

AN ANALYSIS OF THE DOCTRINAL STANCE OF THE MERGER OF THE
LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA, THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH
AND THE ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCHES

by
Michael Duncan

"Lutheranism in America" Term Paper

April 19, 1983

Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library
11831 N. Seminary Drive. 65W
Mequon, Wisconsin

OUTLINE

An Analysis of the Doctrinal Stance of the Merger of the LCA, ALC, and AELC.

- I. An analysis of their concern for doctrine.
 - A. Lack of concern in debate leading up to merger vote.
 1. Union vs. mission debate.
 2. Church structure debated.
 - B. Lack of concern in convention proceedings.
 1. Even in the ALC debate over doctrine was nearly nonexistent.
 2. Lutherans Alert - National laments the silence of conservative pastors.
 - C. Lack of concern in current proceedings of the Commission for a New Lutheran Church.
 1. Dissatisfaction with choosing of members for task forces.
 2. Suggestion of a sort of "College of Cardinals" to deal with theology.
- II. An analysis of the content of their doctrine.
 - A. Doctrine as it is taught in the three merging churches.
 1. Their teaching of Scripture.
 - a. ALC's constitutional statement abandoned.
 - b. LCA's statement favored.
 - c. Task Force on Theology's preliminary statement.
 11. Activity of Scripture stressed over the formal character of Scripture.
 22. Inerrancy and plenary inspiration denied.
 2. Their view of the Confessions.
 - a. Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism are favored above the other doctrinal writings.
 - b. "Satis est" of Augsburg Confession misinterpreted and misused.
 - c. Subscription to Confessions is mainly an "historical subscription".
 3. Their teaching of numerous other doctrines.
 - a. At times, basic teachings such as Christ's deity, virgin birth, etc. are denied.
 - b. General acceptance of evolution, abortion, etc.

OUTLINE (cont.)

- B. Doctrine as it is practiced in these three merging churches.
 - 1. Fellowship with non-Lutheran bodies.
 - a. Interim eucharistic sharing with Episcopalians.
 - b. Plans by some for similar agreements with Roman Catholics, Presbyterians and Methodists.
 - 2. Involvement in numerous social issues such as, environmental problems, domestic policy and international relations.

An Analysis of the Doctrinal Stance of the Merger
of the Lutheran Church in America, the American Lutheran
Church and the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches

"Lutherans have been on this continent for a third of a millenium, a sixth of the Christian era. We do not know what was the most dramatic event in that long period. We do know that so far as their life together is concerned, Lutherans have not had a day that can be more decisive than today."¹ So says church historian, Dr. Martin Marty, on the events of Sept. 8, 1982. On that date, the three conventions of the LCA, ALC and AELC committed themselves to pursue union with one another. Dramatically linked through a three - way telephone hookup, Bishop James Crumley reported the LCA favored union 669-11, presiding Bishop David W. Preus announced the ALC desires union 897-87, and Bishop William Kohn said the AELC approved 136-0. After each overwhelmingly positive vote, delegates cheered and applauded. Dr. Marty, the moderator of this historic telephone call, joked that each church body seemed to be trying to outdo the other in showing support for the new merger. Bishop Crumley exclaimed "(There have been) only a few times in my life where I felt such elation with every fiber of my being. What we have dreamed of, worked for and prayed for seems to have been given us by the Lord God this day."²

Even those who do not share such enthusiasm will admit that Sept. 8, 1982 truly was a big day in American

Lutheranism. Over 5.4 million members will belong to this new church body making it the largest Lutheran church in America. However, the fact that this new church body is bigger does not automatically make it better. To determine whether this day is truly a great day in American Lutheranism, one question needs to be answered: Will the doctrinal stance of this new church body be in full agreement with Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions? Therefore the concern of this paper will not be with the polity, structure or design of this new church body, but with its doctrine. It will be shown that this new Lutheran merger has an appalling lack of concern for doctrine and is desperately weak in its doctrinal content.

To critique the doctrine of this new Lutheran merger is no easy task. For, as of now, there is no doctrinal statement which describes their beliefs. It is true that the Commission for a New Lutheran Church (CNLC) has appointed a 21-member task force on theology. This task force has been given the assignment of preparing "a statement of theological understanding" for the 1984 LCA, ALC and AELC conventions. Of course, this important document is not yet available. Therefore, to determine what the doctrinal stance of this new Lutheran merger will be, three sources will be consulted: reports of the 1982 conventions' proceedings, statements by prominent church leaders and articles in official church publications. By studying a multitude of sources,

a fair and accurate view will be presented.

One must search long and hard for statements relating to doctrine in this new merger. Unfortunately, there appears to be little concern for doctrine. Even Richard Neuhaus, charter member of the AELC, remarked, "But what does this merger proposal have to do with achieving theological agreement? Indeed what does it have to do with theology? There is not even the whisper of a suggestion that the three bodies have any theological problems to resolve among themselves."³ To demonstrate the doctrinal apathy in this union, the debate leading up to the vote to merge, the proceedings at the conventions, and the progress of the newly appointed Task Force on Theology will be analyzed.

