Concordia Theological Monthly

Volume 42 Article 32

5-1-1971

A Growing Commonality Among Lutherans?

Andrew J. White
Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia

A Growing Commonality Among Lutherans?

ANDREW J. WHITE

The author is associate professor of church and community and director of the Urban Church Institute of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia.

A STATISTICAL REPORT FROM THE OFFICE OF LCUSA shows that as of February 1970 there were 50 pan-Lutheran councils and conferences of various sorts in operation, representing 27 states, and another 39 in the process of formation, including 6 additional states. The great majority of these councils have come into existence in major metropolitan centers.

The structured cooperation being achieved nationally among Lutherans through the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. is encouraging a wide variety of attempts at local cooperation by Lutherans throughout the country. Though local cooperation is not new among us, the present development is qualitatively and quantitatively more than our fathers knew.

It has been argued that national inter-Lutheran cooperation resulted historically from local experiences that proved satisfying to the various Lutheran partners.[1] An opposite truth must also be faced. Lutherans in local communities have not always initiated cooperative experiences.

Perhaps it can be said that today a full circle of cooperative thrust has been achieved. Whatever the source of historic cooperative effort, today's achievement at the national level where the major Lutheran bodies are committed to theological dialog and a range of selected cooperative activities is triggering an increased search for commonality in scores of local communities.

One of the challenges before Lutherans is that of adequately estimating the kind and degree of commonality that is held among them. Beyond this it seems reasonable in an era in which there appears to be an emerging regionalism that means should be devised to estimate the commonality among Lutherans of given territories, perhaps on a metropolitan basis. The purpose of this would be to predict probable cooperative spheres of activity.

It is quite human for us to begin where we are, that is, to identify in any given metropolitan area clergy and congregations that belong to one or another of the great Lutheran bodies in America and then compare beliefs and behavioral characteristics of each. From this tendency have sprung gross stereotypes for each of the major Lutheran denominations in America. In many local metropolitan areas these stereotypes have remained unexamined. Some theorists properly argue that a productive

[1] Frederick K. Wentz, *Lutherans in Concert* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1968).

road to understanding commonality is the careful examination of difference.[2] It is premature, however, to assume that all differences can be accounted for by denomination.

One recent attempt sought to differentiate Lutherans by their attitudes toward the mission of the church. Hypothetical constructs related to mission outlook were conceived and then field-tested in a single metropolitan area.[3] The Metropolitan Lutheran Leadership Study in Greater Cleveland received attitudinal data from 105 ordained Lutheran clergymen (85 percent of the total in the area defined by the limits of Cuyahoga County, Ohio).

A goal of the study was to simulate further consideration of mission outlook as a possible differentiator among Lutherans at the local level. If it proves possible to identify differing tendencies among Lutherans within the same synodical framework, at least a more dynamic consideration of Lutheran commonality, or lack of it, may result than if the stereotypes usually assigned the various Lutheran bodies are applied in any given local community indiscriminately.

The Cleveland research project was undertaken with knowledge of the crude state of the measures it utilized. No pretensions were intended at the time of the study or in this reporting. It is likely that more precise propositions can be formulated to sharpen the scales. Likewise it is known that distinguishing attitudinal tendencies by mathematical means can be simplistic. It is also true that indicators other than "mission outlook" may prove to be helpful differentiators. This study, it is hoped, will not be the last attempt to identify the Lutheran commonality potential in a given metropolitan area.

Two dimensions of the respondents' outlook toward the mission of church were plotted along continua. The first sought to differentiate attitudes that tended toward seeing the mission locus of the church as being confined within the church, its membership and institutions, from attitudes tending to view the mission as being out in the world, not limited to the membership narrowly defined. An index was constructed of 18 propositions that it was hoped would allow at least a crude distinction in mission locus tendency to be noted. (See Appendix.)

The second dimension explored had to do with the adequacy of the present means available to the church for carrying out its mission. The similarly crude differentiation attempted was between the tendency to accept as adequate typical means available to the church for mission-task performance and the tendency to question or reject selected means for mission currently utilized. Examples of means tested were the congregation as a vehicle for mission, the currently approved liturgy, and certain historical confessional statements. The index here consisted of 17 propositions. (See Appendix.)

Methodology

The propositions making up the two scales of mission locus and adequacy of mission means were administered to the Lutheran clergy of Greater Cleveland, and their agreement or disagreement was ascer-

[2] Oliver Williams, et al., *Suburban Differences and Metropolitan Policies* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965).

[3] Andrew J. White, *Metropolitan Mission: A Para-Political Problem for the Churches* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1970).

tained. The respondents indicated their attitudes on a six-point scale ranging from *strongly agree* through *agree, probably agree, probably disagree, disagree,* to *strongly disagree.* Thus on each item agreement and disagreement could be differentiated even while the respondent was able to choose from a range of possible answers. These were quantified by means of scores assigned from 1 to 6.

