

TO WHOSE GLORY ?

An Analysis of the Relationship Between the
Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod
and
Church of the Lutheran Confession
1938 - 1982

Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library
11331 W. Democracy Blvd. 65W
Mequon, Wisconsin

John A. Beck
April 19, 1982

TABLE OF CONTENTS

T O W H O S E G L O R Y ?

Introduction

I. THE DETERMINED STAND 1939 - 1952

CHAPTER ONE: 1938 - 1948 The Early Action.....3
CHAPTER TWO: 1949 - 1952 Sharpened Admonition.....5
CHPT. THREE: An Evaluation of 1938 - 1952.....8

II. THE DEBATE 1953 - 1961

CHPT. FOUR: 1953 - 1956 The Stage Is Set.....10

1953 - In Statu Confessionis
1954 - The Action Plan
1955 - Saginaw Convention
1956 - Romans 16:17 "x" 4

CHAPT. FIVE: 1957 - 1961 The Trumpet Sounds.....19

1957 - New Ulm Convention
-Romans 16:17 A Comparison
1958 - "A Letter To the Protesting Brethren"
1959 - "A Call To Decision"
1960 - Impasse and Birth
1961 - The Break
1953 - 1961 A Review

III. THE DEADLOCK 1962 - 1982

CHAPTER SIX: 1962 - 1964 The Issues Defined.....34

1962 - "Where Do Things Stand Now?"
1963 - Words!...Actions?
1964 - Bright Beginning...Dark Ending

CHPT. SEVEN: 1965 - 1969 Procedural Approaches and Difficulties....39

1965 - The "New" Approach
1966 - 1969 "Persistent Errorist"
1968 - 1969 "Weak Brother...False Teacher"

CHPT. EIGHT: 1970 - 1971 The CLC's New Campaign.....44

"Mark...Avoid"
"An Unwarranted Dilemma"

PREFACE

I have been told that there once was a day when you could enter a church building on a Sunday morning with the name Lutheran on its shingle and be relatively certain you would hear orthodox Lutheran doctrine. Today not only are you in danger of hearing non-Lutheran doctrine at such an establishment, but even of hearing it from a Roman Catholic priest! In such a doctrinally permissive age, one would naturally expect church bodies which still cling tightly to the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions to seek out one another's fellowship for mutual edification. Why then does a rift still exist between the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod and the Church of the Lutheran Confession? Wasn't their squabble only over the time to break with the Missouri Synod? Do they disagree only over the interpretation of historical events or is there a real difference in doctrine which fuels the continued separation? Does this division bring glory to God or to men? These questions and others like them have prompted this historical review.

Now, of course, this writer could speculate, as some care to do, on the personal motives of those who separated from their church bodies and eventually formed the Church of the Lutheran Confession (CLC), many of whom were former members of the Wisconsin Synod. I am at an obvious disadvantage there, because I was born too late to observe them in action. But then such an evaluation could easily lead to a careless judging of hearts. Rather a more accurate barometer of a man's thinking would be the documents to which he has signed his name. Those documents shall be the foundation

of this historical study. I realize that there is a danger here too. That is the danger of misunderstanding what a man has written or of making one man's writing inaccurately stand for a group. Hopefully, I have guarded against that pitfall but would most certainly welcome correction.

Anyone who knows something about the CLC, its history, and formation may be ready to call an error to my attention already. The title of this paper proposes to study the historical relationship between the CLC and Wisconsin from 1938 to 1982. But the CLC did not form as a church body until 1960. I assure you that this is not a mistake. The manner of thinking which led to the formation of the CLC did not develop overnight. The divergence of emphasis can be traced back into the Wisconsin Synod documents of the 1950's. During those trying days with Missouri, one can begin to note a sense of discomfort among certain Wisconsin Synod men, a discomfort about the way in which their church body was carrying out its admonition against The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. That discomfort eventually led to charges of false doctrine against their synod and separation from it. Thus this historical outline will not only reveal the two questions which seem to stand between our uniting today, but also trace the birth and development of them from 1938 - 1982.

Whether or not those differences on paper are really differences which should divide will be discussed in the conclusion of this paper. But as you now read on, I urge you to personally answer the question for yourself. Should these differences on paper continue to separate us? To whose glory does this separation continue?

CHPT. NINE: 1972 - The Final Meeting.....50
 CHAPTER TEN: 1973 - 1982 The Wind Down.....52

Conclusion

Appendices.....57

- A. Directory of Pastors and Teachers Who Had Identified themselves with the Lutheran Spokesman, 1958
- B. The Leadership and Membership of the Newborn CLC
- C. Wisconsin Resolution 1953
- D. Wisconsin Preamble and Resolution 1955
- E. Wisconsin Resolution 1956
- F. Wisconsin Resolution 1957
- G. "A Report to the Protest Committee"
- H. "A Call For Decision"
- I. Wisconsin Resolution 1961
- J. CLC Statistics: (1958) - 1980

End Notes.....78

Bibliography.....82

T O W H O S E G L O R Y ?

"So whether you eat or drink or whatever you
do, do it all for the glory of God."
I Corinthians 10:31

Every decision an individual makes and the conclusions an individual draws are grounded on and governed by certain presuppositions. Two men, one a Republican and the other a Democrat, can look at the same unemployment statistic and come to drastically different conclusions as to the effectiveness of the president's economic program. I believe that such a difference of perspective and presupposition among men of the Wisconsin Synod led them to divergent interpretations of the history of the 1950's and in turn to apparently different views of the application of Romans 16, 17, 18. This difference of presupposition seems to have caused the initial split with which we are still living today.

Now to be sure, the difference of presupposition was not based on political association, but on a difference in understanding our Lord's directive as to the handling of false doctrine when it appears within the fellowship. The Word of God clearly points us to two concerns. When we see error arise, we must be concerned about the spiritual welfare of the man who errs seeking to return him to a correct understanding.

Secondly, we must be concerned about the welfare of other members of the fellowship making sure his error does not inflict harm on their faith or our's. An awareness of both concerns will lead to orthodox practice. During the years of Wisconsin's dealing with the Missouri Synod, she tended to stress the concern for the brother. The men who would eventually break with the synod tended to emphasize the need for protection of the flock. I believe that such a difference in presupposition reflects on the way both groups view the historical events of the 1950's and on their application of the "avoid" in Romans 16:17.

For the sake of convenience let's divide the history into three segments. I. The Determined Stand, the years 1938 - 1952 will unveil the unyielding stand of the Wisconsin Synod over against the liberalistic leanings of the Missouri Synod. II. The Debate years, 1953 - 1961, will see that difference in presupposition show itself as the two groups come to different answers to these two questions: May we remain in fellowship with an erring church body while admonishing them (in statu confessionis) ? How do we identify a false teacher, as such who must be avoided (Rom. 16:17) ? Finally, III. The Deadlock, 1962 - 1982, will give us a look at the attempts which have been made to clarify and resolve the differences to date.

I. THE DETERMINED STAND 1938 - 1952

CHAPTER ONE: 1938 - 1948 The Early Action

Since no event in history takes place in a vacuum, a brief run-down of the historical events leading up to 1953 will help set the stage for that action. Although this study will analyze the relationship between the Church of the Lutheran Confession and the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod, the history of the Wisconsin--Missouri strife is essential to our study.