In the events leading up to the decision to merge, what little debate there was centered around missions and church structure rather than theology. Bishop David Preus led a small but vocal minority which opposed merger because, as he here says, "I do not think that a merger... would have any positive effect on our evangelical task; instead, it would distract us from this crucial agenda."⁴ Albert E. Anderson, a prominent ALC official asked, "Are congregations really willing and ready to endure and to finance another national church reorganization? The question of what should be mission and financial priorities for the 1980's must be considered."⁵ Such views drew the wrath of many, especially the respected

historian, E. Clifford Nelson, who minced no words in his condemnation of Preus' views, "I think this argument is theologically unconvincing, logically absurd, and historically irresponsible."⁶

The point to be noted here is not the pros and cons of how union affects missions, but the lack of attention given to doctrine. Debate is not centered on the teachings of God's Word but on the application of these teachings. Thought, time and energy are not devoted to agreement in doctrine but to agreement in adiaphora. What is essential is ignored, and what is non-essential is elevated to the center of attention.

A second bone of contention is over church structure. Some of the polity issues that need to be resolved are: "the national church as a 'union of congregations' (as in the ALC) or as 'ministers and congregations' (as in the LCA); role of clergy; national authority vs. regional autonomy;... ownership and relationship of theological seminaries to church, (etc.)."⁷ Lutherans Alert - National, a group of 100 conservative ALC members, express^{es} its frustration over such an obsession with structural details in these words:

"Apropos of the impending Lutheran merger, Lutheran Perspective informs its readers of twelve issues which confront the merging bodies. It lists the size of the synod; the Districts; who will own the seminaries; what colleges should continue; ownership of local properties; where the headquarters should be and who should be the first president. Oh, yes, then there was the matter of doctrine!"⁸

Preoccupation with such non-essentials at the expense of the one thing that is needful reminds one of the example of the Pharisees who strained out a gnat and swallowed a camel.

One might have thought that the one place where opposition to the merger would arise would be at the ALC convention in San Diego. There a good cross section of ALC people would be represented and some conservatives were bound to be present. Yet, their number was much less than expected and so was their influence. Two observers at the convention recorded these events:

"A coalition of ALC clergy calling themselves the Committee on Church Cooperation, raised questions about the need to settle doctrinal and polity issues before the merger. One delegate from the group asked if commitment to a new Lutheran church before agreement on doctrine and structure wasn't "putting the cart before the horse." In reply one of the ALC representatives on the inter-church Committee on Lutheran Unity... stated that theological agreement between the merging churches was already "sufficient," an opinion echoed by Presiding Bishop Preus."⁹

Out of 5.4 million members, this was the greatest opposition against this merger for doctrinal reasons. Lutherans Alert - National laments these disappointing results in these somber words:

"In past years prior to the vote for merger many pastors within the American Lutheran Church as well as lay people made it very clear that they would have no part in the contemplated merger of the ALC, LCA, and the AEIC. Many pastors in correspondence with us said that when that took place they would take objection and

would fight to stay out of any such merger. In fact, many such letters have come to us unsolicited that have stated strong opposition to any merger. Many pastors said that they would put their ministry on the line at that point. Now the merger has been voted on. These same men remain silent."¹⁰

What a pathetic statement! The 100 members of this small organization are a voice crying out in the wilderness. Orthodoxy in the ALC seems to have gone out with a whimper rather than a bang.

Things have not improved. The current proceedings of the Commission for a New Lutheran Church are at times comical. In choosing members for its Task Force on Theology, a quota system of 50% laity, 40% women, and 16.67% minorities was suggested. After an hour and a half debate - the longest time spent on any single issue - the CNLC compromised and said "that the membership of all committees and task forces to be appointed or elected by the (commission's) planning committee and by the commission reflect the inclusiveness and partnership in relation to minorities, women and the laity evident in the membership of the present commission."¹¹ Still many were not at all happy with this compromise.

Dr. Carl Braaten, a prominent liberal LCA theologian, complains, "One delegate observed that the quota system had managed to include every conceivable category except theologians."¹² Dr. Braaten goes on to level this

harsh indictment:

"The established bureaucracy almost succeeded to create a commission without any theologians, and would have done so but for some last minute maneuvering from the floor... To make matters worse, there was virtually no room for bishops either.... The only thing that is clear is that neither the episcopal office nor the church's theology plays any fundamental role in the teaching that guides Lutheranism in North America."¹³

For these reasons, Dr. Braaten and a few others propose a sort of "college of cardinals" consisting mainly of bishops and theologians to handle the theology and confession of the church. At first, such an idea is appealing in comparison to the confusion on the theology Task Force. However, such an idea might lead back to the monarchical episcopate where the word of the bishop is put on equal level with God's Word. Whatever happens, one thing is certain - confusion will always be the fruit of doctrinal indifference and apathy.

