Raymond Surburg analyzed the historical-critical method and hermeneutical issues "with great learning and acumen" before joining the faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield.<sup>29</sup> Robert Preus cited approvingly seventeenth-century Lutheran dogmatician J. A. Quenstedt that "in the sacred canonical Scriptures there is no lie, no deceit, no error, even the slightest, either in content or words." Every word of Scripture was true "whether it pertains to doctrine, ethics, history, chronology, typography or onomastics."<sup>30</sup>

Yet during the 1950s Concordia experienced a quiet, unheralded "revolution," as some professors investigated and embraced methods of biblical interpretation practiced for decades at many other seminaries but previously unknown at St. Louis.<sup>31</sup> Lewis Spitz, professor of church

---

<sup>27</sup> H. Roepe, "The Proper Use of the Bible," *The Abiding Word: An Anthology of Doctrinal Essays for the Year 1945* (St. Louis: CPH, 1946), 1:68, 69, 72, 80. E. L. Wilson, "Faith," 1:211. Walter W. F. Albrecht, "Holy Scripture the Word of God," *The Abiding Word: An Anthology of Doctrinal Essays for the Year 1946* (St. Louis: CPH, 1947), 2:8, 13, 15, 19, 32.

<sup>28</sup> Edward W. A. Koehler, *A Summary of Christian Doctrine*, 10. See also Francis Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*. Volume 1., trans. H. W. Romoser, et. al., (St. Louis: CPH, 1950), 221–4.

<sup>29</sup> Raymond Surburg, "The Historical Method in Biblical Interpretation," *CTM* 23 (February 1952): 81–104. Raymond Surburg, "The Significance of Luther's Hermeneutics for the Protestant Reformation," *CTM* 24 (April 1953): 241–61. Marquart, *Anatomy of an Explosion*, 111–2.

<sup>30</sup> Robert Preus, *The Inspiration of Scripture: A Study of the Theology of the Seventeenth Century Lutheran Dogmaticians* (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), 77.

<sup>31</sup> Tietjen, *Memoirs in Exile*, 23. According to one researcher, "nearly all the evidence points to the fact that throughout the 1940s the historical-grammatical method was accepted and taught at St. Louis." One Wisconsin Synod pastor who attended Concordia during the 1943–44 school year said he was "not exposed to or taught any form of the historical-critical method," and remembered



history, believed the changes began when professors Arthur Repp and Alfred Fuerbringer “instigated the movement to ‘open up’ the faculty to more ‘scholarly’ conclusions.” Spitz reported overhearing Repp and Fuerbringer, as they walked home from classes one evening, discussing how “something was going to have to be done to ‘modernize’ the faculty.”<sup>32</sup> John Tietjen saw the change as occurring still earlier: “I learned the historical critical method in the classrooms of the now sainted William Arndt, Paul Bretscher, Martin Franzmann, and George Schick,” before Repp and Fuerbringer assumed leadership positions.<sup>33</sup> Edgar Krentz, Norman Habel, Horace Hummel, Fred Danker, Ralph Klein, Arlis Ehlen, Robert Smith, and Holland “Casey” Jones also received mention, as did Wisconsin Synod imports Alfred von Rohr Sauer and Walter Wegner.<sup>34</sup>

---

Walter Maier as “one of the harshest critics of the historical-critical method.” John Jeske, interview with Joel Pless, 12 March 1986; in Pless, “Cancer at Concordia,” 29.

<sup>32</sup> Daniel Moriarity to Joel Pless, 28 January 1986; in Pless, “Cancer at Concordia,” 81.

<sup>33</sup> John H. Tietjen to Joel Pless, 18 March 1986; in Pless, “Cancer at Concordia,” 98. Tietjen was the only man to mention Franzmann as the initiator of historical criticism. What Tietjen regarded as Franzmann’s historical criticism may more rightly reflect the emphasis on direct study of the biblical text and rejection of dogmatism, espoused by Wisconsin professors J. P. Koehler and August Pieper. See Westerhaus, “The Wauwatosa Theology,” 1, esp. 32–8, 85–93.

Martin Marty called Franzmann “the great leader of conservatisms who transcended all and inspired all and held us all together.” Martin E. Marty to Mark Braun, 19 December 1995; copy in possession of the author. Leigh Jordahl wrote in 1973 that both sides in Missouri’s civil war appealed to Franzmann but that he “could not possibly [have felt] at home on either side.” His support of the *Brief Statement* in 1959 would have put him on the conservatives’ side, yet “his whole way of doing theology was so dramatically different than that of the Missouri traditionalists that he was distinctly ‘new breed.’” Leigh D. Jordahl, “Missouri Synod: Dilemma or Trilemma,” *Dialog* 12 (Spring 1973): 125. In a presentation to Missouri’s 1975 convention at Anaheim, Franzmann maintained that “historical-critical tools, as used by LCMS theologians with Lutheran presuppositions” could be “useful” for biblical interpretation. Franzmann called the alternative “frightening,” fearing that Missouri would “lapse into a history-less and undiscerning view of the Holy Scriptures.” Franzmann urged that “in any way we approach the Scripture, there must be complete submission to the Scripture”—which seemed to argue more for scriptural *authority* than for *inerrancy*, as reaction to his comments suggested. H[einrich] Vogel, “The Issues Before the Anaheim Convention,” *WLQ* 72 (July 1975): 259–60.

<sup>34</sup> Tietjen, *Memoirs in Exile*, 14. Robert D. Preus to Joel Pless, 2 April 1986, in Pless, “Cancer at Concordia,” 100.

Kurt Marquart considered it more than coincidental that unrest at Concordia concerning verbal inspiration came to a head during the 1953–54 school year, as student questions centered on “the extent to which the Scriptures themselves and the Confessions of the Church teach a doctrine of Verbal Inspiration.”<sup>35</sup> The student magazine *The Seminarian* over the next few years was “in the hands of a self-perpetuating clique of propagandists for neo-orthodoxy.” In 1955, in an attempt at editorial fairness, *The Seminarian* began to print articles emphasizing the orthodox teaching on Scripture—“but in a kind of conservative ghetto under the quarantine-flag, ‘Another Voice’!”<sup>36</sup> “*Scripture itself does not say that it is inerrant*”

Synodical Conference Lutherans had almost succeeded in uniting or reuniting with the Ohio, Iowa, and Buffalo synods during the 1920s. After these three synods merged into the ALC in 1930, there still appeared to be much the new ALC and the Synodical Conference agreed upon. Indeed, much of the debate centered on the degree to which variant viewpoints on nonfundamental doctrines could affect the realization and declaration of church fellowship.<sup>37</sup>

Yet a persistent concern was whether the constituent synods of the ALC endorsed the same doctrine regarding Scripture as did the Synodical Conference. Michael Reu of the Iowa Synod opposed use of the word *inerrant* in 1926 in a draft of a doctrinal statement for the proposed new church body. While Reu did not believe the Scriptures contained error, he resisted *inerrant* in the

---

<sup>35</sup> R[ichard] R. Caemmerer, ed., “Essays on the Inspiration of Scripture,” *CTM* 25 (October 1954): 738.

<sup>36</sup> Marquart, *Anatomy of an Explosion*, 109.

<sup>37</sup> See, for example, F[rederick] R. W[ebber], “Are We Evading The Real Issue?” *CL* 1 (June 1940): 36–7. “How Much Of Scripture Belongs To The Foundation Of Faith?” (July 1940): 44. “A Correction For The Theological Monthly,” 55. Gullerud, “A New Approach,” 65–6. “Mistaken Argumentation,” 14–7. B[urgdorf], “The Leavening Influence of Error,” 37–8. A[rthur] E. B[eck], “A God-Pleasing Union,” (May 1941): 49–50. J[ohn] B[uenger], “Why?” (May 1941): 54–5. B[urgdorf], “Was The Term ‘Non-Fundamentals’ Used As Identical With The Term ‘Open Questions’ In The St. Louis Resolutions Of 1938?” 97–8.

church's constitution. "Scripture itself does not say that it is inerrant," Reu argued, when it talks about matters not directly related to faith and life.<sup>38</sup>

But as the merger approached, Ohio Synod leaders stood firm on inerrancy. Iowa Synod President C. G. Prottengeier was forced to address the accusation "that since the Fundamentalist society of the Twin Cities has put the word 'inerrant' on its standard, we dare not fall short of them, but must do likewise." Though Prottengeier did not welcome his synod's being coerced by non-Lutheran pressure, he did want his church absolved of "the infamous suspicion and contemptible insinuation that she has modernist views." Ultimately the Iowa Synod capitulated.<sup>39</sup>

The constitution of the new American Lutheran Church in 1930 referred to the Old and New Testament Scriptures as "the inspired Word of God and only infallible authority in all matters of faith and life." An appendix to the constitution said the new synod believed that all the canonical books "as a whole and in all their parts" were "the inspired and inerrant Word of God."<sup>40</sup> When the ALC agreed in 1938 to accept Missouri's *Brief Statement* "in the light of" its own *Declaration* (the Sandusky Resolutions), ALC theologians wrote that "the separate books of the Bible constitute an organic whole without contradiction and error."<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> *Constitution and By-Laws for the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of America: Rules and Regulations for the Synodical Boards and Recommendations of the Joint Commission* (Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1926), 8; in Marty, *The Noise of Conflict*, 211.

<sup>39</sup> Frederick W. Meuser, *The Formation of the American Lutheran Church: A Case Study in Lutheran Unity* (Columbus Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1958), 186, quotes a letter from Michael Reu to the ALC's C. C. Hein, 28 May 1926; in Marty, *The Noise of Conflict*, 211–2. See also Todd Nichol, "'Timely Warnings': Notes on Inerrancy and Inerrant," *Dialog* 24 (Winter 1985): 58.

<sup>40</sup> *Constitution and By-Laws for the American Lutheran Church* (Columbus, Ohio, September 1930), 5–11; in Wolf, ed., *Documents of Lutheran Unity*, 338.

<sup>41</sup> *ALC Minutes, 1938*, 7–11; in Wolf, ed., *Documents of Lutheran Unity*, 395.

Michael Reu's essay, "What Is Scripture?" published under the title *In the Interest of Lutheran Unity* in 1940,<sup>42</sup> confused the concepts of revelation and inspiration, according to George Lillegard of the ELS. "All those who deny or question the inspiration of every part of Scripture invariably confuse [revelation and inspiration] and base their objections to the inspiration of certain parts of the Bible on that confusion." If, for example, a part of Scripture "does not have direct religious value," but deals only with "historical, geographical, and other secular matters," readers such as Reu "do not see why [such a passage] should have to be accepted as the inerrant, inspired Word of God at all." Reu criticized those who regarded "all doctrinal statements on the same level, like the paragraphs of a code of laws, so that one could dive into [Scripture] at random, pick out a truth in the form of a Scripture passage and apply it to the given case." Lillegard remarked that after reading Reu's "involved argument," he could understand why the ALC "was not satisfied to accept the Missouri Synod's *Brief Statement* on the Holy Scripture without adding qualifying paragraphs of their own."<sup>43</sup>

Meanwhile the ALC was also seeking agreement on the doctrine of Scripture with the ULCA.<sup>44</sup> In its *Baltimore Declaration* in 1938, the ULCA confessed "the whole body of the Scriptures" to be "in all its parts" the Word of God and that the Scriptures were "the infallible truth

---

<sup>42</sup> Michael Reu, *In the Interest of Lutheran Unity* (Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1940).

<sup>43</sup> Geo[rge] O. Lillegard, "In the Interest of Lutheran Unity," originally written for *The Lutheran Sentinel*, 13 January and 27 January 1941; reprinted in *Qu* 38 (April 1941): 130–1. Lillegard offered additional "scathing criticisms of the subtle errors" in Reu's essay for publication in *Qu* 38 (July 1941): 217–5. See also P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], "What Do Such Expressions as 'Scripture,' 'All Scripture,' etc., Mean in the American Lutheran Church?" *CL* 16 (April 1955): 42–4.

<sup>44</sup> See "Lutherans Moving Closer Together," *LC* 50 (29 October 1942): 1235–6.

of God in all matters that pertain to His revelation and our salvation.”<sup>45</sup> The *Pittsburgh Agreement* of 1939, endorsed by ULCA and ALC representatives, said the Holy Spirit supplied the Bible’s writers with “content and fitting word,” and so “the separate books of the Bible are related to one another and, taken together, constitute an complete errorless, unbreakable whole of which Christ is the center.”<sup>46</sup>

This *Pittsburgh Agreement* was hailed by *The American Lutheran’s* Otto Geiseman as “a much clearer and much stronger statement” than the *Baltimore Declaration* had been. Geiseman found it “particularly encouraging” that this statement reflected “a general trend toward a more conservative Christianity” and an evidence that “both Christ and the Bible are again becoming more meaningful.” *The Christian Century* had criticized the “extremely conservative character” of the *Pittsburgh Agreement*, even insisting that “the Lutherans are rendering more remote their union with non-Lutheran bodies and are imposing difficulties in the way even of cooperation with them.”<sup>47</sup> Geiseman countered, “What liberal theologians regard as bad news conservative Lutheran Bible theologians regard as good news.”<sup>48</sup>

For George Lillegard of the Norwegian Synod, however, approval of the *Pittsburgh Agreement* created “this strange situation” in which the ALC professed agreement with the ULCA on the doctrine of Scripture while at the same time claiming to agree with Missouri. Yet the ULCA did not agree with Missouri. “By all the laws of logic, the U. L. C. and the Missouri Synod ought to be

---

<sup>45</sup> *ULCA Minutes, 1938*, 473. For the Wisconsin Synod’s take on the ULCA’s action at Baltimore, see [August F.] Z[ich], “The United Lutheran Church,” *NL* 25 (6 (November 1938): 358–9.

<sup>46</sup> *ULCA Minutes, 1940*, 264.

<sup>47</sup> “Lutherans in America Move Toward Unity,” *CC* 56 (15 March 1939): 342.

<sup>48</sup> O[tto] A. Geiseman, “While It Is Day: Good News,” *AL* 22 (April 1939): 6.

officially agreed on the doctrine of Scripture, but as a matter of historical fact they are not; and yet the A. L. C. agrees with both!”<sup>49</sup>

In the 1940s, according to Robert Preus, “there would have been good reason to assume” that in the ALC and the American Lutheran Conference “the absolute authority, infallibility, and inerrancy of the Scriptures was taught and believed.” Still there were exceptions.<sup>50</sup> The editor of the Lutheran Free Church’s *Folkebladet* charged in 1945 that the differences between Missouri and other Lutherans displayed “a basically different attitude toward Scripture.” Rejecting the insistence that every word of the Bible was inerrant, the editor allowed that “there may well be errors in certain portions of Scripture, where purely unessential things are concerned, without having your faith in the revelation weakened thereby.”<sup>51</sup>

Noting variations on inspiration in an article in the ULCA’s 9 January 1946 issue of *The Lutheran*, Carl Gullerud remarked:

It should be evident that we are not agreed with the U. L. C. on inspiration and that the Pittsburgh Agreement, hailed by the American Lutheran Conference members as a satisfactory settlement, has not proved to be a settlement of the question. How can Missouri Synod members join with the U. L. C. men in conducting so-called “Lutheran” seminars when this question, for one thing, hangs in the balance?

Gullerud wondered whether anyone else had noticed that nearly all the Missouri participants at such seminars were signers of the *Statement of the 44*.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> George O. Lillegard, ““In the Interest of Lutheran Unity,”” *LuSen* 24 (13 January 1941): 5. For a similar assessment from the Wisconsin Synod, see M[ax] Lehninger, “Lutheran Union Movement Today,” *NL* 28 (9 March 1941): 68–70.

<sup>50</sup> Preus, “Fellowship Concerns,” 14.

<sup>51</sup> *Folkebladet* (3 October 1945); cited by P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “An Echo From The National Lutheran Editors’ Conference,” *CL* 6 (November 1945): 137–8.

<sup>52</sup> C[arl] M. Gullerud, “Lutheran Union News Digest,” *CL* 7 (March 1946): 33. See also C[arl] M. Gullerud, “Lutheran Union News Digest,” (April 1946): 44–5. C[arl] M. Gullerud, “Lutheran Union News Digest,” (July 1946): 87. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “The Scriptural Principle in

The ALC's *Lutheran Standard* for 21 February 1953 said that the imprecatory Psalms (such as Psalms 59, 69, and 109) were "out of line with the Spirit of Christ." Old Testament believers, in the author's view, possessed "only a limited revelation of God," which also made for "a limited morality." To "children of the New Testament," the imprecatory Psalms "must remain foreign in spirit. Here Jesus is our pattern."<sup>53</sup> Missouri's Theodore Engelder had already addressed such objections in *Scripture Cannot Be Broken*. "Because we believe in Verbal Inspiration," Engelder wrote, "we know that those sentiments express the mind of God." Though some expressions seem harsh to modern readers, "we bridle our thoughts." Every expression in these psalms "is in full accord with the eternal Holiness."<sup>54</sup>

#### *The Doctrinal Affirmation and the Common Confession*

Following the 1940 Synodical Conference convention declaration that three documents would not constitute a reliable basis for church union,<sup>55</sup> Missouri's 1941 convention resolved to make "every possible effort" to prepare a single document of agreement between the ALC and the Missouri Synod that Wisconsin and other constituent bodies could accept.<sup>56</sup> The resulting document,

---

the American Lutheran Church," *CL* 8 (June 1947): 63–4. Theo. Dierks, "Is Every Word of Holy Scripture the Inspired and Inerrant Word of God?" *CL* 9 (August 1948): 94–7. A. V. Kuster, "Missouri 'Errs' on Inspiration," *CL* 10 (August 1949): 98. A. V. Kuster, "'Casual' Theory of Inspiration?" (August 1949): 99. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], "What 'United Lutherans' think about the Bible," *CL* 11 (April 1950): 39.

<sup>53</sup> "David Prays a Curse on his Enemies," *LS* 111 (21 February 1952): 15.

<sup>54</sup> Theodore Engelder, *Scripture Cannot Be Broken: Six Objections to Verbal Inspiration Examined in the Light of Scripture* (St. Louis: CPH, 1944), 237–45. Norman A. Madson, "The ALC on Inspiration," *Qu* 50 (April 1953): 141–2.

<sup>55</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1940*, 92.

<sup>56</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1941*, 302.

the *Doctrinal Affirmation*, appeared in 1944.<sup>57</sup> Edmund Reim called the *Affirmation* “a fruitless attempt” to unite Missouri’s *Brief Statement* and the ALC’s *Declaration* into one document.<sup>58</sup> Missouri’s John Buenger called it “the *most farcical* of all union efforts” between the synods because “there was too much of the controversial truth in it to please the ALC, and not enough of the truth to satisfy the consciences of true Lutherans.”<sup>59</sup>

The key question regarding the *Affirmation* was whether it actually settled past differences between the Lutheran bodies. Reim was pleased to see the *Affirmation* left many articles of the *Brief Statement* unchanged, particularly the doctrine of conversion, where the *Brief Statement* presentation was augmented by an additional statement rejecting the Calvinistic teaching of irresistible grace. The *Affirmation* article on justification retained *Brief Statement* wording verbatim, and the section on election included the *Brief Statement*’s rejection of *intuitu fidei*. For Wisconsin and for those in Missouri who regarded the *Brief Statement* as the standard to be achieved, these were hopeful signs.<sup>60</sup>

Chief cause for concern came in the *Affirmation*’s treatment of Scripture. The *Affirmation* omitted an entire paragraph from the *Brief Statement* article “Of the Holy Scriptures,” which credited the Scriptures with containing “no errors or contradictions,” even “in those matters that treat of historical, geographical, and other secular matters,” but that the Scriptures “are in all their parts and

---

<sup>57</sup> *Doctrinal Affirmation of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States and of the American Lutheran Church*. St. Louis: CPH, 1944.

<sup>58</sup> Reim, “The Debate on Union: How Did We Get Into It?” 137. E[dmund] Reim, “The Debate on Union: Where Do We Stand?” *NL* 34 (11 May 1947): 150.

<sup>59</sup> Buenger, “Brief Review,” 101; emphasis in the original. In spite of these negative assessments, Fredrich, “The Great Debate,” 160, said the *Affirmation* “could not have been as totally bad as the oblivion to which it has been assigned seems to suggest.” Missouri didn’t like it because “it sounded too much like Ohio-Iowa talk while the ALC didn’t like it because it was too close to the *Brief Statement*.”

<sup>60</sup> E[dmund] R[eim], “The Doctrinal Affirmation,” *Qu* 42 (January 1945): 55–6.



words the infallible truth.”<sup>61</sup> This omission, in the viewpoint of *The Confessional Lutheran’s* Paul Burgdorf, demonstrated “an unmistakable false deference to ‘science’” within the ALC. As additional testimony Burgdorf quoted Michael Reu’s statement in his *Lutheran Dogmatics* that “the Christian believer does not quarrel with science when it builds up theories explaining the formation of the world.”<sup>62</sup>

Regarding the ALC’s view of the “organic whole” of Scripture, Burgdorf called the term “an invention of modernists” who used it “to teach and defend false doctrine” and “to escape the confession of every word of Scripture.” Missouri’s doctrine of inspiration insisted that “the Bible *is* the Word of God” in the sense that “*every one of its words is* the Word of God,” without contradiction or error. The *Affirmation* clothed the teaching on Scripture in “weasel words” that “no true and wary Lutheran” would want to accept.<sup>63</sup> John Buenger, also in *The Confessional Lutheran*, wrote:

It is exactly the characteristic of unionistic platforms that they leave room in some way for two contradictory opinions. Modernists within the American Lutheran Church are not troubled by our rejection of their theory of inspiration **as long as we do it on paper only but render this rejection futile by again leaving room for their view also, and by actually fraternizing with them.** Now the Affirmation is meant *as a basis for church fellowship with the American Lutheran Church*, a church body of which, as we all know, modernists form a considerable contingent. Hence this would be the situation if union would be consummated on the basis of the Doctrinal Affirmation. In that case we would **condemn modernism on paper, but fraternize with modernists in fact. . . .**

---

<sup>61</sup> Reim, “The Doctrinal Affirmation,” 56. “The Doctrinal Affirmation—A Closer Scrutiny,” *Qu* 42 (April 1945): 128–9.

<sup>62</sup> P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “Here I Stand! An Examination and a Rejection of the Proposed ‘Doctrinal Affirmation’ of Committees of the American Lutheran Church and of the Missouri Synod,” *CL* 6 (May 1945): 55.

<sup>63</sup> Burgdorf, “Here I Stand!” 53–4; emphases in the original.

The American Lutheran Church cannot accept the Brief Statement without reservations. To offer them an altered Brief Statement with some of their reservations inserted is not the proper way to settle differences.<sup>64</sup>

Missouri's official response, however, was that the *Affirmation* "was not charged with any doctrinal error." No modification of its doctrinal content was required, although some observers feared that certain phrases of the *Affirmation* failed sufficiently to exclude doctrinal errors and required clarification.<sup>65</sup>

Wisconsin remained unconvinced that changes in terminology alone would render the *Affirmation* acceptable. Calling merely for clarifications "seems to be an understatement which will probably convey to the reader the impression that the entire matter was not really as serious as it had at first seemed." The *Affirmation* did not serve as a settlement of past differences.<sup>66</sup> By 1947 it became obvious that the synods would not be uniting on the basis of the *Affirmation*.<sup>67</sup>

A second attempt to draft a single document as a basis for union between the ALC and the Synodical Conference appeared in the *Common Confession* in 1950.<sup>68</sup> Although Missouri's South

---

<sup>64</sup> J[ohn] B[uenger], "Why is the 'Doctrinal Affirmation' Unacceptable?" *CL* 6 (February 1945): 14–5; emphases in the original.

<sup>65</sup> F. H. Brunn, "The Committee on Doctrinal Unity Reports," *LW* 65 (30 July 1946): 256.

<sup>66</sup> E[dmund] Reim, "The Doctrinal Affirmation Revised," *Qu* 43 (October 1946): 288–90.

<sup>67</sup> J[ohn] B[uenger], "What the Doctrinal Affirmation Can Accomplish," *CL* 8 (April 1947): 37–40. The ALC's resolution at its October 1946 convention in Appleton, Wisconsin—that failure to formulate a single doctrinal statement "after years of effort" had led them to "despair of attaining Lutheran unity by way of additional doctrinal formulations and reformulations"—effectively terminated the *Doctrinal Affirmation*. E[dmund] Reim, "The End of the Affirmation," *Qu* 44 (January 1947): 64–5.

<sup>68</sup> E[dmund] Reim, "A Common Confession Missouri and A. L. C.," *Qu* 47 (January 1950): 58–60. E[dmund] Reim, "As We See It: This 'Common Confession of Faith'—I," *NL* 37 (26 February 1950): 74–5. *The Common Confession*, Parts I and II; cited in Wolf, ed., *Documents of Lutheran Unity*, 408–28. Part I was adopted by the Missouri and Slovak Synods, but was withdrawn as a basis for discussion between the synods at the 1956 Synodical Conference convention. Part II, proposed of the *Common Confession*, which appeared in 1952 as a statement "indicative of, and normative for, Christian life in our congregations and synods," was never formally adopted by any of

Wisconsin District Pastors' Conference declared the *Common Confession* "entirely scriptural," G. Elson Ruff, editor of *The Lutheran*, referred to the *Confession* as "the Missouri Compromise." The document "didn't try to solve the old problems—it buried them."<sup>69</sup>

Over the next year and a half, Synodical Conference bodies responded to the *Common Confession* in predictable fashion, and their responses widened the chasm between them.<sup>70</sup> *The American Lutheran* called the *Confession* "complete and well-formulated, neither ignoring nor accentuating the differences hitherto separating the two church bodies." The editorial writer especially urged "those Lutherans not a party to the agreement" to permit "free expression" on the *Confession*, "free of innuendo and personal rancor," and to resist "a modern rehash of all the mistakes or supposed mistakes of the past."<sup>71</sup> *The Confessional Lutheran*, however, considered it "impossible" to accept the *Common Confession*. John Buenger went so far as to say that those Missourians who could accept the *Confession* "are evidently in doctrinal agreement" with the ALC and should join that church body, calling it "the only honorable thing for them to do.

---

the Synodical Conference synods.

<sup>69</sup> "Missouri Compromise," *Lu* 32 (5 April 1950): 7. "Statement Buries Problems Says 'The Lutheran's' Editor," *LS* 108 (22 April 1950): 11. E[dmund] Reim, "As We See It: Adequate?" *NL* 37 (7 May 1950): 152–3. W[illiam] J. S[chaefer], "Missouri's Troubles." (4 June 1950): 180.

<sup>70</sup> See E[dmund] Reim, "As We See It: This 'Common Confession of Faith'—II," *NL* 37 (12 March 1950): 87–8. E[dmund] Reim, "As We See It: This 'Common Confession of Faith'—III," (26 March 1950): 74–5. E[dmund] Reim, "A. L. C. Adoption of the Common Confession," *Qu* 47 (October 1950): 316. E[dmund] Reim, "A. L. C. Acceptance of the Common Confession," *Qu* 48 (January 1951): 59–60.

<sup>71</sup> "'Common Confession of Faith,'" *AL* 33 (March 1950): 3–4. For other positive *American Lutheran* assessments of the *Common Confession*, urging its adoption and critical of those opposed to it, see "Deliver Us From Them That Hinder!" *AL* 33 (May 1950): 4. "The Common Confession," (June 1950). 6–7. O[tto] A. Geiseman, "While It Is Day: The Joint Doctrinal Statement," (June 1950): 8. "Synodical Conference," (August 1950): 4. O[tto] A. Geiseman, "While It Is Day: Common Confession of Faith," (August 1950): 6–7. "Common Confession," *AL* 34 (January 1951): 3–4.

They should not try to oppress and tyrannize the consciences of those who are firmly convinced that the position and practice to which the Missouri Synod has always adhered in former years was right and Scriptural, and who are therefore for conscience sake bound to continue in the old paths.<sup>72</sup>

Missouri's 1950 convention thanked God "that the 'Common Confession' shows that agreement has been achieved in the doctrines treated by the two committees." Delegates directed their synod president to "place this matter before the Synodical Conference in order to secure the consent of the constituent synods to the actions outlined in these resolutions."<sup>73</sup> The Slovak Lutheran Church aligned itself with Missouri, accepting the *Confession* at its 1951 convention, although pointing to seven places where it felt the *Confession* required explanation or clarification.<sup>74</sup>

The Norwegian Church (ELS) unanimously disapproved of the *Common Confession* in 1951 because it "[did] not reject the errors of the American Lutheran Church" in the doctrines of Scripture, conversion, the church, and last things.<sup>75</sup> Wisconsin's convention that same summer at New Ulm, though acknowledging "many fine statements of Scriptural truth" in the *Confession*, declared it to be "inadequate in the points noted" and charged that Missouri's adoption of the *Confession* "involves an

---

<sup>72</sup> J[ohn] B[uenger], "The Latest Union Document," *CL* 11 (April 1950): 48–9. For other negative *Confessional Lutheran* assessments of the *Common Confession*, urging its rejection and critical of those who supported it, see "Missouri Compromise," *CL* 11 (June 1950): 67–8. J[ohn] B[uenger], "The COMMON CONFESSIOIN and Free Conferences," (October 1950): 117–23. W. H. M[cLaughlin], "Those Technical Expressions (Concerning the Doctrine of Inspiration in the 'Common Confession')," (November 1950): 128–33. A. T. K[retzmann], "The Unconstitutionality of the Missouri Synod's Resolution on the 'Common Confession,'" (December 1950): 138–40. [Arthur C.] D[ahms], "Does the Common Confession Settle Doctrinal Differences?" *CL* 14 (July 1953): 78–80.

<sup>73</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1950*, 585, 587. E[dmund] Reim, "The Milwaukee Resolutions on the Common Confession," *Qu* 47 (July 1950): 239–41.

<sup>74</sup> "Resolution Re: The Common Confession," *LB* 8 (September 1951): 135. E[dmund] Reim, "The Slovak Resolutions on the 'Common Confession,'" *Qu* 48 (October 1951): 285–6.

<sup>75</sup> *Norwegian Proceedings, 1951*, 54. E[dmund] Reim, "Norwegian Action on 'Common Confession,'" *Qu* 48 (July 1951): 203–5. See also P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], "Norwegian Synod Rejects 'Common Confession,'" *CL* 12 (July 1951): 83–4.

untruth and creates a basically untruthful situation since this action has been officially interpreted as a settlement of past differences which are not in fact settled.”<sup>76</sup>

Wisconsin’s criticisms of the *Common Confession* were summarized in the word *inadequate*.<sup>77</sup> “We are not going to take the position,” Reim explained, “that a confession is wrong simply because it is a new formulation of some old truths.” Restating doctrinal truths in terms faithful to Scripture “is in itself a wholesome process,” possibly even preventing one from adopting “a rigid and mechanical insistence upon the letter of a doctrine” without “getting at the heart and spirit of the matter.” But the *Common Confession*, as any confessional document, was also intended to serve the negative function of “exposing and warding off the error which the Church is thus forced to deal with.” Because it failed to do that, the *Confession* was inadequate.<sup>78</sup>

Regarding the doctrine of Scripture, critics in both the Missouri and Wisconsin Synods noted the similarity between the wording of the *Common Confession* and that of the *Pittsburgh Agreement*. In 1939 Missouri’s Committee on Doctrinal Unity had judged the *Pittsburgh Agreement* “not adequate” because it contained “loopholes for a denial of the verbal inspiration and inerrancy of the Scriptures.”<sup>79</sup> By adopting the *Confession* with its “fitting and content word” at its 1950 convention, the majority approved “the very sentence which was singled out for most criticism” in 1939.<sup>80</sup> The

---

<sup>76</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1951*, 146–8. E[dmund] Reim, “Wisconsin on the ‘Common Confession,’” *Qu* 48 (October 1951): 286–91.

<sup>77</sup> E[dmund] Reim, “As We See It: A Matter of Terminology,” *NL* 41 (27 June 1954): 205. Irwin J. Habeck, “The Voice Of The C. U. C.: The Seriousness of Inadequacy,” *NL* 43 (1 April 1956): 104.

<sup>78</sup> E[dmund] Reim, “As We See It: Once More: The Common Confession,” *NL* 38 (8 April 1951): 104–5.

<sup>79</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1941*, 279.

<sup>80</sup> [Arthur C.] D[ahms], “Conference Suggests Changes in the ‘Common Confession,’” *CL* 12 (April 1951): 38. See also Erling Ylvisaker, “Comment—Synodical Conference Convention,” *LuSen* 35 (12 September 1952): 259–61. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “The Respective Teachings of the

*Confession* failed entirely to address verbal inspiration or inerrancy. It contained “no small amount of ambiguity” that could offer “a convenient shelter for former erroneous teaching.” The article made room “for those who denied verbal inspiration” and permitted error “to stand side by side with truth.”<sup>81</sup>

Part II of the *Common Confession* did nothing to remove the differences. Noting that the *Common Confession* “was not originally presented to our synod as Part I,” John Buenger said that Part II dealt “mostly with material which has no bearing on the controversy” and therefore did “not serve to clarify the situation.” It only served to deflect readers from attention to the real issues.<sup>82</sup>

The “most basic difference between the ALC and the Synodical Conference” was “a different conception of the inspiration and inerrancy of the Scriptures.” It has been “generally known,” Buenger wrote, that the ALC “has taught and defended the modern view of the Bible,” that only those parts that deal with Christian faith and life are errorless and inspired, while statements that “deal with other, secular matters are not written by inspiration” and may contain errors. Part II said: “The Holy Scriptures are God’s verbally inspired Word, that is, God moved men to write what He wanted recorded in the words which He wanted employed. They alone constitute God’s inerrant Word to men.” But the phrase “what He wanted recorded” left it unclear whether “all Scripture” was inerrant or only those parts that lead directly to Christ and salvation. “Once a loophole is left open

---

Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church with Regard to the Doctrine of Holy Scripture,” *CL* 14 (May 1953): 57–60. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “Does the American Lutheran Church Confess That the Holy Scriptures are in All Their Parts and Words the Infallible Word of God?” (July 1953): 80–83. [Arthur C.] D[ahms], “Content and Fitting Word,” *CL* 15 (July 1954): 75–7.

<sup>81</sup> E[dmund] Reim, “As We See It: Looking to The Foundation,” *NL* 38 (6 May 1951): 135–6. John Hoenecke, “An Investigation of the Common Confession’s Statement on ‘The Word,’” (23 September 1951): 297–8.

<sup>82</sup> J[ohn] B[uenger], “Part II of the COMMON CONFESSIO Does Not Rectify the Shortcomings of Part I,” *CL* 14 (November 1953): 128; (December 1953): 140–4; *CL* 15 (March 1954): 30–4; (June 1954): 72; (November 1954): 128–31.

for those who do not accept the whole Bible as divine revelation, even the expression ‘God’s verbally inspired Word’ which is used in this connection is of no consequence.” When large portions of the Bible are “excepted from inspiration,” the Bible “no longer *is* the Word of God but merely *contains* it.”<sup>83</sup>

*The Scharlemann Papers*

A 1958 *American Lutheran* editorial, while maintaining that the Holy Scriptures are *absolutely true, inerrant, and infallible*, recognized it was not uncommon for Christians “interested in the intellectual implications” of their faith “to become involved in baffling and agonizing difficulties” regarding the doctrine of inspiration.

In almost every case it seemed to us that something like this happened: being brought up in the Lutheran Church, the man in question had for a long time simply taken the Doctrine of Inspiration for granted without giving any serious thought to it. When, very abruptly as a rule, he was brought face to face with facts and suppositions of which he had never heard before—uncertainty of authorship, variations in ancient manuscripts, the *ex cathedra* pronouncements of higher criticism, the historical development of the Old Testament and the New Testament canons, the endless difficulties besetting the translator. The frustrating speculations of philosophy, the awe-inspiring discoveries of modern science, and the like—all at once the very foundation of faith seemed to be crumbling away, and now a frantic effort was made to discover a sure foundation upon which one’s traditional faith might be securely built. Such a foundation would be the Doctrine of Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures firmly established by incontrovertible external evidences and proofs—the kind of proofs demanded, for instance, by the historian, the mathematician, and the scientist. But look where you will outside the Holy Scriptures, you will find no such proof. History does not provide it, philosophy does not provide it, science does not provide it. Shocked to the very depths of his soul, the honest seeker after truth was now confronted with the question, “How then can I accept the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God?”<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Buenger, “Part II,” 128–132; emphases in the original. For a similar appraisal of the *Confession*, see *100 Questions and Answers for Lutherans Of the Synodical Conference* (Chicago: privately published by the Chicago Area Church Councils, 1954), 8–26. For a contrasting, more optimistic view of the *Confession*, see Edward C. Fendt, “The Theology of the ‘Common Confession,’” *LQ* 2 (August 1950): 308–23. See also George J. Meyer, “Pastor George J. Meyer Circulates Wisconsin Clergy,” *CL* 16 (November 1955): 124–5.

<sup>84</sup> “Absolutely True, Inerrant, Infallible?—YES,” *AL* 41 (October 1958): 3–4.

To judge by his own words, Martin Scharlemann was concerned about just such uncertainties in the minds of impressionable college students and thoughtful adults, and it was because of that professed concern that he wrote a series of study papers on inerrancy and the Scriptures in the late 1950s. Though not considered *the* person to initiate the historical critical method of biblical interpretation at Concordia, Scharlemann's public presentations made pastors and professors throughout the Synodical Conference aware of its existence at the St. Louis seminary.

At the first meeting he attended as a new member of Concordia's faculty in 1957, Robert Preus recalled hearing Scharlemann state that the Bible, though true, contained "errors." Reaction from older professors such as Franzmann, Walter Roehrs, and J. T. Mueller was "almost violent." Though many faculty members rejected Scharlemann's position, Scharlemann remained "undaunted and went on and on with exploratory articles," reflecting his graduate training "but *never actually* endorsing the method or even talking much about it." Younger, newer colleagues in time endorsed the method Scharlemann promoted and "brought it into full use at the seminary."<sup>85</sup>

Scharlemann read his first study paper, "The Bible as Record, Witness, and Medium," on 3 April 1959, to the Missouri Synod Council on Bible Study; he then repeated it four days later for the Northern Illinois District Pastors Conference. Scharlemann called his paper "the product of more than six years of investigation and reflection." He did not intend that it be regarded as "the final word on this matter" but presented it to "elicit reaction." It surely did that. Frederick Danker likened the effect of Scharlemann's paper on the Missouri Synod to "a fifty car collision on a turnpike with police car flashers piercing through the fog."<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> Robert D. Preus to Joel Pless, 2 April 1986; in Pless, "Cancer at Concordia," 100.

<sup>86</sup> Frederick W. Danker, *No Room in the Brotherhood: The Preus–Otten Purge of Missouri* (St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House, Inc., 1977), 5–6.



Scharlemann appealed to “God’s undiminished transcendence” to argue that it is impossible for God “to be contained in either place, time, logic, or language.” God’s ways “are never completely captured in a formulation, whether it be a perfect deduction or a neatly structured syllogism.” Biblical revelation “is not primarily a method of transmitting a body of information.” Biblical writers record their understanding of God’s actions, but they do so “from within their own personal limitations in terms of historical, geographical, or scientific information.” Luther, for example, had remarked that “the author of Kings was more accurate than the writer of Chronicles.”<sup>87</sup>

Thus the word *inerrancy* was “inappropriately applied to the Scriptures,” and *inspiration* as a description of the Old Testament occurs only once in Scripture. Just as God breathed life into the first human beings at creation, so the Scriptures are “God-breathed.” Each scriptural document “is in some way a record of and witness to the divine revelation which confronts man with the claims of a living God.”<sup>88</sup>

In additional papers, Scharlemann presented more provocative insights. In “God is One,” in August 1959, Scharlemann argued that Old Testament Israel’s worship “ought to be described as monolatrous rather than monotheistic” because during the years in the wilderness, Israel “came into contact with nations that served other gods, whose existence they did not at first deny.” Only later, by Isaiah’s time, could Israel’s faith be called monotheistic. “The movement toward full and unequivocal monotheism” in Israel, Scharlemann concluded, while not to be considered an evolutionary process, might be regarded as “cumulative, rather than progressive revelation.”<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Martin H. Scharlemann, “The Bible as Record, Witness, and Medium” (essay read to the LCMS Council on Bible Study, 3 April 1959; read in part to the Northern Illinois Pastoral Conference, 7–8 April 1959), 5, 7, 8, 12. The copy of Scharlemann’s paper, contained in the essay file at the WLS library, was the original copy of Siegbert W. Becker, and Becker’s underlinings, marginal notes, and disagreements are visible throughout the paper.

<sup>88</sup> Scharlemann, “The Bible as Record, Witness, and Medium,” 13, 19–20.

<sup>89</sup> Martin H. Scharlemann, “God Is One,” *LQ* 11 (August 1959): 230–1, 235.

In a third paper, “Revelation and Inspiration,” presented in October 1959, Scharlemann, although acknowledging that the Lutheran Confessions contained no specific formulation of the doctrine of the Word, declared his commitment to the doctrine of verbal inspiration.<sup>90</sup> Repeating his assertion that “revelation is a self-disclosure of God as a personal being to man,” and “not *primarily* a body of information,” Scharlemann noted apparent historical discrepancies in the Bible, such as varying accounts of the numbers of exiles returning from Babylon, conflicting genealogies of Jesus, uncertain wording of the superscription on the cross, and differing accounts in the synoptic gospels of what the Father said at Jesus’ baptism.<sup>91</sup>

Concerned that college students have “become almost agnostic” when confronted with such discrepancies, Scharlemann insisted, “If you have built the faith of your confirmands on a theory of inspiration which does not take into full account what the Scriptures say, you have dealt unfairly with that child.” The word *inerrant* can be “a very misleading term to use of the Scriptures” because it “makes sense only in the light of a false view of inspiration” perpetuated by fundamentalism and contained in Missouri’s *Brief Statement*. “It is this particular emphasis which has misled many people into believing Christian faith is belief in a book.” While it might be “more interesting” to have a book untainted by human error, “it just doesn’t happen to be that way.”<sup>92</sup>

In a fourth paper, “God’s Acts As Revelation,” reprinted in *Concordia Theological Monthly* in April 1961, Scharlemann again asserted that “the sacred authors wrote as particular individuals in

---

<sup>90</sup> Richard Donald Labore, “Traditions and Transitions: A Study of the Leadership of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod During a Decade of Theological Change, 1960–1969” (Ph. D. diss., St. Louis University, 1980), 141, contends that Scharlemann opened the paper with this disclaimer at the suggestion of Concordia president Alfred Fuerbringer, “who, while supporting Scharlemann, was also quite aware of the growing reaction” against Scharlemann’s work.

<sup>91</sup> Martin H. Scharlemann, “Revelation and Inspiration” (paper presented to the Triennial Conference of the Western District of the LCMS, Jefferson City, Mo., 20–22 October 1959), 4, 11; emphasis in the original.

<sup>92</sup> Scharlemann, “Revelation and Inspiration,” 12, 19–20.

their own age,” and so their language and method of presenting information differed from ours.<sup>93</sup>

Though the record and witness of biblical authors was utterly reliable, Scharlemann agreed with and cited approvingly a statement from the *Australian Lutheran* that God used the distinctive features of the biblical authors “in such a manner that even that which human reason might call a deficiency in Holy Scripture must serve the divine purpose.”<sup>94</sup>

To synod conservatives, Scharlemann’s papers offered incontrovertible evidence that he was “spearheading a movement to rid the Missouri Synod of the doctrine of inerrancy of Holy Scripture, and, with that, of its Plenary and Verbal Inspiration” as confessed in the *Brief Statement*.<sup>95</sup> For a Missouri Synod Lutheran “to come to unsuspecting fellow-Lutherans, fellow-Missourians” and to tell them “he fully accepts and teaches verbal and plenary inspiration,” yet “at the same time points out alleged errors of the holy writers,” he is doing something “so patently dishonest” that only those who do not want to be treated honestly “can fail to see the fangs of the wolf under the fleece.”<sup>96</sup>

On 20 November 1959 at Old St. Paul’s Church, Chicago, an extended discussion with Scharlemann was held, attended by 116 pastors and professors of the Northern Illinois Pastoral Conference. An 18-page summary of the meeting, “compiled from four separate sources” but “not a

---

<sup>93</sup> Martin H. Scharlemann, “God’s Acts as Revelation,” *CTM* 32 (April 1961): 214–5.

<sup>94</sup> F. J. H. Blaess, “Intersynodical: Theses on Scripture and Inspiration,” *The Australian Lutheran* 44 (22 August 1956): 265.

<sup>95</sup> “What the Missouri Synod is Really Facing Today,” *CL* 20 (November 1959): 109–10.