The first cracks in the confessional walls of the Synodical Conference, of which Wisconsin and Missouri were leading members, occurred in the 1930's. A Bible class presented at Trinity Lutheran Church of Neenah, Wisconsin in the troubled '50's began in this way.

Already in the 30's and 40's troubles began between the Missouri Synod and our Wisconsin Synod with the controversy over the military chaplaincy system, the doctrine of church and ministry and church fellowship. Missouri's position showed a definite change from the days of Walther as they began to show leanings toward fellowship based on less than full doctrinal agreement. ("A Troubled Church")

The LC-MS and the newly formed American Lutheran Church began discussing the possibility of fellowship in the 1930's. In 1938, the Missouri Synod adopted this statement:

The Brief Statement of the Missouri Synod, together with the Declaration of the representatives of the ALC and the provisions of this entire report. . . be regarded as the doctrinal basis for future church fellowship.¹

And soon after, the ALC said in convention that they would now view Missouri's Brief Statement "in light of" their own Doctrinal Declaration. They also added this most disturbing statement: we are "firmly convinced that it is neither necessary nor possible to agree on all non-fundamental doctrines."²

Such a statement suggested just the kind of theological latitude that the Synodical Conference had attempted to avoid since 1872. So in 1939 Wisconsin sent this message;

Not two statements should be issued as a basis for agreement; a single joint statement concerning the contested doctrines thetically and antithetically and accepted by both parties of the controversy is imperative....³

The 1940's painted a steadily deteriorating picture. 1941 saw the advent of the military chaplaincy problem and Missouri's joint work with the ALC. 1944 was the year Missouri abandoned its former position on scouting. And in 1945 a group of men took it upon themselves to draw up a defense of their action. This was the "Statement of the 44." Although this document was really never given official status in the Missouri Synod neither was it properly disowned. Pastor A.T. Kretzmann produced a study outline entitled, "A Comparison Between 'Old Missouri' and 'New Missouri.'" In it he uses two quotations which clearly show the subtle change that had begun to take place.

OLD MISSOURI--We Missourians consider a church body, as a body, orthodox only when the true doctrine resounds from all its pulpits and lecture chairs and in all writings which appear in public within a church body.... If it were shown us that even but one pastor were preaching false doctrine, and we would not put a stop to this false doctrine, we would thereby have ceased to be an orthodox synod and would have become a unionistic body. (Lehre und Wehre, LC-MS XXXVI, p. 262)

He contrasts that sound statement with the 1945 "Statement" and these three points: NEW MISSOURI

1. Deviation in doctrine or practice from certain teachings of the Bible is not divisive of church fellowship.
2. Not all acts of joint religious work with persistent teachers of false doctrine or their adherents are to be looked on as religious unionism forbidden by God.
3. Romans 16:17 is limited in application to those who are not Christians.

Such a deterioration of fellowship principles would bring about the breakup of the Synodical Conference in the years ahead.

CHAPTER TWO: 1949 - 1952 Sharpened Admonition

Perhaps you have begun to ask yourself, why didn't Wisconsin break with Missouri already in the 1940's if this decay was taking place? Well, the issues were certainly not as clear-cut then as they appear to us now. Wisconsin's admonition had to this point been directed at specific instances and was always met with Missouri's assurance that "all is well." 1949 - 1952 will mean a sharpening of that admonition, a zeroing in on the principles at stake.

A look at the proceedings of the 1949 Wisconsin Convention reveals the concern of the delegates and the gravity of the situation.

Your committee (Standing Committee on Church Union) has with deep concern observed an ever increasing number of incidents of joint worship and work under conditions which are contrary to Scripture. We are impressed by the growing frequency and boldness of these incidents.⁴

In the judgment of your committee there are two dangers that must be guarded against: hasty drastic action on one hand and inaction on the other.⁵

This convention took action by addressing six specific questions to the LC-MS in order to alert them to their errors and determine their stand.

In 1950, the ALC and LC-MS issued the "Common Confession Part I." This document would now occasion a study by all concerned to determine on what basis agreement had been reached.

Meanwhile the Wisconsin presses were rolling, churning out articles to educate pastors and laymen alike on the issue of church fellowship. Of future significance for our study is J.P. Meyer's article in the April 1950 Quartalschrift. In it he indicates a 1950 answer to one of the two questions which the CLC feels yet stand between us today. How do you identify a false teacher as such who must be avoided? His answer is based

on the words of the Apostle Paul, Romans 16:17.

Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. (KJV)

Now they must keep a watchful eye on anyone who may deviate from the doctrine which they had learned.... When Paul is here speaking of deviation in doctrine...he is thinking of such as ~~persist~~ in their wrong.⁶

Prof. Meyer says then that "persistence" is the key in determining whether or not one is a weak brother or false teacher. His argument is based on the present participle poiantas and its durative force.

When the 1951 Wisconsin Convention convened it found two documents at its door for study: the "Common Confession" and Missouri's answers to the six questions addressed to them in 1949. As to the answered questions, the Standing Committee on Church Union reported...

...that the various answers sometimes do not meet the facts upon which our questions were based and sometimes are in direct contradiction to them.⁷

The "Common Confession" didn't get a much higher grade for its statements were often of such a nature as to afford opposing views comfortable agreement.

Not only do we find the "Common Confession" to be inadequate in points noted, but that we also hold that the adoption of the "Common Confession" by the LC-MS involves an untruth and creates a basically untruthful situation since this action has been officially interpreted as a settlement of past differences which are in fact not settled.⁸

The Wisconsin men now determined that they would also make use of a second avenue of admonition--the Synodical Conference meetings. That opportunity came in August, 1952 when the Synodical Conference met in St. Paul, Minnesota. There our delegates were compelled to declare themselves in a "state of confession" over against Missouri until the 1951 Wisconsin convention could decide on official action.

Since our delegation was on the one hand determined not to make a decision that must be reserved for our Synod alone, but on the other equally determined that this testimony be upheld in spite of opposition that had been encountered, such a formal declaration was imperative.⁹

In November of this year, another article appeared in the Northwestern Lutheran which will also have significance for our future study. In it Prof. Blume explains that such a state of confession (in statu confessionis) is based on II Thessalonians 3:14,15.

If anyone does not obey our instruction in this letter, take special note of him. Do not associate with him, in order that he may feel ashamed. Yet do not regard him as an enemy, but warn him as a brother. (NIV)

Note the stress in this statement on the fact that we are treating Missouri as a brother.

In it (in statu confessionis) we suddenly find ourselves confronted with a situation wherein nothing is as it formerly was. The brother with whom we walked in peace, shoulder to shoulder, has broken rank.... Now our act of pointing to him in the light of his defection from rank is to serve the purpose of declaring to all men that we have reason, for the future, to refuse to accept such an identification, since the brother no longer stands shoulder to shoulder with us.¹⁰

So now everyone waited with their eyes firmly fixed on the 1953 synod convention to see what action would be taken. Was it now time to break with the sister of 80 years?