A scale average was determined for each respondent after adjustments in terms of direction of response to measure consistently the locus of mission or means of mission attitude. Scale averages from 1.0 through 3.49 were assigned to tendencies toward inclusive mission and change respectively. Scale averages from 3.5 through 6.0 were assigned to tendencies toward exclusive mission and nonchange respectively.

Figure 1 shows how the theoretical constructs identified as *mission types* were conceptualized. The two continua were positioned perpendicular to each other. The mathematical mean was determined on each continuum. On the one, the mean differentiated those respondents seeing the mission locus within the church frame of reference from those identifying the mission as being one of outreach beyond the church itself. On the other continuum the mean differentiated between those respondents who were satisfied with the present means for mission from those desiring change in the means for mission. Extensions from each mean formed a four-cell typology. The resulting cells were given names suggestive of the style of mission outlook tendencies held by those who fell within them by the chance determined mathematically.

Fig. 1 Mission types: A Four-Cell Typology

Change needed in means for mission	Secularist Type	Reformer Type
Change not needed in means for mission	Evangelist Type	Isolate Type
	Locus of mission seen *inclusively* in world	Locus of mission seen *exclusively* in church

The Four Cells Described

The *secularists* may be described as those who tend to question the adequacy of the present means for mission. They look for contemporary expressions of faith and are not convinced that the language of previous ages is readily understood (either in the confessions or in the liturgy). They are not necessarily proponents of wholesale changes, since within the type responses fell on a continuum, but they are open to consider far-reaching reformation in the form of the church. The church is also recognized by them as being a human institution. Clergymen are seen as sinners as well as saints. The Biblical faith is not viewed as a set of rigid doctrines — in fact, many doctrines held by the church are without great relevance today. The church can be a force for good in matters of social justice, and people outside the church may very well respond to human need and justice as quickly or in some cases more quickly than church people.

The chief place for the church to make its witness is outside its own walls. The church is to serve the world. It should be involved in social issues helping to transform the human community, for God is served best in the world. The church is not a hideout. As we live a Christian life

among our own membership, we must be mindful always of injustices in the society as a whole, and we must point to them. World peace is especially important, as is involvement in urban problems.

The *evangelists* want to hold to the past forms. They tend to view the historic confessions of the church as adequate expressions of present-day faith. They feel the liturgy is meaningful or can be made meaningful to most worshipers. They view the holiness of the church as of deeper significance than its humanity. The Biblical faith and the traditional doctrines are accepted as handed down from previous ages. They focus on preaching and prayer as proper responses for churchmen to urban unrest and generally are not too activistic in the cause of justice.

The task of the church is to reach out to people outside and bring them in. We have the truth, and we need to help those who are uninformed by sharing our Gospel with them. We should subsidize the poor or minority churches and be open to all people so that they may benefit from association with us in the community of faith. A concerned, if patronizing, outlook marks this group.

The *reformers* question the adequacy of the old means. They would like to see new tools developed for the church to use in reforming itself. They probably agree with 1 Peter: "The time has come for the judgment to begin; it is beginning with God's own household."

Interestingly, there were no reformers in the Cleveland sample. It would appear that those who are interested in change are not content to act from within the present frames of reference to change the institutional church.

The *isolates* hold rather strictly to the Lutheran Confessions and the liturgy, stressing the adequacy of the language used there. The church is God's holy instrument and is not in need of reformation. They are quite satisfied with the parish form we have. The pulpit is exalted. They tend to stress the historic doctrines of the church as especially relevant for our times. Social justice and urban problems do not have a prime place within the church for these respondents.

The place for the church to be active is within the close fellowship. The church is a place of quiet refuge and reflection. The task is for Christians to be brothers and to demonstrate the life of Christ within the fellowship of the church. The church should stress preparation for eternal life. It is a supportive community somewhat aloof from the turmoil of the world outside.

Field Results

With the possibility of four distinct mission types conceptualized, the actual results found respondents falling into only three of the categories. It is clear that these categories of *secularist, evangelist,* and *isolate* represent a continuum and not absolutely distinct categories. There were among the respondents 33 tending toward the attitudes reported for the secularists, 55 toward those for the evangelists, and 16 toward the isolate pattern of responses.

Fig. 2 Mission Types by Denomination

	Secularist	Evangelist	Isolate
LCMS	12 (21%)	31 (54%)	14 (25%)
LCA	13 (48%)	12 (44%)	2 (7%)
ALC	8 (40%)	12 (60%)	0 (0%)

A study of Figure 2 reveals that there is a wide range of mission types within clergy ranks of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod in Greater Cleveland. The range includes all three mission types. There is also a range within the Lutheran Church in America; however, it is skewed somewhat more toward the secularist tendencies. The American Lutheran Church also is skewed toward the tendencies of the secularist respondents, and there were no isolate types identified in that group.