<sup>96</sup> “The Battle of Verbal Inspiration in the Missouri Synod,” *CL* 20 (November 1959): 113. See also “Dr. Scharlemann’s Rejection of the Inerrancy of Holy Scripture,” (November 1959): 110–1. “The Comedy of Errors in Dr. Scharlemann’s Bible,” (November 1959): 111–2. “Are You Watching Your Seminary?” (November 1959): 113–4. “Human Rules and the Word of God,” (November 1959): 116–7. “The Relationship of Dr. Scharlemann’s Attack on Holy Scripture to the Confessional Conflict Within the Missouri Synod in General,” (December 1959): 129–32. “The Battle Over the Bible in Missouri,” *CL* 21 (March 1960): 37–9. “Acting in Harmony With the Brief Statement,” (April 1960): 39–41. “The Attack on the Word of God,” (September 1960): 100–3. “A Brief Summary of Issues in the Scharlemann Case,” (September 1960): 103–5.

word for word account of the discussion,” reveals the widening gap between Scharlemann’s views and that of “old” Missouri.<sup>97</sup> Scharlemann began by emphasizing that he appeared “reluctantly” to present his viewpoints since this was an “exploratory” essay, yet he felt compelled to do so because upon arriving at Concordia in 1952 he discovered his students “had a fundamentalistic view of the Bible” and “were fundamentalists and not Lutherans.” Scharlemann also repeated the concern he had voiced in “Revelation and Inspiration,” that when the synod’s “Blue Catechism” stated that “Scripture is without error,” it was doing great harm to confirmation classes that would find this an indefensible assumption when they went on to college.<sup>98</sup>

Objections took various forms. Scharlemann was accused of “misrepresenting Luther,” who insisted that “Scripture cannot err” and that “the Bible did not contradict itself.” Appeal was made to John 10:35—“The Scripture cannot be broken”—which had served as the title of Theodore Engelder’s collection of essays defending scriptural inerrancy.<sup>99</sup> Scharlemann insisted repeatedly that he believed there were factual mistakes in the Bible, that there is a “human side” to Scripture that contains discrepancies, that “inerrancy does not apply to Scripture,” and that “inspiration does not mean inerrancy.” When Scharlemann said “scholars never have the final word” but “they are humble” and “scholarship is not decisive,” Siegbert Becker, professor at Concordia College, River Forest, replied:

If I say there is a discrepancy, a mistake, I have made up my mind; I have said, I have so much knowledge that I say, these men made a mistake. I am at least

---

<sup>97</sup> A. H. Werfelmann, “Outline for Discussion of Essay, ‘The Bible as Record, Witness, and Medium,’” 20 November 1959; mimeographed copy in the possession of the author.

<sup>98</sup> Werfelmann, “Outline for Discussion of Essay, ‘The Bible as Record, Witness, and Medium,’” 4.

<sup>99</sup> Regarding John 10:35, Engelder wrote, *Scripture Cannot Be Broken*, 32: “Nowhere does Scripture make a misstatement. If any man dares to eliminate the least statement of Scripture as untrustworthy, he is condemned by this Scripture.” Engelder called it “unworthy of a Christian to refuse to accept any portion of Scripture as the inerrant Word of God.”

sure of something. I put myself above Scripture and place my words into the mouth of God. Thereby I prejudice you toward believing that Scripture can err. This is a logical fallacy. I am begging the question by assuming that there are discrepancies.<sup>100</sup>

In essays written over the next years, Becker attacked Scharlemann's arguments. He dismissed Scharlemann's assertion—that God reveals not things to us but God Himself—as a false antithesis. "While the Scriptures say a few times that God reveals Himself, it says oftener that God reveals things to men." God's acts "would often be unintelligible or of doubtful meaning if we were dependent on them." Referring to one of Scharlemann's arguments against inerrancy, Becker wrote:

A man said before the pastoral conference of an entire district of Synod that there are manifest mistakes in the Bible, not errors, mind you, but mistakes in fact, and as proof he cited the story of the ascension of our Lord as it is recorded in Matthew and Luke. Luke, he said, tells us that Jesus ascended into heaven from Bethany in Judea, while Matthew says that he ascended from a mountain in Galilee. Even the most cursory reading of the last chapter of Matthew would reveal that Matthew does not even say that Jesus ascended into heaven, much less that he ascended from Galilee. It is very evident who made the mistake here, and a stupid, inexcusable mistake at that.<sup>101</sup>

A more detailed analysis of Scharlemann's "Revelation and Inspiration," examining his paper in view of the neo-orthodoxy of Karl Barth, acknowledged that "there are still many inconsistencies in Scripture which probably never will be perfectly resolved in this world." Though these discrepancies "are not nearly so obvious as Dr. Scharlemann would have us believe," a perfect solution for them remains difficult. Scharlemann's views on inerrancy and revelation were distressing, yet the report concluded:

We will want to take care as to what attitude we take over against Dr. Scharlemann and others who espouse his or similar views. It ill becomes us as Christians to wax indignant, personal, and vindictive over against such individuals—as though we were so perfect that we could dispense with the quality of

---

<sup>100</sup> Werfelmann, "Outline for Discussion of Essay, 'The Bible as Record, Witness, and Medium,'" 5, 7–8.

<sup>101</sup> Siegbert W. Becker, "The Verbal Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures" (essay delivered to the Texas District Teachers' Conference, Missouri Synod, 17 August 1960), 43–6.

mercy in our dealings. Rather, we will want our feeling and actions to be guided by love, humility, and the spirit of longsuffering. For we need the fellowship and admonition of our brethren just as surely as they need ours.<sup>102</sup>

*In the synod of Walther, Pieper, and Engelder*

By late 1961 Scharlemann had received many letters both supporting and condemning his views. In the Milwaukee area widespread rumors had Scharlemann resigning his teaching position in St. Louis. President Behnken wrote Scharlemann “a very kind letter advising and suggesting (not demanding or asking) that he consider resigning his present position,” but Scharlemann did not do so.<sup>103</sup> In meetings convened on 26 and 27 September 1961, with the synod’s president, vice presidents, members of the Concordia Board of Control, and the seminary’s president and academic dean, it was concluded that Scharlemann was “in full agreement with the teaching of the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions” and took “a proper position with regard to the formulations of the doctrinal position of the Synod, specifically the *Brief Statement*.”<sup>104</sup>

Scharlemann “withdrew” his essays at Missouri’s 1962 convention, apologizing for the disruption he had caused throughout the synod during the previous three years.<sup>105</sup> The convention’s delegates assured Scharlemann of their forgiveness and resolved to demonstrate their forgiveness by prayers, encouragement, and “the request that [Missouri] members refrain from attacks upon him on

---

<sup>102</sup> “An Analysis of Dr. Martin Scharlemann’s Essay: REVELATION AND INSPIRATION” (mimeographed essay, n. d.), 9–10; copy in possession of the author. See also: “A Summary and Evaluation of Dr. Martin H. Scharlemann’s Attack on Scripture in His Essay, ‘The Bible as Record, Witness, and Medium,’” *CL* 20 (December 1959): 125–9.

<sup>103</sup> L. M. R., “Status of Scharlemann,” *Badger Lutheran* 14 (29 March 1962): 1.

<sup>104</sup> “Special Report,” *LW* 80 (26 December 1961): 634–6.

<sup>105</sup> Many in the Missouri and Wisconsin Synods, however, doubted that the withdrawal of Scharlemann’s essay resolved the issues his studies raised and wondered whether Scharlemann in fact ever changed his views. See, for example, “Prof. Scharlemann’s Position ‘Not Changed,’” *CL* 23 (November 1962): 119–21. “A Letter of Dr. Scharlemann Stating That His Position HAS NOT CHANGED,” (November 1962): 121–2. “What ‘Withdrawal’ of Certain Essays by Professor Scharlemann Does NOT Mean,” *CL* 24 (January 1963): 4.

the basis of [his] essays.”<sup>106</sup> A dozen years later Scharlemann was among the five professors who remained when most faculty and students walked off Concordia’s campus in 1974.<sup>107</sup>

But now it had become clear that scriptural inerrancy, as well as some doctrines traditionally taught in the Missouri Synod, were being openly questioned or disbelieved.<sup>108</sup> Herman Otten, upon entering Concordia Seminary in 1952, discovered that instead of finding professors teaching dead orthodoxy, as he had been led to expect, “there were students and professors at the seminary who rejected some doctrines clearly taught in the Bible.” During the 1953–54 school year, he and a group of other students petitioned the faculty for clarifications regarding the doctrine of inspiration, but the resulting discussions confused rather than clarified the issue. At the end of that academic year, two leading students, Walter Boumann and William Schoedel, denied the traditional formulations of the doctrines of inspiration and inerrancy, as well as the historicity of the Genesis creation account.<sup>109</sup>

During his last year at Concordia, Otten wrote two articles for the student newspaper *The Seminarian* in which he assessed the changes occurring in Lutheran theology. In “Relativism and Modern Theology,” Otten charged that “the believing Church” was in the grips of a “life and death struggle with regard to holding fast the faith that is in Jesus Christ and His Word.” Theories that “all

---

<sup>106</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1962*, 106–7. “Doctrinal Matters,” *LW* 81 (10 July 1962): 334–5.

<sup>107</sup> At a presentation of the highlights of this dissertation at Wisconsin Lutheran College, Milwaukee, 22 March 1999, after the author made a brief reference to Scharlemann’s papers, a member of the audience rose to defend Scharlemann, saying that Scharlemann had renounced these views later in his life, and that he—the speaker—while president of Concordia Seminary, had even ministered to Scharlemann on his deathbed in 1981. The speaker was Karl Barth, former South Wisconsin District President and Concordia president. Siegbert Becker, however, who opposed Scharlemann’s views at the 1959 Chicago meeting and for whom the Scharlemann papers occasioned the most traumatic decision in his ministerial career, remained unconvinced that Scharlemann had undergone a change of heart. Becker used to remark, “To the end of his life, *Scharlemann* was a *charlatan*.”

<sup>108</sup> See examples in “False Teaching Within the Missouri Synod,” *CL* 16 (June 1955): 67–9.

<sup>109</sup> Herman Otten, “Why *Christian News*?” *CN* 10 (12 December 1977): 5.

truth is relative” and that “there are no unchanging absolutes” had affected all of society, including the church. Otten cited Luther that truth is propositional and absolute, then concluded:

It is necessary that we of the Church of the Reformation prayerfully, humbly, yet fearlessly and decisively confront the pyrrhic spectre of relativism and uncertainty; that we tear off unsparingly all its false, deceptively pious marks, vestments, and doctor’s robes; that we refute its errors; condemn all its evil forms before the forum of Scripture and Symbol; and counter its devilish insinuation with the cheerful affirmation of holy faith.<sup>110</sup>

In “The Word of God in Contemporary Lutheranism,” Otten criticized Martin Heinecken for writing that “it is not the person of Jesus that is decisive but only the truth which is proclaimed.” Heinecken labeled several conservative theologians “fundamentalists” because they insisted on verbal inspiration and made “the mistake of basing truths of the reason upon contingent historical events.”<sup>111</sup> Even the resurrection of Christ was to Heinecken “not an event which anyone who that day happened to stroll into Joseph’s garden might have witnessed.”<sup>112</sup> Otten countered that Missouri’s *Brief Statement* “leaves little room for the negative theories of higher criticism or for an ‘open’ attitude towards inerrancy and the historicity of any part of Scripture.”<sup>113</sup>

In these two articles, Otten was careful to avoid directing any accusations or criticisms toward his seminary or his synod. He concluded his second article only with the wish that the Missouri Synod might “retain its loyal attitude toward Holy Scripture, not because of its love for a

---

<sup>110</sup> Herman Otten, “Relativism and Modern Theology,” *Sem* 49 (October 1957): 11–3, 44–7.

<sup>111</sup> Martin J. Heinecken, “Currents in American Theology,” *Lutheran World* 3 (March 1957): 364.

<sup>112</sup> Martin J. Heinecken, “Bultmann’s Theology and the Message of the Preacher,” *LQ* 6 (November 1954): 293.

<sup>113</sup> Herman Otten, “The Word of God in Contemporary Lutheranism,” *Sem* 49 (May 1958): 66–71.



book, but because of its concern for the salvation of lost souls through the vicarious satisfaction of Christ.”<sup>114</sup>

Otten’s voice was but one among many. In 1955 *The Confessional Lutheran* publicized an incident actually dating to 1943 in which a student presented a B. D. thesis containing an erroneous position on Christ’s descent into hell. The student was never called upon to correct his thesis or retract his view but instead received a pastoral call.<sup>115</sup> The author of the thesis, Conrad Coyner, retracted “any and all statements contrary” to scriptural teaching on the descent in November 1955.<sup>116</sup> Discussion continued, however, concerning how Concordia faculty members could have granted approval to this thesis.<sup>117</sup>

The January 1956 *Seminarian* contained an article that proposed a “mytho-poetic” view of Genesis. The student author of the article was allowed to graduate and given a diploma declaring him “fit to preach the Word of God and administer the sacraments.” Two months later, he joined the Unitarian Church. During the 1956–57 school year Otten was asked to state in writing his objections to the teaching of professor Arthur Carl Piepkorn; ultimately eight students brought false doctrine charges against Piepkorn. President Behnken, discussing the students’ concerns, said he “could not

---

<sup>114</sup> Otten, “The Word of God,” 70.

<sup>115</sup> For documentation of this incident, see Julius E. Dahms, “B. D. Thesis Approved at St. Louis Denies Christ’s Descent into Hell,” *CL* 16 (February 1955): 32–3. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “The Brazenness of Unbelief,” (March 1955): 25–6. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “Plain Heresy in Concordia Theological Seminary Thesis,” (April 1955): 37–8. “Where Does the Truth Lie” (June 1955): 61–4. “Questions That Demand Answer in the Matter of the Doctrine of Christ’s Descent into Hell,” (June 1955): 64–6.

<sup>116</sup> “Pastor Coyner’s Retraction,” *CL* 17 (January 1956): 1.

<sup>117</sup> “Concerning Denial of the Doctrine of Christ’s Descent into Hell Within the Missouri Synod,” *CL* 17 (February 1956): 13–5. [Arthur C.] D[ahms], “Tragic,” *CL* 19 (November 1958): 109–10. [Arthur C.] D[ahms], “The Faculty-Approved Thesis on Christ’s Descent Into Hell,” (November 1958): 116–20.

believe that any Missouri Synod professor would deny even such a doctrine as the historicity of Jonah or Adam and Eve.”<sup>118</sup>

In spring 1957 Concordia professor Gilbert Thiele presented in *The Seminarian* a summary of an essay he had already delivered to LCMS districts concerning the immortality of the soul and the resurrection. The concept that man is composed of a material body and an immaterial soul, and at death the soul is released from the body, was described by Thiele as “Platonic, idealistic,” and “rationalistic.” This “perversion, understandable and explicable from the Socratic view and the Platonic presupposition,” had become the language of Continental Enlightenment thinkers, Freemasonry, Gnosticism, and Docetism, but it was “unpardonable as either the first or the last word for Christians.” Thiele contended that “neither a separate bodily nor psychic immortality are taught in the Scriptures.” The Job passage<sup>119</sup> “in all probability does not refer to resurrection or even immortality since it appeals to a vindicator other than God.” It is “out of place” for us to speak of “the chemical, atomic, geographical reconstruction of the flesh of the person who has died.” In the resurrection “we will be recognizable, if that is of any value and comfort.” Thiele asked:

Will there be some sort of mass peregrination to the throne of God, out of the depths of the sea, out of the innumerable graves, catacombs, crypts, urns, and other places of disposal? We do not know. Important is this: We will be before the throne of God and of the Lamb.<sup>120</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> Otten, “Why *Christian News*?” 5.

<sup>119</sup> “For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth. And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me” (Job 19:25-27, *KJV*).

<sup>120</sup> Gilbert A. Thiele, “Easter Hope: Resurrection of the Body or Immortality of the Soul?” *Sem* 48 (March 1957): 15–21. For *Confessional Lutheran* response to Thiele’s essay and article, see “Did Job Proclaim the Resurrection (19:26ff)?” *CL* 19 (May 1958): 60. “The Confusion of Tongues in St. Louis,” (July–August 1958): 73–5. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “Professor Thiele’s Denial of the Immortality of the Soul and His ‘Resurrection’ Doctrine,” (September 1958): 90–3. [Arthur C.] D[ahms], “Denying the Immortality of the Soul,” (November 1958): 113–4. [Arthur C.] D[ahms], “Denying That the Old Testament Clearly Teaches the Resurrection of the Dead,” (November 1958):

Siegbert Becker took a deep interest in the presentations of Scharlemann and others; their comments reflected what Becker had been hearing from his students for several years. “It is actually being said today in at least one Lutheran college,” Becker wrote in 1966, “that we should no longer sing, ‘Jesus loves me, this I know, for the Bible tells me so,’ because the Bible might be wrong.” If Jesus really loves us, Becker was told, “we must have far better authority for this assurance than a statement of the Bible.” A fellow Missouri pastor told Becker that Jesus was mistaken in ascribing the first five books of the Bible to Moses, and when Becker countered that this meant Jesus had not spoken the truth, the pastor answered, “Jesus certainly did speak the truth because he was honestly convinced in his own mind that Moses had written these things because that is what everybody at that time believed, and as a child of His time, Jesus did not know any better.” The pastor concluded, “We have a different definition of truth than you have.” Becker replied:

One can conclude from this only that a person speaks the truth when he expresses the honest conviction of his mind and heart. Truth, therefore, would seem to be that of which you are convinced and not necessarily that which corresponds to reality. This new approach to truth helps us to see a little more clearly how it is possible for ecumenically-minded Lutherans . . . to listen with respect and consideration to the most horrible perversions of God’s Word as views that have a perfect right to exist in Christendom and in the Lutheran Church. After all, these are the honest convictions of the men who hold them.<sup>121</sup>

These views extended even to the most basic of Christian beliefs. Becker recalled another conversation with a Lutheran pastor who denied the immortality of the soul, insisting that this belief had been imported instead from Platonic philosophy and that the church “in its purest form” did not profess it. When Becker quoted to him Jesus’ words about fearing the one who can kill both soul and

---

114–6.

<sup>121</sup> Siegbert W. Becker, “2 Timothy 4:4—An Apt Description of Truth’s Treatment by ‘Modern’ Theologians of the Lutheran Church” (essay read at the Minnesota Convention, Wisconsin Synod, New Ulm, Minn., 1 August 1966), 12, 5–6.

body in hell,<sup>122</sup> the pastor answered simply, “The Lord Jesus would never have said anything like that. He was much too Christian ever to say anything like that.”<sup>123</sup>

There were “Lutherans today,” Becker observed, who taught that while we believe in the resurrection of Christ, “it is possible that the bones of Jesus are moldering in some unknown Palestinian grave.” The “Lutherans today” regarded the resurrection accounts in the gospels to be “so contradictory that we probably will never know exactly what happened on that first Easter Sunday morning.” One such “neo-Lutheran” had written that the resurrection of Christ “was not the resuscitation or the reassembly of a corpse.” Becker cited the comment of a Missouri lay woman: “I just can’t feel comfortable in church anymore. When my pastor recites the Apostles’ Creed, all I can think of is this, that he does not mean the same thing with those words that I do.”<sup>124</sup>

In the wake of Scharlemann’s exploratory papers and growing questions about the teaching at Concordia, Missouri’s 1959 convention in San Francisco passed a resolution requiring all LCMS pastors and professors to pledge unqualified subscription to the *Brief Statement*, particularly its views on scriptural inerrancy, inspiration, and authority.<sup>125</sup> The measure provoked spirited dissent and failed to alter synodical thinking.<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>122</sup> Matthew 10:28.

<sup>123</sup> Becker, “Verbal Inspiration,” 2–3.

<sup>124</sup> Becker, “2 Timothy 4:4,” 14–5. Becker’s citation of a “neo-Lutheran” regarding the resurrection of Christ is from Paul Malte, *Celebrating Deep* (St. Louis: Lutheran Laymen’s League, 1966), 24.

<sup>125</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1959*, 191–2. See also “A Letter of a Pastor to His Congregation,” *CL* 20 (December 1959): 122–3. “What About the Mandate Given at the San Francisco Convention?” (December 1959): 123–6.

<sup>126</sup> Memorials 306–310 to Missouri’s 1962 convention urged that the 1959 resolution be rescinded. Memorial 311, entitled, “Declaration of Obedience and Freedom” and signed by the Albany-Schenectady-Kingston [N. Y.] Pastoral Conference, referred to the “extensive disturbance” the 1959 resolution had caused within the synod. Memorial 311 stated, “We cannot, for conscience’ sake, agree that any statement, resolution, or document has confessional force and status and is in

Soon after the 1959 convention, at a meeting of both factions within Missouri's leadership, Behnken argued in favor of the synod's traditional view of biblical inerrancy. One who attended, citing Walther's long-held dictum that "the Evangelical Lutheran Church accepts no teaching as an article of faith which is not contained in God's Word," was asked to produce a convincing proof text demonstrating the Bible's inerrancy in scientific, historical, and geographic matters. After quoting several passages on *inspiration* that failed to demonstrate his precise point, Behnken settled on John 10:35. At that point a "sympathetic and stalwart conservative exegete" said that the verb *broken* in that verse "does not have that intention and effect." Behnken asked, "Which texts *do* prove this doctrine, then?" The "conservative" exegete replied, "There are none."<sup>127</sup>

In 1960 Concordia's faculty released "A Statement on the Form and Function of the Holy Scriptures." In it, the faculty said:

The Scriptures express what God wants them to say and accomplish what God wants them to do. In this sense and in the fulfillment of this function they are inerrant, infallible, and wholly reliable. Their truthfulness, their infallibility as the only rule and norm of faith and practice, and their reliability are incontrovertible. There is no human or secular criterion by which their truthfulness, their infallibility as the only rule of faith and practice, and their reliability can be made evident.<sup>128</sup>

*The American Lutheran* called this "an excellent statement" and praised it for its "commendable carefulness" regarding the terms *inerrant* and *infallible*. The faculty's statement could serve "as a

---

that sense binding upon our conscience except those to which we have subscribed at our ordination." *Missouri Reports and Memorials, 1962*, 149–51. See also "San Francisco Convention," *AL* 42 (August 1959): 4. "Open Forum," (October 1959): 12. "The St. Louis Faculty Speaks Again," *AL* 45 (May 1962): 3–4.

<sup>127</sup> M[artin] E. M[arty], "Showdown in the Missouri Synod," *CC* 89 (27 September 1972): 944–5.

<sup>128</sup> The Faculty of Concordia Seminary, "A Statement on the Form and Function of the Holy Scriptures," *CTM* 31 (October 1960): 626. "A Statement on the Form and Function of the Holy Scriptures," *LW* 80 (4 April 1961): 160–1.

manifesto around which our whole Church can rally.”<sup>129</sup> *The Confessional Lutheran*, however, said the position of the Faculty’s Statement was “radically different” from that expressed in the *Brief Statement*. While the Statement would “no doubt prove unintelligible to our congregations and to uninitiated pastors,” modernism “can find a shelter within it.”<sup>130</sup>

The same 1962 LCMS convention that granted Martin Scharlemann “forgiveness” for his essay “The Bible as Record, Witness, and Medium” reversed its decision on adherence to the *Brief Statement*.<sup>131</sup> In 1963 Robert Scharleman wrote that “unless one holds to the word ‘inerrancy’ with a sort of blind dogmatism,” the assertion that the Bible contains no errors “simply cannot be supported by the biblical evidence itself.”<sup>132</sup> In 1964 Richard Jungkuntz, now an LCMS professor, challenged the traditional Synodical Conference interpretation of John 10:35 and scriptural inerrancy. “For both modern and traditional interpretations this statement is equivalent to ‘Scripture cannot be denied; if Scripture says something, that something is fact.’” A better understanding of the passage should be, “Scripture cannot be undone, cannot be kept from going into fulfillment.”<sup>133</sup>

The term *inerrancy*, Arthur Carl Piepkorn wrote in 1965, “does not correspond to any vocable of the Sacred Scriptures” nor “to any vocable in the Lutheran symbols.” While the ancient church and early Lutheran orthodoxy affirmed the correctness and adequacy of the Scriptures for

---

<sup>129</sup> “The St. Louis Faculty Statement on Holy Scripture,” *AL* 43 (December 1960): 3–4.

<sup>130</sup> “St. Louis Seminary Faculty Adopts a Position of Its Own on Holy Scripture,” *CL* 21 (November 1960): 130. See also “Why the Bible is God’s Word,” (November 1960): 132–5. “The St. Louis Faculty in the Controversy Concerning the Word of God,” *CL* 22 (October 1961): 157–63. “A Voice in the Wilderness,” (December 1961): 195–6.

<sup>131</sup> *Missouri Proceedings, 1962*, 105–6.

<sup>132</sup> Robert P. Scharlemann, “Letters to the Editor—The Scientist and Genesis I: a Reply,” *The Lutheran Scholar* 20 (April 1963): 39; cited by Otten, “The Doctrinal Situation in The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod,” 59.

<sup>133</sup> Richard Jungkuntz, “An Approach to the Exegesis of John 10:34–36,” *CTM* 35 (October 1964): 559–60.

being saved and for living the Christian life, and while the Scripture's "freedom from error" was "largely an unarticulated assumption of undefined scope," *inerrancy* was a relatively young word with a limited recent history. After examining actual occurrences of *inerrant* or terms of similar etymology, and after cataloguing various apparent discrepancies or contradictions throughout both Testaments, Piepkorn wrote:

The truth of the Sacred Scriptures is something to be evaluated in terms of their own criteria and of the qualities which they themselves exhibit. These qualities do not—speaking generally—include great precision in formulation, stenographic fidelity in reporting exact words, prosaic literalism in interpretation, bibliographically accurate citations of author and title, comprehensive documentation, carefully synchronized chronologies, a modern historiographic sense, harmonically consistent adjustment of sources to one another, and meticulously exact descriptions of attendant historical, physical, and other scientific details.

Such a picture of the Sacred Scripture "is likely to be less tidy than a purely theoretical construct" of inerrancy, but "it is also more likely to be more realistic, more correct, and more genuinely truthful."<sup>134</sup>

To this line of argumentation, Becker replied that the assertion that the word *inerrancy* was not applied to Scripture until the nineteenth century and was thus a "new heresy" revealed the critics' "lack of scholarship, if not their downright dishonesty." While technically correct, such argumentation fails to note that "the word inerrancy, in the sense of 'not subject to error,' was *not in use* before the nineteenth century." One could hardly expect biblical scholars to employ a term that did not exist in current English usage. But "even if the *words* was not used," said Becker, "these men surely knew that the thought which it conveys was clearly expressed long before the nineteenth century."<sup>135</sup>

---

<sup>134</sup> Arthur Carl Piepkorn, "What Does 'Inerrancy' Mean?" *CTM* 36 (September 1965): 577, 579, 588.

<sup>135</sup> Siegbert W. Becker, "Attacks on Inerrancy and Inspiration" (essay given at the "State of the Church" Lutheran Free Conference, Milwaukee, n. d. [15–16 May 1961]), 3; emphases in the

Much of the debate within the LCMS and the Synodical Conference over fellowship issues may have been far removed from the interests and concerns of lay members. But were Adam and Eve real people? Was Jonah actually swallowed by a whale? Could Lutherans still sing, “Jesus loves me, this I know; for the Bible tells me so”?— these were questions the masses could understand and become upset over.

Reflecting twenty years after his election as synod president, Jacob A. O. Preus put in colloquial terms what the battle was about.

We began getting some professors here at the St. Louis seminary along in the fifties, with more emphasis in the sixties, who were at variance with the traditional historic position of this church. Now you’ve got to understand this church. . . . This is a very German organization. And Germans are the greatest law and order people in the world. They operate by rules.

The creation account was explained with, “Well, it’s just a myth, just a mythological way of describing how man became sinful, but not a literal account.” Favorite gospel stories were brushed aside with the comment that “Jesus didn’t really say or do those things.” When the faithful objected, “But the Bible says right here that *this* happened,” they were told, “Well, we can’t be too sure.” Preus remembered one professor who “shilly-shallied and backpedaled and fiddle-faddled around” in front of Concordia’s seminary board, until a board member finally said, “Ever since I was born I’ve been praying, ‘Let Thy holy angels be with me that the wicked foe may have no power over me.’ Now do I have to quit saying that?”<sup>136</sup>

---

original. *The American Lutheran* sought to defend itself against attacks made upon it at this 1961 “State of the Church” conference, reprinting its October 1958 article “Absolutely True, Inerrant, Infallible?— YES.” See “A Time for Patience and Understanding,” *AL* 44 (July 1961): 3–5.

<sup>136</sup> Jacob A. O. Preus, interview, 6 June 1989; in Melody R. Barnhart, “Heresy vs. Orthodoxy” (master’s thesis, University of North Texas, Denton, 1991), 127–8; emphasis in the original. Herbert T. Mayer, managing editor of Concordia’s *Theological Monthly* acknowledged that “a gap may exist in a denomination because a seminary faculty has espoused views that are described with terms like ‘modernistic’ and as a consequence has alienated many of its alumni of a former generation.” Mayer admitted that this had “certainly happened” on the St. Louis campus. H[erbert] T. M[ayer], “The Seminary and the Church,” *CTM* 35 (December 1964): 677. *The Confessional*



What a surprise for those in Missouri who had imagined “it could never happen here”! Siegbert Becker remembered that in the late 1930s Paul Kretzmann had predicted that “the doctrine of the plenary, verbal inspiration of the Bible would become a battlefield for the Lutheran Church in America.” Becker assumed the struggle would occur between the ULCA and the Synodical Conference.

Who of us would have believed at that time that in the Missouri Synod itself voices would be raised against this Biblical teaching? . . . Many of us, I am sure, wonder often how such a thing as this could have happened so quickly to a church which had learned its theology from a Walther and a Pieper and an Engelder.<sup>137</sup>

*“The Grace That Has Spared Us”*

Asked in 1997 what indicators of the Missouri Synod’s transformation became apparent to them, one respondent cited Missouri’s toleration of a “liberal interpretation of Scripture,” and another mentioned “the ‘liberal’ theology of many on the faculty of the St. Louis seminary.” Changes in Missouri “came with a growing unwillingness to endure the criticism from less orthodox and unionistic church bodies.”<sup>138</sup>

One Wisconsin pastor, who received part of his education in LCMS schools, recalled that the faculty of Concordia Seminary in Springfield “respected our Synod’s position and welcomed us from Wisconsin.” In their classes faculty members “would comment about the liberal, left-ward thoughts and actions of such groups as ‘the forty-four,’ the American Lutheran Publicity Bureau, the Atlantic and English Districts, and some St. Louis professors,” and they would note with approval “those who

---

*Lutheran* responded, “It would certainly be far better for the Church if ringleaders of Modernism on the faculty were to be replaced by men who are sound in doctrine and able to convict gainsayers.” The *Confessional Lutheran* writer suggested that “men like Pastor Herman Otten” would be “a splendid replacement” for professors like Scharlemann. “The Gap Between Missouri’s St. Louis Seminary and Its Parishes,” *CL* 26 (January 1965): 3.

<sup>137</sup> Becker, “Attacks on Inerrancy and Inspiration,” 2.

<sup>138</sup> Survey responses 10, 14, 20.

opposed and sought to curb the liberals.” Walter W. F. Albrecht, Clarence Spiegel, and Martin Naumann were remembered for criticizing such trends in Missouri. But there was also “a smugness that took the attitude: ‘We are the Missouri Synod, whatever we do must be OK.’”<sup>139</sup>

One pastor, while a student at Missouri’s Concordia College in Milwaukee, recalled reading in *The Seminarian* about a visit made by Concordia students to a non-Synodical Conference seminary. The article called it “uplifting” to take communion there and to see “the old separations passing away.” The pastor recalled thinking, “If they can print that, I guess the profs there must be in agreement with it.”<sup>140</sup>

One Wisconsin pastor, a Concordia St. Louis graduate who subsequently changed synods, remembered that “the clouds were on the horizon” when he entered Concordia in 1950, and that “the JEDP movement and Higher Critical Theory played a large part, since it stemmed from European theologians. European theologians were the rage at the time.”<sup>141</sup> Another remarked, “Their

---

<sup>139</sup> Survey responses 1, 20.

<sup>140</sup> Survey response 44. Martin Marty, “Wartburg: A. L. S. Unofficial impressions by an official visitor,” *Sem* 41 (16 November 1949): 11–2, though not mentioning reception of Holy Communion, commented favorably on the Association of Lutheran Seminarians, through which students could promote “organized communication” and “good and pleasant unity” with other Lutheran seminarians. Carl S. Meyer, *Log Cabin to Luther Tower*, 228–9, recounts the significant role Concordia students played in the Association. Formed in 1946 at Wartburg Seminary in Dubuque, Iowa, by representatives of ten Lutheran seminaries, the Association received the St. Louis seminary’s support despite protests from Missouri pastors and a plea that the seminary discontinue its membership. By contrast, Concordia Seminary in Springfield, when invited, gave an “inadequate response.” The Norwegian Synod’s Bethany Seminary offered no reply, and the Wisconsin Synod’s Thiensville seminary considered it “inadvisable” for its representatives to attend. Concordia’s membership in the Association provoked debate at the 1950 Synodical Conference Convention. See also A. V. Kuster, “Association of Lutheran Seminarians,” *CL* 9 (May 1948): 46–7. A. C. Dahms, “Theological Students Decline Membership in Seminarian Association,” (September 1948): 105–6. “Lutheran Seminarians Fellowship Each Other,” (December 1948): 143. A. V. Kuster, “A. L. S.,” *CL* 11 (February 1950): 24. [A. V.] K[uster], “The ‘Seminarians’ Situation, St. Louis Viewpoint,” *CL* 12 (February 1951): 21–3. A. V. K[uster], “Developments in Re Association of Lutheran Seminarians,” *CL* 13 (March 1952): 32–5.

<sup>141</sup> Survey response 42.

seminaries became too impressed with advanced degrees for their professors rather than sound theology.”<sup>142</sup> Another pastor recalled hearing former Concordia professor Paul Kretzmann remark that the transformation came about as “the result of calling Ph. D.s instead of Th. D.s to the St. Louis Seminary,” and another respondent commented in greater detail:

I believe that the practice of sending promising theological students off to Harvard, Yale, the University of Chicago, etc., led to these men coming back to teach what they were taught. Doctrinal statements were appearing and not being quashed which were certainly not in accord with Missouri’s doctrinal confessions. I had the assignment of writing a paper on [Gilbert] Thiele’s paper about immortality of the soul and the resurrection. Following the lead of [Oscar] Cullmann, Thiele denied any life of the soul between the time of death and the resurrection. His treatment of the Bible and his whole attitude of “prove me wrong” was most disturbing.<sup>143</sup>

Still another observed “a growing high church tendency” in Missouri, “which almost inevitably breeds doctrinal indifference.”<sup>144</sup> Carleton Toppe noted “the growing emphasis on ritual and ceremony under the guise of going back to Luther’s day” when the Lutheran Church was distancing itself from many Roman ceremonies. Toppe faulted Synodical Conference churches, where “we hear of perpetual lamps burning, custodians crossing themselves before exhibiting sacramental vessels to visitors, altar boys, marriage communion for the bride and groom, and, in general, the dangerous tendency to crowd out the sermon by expanding the liturgy.”<sup>145</sup> Wisconsin Pastor Henry Nitz complained about “certain Romanizing externals” that were “creeping into some

---

<sup>142</sup> Survey response 63.

<sup>143</sup> Survey responses 39, 77. Karl F. Krauss, pastor in Wisconsin’s Michigan District and former First Vice President of the Synodical Conference, was often heard to remark, “The Missouri Synod went down *by degrees*.”

<sup>144</sup> Survey response 10. E. Arnold Sitz, “Observations on Ecumenicity, 7, cited “the English District, the chaplaincy, the high church party, and, sad to say, Concordia Seminary in St. Louis” as the “chief crevasses through which brackish waters” of ecumenism were flowing into the Synodical Conference.

<sup>145</sup> Toppe, “A Time-Honored Warning,” 124–5. See also William J. Schaefer, “Siftings,” *NL* 36 (22 May 1949): 168.

Protestant churches,” including use of the term “sacrifice of the mass,” employing a sanctuary lamp, genuflecting at the altar, and using incense. “We have seen them in Synodical Conference churches!” Nitz warned.<sup>146</sup>

As a young Wisconsin Synod pastor in Crete, Illinois, Paul Eickmann attended one day of the Missouri Synod’s Northern Illinois District Pastoral Conference, on which Martin Scharlemann “delivered a paper on revelation and inspiration.” Eickmann also attended the November 1959 meeting at Old St. Paul’s in Chicago where Scharlemann was asked to discuss his paper further. In Eickmann’s recollection, Scharlemann “distinctly denied the inerrancy of Scripture, while agreeing that it is the inspired Word of God.” When the conference approved by majority vote a motion to thank Scharlemann for his essay and defeated a motion urging that he be disciplined by Northern

---

<sup>146</sup> H. C. Nitz, “‘High Church’ Practices,” *NL* 46 (13 September 1959): 291. “High Liturgical Fences,” *NL* 50 (15 December 1963): 395. J. Jeffrey Zetto, “The Liturgical Movement,” 50–1, noted, “Many laypeople, pastors and Synodical officials were upset, especially in the 1950s, by what they felt was a trend toward ‘Romanism’ in the synod.”

Edmund Reim commented already in 1947 on liturgical innovations introduced by the Society of St. James. While saying that he “appreciated highly” much that he read in the first two issues of *Una Sancta*, Reim warned, “We cannot refrain from voicing a vigorous protest against this tendency to reintroduce a terminology and traditions which are reminiscent of Rome. E[dmund] Reim, “The Society of St. James,” *Qu* 44 (October 1947): 284–5. Beginning in 1949 *The Confessional Lutheran* voiced extreme displeasure with “high church” practices. See, for example, Theo. Dierks, “The Deadly Menace of Sacramentalism,” *CL* 10 (August 1949): 90–4. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “Sacramental Fanaticism Enjoys A Roman Holiday,” (November 1949): 125–8. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “Sacramentalism and the Union Movement,” (December 1949): 142. “Catholics Take Note of Romanizing Tendencies of High Churchmen in Missouri Synod,” *CL* 12 (April 1951): 39–40. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “Not to be Laughed Off!” (April 1951): 40–1. [Theo.] D[ierks], “The Liturgical Movement Within the Lutheran Church,” (September 1951): 106–7. [Theo.] D[ierks], “A Return to the Religion of the Dark Ages,” (October 1951): 110–3. [Theo.] D[ierks], “‘Useless. Foolish Displays,’” (October 1951): 113–5. [Theo.] D[ierks], “The Chief Service of God is to Teach the Gospel,” (November 1951): 122–5. [Theo.] D[ierks], “The Real Presence,” (November 1951): 125–7. [Theo.] D[ierks], “Adoration and Elevation of the Host,” (November 1951): 127–30. [Theo.] D[ierks], “Changing the Nature of the Sacrament,” (November 1951): 130–2. [Theo.] D[ierks], “High Liturgical Worship,” *CL* 13 (January 1952): 6–9. “The High Church Movement,” *CL* 18 (March 1957): 25–9. “The Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Mass in the Missouri Synod,” (March 1957): 30–1. “The High Church Movement Among Lutherans in America,” (September 1957): 93–6. “Some Recent Instances of the Leaven of High-Churchism Within the Missouri Synod,” *CL* 19 (July–August 1958): 75–8.

Illinois District officials, some of the Missouri men present, and Eickmann as well, were “deeply concerned.”

Eickmann wrote a letter of concern to Wisconsin’s seminary President Carl Lawrenz, for two reasons. The situation “shows the wisdom of the intersynodical committees in dealing first with the questions concerning Scripture. There *are* disagreements arising in this area.” Second, the inability of the district and its officials to act on Scharlemann’s paper “casts a definite shadow on our [Wisconsin’s] understanding of the San Francisco resolutions” binding all Missouri pastors and professors to the *Brief Statement*.<sup>147</sup>

Eickmann sent Scharlemann a copy of his letter to Lawrenz, adding a note: “I hope that I have not misrepresented your position on the inerrancy of Scripture,” but “I consider your doctrine a dangerous false teaching in the Church.”<sup>148</sup> Scharlemann, on sabbatical in New York, replied to Eickmann:

I am very sorry to receive this letter, because it is a very thorough misrepresentation of the essay . . . and the discussion that followed. I regret that you did not find it convenient to get your facts straight before writing to Prof. Lawrenz. I think this should have been proper procedure.

I regret that you, too, have been victimized by the half-truths that the *Confessional Lutheran* crowd peddles. This is certainly one such instance.

My basic contention is that the term “inerrancy” is improperly used of Scripture. And this is quite something different from wanting to throw overboard what we usually think of when we in our circles use the word.

You will do me the favor, therefore, of writing at once to Professor Lawrenz correcting the misinformation you sent him. I should have thought that the very fact of the unwillingness of officials to take any disciplinary action should have alerted you. They realize that this is largely a philological and pedagogical question rather than a doctrinal one.

---

<sup>147</sup> Paul E. Eickmann to Carl Lawrenz, 24 November 1959; copy in possession of the author.

<sup>148</sup> Paul E. Eickmann to Martin H. Scharlemann, 24 November 1959; copy in possession of the author.

I should be very happy to receive an apology from you for what is under the most charitable construction improper procedure.<sup>149</sup>

Eickmann replied that he based his remarks on what he had heard Scharlemann himself say.

He disagreed that the question was philological and pedagogical rather than doctrinal.<sup>150</sup>

Scharlemann responded that Eickmann's second letter

confirms what your first letter indicates; namely, a) you haven't read the essay; b) you couldn't stay for the whole session in Chicago; c) you haven't made a study of the problem—and yet you conclude that there is heresy afoot and that the Synodical Conference should do something. . . .

I must say that this is an extraordinary prophetic insight and most irregular procedure. I've never quite had the courage to make up my mind so fast on such a flimsy basis. Is it too presumptuous, really, to ask that you make a thorough study of this matter? (The whole question on "inerrancy" was really quite incidental to the main purpose of the essay, but you would never have guessed it from Chicago.)

. . . I'm having that paper ["Revelation and Inspiration"] sent to you. Then make up your own mind. I think it will demonstrate how large a misconstruction your first letter (to Lawrenz) contained.<sup>151</sup>

At about that same time—1959 or 1960—James Schaefer, pastor at the Wisconsin Synod's Atonement Church in Milwaukee, received a call to teach at Concordia, Springfield. While considering the call, Schaefer met in Springfield with Behnken, who, Schaefer recalled, asked him "a lot of questions about Scripture." The question Schaefer specifically remembered was "whether or not an ax head floated."<sup>152</sup> From there Schaefer traveled to St. Louis to meet with Martin Franzmann, who had been Schaefer's teacher at Northwestern College. When Schaefer asked Franzmann about

---

<sup>149</sup> Martin H. Scharlemann to Paul E. Eickmann, 28 November 1959; copy in possession of the author.

<sup>150</sup> Paul E. Eickmann to Martin H. Scharlemann, 30 November 1959; copy in possession of the author.

<sup>151</sup> Martin H. Scharlemann to Paul E. Eickmann, 3 December 1959; copy in possession of the author.

<sup>152</sup> 2 Kings 6:1-7.

rumors circulating about the Scharlemann paper and about other turmoil at Concordia, Franzmann replied, “All you get from the faculty is a wall of mush.”<sup>153</sup>

In 1958, less than two years before announcing that it had reached an impasse with Missouri regarding church fellowship, Wisconsin joined Missouri, the ELS, and the Slovak Synod to draft what was hailed as an “excellent” statement regarding the inspiration, authority, and interpretation of Scripture.<sup>154</sup> This “Statement on Scripture” was adopted by Wisconsin’s 1959 convention “without a dissenting vote and with the full consent of those present in the convention.”<sup>155</sup> Wilhelm Oesch noted that the first *Conclave Theologorum* in 1959 “definitely proved that an overwhelming majority in the Missouri Synod” was “not only still conservative in a loose way,” but wanted to uphold “the full-orbed, detailed doctrinal position of Synod.” Oesch believed Missouri also demonstrated this resolve in the intense debate at its 1959 convention and subsequent resolution binding all of its pastors and professors to the *Brief Statement*.<sup>156</sup> Responding to the objection voiced by some Missourians that no new confessional statements be adopted to augment the Lutheran Confessions, Wisconsin said it was not restricted to those doctrines presented in the Book of Concord. “Our Confessions do not have the last word when it comes to determining what we are to teach. That belongs to Scripture.”<sup>157</sup>

Concordia Seminary’s “Statement on the Form and Function of Scripture” was a clear disappointment. The Statement’s ambiguity led Wisconsin’s Commission on Doctrinal Matters to

---

<sup>153</sup> James P. Schaefer, interview by author, Milwaukee, Wis., 6 September 1995.

<sup>154</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1958*, 42–5.

<sup>155</sup> Fredrich, “The Great Debate,” 170–1. *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1959*, 164–212. See also C[arleton] Toppe, “The Confession Of Our House,” *NL* 49 (21 October 1962): 323.

<sup>156</sup> Oesch, *Memorandum Inter Nos*, 23.