CHAPTER THREE: An Evaluation of 1938 - 1952

I believe that there are a couple of things we would do well to carry over into the rest of this study. First of all, remember the two questions we mentioned which are thought to have caused the split between the Wisconsin Synod and future CLC men. Both have been answered as far as Wisconsin is concerned.

1. May we remain in fellowship with an erring church body while admonishing them?

The "state of confession" based on II Thessalonians 3:14,15 gives a yes answer to that one.

2. How do we identify a false teacher, as such who must be avoided (Rom. 16:17) ?

Prof. Meyer's article indicates that "persistence" in error is the key. Thus the Wisconsin Synod continued to treat and admonish the LC-MS as a weak brother who is permitting false doctrine to stand unchecked.

Secondly, we can bury the thought that the men who eventually broke with Wisconsin and eventually settled with the CLC were unaware of the events taking place and merely acted on emotion. The truth of the matter is that some of the most talented men of our synod cast their lot with the CLC. E. Reim was the president of our seminary, reporter for the Northwestern Lutheran, and member of the Standing Committee on Church Union. Otto J. Eckert was the Michigan District Chairman and NWL writer. W. Schaller was a Nebraska District Union Committee member. Gordon Radtke was chairman of the union committee in the Minnesota District. M.J. Witt was president and G. Sydow was vice-president of the Pacific-Northwest District. The ability of these men and others like them explain why the CLC established itself so quickly and developed such a smooth

running and efficient structure. These men are not cut from a completely different cloth than those in the Wisconsin Synod. They are classmates and roommates, friends and fellow-pastors.

To say that such men operated solely on emotion and not on conviction would be a terrible misrepresentation. They strongly insisted on protection of the flock. And many of them were in a position to see that such protection was necessary. The smaller districts which would produce many CLC men were usually in areas to which the younger Missouri pastors were sent. There the younger men would find themselves much freer to practice the new fellowship principles than, let us say, in Wisconsin or Michigan where the older Missouri men kept them in check. The smaller districts also afforded more individuals opportunity to get involved in the district union committees and thus have greater first hand knowledge of the "new" Missouri. Now we will see that their desire to protect the flock will lead them to view Missouri's action and the history of the coming years differently than others in the synod. They will demand quicker recognition of Missouri as a false teacher and eventually separate from a church body they feel is guilty of false doctrine.

II. THE DEBATE 1953 - 1961

We are about to enter upon one of the most crucial and most confusing segments of our synod's history. A time during which she could have easily, but for the grace of God, fallen prey to the spirit of ecumenism that still thrives today. Wisconsin was faced with the two concerns mentioned earlier: for her sister synod's spiritual health and for the health of her own congregations and members. As a voting body, the synod generally stressed the need to help Missouri. Those who stress the need to protect the flock at home will come out early in memorials asking for an early break with Missouri. Among those signatures one can easily pick out the names of many individuals who will begin to appear on CLC rosters. (See Appendix A & B) We will also see general confusion over what is said or not said in synod resolutions and different thoughts expressed as to when Roman's 16:17 must be applied. From 1953 - 1956 the stage for the debate of the above issues will be set. And in Chapter 5, the trumpets will sound for the actual debate over the history and the two questions mentioned earlier.

CHAPTER FOUR: 1953 - 1956 The Stage Is Set

1953 - In Statu Confessionis

The 1953 Houston convention of the Missouri Synod offered little hope as she reaffirmed her stand on the "Common Confession" and said Part II which was to help clarify Part I would not be ready until 1956.

The issue was now clearly defined in the eyes of the 1953 Wisconsin Convention as the Floor Committee on Church Union reports:

The issue that has opened this serious breach between our Synod

and the Missouri Synod and threatened the continued existence of the Synodical Conference is unionism.¹¹

In a recessed session on October 8,9 in Milwaukee, the delegates declared themselves in a "state of confession" (in statu confessionis) over against Missouri. (See Appendix C) The delegates did not vote to completely break with their sister synod but to restrict fellowship with her, remaining in fellowship only for the purpose of extricating her from error. The in statu confessionis means just that. Wisconsin was fixed and unmoving (statu) in her stand and confession.

The delegates also realized the need for instruction of the Synod's own and thus commissioned the barrage of tracts that were to be produced. Eleven rolled off the presses which treated the main issues of the controversy.

1. Lutheran Bodies in the U.S.A.
2. 1938 - 1953
3. Every Sinner Declared Righteous
4. Not By My Own Reason or Strength
5. If the Trumpet Give an Uncertain Sound
6. Chosen By Grace From Eternity
7. Our Position Against Scouting
8. Cooperation in External
9. Antichrist
10. Prayer Fellowship
11. The Chaplaincy Question¹²

These also found their way into the hands of the LC-MS laity and the Synodical Conference delegates. Both were not being fairly apprised of the situation by the Missouri Praesidium and committees.

Of interest in 1953 are two statements made by future CLC men. W. Schaller Jr. presented an alternate resolution at the initial 1953 Convention in which he urged immediate break with Missouri.

We find that all efforts over the years to bring the LC-MS back to the scripturally correct position in these matters has failed and that we have exhausted all avenues of admonition-opportunity.¹³

Also note these words of Prof. E. Reim in his "As We See It" column

in the Northwestern Lutheran.

It is granted that issues such as those before us call for the exercise of the best judgment (emphasis mine) of which we are capable, also with regard to such things as method and timing. It is likewise granted that in this area of discussion we may have honest differences of judgment (emphasis mine) which we are bound to respect in each other.¹⁴

These future CLC men still obviously hold to the answers that Wisconsin gave those two questions. Schaller indicates admonition may be carried out over against a church body while in fellowship. And Reim grants that the identification of a false teacher as such is a matter of judging the motives behind the error, thus allowing individuals to come to the conclusion that a break is necessary at different times. Both answers would apparently be unacceptable to them in years to come.

1954 - The Action Plan

At this time the discussions with Missouri were being handled by the Conference of Presidents. They too had met with little progress but continued to urge the need for antithetical statements in the "Common Confession." You can feel the frustration in their NWL report.

We charged the Missouri with unionism and honestly meant it. They showed that they did not understand the term as we do.¹⁵

This year is also the date of a most informative and directive article in the Quartalschrift (the Wisconsin Synod theological publication). In it Prof. C. Lawren~~z~~ outlines the action demanded in the Word of God, the very action that was and would continue to be taken in our dealings with Missouri. He first of all demonstrates that error born of weakness does not demand separation.

Weakness in faith is in itself not a barrier to Christian fellowship. It is rather an inducement for exercising our fellowship for the purpose of helping our brethren overcome their weakness.¹⁶

Even on the day that Jesus ascended into heaven the Apostles showed a woeful ignorance as to the nature of Christ's kingdom.... In patient love Jesus corrected, instructed and strengthened them as weak disciples.¹⁷

Now recall again for yourselves the two questions and hear his answers. Does Scripture allow for a "state of confession?"

We may learn this from Paul in his dealings with the problem at Thessalonica.... In spite of Paul's instruction and admonition, some members of this church would not drop their false opinions concerning the nearness of Christ's return for judgment. and began to act on their false assumptions in that they ceased to work.