Order could have been brought out of this confusion if the conventions had followed the lead of the LCMS, whose view was presented by President Ralph Bohlmann at each of the three conventions: "Unity in doctrine, we believe, is basic and prior to organizational unity or structure."¹⁴ However, Dr. Bohlmann's words fell on deaf ears. The conventions concentrated on organizational unity and ignored doctrinal unity. This caused the conservative Lutheran magazine, "Affirm," to lament: "Consider how little doctrinal issues have been involved

in the negotiations thus far. Doctrine, from what has appeared in print, is near the bottom of the agenda.

It seems sufficient that they all have the name 'Lutheran'.¹⁵ In this way, this new Lutheran merger is a lot like Martha, who "was distracted by all the preparations that had to be made" and to whom our Lord said, "Martha, Martha, you are worried and upset about many things, but only one is needed" (Luke 10:41,42; NIV).

Neglect of the one thing that is needed has had detrimental affects. Doctrinal apathy has led to doctrinal disintegration. The statements of church officials, theologians and commission members reveal a watered-down doctrinal stance. Doctrine as it is taught and practiced by those involved with the merger is often at odds with Scripture and confessional Lutheranism.

In orthodox Lutheranism, the inerrancy of Scripture is a touchstone doctrine. In the new Lutheran merger inerrancy is a troublesome doctrine. At the beginning of discussion on the new church's statement of faith, Bishop Preus remarked, "It will be absolutely amazing if we get through... (the Scripture section) without heavy artillery opening up."¹⁶ However, Bishop Preus had previously done much to extinguish the flames of Scriptural inerrancy in the ALC. At the San Diego convention, he stated his belief that the term "inerrancy" will not be used in the new statement of faith since, as he claims, inerrancy has become a "shibboleth,"

a password or test that tends to divide rather than unite.¹⁷

His remarks were immediately backed up in the following week's issue of "The Lutheran Standard." The editor, Lowell G. Almen, wrote in a full-page editorial:

"Perhaps 'inerrant' and 'infallible' once served a purpose for American Lutherans. But they have been misused and misunderstood, and they must not be perpetuated. As we begin the task of shaping the statement of belief for the new church, we have the chance to find better, clearer, fresher, and stronger words to witness to the Authority of the Word for us and for our church."¹⁸

These statements seem to be representative of the actual feelings of the ALC people. In an informal survey on issues facing the new church, "Lutheran Perspective" reports, "In the three participating bodies, sentiment was uniformly against the idea (of including "inerrancy" in the new statement of faith), 72-73 percent."¹⁹ Perhaps these figures are too low. For, at the ALC convention, there was only "a scanty discussion about the doctrine of scriptural inerrancy."²⁰ It is hard to imagine fiery debate in future discussions of inerrancy. The voices of inerrancy in the ALC have been silenced. The ALC's official view of Scripture as "the divinely inspired, revealed, and inerrant Word of God and the only infallible authority in all matters of faith and life,"²¹ has been abandoned.

In place of their own statement on Scripture, the ALC has adopted the LCA's view, which is:

"The Word of God is essentially the Gospel of God concerning His Son, i.e., the good news of God's creative and saving grace made manifest in Christ. The title 'Word of God' belongs primarily to Christ himself, the Word incarnate, for in him God reveals and imparts himself to men. It applies derivatively to the Christ-centered message of the Old and New Testaments, as well as to the proclamation of the Gospel in the church.

They (the members of the LCA) treasure the Holy Scriptures, therefore as the primary witness to God's redemptive act in Christ, for which the Old Testament prepared the way and which the New Testament proclaims. In the church's continuing proclamation of this gospel the Holy Scriptures fulfill their purpose as God's Word. As such they are normative for the faith and life of the church."²²

Unlike the ALC statement, this statement is near and dear to the heart of every LCA pastor. Dr. Fred Meuser, President of Trinity Lutheran Seminary (ALC), observes, "On the basis of my personal contacts with LCA people, I believe more of the LCA would, as they say, 'go to the wall' for this kind of a statement on Scripture than for almost any aspect of LCA heritage and practice."²³ Apparently this statement has won also the hearts of ALC people. The editor of "The Lutheran Standard" openly recommends the LCA position over the ALC. Without apology, he says, "The LCA constitution while affirming with vigor the authority of the Word, avoids such misleading and mischief - making words as 'inerrant' and 'infallible.'... The LCA statement is more complete and more Christ-centered than the one in the ALC

constitution."²⁴

It is no wonder then that the Task Force on Theology has prepared a statement on Scripture which is strikingly similar to the LCA's. According to the first progress report of the CNLC, "The task force drew up three parallel statements about the Word of God - as message, as Christ, and as Holy Scripture."²⁵ The progress report then quotes the section on Scripture:

"The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the divinely inspired and written Word of God.