<sup>157</sup> Harold Wicke, “What is ‘Doctrine?’” *Qu* 57 (April 1960): 93. See A[rmin W.] Schuetze, “Are Only Personal Interpretations Keeping Lutherans Apart?” *NL* 47 (23 October 1960): 345, 350.

report to the synod's 1961 convention that it was "no longer certain" the two synods were "in agreement on the doctrine of Scripture." Unless certainty on revelation and Scripture could be restored, "we would have lost the basis for a profitable discussion of the other matters in controversy between us, even if there were no impasse on the doctrine of fellowship."<sup>158</sup>

Only thirteen years later, despite dire predictions that it would soon perish without the support of its big sister, the WELS enjoyed an unanticipated growth in membership, an unprecedented building boom on synodical school campuses, and an unparalleled burst of new mission church openings around the country. As the synod looked forward to celebrating its 125th anniversary in 1975, Carleton Toppe wrote, "The Grace for which we give thanks" was "a Grace of positive blessings." The gospel, the Scriptures "as God wrote them," education, unity of faith, "the means and the men to build a confessional and evangelical church" were just some among them.

Well aware of the turmoil at Concordia Seminary, however, and the circumstances that occasioned it, Toppe added: "We also remember from what that Grace has spared us. We look on with amazement and with heartache at a church body that was once our spiritual flesh and blood being lacerated and torn apart by controversy" only two years after its 125th anniversary in 1972.

"What if," Toppe asked,

- ◆ militant members of our Synod were accusing our Synod's president of holding "new views" when he upholds the theology of Hoenecke and Walther and of the Synodical Conference of old?
- ◆ many in our midst rejected *This We Believe*<sup>159</sup> because it was "being placed alongside the Bible and the Lutheran Confessions," and we were branded as a sect because we made this contemporary statement of our ancestral faith?
- ◆ pastors and professors among us would decry our teaching that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God" as a "new doctrine" that destroys the Gospel?

---

<sup>158</sup> *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1961*, 186.

<sup>159</sup> *This We Believe* (Milwaukee: WELS Commission on Inter-Church Relations, 1967). See also Armin Schuetze, "This We Believe," *WLQ* 64 (July 1967): 214–5.



- ◆ our Conference of Presidents, in its supervision of correct doctrine and practice, would be accused of being a “corrupt, unethical, un-Lutheran and un-Christian power structure”?
- ◆ thirteen professors and 160 students at Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary would condemn the Board of Control of the Seminary for “arrogating to [itself] an almost absolutist control” of the Seminary in demanding that the Bible should not be taught by historical-critical methods?

“Who among us,” Toppe concluded, “should not thank God on his knees because we have been spared such anguish in our midst?”<sup>160</sup>

---

<sup>160</sup> Carleton Toppe, “The Grace That Has Spared Us,” *NL* 61 (5 May 1974): 131.

## *Conclusions*

“Are we forever to be isolated,” asked Theodore Graebner in March 1950, “forever to deny fellowship to Lutherans who teach as we do?” Recalling the Wisconsin Synod’s criticisms of the 1938 Union Resolutions and anticipating Wisconsin’s rejection of the *Common Confession*, Graebner charged that for the past dozen years “not one good thing has been said about the other Lutherans by the critics of the Union resolutions.” In Wisconsin’s *Quartalschrift* all other Lutherans “are simply treated as depraved, disloyal, unionistic, modernistic offal from the Lutheran Church.” Any word of commendation or charity for a theological “opponent” would “be stigmatized as rank betrayal.”

The very word *fellowship* had been given “an unusual connotation” among Wisconsin Synod Lutherans. Their pastors refused to join Missouri pastors at the Lord’s Table because a Missouri pastor’s congregation maintains a Boy Scout group. “What is there left of fellowship?” The only solution, as Graebner saw it, was that the Wisconsin Synod “resign its membership in the Synodical Conference.”

This proposal will sound less sensational when we remember that the Synodical Conference convention of 1946 had before it a memorial that it be disbanded on account of the strife which exists in its midst. . . . The memorial might have carried in 1946 if the condition had been made that *the bond of fellowship be retained*—in such measure as may be said to exist today. I refer to conditions known to every Missouri Synod pastor West of Lake Michigan who has not spent his synodical life in a trunk. Largely, Wisconsin Synod conferences are practicing selective fellowship, communing at the altar with us in some conferences, but not in others. Granting fellowship to some members who come with a Missouri letter of transfer, but refusing those who have in their family a Boy Scout.

The advantage for Wisconsin would be that it would “not have to hold itself responsible for [Missouri’s] tolerance of Boy Scouts, of Army and Navy chaplains, or any other matter.” Though not necessarily calling for a “divorce” between the synods, Graebner suggested a “new arrangement”

similar to that in which “husbands sometimes insert a note in the county paper, ‘After this date I am no longer responsible for my wife’s debts.’”<sup>1</sup>

At the time, Graebner’s proposal was regarded as improper and even offensive.<sup>2</sup> Less than a dozen years later, however, Wisconsin’s withdrawal from the Synodical Conference proved to be the only satisfactory solution to the ongoing intersynodical strife.<sup>3</sup> As Norman Madson remarked in 1954, what occurred regarding the *Common Confession* was “not an accident,” but in an oft-quoted remark of Edmund Reim, “it follows a pattern.” We can all grant, Madson wrote, that one might inadvertently do something he would not want to be held accountable for when its full implications have been made clear to him. But when one becomes part of a movement that “in all its disturbing aspects is ever moving toward ‘the left,’ you have a valid reason for holding that the *Kolonne-links* maneuver is more dear to the marchers than is the *Kolonne-rechts*.”<sup>4</sup>

*A solitary bird warbling his little song*

Picking up where “Sophie” left off the year before, “Imaprea Chertoo” called it “the understatement of the decade” to say there were “strained relationships” in the Synodical Conference.

---

<sup>1</sup> Theodore Graebner, “What Price Patience?” *AL* 33 (March 1950): 7–9. An editorial in the *Lutheran Outlook* agreed with Graebner’s proposal, though it recognized such a turn of events was unlikely to occur. If Wisconsin would not depart, the *Outlook* suggested, Missouri could pull out of the Synodical Conference and form a new association with the other major groups. “Graebner’s Suggestion,” *LO* 15 (May 1950): 132–3.

<sup>2</sup> See Norman A. Madson, “What Price Union?” *AL* 33 (May 1950): 7–8.

<sup>3</sup> E[dmund] Reim, “As We See It: We Count The Cost,” *NL* 37 (23 April 1950): 135, 137, admitted at the time that peace could be “purchased at the price of surrender,” but such a peace would constitute disobedience to the Lord’s word. “That is a cost that none of us will want to assume—not even for the sake of perpetuating the Synodical Conference.”

<sup>4</sup> Norman Madson, “The Norwegian Synod’s Reasons for Rejecting the ‘Common Confession,’” *SC Proceedings, 1954*, 55.

Some cliques do not believe in Boy Scouts and do not want a chaplain available for men in the armed forces. They do not even want to pray with others who are sinners but who believe in the [same?] Christ. They have the privilege of feeling that way, but they want all of us to eat what they eat and think what they think. We don't, and they pulled out.

Much as it was Jesus' "passion" that there be one flock and one shepherd, Imaprea Chertoo concluded, "We don't have to devise an arsenal of guns to put on a man's back to make sure that he stays in the Christian family."<sup>5</sup>

In an extended reply three months later, James P. Schaefer, Director of Public Information for the Wisconsin Synod, insisted "there was more behind our August resolutions [to break fellowship] than a spoiled child picking up his marbles and going home." Schaefer repeated—perhaps more winsomely—Wisconsin's standard rationale for its opposition to Scouting and the chaplaincy. He criticized Imaprea Chertoo's statement about prayer fellowship as "an unduly short sentence to cover a complicated situation." There are "many gradations between persistent errorists and Christians whose faith is weak or uninformed, or even misinformed." Some may by their confession reveal themselves as persistent errorists, "but there are many other Christians who confess their Lord and Savior whom we cannot so identify. In these instances, each situation must be considered by itself."

Through years of what proved to be fruitless negotiation, Schaefer said:

Our approach many not have always been with the proper regard for Christian humility—and for this we have repented a thousand times—but in the matter of the life and death of precious souls committed to our charge indifference ought to be deplored rather than zeal.

Luther has said that the Christian is a solitary bird, sitting somewhere on a rooftop, warbling his little song. We are solitary, but we fervently hope and pray that the winds will waft our little song to the four corners of the world.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Imaprea Chertoo, "Shotgun Marriage," *AL* 45 (January 1962): 11.

<sup>6</sup> James P. Schaefer, "A Reply from Wisconsin," *AL* 45 (April 1962): 24.

Missouri was once a church body that “rejected the thought of doing joint church work and of establishing sealed degrees of fellowship with other Lutheran bodies before full agreement in doctrine was reached,” but now “a new spirit reigns in that synod” as strange opinions are now “granted rights alongside truth.”<sup>7</sup> The Wisconsin Synod had severed its fellowship with the LCMS on the basis of Romans 16:17, and “the Missouri Synod has rejected this indictment.”<sup>8</sup>

In 1964, in an open letter “To One Ere Now a Brother,” Carleton Toppe called it “public knowledge that you have abjured our communion and have cast in your lot with those who say we are wrong in our confessional stand.” A Scripture-based stand “was once important to you,” but—reversing the roles Missouri and Wisconsin played in the 1961 convention—Toppe said that now “you left us, I fear, because we are too ‘conservative’ and too ‘narrow-minded.’” But in the almost three years since Wisconsin’s departure, “unionistic practices are more widespread” and “doctrinal experimentation is being accepted” within other Lutheran church bodies Missouri now openly courted. “One step after another is being taken toward intimate ties with Lutherans whose errors you once saw clearly.”<sup>9</sup>

Siegbert Becker, active in the debate over Martin Scharlemann’s study papers, left Missouri for Wisconsin in 1963. He joined the Wisconsin Synod, he wrote in 1965,

---

<sup>7</sup> C[arleton] Toppe, “You Can’t Go Home Again,” *NL* 49 (12 August 1962): 243. See also P[aul] Peters, “The Cleveland Convention,” *WLQ* 59 (October 1962): 281–4. Gerald Hoenecke, “Cleveland—the ‘Turning Point’ and ‘The Beginning of a New Era,’” (October 1962): 284–7. Armin Schuetze, “Missouri’s New Direction,” (October 1962): 287–9. Carl Lawrenz, “The *Lutheran Standard* Appraises the Cleveland Convention,” (October 1962): 289–91. “Missouri Seen Moving.” *Lu* 44 (29 August 1962): 5–6.

<sup>8</sup> Carl Lawrenz, “A Strange Fellowship,” *WLQ* 60 (April 1963): 158.

<sup>9</sup> C[arleton] Toppe, “To One Ere Now a Brother,” *NL* 51 (8 March 1964): 67, 75. See also C[arleton] Toppe, “A Different Language,” (12 July 1964): 215. Carleton Toppe, “With Flags Flying,” *NL* 52 (25 July 1965): 227. Carleton Toppe, “Facade Continued,” (19 September 1965): 291. W. J. Schmidt, “*Quo Vadis?*” (3 October 1965): 308–9.

because it was important to me to be a member of a church in which my own faith was not assailed constantly by men who outwardly passed as brethren but who, by denying the inerrancy of Scripture and other fundamental doctrines of the church, were tearing down the foundations on which all Christian faith must rest—the words and promises of God.<sup>10</sup>

In these and other statements, Wisconsin sought to demonstrate that it exited the Synodical Conference entirely because of LCMS doctrinal aberrations. Writing in 1977, Edward Fredrich was convinced that Wisconsin's judgment "must have been dulled or duped to have permitted the sorry situation to drag on so long." At the time "there just wasn't a clear picture to be viewed." Wisconsin's "inclination was to blame the errors on a leftist and vocal few."<sup>11</sup>

Myron Maltz concluded in 1979 that "the termination of fellowship with the Missouri Synod by the Wisconsin Synod was inevitable." The final days of the synods' shared history were plagued by "continuous areas of disagreement" in areas of church practice. "To make matters worse each Synod viewed its course of action to be proper and in accord with the truth of God's Word."<sup>12</sup> George Gude is undoubtedly correct that "what destroyed the Synodical Conference was the uncertainty within the Wisconsin and Norwegian Synods regarding the direction of the Missouri Synod."<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Siegbert Becker, "Why I Joined the Wisconsin Synod," *NL* 52 (7 February 1965): 44.

<sup>11</sup> Fredrich, "The Great Debate," 162.

<sup>12</sup> Myron Maltz, "The Developmental Background and Analysis of the Termination of Fellowship with The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod by the Wisconsin Synod" (master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1979), 127.

<sup>13</sup> Gude, "Pressures and Difficulties," 164. In 1962 a *Dialog* editorialist, "Autopsy," 70, considered Wisconsin frustration "certainly understandable" in view of Missouri's "paternalistic denials" and its "apparently deliberate attempts to slant or suppress the evidence" of synodical change. "Wisconsin was ultimately forced to conclude that the representatives from Missouri either were incredibly ignorant of the state of affairs in their own churches or were deliberately glossing the troublesome differences and making promises they could not, or did not intend to keep."

*Betrayed and hurt*

But Gude is also surely correct that there was “a deep sense on the part of the Wisconsin and Norwegian Synods that they had been betrayed and hurt by the Missouri Synod.”<sup>14</sup> *The American Lutheran* acknowledged as much in June 1954, remarking that Wisconsin’s complaints against Missouri “reveal hurt feelings that are not unimportant to the Missouri Synod” and that “Wisconsin has some ground for its hurt feelings.”<sup>15</sup>

One obvious example was William Schaefer’s 1945 reaction to the announcement that the Missouri Synod had the second largest number of Scout troops of any Lutheran synod in the United States: “We were shocked beyond measure,” Schaefer wrote. “To publish such a tabulation and commitment” when the Scouting movement was “causing untold confusion and offense” was “most shocking.” It did “not seem to be a fair thing to do” and it was “not brotherly.” The *Witness* article

---

<sup>14</sup> Gude, “Pressures and Difficulties,” 177.

<sup>15</sup> “Facing Realities in the Missouri–Wisconsin Controversy,” *AL* 37 (June 1954): 3–4. The “ground” *The American Lutheran* referred to was “the original impetus” Wisconsin had given to the development of the *Intersynodical Theses* of the 1920s, contrasted to its lack of involvement in discussions regarding the *Common Confession*.

While extending sympathy for the “hurt feelings” in Wisconsin, that very *American Lutheran* article offers ample evidence of the condescension and minimizing of issues the Wisconsin Synod found most hurtful, and most frustrating. The writer dismissed the controversy between the synods as “just a little bonfire in our backyard,” even though he knew what he said would be “resented by those in Wisconsin and Missouri who regard the issues that have been raised as the most important to confront Lutheranism since the Reformation.” Upon further study, pastors and laymen in both synods would “regard some of these issues as manufactured.” Wisconsin’s lack of involvement in the development of the *Common Confession*, as well as its rejection of the *Confession*, is characterized as “the result of misunderstandings, largely personal rather than doctrinal in character.” *The American Lutheran* praised the “excellent qualities” of Wisconsin’s ministerium and voiced confidence in “the good sense of the Wisconsin Synod laity,” yet it characterized Wisconsin’s leadership as “impetuous” and its concerns as “rather insignificant matters.”

hurt “beyond the ability of expressing it.” Schaefer “deeply deplored the incident,” and was “sick at heart.”<sup>16</sup>

Following the 1952 Synodical Conference convention, Erling Ylvisaker of the Norwegian Synod, though protesting he did not speak in bitterness, insisted that if there was to be peace between brothers, “the big brother cannot say to his little brother—least of all in church work: ‘I asked you for your honest opinion and judgment but upon hearing what you have to say, I disagree with you and therefore I will refuse to listen.’” Though he had “lived some years” and had “some varied experiences,” Ylvisaker said, “Never before have we witnessed such adamant closing of all doors and windows.”<sup>17</sup>

Missouri’s publication of *A Fraternal Word*, meant to offer a defense of its position regarding the controverted issues, also provoked hurt and betrayal.<sup>18</sup> Wisconsin’s Standing Committee on Church Union requested the opportunity to study *A Fraternal Word* before it was to be distributed to Wisconsin Synod members, and the committee assumed this request had been granted. When Missouri subsequently distributed *A Fraternal Word* to some Wisconsin members and published it in *The Lutheran Witness* before giving Wisconsin’s Standing Committee the opportunity to study it, Wisconsin leaders felt they had been double-crossed.<sup>19</sup>

Because of this incident, Wisconsin Synod pastor Gervasius Fischer in Mankato, Minnesota, urged his district president to petition the synod’s Conference of Presidents to apply Matthew 7:15<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> William Schaefer, “Boy Scouts And The Missouri Synod,” 122.

<sup>17</sup> Ylvisaker, “Comment—Synodical Conference Convention,” 260.

<sup>18</sup> See [Arthur C.] D[ahms], “Has A FRATERNAL WORD Actually ‘Shown’ That the Common Confession Is Adequate?” *CL* 14 (December 1953): 136–40.

<sup>19</sup> The Standing Committee on Church Union, *A Fraternal Word Examined*, n. d., 2.

<sup>20</sup> “Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravaging wolves” (*KJV*).



to Missouri and to deny them permission to speak at the Wisconsin Synod's October special convention. Missouri had revealed itself as a wolf in "sheep's clothing" with statements of half truth, spreading their confusion also to Wisconsin.<sup>21</sup> In a separate mailing to Wisconsin's district presidents on 8 September 1953, Fischer wrote, "Having had dealings with Missouri's liberals, [I] have found them to have become false brethren, and false brethren are never honest with those who threaten an exposure of their dishonesty."<sup>22</sup>

When Missouri representatives did, in fact, attend Wisconsin's special convention on 8 October 1953, they promised they would correct what Wisconsin regarded as Missouri misquotations and misrepresentations of their position concerning the *Common Confession*. Upon reading *A Fraternal Word*, Wisconsin considered Missouri's corrections "totally inadequate, coming as notes on the last page of the document." The corrections were "limited to technical details of printing and quotation," ignoring "the bearing which these misquotations have on the substance of our argument."<sup>23</sup>

That same fall, Edmund Reim reported an incident "that happened not many years ago" in which a Missouri Synod spokesman delivered what Reim considered "a very strange

---

<sup>21</sup> G[ervasius] W. Fischer to George Barthels, 2 September 1953. Oscar Siegler, File # 1, WELS Archives, WLS, Mequon, Wis.

<sup>22</sup> G[ervasius] W. Fischer to the District Presidents of the Wisconsin Synod, 8 September 1953. Oscar Siegler, File # 1; WELS Archives, WLS, Mequon, Wis.

<sup>23</sup> *A Fraternal Word Examined*, 2–4. See also E[dmund] Reim, "As We See It: This Fraternal Word," *NL* 40 (15 November 1953): 362. Reim called *A Fraternal Word* "unfair and misleading, not necessarily by deliberate intent of its authors, but in actual effect." *A Fraternal Word* "answered us by misrepresenting us." Anyone reading *A Fraternal Word* without examining Wisconsin's 1953 convention resolutions would "get an utterly false picture" of Wisconsin's position: "The case seems so simple. Wisconsin makes its requests. Missouri meets them. Therefore Wisconsin must be utterly unreasonable still to complain after so much has been done to meet its objections. That is the impression which is created." While only a few in Wisconsin were aware of this "misquoting and misrepresenting," yet *A Fraternal Word* was widely disseminated through Missouri's *Lutheran Witness*. Reim asked, "Is this 'fraternal candor'?"

pronouncement.” Noting the difference in size between the two synods, the Missouri man suggested “rather condescendingly” that Wisconsin was smaller because it had been “chiefly concerned about *conserving* the Gospel,” while “Missouri was busy *spreading* the Gospel.” Reim replied, “It must be granted that we *are* spending disproportionately much time and effort on keeping and defending our doctrinal heritage, perhaps at the expense of our mission effort. Let it be remembered, however, that this is not by our choice, but by a stern necessity that has been forced upon us.”<sup>24</sup>

At the 1954 Synodical Conference convention, in discussing the Missouri Synod’s defense of its practices, E. E. Kowalke said:

According to the essays in this book,<sup>25</sup> these acts of the Missouri Synod are in no sense unionistic. They must necessarily, then, be right and holy, done in obedience to the will and Word of God. The Wisconsin Synod’s objections and warnings, on the other hand, are referred to as “working for a separation,” as a “rush toward separation,” as though all the painstaking admonition since 1938 were a heedless rush into separation, an unholy thing that presumes to criticize the righteous dealings of the Missouri Synod in respect to union with other churches, to working arrangements with scouting, military chaplaincy, and so on.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Reim, “As We See It: A Little Strength,” 310; emphases in the original. Edward Borchert, Missouri Synod pastor in Inver Grove Heights, Minnesota, expressed a similar viewpoint in a letter to his Wisconsin Synod brother-in-law several months after the split. “When a church body expands like ours has,” Borchert wrote, “you are bound to have problems. The Gospel must be preached and you cannot sit back and be a watch dog and then bark at everything that goes by either. We will make mistakes and we will be the first to acknowledge it. Think of the growth of our church in the past ten years. We did not grow by sitting still and watching, faultfinding and griping. The record of the Little Norwegian Synod and the Wisconsin Synod has been written. . . . We have been on the defensive long enough or much too long. . . . I think it can be said to our credit that we are trying to line up with those we can walk with and join our hands in our struggle against Satan and his forces. Some are straining gnats and swallowing camels.” Edward Borchert to Herman Danner, 20 October 1961; copy in possession of the author.

<sup>25</sup> Wendland, “The Inadequacy of the ‘Common Confession’ as a Settlement of Past Differences,” *SC Proceedings, 1954*, 17–38. Madson, “The Norwegian Synod’s Reasons for Rejecting the ‘Common Confession,’” 51–56. Fredrich, “The Military Chaplaincy and Scouting,” 57–79. E. E. Kowalke, “Unionism, the Communion Agreement, Negotiating with Lodges, and Joint Prayer,” 102–11.

<sup>26</sup> *SC Proceedings, 1954*, 106.

Following the 1954 Synodical Conference convention, Julian Anderson wrote that most discouraging “was not so much the lack of progress” but “the obvious indifference of spirit displayed by the delegates of the Missouri and Slovak Synods.” As discussions continued “it became increasingly apparent that the two groups looked upon the Scriptures in a different spirit” and “no longer thought alike or spoke the same language.” It would take “a miracle almost as great as the conversion of Nineveh” to heal the breach growing between the synods.<sup>27</sup>

Survey responses from Wisconsin Synod pastors also revealed feelings of hurt and betrayal from the Missouri Synod. “There was a ‘cocksure’ opinion that emphasized THE Missouri Synod,” came one answer. Another said, “When at Mequon and we had correspondence from St. Louis, they would address us with lower case letters.”<sup>28</sup> Another respondent recalled:

At conventions [in the 1950s] when our synod was tearing its guts apart over the fellowship issue, Missouri would send two representatives to our conventions who were not able to really assure us of anything. At the same time they sent 18 representatives to the ALC convention. One had the impression that our fellowship with Missouri was small potatoes compared with what other synods could offer. The Missouri Synod did not seem at all concerned about our distress.<sup>29</sup>

One respondent remembered the remark of a Nebraska WELS pastor: “Our synod was like a little rowboat tied to an ocean liner that was getting into dangerous waters.” Another recalled Missouri “smugness” that seemed to say, “Whatever we do must be OK.” Yet another remembered “a reluctance,” almost disdain, for “what little WELS [had] to say.” Reflecting on the escalating disturbances of the 1950s, another concluded, “We couldn’t help but think that we were being jilted by a former very dear friend. We seemed to be too small for them to bother with.”<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Julian G. Anderson, “Report of the 1954 Synodical Conference Convention,” *LuSen* 37 (12 December 1954): 365.

<sup>28</sup> Survey responses 61, 54.

<sup>29</sup> Survey response 77.

<sup>30</sup> Survey responses 9, 20, 28, 66.

Wisconsin was perhaps also responding to a change in Missouri that was strikingly obvious yet difficult to pinpoint. “The common perception in my experience was that Missourians away from the heartland, both East and West, were more influenced by ecumenism and higher criticism,” one man observed, adding that this may have occurred “because of isolation and a determination to break free of stuffy doctrinal restraints, to ‘play with the big dogs’ (nicer than we thought) in the denominations.”<sup>31</sup> By the 1940s “Missouri was extremely conscious of its public image,” noted another, while still another detected in the 1950s that Missouri exhibited “a strong concern about their P. R. or public image. They wanted to be and be looked on as one of the major American denominations.”<sup>32</sup>

By contrast, Wisconsin’s disinterest in, and even distrust of, favorable publicity is readily apparent in a commentary by Egbert Schaller responding to a favorable characterization of the synod in an editorial in the New Ulm, Minnesota *Daily News* following the synod’s 1951 convention. “We are able to quote the approving words with good grace,” wrote Schaller, because “the testimony of

---

<sup>31</sup> Wisconsin’s Karl Krauss remarked in 1956: “The *American Lutheran* has for quite some time exuded and promoted a liberalistic and unionistic doctrinal and practical theology.” Although subscribers and supporters of the magazine lived throughout the United States, the perception remained that such tendencies were more prominent in areas outside Missouri’s heartland. Karl F. Krauss, “The Voice of the CUC: On the Credit Side of the Ledger,” *NL* 43 (13 May 1956): 153. See also Toppe, “You Can’t Go Home Again,” 243.

<sup>32</sup> Survey responses 7, 11, 81. Some Missourians expressed this same concern as early as 1945: “A few years ago things still stood different with us. We were humble. It mattered little to us how the world, the world at large, the senses of which are blinded, judged our church and our work.” Formerly “it was a matter of indifference to us whether much or little was said or written concerning our work, our task as a church.” The Missouri Synod “quietly carried on [its] work” and made no ado about it, did not boast with figures and successes.” Now “the mountebank tone which our publicity has assumed” had become “excessive in heat but deficient in light. Every wholesome Lutheran sensibility must rise up against the effort to train our lay people to court the praise of uninformed and unbelieving journalists.” Even Missouri pastors were saying, “‘We count for something too! We have become prominent!’” P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “We Must Repent,” *CL* 6 (June 1945): 61. See also “An Alarming Symptom,” (September 1945): 105. P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], “Our Worst Enemy,” *CL* 8 (March 1947): 32–3. “Perils That Attend Our Work,” *CL* 9 (November 1948): 138.

the *Daily News* was neither expected nor solicited.” Schaller considered it “characteristic” of his synod that “we do not desire to have our virtues extolled, nor do we seek to try our case in the public press.” Though not specifically naming Missouri, Schaller charged that “there are church bodies who live by the publicity they can achieve, sensational, sordid, or otherwise.” Wisconsin usually found itself embarrassed by a favorable press because “the friendliest appraisal of our Synod on the outside rarely reveals an understanding of the real character of Synod’s pronouncements and objectives.”<sup>33</sup>

Still another detected “a growing dissatisfaction with the status quo” (by which he meant “a confessional Lutheran church with growth determined by the Spirit”) and witnessed instead “a desire to become ‘big’ like the other Lutheran churches.” Missouri seemed “embarrassed by its immigrant, parochial status,” feeling “it was entitled to a larger role on the Lutheran stage.” Said one more, “I have never got past the sense that [Missouri] wanted to stop being ‘immigrants,’ ‘different,’ ‘strict,’ and start being ‘American,’ ‘Protestants,’ ‘accepted.’”<sup>34</sup> Elmer Kiessling put it, “An increasing number of Missouri Lutherans believed in what Pope John later called *aggiornamento* or accommodation to the needs of the modern era.”<sup>35</sup>

Such observations echoed comments by E. P. Schulze, pastor of The Lutheran Church of Our Redeemer in Peetskill, New York, writing to *Christianity Today* in November 1960. The Missouri

---

<sup>33</sup> E[gbert] S[challer], “Newspaper Reporter’s Opinion of the Wisconsin Synod,” *NL* 38 (9 September 1951): 274. See also E[dmund] Reim, “As We See It: A Lutheran Mother Speaks,” *NL* 39 (27 January 1952): 22–3. C[arleton] Toppe, “A Bad Press,” *NL* 48 (18 June 1961): 195. James P. Schaefer recalled that Wisconsin’s leadership in the 1950s and 1960s “felt that synodical affairs were private, family matters and it was reluctant to discuss them with the press.” Schaefer acknowledged that this mindset “forced reporters to seek information about us wherever they could find it,” and the resulting press coverage “was often incomplete or garbled.” James P. Schaefer, “From this corner,” *NL* 72 (15 October 1985): 335.

<sup>34</sup> Survey responses 28, 15, 57.

<sup>35</sup> Kiessling, *History*, 35.

Synod appeared to him altogether different than it had in 1926, when in an *American Mercury* article he “doled out grudging praise” to Missouri for its “firm conservative position” and its “separated stand.”<sup>36</sup> Now, with some of Missouri’s “prominent professors” being accused of heresy, its clergy appearing “confused or indifferent in doctrinal matters,” and its laymen “grieved and disturbed,” Schulze wondered if he could still praise Missouri for its doctrine or its stand.

Getting to causes, Schulze warned that Missouri must be on guard against “the pride and pleasure of acquaintanceship. . . .

In Germany, our fathers’ principles kept them aloof from errorists, and by their persecutions the false teachers, in turn, kept our fathers humble. Later in America language isolated them, and their foreign ways caused them some embarrassment. True, they were for the most part scholars and gentlemen of culture. Many of them read their Hebrew and Greek Testament daily, and some could even converse in Latin. When they essayed to speak English, however, they could never be sure that people were not inwardly smiling at them for turning Poughkeepsie into “Bogibsi” or announcing to the congregation that they were going to “make a preachment.”

Such factors of safety no longer exist. We are now in the main stream of American life. In our desire to be good fellows we may play a round of golf with the priest or have lunch with the rabbi. There is no harm in it, perhaps, and we may even accomplish a great deal of good, but, aside from missionary implications, should we get chummy with a Presbyterian cleric across the street who does not believe in the Virgin Birth or hobnob with a Methodist dominie who has discarded the deity of Christ?<sup>37</sup>

“*The right thing to do*”

There were “prophets of doom” who predicted separation from the LCMS would spell the demise of the Wisconsin Synod. One survey respondent felt the break “would have come sooner by at least 2-3 years if the WELS men opposed to leaving had not kept up the litany that ‘WELS is too

---

<sup>36</sup> Schulze’s praise was “grudging” indeed. He credited the Missouri Synod with being “keen on orthodoxy” and “the most bellicose of the Lutheran organizations today.” The synod was the same in 1926 as it had been at Walther’s time. “Rationalization of doctrine and laxity of practice has always been violently opposed by its leaders.” Eldor Paul Schulze, “The Lutherans.” *American Mercury* 8 (1926): 310.

<sup>37</sup> E. P. Schulze, “A Letter to Missouri,” *CT* 22 (21 November 1960): 148–50.

small to go it alone,' and 'what Missouri is doing is not all that bad.'"<sup>38</sup> Richard Jungkuntz announced dramatically just prior to the 1961 convention vote to break fellowship, "Brethren, it is one minute to twelve for the Wisconsin Synod." Fears were voiced that Wisconsin "in Linus-like fashion" would take its "doctrinal security blanket of anti-Scouting/chaplaincy/ecumenism/theological conservatism and sit in the corner sulking."<sup>39</sup>

In fact, the split proved "far less disastrous than I possibly feared at first, at least outwardly." Many now view Wisconsin's decision to go it alone as "all positive," "one of the best things that ever happened to our Synod," "the right thing to do," an action that had a "most salutary" and "very wholesome effect" because it "definitely made Wisconsin stronger."<sup>40</sup>

Chief among its benefits was that "during the years of controversy, pastors, teachers, and lay members studied the Scriptures. Not that study hadn't been done before," but at that time "we were reminded to know what Scriptures taught and how to apply them." The controversies "compelled our theologians to get back to the scriptures and do some real digging. Each generation has to take possession of scriptural doctrine for itself, not rely upon the 'fathers.'"<sup>41</sup> It provided "good training" by making pastors and members "fully aware of the importance of God's Word and their sole reliance upon the promises in the Word for our very existence as a synod." The break "unified and strengthened our Synod in its present scriptural position."<sup>42</sup> One pastor, who left the Missouri Synod for the WELS, remembered what "a real treat" it was "to experience the doctrinal unity among the

---

<sup>38</sup> Survey response 28.

<sup>39</sup> Survey responses 64, 67.

<sup>40</sup> Survey responses 12, 28, 70, 11, 64, 74.

<sup>41</sup> Survey responses 1, 28.

<sup>42</sup> Survey responses 43, 56.

pastors”—something he had not experienced in the LCMS. The break made Wisconsin men “thankful for the faithfulness of Prof. Lawrenz” and others like him.<sup>43</sup>

The controversy “cleared the air as to the direction our Synod would take in fellowship matters.” Those who disagreed withdrew from the synod. Their departure “removed much ambiguity” and provided “a catharsis that rid the WELS of extremists on both sides,” resulting in “a truer church.” Ended were “the long debates, the uncertainties, the growing antagonisms.”<sup>44</sup> Though they lost cherished friendships and support from Missouri, “when the dust had settled we found a new kind of close fellowship within the Synod.” What emerged was “a deeper fraternal spirit of cooperation among pastors and teachers and laity,” and “more appreciation of whatever fellowship we have.” This fellowship “helped prevent us from being swept up in a tide of false ecumenicity” and “preserved us from the influences of what was once called ‘neo-orthodoxy.’”<sup>45</sup>

Before the split, “WELS was somewhat tied to Missouri and the Synodical Conference,” but the break “made WELS more self-sufficient and independent,” more able “to stand on its own two feet.” Realizing that “we could no longer lean on ‘Big Brother’ in our mission priorities, we became more independent in accepting these responsibilities,” which “has worked out to our advantage.”<sup>46</sup> One respondent said, “I believe it helped the WELS shed its ugly duckling complex.” Another added, “We no longer have to be the squeaking mouse intimidated by the roaring lion, LCMS or ELCA.” Breaking with the Missouri Synod was “a wonderful thing. It was as if somebody took our water wings off, and we found out, ‘Hey, I can swim!’” The WELS “emerged a more viable church

---

<sup>43</sup> Survey responses 76, 79.

<sup>44</sup> Survey responses 5, 49.

<sup>45</sup> Survey responses 55, 28, 57, 39, 82.

<sup>46</sup> Survey responses 3, 8, 12.



body, no longer in LCMS' shadow."<sup>47</sup> Wisconsin had "gained an identity" and could no longer lean, "carefree and comfortable, on Missouri's strength."<sup>48</sup>

The break made the Wisconsin Synod more mission-minded.<sup>49</sup> Previously it had been "fairly common to let Missouri or the Synodical Conference take care of outreach, while we hung back." No longer able simply to transfer members to Missouri Synod congregations around the United States, "we became more conscious of outreach opportunities."<sup>50</sup> Pastors could no longer commend Missouri Synod congregations as "sister congregations,"<sup>51</sup> but were compelled to recognize that "without the Synodical Conference the WELS would itself be obliged to preach the Gospel to every creature." The break with the LCMS "put us all on notice that the remark of one Missouri pastor was very much in place: 'The WELS is holding the *reine Lehre* (true doctrine), and is sitting on it!'"<sup>52</sup> Wrote Siegbert Becker, "We are only a handful of people, but we are the largest Lutheran body in the world that has remained loyal to the Word in these days of apostasy." WELS members now had to learn "to pray and to work and to give" as never before. "It is no time for anyone in the Wisconsin Synod to be sitting on his hands," Becker added, "or on his pocketbook, for that matter."<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Survey responses 20, 48, 66.

<sup>48</sup> James P. Schaefer, "Stewards of the Mysteries of God in Today's World," *WLQ* 74 (October 1977): 301.

<sup>49</sup> See Norman W. Berg, "1961–1971, A Decade of Decision For Home Missions," *NL* 55 (10 November 1968): 365–6. Wilbert R. Gawrisch, "Foreword 1986: The Cost of Confessionalism," *WLQ* 83 (Winter 1986): 1–2.

<sup>50</sup> Survey responses 5, 2.

<sup>51</sup> James Schaefer, "Stewards," 302.

<sup>52</sup> Survey responses 6, 34.

<sup>53</sup> Becker, "2 Timothy 4:4," 18–9.

In the 1960s and 1970s the WELS became “a haven for those dissatisfied with liberalism” and “a refuge for those outside our circles who were troubled by unionism.” Quite suddenly, the Wisconsin Synod, which for more than a century had been a regional church body, with congregations in only 16 states in 1961, found itself announcing mission openings across the United States.<sup>54</sup> “In our district it provided a new zeal and energy for mission outreach. The Missouri Synod no longer had ‘squatter rights’ to promising fields and areas in which they were located.”<sup>55</sup> Unfortunately, former Missourians who endured the traumatic experience of a church body “changing out from under them” sometimes brought with them to Wisconsin fears that any change in church methodology, however incidental, were bellwethers that “Wisconsin will go just like Missouri did.” One respondent commented on this mixed blessing:

I remember several LCMS pastors coming to our Synod and District, but quite a few of them didn’t come just for doctrinal reasons. We inherited some problem cases with them, so that they didn’t stay in the ministry and were asked to resign. They were of a different spirit.<sup>56</sup>

Wisconsin’s newfound independence fostered theological growth and increased the synod’s appreciation for what it had been given. It helped “develop and utilize more fully the tremendous spiritual gifts with which God blessed WELS.” The WELS became “better able to distinguish law and gospel in practice.” It “spurred us on to value scholarship,” helping the synod realize that “we had true scholars in our midst.” This in turn stimulated scholarly activity that “strengthened our

---

<sup>54</sup> Immanuel Frey wrote in 1967: “The Wisconsin Synod today supports missions in places into which it had no intention of going a few years ago. The reports of its mission boards include far-flung place names not heretofore associated with the Wisconsin Synod.” The WELS “did not plan this expansion, nor has it been carried out by an aggressive search for new mission opportunities. It has literally been forced upon us, in large part as a direct result of the liberal trends which have developed in once conservative churches.” Immanuel G. Frey, “Still Living,” *NL* 54 (11 June 1967): 183.

<sup>55</sup> Survey responses 33, 32. See Hartman, “The Growth of the WELS,” 37–8.

<sup>56</sup> Survey response 48.

seminary program” and led to ongoing graduate study at the seminary.<sup>57</sup> The break “stimulated publishing.” The Synod “had to prepare our own devotional material” and now had more of its people “writing religious books and commentaries on the Books of the Bible.” Stewardship programs improved. “We had major building programs undertaken in our Synod’s schools of higher learning,” building a new Lutheran high school in Milwaukee, adding more than a dozen Lutheran high schools and a Lutheran college around the country.<sup>58</sup>

On a more sobering note, one respondent wrote, “If the Wisconsin Synod had not broken when it did, we would have followed the ways of Missouri. Or the Synod would have fallen to pieces.” Had the Wisconsin Synod voted in 1961 to remain in protesting fellowship with Missouri, hundreds of pastors may have left.<sup>59</sup>

Not all viewed the split entirely in positive terms. It “created strained relations among relatives and friends” where there had been strong Wisconsin-Missouri family and working ties. Though acknowledging positive effects for the WELS, one respondent has observed a “de-emphasis on doctrine” and an “increasing emphasis on practical training of pastors as opposed to theological grounding.” Another noted that “humanism began taking over the Missouri Synod, that is, the emphasis on man to do the job, ‘we don’t need God,’” as well as “the use of gimmicks, instead of the Word, to get and keep people in the Church.”<sup>60</sup>

But other respondents wondered whether separation from a “more liberal” Missouri Synod had caused the Wisconsin Synod to become more reactionary. In 1961, seminary President Carl Lawrenz told students that entering the ministry at that time in the synod’s history would “involve

---

<sup>57</sup> Survey responses 33, 67, 36, 48.

<sup>58</sup> Survey responses 61, 70.

<sup>59</sup> Survey response 4.

<sup>60</sup> Survey responses 50, 9, 8.

special vexations and difficulties.” They would be called upon to exercise “a special measure of patience and forbearance with misunderstandings, unclarities, and criticisms.” Lawrenz urged them to be “all the more on guard against slipping into methods and procedures that are rigoristic and legalistic.”<sup>61</sup> Being separate has made Wisconsin “more independent and aggressive” but also “somewhat more legalistic for a time and negative as a result.

WELS tended to look in some respects to Scripture as a kind of encyclopedia [of doctrine and practice] with the result that every issue had to be tied in a neat ribbon and put in its proper pigeon-hole. WELS has the ability to lay out basic principles very clearly but can get fouled up in application.<sup>62</sup>

Another said: “The pendulum has swung far to the other side concerning Theology of the Word and Theology of Fellowship.”<sup>63</sup>

The same respondent who appreciated that Wisconsin had not been swept into the false ecumenicity of the late twentieth century also feared the break from Missouri “has contributed to a spirit of parochialism.”<sup>64</sup> In elaborating on his comment, this respondent recalled Jesus’ words that his disciples were to be “in the world but not of it,” which the respondent took to mean that “we are to insulate ourselves from the world without isolating ourselves from it.” Parochialism “tends to substitute isolation for insulation, or at least to confuse the two.” He feared that some WELS pastors

---

<sup>61</sup> Carl Lawrenz, “Follow and Serve the Lord With Wholehearted Devotion,” Opening Address Delivered in the Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Chapel, 5 September 1961, *WLQ* 58 (October 1961): 230. See also H[enry] C. Nitz, “Beware of Bitterness,” *NL* 46 (19 July 1959): 227. H[enry] C. Nitz, “The Perils of Orthodoxy,” (25 October 1959): 346. H[enry] C. Nitz, “I May Be Right, Yet Lose My Soul,” *NL* 47 (28 February 1960): 73.

<sup>62</sup> Survey response 69. This respondent’s warning echoes a comment James Schaefer was frequently heard to make before his death in 1995: “The Wisconsin Synod has become more rabbinic.”

<sup>63</sup> Survey response 19.

<sup>64</sup> Survey response 39. A correspondent to *Christian News* predicted that in 1975 “serious talks with the Wisconsin Synod” would be opened but would not produce “any significant results for hard-core Missourians” because “Wisconsin has enjoyed its autonomy and does not want to become Missouri’s sidekick” once again. “Predictions for 1975,” *CN* 7 (30 December 1974): 16.

today regard clergy from other denominations with suspicion, figuring “it’s better to be safe,” and so “we aren’t even cordial [to them], as though cordiality would compromise our confessionalism.”

Another way parochialism manifests itself is in the practical way of recognizing the church.

We all confess to believe in the holy Christian church, the communion of saints, but we have a problem translating that belief into any kind of positive action—as though maybe there aren’t any real saints outside the WELS. In applying fellowship principles we want to be sure to be on the safe side. We overreact. In doing so we exhibit behavior that in part gives credence to the stereotype people have of us. We live and work in an ecclesiastical ghetto, and act as though we think that is one of our strengths.

The spirit of parochialism “operates with a ghetto mentality,” which “obscures the love Jesus wants us to have for one another, even for our enemies.”<sup>65</sup>

In a 1996 essay presented to pastoral conferences in the South Atlantic District, former synod president Carl Mischke remarked on the oft-repeated adage that “the WELS is always twenty years behind Missouri.” The person was usually referring to “something in the WELS that he didn’t like” and would then “point out that he had observed the same thing in Missouri already 20 years earlier.”<sup>66</sup> If the Missouri Synod changed its practice of church fellowship, struggled over the doctrine of Holy Scripture, and succumbed to desires of being a “bigger player” on the American Lutheran scene, and if it is true that “Wisconsin is twenty years behind Missouri,” it would be reasonable to assume—and to fear—that Wisconsin may follow the same path.

But if, by separating from Missouri, the Wisconsin Synod preserved and embraced a more conservative outlook on fellowship and Scripture, then for the WELS the danger of legalism and a

---

<sup>65</sup> Respondent 39, follow-up interview with the author, Milwaukee, Wis., 22 September 1999.

<sup>66</sup> Carl H. Mischke, “Twenty Years Behind Missouri—A Caution for the WELS” (essay presented to two pastoral conferences in the South Atlantic District, Fall 1996), 1.

reactionary spirit may be greater than that of following Missouri's path.<sup>67</sup> Wisconsin's E. E.

Kowalke addressed that very issue in 1956:

Perhaps the greatest danger of all is the danger of resorting to quick legalistic action in dealing with the many practical problems that will have to be solved and that are bound to arise in connection with intermarriage, division of the family into opposing parties, social contacts, business contacts, and even business partnerships. This may sound silly, but in the event of a separation, we may expect such questions as: May I hire a Missourian to work for me? May I invite a Missourian to dinner? May a Wisconsin pastor stop and talk with a Missouri pastor on the street? Should we let our children play with the Missouri neighbor's children? May our colleges and schools employ Missouri Synod janitors? Should our high schools and colleges schedule basketball games with Missouri Synod schools? Questions like that are going to be asked, because some of them have already been asked. How are they and a hundred more like them, some of them much harder questions, going to be answered? We must not think that if our controversy with Missouri is settled that our troubles will be ended. There is no such thing in church life or any other form of life as the end of troubles, and we don't look for such a fool's paradise here on earth.<sup>68</sup>

In 1940 the Norwegian Synod's George Lillegard observed that "family quarrels are notoriously more bitter, civil wars more bloody" than any other. "So it is, perhaps, not strange that the dissension within the Synodical Conference should wax bitter over a union program which threatens to separate old friends."<sup>69</sup> Though probably without knowing it, Lillegard echoed sociologist E. A. Ross, who wrote in 1905: "Conflict is sharpest and most passionate when it comes between those who have been united." Next to family quarrels, church quarrels "are proverbial for the bitterness they develop."<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> See Armin W. Schuetze, "The Other Five Per Cent," *NL* 56 (13 April 1968): 131-2. Immanuel G. Frey, "Avoid . . . Contact!" *NL* 56 (12 October 1969): 367. Joel C. Gerlach, "Thanks, Mr. Mather, we needed that," *NL* 73 (15 April 1986): 150.