Even now Paul does not recommend a complete break of fellowship relations (II Thess. 3:14,15). He is still ready to believe that the offenders are not hardened in their course, for he entertains the hope that they may still be brought to blush in penitent shame when they are given to realize how serious their brethren consider their disorderly conduct. Yet their fellowship is to be restricted now to a final brotherly admonition administered through the very act of withdrawing from these offenders. The brethren are to mark such offenders and that for the purpose of not associating with them.

Such withdrawal is to call his brotherly standing into question, so that he may realize that if he persists, the congregation will be compelled to separate from him....¹⁸

Secondly, how may we identify a false teacher as such who must be avoided?

With equal clarity the Lord tells us likewise in His Word that we can no longer recognize and treat as brethren those who in spite of earnest admonition persistently cling to an error in doctrine, who demand recognition and toleration for their error and make propaganda for it.¹⁹

As Prof. Lawrence indicates, Scripture lays out a plan of action for the Christian when he sees falsehood arise in the brotherhood. He is to admonish with the Word of God making every effort to correct that error. If the individual or church body persistently refuses to accept admonition and the admonisher is convinced that such rejection is no longer born of weakness, then the errorist may be so branded and avoided in obedience to Rom. 16:17.

Before leaving 1954, we also ought to note that in the district conventions of 1954 certain districts (Nebraska, Dakota-Montana and the

Pacific-Northwest) strongly urged the synod to break fellowship in the coming 1955 convention. Obviously many men in these districts were convinced that enough admonition had been given and that Missouri had moved from being a weak brother to a false teacher who must be avoided to protect the flock. Not suprisingly a great number of future CLC men will exit from these districts.

1955-- Saginaw Convention

This convention will probably be the most confusing and difficult to understand of all the conventions that play into this history. Many times I said to myself, "If only I had been there, maybe then I could have a better picture of what actually was voted or not voted on." But then again, even individuals who were present in Saginaw came away with drastically different conclusions. As the convention began, there was a great fear that Wisconsin herself might be becoming a unionistic body by her continued association with Missouri. The real question at hand was, is the LC-MS beyond help, have we done all we can without seriously endangering our own?

The answer to that question would depend on whom you happened to ask. The president stated in his report:

Let us diligently and honestly inquire whether we have paid our entire debt of love and patience, whether we have made full proof of our ministry.²⁰

For those of us who have been closest to these problems, it appears quite definite that we must now obey the Lord's Word in Romans 16:17.²¹

The Standing Committee on Church Union which had been working directly with Missouri suggested a resolution which would call for the break. The Floor Committee examined that resolution and produced a preamble (Appendix D) which was unanimously adopted. The preamble

was intended to clearly show Missouri's causing of divisions and offences itself was warrant enough for a break without a specific charge of false doctrine.

The preamble, which reiterated the 1953 charges of our Synod and applied Rom. 16:17,18 was unanimously adopted. All were firmly convinced and fully agreed that the charge of unionism against the LC-MS was valid and that the Romans passage is applicable....²²

Certainly with all the above, one would expect that preamble to be followed by a resolution to break fellowship. But a quick look at Appendix D will reveal that the application of the "avoid" of Romans 16 was held up. The reason for the delay is difficult to pin down. As I understand it, the LC-MS at this time met in convention every three years. They had last met in 1953 just prior to the Wisconsin convention of that year, and so had no opportunity as yet to consider the 1953 in statu declaration in assembled convention. Thus a recessed convention of Wisconsin delegates was called for in 1956 whose duty would be to examine the Missouri response to our "state of confession." The Northwestern Lutheran reported:

By applying this Word of God (Rm. 16:17,18) to the present situation the Wisconsin Synod declares publicly that it will and must, in obedience to the Lord, terminate fellowship with the LC-MS if there is no concrete evidence of a substantial change in situation.²³

The Post-Convention News Bulletin put it this way:

Agreement on the fact that Rm. 16 applied to the situation in the Missouri Synod was almost unanimous. The divisions and offences are clear. There was an honest difference of opinion on whether to break completely with the LC-MS now or whether we..."still have an unpaid debt of love...."

We ought to note here that the Wisconsin delegates were not voting on whether or not to obey the words of Rom. 16, but on whether or not they applied to the situation. There were divisions and offences but were they of such a nature that demanded the "avoid" of Rom. 16:17?

The confusing element is that the convention voted in the preamble that the words did apply, but then voted to hold up the vote on that conclusive judgment until 1956. The preamble of a resolution like a rider to a motion only becomes valid when both are passed.

Prof. Lawrence added a little side note here. In past years the synod had left itself in a fix with the Protestant controversy because of lack of documentation. This time they were looking for charges that could be substantiated by black-on-white evidence which would stand the test of time.

Well at the adoption of the resolution to hold up the judgment vote, Prof. Reim submitted his resignation from the Union Committee and from the seminary presidency. The convention, however, reiterated its confidence in him and urged the Board of Control not to accept it. Several other men also noted their disapproval with the synod's action many of whom would become members of the CLC.

It is also significant to note that Pastor W. Schaller submitted a memorial to this convention which called into question the Scriptural grounds for an in statu confessionis. We now have men who desire to protect the synod's members that are beginning to seriously question the synod's action.

1956 - Romans 16:17 "x" 4

The honest misgivings some men are having about the action taken at Saginaw will now also be compounded by the various interpretations and applications of Romans 16:17. What is Paul telling us to do and how does it relate to the other directives on fellowship in Scripture?

The 1956 LC-MS convention offered new rays of hope. Missouri had declined an invitation to the unionistic Lutheran World Federation and retired the "Common Confession" as a functioning document.

This action led the 1956 Wisconsin delegates to adopt a resolution to continue the state of confession and hold up the final vote on the application of Rom. 16:17 again. (See Appendix E) Another plan was also set in motion which promised to iron out the difficulties or at least get the issues into the open on black-and-white. The convention voted to participate in the proposed "conclave of theologians." This Synodical Conference effort to draw up a working doctrinal statement held much promise.

This convention was also besieged with memorials. Many of them read like a "Who's Who" of the later CLC organization. Of special note is the stronger language being employed by the Dakota-Montana and the Pacific-Northwest Districts. President Witt in the Pacific-Northwest strongly urged his district in convention that the time for the break had come. We must remember that these districts were undoubtedly seeing the new Missouri fellowship principles in practice right next door. That coupled with their desire to protect the flock had brought many men close to calling their synod's action unscriptural.

The delegates at the 1956 Convention also heard a paper read by Prof. Kowalke which added sharply to the misunderstanding and confusion surrounding the Romans passage. He had some very fine things to say.

Although our admonition is not identical with the discipline that leads to excommunication, the principle laid down in Matt. 18 applies to all cases of admonition, namely this, that no effort to win our brother must be spared and that we give up only when he proves that he does not want to hear us. The alternative to Christian judgment in the practical application is the legalistic form of application.²⁴

That again very clearly reflects the Wisconsin answer to the question of identifying a false teacher as such. Sanctified Christian judgment is the key. But the confusion in the matter comes with this statement.