The Holy Scriptures are the source and norm for the faith and life of the church. They bear witness to the God who delivered the people of Israel from oppression and who in the fullness of time raised Jesus Christ our Lord from the dead.

Through the Scriptures and the proclamation of their message the Holy Spirit speaks judgment and grace to all people."²⁶

Although this statement is tentative, it does give an idea of the direction that the task force is moving. Like the LCA statement, it defines the Word of God as message, as Christ, and as Scripture and emphasizes the activity of Scripture rather than the formal character of Scripture. This emphasis has led to a denial of inerrancy and plenary inspiration. Therefore one must come to the sad conclusion that if the merger actually forms on this basis, it will have failed in this touchstone doctrine.

The same disregard that is shown for Scripture

is also shown for the Confessions. Referring back to the survey taken by "Lutheran Perspective," the question was asked "on which doctrinal writings the members of the new churchbody should be committed to."²⁷ The majority of those in the ALC (48 percent) and in the LCA (46 percent) wanted to include the Augsburg Confession and the Small Catechism but omit the Apology, the Large Catechism, the Smallcald Articles and the Formula of Concord. On the other hand, a majority of the AELC (48 percent) wanted the entire Book of Concord. The Task Force on Theology tries to please both parties, as the first progress report on the CNLC proceedings relates:

"As for the Lutheran Confessions from the Reformation period, the statement (of faith) reads: 'We join with all the Lutheran family in confessing the faith as witnessed to in the Lutheran confessions.' The task force commented that the Augsburg Confession and Small Catechism should be singled out for 'unquestioned priority' and wide congregational usage respectively. Other documents in the Book of Concord 'have generally been affirmed as valid applications and elaborations of the Reformation insights.'²⁸

One wishes the task force would explain why the other four writings in the Book of Concord do not have "unquestioned authority." Yet the Augsburg Confession, and Luther's Small Catechism have always been the sweethearts of these church bodies. The Augsburg Confession especially has endeared itself to the

hearts of these Lutherans.

However, it is for the wrong reasons that the Augustana is so treasured. Countless times Lutherans involved with the merger refer to the Augsburg Confession as a document that unites rather than divides. Dr. John Tietjen, President of ~~the~~ Christ Seminary and author of the important work, Which Way to Lutheran Unity?, is typical in his appeal to the Augsburg Confession as the basis for union. In "Unity is not an Option," he writes "As much as we like to divide ourselves up into camps, a Lutheran is a Lutheran is a Lutheran, and espousal of the teaching of the Augsburg Confession makes it so."²⁹ Dr. Tietjen goes on to say, "What we have in common is what makes us Lutheran. In comparison the differences are insignificant and dare not be used as reasons to keep us apart - not if we are serious about our commitment to the Augsburg Confession."³⁰

So popular is this thinking that it has led to the current merger efforts. "Current union negotiations," according to one Lutheran church historian, "began and proceed with a total commitment to the proposition that Augustana subscription is an altogether sufficient basis for spiritual fellowship and closer union."³¹ This is why so little is said about doctrine in this new Lutheran merger. Agreement in the gospel is taken for granted. Doctrinal unity is assumed. Therefore it

need not be discussed. However, such a view ignores the centuries-old interpretation of the "satis est," namely, "that what is called for is agreement in all biblical doctrine"³² and that "subscription must be matched by conforming public doctrine and practice."³³

The concept of subscription has almost been lost in those bodies involved with the merger. Lip-service is paid to the confessions, but allegiance is not. One example is the empty talk of editor Lowell Almen who said, "This new church... should radiate a strong biblical and confessional commitment."³⁴ One month later this same man undercut the confessions by leading a powerful and persuasive attack on the inerrancy of Scripture in a lengthy editorial.

What is actually meant by subscription in these merging churches is hinted at by Bishop James Crumley when, after saying, "The Church must be a confessional Church,"³⁵ he adds, "It is essential for a group of people, especially for a Church, to have a sense of identity."³⁶ Edgar Trexler, editor of "The Lutheran," has the same idea, when in discussing the LCA's role in the new church, he says, "The doctrinal distinctiveness of the Lutheran confessions is being taken seriously."³⁷ A clear statement of the meaning of subscription is in the progress report on the Task Force on Theology. "Other documents in the Book of Concord (everything except the Augsburg Confession and the Small Catechism) 'have

generally been affirmed as valid applications and elaborations of the Reformation's insights.'"38 Simply put, subscription is acceptance of the Lutheran Confessions as a valid statement of what the Lutherans of the 16th century believed. Thus, the confessions are not necessarily a valid statement of what the subscriber personally believes. The confessions only serve to give him a "doctrinal distinctiveness," a "sense of identity," a heritage and a tradition. Therefore, the subscriber is for the most part free to believe and teach differently from the confessions.

Such disregard for the confessions, as well as Scripture, has led to doctrinal deterioration. Some of the problem areas are briefly referred to in the following list from an editorial critical of the merger.