<sup>68</sup> Kowalke, "Romans 16:17-18," 12.

<sup>69</sup> Lillegard, "Lutheran Union," 10.

<sup>70</sup> E. A. Ross, *The Principles of Sociology* (New York: Century, 1920), 161.

The estrangement of the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod from The Lutheran Church—  
Missouri Synod, once her sister in midwestern American Lutheranism, is now almost four decades  
old. As time goes by, fewer and fewer members of the WELS will recall or cherish the fellowship,  
despite the bitterness in parting, that once was ours with Missouri. One who did remember, and who  
rose above that bitterness, wrote in 1971:

Many of us have not forgotten our days of brotherhood, when we worshiped  
in each other's churches, preached in each other's pulpits, held joint mission  
festivals and Reformation rallies, and sang together at Saengerfests. . . .

We who recall what Missouri was and who cherish the faith that many in her  
churches still cling to, shouldn't we pray for her in her troubled hour? Pray that she  
may stand in awe of every syllable and letter that God has inscribed in His Book.  
Pray that she may place fidelity in eternal truth above concord among her churches,  
above prestige in her halls of learning, above filial love for the church of her fathers.  
Pray that she may remember the crown God gave her, and pray that God may keep  
her for that crown.<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> Carleton Toppe, "A Prayer for The Missouri Synod," *NL* 58 (4 July 1971): 215.

## *Appendix*

April 4, 1997

Dear [Pastor/Professor] . . . ,

I am completing my dissertation toward a Doctor of Theology degree from Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. My dissertation topic concerns the breakup of the Synodical Conference, with special reference to the theological changes that occurred in the Missouri Synod, the Wisconsin Synod's reactions to Missouri's changes, and the subsequent internal tensions in the Wisconsin Synod, including the development of the Church of the Lutheran Confession.

There are numerous source documents in the *Quartalschrift* and *The Northwestern Lutheran*, synodical convention proceedings, major conference and convention essays, as well as a wide variety of archival material at our Seminary. Some of the most interesting and useful information, however, lies in the personal anecdotes and recollections of those who were involved in this history.

Your name has been selected from among about ninety pastors and professors of our Synod to receive the enclosed questionnaire. Because the questionnaire covers several areas of Synodical history, you may not have personal recollections or information to offer for every question. I would greatly appreciate your answers to as many of the questions as you are able to give.

Enclosed is a self-addressed, stamped envelope in which you may return your answers. If, in addition, you have in your files any study papers or reports concerning the chaplaincy, Scouting, Romans 16:17,18, prayer fellowship, or the Common Confession, and if you could make a photocopy of those papers and send them to me, I would greatly appreciate it. I will reimburse you for additional copying and postal expenses.

If you would prefer to communicate by a different method, I would be happy to phone you or, if you wish, arrange for a personal interview. Unless you indicate otherwise, I will consider all of your written comments to be "for the record." If you feel you need to protect your anonymity concerning any or all of your answers, you may indicate that on the questionnaire form.

Please send your answers and other information to me no later than May 1, 1997.

The majority of our WELS pastors and members have little memory of our former relations with the Missouri Synod, or the traumatic events surrounding our break in fellowship with Missouri and the demise of the Synodical Conference. I hope we can record more of this history, so that others may read and learn from it. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

In Him,

Prof. Mark Braun  
Home phone: 414-258-4128  
Office phone: 414-443-8849  
FAX: 414-443-8514  
E-mail: mbraun@post.its.mcw.edu



*Questions relating to Missouri/Wisconsin history*

1. During your ministry, how would you describe your relations with neighboring Missouri Synod pastors, professors, or congregations?

strained  
 indifferent  
 cordial  
 cooperative  
 other

2. Some observers have commented on a “triumphalist” or “cock sure” attitude in the Missouri Synod in previous generations, and a corresponding feeling of “small Synoditis” on the part of Wisconsin. Based on your experience, would you agree or disagree with that observation?

Strongly agree   Agree                      Neutral Disagree                      Strongly disagree  
                    1                      2                      3                      4                      5

3. How would you characterize the attitude of your pastoral conference, district, or geographical area?

strongly opposed to breaking with Missouri  
 mildly opposed to breaking with Missouri  
 neutral  
 mildly in favor of breaking with Missouri  
 strongly in favor of breaking with Missouri

4. How many pastors and congregations from your area left the Wisconsin Synod, either to join the Missouri Synod, form the CLC, or become independent?

0-5                       6-10                       11-15                       16-20                       20 +



### *Archival Material*

- Albrecht, Paul G. "When is a Person a Separatist?" Essay delivered to the Missouri–Wisconsin Synod Presidents' Conference, Milwaukee, Wis.. 12–15 January 1954. Copy in possession of the author.
- Antichrist*. Continuing in His Word, Tract Number 9. Milwaukee: Conference of Presidents, The Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, 1954. Copy in possession of the author.
- Becker, Siegbert W. "An Analysis of Dr. Martin Scharlemann's Essay: REVELATION AND INSPIRATION." Copy in possession of the author.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Attacks on Inerrancy and Inspiration." Essay given at the "State of the Church" Lutheran Free Conference, Milwaukee, n. d. [1961?]. WLS essay file.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "2 Timothy 4:4—An Apt Description of Truth's Treatment by 'Modern' Theologians of the Lutheran Church." Essay read at the Minnesota Convention, Wisconsin Synod, New Ulm, Minn., 1 August 1966. WLS essay file.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Verbal Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures." Essay Delivered to the Texas District Teachers Conference, Missouri Synod, 17 August 1960. WLS essay file.
- Birner, Herbert A. "The Saga of a Mission District: Dakota–Montana, the First Ninety Years, 1880–1970." Dakota–Montana District Convention, Wisconsin Synod, 14–16 June 1994. WLS essay file.
- Borchert, Edward. Letter to Herman Danner, 20 October 1961. Copy in possession of the author.
- Buenger, John. *Missouri, Iowa, and Ohio: The Old and the New Differences*. N. p., n. d., [1928]. WLS essay file.
- The Chaplaincy Question*. Continuing in His Word, Tract Number 11. Milwaukee: Conference of Presidents, The Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, 1954. Copy in possession of the author.
- Chosen By Grace From Eternity*. Continuing in His Word, Tract Number 6. Milwaukee: Conference of Presidents, The Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, 1954. Copy in possession of the author.
- The Church's Opportunities in The Military Chaplaincy: An Open Letter to the Conference of Presidents of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States*. June 1955.
- The Common Confession and Other Pertinent Documents*. N. p., n. d. Copy in possession of the author.

*Cooperation in Externals*. Continuing in His Word, Tract Number 8. Milwaukee: Conference of Presidents, The Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, 1954. Copy in possession of the author.

Dahlke, J. C. "The Scriptural Meaning of 'Koinonia' Fellowship; Its Manifestations and Restrictions." Essay read to the Southeastern Wisconsin District Convention, Wisconsin Synod, Thiensville, Wis., June 1948. WLS essay file.

Danner, Herman. Letter to Edward Borchert, 5 February 1961. Copy in possession of the author.

Dierks, Theo. *An Examination of the Proposed Doctrinal Affirmation*. N. p., n. d. Copy in possession of the author.

Eckert, O. W. Open letter to Wisconsin Synod pastors: "Resolved: . . . A Last Effort to Bring Synod Back to the Word By Means of Mailings." Winner, S. D.: Trinity Lutheran Church, 12 March 1958. Copy in possession of the author.

Eickmann, Paul E. Correspondence with Dr. Martin Scharlemann and Prof. Carl Lawrenz, 24 November 1959–3 December 1959. Copy in possession of the author.

\_\_\_\_\_. "What Does the Bible Say About Church Fellowship?" and other brief essays. Presented to his congregation at Crete, Ill., Wisconsin Synod, after the break in fellowship with the Missouri Synod, 1961. Copy in possession of the author.

*Every Sinner Declared Righteous*. Continuing in His Word, Tract Number 3. Milwaukee: Conference of Presidents, The Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, 1954. Copy in possession of the author.

Franzmann, Werner. "Being Made All Things to All Men." Essay read to the 33rd Convention of Joint Synod, summarized by the essay recorder. Copy in possession of the author.

*A Fraternal Reply*. St. Louis: The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, July, 1954. WLS essay file.

*"A Fraternal Word" Examined*. 1953. WLS essay file.

*A Fraternal Word on the questions in controversy between the Wisconsin Synod and the Missouri Synod*. St. Louis: The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, 31 August 1953. WLS essay file.

Fredrich, E[dward] C. "By God's Grace a Confessing Confessional Lutheran Church." Presented to the Southeastern Wisconsin District Pastor-Teacher Conference, Wisconsin Synod, 11–12 June 1975. WLS essay file.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The WELS Mission Enterprise Among the Apaches." Presented to the LHC, San Francisco, Calif., 6–9 November 1986. WLS essay file.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Minnesota District's First Fifty Years." Presented to the Minnesota District Convention, Dr. Martin Luther College, New Ulm, Minn., 29 July–1 August 1968. WLS essay file.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Twentieth Century Shaping of United States Lutheranism*. Mequon, Wis.: Seminary Mimeo Company, 1984. WLS essay file.
- Frey, I[manuel] P. "Joint Prayer." Essay delivered to the Missouri–Wisconsin Synod Presidents' Conference, Milwaukee, Wis., 12–15 January 1954. Copy in possession of the author.
- Galstad, Martin. Letter to Mark Braun, 24 September 1998. Copy in possession of the author.
- Gehrke, Ralph. "Church Fellowship." Essay delivered at the twenty-first biennial convention of the Western Wisconsin District, Wisconsin Synod, Northwestern College, Watertown, Wis., 15 July 1958. WLS essay file.
- Graebner, Martin. "Army Chaplains." St. Paul, Minn.: n. p., n. d. Copy in possession of the author.
- Guenther, A[rthur] A. "The Ministry among the Apaches after 100 Years." Paper presented to the Arizona Pastoral Conference, Grace Ev. Lutheran Church, Wisconsin Synod, San Carlos, Ariz., 4–5 May 1993. WLS essay file.
- Gullerud, Carl M. "History of the Church of the Lutheran Confession." Date and place of presentation unrecorded. WLS essay file.
- Habeck, I[rwin] J. "Wisconsin's Objections to Missouri's Continuing Negotiations with the A. L. C." Essay delivered to the Missouri–Wisconsin Synod Presidents' Conference, Milwaukee, Wis., 12–15 January 1954. Copy in possession of the author.
- Hartzell, Eric. "Mission Zeal of the Infant Wisconsin Synod, 1850–1893." Senior church history paper, WLS, 1976. WLS essay file.
- Huggins, Marvin A. "Missouri in the Northeast: Hostile Outpost or Cutting Edge?" Paper presented to the LHC, Staten Island, N. Y., 29 October 1998. Copy in possession of the author.
- If the Trumpet Give an Uncertain Sound*. Continuing in His Word, Tract Number 5. Milwaukee: Conference of Presidents, The Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, 1954. Copy in possession of the author.
- "The Issue Before Us." Mimeographed collection of weekly articles from the Sunday bulletins of St. John's Ev. Lutheran Church, Sleepy Eye, Minn., 23 August–18 October 1959; mailed to area congregations. Copy in possession of the author.
- Janke, Philip R. Letter to The Protest Committee, 30 August 1957. Copy in possession of the author.
- Jeske, Mark A. "A Half Century of *Faith–Life*: An analysis of the circumstances surrounding the formation of the Protes'tant Conference." Senior church history paper, WLS, 22 April 1978. Copy in possession of the author.
- Keibel, Armin C. Letter to Joel Gerlach, 29 August 1957. Copy in possession of the author.

- Keibel, Armin K. E. "Why the Wisconsin Synod Suspended Fellowship with the Missouri Synod." Presented to the WELS Arizona–California Pastors' Conference, Reformation Lutheran Church, San Diego, Calif., 30 October 1996. Copy in possession of the author.
- Koehler, E. W. A. *An Analysis of "A Statement."* Elizabeth, Ill.: privately published, available from Rev. E. Wiedbusch, n. d. WLS library essay file.
- Koehler, John Philipp. Reminiscences, under the title, "Beginnings of the opposition in the Wisconsin Synod underlying the Controversies in the Years from 1924 to 1930," recorded 1930. Unpublished manuscript, Koehler file, CHI. Copy in possession of the author.
- Kowalke, E[rwin] E. "Romans 16:17–18." Essay delivered at the Minnesota District Pastoral Conference, Wisconsin Synod, April 1956. Copy in possession of the author.
- Krauss, K[arl] F. "Cooperation with Unorthodox Church Bodies in Matters Clearly Not in the Field of Externals." Essay delivered to the Missouri–Wisconsin Synod Presidents' Conference, Milwaukee, 12–15 January 1954. Copy in possession of the author.
- Kretzmann, A. T. "Church Fellowship: A Comparison Between the 'Old Missouri' and the 'New Missouri' Positions." Study outline compiled and mimeographed, 7 August 1961. Copy in possession of the author.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Convinced Me That I Must Sever Fellowship with the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod as a Corporate Body." Crete, Ill.: Trinity Lutheran Church, 7 September 1961. Copy in possession of the author.
- Krueger, Mark. "The Cost in Pastors, Professors, Teachers, and Communicants in Connection with our Severance of Fellowship with the Missouri Synod." Senior church history paper, WLS, 1974. WLS essay file.
- Krug, Clayton. "Shifts of Fellowship Teachings in WELS, 1860–1996; a Personal View." Paper prepared for the Winnebago Pastoral Conference, Northern Wisconsin District, Wisconsin Synod, 17 September 1996. Copy in possession of the author.
- Kuster, A. V. *The Missouri Synod Must Reject the Doctrinal Affirmation.* Elizabeth, Ill.: privately published, available from Rev. E. Wiedbusch, n. d. WLS essay file.
- Lange, Lyle. "The Doctrinal Differences Between the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod and the Church of the Lutheran Confession, the Concordia Lutheran Conference, and the Lutheran Churches of the Reformation." Prepared for the Minnesota District Pastoral Conference, Wisconsin Synod, St. James, Minn., 17 April 1985. WLS essay file.
- Lawrenz, Carl. *Church Fellowship: This is the Presentation of our Wisconsin Synod Committee on Doctrinal Matters, Discussed by the Joint Doctrinal Committees of the Synodical Conference.* n. d. WLS essay file.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The History of the Boy Scout Issue." Essay presented to the special Michigan District Convention, Wisconsin Synod, St. Paul's Ev. Lutheran Church, Saginaw, Mich., 28–29 June 1951. Supplemented, June 1988, to cover also the period 1951–1954. Copy in possession of the author.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Report to the Protest Committee." Doctrinal discussions, ca. 1959, including an addendum of excerpts of a personal letter, Prof. Carl Lawrenz to Rev. Rollin Reim, 17 March 1959. WLS essay file.
- Lehninger, Max. "A Brief Factual Presentation of the Historical Development of Efforts toward Lutheran Unity in the U. S. A." No place or occasion for the paper is listed, 8 January 1954. WLS essay file.
- Lutheran Bodies in the U. S. A.* Continuing in His Word, Tract Number 1. Milwaukee: Conference of Presidents, The Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, n. d. [1953?]. Copy in possession of the author.
- Marschausen, John J. "Dr. Adolph A. Brux and Prayer Fellowship in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod." Research paper, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1970. Concordia Seminary library.
- Marty, Martin E. Letter to Mark Braun, 19 December 1995. Copy in possession of the author.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Mark Braun, 4 March 1996. Copy in possession of the author.
- Mischke, Carl H. "Twenty Years Behind Missouri—A Caution for the WELS." Essay presented to two pastoral conferences of the South Atlantic District, Fall 1996. Copy in possession of the author.
- 1938–1953.* Continuing in His Word, Tract Number 2. Milwaukee: Conference of Presidents, The Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, n. d. [1953?]. Copy in possession of the author.
- Nitz, H. C. "Negotiation with Deistic Organizations." Essay delivered to the Missouri–Wisconsin Synod Presidents' Conference, Milwaukee, 12–15 January 1954. Copy in possession of the author.
- Nolting, Paul. "Romans 16:17." Essay delivered before the New Ulm Pastoral Conference, Wisconsin Synod, at Sleepy Eye, Minn., 25 September 1957. WLS essay file.
- Not By My Own Reason or Strength.* Continuing in His Word, Tract Number 4. Milwaukee: Conference of Presidents, The Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, 1954. Copy in possession of the author.
- Our Position Against Scouting.* Continuing in His Word, Tract Number 7. Milwaukee: Conference of Presidents, The Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, 1954. Copy in possession of the author.

- Our Relations With the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.* Published by the Union Committee of the Norwegian Synod, n. d. Copy in possession of the author.
- Pieper, Francis. "The Difference between Orthodox and Heterodox Churches." Essay originally presented to the Southern District Convention, Missouri Synod, 1889. English translation available from Rev. Arthur Schulz, Tracy, Minn. WLS essay file.
- Pless, Joel. "Cancer at Concordia: An examination of how the historical-critical method of Biblical interpretation was introduced to the classroom teaching at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri, and what were the subsequent effects." Senior church history paper, 27 May 1986. WLS essay file.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Prof. John P. Koehler's 1930 Reminiscences: A Synopsis, Analysis, and Application." Presented to the annual meeting of the WELS Historical Institute, Mequon, Wis., 13 October 1996. Copy in possession of the author.
- Pless, W[aldemar] O. "Historical Background of the Present Issues Between the Missouri and Wisconsin Synods," paper read at a special meeting of the Northern Wisconsin District, Wisconsin Synod, Reedsville, Wis., 5 October 1953. WLS essay file.
- Pope, Reginald E. "The C. L. C. in South Dakota: 'The Turbulent Years.'" Paper presented to the Eastern Pastor Conference, Dakota-Montana District, Wisconsin Synod, 26–27 October 1987. Copy in possession of the author.
- Prange, Victor H. "Report and Reaction (Wisconsin Synod convention 1961)." Unpublished manuscript. Copy in possession of the author.
- Prayer Fellowship.* Continuing in His Word, Tract Number 10. Milwaukee: Conference of Presidents, The Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, 1954. Copy in possession of the author.
- Press, G[erhard] A. "The Military Chaplaincy." Essay delivered to the Missouri–Wisconsin Synod Presidents' Conference, Milwaukee, 12–15 January 1954. Copy in possession of the author.
- Preus, J[acob] A. O., Jr. *What Stands Between?* N. p., revised edition 1949. Copy in possession of the author.
- Raabe, John. "The Blessings of Our Church Fellowship." Essay presented to the Minnesota District Convention, Wisconsin Synod, Litchfield, Minn., 13–16 June 1960. WLS essay file.
- Reim, Edmund. "An Open Letter to the Protest Committee, Wisconsin Synod." Mimeographed paper, 29 October 1958. WLS essay file.
- "Report of the Conference Held at Immanuel Lutheran Church, Mankato, Minnesota. December 4th–5th, 1957." Copy in possession of the author.
- Sauer, Theodore A. Letter to Mark Braun, 18 April 1997. Copy in possession of the author.



- Schaefer, James P. "Some Reflections on the 125th Anniversary of the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod." Paper presented to the Metro-North Pastoral Conference, Southeast Wisconsin District, Wisconsin Synod, 19 May 1975. WLS essay file.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Statement to the WELS Convention, August 17, 1961." Copy in possession of the author.
- Schaller, Egbert. "The '*Status Controversiae*' (The Principle Question in the Controversy) Within the Synodical Conference." Essay given at the Dakota-Montana District Conference, Wisconsin Synod, 1958. WLS essay file.
- Schaller, Paul W. "The Role of Admonition in Romans 16:17." Mimeographed study paper, 17 October 1963. Copy in possession of the author.
- Scharlemann, Martin H. "The Bible as Record, Witness and Medium." Essay first read to the LCMS Council on Bible Study, 3 April 1959. WLS essay file.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Revelation and Inspiration." Paper presented to the Triennial Conference of the Western District of the LCMS, Jefferson City, Mo., 20-22 October 1959. Copy in possession of the author.
- Schroeder, M. C. "What Ought To Be Our Attitude in Respect to 'The Boy Scouts of America.'" Mimeographed paper. Copy in possession of the author.
- Schroeder, Morton A. Letter to Mark Braun, 3 October 1997. Copy in possession of the author.
- Schwepe, Carl. *The Government Chaplaincy: An Appraisal*. Published by resolution of the Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, convened at Watertown, Wisconsin, 4-11 August 1943, for distribution to all delegates. Copy in possession of the author.
- Scouting in the Light of Scripture*. Prepared by a committee appointed by the Milwaukee Pastoral Conference of the Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States. Copy in possession of the author.
- Scouting in the Lutheran Church*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Lutheran Committee on Scouting, 1951. Copy in possession of the author.
- Siegler, Oscar. "Boy Scouts." Essay delivered to the Missouri-Wisconsin Synod Presidents' Conference, Milwaukee, 12-15 January 1954. Copy in possession of the author.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Common Confession—Article XII: The Last Things." Mimeographed paper, August 1951. Copy in possession of the author.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Files from the Commission on Inter-Church Relations of the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod, 1952-1987, File # 1: Union Committee (March 1952-August 1955). WELS Archives, WLS, Mequon, Wis.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Files from the Commission on Inter-Church Relations of the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod, 1952–1987, File # 2: Union Committee (October 1955–August 1959). WELS Archives, WLS, Mequon, Wis.
- Sippert, Albert. “An Analysis and History of the Downfall of the Wisconsin Synod.” Mimeographed paper, Clear Lake, S. D., 22 June 1959. Copy in possession of the author.
- Sitz, E. Arnold. “Exercising Patience and Longsuffering.” Essay read to the 33rd Joint Convention, summarized by essay recorder, n. d. Copy in possession of the author.
- Suspension of Relations with The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod by the 38th Regular Convention of the Norwegian Synod*, reprint from convention proceedings, June 1955. Copy in possession of the author.
- Taepke, George. *To the Pastors and Professors of the Ev. Luth. Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States and All Concerned*. N. p., April 1944. Copy in possession of the author.
- Unity, Union and Unionism*. Reprint from the 1936 Convention report of the Norwegian Synod. Mankato, Minn.: Luther Synod Book Company, Bethany College, 1938. WLS essay file.
- Vallesky, W[ilmer]. “What Should Be Our Attitude Toward the Boy Scouts?” West Allis, Wis.: mimeographed by L. Hallauer, n. d. Copy in possession of the author.
- Wendland, Ernst H. “The Biblical Concept of Church Fellowship.” Paper written following the meeting with the WELS committee assigned to answer questions relating to the statement of the Synod's doctrinal committee on matters relating to its Fellowship Theses, February 1961. Copy in possession of the author.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Church Fellowship—a Unit Concept?” Paper presented to the Southwestern Conference, Michigan District, Wisconsin Synod, January 1961. Copy in possession of the author.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Inadequacy of the Common Confession as a Settlement of Past Differences.” Essay prepared for the convention of the Synodical Conference, Detroit, 8–10 August 1954. Copy in possession of the author.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to the Committee on Doctrinal Matters, Michigan District Pastor-Teacher Conference, 2 June 1961. Copy in possession of the author.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to Mark Braun, 7 April 1997. Copy in possession of the author.
- Wendland, Paul. E-mail to Mark Braun, 3 October 1996. Copy in possession of the author.
- Werfelmann, A. H. “Outline for Discussion of Essay, ‘The Bible as Record, Witness, and Medium.’” 20 November 1959. Copy in the possession of the author.
- Witt, M[aynard] J. “When is a Person a Unionist?” Essay delivered to the Missouri–Wisconsin Synod Presidents’ Conference, Milwaukee, 12–15 January 1954.

### *Interviews*

- Gerlach, Joel C. Interview by author. Wauwatosa, Wis., 14 April 1997.
- Kiecker, James G. Interview by author. Milwaukee, Wis., 28 April 1997.
- Schaefer, James P. Interview by author. Milwaukee, Wis., 6 September 1995.
- Schuetze, Armin W. Interview by author. Watertown, Wis., 18 April 1997.
- Westerhaus, Martin O. Interview by author. Mequon, Wis., 10 February 1997.

### *Theses and Dissertations*

- Albers, James W. "The History of Attitudes within the Missouri Synod Toward Life Insurance." Th. D. diss., Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1972.
- Bachmann, Ernest Theodore. "The Rise of 'Missouri Lutheranism.'" Ph. D. diss., University of Chicago, 1946.
- Barnhart, Melody R. "Heresy vs. Orthodoxy." Master's thesis, University of North Texas, Denton, 1991.
- Bornmann, Carl Louis. "The Concepts of Unity, Fellowship, and Cooperation Among Various Lutheran Bodies in America." Master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1959.
- Bunzel, Charles F. "The Missouri Synod and the Chicago (Intersynodical) Theses." Master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1964.
- Busch, Edward E. "The Relations Between the American Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod from 1930 to 1941, and Their Failure to Establish Church Fellowship." Ph. D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, Calif., 1973.
- Freese, John Richard. "A Symbolic Analysis of State Educational Policy and Reaction in a Selected State." Ed. D. diss., University of Arizona, Tucson, 1993.
- Frobe, Roger P. "An Exegetical Study of Romans 16:17-20 in Light of Its Use in the Missouri Synod During the Last Thirty Years for the Question of Fellowship." Master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1970.
- Graebner, Alan Niehaus. "The Acculturation of an Immigrant Lutheran Church: The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, 1917–1929." Ph. D. diss., Columbia University, New York, 1965.
- Greising, Jack Howard. "The Status of Confessional Conservatism: Background and Issues in The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod." Ph. D. diss., St. Louis University, 1972.

- Griffin, Dale E. "The Effects of the Participation of the Missouri Synod in the Military Chaplaincy during World War II on its Subsequent History." Master's thesis, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, 1964.
- Gude, George J. "A Description and Evaluation of the Pressures and Difficulties within the Synodical Conference which led to its Destruction." Master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1986.
- Hattery, John W. "The Historical Development of the Doctrine of Unionism in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod." Master's thesis, Gettysburg Lutheran Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., 1970.
- Hayes, Laurie Ann S. "The Rhetoric of Controversy in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod with Particular Emphasis on the Years 1969–1976." Ph. D. diss., University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1980.
- Hess, Robert M. "Prayer Fellowship in the First Half of Synod's History." Master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1985.
- Hilgendorf, Mary E. "C. F. W. Walther and Education in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod." Ph. D. diss., Marquette University, Milwaukee, 1997.
- Janzow, Walter T. "Secularization in an Orthodox Denomination." Ph. D. diss., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 1971.
- Johnson, Niel Melvin. "The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod in World War I." Master's thesis, State University of Iowa, Ames, 1965.
- Jordahl, Leigh Donald. "The Wauwatosa Theology, John Philipp Koehler, and the theological tradition of mid-western American Lutheranism." Ph. D. diss., University of Iowa, Cedar Rapids, 1964.
- Keller, Phyllis. "German-America and the First World War." Ph. D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pa., 1969.
- Kuster, Thomas Arnold. "The Fellowship Dispute in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod: A Rhetorical Study of Ecumenical Change." Ph. D. diss., University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1969.
- Labore, Richard Donald. "Traditions and Transitions: A Study of the Leadership of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod During a Decade of Theological Change, 1960–1969." Ph. D. diss., St. Louis University, 1980.
- Leech, Gladys. "The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod in the Great Depression, 1929–1941." Master's thesis, George Washington University, Washington, D. C., 1956.

- Maltz, Myron C. "The Developmental Background and Analysis of the Termination of Fellowship with the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod by the Wisconsin Synod." Master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1979.
- Pfabe, Jerald. "Theodore Graebner: Apologist for Missouri Synod Lutheranism." Ph. D. diss., St. Louis University, St. Louis, 1972.
- Robinson, Jack Treon. "The Spirit of Triumphalism in The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod: The Role of 'A Statement' of 1945 in the Missouri Synod." Ph. D. diss., Vanderbilt University, Nashville, 1972.
- Russow, James R. "An Examination of the Issues Which Led to the Suspension of Fellowship Between the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod and the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod in 1961." Master's thesis, Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield, Ill., 1973.
- Schmiel, David. "The History of the Relationship of the Wisconsin Synod to the Missouri Synod Until 1925." Master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1958.
- Stevens, Leland Robert. "The Americanization of the Missouri Synod as Reflected Within the *Lutheran Witness*." Ph. D. diss., St. Louis University, St. Louis, 1986.
- Suelflow, Roy Arthur. "The History of the Missouri Synod During the Second Twenty-Five Years of Its Existence, 1872–1897." Th. D. diss., Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1946.
- Tietjen, John H. "The Principles of Church Union Espoused in the Nineteenth Century Attempts to Unite the Lutheran Church in America." Th. D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1959.
- Todd, Mary. "'Not in God's Lifetime': The Question of the Ordination of Women in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod." Ph. D. diss., University of Illinois at Chicago, 1996.
- Toepper, Robert Marvin. "'The Fathers' Faith—The Children's Language': The Transition of the Missouri Synod from German to English." Master's thesis, Washington University, St. Louis, 1967.
- Utech, William George. "The History and Use of the Galesburg Rule in American Lutheranism." Master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1987.
- Wohlrabe, John C., Jr. "The Missouri Synod's Unity Attempts During the Pfotenhauer Presidency, 1911–1935." Master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1982.
- Zetto, J. Jeffrey. "Aspects of Theology in the Liturgical Movement in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, 1930–1960." Th. D. diss., Christ Seminary—Seminec, St. Louis, May 1982.

### **Books**

- Aaberg, Theodore A. *A City Set on a Hill: A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod (Norwegian Synod) 1918–1968*. Lake Mills, Ia.: Graphic Publishing Company, Inc., 1968.
- Adams, James E. *Preus of Missouri and the Great Lutheran Civil War*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1977.
- Albrecht, Walter W. F. *Dr. Theo. Graebner's "Prayer Fellowship" In the Light of Scripture and the Faith of our Fathers*. Milwaukee: NPH, 1946.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Holy Scripture the Word of God." *The Abiding Word: An Anthology of Doctrinal Essays for the Year 1946* (St. Louis: CPH, 1947), 2:1–34.
- Anderson, Charles. *The Reformation, Then and Now*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1966.
- Anderson, Charles H. *White Protestant Americans: From National Origins to Religious Group*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Arand, Charles P. *Testing the Boundaries: Windows to Lutheran Identity*. St. Louis: CPH, 1995.
- Babbie, E. R. *The Practice of Social Research*, 5th ed. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1983.
- Baepler, Walter A. *A Century of Grace: a History of the Missouri Synod, 1847–1947*. St. Louis: CPH, 1947.
- Beck, Walter H. *Lutheran Elementary Schools in the United States: A History of the Development of Parochial Schools and Synodical Educational Policies and Programs*. St. Louis: CPH, 1939.
- Becker, Siegbert W., "Jesus Christ, Son of God and Son of Man—Fact Not Fiction." In Vernon Harley, ed., *Jesus Christ—Fact or Fiction? Five Essays on Christology*. Milwaukee: NPH, 1969, 7–30.
- Behnken, John W. *This I Recall*. St. Louis: CPH, 1964.
- Beyer, J. P. *Stenographische Aufgezeichnetes Colloquium der Vortreter der Synode von Illinois [sic for Iowa] und der Missouri, Ohio, u. a. St., gehalten vom 13–19 November in Milwaukee, Wis.* Chicago: Gedrukt in der Office der Chicago Union, 1868.
- Bivens, Forrest L., Richard A. deRuiter, and Daniel L. Schaller, eds. *Michigan Memories: Things Our Fathers Have Told Us*. Saginaw, Mich.: Michigan District of the WELS, 1985.
- Bretscher, Paul M., O. F. Engelbrecht, and Theodore Graebner. *Report on Veterans' Organizations*. St. Louis: CPH, 1945.
- Brug, John F. *Church Fellowship: Working Together for the Truth*. Milwaukee: NPH, 1996.

- \_\_\_\_\_, "Dedicatory Preface" to *Essays on Church Fellowship*. Edited by Curtis Jahn. Milwaukee: NPH, 1996, 9–10.
- Brug, John F., Edward C. Fredrich II, and Armin W. Schuetze. *WELS and Other Lutherans*. Milwaukee: NPH, 1995.
- Brux, Adolph A. *An Appeal to Synod With History of Case Including Charges Against the Board of Foreign Missions and Its General Secretary and Charges Against the President of Synod*. Racine, Wis., 1934.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Christian Prayer-Fellowship and Unionism: An Investigation Of Our Synodical Position With Respect To Prayer-Fellowship With Christians Of Other Denominations*. Racine, Wis., 1935.
- Campbell, Jeremy. *Grammatical Man: Information, Entropy, Language, and Life*. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1982.
- Centennial Convention Proceedings, Thirtieth Convention, Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, Milwaukee, August 3–9, 1949*. Milwaukee: NPH, 1949.
- Coburn, Carol K. *Life at Four Corners: Religion, Gender and Education in a German-Lutheran Community, 1868–1945*. Lawrence, Kans.: University of Kansas Press, 1992.
- A Committee of the Ev. Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States. *Veterans' Organizations Examined in the Light of Scripture*. Milwaukee: NPH, 1947.
- Concerning Church Fellowship*. New Ulm, Minn.: CLC Book House, 1961.
- Conzen, Kathleen Neils. *Immigrant Milwaukee: 1836–1860. Accommodation and Community in a Frontier City*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Danker, Frederick W. *No Room in the Brotherhood. The Preus-Otten Purge of Missouri*. St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House, Inc., 1977.
- Dau, W. H. T., ed. *Ebenezer: Reviews of the Work of the Missouri Synod during Three Quarters of a Century*. St. Louis: CPH, augmented edition, 1922.
- Doctrinal Affirmation of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States and of the American Lutheran Church*. St. Louis: CPH, 1944.
- Doctrinal Declarations. A Collection of Official Statements on the Doctrinal Position of Various Lutheran Synods in America*. St. Louis: CPH, 1939.
- Doctrinal Statements of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, 1970*. Milwaukee: reprint authorized by the WELS Commission on Doctrinal Matters.
- Dolan, Jay P. *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present*. Garden City, N. Y.: Image Books, 1987.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Immigrant Church: New York's Irish and German Catholics, 1815–1865*. Baltimore, Md.: The John Hopkins University Press, 1975.
- Douglass, H. Paul, and Edmund S. de Brunner, *The Protestant Church as a Social Institution*. New York: Harper and Bros., 1935.
- Dreissigster Synodalbericht der Allgemeinen Deutschen Ev.-Luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio und andered Staaten, versammelt als Fuenfzehnte Delegatensynode im Jahre 1917 in Milwaukee, Wis.* St. Louis: CPH, 1917.
- Drevlow, Arthur F., John H. Drickamer, and Glen E. Reichwald. *C. F. W. Walther, The American Luther*. Mankato, Minn.: Walther Press, 1987.
- Einunddreissigster Synodalbericht der Evangelisch–Lutherischen Synode von Missouri, Ohio und andered Staaten, versammelt als Sechzehnte Delegatensynode im Jahre 1920 in Detroit, Mich.* St. Louis: CPH, 1920.
- Ellis, Lee. *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*. Madison, Wis.: Brown and Benchmark, 1994.
- Engelder, Theodore. *Scripture Cannot Be Broken: Six Objections to Verbal Inspiration Examined in the Light of Scripture* (St. Louis: CPH, 1944).
- Entrenched Unionistic Practices: A Record of Unionistic Practice in The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod*. Milwaukee, Wis.: The Commission on Doctrinal Matters, Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod, n. d. [1961].
- Erlandsson, Seth. *Church Fellowship: What Does The Bible Say?* Translated by Siegbert W. Becker. Milwaukee: NPH, 1979.
- Fellowship Then and Now: Concerning the Impasse in the Intersynodical Discussions on Church Fellowship*. Milwaukee: WELS Commission on Doctrinal Matters, 1961.
- Fendt, Edward C. *The Struggle for Lutheran Unity and Consolidation in the U.S.A. from the Late 1930s to the Early 1970s*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1980.
- Finke, Roger and Rodney Stark. *The Churching of America, 1776–1990. Winners and Losers in our Religious Economy*. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1992.
- Forster, Walter. *Zion on the Mississippi: The Settlement of the Saxon Lutherans in Missouri, 1839–1841*. St. Louis: CPH, 1953.
- Four Statements on Fellowship. Presented by the constituent synods of the Synodical Conference for study and discussion*. St. Louis: CPH, 1960.
- Franzmann, Martin H. “What Kind of Cooperation is Possible, In View of Discussions to Date?” *Toward Cooperation Among American Lutherans*. Published jointly by the National Lutheran Council, New York, N. Y. and The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, St. Louis, 1961.



- Fredrich, Edward C. "The Military Chaplaincy and Scouting." *SC Proceedings, 1954*, 57–79.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Wisconsin Synod Lutherans: A History of the Single Synod, Federation, and Merger*. Milwaukee: NPH, 1992.
- Fritz, John H. C. *Religious Unionism*. St. Louis: CPH, 1930.
- Fuerbringer, Ludwig. *Briefe von C. F. W. Walther*. St. Louis: CPH, 1916.
- Fuerbnnger, Ludwig, Theodore Engelder, and Paul E. Kretzmann, eds. in chief. *The Concordia Cyclopedia: A Handbook of Religious Information with Special References to the History, Doctrine, Work, and Usages of the Lutheran Church*. St. Louis: CPH, 1927.
- Gordon, Milton M. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Graebner, Alan. "Birth Control and the Lutherans: The Missouri Synod as a Case Study." In Janet Wilson James, ed. *Women in American Religion*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980, 229–52.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Uncertain Saints: The Laity in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, 1900–1970*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1975.
- Graebner, Theodore. *Concordia Seminary. Its History, Architecture and Symbolism*. St. Louis: CPH, 1926.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Dr. Francis Pieper: A Biographical Sketch*. St. Louis: CPH, 1931.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Historic Lutheran Position in Non-Fundamentals*. St. Louis: CPH, 1939.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Prayer Fellowship*. St. Louis: CPH, 1945.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Problem of Lutheran Union and Other Essays*. St. Louis: CPH, 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Secret Empire: A Handbook to Lodges*. St. Louis: CPH, 1927.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Winning the Lodge-Man*. St. Louis: CPH, 1925.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Y" *Religion and Boy Scout Morality*. St. Louis: CPH, n. d.
- Graebner, Theodore, and Paul E. Kretzmann. *Toward Lutheran Union: A Scriptural and Historical Approach*. St. Louis: CPH, 1943.
- Grumm, Arnold. A. "Other Issues Causing Tensions Between Wisconsin and Missouri." *SC Proceedings, 1954*, 87–102.
- Gunther, Martin. *Dr. C. F. W. Walther*. St. Louis: Lutherischer Concordia-Verlag, 1890.

- Gurda, John. *The Making of Milwaukee*. Milwaukee: Milwaukee County Historical Society, 1999.
- Hadden, Jeffrey K. *The Gathering Storm in the Churches*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1969.
- Hansen, Marcus Lee. *The Immigrant in American History*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940.
- Hanssen, Theodore. *The Historical Open Questions Among American Lutherans*. Burlington, Ia.: The Lutheran Literary Board, 1936.
- Hanssen, Theodore, and E. F. Melcher. *A Synodical Mistrial in Matters of Doctrine*. Chicago: The Lutheran Press, n. d.
- Hein, Carl Christian. *The Lutheran Church of the United States in the Jubilee Year 1917*. Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1917.
- Hoenecke, Adolf. *Ev Lutheran Dogmatik*, Vol. 3. Milwaukee: NPH, 1912.
- Hoerber, Robert G. *A Grammatical Study of Romans 16,17*. Milwaukee: NPH, n. d.
- Hofman, John E. "Mother Tongue Retentiveness in Ethnic Parishes." In Joshua A. Fishman, et. al. *Language and Loyalty in the United States: The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups*. The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1966, 127–55.
- Holmes, David L. *A Brief History of the Episcopal Church*. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1993.
- Hudson, Winthrop S. *Religion in America*, 4th ed. New York: Macmillan, 1987.
- Hummel, Horace D. *The Word Becoming Flesh: An Introduction to the Origin, Purpose, and Meaning of the Old Testament*. St. Louis: CPH, 1979.
- Hutchinson, E. P. *Immigrants and Their Children*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1956.
- Jensen, Richard J. *The Winning of the Midwest: Social and Political Conflict, 1888–1896*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Jones, Maldwyn Allen. *American Immigration*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Jordahl, Leigh D. Introduction to *The History of the Wisconsin Synod*, by John Philipp Koehler. St. Cloud, Minn.: Faith–Life, 1970, vi–xxix.
- Kiessling, Elmer C. "The Tie That Binds." *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1957*, 106–118.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *History of the Western Wisconsin District*. Watertown, Wis.: Northwestern College, 1970.

- Kloss, Heinz. "German-American Language Maintenance Efforts." In Joshua A. Fishman, et. al. *Language and Loyalty in the United States: The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups*. The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1966, 206–252.
- Koehler, Edward W. A. *Romans 16:17-20*. n. p., 1946.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Summary of Christian Doctrine: A Popular Presentation of the Teachings of the Bible*. St. Louis: CPH 1939, reprint 1971.
- Koehler, John Philipp. *The History of the Wisconsin Synod*. St. Cloud, Minn.: Faith–Life, 1970.
- Kowalke, Erwin Ernst. *Centennial Story: Northwestern College 1865–1965*. Watertown, Wis.: Northwestern College, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ephesians 4, 1–6*. Milwaukee: NPH, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Unionism, the Communion Agreement, Negotiating with Lodges, and Joint Prayer." *SC Proceedings, 1954*, 102–11.
- Lee, Robert. *The Social Sources of Church Unity: An Interpretation of Unitive Movements in American Protestantism*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.
- Lehninger, Max. *Continuing In His Word. The History of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States*. Milwaukee: NPH, 1951.
- Lenski, R. C. H. *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1936, 1961.
- Lillegard, George O., ed. *Faith of our Fathers*. Mankato, Minn.: Lutheran Synod Book Company, 1953.
- Luebke, Frederick C. *Bonds of Loyalty: German Americans in World War I*. De Kalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Legal Restrictions on Foreign Languages in the Great Plains States, 1917–23," *Germans in the New World: Essays in the History of Immigration*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1990, 31–43.
- Lueker, Erwin L. *Lutheran Cyclopedia*. St. Louis: CPH, 1954.
- Lueking, F. Dean. *Mission in the Making: The Missionary Enterprise Among Missouri Synod Lutherans, 1846–1963*. St. Louis: CPH, 1964.
- Madson, Norman A. "The Norwegian Synod's Reasons for Rejecting the 'Common Confession.'" *SC Proceedings, 1954*, 51–6.

- Maier, Paul L. *A Man Spoke, A World Listened: The Story of Walter A. Maier*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963.
- Malte, Paul. *Celebrating Deep*. St. Louis: Lutheran Layman's League, 1966.
- Mann, Arthur. *Immigrants in American Life. Selected Readings*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.
- Mann, W. J. *Lutheranism in America: An Essay on the Present Condition of the Lutheran Church in the United States*. Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston, 1857.
- Manthey-Zorn, Carl. *Questions on Christian Topics Answered from the Word of God*. Translated by J. A. Rimbach. Milwaukee: NPH, 1918.
- Marquardt, Kurt E. *Anatomy of an Explosion: Missouri in Lutheran Perspective*. Fort Wayne, Ind.: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 1977.
- Marty, Martin E. *Modern American Religion, Volume 1: The Irony of it All, 1893–1919*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Modern American Religion, Volume 2: The Noise of Conflict, 1919–1941*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Modern American Religion, Volume 3: Under God, Indivisible, 1941–1960*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Nation of Behavers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Pilgrims in Their Own Land: 500 Years of Religion in America*. New York: Penguin Books, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Righteous Empire: The Protestant Experience in America*. New York: The Dial Press, 1970.
- Marty, Myron A. *Lutherans and Roman Catholicism: The Changing Conflict 1917–1963*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.
- Mauelschlagen, Carl. *American Lutheranism Surrender to Forces of Conservatism*. Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Division of Publications, 1936.
- Mayer, F. E. *The Religious Bodies of America*. Fourth edition rev. by Arthur Carl Piepkorn. St. Louis: CPH, 1961.
- Mead, Frank S. *Handbook of Denominations in the United States*, new eighth ed. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1985.
- Mead, Sidney E. *The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963.