Paul expects the Christian not only to avoid them, but to know how to avoid them. We do the avoiding; how we do it is our responsibility?²

Are we shunning them? We have reproved them for practices that we consider contrary to the word and spirit of the Gospel; we have tried to convince them ~~of~~ the wrongfulness of their actions; we have refused to become participants in those actions; we have warned them that we must declare them out of fellowship if they persist. That I maintain is shunning; that is avoiding them.²⁴

At this time, we can now see 3 and possibly 4 opinions on when the "avoid" of Romans 16:17 must be applied.

1. Dr. A Brux of the LC-MS had contended that the passage dealt only with the avoiding of unbelievers. Thus the passage was beyond consideration in a fellowship situation.

2. Prof. Lawrence maintained, as we saw in the 1954 Quartalschrift article, that the passage does apply in dealing with fellow Christians who err and that the avoid must be enforced when Missouri was determined to be fixed in her error despite admonition. Remember that vote on the 1955 resolution is still pending.

3. Prof. Kowalke suggests that we have already exhausted the demands of the passage with our state of confession.

4. This is the application which is developing in the minds of those who feel a greater need for protection of the flock. They are about to demand that once admonition has been given and rejected by an erring church body, they must be avoided. Thus the identification of a false teacher is not a matter of human judgment used to determine when the church body is fixed in its error, but simply a matter of seeing one's admonition rejected.

The years 1953 - 1956 have set the stage. All the emotions and feelings are right for the debate on the question above.

CHAPTER FIVE: 1957 - 1961 The Trumpet Sounds

This portion of history is perhaps more action packed as far as debate is concerned than the years following when the CLC has formed. 1957 will reveal groups beginning to meet in free conferences as they see the Wisconsin Synod putting off the break again. The 1958 "Letter to the Protesting Brethren" which was sent to calm the troubled waters served to stir them and called forth the "Call to Decision." Finally this period ends with the birth of the Church of the Lutheran Confession and the death of the Missouri--Wisconsin fellowship.

1957 - New Ulm Convention

If you have enjoyed trying to figure out the 1955 convention, you'll no doubt appreciate the challenge of 1957. The delegates arrived at New Ulm knowing that nothing had really changed on the Missouri--Wisconsin scene. But in Wisconsin itself there was trouble. The divided feelings on the issues had begun to take a toll in the parishes themselves. The president's report certainly tells a big story.

Many individuals, several conferences, and one district are convinced that we as a synod are guilty of disobedience to God's Holy Word, because we have not yet applied the injunction of Rom. 16:17,18 to the LC-MS.

Others in Synod are of the conviction that doctrinal discussions as now carried on are the one means by which we can testify of our conviction.²⁵

President Naumann was speaking of memorials like this one signed by three future CLC men.

It is with deepest regret that we find it necessary to admonish our own Synod in a matter of doctrine and practice. But we dare not tolerate our Synod's false position....

...once Christians have found an individual or church body guilty of causing divisions and offences contrary to the true doctrine (Rom. 16;17), there must be no delay in carrying out the Lord's command to avoid such an individual or church body by a cessation of all practice of church fellowship.

This separation must take place, even though, for example, there may seem to be hope of winning errorists back to the truth. Such an assumption would be a matter of human judgment only, where God's Word simply says: "Avoid."

John Lau

Paul H. Praeter

Jon. Schaller 26

Already here is evident the understanding that the avoiding of Rom. 16 must take place upon observation of rejected admonition and not upon determining the motive behind that action. The first cracks have appeared and will continue to grow in this convention.

Because of the volume of such protests and memorials, a special Protest Committee had been set up earlier to handle them. Their report to the 1957 Convention gives us an inside look at the confusion over the understanding of the Saginaw Convention and the application of Rom. 16:17,18.

While there exists in our midst confusing divergence of opinion concerning the interpretation of Rom. 16:17,18 especially with regard to the meaning of the expression "avoid them;" while essays were delivered and it would appear were officially or tacitly accepted in our midst which are not in harmony with one another; yet the Synod did speak very clear language concerning the passage at the Saginaw Convention in 1955 when it passed a resolution unanimously, stating that the passage did apply to the LC-MS, though the voting on the break was delayed....²⁷

When it came time for this 1957 Convention to vote both the Standing and Floor Committee on Church Union ~~suggested~~ a resolution to break. After lengthy discussion the motion to break was defeated on a close vote, 77 - 61. A hurriedly produced second resolution (Appendix F) has weaknesses as the author has freely admitted. I must confess that I still do not have a completely clear understanding of what that resolution means, other than that nothing had changed in our relationship with Missouri and the in statu confessionis remains.

However, it obviously meant something very serious to Pastors M.J. Witt, P. Albrecht and W. Schaller for all made statements after the vote charging the Synod with unscriptural practice. Prof. Ed. Reim resigned again with these words;

I find myself compelled to discontinue my fellowship with the Synod. I hope and pray that the Synod may yet return to its former ways and to full obedience to the Word of God, specifically Romans 16:17,18. ²⁸

Now that charges of false doctrine have been leveled and fellowships broken, these men began to meet in free conferences. October saw the first in Lyons, Nebraska but was quickly followed by meetings in Spokane, Washington and Mankato, Minnesota in the last months of the year. The purpose of those meetings was for mutual discussion and strengthening as well as to give support to the Japanese mission under Pastor F. Tiefel that had left the Wisconsin Synod in January of this year. Not surprisingly at the very first meeting in Lyons, the initial steps were taken ^{toward} ~~for~~ the production of Concerning Church Fellowship. That document would become the chief article of the CLC on the matter of fellowship.

Romans 16:17 A Comparison

As we have just seen, the 1957 convention saw the initial move taken by several men toward an application of Romans 16:17 which at least on paper will be a divisive issue in the years to come. Keep in mind that there is no Church of the Lutheran Confession as yet, but men have begun to gather into groups and express common concerns. One of these men, Pastor Paul F. Nolting, prepared a paper in September of 1957 entitled "Theses and Antitheses on Romans 16:17." When statements made in that paper are compared with those in a study of the

same passage prepared at Thiensville on Nov. 19,20,21, 1957 upon the request of President Naumann, the difference in presupposition in approaching the passage becomes clear.

The Wisconsin study indicates:

The Apostle tells us to "mark" (observe, examine, take note of) those who cause divisions and offenses. From the rest of Scripture there can be no doubt that such dividers and offenders must be admonished, warned, and instructed, so that the law of Christian love might indeed be fulfilled. Whether the marking occurs concurrently with such admonition, or results from it, makes little difference in the application of this passage in practical church life. The admonition stands, however, that certain people must be "marked." While the word "marking" in itself does not contain the idea of admonishing, warning, and educating, the rest of Scripture is too clear on that point even to permit the thought to arise that the law of Christian love must not receive recognition.

Over against that, here is the statement by Nolting in his study.