"The publishing houses of the LCA and ALC have published and promoted books which attack such doctrines as the deity of Christ, Christ's virgin birth, the existence of angels, etc. We know of no active professor in any LCA, ALC, or AELC seminary who still insists upon the scriptural and Lutheran doctrine of the inerrancy of the Bible. Almost all of these professors tolerate the anti-scriptural and unscientific myth that man evolved from some primary organism.

The LCA, ALC, and AELC allow for the murder of unborn infants. They have opened the door wide for the 'new morality,' including homosexual clergymen.

The LCA, ALC, and AELC all reject what God says in His Word about women being pastors."39

And to think this is only a partial listing! It is no wonder a retired, conservative pastor exclaimed,

"The doctrinal deterioration in the upper echelons (and seminaries) of the three merging bodies together with the proposed abandonment of much that has been distinctly Lutheran is so widespread as to boggle the mind."⁴⁰

One of the most vivid examples of this doctrinal decay is inter-communion with the Episcopal church. The same conventions which voted to merge also voted to have interim Eucharistic sharing with Episcopalians. Dr. Ralph Bohlmann, in speaking of the historic significance of the merger, told each convention "Of potentially even greater significance is the decision on Eucharistic sharing between these Lutheran churches and a church body that does not hold our Lutheran confessional position."⁴¹

When this historic decision was made, doctrine was thrown out the window. The teaching of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper was completely ignored and forgotten. It is enough, the editor of "The Lutheran" says, "If the churches agree that the sacrament conveys the Gospel's gracious promise of justification and forgiveness.... This understanding goes beyond argument about whether communion is a memorial meal (Methodist), whether the nature of the bread and wine are changed (Roman Catholic) or how Christ is truly present (Lutheran and Reformed)."⁴² The justification for such action is supposedly "basic agreement in the Gospel."⁴³ To this point, the editor

of the liberal "Lutheran Forum" replies:

"Our previously expressed qualms about Lutheran recognition of the Episcopal Church 'as a Church in which the Gospel is preached and taught!.. were not allayed by an announcement which appeared in the New York Times only a couple of weeks after the September conventions. A prominent Episcopal parish in this city advertised as its Sunday Preacher a neighboring Unitarian clergyman. Do we need to amend our guidelines to warn our people that they won't always hear the gospel if they attend a Episcopal Church?"⁴⁴

What confusion and offense this eucharistic sharing is bound to cause! All Lutheran principles of fellowship have been cast to the winds. In view of this, one LCMS pastor asks "Would it not be more honest to abandon the Lutheran name altogether?"⁴⁵

As if they had not gone far enough, some members of the new merger are talking about reaching out to even more non-Lutheran church bodies. Bishop Crumley is reported in the "Virginia Lutheran" of the LCA as being "open to relations with the Roman Catholic Church. He said he 'would have great difficulty in saying that Jesus Christ is not central in their life.'"⁴⁶ In commenting on relations with the Episcopal church, Bishop Crumley also expressed hope that "the 1984 LCA convention will implement the same kind of agreement reached with Presbyterians. He hopes closer ties with Methodists also will come soon."⁴⁷ One wonders if such

brazen ecumenism will shake some Lutherans out of their doctrinal lethargy. It is hard to imagine the ALC and AELC, two bodies with conservative roots, blindly marching down the road to union with Rome. Perhaps the bold ecumenism of the LCA will be a divisive issue in the years leading up to the actual merger in 1988. However, in view of the doctrinal drift that has already taken place, one will not be too surprised if Richard Neuhaus' prediction of union with Rome by the year 2000 is proved right.

Such intense desire for union is matched only by an intense desire to be active in social issues. A visitor to one of the three conventions might get the idea that he is in the United States Congress rather than at a gathering of Christians. A typical agenda of social issues is listed by an observer at the ALC San Diego convention.

"An impressive list of social concerns was before the convention: from environmental concerns to a resolution calling for a 'freeze on the development of any new nuclear weapons systems'; from a resolution urging the United States to normalize relations with Marxist Nicaragua to a resolution asking the U.S. Navy not to use the name 'Corpus Christi' (body of Christ) for a new nuclear submarine,"⁴⁸

Recently Bishops Crumley, Preus and Kohn wrote letters to President Reagan and told him that his 1984 budget "will result in increased suffering for people in need,"

and "will actually decrease our national security."⁴⁹ Even the areas of nuclear waste storage, land management and divestment of church funds from establishments which do business with South Africa have occupied the attention of one or all of the three church bodies.

One wonders where the LCA, ALC, and AELC would be today if only half of the energy they have devoted to union and social issues were devoted to doctrinal purity. Perhaps their union would rival even the renowned Synodical Conference. But such is only a pipe dream. Doctrine as it is taught and practiced in these three Lutheran churches is on the verge of bankruptcy. Concern for doctrine in general is at an all-time low. The source of all doctrine, Scripture, is downgraded and undercut. Lip-service is paid to the confessions. Union is sought where there is no unity and concern for man's physical needs outweighs concern for his spiritual needs.