- Meyer, Carl S. *A Brief Historical Sketch of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod*. St. Louis: CPH, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_, editor and translator. *Letters of C. F. W. Walther: A Selection*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Log Cabin to Luther Tower: Concordia Seminary During One Hundred and Twenty-Five Years Toward a More Excellent Ministry, 1839–1964*. St. Louis: CPH, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Moving Frontiers: Readings in the History of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod*. St. Louis: CPH, 1964, 1986.
- Minutes of the Ninth Biennial Convention of the United Lutheran Church in America, Savannah, Georgia, October 17–24, 1934*. Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, 1934.
- Minutes of the Eleventh Biennial Convention of the United Lutheran Church in America, Baltimore, Maryland, October 5–12, 1938*. Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, 1938.
- Minutes of the Twelfth Biennial Convention of the United Lutheran Church in America, Omaha, Nebraska, October 9–16, 1940*. Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, 1940.
- Monette, D. R., T. J. Sullivan, and C. R. De Jong. *Applied Social Research: Tools for the Human Services*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1986.
- Montgomery, John Warwick. *Crisis in Lutheran Theology: The Validity and Relevance of Historic Lutheranism vs. Its Contemporary Rivals*, Vol. 1. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1967.
- Mueller, A. C. *The Ministry of the Lutheran Teacher*. St. Louis: CPH, 1964.
- Munding, Carl S. *Government in the Missouri Synod*. St. Louis: CPH, 1947.
- The Nature and Implications of the Concept of Fellowship*. St. Louis: Commission on Theology and Church Relations of the LCMS, 1981.
- Nelson, E. Clifford. *Lutheranism in North America, 1914–1970*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Lutherans in North America*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Nelson, Jeffrey S. *The Theology of Inexpedience: Two Case Studies in “Moderate” Congregational Dissent in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod*. New York: University Press of America, 1998.
- Neuundzwanzigsten Synodal-Bericht der Allgemeinen Deutschen Ev.-Luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio und anderen Staaten, versammelt als Vierzhente Delegatensynode im Jahre 1914 in Chicago, Illinois*. St. Louis: CPH, 1914.

- Nickel, Theo. F. "A Defense of the 'Common Confession' in Order to Preserve the Wonderful Gift of the Fellowship of Faith as Found in the Synodical Conference These Many Years." *SC Proceedings, 1954*, 39–51.
- Nolting, Paul Frederick, "*Mark . . . Avoid*" (*Lest the hearts of the simple be deceived*) *Romans 16:17–18: Origin of the CLC*. West Columbia, S. C.: Coordinating Council of the CLC, 1970.
- Ochsenford, S. E. *Documentary History of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America*. Philadelphia: General Council Publication House, 1912.
- Oesch, Wilhelm M. *Memorandum Inter Nos. Presenting a Series of Observations on the Present State of American Lutheranism of the Synodical Conference and the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod*. First Installment. Hessen, West Germany: Druck- und Verlagshaus Phil L. Fink KG, Gross-Gerau, 1960.
- Official Minutes: Third Convention of the American Lutheran Church. Held in Waverley, Iowa, October 12–18, 1934*. Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1934.
- Official Minutes: Fifth Convention of the American Lutheran Church. Held in Sandusky, Ohio, October 14 to 20, 1938*. Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1938.
- Olmstead, Clifton E. *History of Religion in the United States*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1960.
- 100 Questions and Answers for Lutherans Of the Synodical Conference*. Chicago: privately published by the Chicago Area Church Councils, 1954.
- Pankow, Erhard C. *Scouting in the Light of Holy Scripture*. Essay adopted by and published at the request of the Milwaukee City Pastoral Conference, Wisconsin Synod. Milwaukee: NPH, 1946.
- Pannkoke, Otto H. P. *A Great Church . . . Finds Itself: The Lutheran Church Between the Wars*. Quitman, Ga.: privately published, 1966.
- Peterson, Brent O. *Popular Narratives and Ethnic Identity: Literature and Community in Die Abendschule*. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Pieper, August. "Anniversary Reflections: Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther, 1811–1887." Originally published under the title "*Jubilaeumsnachgedanken*." *Qu* 20 (January 1923): 1–18; (April 1923): 88–112; (July 1923): 161–77; (October 1923): 254–70; 21 (January 1924): 22–45; (April 1924): 104–11. Translated by R. E. Wehrwein. Edited by Curtis A. Jahn. *The Wauwatosa Theology*, 3 vols. Milwaukee: NPH, 1997, 3:229–94.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "*Vorwort zum zehnten Jahrgang*." *Qu* 10 (January 1913): 1–10. Translated by Philemon Hensel. "Foreword to Volume 10 of *Quartalschrift*." Translated by Philemon Hensel. *F–L* 58 (November–December 1990): 16–20. Rev. James Langebartels. In Jahn, ed. *The Wauwatosa Theology*, 1:109–18.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Significance of Dr. Adolf Hoenecke for the Wisconsin Synod and American Lutheranism." Originally published under the title, "*Dr. Hoeneckes Bedeutung fuer die Wisconsinssynode und die amerikanisch-lutherische Kirche.*" *Qu* 32 (July 1935): 161–74; (October 1935): 225–44; 33 (January 1936): 1–19; (April 1936): 81–101. Translated by Werner Franzmann. In Jahn, ed. *The Wauwatosa Theology*, 3:347–418.
- Pieper, Francis. *Christian Dogmatics*. Volume 1. Translated by H. W. Romoser, et. al. St. Louis: CPH, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Christian Dogmatics*. Volume 3. Translated by Walter W. F. Albrecht. St. Louis: CPH, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Conversion and Election. A Plea for a United Lutheranism in America*. St. Louis: CPH, 1913.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *What is Christianity? And Other Essays*. Translated by John Theodore Mueller. St. Louis: CPH, 1933.
- Polack, W. G. *The Building of a Great Church: A Brief History of the Lutheran Church in America, With Special Reference to the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States*, 2nd ed. St. Louis: CPH, 1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Story of C. F. W. Walther*. St. Louis: CPH, 2nd ed., 1941.
- Preus, Robert D. *The Inspiration of Scripture: A Study of the Theology of the Seventeenth Century Lutheran Dogmaticians*. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference of North America, Assembled at Mankato, Minnesota, August 10–15, 1932*. St. Louis: CPH, 1932.
- Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference of North America, Assembled at Indianapolis, Indiana, August 6–11, 1936*. St. Louis: CPH, 1936.
- Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh Convention of the Ev. Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America, Chicago, Ill., August 1–6, 1940*. St. Louis: CPH, 1940.
- Proceedings of the Thirty-Eighth Convention of the Ev. Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America, Cleveland, Ohio, August 1–4, 1944*. St. Louis: CPH, 1944.
- Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference of North America, Assembled at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, August 6–9, 1946*. St. Louis: CPH, 1947.
- Proceedings of the Fortieth Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference of North America, Assembled at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, August 3–6, 1948*. St. Louis: CPH, 1949.
- Proceedings of the Forty-First Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference of North America, Assembled at Fort Wayne, Ind., August 9–11, 1950*. St. Louis: CPH, 1951.

- Proceedings of the Forty-Second Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference of North America, Assembled at St. Paul, Minn., August 12–15, 1952.* St. Louis: CPH, 1953.
- Proceedings of the Forty-Third Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference of North America, Assembled at East Detroit, Mich., August 10–13, 1954; Chicago, Ill., November 16–19, 1954.* St. Louis: CPH, 1955.
- Proceedings of the Forty-Fourth Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference of North America, Assembled at Chicago, Ill., December 4–7, 1956.* St. Louis: CPH, 1957.
- Proceedings of the Forty-fifth Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference of North America, Assembled at Lakewood, Ohio, August 5–8, 1958.* St. Louis: CPH, 1958.
- Proceedings of the Forty-sixth Convention of the Lutheran Synodical Conference, Assembled at Milwaukee, Wis., August 2–5, 1960.* St. Louis: CPH, 1960.
- Proceedings of the Recessed Forty-sixth Convention of the Lutheran Synodical Conference, Milwaukee, 17–19 May 1961.* St. Louis: CPH, 1961.
- Proceedings of the Forty-seventh Convention of the Lutheran Synodical Conference Assembled at Chicago, Ill., November 13–15, 1962.* St. Louis: CPH, 1963.
- Proceedings of the Twenty-third Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, New Ulm, Minn., August 7th to August 13th, 1935.* Milwaukee: NPH, 1935.
- Proceedings of the Twenty-fourth Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, Appleton, Wis., August 11 to August 17, 1937.* Milwaukee: NPH, 1937.
- Proceedings of the Twenty-fifth Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, Watertown, Wis., August 2–9, 1939.* Milwaukee: NPH, 1939.
- Proceedings of the Twenty-sixth Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, Saginaw, Mich., August 6–13, 1941.* Milwaukee: NPH, 1941.
- Proceedings of the Twenty-seventh Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, Watertown, Wis., August 4–11, 1943.* Milwaukee: NPH, 1943.
- Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, New Ulm, Minn., August 1–6, 1945.* Milwaukee: NPH, 1945.
- Proceedings: Twenty-ninth Convention, Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, Watertown, Wis., August 6–12, 1947.* Milwaukee: NPH, 1947.
- Proceedings: Thirty-first Convention, Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, New Ulm, Minn., August 8–15, 1951.* Milwaukee: NPH, 1951.



- Proceedings: Thirty-second Convention, Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, Watertown, Wis., August 5–12, 1953. Milwaukee: NPH, 1953.*
- Proceedings: Thirty-third Convention, Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, Saginaw, Mich., August 10–17, 1955. Milwaukee: NPH, 1955.*
- Proceedings: Thirty-third Convention, Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, Recessed Session, Watertown, Wis., August 21–23, 1956. Milwaukee: NPH, 1956.*
- Proceedings of the Thirty-fourth Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, New Ulm, Minn., August 7–14, 1957. Milwaukee: NPH, 1957.*
- Proceedings of the Thirty-fifth Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, Saginaw, Mich., August 5–12, 1959. Milwaukee: NPH, 1959.*
- Proceedings of the Thirty-sixth Convention of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, Milwaukee, Wis., August 8–17, 1961. Milwaukee: NPH, 1961.*
- Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Regular Meeting of the Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, Assembled at Fort Wayne, Indiana, June 20–29, 1923. St. Louis: CPH, 1923.*
- Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Regular Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, Assembled at St. Louis, Mo., June 9–18, 1926. St. Louis: CPH, 1926.*
- Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Regular Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, River Forest, Illinois, June 19–28, 1929. St. Louis: CPH, 1929.*
- Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Regular Convention of the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, Assembled as the Twentieth Delegate Convention at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, June 15–24, 1932. St. Louis: CPH, 1932.*
- Proceedings of the Thirty-Sixth Regular Convention of the Ev. Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, Cleveland, Ohio, June 19–29, 1935. St. Louis: CPH, 1935.*
- Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh Regular Convention of the Ev. Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, St. Louis, June 15–24, 1938. St. Louis: CPH, 1938.*
- Proceedings of the Thirty-Eighth Regular Convention of the Ev. Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, Fort Wayne, Ind., June 18–27, 1941. St. Louis: CPH, 1941.*
- Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Regular Convention of the Ev. Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, Saginaw, Mich., June 21–29, 1944. St. Louis: CPH, 1944.*
- Proceedings of the Fortieth Regular Convention of the Ev. Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, Chicago, 1947. St. Louis: CPH, 1947.*
- Proceedings of the Forty-First Regular Convention of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, Milwaukee, 1950. St. Louis: CPH, 1950.*

- Proceedings of the Forty-Second Regular Convention of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, Houston, Texas, June 17–26, 1953.* St. Louis: CPH, 1953.
- Proceedings of the Forty-Third Regular Convention of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, St. Paul, Minn., June 20–29, 1956.* St. Louis: CPH, 1956.
- Proceedings of the Forty-Fourth Regular Convention of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, San Francisco, Calif., June 17–26, 1959.* St. Louis: CPH, 1959.
- Proceedings of the Forty-Fifth Regular Convention of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, Cleveland, Ohio, June 20–29, 1962.* St. Louis: CPH, 1962.
- Proceedings of the 46th Regular Convention of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, Detroit, Michigan, June 16–26, 1965.* St. Louis: CPH, 1965.
- Proceedings of the 47th Regular Convention of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, New York, July 7–14, 1967.* St. Louis: CPH, 1967.
- Reeves, Thomas C. *The Empty Church: The Suicide of Liberal Christianity.* New York: The Free Press, 1996.
- Reim, Edmund C., “Church Fellowship and Its Implications.” *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1935*, 17–46.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Where Do We Stand? An Outline of the Wisconsin Position.* Milwaukee: NPH, 1950.
- Report of the Thirty-Fourth Regular Convention of The Norwegian Synod of the American Ev. Lutheran Church, Mankato, Minn., June 13–19, 1951.* Mankato, Minn.: n. p., n. d.
- Report of the Twenty-second Meeting of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, August 2nd–9th, 1933.* Milwaukee: NPH, 1933.
- Reports and Memorials for the Twenty-Third Delegate Synod Assembled at Fort Wayne, Indiana, June 18–28, 1941.* St. Louis: CPH, 1941.
- Reports and Memorials, Synodical Centennial Convention, Twenty-fifth Delegate Synod Assembled at Chicago, June 20–29, 1947.* St. Louis: CPH, 1947.
- Reports and Memorials for the Twenty-Sixth Delegate Synod Assembled at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, June 21–30, 1950.* St. Louis: CPH, 1950.
- Reports and Memorials for the Twenty-seventh Delegate Synod Assembled at Houston June 17–27, 1953.* St. Louis: CPH, 1953.
- Reports and Memorials for the Twenty-Eighth Delegate Synod of The Lutheran Church— Missouri Synod, Assembled at St. Paul, June 20–30, 1956.* St. Louis: CPH, 1956.
- Reports and Memorials for the Fourth-Fourth Regular Convention, The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, San Francisco, California, June 17–27, 1959.* St. Louis: CPH, 1959.

- Reports and Memorials for the Fourth-Fifth Regular Convention, The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, Cleveland, Ohio, June 20–30, 1959.* St. Louis: CPH, 1962.
- Reports and Memorials for the Thirty-fifth Convention, Ev. Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, 1959.* Milwaukee: NPH, 1959.
- Reu, Michael. *In the Interest of Lutheran Unity.* Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1940.
- Ripley, LaVern J. *The German-Americans.* Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1976.
- Roepe, H. "The Proper Use of the Bible." *The Abiding Word: An Anthology of Doctrinal Essays for the Year 1945* (St. Louis: CPH, 1946), 1:67–84.
- Ross, E. A. *The Principles of Sociology.* New York: Century, 1920.
- Rudnik, Milton L. *Fundamentalism and the Missouri Synod: A Historical Study of Their Interaction and Mutual Influence.* St. Louis: CPH, 1966.
- Sasse, Hermann. "Luther and the Word of God." In Heino O. Kadai, ed. *Accents in Luther's Theology: Essays in Commemoration of the 450th Anniversary of the Reformation.* St. Louis: CPH, 1967, 47–97.
- Schaefer, James P. "Wisconsin: Uncompromising." Omar Bonderud and Charles Lutz, eds. *America's Lutherans.* Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1995, 35–37.
- Schaller, Adalbert. "The Brotherhood of Faith." *SC Proceedings, 1940*, 10–34.
- Scharlemann, Martin H. "The Boy Scouts of America and the Military Chaplaincy." *SC Proceedings, 1954*, 79–87.
- Schuetze, Armin W. *Topics Relating to the Termination of Fellowship with the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.* Originally published as a series of five articles in "A Lantern to our Footsteps," in *NL* 48 (22 October 1961–17 December 1961). Milwaukee: The Commission on Doctrinal Matters, Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod, n. d.
- Sittser, Gerald L. *A Cautious Patriotism: The American Churches and the Second World War.* Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Speaking the Truth in Love: Essays Related to "A Statement."* Chicago: Willow Press, n. d. [1946].
- Spitz, Lewis W. *Life in Two Worlds: Biography of William Sihler.* St. Louis: CPH, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Life of Dr. C. F. W. Walther.* St. Louis: CPH, 1961.
- Steffens, D. H. *Doctor Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther.* Philadelphia: The Lutheran Publication Society, 1917.
- "A Study of Boy Scoutism." *Wisconsin Proceedings, 1947*, 106–11.

- Suelflow, August R., ed. *Selected Letters of C. F. W. Walther*. St. Louis: CPH, 1981.
- Synodal-Bericht Verhandlungen der Einundzwanzigsten Versammlung der Allgemeinen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Synode von Wisconsin und anderen Staaten, Watertown, Wis., vom 12. bis 18. August 1931*. Milwaukee: NPH 1931.
- Synodical Report: Proceedings of the Nineteenth Biennial Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, August 17–23, 1927*. Milwaukee: NPH, 1927.
- Synodical Report: Proceedings of the Twentieth Biennial Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, August 14–21, 1929*. Milwaukee: NPH, 1929.
- 38th Regular Convention of The Norwegian Synod of the American Ev. Lutheran Church, Mankato, Minn., June 20–26, 1955*. Mankato, Minn.: n. p., n. d.
- This is Your Church: Church of the Lutheran Confession*. CLC Book House, 1985.
- This We Believe*. Milwaukee: WELS Commission on Inter-Church Relations, 1967.
- Tietjen, John H. *Memoirs in Exile: Confessional Hope and Institutional Conflict*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Which way to Lutheran unity? A History of Efforts to Unite the Lutherans of North America*. St. Louis: CPH, 1966.
- Toppe, Carleton. *Holding the Course: Northwestern College 125*. Milwaukee: NPH, 1990.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. *U. S. Census Population, 1900*, Vol. 1. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1901.
- Vallesky, Wilmer. *What Should Be Our Attitude Toward Boy Scouts?* Mimeographed, available from L. Hallauer, n. d.
- Verhandlungen der Freien Ev. Luth. Konferenz*. New York: H. Ludwig, 1858.
- Walther, C. F. W. *The Proper Distinction Between Law and Gospel*. Translated by W. H. T. Dau. St. Louis: CPH, n. d. [1928?].
- Weisheit, Eldon. *The Zeal of His House: Five Generations of Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod History (1847–1972)*. St. Louis: CPH, 1973.
- Wendland, Ernst H. “The Inadequacy of the ‘Common Confession’ as a Settlement of Past Differences.” *SC Proceedings, 1954*, 17–38.
- Wentz, Abdel Ross. *A Basic History of Lutheranism in America*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, revised 1964.

Wesselschmidt, Quentin F. "Repristination Theology and the Doctrinal Position of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod." In *Light for Our World: Essays Commemorating the 150th Anniversary of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri*. Edited by John W. Klotz. St. Louis: Concordia Seminary, 1989, 83–98.

Westerhaus, Martin O. "The Wauwatosa Theology: The Men and Their Message." In Jahn, ed., *The Wauwatosa Theology* (Milwaukee: NPH, 1997), 1:13–98.

Wicke, Harold E. *A Catechism of Differences*. Milwaukee: NPH, n. d.

Wilson, E. L. "Faith." *The Abiding Word: An Anthology of Doctrinal Essays for the Year 1945* (St. Louis: CPH, 1946), 1:188–220.

Wohlrahe, John C., Jr. *Ministry in Missouri Until 1962. An Historical Analysis of the Doctrine of the Ministry in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod*. Th. D. Diss., 1987, privately published by the author.

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

Wuthnow, Robert. *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith Since World War II*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Wyman, Mark. *Immigrants in the Valley. Irish, Germans, and Americans in the Upper Mississippi Country, 1830–1860*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1984.

*Your Blessed Fellowship in Christ*. Milwaukee: NPH, n. d.

*Your Church and its more than 5000 Son in Military Service*. Milwaukee: Spiritual Welfare Commission, Ev. Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, n. d.

#### *Periodicals*

"Absolutely True, Inerrant, Infallible?—YES." *AL* 41 (October 1958): 3–4.

"Acting in Harmony With the Brief Statement." *CL* 21 (April 1960): 39–41.

Adams, James E. "Concordia Students Vote to Join 'Seminary in Exile.'" *StLP–D*, 19 February 1974). Reproduced in *CN* 7 (25 February 1974): 8.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod: Dynamic Tensions of Sect and Church." *CC* 88 (8 September 1971): 1058–62.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Majority at Concordia Suspend Themselves." *StLP–D*, 22 January 1974. Reproduced in *CN* 7 (28 January 1974): 5.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Missouri Synod Lutherans: Conservative Takeover." *CC* 90 (1–8 August 1973): 772–3.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Missourian Dilemma: What Price Preus?" *CC* 90 (23 May 1973): 591–2.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Seed of Schism: A Seminary in Exile." *CC* 91 (6 March 1974): 252–4.
- "Again." *AL* 43 (September 1960): 3.
- "All Is in Readiness Here for V-J Day Celebration." *MJ*, 10 August 1945, 2:1, 10.
- "The American Lutheran Publicity Bureau." *AL* 15 (June 1933): 1568.
- "American Lutherans Close Ranks." *LC* 50 (28 May 1942): 675–7.
- "The American Lutheran's Position Regarding Lutheran Unity." *AL* 23 (December 1940): 4.
- "An Alarming Symptom." *CL* 6 (September 1945): 105.
- Anderson, Julian G. "Report of the 1954 Synodical Conference Convention." *LuSen* 37 (12 December 1954): 365.
- Arand, Charles P. "The Confessionalism of Missouri in the Early Twentieth Century." *CHIQ* 70 (Winter 1997): 194–203.
- "Are Our Churches Undermanned?" *AL* 11 (April 1928): 1–2.
- "Are You Watching Your Seminary?" *CL* 20 (November 1959): 113–4.
- Arndt, Paul F. "Understandest Thou What Thou Readest?" *AL* 18 (October 1935): 16–7.
- Arndt, William. "Are Synodical Conference Lutherans Separatists?" *CTM* 1 (December 1930): 940–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Conference of Professors at Lutheran Seminaries." *AL* 26 (July 1943): 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Foreign Missions and Intersynodical Cooperation." *AL* 24 (February 1941): 10–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Missouri's Insistence on Acceptance of the Word of God and the Confessions of the Lutheran Church as a Condition of Fellowship." *CTM* 18 (March 1947): 171–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Story of *Lehre und Wehre*." *CTM* 26 (December 1955): 885–92.
- "As Others See Us." *Qu* 50 (October 1953): 292.
- "Asks Missouri to Repent." *LC* 98 (28 October 1953): 7.
- "The Attack on the Word of God." *CL* 21 (September 1960): 100–3.
- "Atomic Bomb Loosed on Japan; One Equals 20,000 Tons of TNT." *MJ*, 6 August 1945, 1:1.
- "*Auszug aus den Verhandlungen der freien evangelisch-Lutherischen Conferenz, versammelt zu Columbus, Ohio, vom 1. Bis 7. October 1856.*" *DL* 13 (18 November 1856): 49–52.

- “Auszug aus den Verhandlungen der freien evangelisch–Lutherischen Conferenz waehrend der zweiten Versammlung derselben zu Pittsburg, Pa., vom 29. October bis zum 4. November 1857.” DL 14 (12 January 1858): 81–5.*
- “Autopsy.” *Dialog* 1 (Winter 1962): 70.
- “An Autopsy on the Synodical Conference.” *CL* 23 (March–April 1962): 40–1.
- B., P. “The Fear of the Fathers.” *NL* 37 (1 January 1950): 9; (15 January 1950): 22.
- Bachmann, E. Theodore. “Missouri and Its Relations to Other Lutherans: Some Observations on the Shaping and Exercising of Conscience.” *CHIQ* 45 (May 1972): 159–70.
- Balge, Richard D. “The Federation of 1892.” *WLQ* 89 (Summer 1992): 168–81.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Von Rohr: a Beloved Brother and Faithful Minister.” *WLQ* 72 (July 1975): 211–34.
- Barnes, Glenn R., and John R. Isch. “Who We Are.” *NL* 69 (1 Mat 1982): 138–9.
- Bartelt, V. A. Letter to *The American Lutheran*, “Open Forum.” *AL* (June 1944): 25–6.
- “The Battle of Verbal Inspiration in the Missouri Synod.” *CL* 20 (November 1959): 113.
- “The Battle Over the Bible in Missouri.” *CL* 21 (March 1960): 37–9.
- Bauer, Walter E. “To Recall as Well as I Can.” *CHIQ* 43 (November 1970): 171–3.
- “Beating The Devil ’Round The Bush.” *CL* 6 (January 1945): 11–2.
- Beck, Arthur E. “The Attitude of Our Clergy as to the Question of Union with the A. L. C.” *CL* 2 (March 1941): 34–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “A God-Pleasing Union.” *CL* 2 (May 1941): 49–50.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Shall We Continue Negotiations?” *CL* 1 (October–November 1940): 71–4.
- Becker, Siegbert W. “Faithful to our Calling—Faithful to our Lord.” *WLQ* 70 (April 1973): 130–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “LCMS and WELS Representatives Meet.” *WLQ* 75 (July 1978): 220.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Why I Joined the Wisconsin Synod.” *NL* 52 (7 February 1965): 44.
- “The Beginning of a New Era.” *AL* 45 (August 1962): 3–6.
- Behnken, John W. “Direct from 210: Synodical Conference Developments.” *LW* 79 (15 November 1960): 10–1.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Fellowship Among Lutherans: An Address to the American Lutheran Conference, November 14, 1946, Rockford, Illinois." *CTM* 18 (February 1947): 120–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Fellowship with Missouri Synod Suspended." *LW* 80 (5 September 1961): 419, 436.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Home Congregation and Her Boy Under the Flag." *NL* 5 (19 May 1918): 78–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Letter from the President." *CHIQ* 43 (November 1970): 182–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reactions to Wisconsin Synod Resolutions." *LW* 80 (19 September 1961): 450, 459–60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Universal Approval of A-L-P-B Tracts." *AL* 21 (January 1938): 14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wisconsin Synod Postpones Termination of Fellowship Relations." *LW* 74 (13 September 1955): 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Your Synod." *LW* 74 (19 July 1955): 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Your Synod." *LW* 74 (2 August 1955): 6–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Your Synod." *LW* 74 (11 October 1955): 74.
- Behnken, W. F. "The Radio—A Missionary Agency." *AL* 9 (February 1926): 7.
- Bente, Frederick Gerhard. "Vorwort." *LuW* 50 (January 1904): 1–20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Warum koennen wir keine gemeinsame Gottesdienste mit Ohioern und Iowaern veranstalten und abhalten?" *LuW* 51 (February 1905): 49–53; (March 1905): 97–115.
- Berg, Norman W. "1961–1971, A Decade of Decision For Home Missions." *NL* 55 (10 November 1968): 365–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Report on the Synodical Conference Convention August 5–8, 1958." *NL* 45 (31 August 1958): 281–3.
- Beyer, J. N. "Die Wisconsin Synode." *DL* 18 (5 March 1862): 120.
- Beyersdorf, Edward A. "Typing Our Thinking." *ML* 12 (May 1961): 8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Typing Our Thinking." *ML* 14 (September 1961): 6, 17.
- Beyersdorff, Jerry. "They Day They Split." *ML* 14 (September 1961): 14.
- Bielenberg, Herman. Letter. *CT* 6 (13 October 1961): 44.
- "Big Congregation Divided." *Lu* 42 (2 March 1960): 7–8.



- Birkner, H. "The Great Work of Our Missouri Synod in Fort Wayne, Ind., and its Great Sorrow at St. Louis, Mo." *LW* 6 (7 June 1887): 4–5, 8.
- Black, Arthur P. "Lutheran Laymen's Dinner, Washington, D. C." *Lu* 24 (26 November 1941): 20.
- Blackwood, James Russell. "Inside Missouri Synod." *CTM* 23 (June 1952): 428–38.
- Blaess, F. J. H. "Intersynodical: Theses on Scripture and Inspiration." *The Australian Lutheran* 44 (22 August 1956): 264–6.
- Blakewell, E. R. "Spiritual Welfare Commission." *NL* 28 (20 April 1941): 123.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Spiritual Welfare Commission." *NL* 32 (1 April 1945): 70.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Spiritual Welfare Commission: For Our Men in Military Service." *NL* 28 (1 June 1941): 172.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Spiritual Welfare Commission: For Our Men in Military Service." *NL* 28 (19 October 1941): 328.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Spiritual Welfare Commission: For Our Men in Military Service." *NL* 28 (14 December 1941): 391.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "News and Notes." *NL* 29 (9 August 1942): 250.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Your Church Serving More Than 20,000 Members in the Armed Forces." *NL* 31 (6 August 1944): 165.
- Blume, Frederic E. "Dr. Behnken on Scouting." *Qu* 52 (October 1955): 293–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Report on the Cleveland Convention of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. July 20–30, 1962." *NL* 49 (26 August 1962): 262–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Resolution of the Union Committee on Girl Scouts." *Qu* 52 (October 1955): 291–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A State of Confession: A Study of Its Implications on the basis of II Thess. 3:14-15." *NL* 39 (2 November 1952): 345–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: Does Romans 16:18 Limit the Application of the 'Avoid' of Verse 17?" *NL* 42 (27 November 1955): 374–5.
- Bodamer, William. "Historical Survey of the Present Union Movement." *Qu* 40 (January 1943): 9–34.
- Boszin, A. F. "The Ministry of Tracts." *AL* 13 (January 1930): 8–9.
- Bouman, Herbert J. A. "Activities of the Synodical Conference Joint Union Committees: Unfinished, but Progressing." *LW* 77 (3 June 1958): 250.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Doctrine of the Anti-Christ with Special Reference to Subscription to the Lutheran Confessions." *Sem* 46 (December 1954): 27–31.
- Bowman, Algot J. "Lutheran Unity from a Layman's Viewpoint." *AL* 32 (June 1949): 9–11.
- "Boy Scouts of Today Make Better Citizens of Tomorrow." *PTR*, 2 February 1950, 1.
- Braun, Mark. "'Those were trying years!' Recollections of the 'split.'" *WHIJ* 18 (April 2000): 21–66.
- Brenner, John. "An Example." *NL* 5 (10 March 1918): 34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Birth Control." *NL* 3 (7 July 1916): 99.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Bit." *NL* 11 (4 May 1924): 133–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Boy Scouts and the Navy." *NL* 16 (31 March 1929): 100.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Boy Scouts Attacked." *NL* 20 (4 June 1933): 182.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Celebration is Over." *NL* 12 (29 November 1925): 372.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Elks Look After Boy Scouts." *NL* 10 (20 May 1923): 147.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "In Favor of Sunday Law." *NL* 12 (8 March 1925): 67–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Fosdick Among Lutherans." *NL* 12 (28 June 1925): 198.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Intersynodical Organization." *NL* 8 (4 September 1921): 275.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Introducing the U. L. C." *NL* 19 (3 July 1932): 211–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Lutheran Loyalty' By a Non-Lutheran," (30 November 1924): 372–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Merging Churches." *NL* 20 (2 July 1933): 214–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mr. Boyer Appeals to Lutheran Laymen." *NL* 11 (13 January 1924): 5
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Must Go." *NL* 12 (19 April 1925): 114.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "National Lutheran Council." *NL* 7 (8 February 1920): 38–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "National Lutheran Publicity Week." *NL* 14 (20 February 1927): 51–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "New Method?" *NL* 12 (29 November 1925): 372.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Not Competition—But Conservation." *NL* 14 (12 June 1927): 181–2.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Our Future." *NL* 12 (15 November 1925): 357–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Our Slogan." *NL* 15 (24 June 1928): 198–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Pastors Refuse to Ratify Scout Reorganization." *NL* 7 (7 March 1920): 66–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Proselyting Propaganda—Publicity Work." *NL* 12 (4 October 1925): 308–11.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Relation of the Iowa Synod To Other Lutheran Bodies." *NL* 7 (3 October 1920): 306–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Should Not Be Delegated." *NL* 14 (17 April 1929): 117–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Slogan." *NL* 15 (29 April 1928): 131.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Spiritual Welfare Commission." *NL* 28 (9 March 1941): 71.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Unity in the United Lutheran Church." *NL* 6 (16 November 1919): 178–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Urges Lutherans to Political Activity." *NL* 3 (21 September 1916): 138–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Vampire of Movieland." *NL* 3 (7 May 1916): 65–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Vested Choir." *NL* 15 (1 April 1928): 99–100.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Waking Up?" *NL* 3 (21 September 1916): 137–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What's in a Name?" *NL* 9 (5 February 1922): 38–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Why Do We Not Cooperate?" *NL* 5 (24 February 1918): 8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Why Do We Not Have Fellowship?" *NL* 15 (24 June 1928): 198.
- Brenner, John F. "The Lord's Prayer—A 'Non-Denominational' Prayer?" *NL* 44 (4 August 1957): 248.
- Brenner, John M. "Forward in Christ: Doctrinal Challenges and Language Change." *WLQ* 97 (Summer 2000): 164–91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "LCMS President Barry on Fellowship." *WLQ* 90 (Fall 1993): 301–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Statement of the 44 Revisited." *WLQ* 93 (Winter 1996): 34–6.
- Bretscher, Paul G. ". . . As I Saw It: The Dissolution of the Synodical Conference, 1954." *CHIQ* 67 (Summer 1994): 65–78.
- Bretscher Paul M. "Theodore Conrad Graebner, 1876–1950." *CTM* 22 (January 1951): 1–8.

- “Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod.” *CTM* 2 (May 1931): 401–16.
- “A Brief Summary of Issues in the Scharlemann Case.” *CL* 21 (September 1960): 103–5.
- Brueggemann, M. “Prohibition.” *LW* 35 (25 January 1916): 17.
- Brug, John F. “Christ and the Pastoral Office.” *WLQ* 95 (Fall 1998): 287–94.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Current Debate Concerning the Doctrine of the Ministry.” *WLQ* 91 (Winter 1994): 28–44.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Doctrine and Practice.” *WLQ* 93 (Fall 1996): 293–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Exegetical Brief; 2 Thessalonians 3:6, 14, 15—Admonish Him as a Brother.” *WLQ* 96 (Summer 1999): 208–17.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Grabau Rehabilitated.” *WLQ* 94 (Spring 1997): 128–30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *The Church and Her Fellowship, Ministry, and Government (Volume IX of Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics)*, by Kurt Marquart. *WLQ* 89 (Fall 1992): 312–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Church and Ministry: The Role of Church, Pastor, and People from Luther to Walter*, by Eugene Klug. *WLQ* 91 (Summer 1994): 229–30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Communion Fellowship*, by Paul T. McCain. *WLQ* 90 (Spring 1993): 156–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “This Blessed Fellowship.” *WLQ* 94 (Winter 1997) 3–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “‘Working Together for the Truth’—The Biblical Concept of Fellowship.” *WLQ* 83 (Summer 1986): 168–83.
- Brunn, Arthur. “The ‘Missourian’ Approach To The Question of Lutheran Unity.” *AL* 24 (December 1941): 8–9, 20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “We Look Back.” *AL* 25 (February 1942): 10, 21.
- Brunn, F. H. “The Committee on Doctrinal Unity Reports.” *LW* 65 (30 July 1946): 256.
- Bryan, Bill. “Seminarisians attack ‘theological power play.’” *StLG-D*, 22 January 1974. Reproduced in *CN* 7 (28 January 1974): 7.
- Buehring, Paul H. “Toward Lutheran Union.” *LS* 101 (21 August 1943): 2.
- Buenger, John. “A Brief History of the Various Union Documents.” *CL* 12 (September 1951): 97–102.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The COMMON CONFESSIO and Free Conferences.” *CL* 11 (October 1950): 117–23.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Dogmatical-Historical Background Of The Present Union Movement." *CL* 1 (June 1940): 37–9; (July 1940): 44–7; (August 1940): 56–8; (September 1940): 59–64; (October–November 1940): 67–71; (December 1940): 79–86; 2 (January 1941): 7–12; (February 1941): 41–6; (June 1941): 69–71; (July 1941): 82–4; (August–September 1941): 93–5; 3 (February 1942): 15–20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Latest Union Document." *CL* 11 (April 1950): 40–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Modernist Editorial." *CL* 15 (September 1953): 103–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "NO MIRACLE." *CL* 2 (January 1941): 1–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "One Joint Document," *CL* 1 (August 1940): 51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Part II of the COMMON CONFESSIO Does Not Rectify the Shortcomings of Part I." *CL* 14 (November 1953): 128; (December 1953): 140–4; *CL* 15 (March 1954): 30–4; (June 1954): 72; (November 1954): 128–31.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Prayer Fellowship." *CL* 3 (March 1942): 34–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Present Task of the 'Confessional Lutheran.'" *CL* 2 (July 1941): 73–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What the Doctrinal Affirmation Can Accomplish." *CL* 8 (April 1947): 37–40.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Is True And What Is False In The Statement Of The 'Forty-Four'?" *CL* 7 (August 1946): 90–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Why?" *CL* 2 (May 1941): 54–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Why is the 'Doctrinal Affirmation' Unacceptable?" *CL* 6 (February 1945): 13–7.
- Buenger, Theo. "C. F. W. Walther. An Appreciation and Reminiscences." *CHIQ* 9 (October 1936): 65–73.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Festival Address at the Academic Service Commemorating the Centennial of the Founding of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, June 3, 1939." *CTM* 10 (August 1939): 605–14.
- Buerger, E. H. "The History of the Lutheran High School in Milwaukee, Wisconsin." *CHIQ* 33 (January 1961): 107–20; 34 (April 1961): 5–17.
- "Building a New Unity in the Synodical Conference." *AL* 39 (October 1956): 5–6.
- Burgdorf, Paul H. "The ALC in Its Relations to Other Lutherans." *CL* 16 (January 1955): 4–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Annual Meeting of the C. L. P. B.," (December 1942): 136.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Brazenness of Unbelief." *CL* 16 (March 1955): 25–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Confessional Lutheran." *CL* 1 (January 1940): 1–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dr. Geiseman Concedes That Missouri Synod is 'Highly Unionistic' on the Basis of Its Own Confession." *CL* 16 (March 1955): 30–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "An Echo From The National Lutheran Editors' Conference." *CL* 6 (November 1945): 137–38.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Concerning Unionism Among Chaplains of the Missouri Synod." *CL* 13 (April 1952): 38–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Does the American Lutheran Church Confess That the Holy Scriptures are in All Their Parts and Words the Infallible Word of God?" *CL* 14 (July 1953): 80–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "For The First Time." *CL* 3 (June 1942): 71–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Has The Missouri Synod A Doctrinal Platform With The American Lutheran Church?" *CL* 5 (January–February 1944): 3–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Here I Stand! An Examination and a Rejection of the Proposed 'Doctrinal Affirmation' of Committees of the American Lutheran Church and of the Missouri Synod." *CL* 6 (May 1945): 55.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Inter-Synodical Conference at Cedar Rapids, Iowa." *CL* 2 (January 1941): 2–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Is 'Withdrawal' of a Confessional Statement 'As a Basis of Discussion' the Proper Way Toward Settlement of Its Issues?" *CL* 8 (March 1947): 30–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Leavening Influence of Error—An Easter Meditation." *CL* 2 (March 1941): 37–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lessons From the Life of 'Bad' Bishop Brown." *CL* 9 (January 1948): 1–12.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mistaken Argumentation." *CL* 2 (February 1941): 14–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 1938 Resolutions of the Missouri Synod on Lutheran Union." *CL* 2 (July 1941): 75.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Not to be Laughed Off!" *CL* 12 (April 1951): 40–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "An Open Forum?" *CL* 1 (January 1940): 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Our Worst Enemy." *CL* 8 (March 1947): 32–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Pastor Gockel's 'Basic Principles Of Lutheran Unity.'" *CL* 5 (May 1944): 25–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Plain Heresy in Concordia Theological Seminary Thesis." *CL* 16 (April 1955): 37–8.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Prayer Fellowship." *CL* 8 (August–September 1947): 93.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Prayer Fellowship: The Position of the Missouri Synod." *CL* 7 (May 1946): 51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Professor Thiele's Denial of the Immortality of the Soul and His 'Resurrection' Doctrine." *CL* 19 (September 1958): 90–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Resolution to Rescind the St. Louis Union Articles of 1938." *CL* 2 (February 1941): 13–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Respective Teachings of the Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church with Regard to the Doctrine of Holy Scripture." *CL* 14 (May 1953): 57–60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Romans 16:17-20* by E. W. A. Koehler. *CL* 7 (November 1946): 134–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sacramental Fanaticism Enjoys A Roman Holiday." *CL* 10 (November 1949): 125–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sacramentalism and the Union Movement." *CL* 10 (December 1949): 142.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Scriptural Principle in the American Lutheran Church." *CL* 8 (June 1947): 63–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Was The Term 'Non-Fundamentals' Used As Identical With The Term 'Open Questions' In The St. Louis Resolutions Of 1938?" *CL* 2 (October 1941): 97–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'We Know—Romans 16, 17.'" *CL* 8 (May 1947): 50.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "We Must Repent." *CL* 6 (June 1945): 61–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Do Such Expressions as 'Scripture,' 'All Scripture,' etc., Mean in the American Lutheran Church?" *CL* 16 (April 1955): 42–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Is at Issue in the Statementarian Controversy?" *CL* 8 (March 1947): 28–30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What 'United Lutherans' think about the Bible." *CL* 11 (April 1950): 39.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Who Subscribes To The 'Confessional Lutheran'?" *CL* 7 (July 1946): 88.
- Busch, Edward E. "Another Turning Point." *CuThM* 2 (April 1975): 75–81.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Predestinarian Controversy 100 Years Later." *CuThM* 9 (June 1982): 132–48.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Where There's a Will, There's a Way." *Dialog* 17 (Winter 1978): 53–7.
- Caemmerer, Richard R., ed. "Essays on the Inspiration of Scripture." *CTM* 25 (October 1954): 738.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "No Continuing City." *CuThM* 5 (October 1978): 268–317.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Recollections of 'A Statement.'" *CHIQ* 43 (November 1970): 156–8.

- Caemmerer, Richard, Theodore Graebner, William G. Polack, and Martin S. Sommer. "The Quest for Lutheran Union Continues." *LW* 61 (10 November 1942): 387–8.
- "Camp Fire Girls Make World Their Back Yard for Good Work." *PTR*, 27 April 1950, 3.
- "Can the Dream Become Reality?" *AL* 21 (December 1938): 5–6.
- "Can There Be Cooperation Without Unity?" *AL* 24 (May 1941): 3.
- Carlan, Margaret M. "The Missouri Synod: Still the Church Militant." *Commonweal* 100 (3 May 1974): 208–12.
- "Catholics Take Note of Romanizing Tendencies of High Churchmen in Missouri Synod." *CL* 12 (April 1951): 39–40.
- "City Will Fence Off Downtown as a Playground for V-J Day." *MJ*, 9 August 1945, 1.
- "A Changeless Christ for a Changing World." *AL* 11 (May 1928): 12.
- "Changing Missouri and Its New Course." *CL* 23 (August–September 1962): 94–6.
- "A Chaplain's Duties." *Lu* 25 (14 July 1943): 2.
- "A Chaplain Looks Ahead." *Lutheran Herald* 29 (31 July 1945): 543–4.
- "Chicago Theses," *Qu* 26 (October 1929): 250–73.
- "The Church Cares." *AL* 27 (August 1944): 4.
- "Church Decorum." *AL* 2 (February 1919): 2.
- "Church Decorum." *AL* 10 (March 1927): 2.
- "Church's Ownership Affirmed." *Lu* 44 (21 March 1962): 8.
- Clark, Elmer T. "Non-theological Factors in Religious Diversity." *ER* 3 (July 1951): 347–56.
- "Cleveland and Lutheran Unity." *AL* 45 (May 1962): 5.
- Clyde, Velma. "Most feel Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod will split up." *The Oregonian*, 2 February 1974. Reproduced in *CN* 7 (18 February 1974): 14.
- Coates, Thomas. "A Statement—Some Reminiscences." *CHIQ* 43 (November 1970): 159–64.
- "The Comedy of Errors in Dr. Scharlemann's Bible." *CL* 20 (November 1959): 111–2.
- "The Committee to Missouri Synod Pastors, 20 September 1945." *AL* 28 (November 1945): 4.