Thus it is possible to continue to examine Lutheran attitudes using synodical connection as an important variable. In the Cleveland instance it appears that the number of Missouri Synod clergy affects the total in such a way as to influence the configuration of the responses. One could, for example, observe that the Missouri Synod clergy in Cleveland have three aggregates of mission outlook. A middle-of-the-road-position respondent would clearly face two significant though opposite points of view among colleagues. The respondents from the LCA and the ALC would tend to have only one opposing view with which to contend within their own body.

It would be a mistake, however, to overlook the fact that diversity has been shown within each of the bodies.

So What?

When feedback was provided to a group of the respondents who had gathered for the purpose, the anonymity of individual respondents was protected as promised throughout the study. One respondent, guessing at his own mission-type identification, was heard to exclaim, "I did not know there were so many of us!" Presumably he and others, when confronted by another kind of differentiation than the common stereotypes assigned to the major Lutheran bodies, were motivated to search among colleagues for commonality.

The underlying values of the research project included the hope that a search for common mission could be advanced in the Cleveland area. The method of examining differences was used to add a degree of precision not possible with a more direct quest for commonality.

When the major Lutheran bodies joined together in forming the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., they bound themselves to continuing theological dialog. As Lutherans take seriously their theology, concern and action will flow from commonality that is discovered. The Cleveland study warns that commonality may not be limited to common synodical affiliation.

A wide variety of variables were tested in the Cleveland effort. These included a range of theological, ecclesiological, and social values. On most of the variables tested the use of mission type resulted in far greater differentiation among the respondents than did the use of the synodical label. This suggests that there are significant differences within each Lutheran group and that these need to be considered at the local level, especially if common mission tasks are desired.

The reader should avoid concluding that synodical differences are unimportant, but it is hoped that he will note that it is oversimplistic to differentiate Lutheran leaders only by synodical affiliation.

Philadelphia, Pa.

APPENDIX

Locus of Mission Scale

1. The mission of the church is to bring new awareness of the possibilities of life and to prepare people to serve the world.
2. The Christian church can only be its true self as it exists for humanity.
3. The church should be a place of refuge and of quiet reflection away from the world.
4. The primary mission of the church is to live the Christian life among its own membership and activities rather than to try to reform the world.
5. The church must speak to the great social issues of our day, or else its very existence is threatened.
6. The main purpose of the church is to help people live a good life.
7. God intends that the church be a means of transforming human community.
8. The church should leave it to each individual member to apply religious conviction to daily life.
9. The church should take a much more active role in the struggle for world peace.
10. The primary mission of the church is to help to prepare men for eternal life.
11. A critical problem facing the churches today is finding ways for the church to become vitally involved in seeking solutions to urban, national, and international problems.
12. God can be loved and served only as men express compassion and concern for the problems of their fellowmen in the world.
13. The church has the responsibility of pointing out injustices and trying to correct them.
14. The traditional Lutheran concept of political life, especially the doctrine of the two kingdoms, calls for separation of religion from politics.
15. The primary mission of the church today is its ministry to the city.
16. Churches together should subsidize or support congregations of poor or minority group people.
17. One of the church's major jobs is to help Christian laity see the relationship between their religious faith and their daily work.
18. Concern for the welfare of others in society ought to be just as important to the Christian as his concern for stewardship and loyalty to the church.

Means of Mission Scale

(Change-nonchange)

1. The Augsburg Confession of 1529 is "contemporary" in a real sense; a most adequate expression of the Christian faith in 1967.
2. The language of the Augsburg Confession is archaic, and its present usefulness is limited to historical study.
3. The church is holy and not to be equated with other human institutions.
4. Practically every element of church life today needs radical reformation.
5. The parish or congregational form of church is still the most essential form of church life.
6. The Lutheran liturgy is rich with meaning which is readily understood by contemporary worshipers.
7. There is probably as much blasphemy in the pulpit on Sunday mornings as in the taverns on Saturday nights.

8. The Augsburg Confession is totally inadequate as a confession of a 1967 Christian faith.
9. We must try to translate the language of Biblical faith into meaningful contemporary symbols because Biblical faith is not rigid doctrine.
10. Many of the doctrines of the church have little relevance in the modern world.
11. The language of the liturgy needs updating.
12. Let's face it, the Lutheran liturgy does not serve as an adequate instrument for our praise of God today.
13. Christianity must have some institutional form no matter how inadequate it may be.
14. Aside from preaching and prayer, there is little that churches can really do about social and economic problems.
15. People outside the churches often respond more quickly to needs of people in the world than do church members.
16. If it comes to a choice between one or the other, I would rather see laity vitally involved in seeking solutions to urban problems than in the internal functions of the church.
17. If the Christian faith is to be real today, it must be less concerned with the traditional forms of sacrament and worship and more concerned with concrete expressions of love and concern for social justice.