Amidst all of these problems, one sad fact stands out above the rest. The very thing that these three church bodies claimed to hold onto, the very thing that was supposed to be the basis of all their union efforts - the gospel - was lost. Countless times church officials and theologians spoke of the gospel in glowing terms. Countless times it was emphasized that this new

church must be evangelical and mission-oriented. However, the gospel was never defined. I can truthfully say that in the hundreds of articles I read on this topic, not once was the gospel explained. The most that was ever said, and this rarely, was "the gospel of God's justifying grace." Words such as blood, sin and atonement were never mentioned. Forgiveness was not mentioned more than three times. The simple truth, "The blood of Jesus, his Son, purifies us from every sin," was never spoken.

As one who was baptized in the ALC and confirmed in the LCA, it is not a happy judgment I must come to. It is not a pleasant thing to point to the doctrinal emptiness in these churches. For the 5.4 million members of this proposed merger need the gospel every bit as much as those members in conservative Lutheran churches. Undoubtedly, in the confirmation classes of these merging churches, there are young boys and girls with tormented consciences who do not have the peace which surpasses all understanding. There are adults in the pews who need to find what gives real meaning to life and there are prodigal sons who need to be reminded of their heavenly Father's love. I am not confident that these lambs in the flock of God will be fed with the one thing that is needful. In view of this and all that

has been said, Sept. 8, 1982 cannot be looked upon as a great day in American Lutheranism. Instead it is a sad and shameful day. For it testifies to how far the majority of American Lutheranism has drifted from its Scriptural and confessional moorings. The fire of Lutheran orthodoxy has nearly gone out. In these dark days, may we who are confessional Lutherans let our light shine brightly. Out of love for all Lutherans, may we light the path to true unity.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹Dr. Martin Marty. "A Historical Perspective on a Significant Day in U.S. Lutheranism," Foreword, March 1983, p.2.
- ²Walter A. Kortrey, Carolyn J. Lewis, Mark A. Staples and Edgar R. Trexler, "Hallelujahs and Tears," The Lutheran, Oct. 6, 1982, p. 5.
- ³Richard J. Neuhaus, article in the Winter 1981 issue of Dialog, "Nothing exciting so far from the Committee."
- ⁴David W. Preus, "From the President," The Lutheran Standard, March 20, 1981, p. 26.
- ⁵Albert E. Anderson, editorial. "I think," The Lutheran Standard, March 20, 1981, p. 14.
- ⁶E. Clifford Nelson, editorial. "I think," The Lutheran Standard, Feb. 6, 1981, p. 14.
- ⁷Anderson.
- ⁸"Some ALC History," Lutherans Alert - National, March 1983, p. 2.
- ⁹Charles L. Cortright and John Baumann, "A New Volume in Lutheran History," The Northwestern Lutheran, Nov. 1, 1982, p. 314.
- ¹⁰Redal, Dr. R. H. "President's Page," Lutherans Alert - National, Feb. 1983, p. 2.
- ¹¹Lowell G. Almen, "Newsfront: Preus warns: 'The tough jobs are ahead,'" The Lutheran Standard, March 4, 1983, p. 19.
- ¹²Dr. Carl E. Braaten, "Editorials: 'Where is the Magisterium?'" Dialog, Winter 1983.
- ¹³IBID,
- ¹⁴Dr. Ralph A. Bohlmann, "From the President," The Lutheran Witness, Oct. 1982, p. 33.
- ¹⁵Dr. Ewald J. Otto, Em. "The Lutheran Merger," Affirm, Christmas 1982, p. 4.
- ¹⁶Lowell G. Almen, "Newsfront: Preus warns: 'The tough jobs are ahead'" The Lutheran Standard, March 4, 1983, p. 18.

FOOTNOTES
(cont.)

- 17 Lowell G. Almen, "The Back Page," The Lutheran Standard, Oct. 15, 1982, p. 31.
- 18 IBID.
- 19 "Informal Survey Reveals Attitudes Toward Issues Facing New Church," Lutheran Perspective, Oct. 4, 1982, p. 5.
- 20 Cortright, pp. 314-315.
- 21 "ALC Leader Says that Biblical Inerrancy Cannot be Teaching of New Lutheran Church," Christian News, March 14, 1983, p. 15.
- 22 "News and Comments: A New Doctrinal Statement," as quoted in the Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Volume 55, 1958, p. 73.
- 23 "ALC Leader says that Biblical Inerrancy Cannot Be Teaching of New Lutheran Church," Christian News, March 14, 1983, p. 15.
- 24 Almen, "The Back Page," Oct. 15, 1982, p. 31.
- 25 Commission for a New Lutheran Church Progress Report #1
p. 4.
- 26 IBID.
- 27 "Informal Survey Reveals Attitudes Toward Issues Facing New Church," Lutheran Perspective, Oct. 4, 1982, p. 5.
- 28 Commission for a New Lutheran Church Progress Report #1
p. 4.
- 29 Dr. John Tietjen, "Unity is not an Option," Dialog, Spring 1981, p. 145.
- 30 IBid, p. 146.
- 31 Edward C. Fredrich, "A Sideline Perspective," Dialog, Spring 1981, p. 165.