<p style="text-align: center;">Thesis:</p> <p>that God's directive, "Mark... avoid," admits of no delay when the erring reveals themselves to be causers of divisions and offences.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Antithesis:</p> <p>as sophistry any argument that the "avoiding" must be deferred until all hope of regaining the errorist is extinguished.</p>
---	---

Be careful not to make the same mistake this writer did at first analysing the difference in position. It would be easy to come to the conclusion on the basis of what some Wisconsin men had written that the Synod's view of this passage was "Mark...admonish...avoid." This could be understood correctly but to be sure Paul in the Romans passage in question is speaking of someone who is "marked" as an errorist after admonition has been given. Both of the above demand separation once an errorist is identified as such. The difference will come in the application not the interpretation of the passage.

The difference I would like you to note in the two quotations is the emphasis. The Wisconsin evaluation stresses a real concern for the erring and the paper by Nolting stresses protection of the flock. Undoubtedly an individual whose concern lies with the flock will

have a tendency to identify a person in error as beyond help sooner, while the individual whose concern is with the brother will perhaps give him more time. I would imagine that difference has been seen by the reader in pastors within our own Synod.

That basic difference in presupposition is leading the two camps to a different view of when Romans 16:17 needs applying. Wisconsin has maintained that the use of sanctified Christian judgment will determine when the one in error is fixed in that error despite admonition. The other view is that Rom. 16 must be applied when the one in error reveals himself to be so. Thus it requires no human judgment of the motive only the ability to see. They feel Wisconsin confuses the passages which deal with excommunication (Matthew 18) and those that deal with termination of church fellowship.

A quick jump ahead to a paper prepared by Rev. L. Schierenbeck for the CLC's initial convention will illustrate this point. He says,

The moment that we mark anyone to be a causer of divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine we have learned, they are to be avoided. At this point, in contradistinction to excommunication, no lengthy process is to be instituted to discover the cause of this tragedy. As soon as we have marked a brother as a causer of divisions and offences, he is to be avoided.²⁹

Excommunication requires the establishment of impenitence; termination of church fellowship requires only the establishing of the fact of continuance in error, without regard to the cause or underlying motive of the action.²⁹

The question seems to revolve around whether the motive or action is the important indicator. But do not think that at this time the issues were so clear cut. The debate on these issues and the clarifying of positions has only just begun.

1958 - "A Letter to the Protesting Brethren"

As the "Report to the Nine Districts" was being prepared, there was good news from the Joint Union Committee. The "conclave of theologians" in which all Synodical Conference synods were represented had produced several strong statements on: the inspiration, the authority, and the interpretation of Scripture.

But again trouble in the districts is evident. In general, the minutes of those district conventions reveal discontent over the lack of understanding of the resolutions from recent conventions and over the application of Romans 16:17. This Minnesota District resolution is representative.

We deplore the lack of clarity and unity with which our own Synod has spoken and acted in its efforts to admonish and correct the sister synod of Missouri, as is evidenced by the confusion and division in our midst.³⁰

Pastor P. Albrecht, president of the Dakota-Montana District, was urging strong action.

We need of course not agree with our Synod in everything that it resolves. There are matters in which the Word of God is not at stake. When the majority strays from the Word then love compels us to speak clearly and loudly in disavowal and do all that we can to bring the majority back into harmony with the Word.³¹

Despite this plea his district supported the present synodical action. He resigned after the vote, but was asked by the convention to reconsider.

The troubled Pacific-Northwest District reported seven resignations in 1957: R. Dommer, W. Karnitz, L. Bernthal, I. Zarling, M. Witt, F. Tiefel, and G. Sydow. The first six will have associated themselves with the Lutheran Spokesman publication by the end of the year. (See Appendix A)

I believe that is sufficient evidence to reveal the unrest in several of the districts. The Protest Committee felt somewhat bound

at this time because the information needed to answer the questions and protests lay in the hands of other committees. Seeking first-hand information, they met with the Church Union Committee. As a result of that meeting, a written report was drawn up by the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Church Union Committee, Prof. C. Lawrence, and sent to the Protest Committee for their use. They, in turn, decided to send that letter out intact along with a cover letter. At this time the reader would do well to read that report found in Appendix G.

The four questions discussed reveal two important facts:

1. What our Synod therefore held in abeyance at Saginaw (1955) was not merely the "avoiding," the breaking of fellowship, enjoined in Romans 16:17f but also the conclusive application of the very judgment, namely the judgment that the Missouri Synod was persistent in causing divisions and offenses.³²
2. The fact that an individual or a church body has fallen into an error of doctrine or practice, or even the fact that the individual or the church body still defends that error of doctrine or practice, is not yet in itself a reason for terminating church fellowship. TERMINATION OF CHURCH FELLOWSHIP IS CALLED FOR WHEN YOU HAVE REACHED THE CONVICTION THAT ADMONITION IS OF NO FURTHER AVAIL AND THAT THE ERRING BROTHER OR CHURCH BODY DEMANDS RECOGNITION FOR THEIR ERROR.³²

Point one attempts to help the protesters who thought the Synod had already voted that Missouri was a "causer of divisions and offenses" without enforcing the "avoid." It states that the conclusive identification of Missouri with any part of the passage was still being held in abeyance (and in fact it will be until 1961).

In the second point, you can clearly see the Wisconsin key for identification of a false teacher who must be avoided. The portion I have emphasized which shows the need for sanctified Christian judgment in determining the motive of the error will come in for harsh criticism very soon.

Several of the protesters penned immediate responses. Perhaps the clearest can be found in the "Open Letter to the Protest Committee" by E. Reim dated October 28, 1958. Both of the points just mentioned are addressed.

1. Since both the final development by its author and its eager acceptance by so many others falls into the period when it became imperative to find what is called "an interpretation that makes sense," is it not possible that the natural human desire to rationalize a bad situation has played a part in all this? Isn't the real question before you not whether the interpretation, but whether the original action of Saginaw made sense? My contention and I think that of most of the protesters, is that it did not.³³

2. Is it not an injection of a foreign, man-made thought into the simple sense of Romans 16:17 to say that "termination of church fellowship is called for when you have reached the conviction that admonition is of no further avail and that the erring brother or church body demands recognition for their error?" After all the passage in question states that this is to be done when one has "marked (noted, identified, recognized) them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine that we have learned."³³

The same type of thinking is also now finding voice in publication. The men who were meeting in the free conferences began a publication called The Lutheran Spokesman. The "Forward" states:

The policy and purpose of this new periodical which greets you at this time is summarized on the front cover. The name, "Lutheran Spokesman," indicated that it is our purpose to be a true daughter of the reformation and to speak as Martin Luther did in his time.³⁴

If any of you has read portions of this publication or portions of the CLC's theological publication, The Journal of Theology, I am sure you would agree with me that both contain excellent articles. A particularly strong point of the Spokesman is its daily suggested study of the Lord's Word and Luther's Catechism.

But as I mentioned, the Spokesman will be the source of strong language when it comes to Wisconsin Synod practice. Already in the December, 1958 issue we find this well-honed jab at the Lawrence letter.

That this should have been written by one calling himself a Lutheran is unthinkable; John Calvin could not have done a better job of placing human reason in a judicial position over the Word of God; the Pope could not have done a better job of sophistry.

This whole concept of making our human reasoning the final determining factor (in terminating fellowship) is patently unscriptural.³⁵

1959 - "A Call ~~For~~ Decision"

The 1959 Convention was again faced with a tough decision.