- “A Common Case.” *AL* 1 (March 1918): 1–2.
- “The Common Confession.” *AL* 33 (June 1950): 6–7.
- “Common Confession.” *AL* 34 (January 1951): 3–4.
- “The Common Confession.” *Lutheran Herald* 35 (18 September 1951): 871–2.
- “Common Confession of Faith.” *AL* 33 (March 1950): 3–4.
- “The Compulsion of Orthodoxy.” *AL* 16 (April 1933): 4.
- “Concerning a Changed Missouri Synod.” *CL* 26 (January 1965): 2–3.
- “Concerning Denial of the Doctrine of Christ’s Descent into Hell Within the Missouri Synod.” *CL* 17 (February 1956): 13–5.
- “The Confessional Lutheran Publicity Bureau,” *CL* 3 (March 1942): 36.
- “The Confusion of Tongues in St. Louis.” *CL* 19 (July–August 1958): 73–5.
- “Congregations Leave Missouri Synod.” *CL* 24 (April 1963): 41–2.
- “‘Conservative’ theologians differ.” *Lu* 42 (17 August 1960): 5–6.
- “A Correction For The Theological Monthly.” *CL* 1 (August 1940): 55.
- “A Crying Shame.” *AL* 34 (December 1951): 4–5.
- “A Curious Position.” *CL* 21 (November 1960): 140.
- “Curiosa.” *LuW* 25 (January 1879): 25–6.
- Dahms, Arthur C. “Conference Suggests Changes in the ‘Common Confession.’” *CL* 12 (April 1951): 38.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Content and Fitting Word.” *CL* 15 (July 1954): 75–7
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Denying the Immortality of the Soul.” *CL* 19 (November 1958): 113–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Denying That the Old Testament Clearly Teaches the Resurrection of the Dead.” *CL* 19 (November 1958): 114–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Does the Common Confession Settle Doctrinal Differences?” *CL* 14 (July 1953): 78–80.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Faculty-Approved Thesis on Christ’s Descent Into Hell.” *CL* 19 (November 1958): 116–20.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Has A FRATERNAL WORD Actually 'Shown' That the Common Confession Is Adequate?" *CL* 14 (December 1953): 136–40.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Is Every Word of Holy Scripture the Inspired and Inerrant Word of God?" *CL* 9 (August 1948): 94–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Theological Students Decline Membership in Seminarian Association." (September 1948): 105–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Tragic." *CL* 19 (November 1958): 109–10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Where Do Our Professors Stand Today?" *CL* 7 (March 1946): 28–33.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Word Of God in Romans 16:17–18 And 'Interpretations' by The 44." *CL* 7 (June 1946): 64–7.
- Dahms, Julius E. "B. D. Thesis Approved at St. Louis Denies Christ's Descent into Hell." *CL* 16 (February 1955): 32–3.
- Daib, Martin. "The Lutheran Hour." *AL* 20 (December 1937): 13.
- Dallmann, William. "Doctor Walther. Some Snapshots." *CHIQ* 9 (October 1936): 79–82.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The English Work of the Missouri Synod." *CHIQ* 70 (Fall 1997): 99–109.
- Dannenfeldt, Paul L. "Our Chaplains." *LW* 60 (16 September 1941): 323.
- "Dare A Church Declare Doctrinal Matters Non-Divisive?" *CL* 1 (May 1940): 34.
- "The Dark Ages or a Revival." *AL* 18 (January 1935): 4.
- Dau, W. H. T. "Regarding Birth Control." *TM* 5 (February 1925): 51.
- \_\_\_\_\_, trans. "Dr. George Stoeckhardt." *TQ* 17 (April 1913): 68.
- "David Prays a Curse on his Enemies." *LS* 111 (21 February 1952): 15.
- Davis, Chester M. "Are We Losing the War on the Spiritual Front?" *Presbyterian* 112 (2 April 1942): 7.
- "A Day of Humiliation and Prayer." *AL* 25 (December 1942): 3–4.
- "A Dead End for the Synodical Conference." *AL* 46 (October 1963): 5.
- Deffner, L. H. "'A Statement Was a Turning Point.'" *CHIQ* 43 (November 1970): 178.

Deindoerfer, Johannes. "Die Wirksamkeit der evangelisch-Lutherischen Synode von Iowa in Staate Wisconsin." *Kirchliches Mittheilungen aus und ueber Nord-America* 19 (18 September 1860): 20–2.

"Deliver Us From Them That Hinder!" *AL* 33 (May 1950): 4.

DeVries, Kim. "The Prussian Union." *CHIQ* 49 (Fall 1976): 131–40.

"Did Job Proclaim the Resurrection (19:26ff)?" *CL* 19 (May 1958): 60.

"Die alten Kirchenvaeter ueber die Suende der Trunkenheit." *DL* 11 (24 October 1854): 38–9.

"Die Convention zu Reading zum Zweck der Bildung einer neuen General Synode." *DL* 23 (1 January 1872): 71.

"Die Synode von Wisconsin." *LuW* 8 (August 1862): 252–3.

Dierks, Theodore. "Adoration and Elevation of the Host." *CL* 12 (November 1951): 127–30.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Changing the Nature of the Sacrament." *CL* 12 (November 1951): 130–2.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Chief Service of God is to Teach the Gospel." *CL* 12 (November 1951): 122–5.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Deadly Menace of Sacramentalism." *CL* 10 (August 1949): 90–4.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Doctrine Of The Church With Special Reference To Altar Fellowship And Prayer Fellowship." *CL* 7 (February 1946): 17–23.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The False Argumentation and Rationalism of the Statementarians." *CL* 9 (December 1948): 147–9.

\_\_\_\_\_. "High Liturgical Worship." *CL* 13 (January 1952): 6–9.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Liturgical Movement Within the Lutheran Church." *CL* 12 (September 1951): 106–7.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Real Presence." *CL* 12 (November 1951): 125–7.

\_\_\_\_\_. "A Return to the Religion of the Dark Ages." *CL* 12 (October 1951): 110–3.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Useless, Foolish Displays." *CL* 12 (October 1951): 113–5.

Dietz, Paul T. "The Transition from German to English in the Missouri Synod from 1910 to 1947." *CHIQ* 22 (October 1949): 97–127.

"Disaster won't halt shuttles." *MS*, 29 January 1986, 1:1.

"Discord at Concordia." *Time*, 4 February 1974, 54.

- “Dissenting Lutherans Organize.” *Lu* 42 (7 September 1960): 8–9.
- “Distinguished Visitors.” *Lu* 25 (28 October 1942): 31.
- Dobberstein, Leroy A. “Levels of Fellowship.” *WLQ* 86 (Fall 1989): 302–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Office of the Ministry.” *WLQ* 90 (Summer 1993): 223–4.
- “Dr. Behnken at the American Lutheran Conference.” *Qu* 44 (January 1947): 65–70.
- “Dr. Behnken Deplores Break with Wisconsin.” *LB* 18 (September 1961): 135.
- “Dr. Behnken Voices Regret for Synod’s Doctrinal Discipline.” *CL* 21 (September 1960): 197.
- “Dr. Hamann Addresses Himself to the Missouriian Situation.” *CL* 23 (January 1962): 7–9.
- “Dr. Scharlemann’s Rejection of the Inerrancy of Holy Scripture.” *CL* 20 (November 1959): 110–1.
- “Dr. Walther’s Foreword to Volume XIV of ‘Lehre und Wehre,’ 1868.” Translated by Alex Wm. Guebert. *CTM* 17 (July 1946). Reprinted in *CJ* 1 (June 1975): 119–24.
- “Doctrinal Differences.” *AL* 33 (February 1950): 3.
- “Doctrinal Matters.” *LW* 81 (10 July 1962): 334–5.
- Dodd, Charles H. “A Letter Concerning Unavowed Motives in Ecumenical Discussions.” *ER* 2 (Autumn 1949): 52–6.
- “Does ‘The Theology of Fellowship’ Represent a Change in Position?” *CL* 22 (November 1961): 171–2.
- Dorn, Otto A. “Early Printing in the Missouri Synod.” *CHIQ* 24 (April 1951): 1–23.
- Dorr, Stuart A. “Toward Lutheran Union.” *NL* 33 (9 December 1946): 391–2.
- Drevlow, Arthur H. “C. F. W. Walther: Shaped by Adversity.” *CHIQ* 69:1 (Spring 1996): 49–57.
- Duemling, E. “My Country.” *NL* 29 (8 March 1942): 72.
- Eckert, Otto J. “The Cow Jumped Over the Moon.” *CL* 16 (November 1955): 131–2.
- Eckhardt, E. “Lutheranism in America.” *LW* 55 (16 June 1936): 194.
- “The Editor Muses.” *AL* 13 (January 1930): 1.
- “Editorial.” *AL* 1 (January 1918): 1.
- “Editorial: Another Year.” *AL* 9 (January 1926): 1.

- “Editorial: The New Year.” *AL* 8 (January 1925): 1.
- “Efficiency in Church Management.” *AL* 11 (April 1928): 1.
- “*Ein Kaplan aus der Missouri-Synode.*” *DL* 18 (28 May 1862): 167.
- Elliott, Edwards S. “Re-Thinking the Chaplaincy.” *The Presbyterian Guardian* 13 (10 July 1944): 202–3.
- Ellul, Jacques. “On the Cultural and Social Factors Influencing Church Division.” *ER* 4 (April 1952): 269–75.
- “Emanuel—God With Us in His Word, 125.” *NL* 68 (18 January 1981): 27.
- Engel, Armin. “The Bergemann Era—1908–1933.” *WLQ* 72 (October 1975): 294–308.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Our President—Johannes Bading.” *NL* 63 (16 May 1976): 152–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Our President—Philipp von Rohr.” *NL* 63 (30 May 1976): 169–70.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Our Presidents: Johannes Muehlhaeuser.” *NL* 63 (2 May 1976): 135–6.
- Engelbrecht, Harold H. “Concerning ‘A Statement.’” *CHIQ* 43 (November 1970): 167–70.
- Engelder, Theodore. “The Church and the Social Problem.” *CTM* 11 (April 1940): 306–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “‘Verbal’ Inspiration No ‘Theory.’” *CTM* 10 (January 1939): 65.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Walther, a Christian Theologian.” *CTM* 7 (October 1936): 731–43; (November 1936): 801–15.
- Eppling, F. “Appointment of a Chaplain in the Army by the Wisconsin Synod During the Spanish-American War.” *CHIQ* 19 (April 1946): 16–9.
- “An Evaluation by the Commission on Inter-Church Relations (Wisconsin Synod) of ‘The Nature and Implications of Church Fellowship.’” *WLQ* 80 (Winter 1983): 61–9.
- Faasch, L. E. “Governor Stevenson Takes Notice of Service Center.” *LW* 63 (23 May 1944): 174.
- “Facing Realities in the Missouri–Wisconsin Controversy.” *AL* 37 (June 1954): 3–4.
- The Faculty of Concordia Seminary. “A Statement on the Form and Function of the Holy Scriptures.” *CTM* 31 (October 1960): 626–7.
- “A False Emphasis.” *AL* 33 (September 1950): 3–4.
- “False Teaching Within the Missouri Synod.” *CL* 16 (June 1955): 67–9.

- "Fellowship With Other Christians." *AL* 35 (October 1952): 3–4.
- Fendt, Edward C. "American Lutheranism in 1940." *AL* 23 (June 1940): 6–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Theology of the 'Common Confession.'" *LQ* 2 (August 1950): 308–23.
- Feucht, Oscar E. "How To Conduct a Missionary Canvass." *AL* 11 (January 1928): 7–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wanted—A Slogan." *AL* 10 (November 1927): 6–7.
- "Fidelity to the Word: The Burden of the Missouri Synod. C. F. W. Walther's Foreword to *Lehre und Wehre*, 1860." Translated by Herbert B. Fehner and Hilton Oswald. *CJ* 1 (March 1975): 69–85.
- "Fifth Army Chaplain Is Interviewed." *LW* 64 (27 March 1945): 105.
- Finke, Roger and Rodney Stark. "How the Upstart Sects Won America, 1776–1850." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 28 (1989): 27–44.
- Fischer, Gervasius W. "The Boy Scouts Teach a Boy To Go To Church." *NL* 36 (22 May 1949): 169–70.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Men in America Kick Back." *NL* 24 (20 June 1948): 200–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "An Unwarranted Attack." *NL* 34 (28 September 1947): 312–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What is Wrong with the 'Lutheran Men of America in Wisconsin?'" *NL* 34 (12 October 1947): 325–6.
- Foehlinger, F. W. "*Bildung evang. Luth. Gemeinden unter unsern englisch redenden Nachkommen.*" *LuW* 11 (August 1865): 236–42.
- Frank, Victor C. "The Response of the Air Corps Soldier." *LW* 61 (18 August 1942): 291–2.
- Franzmann, Martin H. "Exegesis of Romans 16:17ff." Reprinted in *CJ* 7 (March 1981): 13–20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to *LO* 17 (December 1952): 375.
- Franzmann, Werner H. "'In View of the Gravity of the Situation': The Synodical Conference Convention of 1960." *NL* 47 (28 August 1960): 279–81.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Synodical Conference Convention, Chicago, Illinois, November 13–15, 1962: A report and An Evaluation." *NL* 34 (12 October 1947): 392–4.
- Fredrich, Edward C. "Bading and the Formative Presidency of the Wisconsin Synod." *WLQ* 72 (April 1975): 110–28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Convention Comes to You: Union Matters." *NL* 46 (13 September 1959): 300–1.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Depression Nostalgia." *NL* 67 (20 July 1980): 227.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dr. C. F. W. Walther: 'American Lutheranism has had no equal.'" *NL* 74 (15 May 1987): 187–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ehlen, Preus, and Tietjen." *WLQ* 69 (July 1972): 194–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Fellowship to Continue: Report of Recessed Convention." *NL* 43 (16 September 1956): 294–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Few, Faithful in Few Things: Our Synod's Fathers and the Formation of the Synodical Conference." *WLQ* 69 (July 1972): 154–73.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Great Debate with Missouri." *WLQ* 74 (April 1977): 157–73.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Interchurch Relations in Recent Years." *WLQ* 74 (July 1977): 234–49.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Looking at the Religious World: Doctrine of the Ministry." *NL* 51 (28 June 1964): 208.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Looking at the Religious World: Missouri's Dilemma." *NL* 59 (26 March 1972): 111.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Looking at the Religious World: Neuhaus and New Orleans." *NL* 60 (9 September 1973): 290.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Looking at the Religious World: Prediction and Response." *NL* 62 (9 February 1975): 46.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Lutheran Church in America on July 4, 1776." *WLQ* 73 (July 1976): 169–83.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Professor Carl J. Lawrenz, 1908–1989." *WLQ* 87 (Winter 1990): 9–12.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Editorials from "Lehre und Wehre,"* translated by J. A. Bouman. *WLQ* 79 (Winter 1982): 75–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Memoirs in Exile,* by John H. Tietjen. *WLQ* 89 (Winter 1992): 71.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Sigurd Christian Ylvisaker: 1884–1959,* edited by Peter T. Harstad. *WLQ* 82 (Summer 1985): 233–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Trumpet with a Certain Sound: The Synodical Conference's Confessional Commitment." *WLQ* 90 (Winter 1993): 14–32.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wisconsin's First Federation Memberships." *WLQ* 73 (October 1976): 268–86.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wisconsin's Interchurch Relations in the Early Years." *WLQ* 73 (April 1976): 83–104.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wisconsin's Interchurch Relations in the First Third of this Century." *WLQ* 74 (January 1977): 36–53.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wisconsin's Theological-Confessional History—Viewed Especially in the Light of its Fellowship Principles and Practices." *LHC essays and reports, VI* (1977): 78–116.
- "Free Inter-Synodical Conference." *LS* 63 (26 August 1905): 529–33.
- Frey, A. E. "Spiritual Welfare Commission." *NL* 28 (4 May 1941): 138.
- Frey, Immanuel G. "Avoid . . . Contact!" *NL* 56 (12 October 1969): 367.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Still Living." *NL* 54 (11 June 1967): 183.
- Frey, Immanuel P. "Admitted Dangers of the Military Chaplaincy." *NL* 44 (17 March 1957): 83.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Application of the Principle of the Separation of Church and State to the Chaplaincy." *NL* 35 (1 February 1948): 35–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Boycotts and the Church." *NL* 23 (29 March 1936): 104.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Cigarette Shortage." *NL* 32 (18 March 1945): 51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Church Forums." *NL* 25 (19 June 1938): 199–200.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Church Union Sentiment." *NL* 25 (14 August 1938): 261.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Days' and 'Daze.'" *NL* 25 (23 October 1938): 340.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The God of the Boy Scouts." *NL* 34 (2 March 1947): 67.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Impact of the War on Church Union." *NL* 32 (27 May 1945): 107.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Liquor-Guzzling Girls." *NL* 23 (5 January 1936): 7–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Our Synodical Centennial." *NL* 37 (1 January 1950): 3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Rebuke." *NL* 49 (14 January 1962): 3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Two Views of The Military Chaplaincy." *NL* 50 (14 July 1963): 211.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Voice From The Recent Past on Church Union." *NL* 37 (22 October 1950): 340–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: Joint Prayer and Church Fellowship." *NL* 43 (19 February 1956): 56–7.
- Friederich, E. J. "Foreword." *CHIQ* 43 (November 1970): 153–5.
- Fritz, John H. C. "The Case of Publicity." *AL* 10 (December 1927): 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Publicity and Popularity." *AL* 2 (September 1919): 3.



- \_\_\_\_\_. "Who Is To Blame For Lutheran Division." *LW* 54 (12 (March 1935): 90–1.
- Fuerbringer, Alfred O. and Martin H. Franzmann. "A Quarter Century of Interchurch Relations: 1935–1960." *CTM* 32 (January 1961): 5–14.
- Fuerbringer, Ludwig. "*Gemeinschaftliches Gebet in gemischten Versammlungen.*" *DL* 101 (29 May 1945): 164–5. Translated by A[rthur] C. Dahms, "Joint Prayer in Mixed Assemblies." *CL* 6 (August 1945): 98–100.
- "The Function of Church Publicity." *AL* 21 (September 1938): 6.
- "The Future of the American Lutheran." *AL* 3 (May 1920): 1.
- "Future of Conference." *Lu* 33 (5 September 1951): 5–6.
- "The Future of the Synodical Conference." *AL* 44 (July 1961): 3.
- Gaertner, Carl A. "Responsibility, Purity, and Humility." *CTM* 42 (February 1971): 67–9.
- Galen, Albert W. "Concordia Publishing House's One Hundred Years." *CHIQ* 42 (November 1969): 157–70.
- "The Gap Between Missouri's St. Louis Seminary and Its Parishes." *CL* 26 (January 1965): 3.
- Gawrisch, Wilbert R. "Foreword 1986: The Cost of Confessionalism." *WLQ* 83 (Winter 1986): 1–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "If Ye Continue in My Word." *WLQ* 90 (Winter 1993): 3–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "History and Work of the Commission on Inter-church Relations—Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod." *WLQ* 90 (Fall 1993): 289–98.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Levels of Fellowship'—Scriptural Principles or Rules of Men?" *WLQ* 88 (Winter 1991): 3–14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Romans 16:17,18 and Its Application to Individual Fellowship." *WLQ* 77 (October 1980): 248–69.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "WELS, ELS, and CLC Representatives Hold Doctrinal Discussions." *WLQ* 86 (Spring 1989): 143–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The WELS' Walther Legacy." *WLQ* 84 (Winter 1987): 3–5.
- Gehrke, Ralph D. "Genesis Three in the Light of Key Hermeneutical Consideration." *CTM* 36 (September 1965): 534–60.
- Geiseman, Otto A. "How Can the Lutheran Church of America Be a Blessing to Christendom?" *AL* 28 (February 1945): 6–8.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Suggested Thoughts on the Question: Can We Escape Both Traditionalism and Liberalism?" *CTM* 7 (October 1936): 749–52.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day," *AL* 32 (May 1949): 5–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day." *AL* 38 (January 1955): 5–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: Accusation a Confession." *AL* 33 (April 1950): 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: Bible Interpretation." *AL* 23 (May 1940): 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: A Book You Will Like." *AL* 28 (March 1945): 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: Chaplaincies." *AL* 32 (May 1949): 5
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: Common Confession of Faith." *AL* 33 (August 1950): 6–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: The Convention at Fort Wayne." *AL* 24 (August 1941): 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: A Dangerous Fallacy." *AL* 28 (December 1945): 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: Darkest Before Dawn." *AL* 43 (October 1960): 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: The Ecumenical Outlook." *AL* 24 (May 1941): 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: Good News." *AL* 22 (April 1939): 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: Hallelujah Convention!" *AL* 45 (August 1962): 7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: Inescapable." *AL* 36 (October 1953): 7–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: The Joint Doctrinal Statement." *AL* 33 (June 1950): 8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: Lutheran Union and Intersynodical Conferences." *AL* 24 (November 1941): 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: Matters of Doctrine." *AL* 36 (August 1953): 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: Meanness." *AL* 33 (July 1950): 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: A Memorable Meeting." *AL* 28 (November 1945): 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: A Parable and Lutheranism." *AL* 39 (July 1956): 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: Praying for Trouble." *AL* 44 (September 1961): 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: Spirit at Work." *AL* 45 (March 1962): 6.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: 'A Statement.'" *AL* 29 (February 1946): 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: Strange Tracts." *AL* 37 (June 1954): 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: Study." *AL* 44 (July 1961): 6–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: Synod." *AL* 21 (October 1938): 8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: The Synodical Conference." *AL* 32 (May 1949): 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: Synodical Conference Meetings." *AL* 38 (January 1955): 5–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: What are We to Do?" *AL* 36 (October 1953): 7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "While It Is Day: What to Do?" *AL* 35 (May 1952): 5.
- Gerlach, Joel C. "Looking at the Religious World: The Battle of New Orleans—II." *NL* 60 (17 June 1973): 185–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Looking at the Religious World: Missouri Stalemate." *NL* 61 (14 July 1974): 215–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Looking at the Religious World: Phoenix in St. Louis." *NL* 61 (7 April 1974): 106–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Looking at the Religious World: Politics of Polarization." *NL* 61 (10 February 1974): 44.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Missouri's Fellowship Dilemma." *WLQ* 69 (April 1972): 126–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Missouri's Slip is Showing." *WLQ* 69 (October 1972): 287–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Thanks, Mr. Mather, we needed that." *NL* 73 (15 April 1986): 150.
- "Glimpses from the past." *The Watertown Daily Times*, 8 July 1997.
- Gockel, J. H. "Basic Principles of Lutheran Unity." *AL* 27 (April 1944): 8–10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "For a Re-Study of So-Called Non-Fundamentals." *AL* 25 (June 1942): 6–8.
- Graeber, Fred. "Are You a Theater-Goer?" *NL* 1 (21 January 1914): 9–10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Be Ye Steadfast." *NL* 2 (21 September 1915): 138.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Birth Rate Regulation and Wars." *NL* 7 (12 December 1920): 388–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Boy Scouts." *NL* 1 (7 April 1914): 54.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jazz and the Dance." *NL* 8 (20 February 1921): 51.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Prayers at Convention." *NL* 7 (22 July 1920): 210.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Missouri, Iowa, and Ohio—The Old and the New Differences*, by J[ohn] Buenger. *NL* 15 (9 December 1928): 398.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Why Prayer At All?" *NL* 8 (6 February 1921): 36–7.
- Graebner, Alan. "50 Years of the A. L. P. B." *AL* 46 (August 1963): 14–5; (September 1963): 14–5; (October 1963): 14–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "World War I and Lutheran Union: Documents from the Army and Navy Board, 1917 and 1918." *CHIQ* 41 (May 1968): 51–64.
- Graebner, Alex. "A Brief Commemorative Profile of Theodore Graebner, The Professional Churchman." *CHIQ* 44 (February 1971): 13–6.
- Graebner, August L. "*In der Welt, nicht von der Welt.*" *DL* 50 (14 August 1894): 135.
- Graebner, Theodore. "Agreement with Thiensville Faculty." *NL* 19 (11 September 1932): 301.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Burden of Infallibility: a Study in the History of Dogma." *CHIQ* 38 (July 1965): 88–94.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Cloak of the Cleric." *CHIQ* 44 (February 1971): 3–12.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Cooperation In Externals." *AL* 25 (January 1942): 7; (February 1942): 7; (March 1942): 7–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Corporation of the Saints." *LW* 61 (14 April 1942): 131.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Disunited Lutheran Church." *LW* 53 (31 July 1934): 269–70.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man." *LW* 36 (6 February 1917): 38–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "For a Penitent Jubilee." *CHIQ* 45 (February 1972): 3–28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Importance of Lutheran Union." *AL* 27 (June 1944): 6–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Joint Reformation Celebrations." *LW* 36 (18 September 1917): 292.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Letters to a Masonic Friend." *LW* 42 (27 February 1923): 66–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Letters to a Young Preacher: Joint Prayers." *Magazin fuer evang.-Luth. Homiletik und Pastoraltheologie* 44 (May 1920): 231–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Lutheran Church and Modern Issues." *WLM* 29 (January 1921): 165–6.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Union." *LW* 42 (August 14, 1923): 263.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Marshaling Resources for Conquest." *LW* 62 (16 February 1943): 56.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Misrepresentations Regarding Chaplain Service." *LW* 37 (2 April 1918): 107–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Modern Church Looks at Society." *CTM* 2 (May 1931): 336–43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Norwegian Situation." *LW* 34 (1 June 1915): 170.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Not a Sect—Yet." *AL* 23 (January 1940): 7–9, 22.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Notes on Scouting." *LW* 64 (3 July 1945): 212.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Obstacles to Lutheran Union." *LW* 62 (6 July 1943): 225–6; (20 July 1943): 243–4; (3 August 1943): 259–60; (17 August 1943): 273–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reject the 'Social' Gospel." *LW* 36 (12 June 1917): 182–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Separation of Church and State." *CTM* 4 (April 1933): 249–55.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "*Was ist von der 'Boy Scout'—Bewegung zu halten?*" *DL* 72 (25 April 1916): 158–60; (9 May 1916): 178–80; (23 May 1916): 198–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Weakness of Fundamentalism." *LW* 47 (24 July 1928): 254.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What is Unionism?" *CTM* 2 (August 1931): 565–82.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Price Patience?" *AL* 33 (March 1950): 7–9.
- Graebner, Theodore, and Martin S. Sommer. "Lutheran Union: A Discussion, II." *LW* 59 (11 June 1940): 201.
- "Graebner's Suggestion." *LO* 15 (May 1950): 132–3.
- "A Grave Indictment." *AL* 26 (January 1943): 3–4.
- "The Great Illusion." *Cru* 1 (May–June 1939): 6–9.
- Grimm, A. Ira. "Synodical Loyalty 1910 Style." *CHIQ* 48 (Fall 1975): 87–98.
- Gullerud, Carl M. "Confessional Lutheran Publicity Bureau Organized." *NL* 29 (8 March 1942): 74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Union News Digest." *CL* 7 (March 1946): 33; (April 1946): 44–5; (July 1946): 87.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A New Approach." *CL* 1 (September 1940): 65–6.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Is Troubling the Church?" *CL* 20 (October 1959): 106–7.
- Gullixson, Theodore. "A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod 1935 to 1950." *LSQ* 37 (June 1997): 25–39.
- Gustafson, Paul E. "The Princeton Issue—the Church vs. the Scouts." *MS*, 20 May 1950, 1:8.
- H., W. P. "Broadcast of a Lutheran Church Wedding." *NL* 23 (2 August 1936): 248–9.
- Habeck, Irwin J. "Church Discipline." *WLQ* 58 (April 1961): 95–100.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Commission on Doctrinal Matters Reports." *NL* 47 (28 February 1960): 70–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Commission on Doctrinal Matters Reports." *NL* 47 (19 June 1960): 197, 205.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Convention and Intersynodical Relations." *NL* 46 (19 July 1959): 232–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Deaths of Dr. Behnken and Dr. Fry." *WLQ* 65 (October 1968): 290–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Disobedient to God's Word?" *NL* 45 (27 April 1958): 135–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Intersynodical Situation." *NL* 44 (21 July 1957): 233.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "President Oscar J. Naumann, 1909–1979." *WLQ* 76 (October 1979): 279–82.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Religious Press and Our Problem." *NL* 47 (18 December 1960): 410–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Report of the Committee on Doctrinal Matters." *NL* 49 (16 December 1962): 394–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Synodical Conference Meeting." *NL* 43 (25 November 1956): 379–80.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice of the Church Union Committee: The Antichrist." *NL* 46 (4 January 1959): 8–10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: Participation in Synodical Conference Committees on Doctrine Suspended, II." *NL* 42 (25 December 1955): 411.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: A Preachers' Quarrel?" *NL* 43 (4 March 1956): 72–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: The Seriousness of Inadequacy." *NL* 43 (1 April 1956): 104.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice of the Church Union Committee: Statement on Scripture Adopted by the Joint Committee of the Synodical Conference." *NL* 46 (15 February 1959): 59–60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: Were We Wrong?" *NL* 43 (24 June 1956): 200–1.

- Hadden, Jeffrey K. "A Protestant Paradox—Divided They Merge." *TRANS-ACTION* (July–August 1967): 63–9.
- "Handicapping the Word." *AL* 9 (December 1926): 4.
- Handy, Robert T. "The American Religious Depression, 1925–1935." *Church History* 29 (March 1960): 3–16.
- Hartman, Robert C. "The Growth of the WELS Through the Years." *WHIJ* 9 (Spring 1991): 31–49.
- "Hat Dr. Luther das Werk der Reformation fuer unvollendet ansgeben?" *DL* 2 (30 May 1846): 80.
- Hattery, John W. "The Historical Development of the Doctrine of Unionism in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod." *CHIQ* 43 (October 1970): 179–81.
- Hatton, Timothy J., and Jeffrey G. Williamson. "What Drove the Mass Migrations from Europe in the Late Nineteenth Century?" *Population and Development Review* 20 (September 1994): 533–57.
- "Have We a Policy?" *AL* 13 (April 1930): 7.
- "Head of School Quits in Lutheran Dispute." *MJ*, 19 August 1957, 1:1, 8.
- Hedeem, N. Everett. "A God-pleasing Fruit of Lutheran Unity." *LC* 50 (15 October 1942): 1172
- Heerboth, Paul M. "Leaning on the Lord during the Lean Years: The Lutheran Church during the Great Depression." *CHIQ* 70 (Winter 1997): 217–27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Missouri Synod Approach to Mission in the Early Period." *Missio Apostolica* 1 (1993): 19–26.
- Heinemann, E. "Some Thoughts About Parochial Schools." *LW* 1 (21 March 1883): 168.
- Heinecken, Martin J. "Bultmann's Theology and the Message of the Preacher." *LQ* 6 (November 1954): 283–98.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Currents in American Theology." *Lutheran World* 3 (March 1957): 364.
- Hemmeter, Bernard H. "Reflections on the Missouri Synod." *CHIQ* 43 (November 1970): 174–7.
- Hemmeter, H. B. "Early English Mission Efforts in the Missouri Synod." *CHIQ* 11 (October 1938): 67–74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Missouri Synod and English Work." *CTM* 17 (May 1946): 321–33.
- Hensel, O. "The Christian Mother and the Dance of Her Children." *NL* 11 (13 January 1924): 8–12; (27 January 1924): 25–7; (10 February 1924): 39–41.

- Herrmann, Gottfried. "The Theological Development of the WELS with Particular Reference to its Doctrine of the Ministry." *WLQ* 96 (Spring 1999): 103–21.
- Hiestand, E. L. "Princeton Scouts Organized 35 Years." *PTR*, 2 February 1950, 1.
- "The High Church Movement." *CL* 18 (March 1957): 25–9.
- "The High Church Movement Among Lutherans in America." *CL* 18 (September 1957): 93–6.
- "Hindering Christ." *AL* 24 (March 1941): 3.
- "Hiroshima Two-thirds Destroyed." *MJ*, 8 August 1945, 1:1.
- "The History of the A-L-P-B." *AL* 15 (December 1932): 7–12.
- Hoenecke, Edgar H. "Reflections on the Inter-Relationship Between Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary and World Missions." *WHIJ* 7 (Spring 1989): 21–39.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Reflections' on the World Mission Development in the Wisconsin Synod." *WLQ* 75 (July 1978): 199–212.
- Hoenecke, Gerald O. "Dr. Martin H. Franzmann." *WLQ* 73 (July 1976): 226.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Cleveland—the 'Turning Point' and 'The Beginning of a New Era.'" *WLQ* 59 (October 1962): 284–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Prof. Edmund Reim." *WLQ* 66 (October 1969): 276.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Recent Meeting of the Board of Doctrine of the Church of the Lutheran Confession and the Commission on Doctrinal Matters of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod." *WLQ* 69 (October 1972): 281–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Supplement to the Report and Recommendations of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod re: Theology of Fellowship." *WLQ* 63 (January 1966): 57–61.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: Church Fellowship." *NL* 43 (8 July 1956): 216–7.
- Hoenecke, John. "An Investigation of the Common Confession's Statement on 'The Word.'" *NL* 38 (23 September 1951): 297–8.
- Hoffmann, Ben. G. "They Do Come to Church." *LW* 61 (17 February 1942): 60.
- "The Houston Convention." *AL* 36 (August 1953): 3–5.
- "How Much Of Scripture Belongs To The Foundation Of Faith?" *CL* 1 (July 1940): 44.
- "How One Congregation Reacted to What 'Sophie' Thinks." *CL* 22 (November 1961): 183–4.



- Huebener, G. "Agreement in Substance and Phraseology." *CL* 10 (June 1949): 72–4.
- "Human Rules and the Word of God." *CL* 20 (November 1959): 116–7.
- "Humble Beginnings." *AL* 10 (December 1927): 259–60.
- Hunt, Thomas. "Education for Citizenship and Clashes of Culture over Parochial Schooling: The Case of Late 19th–Century Wisconsin." *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 5 (Spring 1996): 33–48.
- "I Am An American Day!" *MS*, 20 May 1950, 1:10.
- "Imitate Their Faith." *AL* 23 (August 1940): 3–4.
- "Increasing Demand for Publicity." *AL* 9 (June 1926): 4.
- "Intersynodical and Doctrinal Matters." *LW* 75 (31 July 1956): 292–7.
- "Is the Lutheran Church Evangelistically Minded?" *AL* 13 (November 1930): 7.
- "The Isolated Synod." *Time*, 23 August 1963, 49.
- "It Was Drink That Did It!" *LW* 7 (7 June 1889): 7.
- Jacobs, Charles M. "The Problem of Lutheran Union: A Review." *LCQ* 8 (October 1935): 411–4.
- Janke, Martin P. "The Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod and The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod." *WLQ* 83 (Fall 1986): 250–7.
- "Japs Offer to Surrender if Hirohito Keeps Throne." *MJ*, 10 August 1945, 1:1.
- Jenkins, Daniel. "The Ecumenical Movement and its 'Non-theological Factors.'" *ER* 3 (July 1951): 339–46.
- Jenny, Gerald. "Our Rural Field." *AL* 9 (July 1926): 7.
- Jenny, John. "Golden Jubilee of the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America." *NL* 9 (25 June 1922): 196.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Diamond Anniversary of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States." *NL* 9 (28 May 1922): 174.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Eighty-Fourth Psalm: Our New Seminary—a Tabernacle of the Lord." *NL* 16 (15 September 1929): 289–91; (29 September 1929): 305–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Introductory." *NL* 1 (7 January 1914): 1–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The One Hundred and Thirty-Third Psalm." *NL* 14 (16 October 1927): 321–3.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Pressing the Church into Politics." *NL* 9 (5 February 1922): 35.
- Jensen, Ros. "Missouri Synod Survives Strain." *CC* 86 (13 August 1969): 1072–3.
- Jeske, John G. "The Work Expands." *NL* 29 (18 October 1942): 328.
- Jewett, Robert. "The Gospel as Heresy: Seminary in Exile." *CC* 91 (27 March 1974): 336–40.
- Johnson, James M. "Lutheran Split Theses Rapped as 'Unclear.'" *MS*, 17 August 1961, 1:3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Synod Head Pleads For Lutheran Accord." *MS*, 11 August 1961, 2:1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wisconsin Synod Bids for Backing." *MS*, 9 August 1961, 1:4
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wis. Synod, Missouri Break Urged." *MS*, 16 August 1961, 1:4
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wis. Synod, Missouri Split." *MS*, 18 August 1961, 1:1, 4.
- Johnson, Neil M. "The Patriotism and Anti-Prussianism of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, 1914–1918." *CHIQ* 39 (October 1966): 99–118.
- Johnston, Paul I. "Freedom of Speech Means Freedom to Teach: The Constitutional Battle in Nebraska, 1919–1923." *CHIQ* 52 (Fall 1979): 118–24.
- Jordahl, Leigh. "J. A. O. Preus." *Logia* 5 (Eastertide 1996): 45–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Missouri Synod: Dilemma or Trilemma." *Dialog* 12 (Spring 1973): 121–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Old Missouri is Gone." *Dialog* 13 (Spring 1974): 86–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Moving Frontiers*, by Carl S. Meyer. *Una Sancta* 22 (Pentecost 1965): 51–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Theology of Franz Pieper: A Resource for Fundamentalistic Thought Modes Among American Lutherans." *LQ* 23 (May 1971): 118–37.
- Jungkuntz, Richard. "An Approach to the Exegesis of John 10:34–36." *CTM* 35 (October 1964): 556–65.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Lutheran Quest for a More Visible Unity." *CT* 31 (6 June 1969): 5–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Ministry of Reconciliation." *Qu* 52 (January 1955): 21–36.
- Keibel, Armin K. E. "The Pope Is The Very Antichrist." *NL* 43 (25 November 1956): 377–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Religion in Scouting." *NL* 40 (4 October 1953): 313–5.
- "Kennedy Slain by an Assassin." *MS*, 23 November 1963, 1:1.

- Kenyon, Richard L. "A dream: church merger succeeds." *MJ*, 18 September 1982, 2:5.
- Kiecker, James G. "A distant echo." *NL* 72 (15 May 1985): 164–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Three days in May, Part 1." *NL* 77 (1 May 1990): 170–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Three days in May, Part 2." *NL* 77 (15 May 1990): 188–9.
- Klausler, Alfred P. "50 Years of the A. L. P. B." *AL* 46 (November 1963): 20–1, 28; (December 1963): 6–7, 25.
- Koch, Henry A. "The Antichristian Religion Of The Scouts." *NL* 43 (30 September 1956): 314–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As Others See Us." *Qu* 40 (January 1943): 73.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dangerous, Eventually Fatal Steps." *Qu* 39 (July 1942): 186–99.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Joint Prayer at Public Meetings." *NL* 35 (23 May 1948): 165–7.
- Koehler, Edward W. A. "An Agreement" [River Forest, Ill., 1947]. *CHIQ* 43 (November 1970): 184–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Speaking the Truth in Love." *CL* 7 (September 1946): 103–4.
- Koehler, J. Ph. "The Synodical Conference in the History Of The Lutheran Church in America." Originally published in *Qu* 19 (July 1922). Translated by Paul Hensel, *F–L* 29 (May 1956): 1–8.
- Koelpin, Arnold J. "A WELS Historical Profile: Chronological Sketches of Our Synod's Past, 1950–1961." *WHIJ* 9 (Spring 1991): 19–30.
- Koenig, George C. "A Lutheran Broadcasting Station." *AL* 6 (April 1923): 3.
- Koenig, Richard E. "'Answers Seven': A Reply to Dr. E. Clifford Nelson." *AL* 45 (October 1962): 14–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Post-mortem on the showdown in the LCMS: The issue was conscience." *LF* 10 (September 1976): 6–11.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Use of Scripture (Matthew 18, 19)." *AL* 37 (August 1954): 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What's behind the showdown in the LCMS? Church and Tradition in collision." *LF* 6 (November 1972): 17–20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What's behind the showdown in the LCMS? Conservative reaction: 1965–1969." *LF* 7 (May 1973): 18–21.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "What's behind the showdown in the LCMS? Missouri turns moderate: 1938–1965." *LF* 7 (February 1973): 19–20, 29.
- Kohn, William C. "Lutheran Church Board for Army and Navy, U. S. A." *NL* 5 (2 June 1918): 84–5.
- Kowalke, Erwin E. "A Civilian Visits the Army Camps." *NL* 29 (14 June 1942): 183–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "German to English." *NL* 49 (18 November 1962): 355, 363.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "An Investigation of the Common Confession's Statement On The Church And On The Ministry." *NL* 38 (18 November 1951): 360–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mail for the Soldiers." *NL* 29 (19 April 1942): 118.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Pastor John Brenner, A Man With a Strong and Wide Pastoral Interest." *NL* 49 (4 November 1962): 345–6.
- Krauss, Karl F. "On the Need of Church Union." *NL* 38 (22 April 1951): 116–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Progress Report, Joint Doctrinal Committee." *NL* 45 (21 December 1958): 410.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Report Of The Meeting Of The Joint Union Committees Of The Synodical Conference." *NL* 44 (17 March 1957): 89–90.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sermon Preached at the Opening Service of the Synodical Conference Convention." *WLQ* 57 (October 1960): 232–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice Of The Church Union Committee." *NL* 46 (1 March 1959): 75.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: On the Credit Side of the Ledger." *NL* 43 (13 May 1956): 153.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: A Progress Report." *NL* 45 (22 June 1958): 204.
- Krauss, Karl F. and Irwin J. Habeck. "Wisconsin–Missouri Presidents' Conference." *NL* 41 (7 February 1954): 42.
- Krauss, Paul H. "Review of *Toward Lutheran Union* by Theodore Graebner and Paul E. Kretzmann." *LCQ* 42 (January 1944): 107–8.
- Krentz, Edgar. "Truly Evangelical=Truly Lutheran." *CuThM* 6 (October 1979) 271–84.
- Kretzmann, A. T. "Doctrinal Resolutions at the Centennial Convention." *CL* 8 (August–September 1947): 87–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Statement of the 44, 1945–1979." *CHIQ* 55 (Summer 1982): 69–81.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Thesis V of A STATEMENT to the LUTHERAN WITNESS." *CL* 13 (February 1952): 20–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Unconstitutionality of the Missouri Synod's Resolution on the 'Common Confession.'" *CL* 11 (December 1950): 138–40.
- Kretzmann, A. T., and H. J. Wunderlich. "The Forty-Four and Romans 16, 17. 18." *CL* 7 (April 1946): 40–3.
- Kretzmann, Karl. "A Chaplain from the Missouri Synod (1862)." *LW* 63 (21 November 1944): 380.
- Kretzmann, O. P. "J. Michael Reu, Th. D., Litt. D., November 14, 1869–October 14, 1943." *AL* 26 (November 1943): 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The State of Visible Christendom, VIII—Lutheranism in America—Cultural and Social Functions." *AL* 23 (February 1940): 11–2.
- Kretzmann, Paul E. "Can the Lutheran Bodies of America Get Together?" *CTM* 4 (January 1933): 1–11.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 'New Approach' in 'Lutheran Teaching.'" *Qu* 46 (October 1949): 259–64.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letter to the editor. *CL* 7 (July 1946): 87.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Trying To Force The Issue." *CL* 4 (May-June 1943): 61–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Trying to Force the Issue." *AL* 27 (December 1944): 10–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "When Separation Becomes a God-given Duty." *NL* 37 (2 July 1950): 212–3.
- Kuiper, H. J. "The Chaplaincy Question." *Banner* 77 (6 November 1942): 996–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Should the Christian Reformed Church Administer Open Communion?" *Banner* 77 (2 October 1942): 876–7.
- Kunkel, Howard R. "Common Ground for Lutherans." *AL* 26 (November 1943): 6–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Form or Content?" *AL* 20 (November 1937): 13–4.
- Kurth, Carl. "Synodical Conference Builds Hall for Soldier Boys at Army City, Kans." *NL* 5 (5 May 1918): 69–70.
- Kuster, Arthur V. "A. L. S." *CL* 11 (February 1950): 24.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Armed Forces Communion Agreement." *CL* 13 (April 1952): 45–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Association of Lutheran Seminarians." *CL* 9 (May 1948): 46–7.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "‘Casual’ Theory of Inspiration?" *CL* 10 (August 1949): 99.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Developments in Re Association of Lutheran Seminarians." *CL* 13 (March 1952): 32–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Koch–Friedrich Incident at Milwaukee, 1950, and Its Significance." *CL* 12 (June 1951): 73–83.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Missouri ‘Errs’ on Inspiration." *CL* 10 (August 1949): 98.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The ‘Seminarians’ Situation, St. Louis Viewpoint." *CL* 12 (February 1951): 21–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "‘A Statement’ Revived Again." *CL* 12 (April 1951): 44.
- "Large Crowd Attends Girl Scout Banquet." *PTR*, 11 May 1950, 1.
- "The Latest Lutheran Statistics." *AL* 11 (April 1928): 1.
- "A Laudable Effort Toward Unity." *AL* 23 (December 1940): 3.
- Lawrenz, Carl J. "The Doctrine of Confessional Fellowship: Of joint worship and church work." *WLQ* 82 (Spring 1985): 83–94.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Follow and Serve the Lord With Wholehearted Devotion." Opening Address Delivered in the Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Chapel, 5 September 1961. *WLQ* 58 (October 1961): 229–31.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Intercommunion." *WLQ* 58 (April 1961): 144–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The *Lutheran Standard* Appraises the Cleveland Convention." *WLQ* 59 (October 1962): 289–91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Meeting Of The Synodical Conference." *NL* 41 (5 September 1954): 378–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Memorials Requesting Dissolution of the Synodical Conference." *WLQ* 59 (January 1962): 48–56.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Natural Law, Natural Knowledge of God, Civic Righteousness, and their Application to the Boy Scout Question." *WLQ* 69 (April 1972): 67–79.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 1904 Free Conferences in Michigan." *WLQ* 60 (April 1963): 139–53.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "On Pulpit Fellowship." *WLQ* 58 (April 1961): 145–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Resolutions on the Intersynodical Issues." *Qu* 54 (October 1957): 290–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Which Way to Lutheran Unity?* by John H. Tietjen. *WLQ* 64 (January 1967): 76–7.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Scriptural Principles Concerning Church Fellowship." *Qu* 51 (October 1954): 258–91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Scriptural Truths of the Church and Its Ministry." *WLQ* 82 (Summer 1985): 167–85.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Strange Fellowship." *WLQ* 60 (April 1963): 158.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Synodical Conference Convention." *Qu* 54 (January 1957): 57–60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Synodical Conference Proceedings." *WLQ* 58 (January 1961): 74–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: The Missouri Synod's Position on Scouting." *NL* 43 (18 March 1956): 88–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Warning Against 'Armed Forces' Religion." *Qu* 54 (April 1957): 149–50.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Withdrawal from the Lutheran Synodical Conference." *WLQ* 62 (October 1965): 296–7.
- "Laymen Are Interested In Lutheran Unity." *AL* 24 (December 1941): 3.
- Lehmann, Edwin A. "The Pastor Who Possessed an All-consuming Love." *WHIJ* 1 (Spring 1983): 8–20.
- Lehninger, Max. "The Brief Statement of the Missouri Synod and the Declaration of the A. L. C. as the Doctrinal Basis for Church-Fellowship." *Qu* 36 (April 1939): 81–96.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Development of the Doctrinal Position of the Wisconsin Synod During the Century of its History." *Qu* 47 (January 1950): 1–15; (April 1950): 88–107.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Union Movement Today." *NL* 28 (9 March 1941): 68–70.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ninety Years of the Wisconsin Synod." *LW* 49 (23 July 1940): 254–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *A Handbook of Organizations*, by Theodore Graebner. *Qu* 46 (April 1949): 150–52.
- "A Letter." *AL* 25 (July 1942): 11.
- "A Letter of Dr. Scharlemann Stating That His Position HAS NOT CHANGED." *CL* 23 (November 1962): 121–2.
- "A Letter of a Pastor to His Congregation." *CL* 20 (December 1959): 122–3.
- "The Letter of Simplicissimus." *AL* 25 (August 1942): 3–4.
- Lillegard, George O. "The Great Divide." *LuSen* 28 (27 September 1945): 273–5.