FOOTNOTES

- 32 IBID.
- 33 IBID, p. 164.
- 34 Lowell G. Almen, "The Back Page," The Lutheran Standard,
Sept. 4, 1981, p. 31.
- 35 James R. Crumley, "Toward a New Church: The Process
and the Issues," The Lutheran Forum, Lent, 1983,
p. 14.
- 36 IBID, p. 15.
- 37 Edgar R. Trexler, "Editor's Opinion: Clearer Direction
for Lutherans," The Lutheran, Aug. 1981, p. 34.
- 38 Commission for a New Lutheran Church: Progress Report #1
p. 4.
- 39 "Editorial: The Right Direction," Christian News,
Jan. 31, 1983, p. 2.
- 40 Otto, p. 5.
- 41 Ralph A. Bohlmann, "From the President: The LCMS
and Lutheran Unity," The Lutheran Witness,
Oct. 20, 1982, p. 33.
- 42 Edgar R. Trexler, "Editor's Opinion," The Lutheran,
Oct. 1982.
- 43 Crumley, p. 15.
- 44 "Editor's Ambo: What's Next in Lutheran/Episcopal
Ecumenism?" The Lutheran Forum, Advent 1982, p. 4.
- 45 Kurt Marquart, "Theological Observer: Fellowship
and Merger: Some Lutheran Commonplaces,"
Concordia Theological Quarterly, Oct. 1982, p. 300.
- 46 March 16th issue of Virginia Lutheran as quoted in
Christian News: "Turret of the Times," April 4, 1983,
p.2.
- 47 IBID.
- 48 Cortright, p. 315.
- 49 "Three Lutheran Leaders Say Reagan Budget will add to
Suffering," Foreword, March 1983, p.1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "ALC Leader Says That Biblical Inerrancy Cannot Be Teaching of New Lutheran Church," Christian News, March 14, 1983, p. 1&15.
- Almen, Lowell G. "The Back Page," The Lutheran Standard, Oct. 15, 1982, p.31.
- _____. "The Back Page: Lutheran Union Favored by 64% of ALC District Delegates," The Lutheran Standard, Sept. 4, 1981, pp. 29-31.
- _____. "Committee on Lutheran Unity Takes 'Historic' Step Toward New Church in U.S." The Lutheran Standard, Feb. 19, 1982, p. 21.
- _____. "Newsfront: Preus warns: 'The tough jobs are ahead.'" The Lutheran Standard, March 4, 1983, pp. 18-19.
- "An Informal Survey on Lutheran Union Issues," Lutheran Perspective, July 26, 1982, p.5.
- Anderson, Albert E. "I think: Lutheran Merger," The Lutheran Standard, March 20, 1981, p. 14.
- Beck, Norman A. "Views and Counterviews: Call for a Statement of Faith for a New Church," Dialog, Winter 1981, pp. 54-55.
- Bohlmann, Ralph A. "From the President: The LCMS and Lutheran Unity," The Lutheran Witness, Oct. 1982, pp. 33-34.
- _____. "From the President: Interim eucharistic sharing," The Lutheran Witness, Dec. 1982, p. 414.
- Braaten, Dr. Carl. "Where is the Magisterium?" An editorial in the Winter issue of Dialog, 1983.
- Brown, David L. "I think: Lutheran Unity," The Lutheran Standard, April 3, 1981, p. 14.
- _____. "I think: The New Church," The Lutheran Standard, Feb. 18, 1983, p. 20.
- Commission for a New Lutheran Church: Progress Report #1.
- "Conservatives Ask True Lutherans Not to Join the New 'Liberal' Church," Christian News, July 5, 1982, p. 1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
(cont.)