The Standing Committee on Church Union reporting on the Synodical Conference discussions concluded that things again looked dim. But since those meetings had now arrived at the real issue in question, church fellowship, the convention delegates voted to continue the state of confession and urged the Union Committee to give primary attention to the fellowship issue in the Synodical Conference meetings.

Several memorials again charged the Synod with unscriptural practice, but the most notable would have to be the "Call ~~For~~ Decision" (see Appendix H). This document is obviously striking a blow at the 1958 Protest Committee letter, and particularly its directive that "termination of church fellowship is called for when the conviction has been reached that admonition is of no further avail and that the erring brother or church body demands recognition for their error." The memorial demands that the 1959 Convention disavow this statement because human judgment dare never be the basis for such a decision. Instead they maintain that the break must come "when Scriptural correction has been offered ~~and~~ rejected,"³⁶ so that the identification is merely a matter of seeing, "Mark...Avoid."

In Romans 16:17,18 the sole responsibility of human reason is to recognize the fact that the erring one continues in his error while rejecting previous admonition.³⁶

By this time you may have guessed that a great number of the men who signed that memorial, over half, would become members of the CLC.

Meanwhile, the free conferences continued to meet and their attendance grew. In October of 1959 at the "Red Wing Conference," this vote of confidence and subtle invitation for membership was given those leaving the ELS and Wisconsin Synod.

We conclude therefore, that both the Wisconsin Synod and the ELS are persisting in unscriptural fellowship with the heterodox Missouri Synod, and we are constrained to give full support and encouragement to those who have severed or are in the process of severing their membership in the above bodies in obedience to God's Word.³⁷

By this time, the paper on church fellowship was well underway and this group had established Immanuel Lutheran College in Eau Claire, Wisconsin. Obviously they are nearing the point of forming a church body of their own.

1960 - "Impasse" & "Birth"

The 1960 "Report to the Nine Districts" contained some very disturbing news. The troubles with Missouri had brought about an exodus from the Wisconsin Synod of 44 pastors, 6 professors, and 10 teachers, plus 3100 communicants.

This disturbing fact was coupled with what appeared to be a reluctance on Missouri's part to get at the fellowship issue in the Joint Union Committee meetings. Both at the October 1959 and January 1960 meetings, the Missouri representatives could present no official fellowship statement which discussed the issues. The Wisconsin representatives were determined to get to the bottom of this matter and indicated there would be no further discussions without such a statement "since an unscriptural practice of doctrine in this area would eventually undermine any joint statement on doctrine that we have drawn up or

might draw up in the future.³⁸

In May, the Missouri representatives had such a statement but one in which they made a distinction between the need for governed altar and pulpit fellowship, and the other areas of fellowship in question: youth work, armed services chaplaincy, mission work and prayer. Just a taste of their thinking on joint-prayer will suffice.

...a decision as to the propriety or impropriety of joint prayer must be based upon a consideration of the situation in which such prayer is offered, the character of the prayer itself, its purpose and its probable effect on those who unite in the prayer.³⁹

Despite all efforts to show the error and danger of such a position, Missouri held fast. So the committee reports than an "Impasse" has been reached in the Joint Union Committee discussions.

We as a committee believe that our full admonitory testimony on the Scriptural support of our conviction and on our adverse evaluation of the Missouri Synod viewpoint has been given and that the differences have not been resolved.⁴⁰

All the districts sound support to the work being done and by now it has become reasonably clear what must happen at the next convention.

While these ties between the Missouri and Wisconsin Synod had all but been severed, the interim conferences continued to meet and grow in strength. In January the Interim Conference at Mankato, Minnesota found the name "Church of the Lutheran Confession" suggested as the title for this new group. And the August convention at Watertown, South Dakota saw them organize beneath it.

An outgrowth and culmination of many meetings held during the preceding months of preparation and concentrated study and discussion, brethren from as far west as the state of Michigan, as well as the deep south, namely the state of Florida, gathered in convention as the invited guests of Trinity Lutheran Church of Watertown, South Dakota. Under the blessing and guidance of God this meeting together with the recessed sessions at Sleepy Eye, Minnesota, proved to be the organizing convention of the Church of the Lutheran Confession.⁴¹

Now I would suppose you would expect a note of happiness among this group of men just organized over the impending break between Missouri and Wisconsin. Instead, the closer the break seemed to get the harsher and sterner the criticism became. A paper entitled, "The Deepening Wedge of Error," written by Pastor Paul F. Nolting brings three charges against the Wisconsin Synod that a break now will not settle.

1.) The Wisconsin Synod's "New Doctrine" of church fellowship.
After the Saginaw Convention of 1955, the "synod" men began to feel constrained to justify Synod's refusal to obey Rom. 16:17. It became necessary for the leaders of the Synod to make themselves and others who were troubled believe that disobedience was actually obedience.

This effort to justify the action of Synod resulted in a pollution of the doctrine of fellowship, specifically in the area of termination of fellowship.⁴²

...one of the clearest passages (is) Rom. 16:17. As soon as this passage is mentioned, many of our opponents object: "But there are other passages!" It should be noted by us, when such objections are raised, that men begin to hate any Word of God that they do not want to obey.⁴²

The Wisconsin Synod has now provided such a "new" doctrine for its people, who besides being afflicted with "itching ears" are suffering also from complications brought on by the "ecumenical virus."⁴²

2.) Wisconsin's violation of the call.

(Synod) has assisted, encouraged, and almost applauded the ousting of faithful pastors. In all cases it has put the stamp of approval on such ungodly action by providing vacancy pastors and replacements.⁴²

3.) Wisconsin's denial of the authority and clarity of Scripture.

Satan used a very pious question to destroy the authority of the Word in the Wisconsin Synod. "When is the time, the right time to begin to obey?"⁴²

These same charges will be repeated again and again in the years to come.

1961 - The Break

One last effort in April of 1961, a meeting of the Joint Union Committees with the Overseas Brethren, failed to remove the impasse between Missouri and Wisconsin. And so the 1961 delegates voted to sever fellowship on the basis of Rom. 16:17,18. (See Appendix I)

The action of our Synod in suspending the practice of fellowship with the LC-MS did not come like a bolt out of the blue and break up the relationship between two bodies who were completely one in doctrine, but only established a fact that was becoming increasingly evident: that we were no longer united in the doctrine of church fellowship as once we were, but that the Missouri Synod had left what had been once common ground and that, therefore, we had no right to continue to practice fellowship.⁴³

An important thesis also came out of this convention which clearly states the Wisconsin position on fellowship. It was entitled "Church Fellowship." A couple of lines will reveal the principles which may have begun to sound quite familiar to you by this time.