- \_\_\_\_\_. “In the Interest of Lutheran Unity,” originally written for *LuSen* 24 (13 January 1941): 2–5; (27 January 1941): 2–4. Reprinted in *Qu* 38 (April 1941): 127–32.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “In the Interest of Lutheran Unity.” *Qu* 38 (July 1941): 217–225.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “A Living Lutheran Theology.” *Qu* 43 (October 1946): 282–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Lutheran Union (An Answer to Dr. Graebner).” *AL* 23 (March 1940): 10–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Modern Ecumenism and Cooperation in Externals.” *Qu* 56 (October 1959): 233–50; *WLQ* 57 (January 1960): 14–33.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Progressive Revelation.” *Qu* 48 (January 1951): 45–58.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The World Council of Churches and ‘Co-operation in Externals.’” *Qu* 47 (July 1950): 207–34.
- Lind, Edward, and Richard Luecke. “The ‘Test Your Alertness’ Questionnaire.” *AL* 42 (February 1959): 15–6.
- Lindemann, Fred H. “The Churchman’s Digest.” *AL* 25 (November 1942): 12–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Churchman’s Digest.” *AL* 26 (December 1943): 11–3, 23.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Churchman’s Digest.” *AL* 27 (April 1944): 10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Synod and Selective Fellowship.” *AL* 28 (September 1945): 9–12.
- Lindemann, Herbert. “Personal Reflections on the Twenty-Fifty Anniversary of the Publication of ‘A Statement.’” *CHIQ* 43 (November 1970): 164–6.
- Lindemann, Paul. “A. L. P. B. Celebrates Twenty-Fifth Anniversary.” *AL* 22 (January 1939): 3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Progress Towards Lutheran Union.” *AL* 21 (September 1938): 5.
- Lindsell, Harold. “Who Is Right in the Missouri Synod Dispute?” *CT* 19 (11 April 1975): 10–1.
- “A Little History, 1917–1937.” *AL* 20 (April 1937): 7.
- “The Liturgical Question.” *AL* 18 (November 1935): 68.
- Lotz, David W. “The Sense of Church History in Representative Missouri Synod Theology.” *CTM* 42 (October 1971): 597–619.
- Lowell, C. Stanley. “I Was a Chaplain.” *CC* 61 (28 June 1944): 773–4.
- Loy, W. D. “A Memorable Meeting: Lutheran Faculties Meet at Valparaiso University.” *AL* 26 (November 1943): 16–7.



- "Loyalty Oath Opposition." *MS* 14 April 1950, 1:16.
- Luebke, Frederick C. "The Immigrant Condition as A Factor Contributing to the Conservatism of The Lutheran Church." *CHIQ* 38 (April 1965): 19–28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Politics and Missouri Synod Lutherans: A Historiographical Review." *CHIQ* 45 (May 1972): 141–58.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Superpatriotism in World War I: The Experience of a Lutheran Pastor." *CHIQ* 41 (February 1968): 3–11.
- Lueker, Erwin L. "Functions of Symbols and of Doctrinal Statements." *CTM* 32 (May 1961): 274–85.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Stance of Missouri in 1917." *CHIQ* 40 (October 1967): 119–26.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Walther and the Free Lutheran Conferences of 1856–1859." *CTM* 15 (August 1944): 529–63.
- "Lugubrious Churches." *AL* 12 (January 1929): 5.
- "Luther and Romans 16:17. 18." *CL* 9 (July 1948): 87.
- "*Luther ueber die Trunkheit.*" *DL* 7 (19 March 1850): 109–10.
- "Luther Used Romans 16:17, 18." *CL* 12 (April 1951): 44–5.
- "The Lutheran Church's Response to the Call of the Nation." *Lu* 22 (7 March 1918): 1.
- "Lutheran Collaboration at Saginaw." *AL* 27 (August 1944): 3–4.
- "Lutheran Isolation." *CC* 59 (4 November 1942): 1342–3.
- "Lutheran Liturgists." *Time*, 19 February 1934, 26.
- "Lutheran Seminarians Fellowship Each Other." (December 1948): 143.
- "Lutheran Service Center Opens in London." *LW* 64 (16 January 1945): 24.
- "Lutheran Theologians In Hopeful Meeting." *LC* 51 (30 June 1943): 804.
- "Lutheran Union? A Case of Sanity and Charity Plus—" *CL* 1 (January 1940): 2–4; (February 1940): 6–7; (March, 1940): 12–6.
- "Lutheran Union in the Air." *AL* 32 (June 1949): 3–4.
- "Lutheran Union News Digest." *CL* 6 (October 1945): 123.

- “Lutheran Unity Impasse Cited.” *MS*, 10 August 1961, 2:1.
- “The Lutheran Witness.” *Lu* 2 (30 June 1898): 616.
- “Lutheranism—As You Like It.” *ML* 5 (May 1952): 3
- “Lutheranism at the Twentieth Century Midway Point.” *AL* 33 (January 1950): 3–4.
- “Lutheranism in Ferment.” *AL* 39 (January 1956): 3–4.
- “Lutherans in America Move Toward Unity.” *CC* 56 (15 March 1939): 341–2.
- “Lutherans Moving Closer Together.” *LC* 50 (29 October 1942): 1235–6.
- “Lutherans to Weigh Some Critical Issues.” *MJ*, 5 August 1961, 4.
- “Machinery and the Holy Spirit.” *AL* 14 (September 1931): 3.
- Madson, Norman A. “The A. L. C. on Inspiration.” *Qu* 50 (April 1953): 141–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Chaplaincies: Pieper Right Also on Chaplaincy.” *NL* 44 (3 February 1957): 39.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Opening Sermon at Seventy-fifth Anniversary Convention of the Synodical Conference of North America, Trinity Lutheran Church, Milwaukee, Wis., August 3, 1948, 10:00 A. M.” *Qu* 46 (January 1949): 1–11.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “A Pastor on Scouting.” *NL* 36 (27 March 1949): 107–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Scouting as a Character Builder.” *CL* 15 (March 1954): 18–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “What Price Union?” *AL* 33 (May 1950): 7–8.
- Manley, Robert N. “Language, Loyalty and Liberty: the Nebraska State Council of Defense and the Lutheran Churches, 1917–1918.” *CHIQ* 37 (April 1964): 1–16.
- Marozick, Mark. “The Dissolution of the Synodical Conference Revisited: An ELS Perspective, 1957–1962.” *LSQ* 37 (September 1977): 49–85.
- Martin, W. S., W. J. Duncan, T. L. Powers, and J. C. Swayer. “Costs and Benefits of Selected Response Inducement Techniques in Mail Survey Research.” *Journal of Business Research* 19 (1989): 67–79.
- Marty, Martin E. “Head First But Not Headlong: Missouri’s New Direction.” *LS* 2 (14 August 1962): 3–5, 12.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Missouri Dilemma: What Price Preus?” *CC* 90 (23 May 1973): 591.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Showdown in the Missouri Synod.” *CC* 89 (27 September 1972): 944–5.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wartburg: A. L. S. Unofficial impressions by an official visitor." *Sem* 41 (16 November 1949): 11–2.
- Maurer, Heinrich H. "Studies in the Sociology of Religion. IV. The Problems of Group Consensus: Founding of the Missouri Synod." *American Journal of Sociology* 30 (May 1925): 665–82.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Studies in the Sociology of Religion. V. The Fellowship Law of a Fundamentalist Group. The Missouri Synod." *American Journal of Sociology* 31 (July 1925): 39–57.
- Mayer, Herbert T. "The Seminary and the Church." *CTM* 35 (December 1964): 677–81.
- Mayer, Herman A. "Illustrirte Abendschule." *CHIQ* 58 (Summer 1985): 59–70.
- McLaughlin, Wallace H. "Those Technical Expressions (Concerning the Doctrine of Inspiration in the 'Common Confession.'" *CL* 11 (November 1950): 128–33.
- McLaughlin, Wallace H., and H. O. Mensing. "The Statement Controversy Up To Date." *CL* 10 (November 1949): 131–34.
- "Mein Lieber Hans!" *DL* 18 (13 November 1861): 49–51.
- "A Memorable Meeting." *AL* 27 (March 1944): 5.
- Merkens, Albert G. "Early Lutheran Settlers and Schools in Northern Illinois." *CHIQ* 21 (July 1948): 68–74; (October 1948): 128–35; (January 1949): 180–6; 22 (April 1949): 37–42.
- Meyer, A. W. "Marriage a Success." *LW* 34 (6 April 1915): 100–2.
- Meyer, Adolf F. "Convention Impressions." *AL* 21 (July 1938): 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Hot Dogs Versus Tracts." *AL* 20 (November 1937): 6.
- Meyer, Carl S. "The Historical Background of 'A Brief Statement.'" *CTM* 32 (July 1961): 403–28; (August 1961): 466–82; (September 1961): 526–42.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Role of *A Brief Statement* Since 1932." *CTM* 33 (April 1962): 199–209.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Some Aspects of the Observance of the Reformation Quadricentennial by America's Lutherans." *CHIQ* 41 (February 1968): 14–35.
- Meyer, George J. "Pastor George J. Meyer Circulates Wisconsin Clergy." *CL* 16 (November 1955): 124–5.
- Meyer, Joh. P. "All-American Lutheran Convention." *Qu* 40 (April 1943): 149–50.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "An All-Lutheran Federation Proposed." *Qu* 39 (April 1942): 149–50.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "American Lutheran Church." *Qu* 27 (October 1930): 277–9.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Brief Items on the Union Negotiations." *Qu* 39 (January 1942): 60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Can We Stand on the Following Platform?" *Qu* 34 (April 1937): 148–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Columbus Conference." *Qu* 38 (April 1941): 133–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Communion Service That Makes History." *Qu* 41 (January 1944): 62–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Cooperation in War Efforts." *Qu* 40 (July 1943): 210–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Cooperation with non-Lutheran Church Bodies." *Qu* 34 (April 1937): 147–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Danger of Lutheran Brotherhoods." *Qu* 29 (January 1932): 70–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Disruption of the Lutheran Church in America." *Qu* 27 (October 1930): 275–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Do the Recent Declarations of the A. L. C. Warrant the Establishment of Fraternal Relations?" *Qu* 36 (October 1939): 249–78.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dr. Arndt on the Second Columbus Conference." *Qu* 40 (January 1943): 66–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dr. Behnken's Statement at Columbus." *Qu* 39 (October 1942): 283–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dr. Dell on Inspiration." *Qu* 36 (July 1939): 219–20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dr. Graebner at the Louisville, Ky., Convention." *Qu* 40 (January 1943): 69–70.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dr. Reu on Missouri's Attitude toward an All-American Lutheran Federation." *Qu* 40 (January 1943): 67–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dr. W. G. Polack's Evaluation of the Columbus Conference." *Qu* 39 (July 1942): 221–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Doctrinal Affirmation Doomed?" *Qu* 43 (October 1946): 289–90.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Doctrinal Content." *Qu* 43 (January 1946): 64.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Doctrine of God's Election in American Lutheran Controversy." *NL* 39 (16 November 1953): 356–7; (30 November 1952): 374–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Folkebladet' on Pending Issues." *Qu* 40 (April 1943): 150.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ft. Wayne Resolutions on the Union Matter." *Qu* 38 (October 1941): 300–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Galesburg Rule Repudiated." *Qu* 28 (April 1931): 140–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Greatness." *Qu* 27 (April 1930): 152–3.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Is Conservatism Traditionalism?" *WLQ* 59 (April 1962): 148.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Is the Missouri Synod Veering?" *Qu* 38 (July 1941): 229–30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "*Ist die Wisconsinssynode absichtlich uebergangen worden bei der Einladung zu Vereinigungskonferenz?*" *Qu* 39 (January 1942): 62–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "It Is To Weep!" *Qu* 41 (January 1944): 66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "*Logenbeschluesse der Missouri-Synode.*" *Qu* 29 (October 1932): 293–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Intersynodical Conferences." *Qu* 39 (January 1942): 68–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Pastors on Social Problems." *Qu* 37 (July 1940): 198–201.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Solidarity." *Qu* 34 (April 1937): 146–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 'Lutheran Standard' on Acts 13, 48." *Qu* 29 (October 1932): 291–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Theologians in Hopeful Meeting." *Qu* 40 (October 1943): 288–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheranism in the United States." *AL* 37 (January 1954): 4–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church." *Qu* 35 (July 1938): 208–13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "National Lutheran Editors' Association and the Proposed Convention." *Qu* 39 (April 1942): 150–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Natural Knowledge of God and Civic Righteousness." *Qu* 44 (January 1947): 1–16; (April 1947): 91–104.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A New Name for Open Questions?" *Qu* 41 (January 1944): 64–6
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Noble Souls' Knocking at Our Doors." *Qu* 33 (July 1936): 200–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Objective Justification." *Qu* 37 (January 1940): 31–41; (April 1940): 107–22.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Oldness of the Letter." *Qu* 39 (January 1942): 61–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Organic Union Proposed." *Qu* 29 (July 1932): 230.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Parents' Duties." *Qu* 18 (July 1921): 193–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Prayer Fellowship." *NL* 34 (26 October 1947): 346–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Prayer Fellowship." *Qu* 46 (July 1949): 184–95; (October 1949): 244–59; 47 (January 1950): 33–45; (April 1950): 124–36; (July 1950): 196–207; (October 1950): 288–98.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Present Stage of the Church Union Deliberations." *Qu* 37 (January 1940): 53–61.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Present Urge for Closer Union of the Lutheran Church Bodies." *Qu* 32 (January 1935): 70–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "President Brenner's Letter." *Qu* 39 (July 1942): 214–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "President John Brenner." *WLQ* 60 (January 1963): 5–12.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "President Knubel on Growing Unity among Lutherans." *Qu* 36 (January 1939): 59–61.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Pulpit and Altar Fellowship Declared." *Qu* 26 (January 1929): 57–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Regiment's Finest.'" *Qu* 40 (October 1943): 289–90.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Remarks on Eph. 4,1-16." *Qu* 41 (October 1944): 217–30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Resolutions on Church Union." *Qu* 35 (October 1938): 284–89.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Resolutions of the Columbus Conference regarding Missouri." *Qu* 39 (July 1942): 216–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Re-Thinking the Chaplaincy." *Qu* 41 (October 1944): 267–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Church Unity. A Commentary on The Epistle to the Ephesians*, by F. H. Knubel. *Qu* 35 (January 1938): 57–60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *The Historic Lutheran Position in Non-Fundamentals*, by Theodore Graebner. *Qu* 36 (October 1939): 299–301.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *The Historical Open Question among American Lutherans*, by Theo. Hanssen. *Qu* 33 (July 1936): 216–21.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel*, by R. C. H. Lenski. *Qu* 29 (April 1932): 153–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *The Interpretation of St. Mark's and St. Luke's Gospels*, by R. C. H. Lenski. *Qu* 31 (April 1934): 145–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *The Problem of Lutheran Union and Other Essays*, by Theodore Graebner. *Qu* 32 (October 1935): 300–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Proceedings of the Thirty-third Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference of North America, Mankato, Minn., Aug. 10–15, 1932*. *Qu* 30 (April 1933): 157.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Theological Monthly*. *Qu* 18 (January 1921): 77–8.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Winning Souls for Jesus Through Personal Missionary Work*, by John Theodore Mueller. *Qu* 26 (April 1929): 159.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Scout Oath." *NL* 34 (6 July 1947): 219–20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Scouting." *Qu* 38 (January 1941): 75–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Second Columbus Conference." *Qu* 39 (July 1942): 210–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Second Thessalonians 3:14, 15." *Qu* 54 (January 1957): 14–27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Selective Fellowship Favored by Committee on Fellowship." *Qu* 43 (January 1946): 65.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Synod and Congregation." *WLQ* 61 (October 1964): 233–65.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Synodical Conference and the Proposed Convention." *Qu* 39 (April 1942) 152–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "2 Thessalonians 3:14, 15." *Qu* 54 (January 1957): 14–27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Third of a Loaf Is Needed." *Qu* 39 (July 1942): 217–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Toward Oneness of Spirit." *Qu* 39 (January 1942): 69–70.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The U. L. C. A. on Peace." *Qu* 34 (April 1937): 149.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Union Negotiations Increase Complications." *Qu* 39 (January 1942): 60–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Unionism." *Qu* 42 (October 1945): 209–38; 43 (January 1946): 9–25.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Unity of the Church." *Qu* 40 (January 1943): 71–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: Participation in Synodical Conference Committees on Doctrine Suspended, I." *NL* 42 (11 December 1955): 392–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What is Ecumenical?" *Qu* 34 (April 1937): 146.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Will Be the Attitude of the Various Constituents of the A. L. C.?" *Qu* 39 (January 1942): 61.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Would Luther Say?" *Qu* 39 (July 1942): 219–20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Who Testified What?" *Qu* 39 (January 1942): 70–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Why Some Baptist Chaplains Resign." *NL* 30 (22 August 1943): 261.
- Miegge, Mario. "Is Ecumenism a Cultural, Rather Than a Theological Phenomenon?" *Communio Viatorum* 7 (1964): 16–24.

- “Milwaukee Journal Prints ‘Editorial’ Story, Many Comments Received By Mail.” *PTR*, 25 May 1950, 1.
- Minnesota Correspondent. “Among the Doctors.” *NL* 22 (22 December 1935): 405–6.
- “Missouri Compromise.” *CL* 11 (June 1950): 67–8.
- “Missouri Compromise.” *Lu* 32 (5 April 1950): 7–9.
- “Missouri Has Problem.” *Lu* 33 (5 September 1951): 5–6.
- “Missouri Refutes Charges.” *Lu* 43 (10 May 1961): 7.
- “Missouri Seen Moving.” *Lu* 44 (29 August 1962): 5–6.
- “Missouri Synod Debates.” *Lu* 32 (12 July 1950): 8–9.
- “Missouri Votes Co-operation.” *Lu* 44 (11 July 1962): 4–5.
- “Missouri’s Dilemma.” *LO* 17 (October 1952): 291–2.
- “Missouri’s Open Door.” *AL* 27 (March 1944): 3–4.
- “Missouri’s Plight.” *CL* 22 (October 1961): 155.
- “Missourian Liberalism Shows Its Face.” *CL* 23 (October 1962): 102–5.
- Montgomery, John Warwick. “Missouri Compromise.” *CT* 13 (17 January 1969): 49–50; (28 March 1969): 46–7; (6 June 1969): 50–1.
- “More Accommodation to Modernism In St. Louis.” *CL* 26 (January 1965): 5–6.
- Moussa, Hans K. “The Age of Audacity.” *NL* 3 (21 January 1916): 9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “At Last! An Argument For Dancing.” *NL* 8 (27 November 1921): 374–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “At Last, Chicago Becomes Religious.” *NL* 12 (22 February 1925): 53–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Boy Scout Church.” *NL* 12 (22 February 1925): 51–52.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Boy Scout Week.” *NL* 6 (15 June 1919): 91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Conventions and Invocations.” *NL* 3 (7 July 1916): 97–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Cradle Snatcher.” *NL* 13 (19 September 1926): 294–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Craze for Organizations.” *NL* 1 (7 January 1914): 5.



- \_\_\_\_\_. "Divided Lutherans." *NL* 13 (30 May 1926): 163–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Federation Plans." *NL* 2 (21 June 1915): 89.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Modern Dictators of Fashion." *NL* 1 (7 January 1914): 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Now Is the Time to Say It." *NL* 6 (27 July 1919): 115.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Our Chronicle." *NL* 13 (11 July 1926): 216.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Our Chronicle." *NL* 14 (13 November 1927): 355.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Render Unto Caesar." *NL* 1 (21 April 1914): 57.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Seventy-Five Years of the Wisconsin Synod in Brief Survey." *NL* 12 (1 November 1925): 350.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Worth of Serious Consideration.'" *NL* 8 (7 August 1921): 245–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Y. M. C. A. and the War." *NL* 5 (6 October 1918): 156–7.
- "Moving Faster." *AL* 43 (January 1960): 3–4.
- "Must We Be So Bulldogmatic?" *AL* 41 (May 1958): 3–4.
- Nass, Thomas P., and Lyle W. Lange. "'Inter-Christian Relationships'—An Evaluation." *WLQ* 89 (Summer 1992): 217–20.
- "A Nation-Wide Broadcast." *AL* 13 (August 1930): 3.
- "National Lutheran Publicity Week." *AL* 6 (July 1923): 2.
- Natterer, M. L. "Why I Am No Longer in the Missouri Synod." *CL* 24 (October–November–December 1963): 99–100.
- Naumann, Oscar J. "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: 1956—A Year Of Decision." *NL* 43 (8 January 1956): 8–9.
- Naumann, Oscar J., and Oscar J. Siegler. "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: Report of the Standing Committee on Matters of Church Union to the Nine Districts of the Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States." *NL* 43 (22 July 1956): 231–5.
- "A Needed Voice." *AL* 22 (December 1939): 1.
- "A Needed Voice II." *AL* 23 (January 1940): 1.
- "A Needed Voice III." *AL* 23 (February 1940): 5–6.

- Nelson, E. Clifford. "Questions Seven: Concerning American Inter-Lutheran Relations." *Lutheran World* 9 (May 1962): 167–9.
- "'New Approach' to Fellowship Within Missouri Credited to 1945 Statementariansim." *CL* 23 (January 1962): 9–10.
- "A New Day for Lutheran Unity." *AL* 32 (August 1949): 3–4.
- "The New Scholasticism." *AL* 26 (February 1943): 4.
- "The New Season of the Lutheran Hour." *AL* 19 (September 1936): 22.
- Nichol, Todd. "'Timely Warnings': Notes on Inerrancy and Inerrant." *Dialog* 24 (Winter 1985): 52–60.
- Nickelsburg, J. F. E. "The A. L. P. B. Office As A Clearing House." *AL* 14 (March 1931): 17–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Concrete Examples of Intersynodical Cooperation." *AL* 26 (October 1943): 7–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "News Briefly Told." *AL* 44 (February 1961): 24.
- Nitz, Henry C. "Beware of Bitterness." *NL* 46 (19 July 1959): 227.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'High Church' Practices." *NL* 46 (13 September 1959): 291.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "High Liturgical Fences." *NL* 50 (15 December 1963): 395.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "I May Be Right, Yet Lose My Soul." *NL* 47 (28 February 1960): 73.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Perils of Orthodoxy." *NL* 46 (25 October 1959): 346.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: One Another." *NL* 43 (6 February 1956): 40–1.
- Nitz, Marcus. "Doctrinal Matters." *NL* 50 (22 September 1963): 292–3.
- Nohl, Frederick. "The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod Reacts to United States Anti-Germanism During World War I." *CHIQ* 35 (July 1962): 49–66.
- "Notes and Quotes." *LW* 80 (17 October 1961): 511.
- "Notes and Quotes." *LW* 80 (14 November 1961): 563.
- "The Oakland Conference of Theologians." *NL* 46 (30 August 1959): 281.
- "Objection." *AL* 22 (March 1939): 5–6.
- Oesch, Wilhelm M. "Foreword." *Cru* 1 (January–February, 1939): 3.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Quo Vadis, Ecclesia?" *Cru* 1 (January–February, 1939): 3–10.
- "The Old Complaint." *AL* 7 (February 1924): 3.
- "Open Forum." *AL* 27 (March 1944): 4.
- "Open Forum." *AL* 42 (October 1959): 12.
- "An Open Letter." *AL* 30 (January 1947): 3–4; (February 1947): 3–4.
- Otten, Herman. "Canadians Say New Lutheran Curriculum Undermines Bible." *LN* 5 (5 September 1966). Reproduced in *CN* 2 (3 March 1969): 35.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Doctrinal Situation in The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod." *CN* 2 (3 March 1969): 58–61.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "LCA Officials Silent on Denial of Deity of Christ." *CN* 1 (10 February 1968). Reproduced *CN* 2 (3 March 1969): 47.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Liberal Lutherans Deny Christ Is Only Way to Heaven." *CN* 1 (30 December 1968). Reprinted in *CN* 2 (3 March 1969): 34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutherans And the Holy Trinity." *LN* 6 (26 June 1967). Reproduced in *CN* 2 (3 March 1969): 50, 53.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Relativism and Modern Theology." *Sem* 49 (October 1957): 11–13, 44–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "St. Louis Student Strike." *CN* 2 (3 March 1969): 2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Surveys Reveal Doctrinal Crisis." *CN* 2 (3 March 1969): 1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Why *Christian News*?" *CN* 10 (12 December 1977): 5–13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Word of God in Contemporary Lutheranism." *Sem* 49 (May 1958): 66–71.
- "Our Contact Pastors." *NL* 31 (16 April 1944): 88.
- "Our Past." *AL* 2 (January 1919): 1.
- Pankow, Walter. "Government Chaplaincies." *NL* 38 (20 May 1951): 146–8.
- Panning, Armin J. "The Role of Admonition in Termination of Church Fellowship Between Church Bodies." *WLQ* 93 (Fall 1996): 243–54.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Romans 16:17,18." *WLQ* 93 (Summer 1996): 188–95.
- Pannkoek, O. H. "What is Church Publicity?" *AL* 4 (October 1921): 4.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Is Disturbing the Lutherans?" *CC* 61 (14 June 1944): 721–3.
- "Paper Hits Synod Anti-Scout Stand." *LO* 15 (July 1950): 216.
- "Parish Backs Wisconsin Pastor." *Lu* 41 (28 January 1959); 8–9.
- "Parish Quits Wisconsin Synod." *Lu* 41 (1 July 1959): 6–7.
- Parnell, Dorothy. "How to Avoid Falling Into Communist Trap." *MS* 2 May 1950, 1:1.
- "Pastor Coyner's Retraction." *CL* 17 (January 1956): 1.
- "A Pastor in Nebraska Pours Out His Heart." *CL* 9 (March 1948): 35–6.
- "Pastor's Ban on Scouting Splits Town." *LO* 15 (July 1950): 216.
- "Pastor's Dismissal Upheld." *Lu* 43 (21-28 December 1960): 8.
- "Pastor-Scout Issue Hotter." *MS*, 13 May 1950, 1:3.
- Paulson, Charles. "P. E. Kretzmann and Fellowship in the LCMS." *CHIQ* 57 (Winter 1984): 176–83.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. "Theological Observer: John Philip Koehler (1859–1951)." *CTM* 23 (January 1952): 50–1.
- "Perils That Attend Our Work." *CL* 9 (November 1948): 138.
- "The Period of Groping." *NL* 48 (26 February 1961): 74–5.
- "Pernicious Publicity." *AL* 12 (September 1929): 4–5.
- "Persistence in Advertising." *AL* 3 (March 1920): 2.
- Peters, Paul. "The Cleveland Convention." *WLQ* 59 (October 1962): 281–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dr. Behnken on Joint Prayer." *Qu* 53 (July 1956): 216–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dr. Behnken on the New Communion Agreement." *Qu* 53 (January 1956): 72–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_, trans. "Dr. Hans Kirsten's Address to the Saginaw Convention, August 7, 1959." *Qu* 56 (October 1959): 298–301.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 'Pro Deo et Patria Award.'" *Qu* 48 (July 1951): 208–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Thiensville Conclave and its Commentators." *WLQ* 57 (October 1960): 291–3.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Two Opponents of a Government-Sponsored Military Chaplaincy." *WLQ* 62 (October 1965): 300–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: A New Communion Agreement." *NL* 43 (22 January 1956): 24–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly." *WLQ* 57 (January 1960): 72.
- Pfeiffer, D. L. "Some Historical Errors Of The Union Articles Adopted By The Missouri Synod In 1938." *CL* 1 (August 1940):53–4.
- Phillips, Clara. "What's Behind Lutheran Split: Power struggle or Bible dispute?" *Everett (Washington) Herald*, 27 May 1978; cited in *CN* 11 (5 June 1978): 7.
- Pickle, Linda Schelbitzki. "Women of the Saxon Immigration and Their Church." *CHIQ* 57 (Winter 1984): 146–61.
- Piehl, Charles K. "Ethnicity, the Missouri Synod, and the Mission of the Church." *CuThM* 3 (August 1976): 239–44.
- Pieper, August. "Concerning the Doctrine of the Church and of Its Ministry, with Special Reference to the Synod and its Discipline." *WLQ* 59 (April 1962): 81–136.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "*Luthers Lehre von Kirche und Amt.*" *Qu* 14 (July 1917): 211–41; 15 (January 1918): 65–80. Translated by Harold R. Johne, "Luther's Doctrine of the Church and Ministry." *WLQ* 60 (January 1963): 13–47; (April 1963): 81–110 (October 1963): 247–63.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "*Menschenherrschaft in der Kirche.*" *Qu* 8 (January 1911): 30–44; (April 1911): 98–123.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "*Zur Verstaendigung in der gegenwaertigen Diskussion ueber Kirche und Amt.*" *Qu* 9 (July 1912): 182–208.
- Pieper, Franz. "Division and Offense According to Romans 16:17." *CL* 8 (August–September 1947): 96.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dr. C. F. W. Walther as Theologian." *LuW* 36 (January 1890): 10–4. Translated by John Theodore Mueller. *CTM* 26 (December 1955): 913–28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Foreword to Volume 1, No. 1 of the *CTM*," (January 1930). Translated by Paul H. F. Boecler. *CJ* 1 (January 1975): 15–20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "From the Proceedings of the 24th Convention of the Ev. Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America at Saginaw, Michigan, August 14–19, 1912." Translated by E[gbert] Schaller." *Qu* 54 (July 1957): 173.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Kirchliche-Zeitgeschichtliches: Texas hat einen weiblichen Gouverneur." *LuW* 71 (February 1925): 61.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lectures on the Church, 1890-91," II, 95-7. Cited by P[aul] H. B[urgdorf,] "The Question of 'Personalities' In Religious Controversy." *CL* 2 (May 1941): 58.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Opening Address for the New Student Year, 1930-31, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis." Translated by B .L. Winter. *CTM* 1 (November 1930): 801-3; reprinted in *CN* 30 (17 March 1997): 30, 32.
- Piepkorn, Arthur Carl. "Chaplains' Training Conference." *LW* 60 (18 February 1941): 56.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Does 'Inerrancy' Mean?" *CTM* 36 (September 1965): 577-93.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Where Leaders Stand on Lutheran Union." *AL* 23 (October 1940): 7-9.
- "Planning Ahead." *AL* 6 (December 1923): 1-2.
- "A Pleasant Experience." *AL* 32 (October 1949): 4-5.
- Pless, Waldemar O. "Convention Reports: Union Reports." *NL* 48 (10 September 1961): 295-7.
- Plocher, Karl J. "Why can't we have fellowship with the U. L. C. and the A. L. C?" *NL* 19 (28 August 1932): 278-9; (11 September 1932): 299-301.
- Polack, William G. "Walther's Attitude Toward Lutheran Unity and his Part in the First Free Conferences." *AL* 32 (July 1949): 6-7.
- "Poor Reasoning." *AL* 3 (January 1920): 2.
- "Poor Sophie!" *CL* 22 (December 1961): 193-5.
- "'Popularizing' the Service." *AL* 8 (March 1925): 2-3.
- "Potpourri." *CHIQ* 42 (November 1969): 189.
- Prange, Victor H. "The decade of the '20s." *NL* 74 (December 1987): 406.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The dissolution of the Synodical Conference." *NL* 75 (1 January 1988): 12.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Synodical Conference." *NL* 74 (15 October 1987): 349.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "World War I and the National Lutheran Council." *NL* 74 (1 November 1987): 368.
- "Pray For and With One Another?" *AL* 41 (December 1958): 4.
- "Prayer Fellowship." *AL* 26 (April 1943): 4.

- “Prayer Fellowship.” *AL* 37 (August 1954): 3–4.
- “Predictions for 1975.” *CN* 7 (30 December 1974): 16.
- “Present Stage of the Church-Union Deliberations.” *LW* 58 (14 November 1939): 391–2.
- “Presentation on the Doctrine of the Church.” *NL* 48 (7 May 1961): 151–2.
- “President Naumann Concerning Developments Within the Missouri Synod.” *CL* 26 (January 1965): 3–4.
- Press, Gerhard L. “The Voice Of The C. U. C.: The Military Chaplaincy.” *NL* 43 (27 May 1956): 168–9.
- Press, Philip K. Letter to the Editor. *CHIQ* 44 (February 1971): 31.
- Preus, Jacob A. O. “Integrity, Schism, Neither, Both.” *CT* 19 (25 October 1974): 11–5.
- Preus, Robert D. “Fellowship Concerns: A Study of Some of the Issues in the Questioning of Joining with the American Lutheran Church in Pulpit and Altar Fellowship.” Essay delivered to the Missouri District of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, 24–28 June 1968. Reproduced in *CN* 2 (3 March 1969): 14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “From Norway to Missouri.” *Sem* 45 (May 1958): 33–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Memoirs in Exile, Confessional Hope and Institutional Conflict*, by John H. Tietjen.” *Logia* 1 (October 1992): 65–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Some Hard Facts About Scouting.” *CL* 18 (March 1957): 33–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Walther and the Scriptures.” *CTM* 32 (November 1961): 669–91.
- “The Price That Missouri Is Paying For Its New ‘Unity.’” *CL* 23 (March–April 1962): 41.
- “Princeton Minister Named District Chief.” *PTR*, 23 June 1950, 1.
- “The Problem of Lutheran Unity: An Editorial Program.” *AL* 25 (September 1942): 3–4.
- “The Problem of Lutheran Unity: I. Our Fathers and Prayer Fellowship.” *AL* 26 (August 1943): 6–8.
- “The Problem of Lutheran Unity: 2. Why Did They Pray Together?” *AL* 26 (September 1943): 6.
- “The Problem of Lutheran Unity: V. c. Prayer Fellowship and Unionism.” *AL* 26 (February 1943): 6–8.
- “The Problem of Lutheran Unity: 3. The Voice of the Laity.” *AL* 26 (October 1943): 6–7.
- “The Problem of Lutheran Unity at Saginaw.” *AL* 27 (June 1944): 4.

- “The Problem of Lutheran Unity: The Melting Pot of Lutheran Union.” *AL* 27 (February 1944): 5–6.
- “The Problem of Lutheran Unity: The Trend Toward Confessionalism in the Lutheran Church of America.” *AL* 27 (May 1944): 8–10.
- “Proceedings of the Michigan Dist. Synod assembled at Scio, Mich., 1918.” *NL* 5 (28 July 1918): 115.
- “Proceedings of the 15th Convention of the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Wisconsin and Other States held in the German Evangelical Lutheran Church of Watertown, Wis., June 22 to 28, 1865, Watertown.” Printed by the power-press of the Weltburger office, 1865. Translated by Arnold O. Lehmann. *WHIJ* 14 (October 1996): 3–26; 15 (April 1997): 3–16.
- “Prof. Scharlemann’s Position ‘Not Changed.’” *CL* 23 (November 1962): 119–21.
- “Progress Towards Lutheran Union.” *AL* 21 (September 1938): 5.
- Prokopy, Paul G. “Publish and Conceal Not.” *AL* 7 (July 1924): 6–7.
- “The Proper Place.” *AL* 3 (March 1920): 2.
- “The Prospect for Lutheranism.” *AL* 36 (January 1953): 3–5.
- “Publicity Needed.” *AL* 1 July 1918): 2.
- “Pure Goods in Slovenly Packages.” *AL* 8 (January 1925): 3.
- “‘Put Off Thy Shoes.’” *AL* 34 (January 1951): 4.
- “Questions That Demand Answer in the Matter of the Doctrine of Christ’s Descent into Hell.” *CL* 16 (June 1955): 64–6.
- R., D. “*Grundlage einer Lutherischen Kirchlichen Einigung in Deutschland.*” *LuW* 19 (October 1873): 290.
- R., L. M. “Status of Scharlemann.” *Badger Lutheran* 14 (29 March 1962): 1.
- Raabe, John. “Spiritual Welfare Commission: The S. W. C. Mailing List.” *NL* 31 (28 May 1944): 116.
- “The Radio for Home Missions.” *AL* 8 (October 1925): 7.
- Randolph, Paul. “The Testimony of a Former Scout.” *CL* 12 (August 1951): 89–95.
- “The Recessed Convention of The Lutheran Synodical Conference, May 17–19, 1961.” *NL* 48 (18 June 1961): 199–202.
- Reim, Edmund. “A. L. C. Acceptance of the Common Confession.” *Qu* 48 (January 1951): 59–60.



- \_\_\_\_\_. "A. L. C. Adoption of the Common Confession." *Qu* 47 (October 1950): 316.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Affirmation on Election." *Qu* 42 (October 1945): 270–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "... and then there were three." *Qu* 48 (October 1951): 293–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Another 'Agreement': Communion." *Qu* 48 (April 1951): 141–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Another Merger Invitation." *Qu* 53 (January 1956): 67–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As Others See Us: Separation or Separatism?" *NL* 37 (12 February 1950): 57–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: Adequate?" *NL* 37 (7 May 1950): 152–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: Another Report—Chaplaincy." *NL* 42 (20 March 1955): 87.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: A Bit of History." *NL* 41 (24 January 1954): 23–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: The Chicago Convention." *NL* 41 (12 December 1954): 393.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: The Church Of The Lord." *NL* 38 (20 May 1951): 151–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: The Common Confession: A Year Ago—And Now." *NL* 39 (29 June 1952): 197.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: The Fact Remains . . . ." *NL* 42 (3 April 1955): 103–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: The Fort Wayne Statement." *NL* 37 (5 November 1950): 358–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: The Gist Of The Letter." *NL* 37 (18 June 1950): 202–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: A Grain of Truth." *NL* 41 (10 January 1954): 7–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: The Houston Convention." *NL* 40 (12 July 1953): 210–1, 220.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: The Houston: Number Nineteen." *NL* 40 (26 July 1953): 226–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: Is This The Way?" *NL* 42 (20 February 1955): 58.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: Lest, when I have preached to others . . . ." *NL* 41 (18 April 1954): 124.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: Let's Get This Straight." *NL* 37 (19 November 1950): 295.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: A Letter To Missouri." *NL* 37 (9 April 1950): 131–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: A Little Strength." *NL* 40 (4 October 1953): 310.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: Looking to The Foundation." *NL* 38 (6 May 1951): 134–6.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: The Lutheran High School Problem in Milwaukee." *NL* 39 (13 January 1952): 10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: A Lutheran Mother Speaks." *NL* 39 (27 January 1952): 22–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: A Matter of Method." *NL* 41 (11 July 1954): 221–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: A Matter of Terminology." *NL* 41 (27 June 1954): 198, 205.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: The News: How To Read It." *NL* 41 (25 July 1954): 233.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: . . . The Norwegian Action." *NL* 42 (10 July 1955): 215–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: On Guard—At Work." *NL* 40 (13 December 1953): 392.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: Once More: The Common Confession." *NL* 38 (8 April 1951): 104–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: The Practical Problems." *NL* 39 (13 July 1952): 210–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: The Problem of Church Fellowship." *NL* 38 (3 June 1951): 166–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: The Question Before The House." *NL* 40 (6 September 1953): 285–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: Questions and Answers." *NL* 39 (16 November 1952): 360.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: A Report On Milwaukee." *NL* 37 (16 July 1950): 233–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: A Report—Scouting." *NL* 42 (6 March 1955): 70–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: The Role Of The Synodical Conference." *NL* 37 (30 July 1950): 250–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: The Role Of The Synodical Conference—II." *NL* 37 (10 September 1950): 298–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: A Serviceman Speaks." *NL* 42 (26 June 1955): 200.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: Special Convention Of The Joint Synod Of Wisconsin Held in Milwaukee October 8–9." *NL* 40 (1 November 1953): 344–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: Something to Read." *NL* 41 (21 February 1954): 57.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: Spoken . . . That Ye Should Not Be Offended." *NL* 37 (4 June 1950): 187.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: A State Of Confession." *NL* 39 (7 September 1952): 282–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: Synodical Conference: What Does It Stand For?" *NL* 38 (22 April 1951): 119–20.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: That They All May Be One." *NL* 41 (4 April 1954): 108–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: This 'Common Confession of Faith'—I." *NL* 37 (26 February 1950): 74–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: This 'Common Confession of Faith'—II." *NL* 37 (12 March 1950): 87–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: This 'Common Confession of Faith'—III." *NL* 37 (26 March 1950): 74–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: This Fraternal Word." *NL* 40 (15 November 1953): 362.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: Two Necessary Questions." *NL* 42 (17 April 1955): 120.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: The Unionism of the CC: Antichrist." *NL* 42 (12 June 1955): 183–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: The Unionism of the CC: Justification." *NL* 42 (15 May 1955): 150–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: A Voice From The Past." *NL* 37 (2 July 1950): 218–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: We Count The Cost." *NL* 37 (23 April 1950): 135, 137.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: We Go To St. Paul." *NL* 39 (27 July 1952): 226–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: Who Has Changed?" *NL* 39 (14 December 1952): 396–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: Why?" *NL* 41 (5 September 1954): 279–80.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: Why Not?" *NL* 41 (19 September 1954): 296–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "As We See It: Why So Serious?" *NL* 40 (20 September 1953): 295–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Chicago—What Does It Mean?" *Qu* 44 (October 1947): 283–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Common Confession Missouri and A. L. C." *Qu* 47 (January 1950): 58–60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dean Madson and the *Lutheran Outlook*." *Qu* 46 (January 1949): 61–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Debate on Union: The Chicago Convention." *NL* 34 (31 August 1947): 285–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Debate on Union: Doctrinal Differences in the Synodical Conference?" *NL* 34 (3 August 1947): 245–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Debate on Union: How Did We Get Into It?" *NL* 34 (27 April 1947): 136–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Debate on Union: The Intersynodical Movement." *NL* 34 (20 July 1947): 233–4.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Debate on Union: Scouting in the Lutheran Church." *NL* 34 (22 June 1947): 198–200.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Debate on Union: The Watertown Convention." 34 (14 September 1947): 295–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Debate on Union: What Are The Prospects?" *NL* 34 (8 June 1947): 182–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Debate on Union: Where Do We Stand?" *NL* 34 (11 May 1947): 150 (25 May 1947): 165–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Did Missouri Once Teach 'Election on View of Faith'?" *Qu* 41 (April 1944): 141–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Discussion of 'A Statement.'" *Qu* 43 (January 1946): 61–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dr. Graebner and the *Lutheran Witness*." *Qu* 46 (April 1949): 130–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dr. Sasse on Inspiration and the New Missouri." *Qu* 49 (January 1952): 59–61.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Doctrinal Affirmation." *Qu* 42 (January 1945): 55–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Doctrinal Affirmation—A Closer Scrutiny." *Qu* 42 (April 1945): 55–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Doctrinal Affirmation Revised." *Qu* 43 (October 1946): 288–90.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The End of the Affirmation." *Qu* 44 (January 1947): 64–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Fellowships—or Fellowship?" *Qu* 43 (April 1946): 144–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Frank Statement." *Qu* 46 (July 1949): 210–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Is this the Way toward Unity?" *Qu* 41 (July 1944): 197–200.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lest We Forget." *Qu* 50 (October 1953): 285–92.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lest We Forget." *Qu* 51 (July 1954): 208–14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Let the Record Speak." *Qu* 41 (July 1944): 200–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Editors' Group Urges Lutheran Federation." *Qu* 45 (October 1948): 270–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Free Conferences—Who Is Inviting Whom?" *NL* 36 (17 July 1949): 227.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Students Serve as Scout Camp Chaplains." *Qu* 51 (April 1954): 138.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Milwaukee Resolutions on the Common Confession." *Qu* 47 (July 1950): 239–41.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Missouri and the American Lutheran Church." *Qu* 44 (April 1947): 132–4.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Missouri and the National Lutheran Council." *Qu* 47 (April 1950): 136–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Missouri Synod Again Upholds Doctrinal Agreement." *Qu* 50 (July 1953): 211–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Missouri's Saginaw Convention on Union." *Qu* 41 (October 1944): 262.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A New Approach to Lutheran Union." *NL* 33 (24 November 1946): 371.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "New Lutheran Award Set For Scout Leaders." *Qu* 53 (January 1956): 70–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Norwegian Action." *Qu* 52 (July 1955): 213–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Norwegian Action on 'Common Confession.'" *Qu* 48 (July 1951): 203–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "On Religious Awards." *NL* 42 (13 November 1955): 365–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "An Overture and a Reply." *Qu* 46 (July 1949): 207–10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "An Overture for Lutheran Unity." *Qu* 41 (April 1944): 135–41.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Problem of Scriptural Proof." *Qu* 54 (January 1957): 1–13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Religion On The Battlefield—Sectarian Lines Vanish As Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish Chaplains Hold Services for Men and Women of All Faiths in Midst of War." *Qu* 42 (July 1945): 204–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Scouting in the Lutheran Church." *NL* 34 (22 June 1947): 198–200; (6 July 1947): 218–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Grace for Grace: A Brief History of the Norwegian Synod*, by S. C. Ylvisaker. *Qu* 40 (October 1943): 300–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Prayer Fellowship*, by Theodore Graebner. *Qu* 43 (April 1946): 157–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Scouting Must Go On." *Qu* 40 (July 1943): 213–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Slovak Resolutions on the 'Common Confession.'" *Qu* 48 (October 1951): 285–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Society of St. James." *Qu* 44 (October 1947): 284–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Statement." *Qu* 43 (January 1946): 56–62.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'A Statement' Withdrawn." *Qu* 44 (April 1947): 135.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Strength of Christian Unity." *Qu* 37 (October 1940): 240–74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Synodical Conference Report." *Qu* 52 (January 1955): 62–4.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Tide of Union." *Qu* 46 (January 1949): 60–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Time to Keep Silence, A Time to Speak." *NL* 34 (13 April 1947): 115.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Twenty-Five Lutheran Army and Air Force Chaplains." *Qu* 49 (January 1952): 61–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Union, Unity, Unionism." *NL* 34 (13 April 1947): 119–20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "An Understanding and A Misunderstanding." *Qu* 50 (April 1950): 136–40.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice Of The C. U. C.: Cooperation in Externals." *NL* 48 (15 April 1956): 120–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Voice of Missouri—Which Is It?" *Qu* 44 (January 1947): 70–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Constitutes False Doctrine?" *Qu* 51 (April 1954): 81–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Where Do We Stand? The Point of the Question." *NL* 36 (30 January 1949): 37.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Where Do We Stand? Still More Problems: Cooperation." *NL* 36 (24 April 1949): 133–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Where Do We Stand? VIII. A Strong Position." *NL* 36 (8 May 1949): 154–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Where Do We Stand? II. We Face A Trend." *NL* 36 (13 February 1949): 56–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Where Do We Stand? V. We Have a Problem: Scouting." *NL* 36 (27 March 1949): 106–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Where Do We Stand? We Have Another Problem: L. M. A." *NL* 36 (10 April 1949): 119–20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Where Do We Stand? III. We Judge The Trend." *NL* 36 (27 February 1949): 70–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Where Do We Stand? IV. We Resist The Trend." *NL* 36 (13 March 1949): 87–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Who Has Changed?" *NL* 39 (14 December 1952): 396–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wisconsin on the 'Common Confession.'" *Qu* 48 (October 1951): 286–91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Wisconsin Reaction." *Qu* 53 (October 1956): 291–300.
- Reiss, W. J. "Chaplain, You Lutherans." *LW* 60 (25 December 1941): 419–20.
- "Relation of Synodical Conference to National Lutheran Commission." *LW* 37 (9 July 1918): 219; reprinted in *NL* 5 (8 September 1918): 144.
- "The Relationship of Dr. Scharlemann's Attack on Holy Scripture to the Confessional Conflict Within the Missouri Synod in General." *CL* 20 (December 1959): 129–32.