- "Consevatives Ask ALC Not to Merge," The Lutheran,
Aug. 1982, p. 19.
- Cortright, Charles L. and John Baumann, "A New Volume
in Lutheran History," The Northwestern Lutheran,
Nov. 1, 1982, p. 314.
- Crumley, James R. Jr. "Toward a New Church: The
Process and the Issues," The Lutheran Forum,
Lent 1983, pp. 13-16.
- David, Herb. "Delegates to Take Key Steps in Union
Process," The Lutheran Standard, Aug. 6, 1982, p. 17.
- "Delegates Commit to Union," Lutheran Perspective,
Sept. 20, 1982, pp 1&4.
- Dickson, Charles. "The Lutheran Name Dilemma,"
Currents in Theology and in Mission, Feb. 1983,
pp. 47-48.
- "Editor's Ambo: What Next in Lutheran/Episcopal Ecumenism?"
The Lutheran Forum, Aug. 1982, p. 4.
- "Editorial: The Right Direction," Christian News,
July 5, 1982.
- Forde, Gerhard O. "Unity Without Concord," Dialog
Spring 1981, pp. 166-173.
- Fredrich, Edward. "A Sideline Perspective," Dialog,
Spring 1981, pp.164-166.
- _____. "Editorial Comment:Lutheran Union,"
The Northwestern Lutheran, Sept. 1, 1982, p. 244.
- Hankins, Richard. "Forum: ALC Conservatives Want
Inerrancy of Bible in New Constitution,"
Christian News, March 21, 1983, p. 13.
- Heidmann, Armin R. "9.5 Theses Regarding Lutheran Unity,"
Dialog, Spring 1981, pp. 155-156.
- "Informal Survey Reveals Attitudes Toward Issues
Facing New Church," Lutheran Perspective, Oct. 4, 1982,
p. 5.
- Kohn, William H. "Merger is the Answer!" Dialog,
Spring 1981, pp. 147-150.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
(cont.)

- Kohn, William H. "'The Church's One Foundation'
We have now come full cycle," Foreword,
Sept. 1983.
- Kortrey, Walter A., Carolyn J. Lewis, Mark A. Staples,
and Edgar R. Trexler. "Hallelujahs and Tears."
The Lutheran, Oct. 6, 1982, pp. 4-7.
- Lawrenz, Carl. "A New Doctrinal Statement," Wisconsin
Lutheran Quarterly, Vol. 55, 1958, pp. 72-74.
- "LCA Approves Broad Statement on Ecumenism," Foreword,
March 1983, p. 4.
- Marquart, K. "Theological Observer: Fellowship and
Merger: Some Lutheran Commonplaces," Concordia
Theological Quarterly, Oct. 1982, pp. 299 ff.
- Marty, Martin E. "A Historical Perspective on a Significant
Day in U.S. Lutheranism," Foreword, March 1983, p. 2.
- "New Churchbody Should Omit 'Inerrancy,'" Lutheran
Perspective, Nov. 1, 1982.
- "News: Lutheran Union Favored 6 to 1," The Lutheran,
Oct. 7, 1981, pp. 18-19.
- "Newsfront: Lutheran Union Favored by 64% of ALC
District Delegates," The Lutheran Standard,
Oct. 2, 1981, pp. 18-19.
- "Newsfront: Commission Starts Work on New Church,"
The Lutheran Standard, Oct. 15, 1982, p. 18.
- Ofstedal, Paul. "I think," The Lutheran Standard,
Jan. 23, 1981, p. 22.
- _____. "On Being Pro-Unity but Anti-Present
Process," Dialog, Spring 1981, pp. 160-161.
- Otto, Dr. Ewald J. "The Lutheran Merger," Affirm,
Christmas 1982, pp. 4-6.
- Poovey, William A. "Question Box: Does ALC Believe
in Inerrant Bible?" The Lutheran Standard,
Jan. 7, 1983.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
(cont.)

- Preus, David W. "From the President: Will We Meet the Challenge," The Lutheran Standard, March 20, 1981, pp. 26-27.
- _____. "From the President," The Lutheran Standard, June, 1981, p. 29.
- _____. "From the President," The Lutheran Standard, Oct. 16, 1981, p. 36.
- _____. "From the President; Lutheran Unity Recommendations," The Lutheran Standard, May 28, 1982, p. 36.
- _____. "From the President: Decisions of Unusual Importance," The Lutheran Standard, Oct. 15, 1982, p. 29.
- "Proposals Surface at Chicago Convocation," Lutheran Perspective, March 14, 1983.
- Reda, Dr. R. H. "President's Page," Lutherans Alert-National, Feb. 1983, p. 2.
- Schuetze, Armin W. "News and Comments: Mission not Merger," Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Volume 73, 1976, p. 71.
- "Some ALC History," Lutheran Alert-National, March 1983 pp. 13-14.
- "Three Lutheran Leaders say Reagan Budget will add to Suffering," foreword, March 1983, p. 1.
- "Thoughts on Inerrancy," Lutheran Perspective, Nov. 1, 1982.
- Tietjen, John N. "Union is Not An Option," Dialog, Spring 1981, pp. 144-147.
- _____. Which Way to Lutheran Unity? St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1966.
- Trexler, Edgar R. "Editor's Opinion: Clearer Directions for Lutherans," The Lutheran, Aug. 1981, p. 34.
- _____. "Editor's Opinion: Firm Steps Toward Christian Unity," The Lutheran, Jan. 20, 1982, p. 34.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
(cont)

"Turret of the Times," Christian News, April 4, 1983, p. 2.

Vogel, H. "News and Comments: Plans for Lutheran Unity,"
Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Volume 73, 1976, p. 71.

Wietzke, Walter R. "Against the Tide: The Case for
Lutheran Unity," The Cresset, March 1983, pp. 5-8.