- “Reminiscences from Professor August Pieper.” *WHIJ* 1 (Fall 1983): 49–56.
- “A Report and Appraisal of the Convention of the Missouri Synod at St. Paul, 1956.” *CL* 18 (February 1957): 17–21.
- “A Report by the Wisconsin Synod Committee on Church Union.” *CL* 13 (November 1952): 124–5.
- “A Report by the Wisconsin Synod Committee on Church Union.” *NL* 39 (7 November 1952): 281–2.
- “Report of Committee for Doctrinal Unity.” *LW* 62 (11 May 1943): 162–3.
- “Report of the Twenty-Second Delegate Synod (Thirty-Seventh Regular Convention) of the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, Assembled at Saint Louis, Mo., June 15–24, 1938.” *LW* 57 (12 July 1938): 233–4.
- Repp, Arthur C. “The Binding Nature of Synodical Resolutions for a Pastor or Professor of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.” *CTM* 41 (March 1971): 153–62.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Changes in the Missouri Synod.” *CTM* 38 (July–August 1967): 458–78.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Editorial.” *CHIQ* 43 (November 1970): 147.
- “Re-Statement of Editorial Policy.” *AL* 37 (April 1954): 3.
- “Resolution Re: The Common Confession.” *LB* 8 (September 1951): 135.
- “Results Are Tests Of Loyalty.” *MS*, 11 May 1950, 1:18.
- Reu, D. Michael. “*Muessen die Verhaendlungen mit Missouri nun aufhoeren?*” *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 65 (October 1941): 577–607.
- “The Rightful Claims of the English Language in the Lutheran Church.” *LW* 5 (21 November 1886): 100; (7 December 1886): 108; (21 December 1886): 116; (7 January 1887): 124; (21 January 1887): 132; (7 February 1887): 140.
- Robinson, Jack T. “The Brux Case.” *CuThM* 4 (June 1977): 143–50.
- Robinson, Stewart M. “The Box Butte Overture.” *Presbyterian* 110 (14 March 1940): 6.
- Roehrs, Walter R. “Our Anniversaries (1855–1955) (1930–1955).” *CTM* 26 (December 1955): 881–4.
- Rohrman, H. F. “Our Lutheran Centers.” *NL* 5 (22 September 1918): 146–7.
- “The Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Mass in the Missouri Synod.” *CL* 18 (March 1957): 30–1.
- “Rom. 16, 17.” *CL* 1 (April 1940): 35.

- Rubel, Warren G. "Pathos and Polemic in Missouri: Tacit Dimensions." *Cre* 29 (April 1976): 22–32.
- Ruff, G. Elson. "The Church in Convention in Louisville." *Lu* 25 (28 October 1942): 39.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "In Conclusion." *Lu* 44 (13 June 1962): 50.
- "Ruff on Missouri." *AL* 33 (September 1950): 4–5.
- Ruhland, Fr. "*Kirchliche Nachrichten aus dem noerdlichen Wisconsin.*" *DL* 17 (18 September 1860): 20–2.
- Ruhland, C. F. T., Chr. Hochstetter, and M. C. Barthel. "*Das Buffaloer Colloquium.*" *DL* 23 (15 December 1866): 57–8.
- Runge, David A. "Delegates Divided on Synod's Stand." *MJ*, 10 August 1961, 2:1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Faculty Member Quits in Lutheran Dispute." *MJ*, 15 August 1961, 1:1, 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Hint Some Clergymen May Pull Out of Synod." *MJ*, 13 August 1961, 1:18.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutherans Sever Relations." *CC* 78 (20 September 1961): 1124.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Missouri Synod Head Denies Doctrinal Rift." *MJ*, 11 August 1961, 2:1, 8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Partnership in School Ended by Synod Split." *MJ*, 2 September 1961, 2:4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sharp Debate Erupts at Lutheran Meeting." *MJ*, 17 August 1961, 2:1, 15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Split Widens, Synod Hears." *MJ*, 8 August 1961, 1:1, 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Synod Opens Debate on Lutheran Dispute." *MJ*, 16 August 1961, 2:1, 8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wisconsin Synod Votes to Split With Missouri." *MJ*, 18 August 1961, 1:1, 10.
- Ryden, E. E. "Lutherans Grapple with War Problems." *LC* 49 (6 February 1941): 163–4.
- S., F. "Prohibition and the Saloon." *NL* 4 (21 April 1917): 61–3; (7 May 1917): 68–9.
- "A Sad Day for the Synodical Conference." *LB* 18 (September 1961): 130.
- "St. John's of Princeton Observes Stroschein's Fiftieth." *NL* 67 (9 September 1980): 368.
- "The St. Louis Faculty in the Controversy Concerning the Word of God." *CL* 22 (October 1961): 157–63.
- "The St. Louis Faculty Speaks Again." *AL* 45 (May 1962): 3–4.



“St. Louis Seminary Faculty Adopts a Position of Its Own on Holy Scripture.” *CL* 21 (November 1960): 130–2.

“San Francisco Convention.” *AL* 42 (August 1959): 3–4.

Sasse, Hermann. “Selective Fellowship.” *Australasian Review* 28 (September 1957): 45–62.

Scaer, David P. “Missouri at the End of the Century: A Time for Reevaluation.” *Logia* 7 (Epiphany 1998): 39–52.

Schaefer, James P. “And Another Synod Speaks.” *NL* 41 (8 August 1954): 244.

\_\_\_\_\_. “From this corner.” *NL* 71 (December 1984): 338.

\_\_\_\_\_. “From this corner.” *NL* 72 (1 January 1985): 2.

\_\_\_\_\_. “From this corner.” *NL* 72 (15 October 1985): 335.

\_\_\_\_\_. “From this corner.” *NL* 75 (1 February 1988): 59.

\_\_\_\_\_. “From this corner.” *NL* 76 (1 January 1989): 19.

\_\_\_\_\_. “From this corner.” *NL* 77 (1 February 1990): 59.

\_\_\_\_\_. “From this corner.” *NL* 77 (1 May 1990): 179.

\_\_\_\_\_. “From this corner.” *NL* 78 (1 February 1991): 59.

\_\_\_\_\_. “A Pertinent Letter.” *NL* 49 (25 March 1962): 93.

\_\_\_\_\_. “A Reply from Wisconsin.” *AL* 45 (April 1962): 24.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Stewards of the Mysteries of God in Today’s World.” *WLQ* 74 (October 1977): 282–305.

Schaefer, William J. “Be Not Deceived.” *NL* 30 (24 January 1943): 19–20.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Boy Scout Issue.” *NL* 28 (1 June 1941): 170–1.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Boy Scouts And The Missouri Synod.” *NL* 32 (10 June 1945): 122.

\_\_\_\_\_. “A Case in Point.” *NL* 30 (24 January 1943): 20–1.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Chaplains Are Popular.” *NL* 42 (27 November 1955): 372.

\_\_\_\_\_. “A Hybrid Arrangement.” *NL* 35 (18 January 1948): 19.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Is Union Necessary?” *NL* 30 (24 January 1943): 20.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Isolation." *NL* 29 (15 November 1942): 356–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Meeting of the Synodical Conference." *NL* 39 (24 August 1952): 260.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Meeting of the Synodical Conference." *NL* 41 (12 December 1954): 390.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Missouri's Troubles." *NL* 37 (4 June 1950): 180.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 1947 Convention of Joint Synod." *NL* 34 (31 August 1947): 275.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Our Sixteen Thousand Boys." *NL* 31 (19 March 1944): 66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Our Soldier Boys." *NL* 27 (17 November 1940): 356.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Pleasant Experience." *NL* 36 (28 August 1949): 275.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Princeton Issue." *NL* 37 (4 June 1950): 180–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Read the Article." *NL* 36 (22 May 1949): 163.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Scouting in the Light of Scripture*. *Qu* 43 (July 1946): 221–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Road of the Unionists—Where Does It Lead?" *NL* 27 (15 December 1940): 387.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Shameful Distortion." *NL* 37 (28 October 1950): 324.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Siftings." *NL* 29 (29 November 1942): 377.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Siftings." *NL* 35 (21 November 1948): 373.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Siftings." *NL* 36 (22 May 1949): 168.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Siftings." *NL* 36 (17 July 1949): 233.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Siftings: National Lutheran Council." *NL* 34 (30 March 1947): 104.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Some More Unionism." *NL* 35 (10 October 1948): 323.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "This We Can Do." *NL* 28 (9 February 1941): 37.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Timely Warning." *NL* 32 (10 June 1945): 122.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Veterans of Foreign Wars." *Qu* 46 (January 1949) 63–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "We Are Not Alone." *NL* 37 (12 March 1950): 84.
- Schaller, Egbert. "A Brief Catechism On Unionism." *NL* 37 (7 May 1950): 155–6.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Can Lutherans Get Together?" *NL* 37 (18 June 1950): 196.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Concerning Christian Brotherhood and Christian Fellowship: Their Relationship and Certain Practical Questions Involved." *Qu* 45 (April 1948): 87–97.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Confused Policies." *NL* 38 (6 May 1951): 132.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Has It Come To This?" *NL* 38 (25 March 1951): 84.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Is God's Will 'Expendable'?" *NL* 38 (6 May 1951): 132.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Newspaper Reporter's Opinion of the Wisconsin Synod." *NL* 38 (9 September 1951): 274.
- \_\_\_\_\_, translator. "What Is Meant By The Commingling of Religions.'" *NL* 37 (7 May 1950): 155.
- Schaller, John. "Lutheran Brotherhoods of America." *Qu* 17 (January 1920): 86.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Election and Conversion: A Frank Discussion of Dr. F. Pieper's Book on "Conversion and Election,"* by Leanders S. Keyser. *Qu* 11 (April 1914): 140–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Religion and Drink*, by E. A. Wasson. *Qu* 12 (October 1915): 276–9.
- Schaller, Winfred, Jr. "Unionism." *NL* 42 (11 December 1955): 388–9.
- Scharf, Erwin R. "Spiritual Welfare Commission." *NL* 30 (13 June 1943): 186–8.
- Scharlemann, Martin H. "God Is One." *LQ* 11 (August 1959): 230–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "God's Acts As Revelation." *CTM* 32 (April 1961): 209–16.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Lutheran Church and Its American Environment." *CTM* 26 (August 1955): 597–602.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Mob is Coming." *CHIQ* 49 (Fall 1976): 123–30.
- Scharlemann, Robert P. "Letters to the Editor—The Scientist and Genesis I: a Reply." *The Lutheran Scholar* 20 (April 1963): 36–9.
- Scheidt, David L. "Some Effects of World War I on the General Synod and General Council." *CHIQ* 43 (May 1970): 83–92.
- Schick, George. "The Columbus Conference and its Repercussions, I." *LW* 55 (13 May 1941): 168.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "News." *LW* 63 (5 January 1943): 2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "News." *LW* 64 (8 May 1945): 146.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "News." *LW* 64 (9 October 1945): 330.
- Schiotz, Fredrick A. "The Church's Confessional Stand Relative to the Scriptures." Prepared for distribution by the Office of Public Relations of The American Lutheran Church, 4, 7. Reproduced in *CN* 2 (3 March 1969): 27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Lutheran Church and Her Students." *AL* 23 (October 1940): 9–10.
- Schleuter, E. Benj. "Spiritual Welfare Commission." *NL* 31 (20 February 1944): 54.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Spiritual Welfare Work More Necessary Than Ever." *NL* 29 (22 February 1942): 53.
- Schmelder, William J. "The Predestinarian Controversy: Review and Reflection." *CJ* 1 (January 1975): 21–33.
- Schmidt, George P. "Concordia–Fort Wayne in the Early Twentieth Century." *CHIQ* 47 (Fall 1974): 103–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reminiscences of Concordia Seminary in the Early Twentieth Century." *CHIQ* 43 (May 1970): 79–82.
- Schmidt, W. J. "*Quo Vadis?*" *NL* 52 (3 October 1965): 308–9.
- Schmiel, David. "State Synods and Geographic Parishes: The Abortive Movement of the 1870s." *CHIQ* 38 (January 1966): 191–6.
- Schramm, E. W. "News Jottings." *LS* 108 (29 July 1950): 10.
- Schroeder, M. C. "What Ought To Be Our Attitude in Respect to 'The Boy Scouts of America'?" *NL* 16 (23 June 1929): 197–200; (7 July 1929): 215–8.
- Schroeder, Morton. "The magazine debuts." *NL* 76 (15 March 1989): 108–9.
- Schuetze, Armin W. "Are Only Personal Interpretations Keeping Lutherans Apart?" *NL* 47 (23 October 1960): 345, 350.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dr. Siegbert W. Becker, 1914–1984." *WLQ* 81 (Fall 1984): 243–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Evading the Issue." *WLQ* 59 (January 1962): 56–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Foreword—1969, The Other Five Percent." *WLQ* 66 (January 1969): 3–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Foreword—1972, Lessons From the Past." *WLQ* 69 (January 1972): 3–12.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Foreword for Volume 65: A Last Vestige Disappears." *WLQ* 65 (January 1968) 3–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "How is the Word 'Beseech' To Be Understood in Romans 16:17?" *NL* 49 (15 July 1962): 215.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "In Joint Prayer, Is Only the Content to be Considered?" *NL* 52 (4 April 1965): 102.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "An Investigation Of The Common Confession's Statement on 'Election.'" *NL* 38 (4 November 1951): 341-2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Joining Together in Prayer and the Lord's Supper: The Scriptural Principles of Fellowship Applied to Prayer and Holy Communion." *WLQ* 93 (Spring 1996): 114-37.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "May We Pray At Table With People Not of the Wisconsin Synod?" *NL* 48 (22 October 1961): 342, 350.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Missouri's New Direction," *WLQ* 59 (October 1962): 287-9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Muehlhaeuser, Founding Father of the Wisconsin Synod." *WLQ* 72 (July 1975): 194-210.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Other Five Per Cent." *NL* 56 (13 April 1968): 131-2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Professor Heinrich J. Vogel." *WLQ* 79 (Spring 1982): 83-4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Professor Irwin J. Habeck, 1904-1984." *WLQ* 81 (Summer 1984): 163-5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Shall I join a congregation of the American Lutheran Church?" *NL* 47 (31 January 1960): 40-1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Theologians' Conference, July 20-30, 1960." *NL* 47 (28 August 1960): 277-8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "This We Believe." *WLQ* 64 (July 1967): 214-5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The WELS and the LCMS—Where Are We Now?" *WLQ* 85 (Fall 1988): 261-84.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Who May Serve As Organist?" *NL* 55 (November 1968): 386.
- Schulz, Paul. "Dr. C. F. W. Walther's Book, 'That the Evangelical Lutheran Church is the True Visible Church of God on Earth.'" *CTM* 10 (January 1939): 25-37.
- Schulze, Eldor P. "A Letter to Missouri." *CT* 22 (21 November 1960): 148-50.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Lutherans." *American Mercury* 8 (1926): 308-16.
- Schumann, Walter A. "Romans 16:17,18." *Qu* 38 (October 1941): 260-72.
- "The Second Columbus Conference." *LC* 50 (4 June 1942): 712-5; (18 June 1942): 781-4.
- "The Secret of Successful Church Advertising." *AL* 6 (December 1923): 1.
- "Semantics Mentioned in Dispute on Doctrine." *MJ*, 5 August 1961, 2:4.

- “Services By Radio.” *AL* 6 (January 1923): 2.
- Sieck, H. “Church News and Comment.” *LW* 22 (24 September 1903): 157–8.
- Siegler, Oscar. “An Investigation Of The Common Confession’s Statement on The Last Things.” *NL* 38 (2 December 1951): 378–9.
- “Significant Year.” *AL* 41 (January 1958): 3–4.
- “The Silver Cord.” *Christian Herald* 66 (June 1943): 21.
- “The Sin of Separation.” *AL* 32 (December 1949): 3–4.
- Sitz, E. Arnold. “An Open Letter.” *NL* 40 (13 December 1953): 395.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Observations on Ecumenicity.” *Qu* 51 (January 1954): 1–17.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Voice Of The C. U. C.: On the Defense of the Common Confession.” *NL* 43 (29 April 1956): 136–7.
- Skov, Bunde. “Intersynodical Attitudes.” *AL* 24 (June 1941): 8–9.
- “The Slogan Contest, Time Extended to April 15, 1928.” *AL* 11 (March 1928): 9.
- Smith, Harry H. “Let Us Be Charitable.” *CL* 1 (December 1940): 76–7.
- “Some Recent Instances of the Leaven of High-Churchism Within the Missouri Synod.” *CL* 19 (July–August 1958): 75–8.
- Sommer, Martin S. “America’s Religious Liberty.” *LW* 41 (3 January 1922): 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Avoid Them!” *CL* 7 (August 1946): 100.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Birth Control and Divorces.” *LW* 46 (11 January 1927): 8–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Christians in other Churches.” *LW* 39 (16 March 1920): 83–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Dance.” *LW* 34 (6 April 1915): 110.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Demand for Lutheran Union.” *LW* 53 (5 June 1934): 208–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The English Language in the Missouri Synod.” *CHIQ* 10 (October 1937): 65–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Fruits of the Chaplains’ Work.” *LW* 65 (9 April 1946): 120.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Morality and the Stage.” *LW* 34 (27 July 1915): 235.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reminiscences of My Student Days at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., from 1889 to 1892." *CHIQ* 12 (April 1939): 14–21.
- Sommer, Roger L. "The Golden Anniversary. An Old District with New People, An Old Cause with New Objectives." *CHIQ* 24 (April 1961): 1–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Martin Samuel Sommer (1869–1949)." *CHIQ* 23 (October 1950): 123–131; (January 1951): 159–69.
- Spaude, H. H. "Our Synod: Twenty-Third Meeting of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, at New Ulm, Minnesota, August 7–14, 1935." *NL* 22 (15 September 1935): 297–8.
- "Special Report." *LW* 80 (26 December 1961): 634–6.
- "Spiritual Welfare Commission." *NL* 32 (18 March 1945): 56.
- "Spiritual Welfare Commission: '1916 E. Thomas Avenue.'" *NL* 30 (7 February 1943): 38–40.
- Spitz, Lewis W. "The Public Pulse." *AL* 7 (March 1924): 4–5.
- "Splinter Group Organizes." *Lu* 43 (15 February 1961): 8–9.
- "Split Regretted by Synod Leader." *MJ*, 19 August 1961, 1:7.
- "Suspended, Not Discontinued." *AL* 37 (November 1954): 3.
- "State Synod Loses Church." *MJ* 14 August 1961, 2:14.
- "A Statement." *AL* 28 (November 1945): 4.
- "A Statement." *CHIQ* 18 (November 1970): 150–2.
- "Statement Buries Problems Says 'The Lutheran's' Editor." *LS* 108 (22 April 1950): 11.
- "A Statement on the Form and Function of the Holy Scriptures." *LW* 80 (4 April 1961): 160–1.
- "Statements to the Synodical Conference Convention." *CL* 24 (January 1963): 9–11.
- Stein, Henry F. A. "Dr. C. F. W. Walther." *CHIQ* 9 (October 1936): 74–9.
- Steinbach, F. "*Neueste Praxis der Wisconsin Synode im Missioniren unter den Deutschen.*" *DL* 17 (5 March 1861): 116.
- Stellhorn, F. W. "Meeting of the Intersynodical Conference at Ft. Wayne, Ind., October 24 and 25." *LS* 64 (3 November 1906): 694.
- "Still Living." *AL* 3 (January 1920): 2.

- Stoeckhardt, George. "Die Lehrdifferenzen zwischen Missouri und Ohio." *LuW* 50 (October 1904): 441. Cited by P[aul] H. B[urgdorf], "The Unalterable Prerequisite of Fellowship Among Confessional Lutherans." *CL* 2 (February 1941): 13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Der Saloon." *DL* 64 (7 April 1908): 106–8; (21 April 1908): 123–5.
- "The Story Behind 40 Years of Scouting." *PTR*, 2 February 1950, 1.
- "The Stranger Within Our Gates." *AL* 19 (August 1936): 3–5.
- "Straw Men." *AL* 23 (February 1940): 3–4.
- Streufert, F. C. "News From Our 'Boys Under the Flag' as reported by Our Camp Pastors." *NL* 5 (13 January 1918): 10.
- Strietelmeier, John. "Reflections of a Loyal Oppositionist." *Cre* 34 (April 1971): 27.
- Stumpf, Eric C. "Memories of Graduates, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1910–1923." *CHIQ* 59 (Spring 1986): 13–25.
- "'Substantia progress' marks meetings with CLC." *NL* 77 (15 April 1990): 153.
- Suelflow, August R. "Concordia Magazine." *CHIQ* 21 (April 1948): 3–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Fathers' Faith—The Children's Language: The First Seventy-Five Years of the *Lutheran Witness*." *CHIQ* 30 (Fall 1957): 130–41; (Winter 1958): 182–8; 31 (April 1958): 7–26.
- Suelflow, Roy Arthur. "Franz August Otto Pieper: Orthodoxist or Confessionalist?" *LHC* 8 (1979): 42–56.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The History of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Part I." *CHIQ* 24 (July 1951): 49–68.
- "A Summary and Evaluation of Dr. Martin H. Scharlemann's Attack on Scripture in His Essay, 'The Bible as Record, Witness, and Medium.'" *CL* 20 (December 1959): 125–9.
- Surburg, Raymond. "The Historical Method in Biblical Interpretation." *CTM* 23 (February 1952): 81–104.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Significance of Luther's Hermeneutics for the Protestant Reformation." *CTM* 24 (April 1953): 241–61.
- "Surveying the Field." *AL* 7 (October 1924): 2–3.
- "Synod Group Will Watch Wisconsin." *MS*, 2 September 1961.
- "Synod Urged to Place Emphasis on Theology." *MJ* 12 August 1961, 1:7.



- “Synodical Break Postponed.” *Lu* 43 (4 January 1961): 6.
- “Synodical Conference.” *AL* 33 (August 1950): 4.
- “The Synodical Conference Continues.” *AL* 46 (January 1963): 7.
- “Synodical Conference Essay.” *Cru* 1 (March–April 1939): 17–8.
- “Synodical Conference May Disband.” *Lu* 45 (21 November 1962): 7–8.
- “Synodical Conference Won’t Quit.” *Lu* 45 (21 November 1962): 8–9.
- “Synodical Conference 1954.” *NL* 41 (8 August 1954): 244.
- Tappert, Theodore G. “Intercommunion in 1866.” *CHIQ* 40 (April 1967): 42.
- Teuscher, Robert H. “‘No compromise,’ says Dr. Preus.” *StLG–D*, 29 January 1974. Reproduced in *CN* 7 (4 February 1974): 7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Preus charges Tietjen fueling Concordia split.” *StLG–D*, 29 January 1974. Reproduced in *CN* 7 (28 January 1974): 9.
- “Termites at Work Here.” *MS*, 11 May 1950, 1:18.
- “Theologians’ Conference to Meet at Seminary in Mequon.” *NL* 47 (17 July 1960): 235–6.
- “There Must Be An Answer.” *PTR*, 18 May 1950, 1.
- “*Thesen zur kurzen Darlegung der Lehrstellung der Missourisynode.*” *CTM* 2 (May 1931): 321–36.
- “Theses on Scouting in the Lutheran Church.” *NL* 32 (19 August 1945): 172–4.
- Thiele, Gilbert A. “Easter Hope: Resurrection of the Body or Immortality of the Soul?” *Sem* 48 (March 1957): 15–21.
- Tietjen, John H. “Piercing the Smokescreen: Toward an Understanding of the issues in the Missouri Synod.” *CT* 19 (11 April 1975): 8–10.
- Tiffany, Henry W. “One Reason for the Dearth of Baptist Chaplains.” *The Watchman-Examiner* 125 (8 July 1943): 648–9.
- “The Time After Confessional Lines Had Been Clearly Drawn.” *NL* 48 (26 March 1961): 101–2.
- “A Time for Patience and Understanding.” *AL* 44 (July 1961): 3–5.
- “To Pray or Not to Pray.” *Time*, 8 August 1960, 63.

- Toepel, Adolf. "Wird durch Sussension der Synodalgemeinschaft die Glaubensgemeinschaft oder 'Bruderschaft' aufgehoben." *Qu* 3 (April 1906): 65–87.
- Toepper, Robert M. "Rationale for Preservation of the German Language in the Missouri Synod of the Nineteenth Century." *CHIQ* 41 (November 1968): 156–67.
- Toppe, Carleton. "A Bad Press." *NL* 48 (18 June 1961): 195.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Better, A Hallowed Memory." *NL* 51 (12 January 1964): 3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Confession Of Our House." *NL* 49 (21 October 1962): 323.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Different Language." *NL* 51 (12 July 1964): 215.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dreadful Unawareness." *NL* 64 (30 October 1977): 351, 361.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Drifting." *NL* 48 (24 September 1961): 307.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Facade Continued." *NL* 52 (19 September 1965): 291.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Grace That Has Spared Us." *NL* 61 (5 May 1974): 131.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Innovations?" *NL* 49 (25 March 1962): 83, 90.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Misericordia." *NL* 58 (14 February 1971): 51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "No Middle 'Between Two Extremes.'" *NL* 62 (19 October 1975): 331.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Prayer for The Missouri Synod." *NL* 58 (4 July 1971): 215.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Progressive Traditionalists?" *NL* 48 (10 September 1961): 291.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reversing Time and Tide." *NL* 60 (26 August 1973): 263.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Shaping the Image." *NL* 54 (9 July 1967): 215.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Small Synoditis." *NL* 47 (6 November 1960): 355.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Solid Lutheran backing." *NL* 45 (31 August 1958): 275.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'They Want to Be, So They Say They Are.'" *NL* 45 (12 October 1958): 323.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Thinking Hasn't Done It.'" *NL* 56 (7 December 1969): 439.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Time-Honored Warning Against Present Dangers to the Church from Pharisaism." *Qu* 48 (July 1951): 185–203; (October 1951): 267–79.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "To One Ere Now a Brother." *NL* 51 (8 March 1964): 67, 75.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "To Prove What Is Right." *NL* 48 (30 July 1961): 243.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Western Wisconsin District Convention." *NL* 45 (3 August 1958): 248–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "With Flags Flying." *NL* 52 (25 July 1965): 227.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "You Can't Go Home Again." *NL* 49 (12 August 1962): 243.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Your Convention: Union Matters." *NL* 44 (1 September 1957): 283.
- "Toward Lutheran Union: Dr. Paul H. Buehring Sees in the Latest Book on This Subject a Most Hopeful Sign of Progress." *LS* 101 (21 August 1943): 2.
- "Tragic Misunderstandings." *AL* 24 (November 1941): 3.
- Trinklein, O. H. "New York Lutherans and World War I." *CHIQ* 40 (April 1967): 2.
- Troeger, Walter F. "Does Religious Broadcasting Pay?" *AL* 14 (August 1931): 12.
- "Two-thirds Better Than Nothing." *LC* 50 (4 June 1942): 707–8
- Uhlig, Walter D. "Eighteen Sixty-Eight—Year of Involvement." *CHIQ* 41 (August 1968): 99–112.
- "U[nited] B[rethren] Church Will Honor Boy Scouts." *PTR*, 9 February 1950, 1.
- "Unionism Marches On." *CL* 13 (February 1952): 24.
- "Unionism or Separatism." *AL* 23 (January 1940): 5.
- "University Training." *AL* 3 (July 1920): 2.
- "U. S. Islands Bombed as Japs Start War." *MS*, 8 December 1941, 1:1.
- "*Vereinige mit der U. L. C.?*" *Kirchenblatt* 77 (25 August 1934): 3.
- "*Verhandlungen: Temperenz-Gesellschaft.*" *DL* 10 (6 December 1853): 62.
- Vogel, Heinrich. "Civilian Chaplains." *WLQ* 68 (July 1971): 200–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dissolution of the Lutheran Synodical Conference." *WLQ* 65 (January 1968): 61–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Evangelical Lutherans in Mission (ELIM)." *WLQ* 71 (January 1974): 62–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Issues Before the Anaheim Convention." *WLQ* 72 (July 1975): 258–64.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Missouri's Troubles Continue." *WLQ* 71 (July 1974): 227–31.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Publication of *Gemeinde-Blatt* Ends." *WLQ* 67 (January 1970): 60–1.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles." *WLQ* 69 (July 1972): 200–10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Theologians' Conference." *WLQ* 59 (October 1962): 295–300.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Troubled Missouri." *WLQ* 71 (April 1974): 141–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Unofficial Journalism." *WLQ* 77 (April 1980): 130–1.
- "A Voice in the Wilderness." *CL* 22 (December 1961): 195–6.
- "Volume XXV, Number 1." *AL* 25 (January 1942): 3.
- von Rohr Sauer, Philip. "The Rev. Philip von Rohr: Devoted Pioneer Pastor and Leader of the Wisconsin Synod." *WHIJ* 5 (Spring 1987): 3–20.
- Voss, Arthur P. "History of the 'Theses on Scouting in the Lutheran Church.'" *NL* 32 (19 August 1945): 170.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Convention Proceedings." *NL* 32 (2 September 1945): 181–2.
- Voss, Luther. "Pastor E. R. Blakewell." *NL* 53 (21 February 1965): 60.
- W. "Church News and Comment." *LW* 23 (5 May 1904): 77.
- W., J. F. "Church News and Comments." *LW* 25 (15 November 1906): 182.
- Walther, Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm. "*Die falschen Stuetzen der modernen Theorie von den offenen Fragen.*" *LuW* 14 (April 1868): 100–14; (June 1868): 161–9; (July 1868): 120–2; (August 1868): 233–40; (October 1868): 297–305. Translated by William Arndt and Alex Guebert. "The False Arguments for the Modern Theory of Open Questions." *CTM* 10 (April 1939): 254–62; (May 1939): 351–7; (June 1939): 415–20; (July 1939): 507–13; (August 1939): 587–95; (September 1939): 656–66; (October 1939): 752–59; (November 1939): 827–34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Fidelity to the Written Word: The Burden of the Missouri Synod." Foreword to *Lehre und Wehre*, 1860. Reprinted in *CJ* 1 (March 1975) 69–85.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Foreword of *Lehre und Wehre*, for 1862 (Vol.8)." Translated by William F. Arndt. *CTM* 26 (December 1955): 893–912.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "*Wieder eine Friedenbotschaft.*" *DL* 25 (1 November 1868): 37–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Want Conference Disbanded." *Lu* 43 (13 September 1961): 4–5.
- "War Ended! Truman Tells Nation." *MJ*, 14 August 1945, 1:1.
- "The Watertown Lutheran Conference." *LS* 61 (23 May 1903): 331.
- "We Are Puzzled." *AL* 26 (January 1943): 4–5.

- “We Contend for God’s Word.” *AL* 26 (January 1943): 5–6.
- “We Contend for God’s Word—Again.” *AL* 26 (February 1943): 3–4.
- “We Speak for Participation.” *AL* 26 (January 1943): 6.
- “We Object and We Regret.” *AL* 23 (November 1940): 3.
- Webber, Frederick R. “Are We Evading The Real Issue?” *CL* 1 (June 1940): 36–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Shall We Fold Up?” *AL* 18 (February 1935): 16–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Synodical Conference Still the Largest Body in America.” *NL* 5 (14 July 1918): 110–1.
- Wehausen, Martin J. “Convention of the Synodical Conference, Mankato, Minnesota, August 10 to 15, 1932.” *NL* 19 (25 September 1932): 310–1.
- Wehmeier, Waldemar W. “Missouri and Public Doctrine.” *CuThM* 2 (February 1975): 23–31.
- Wehrwein, L. “On Religious Awards.” *NL* 42 (13 November 1955): 365–6.
- Wenchel, J. F. “Service Center at National Capital is Dedicated.” *LW* 63 (9 May 1944): 156.
- Wendland, Ernst H. “An Investigation Of The Common Confession’s Statement on ‘Justification.’” *NL* 38 (7 October 1951): 311–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Our Synod’s First Mission Overseas.” *WHIJ* 2 (Spring 1984): 34–45.
- Wentz, Abdel Ross. “Clutz and Walther Meet and . . . .” *CHIQ* 45 (August 1972): 219–22.
- Werth, Charles E. “Fiddle-Playing Teacher.” *CHIQ* 53 (Fall 1980): 11–3.
- Westerhaus, Martin O. “Adolph Hoenecke and the *Quartalschrift*.” *WLQ* 76 (January 1979): 41–51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Confessional Lutheran Emigrations from Prussia and Saxony around 1839.” *WLQ* 86 (Fall 1989): 247–64; 87 (Winter 1990): 38–60; (Spring 1990): 123–36; (Summer 1990): 192–208; (Fall 1990): 283–93; 88 (Winter 1991): 34–63.
- Westerhaus, Gustav A. “Why Do We Still Stress the Study of German at our Synodical Institutions?” *NL* 23 (19 July 1936): 233–4.
- Weyland, Victor J. “Doctrinal Matters.” *NL* 49 (2 December 1962): 376–7.
- “What About the Mandate Given at the San Francisco Convention?” *CL* 20 (December 1959): 123–6.
- “What Caused the Breakup of the Synodical Conference?” *CL* 23 (May 1962): 73.

- “What Does Romans 16:17 Say To The Current Situation?” *Sola Scriptura* 1 (January–February 1971): 12–5.
- “What Drink Had Done For Him.” *LW* 20 (21 June 1901): 15–6.
- “What Good Comes of This?” *AL* 26 (August 1943): 4.
- “What Is Happening to Doctrine Within the Missouri Synod.” *CL* 26 (January 1965): 4–5.
- “What Is The Difference Between The Various Lutherans?” *CL* 7 (April 1946): 48.
- “What Is Troubling the Lutherans?—Part III, The Right.” *News and Views*. Wheaton, Ill.: National Laymen’s Council of the Church League of America, 24 (June 1961): 1–55.
- “What’s Wrong?” *AL* 33 (September 1950): 4.
- “What the Missouri Synod is Really Facing Today.” *CL* 20 (November 1959): 109–10.
- “What Will Sophie Think?” *LW* 80 (19 September 1961): 435.
- “What ‘Withdrawal’ of Certain Essays by Professor Scharlemann Does NOT Mean.” *CL* 24 (January 1963): 4.
- “What Would Luther Say?” *LS* 100 (18 April 1942): 7.
- “Where Does the Truth Lie?” *CL* 16 (June 1955): 61–4.
- “Who Are the Isolationists?” *AL* 32 (July 1949): 4–5.
- “Why I Should Join The American Lutheran Publicity Bureau.” *AL* 11 (February 1928): 322.
- “Why the Bible is God’s Word.” *CL* 21 (November 1960): 132–5.
- Wicke, Harold E. “Briefs by the Editor.” *NL* 59 (23 April 1972): 134.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Is the Pastorate in the Congregation the Only God-ordained Office in the Church?” *WLQ* 68 (April 1971): 113–21.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “What is ‘Doctrine’ According to Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions?” *WLQ* 57 (January 1960): 34–49; (April 1960): 81–97.
- Wietzke, Walter R. “Vision of a House United.” *CuThM* 8 (April 1981): 79–85.
- “Will the Albatross Remain?” *AL* 46 (October 1963): 5.
- Wilson, Andrew. “Concordia classes ordered open.” *StLG–D*, 24 January 1974. Reproduced in *CN* 7 (28 January 1974): 9.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Concordia Staff Vows Showdown on Doctrine." *StLP-D*, 23 January 1974. Reproduced in *CN 7* (28 January 1974): 7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "45 fired in Concordia dispute." *StLG-D*, 19 February 1974. Reproduced in *CN 7* (25 February 1974): 10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Hymn is marching tune as students go into exile." *StLG-D*, 20 February 1974. Reproduced in *CN 7* (25 February 1974): 8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Seminary in Exile,' classes dwarf Concordia enrollment." *StLG-D*, 19 February 1974. Reproduced in *CN 7* (25 February 1974): 10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Striking Students Shut Concordia, Back Tietjen." *StLG-D*, 22 January 1974. Reproduced in *CN 7* (28 January 1974): 9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Uproar at Concordia." *StLG-D*, 22 January 1974. Reproduced in *CN 7* (28 January 1974): 9.
- Wind, Henry F. "Lutheran Union and Human Welfare." *AL 24* (March 1941): 6-7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Stumbling Blocks to the Realization of Lutheran Unity." *AL 32* (September 1949): 7-8.
- "Wisconsin Asked to be Tolerant." *Lu 41* (26 August 1959): 8.
- "Wisconsin Dissenters Open School." *Lu 42* (25 November 1959): 7-8.
- "Wisconsin Has 'No Confidence.'" *Lu 43* (23 August 1961): 6-7.
- "Wisconsin Lutherans Break With Missouri Synod." *CT 5* (28 August 1961): 989.
- "Wisconsin Pastor Suspended." *Lu 41* (18 March 1959): 7-8.
- "Wisconsin Pastors Protest Unionism." *Lu 41* (19 August 1959): 6.
- "Wisconsin Proceedings, 1854." Translated by Arnold O. Lehmann. *WHIJ 10* (October 1992): 5.
- "Wisconsin Proceedings, 1856." Translated by Arnold O. Lehmann. *WHIJ 11* (April 1993): 6.
- "Wisconsin Shuns Talks." *Lu 44* (28 February 1962): 6.
- "Wisconsin Split Hardens." *Lu 42* (2 March 1960): 7-8.
- "Wisconsin Splits Conference." *Lu 43* (30 August 1961): 6-7.
- "Wisconsin Suspends Fellowship." *AL 44* (October 1961): 4.

- “Wisconsin Suspends Fellowship With Missouri.” *LL*, 1 September 1961, 8.
- “Wisconsin Suspension Action Calls for Adjustments in Joint Conference Work.” *LW* 80 (19 September 1961): 456.
- “The Wisconsin Synod.” *AL* 36 (November 1953): 3.
- “Wisconsin Synod Publication ‘Faults’ Both Missouri and Wisconsin Synods.” *LW* 81 (20 February 1962): 88–9.
- “Wisconsin Synod Quotes Luther.” *AL* 25 (May 1942): 10.
- “Wisconsin Synod Rift Widens.” *Lu* 42 (3 February 1960): 7–8.
- Wohlrabe, John C., Jr. “Zur Einigung. The St. Paul Theses—A Document Study.” *CHIQ* 56 (Fall 1983): 133–40.
- “Wooden Shoe Lutheranism Defined.” *AL* 35 (September 1952): 10.
- “Wooden Shoe Lutheranism Defined.” *ML* 5 (June 1952): 4.
- “Yea and Amen.” *AL* 12 (September 1929): 4–5.
- “A Year of Decision.” *AL* 44 (January 1961): 4.
- Ylvisaker, Erling. “Comment—Synodical Conference Convention.” *LuSen* 35 (12 September 1952): 259–61.
- Ylvisaker, S. C. “A Truly Biblical Union.” *Qu* 52 (April 1955): 95–103.
- Zich, August F. “‘Activistic’ Lutherans.” *NL* 24 (29 August 1937): 276–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The American Federation of Lutheran Brotherhoods.” *NL* 21 (21 January 1934): 19–20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The American Lutheran Conference.” *NL* 21 (23 December 1934): 405–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Birth Control.” *NL* 17 (21 December 1930): 406.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Breaking Down the Lines.” *NL* 21 (18 March 1934): 83–4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Christian and Other Churches.” *NL* 23 (10 May 1936): 151–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Church Conventions.” *NL* 23 (22 November 1936): 373.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Doctrine of The Divine Call With Reference To Present Day Abuses.” *Qu* 35 (October 1938): 225–45.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Falling Birthrate and Christianity.” *NL* 18 (30 August 1931): 275.



- \_\_\_\_\_. "God's Moment." *NL* 21 (27 May 1934): 164.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Home Missions and Union." *NL* 22 (17 March 1935): 86.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Inerrancy of the Bible." *NL* 23 (15 March 1936): 86.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Is There No Escape?" *NL* 26 (7 May 1939): 150–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Liberalism and Lutheranism." *NL* 23 (27 September 1936): 310.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Boy Scouts." *NL* 24 (12 September 1937): 292–3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Boy Scouts." *NL* 25 (13 March 1938): 84.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran-Episcopalian Church Union." *NL* 23 (2 February 1936): 39.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Follies." *NL* 26 (12 March 1939): 59–60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Lutheran Men's Alliance." *NL* 21 (13 May 1934): 148.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Solidarity." *Qu* 34 (January 1937): 26–40.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Union Movements." *NL* 25 (23 October 1938): 339.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutheran Unity." *NL* 20 (8 October 1933): 324–5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutherans and the Line." *NL* 25 (28 August 1938): 277–8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lutherans and Social Welfare." *NL* 24 (3 January 1937): 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Narrowmindedness." *NL* 25 (22 May 1938): 165.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Of Brotherhoods." *NL* 25 (27 February 1938): 69–70.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "On Christian Fellowship." *NL* 25 (9 October 1938): 325–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "On Landmarks and Line Fences." *NL* 25 (14 August 1938): 260–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "On The Need of More Lutheran Books in English." *Qu* 29 (October 1932): 252–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Political Neutrality of the Church." *NL* 25 (25 September 1938): 309–10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Scientific Training." *NL* 25 (27 March 1938): 100–1.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sobering Words." *NL* 23 (10 May 1936): 149–50.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Strange Bedfellows." *NL* 25 (4 December 1938): 390.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Strange Gods." *NL* 23 (1 March 1936): 68.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Taking Heed Unto the Doctrine." *NL* 23 (2 August 1936): 248.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The United Lutheran Church." *NL* 25 (6 (November 1938): 358–9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Words of Warning." *NL* 25 (28 August 1938): 276–7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The World Council Again." *NL* 25 (31 July 1938): 244.
- Zimmermann, M. A. "This Thing Is from Me, Saith the Lord." *F-L* 34 (October 1961): 13–5.