...we see that in the matter of the outward expression of Christian fellowship, the exercise of church fellowship, particularly two Christian principles need to direct us, the great debt of love which the Lord would have us pay to the weak brother, and His clear injunction (also flowing out of love) to avoid those who adhere to false doctrine and practice and all who make themselves partakers of their evil deeds. Conscientious recognition of both principles will lead us to evangelical practice...which properly lies in the field of casuistry.⁴⁴

So fellowship may continue with a brother who is in error until such time as you determine he is stubbornly holding to that position in strength and not in weakness--

...who in spite of admonition persistently adheres to an error in doctrine or practice, demands recognition for error, and makes propaganda for it.⁴⁵

This same year the now established CLC published that document on fellowship which had been in the works since 1957--Concerning Church Fellowship. The majority is a very fine statement but there are two areas in which the seeds of trouble are planted. Although no names are used, there are two obvious references to the Wisconsin Synod by implication. In both cases the Wisconsin Synod is charged with positions she does not hold.

We further believe, teach and confess that established fellowships or existing fellowships are to be terminated when it has been ascertained that a person or group through a false position is

causing divisions and offences in the church.*⁴⁶

*NOTE: The place of admonition...is discussed later in this article. It does not belong to the essence of the principle stated below.

In this statement, you can see the charge which will be leveled at Wisconsin, that she claims admonition is an "essential part" of this Romans passage. Again there were men who had said that but it was never assumed as the official position of the Synod.

The second also goes beyond what Wisconsin maintained.

We further reject the teaching that false teachers and churches are to be avoided only when they no longer listen to admonition. In those communions which agree with us that there must be unanimity in all doctrines of Scripture as a basis for fellowship, some teachers have arisen who have thought that an existing fellowship is not to be terminated as long as the errorist will discuss the issues involved and permit admonition to be addressed to him.⁴⁷

Wisconsin never said that admonition must go on and on in fellowship as long as the errorist will hear it. These misunderstandings will be a source of great difficulty in the discussions to come.

But perhaps the biggest question for 1961 would be, what did the CLC think of Wisconsin's break with Missouri? The 1961 CLC convention report in The Lutheran Spokesman appraised the situation in this way:

The suspension of fellowship with the Missouri Synod was noted, but also noted was that this suspension of fellowship does not itself remove the real issues that lie between us, namely: deviation from the Scriptural doctrine of church fellowship, and the doctrine of the clarity and authority of Scripture, as well as instances of violation of the call.⁴⁸

Certainly this action of the Wisconsin Synod did little to remove the wedge between the two church bodies. The division would continue until those problems were resolved.

1953 - 1961 In Review

So far we have witnessed a good deal of action and history so a quick look back might be helpful at this time. In this past section we have seen men who would eventually join the CLC come out very early in memorials asking for an early separation from Missouri. They were certainly men who were aware of the decay in Missouri and felt a deep need to safeguard the Wisconsin members from it. The general unclarity of resolutions and different views on Romans 16:17 led them to different conclusions as to what the delegates had voted on and as to when the avoid of Romans 16:17 must be obeyed. They will continue to hold that the 1955 Convention disobeyed Scripture when it failed to avoid Missouri. And the question of how to identify a false teacher as such will continue to cause difficulty; Wisconsin saying that such identification consists in judging the motives behind the error, and the CLC men saying that it consists in seeing the error. The basic presupposition of protection of the flock, undoubtedly affecting both their historical and theological views, will continue.

The above differences led to charges of false doctrine and broken fellowships. But meanwhile another church body was being born as those men began to meet in conferences to discuss their beliefs. After several years of meeting in free conferences, they banded to form the Church of the Lutheran Confession. All attempts between the two church bodies to understand each other have failed. The conclusion Prof. Reichwald of the ELS draws after examining the 1961 CLC convention resolutions sums up the situation to date.

This wound in the Lutheran church shows no sign of healing.⁴⁹

III. THE DEADLOCK 1962 - 1982

Unfortunately at this point in the history, the issues between the Church of the Lutheran Confession and the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod were very hazy. Remember both had been occupied on other fronts. The CLC had been busy organizing and the Wisconsin Synod had been and would continue to be involved in the dissolution of the Synodical Conference. The efforts of the final period of history will reveal weary efforts to understand each other's position and will generally be characterized by one deadlock after the next. 1962 - 1964 will involve both bodies in efforts to focus the issues. The late 60's will continue that effort to understand each other and end in a frustrating procedural disagreement. That disagreement will center on whether or not historical references will be allowed into the discussion before agreement in principle. Frustrated at not being able to get their historical evidence admitted in court, the advent of the 70's will see the CLC go public with their historical view of Wisconsin's error. Finally we will examine the last meeting which took place between the two bodies in 1972. Since then there has been a gradual fading of interest in both camps.

CHAPTER SIX: 1962 - 1964 The Issues Defined

1962 - "Where Do Things Stand Now?"

"Where Do Things Stand Now?" was an article written in the November issue of The Lutheran Spokesman. In it Pastor C.M. Gullrud expresses

from the CLC's point of view where the trouble lies today.

The basic difference remains. So long as past actions are defended and supported instead of being repudiated, the differences will remain.⁵⁰

Although it is not expressly stated, I believe the chief difference he has in mind is that of how a false teacher is identified. He continues...

Furthermore, we cannot pass over actions that have been taken with official guidance whereby pastors and other called servants faithful to the Word have been separated from their God-appointed flocks and have suffered a violation of their divine calls.⁵⁰

On November 10, the initial meeting between the representatives of the CLC and Wisconsin Synod was held. The purpose was to discuss the reason for Wisconsin's break with Missouri. O.J. Naumann, C. Lawrence, and O. Siegler represented Wisconsin, E. Reim, E. Schaller, H. Duehlmeier and R. Gurgel the CLC. The discussion turned to church fellowship and received this grade from the Spokesman.

Inquiry concerning the sense in which this passage was understood led to a lengthy and inconclusive study of the Wisconsin theses, "Church Fellowship."⁵¹

Although the meeting apparently gained little, at least an initial effort had been made and the door was now open for future discussion.

This same year, Prof. Reim wrote an article for the December issue of the Journal of Theology which will be used as a tool for discussing the issues at a future meeting. A quick look here, however, will again reveal a nagging problem which will hamper discussion. The article, "Admonition and Romans 16" attacks two positions which Wisconsin is said to hold.

Now we contend that when the "marking" represents the identification, as Wisconsin holds the text implies, then to inject the process of admonition after this point and to postpone the "avoiding" until "this proves fruitless" is nothing less than to defeat the purpose of the Apostle's plea for "protection of the simple."⁵²

That implication I spoke of earlier in Concerning Church Fellowship

now has been stated clearly. But again Wisconsin agrees that once a false teacher has been marked as such he must be avoided. The problem will again come in the identification of such a false teacher. The second statement is this:

Yet making admonition an essential part of the "marking," a determinative part that fixes the time when the "marking" must cease and "avoiding" begin--this is again something that obviously defeats the plain purpose of the procedure. It offers talk where Paul calls for action.⁵³

Again, I know of no Wisconsin statement that "demands" admonition as a sine qua non in the application of this passage. This assigning of positions will add tremendously to the confusion.

Finally the article reveals just what the CLC key is for identification of a false teacher as such, the mere seeing of one's admonition rejected.

We have no right to consider them anything else than weak brethren; brethren overtaken in a fault. This is where we owe them an obligation, a debt of love, if you please, and where admonition is a "must." We pray and labor that it may succeed. But when it has been rejected--then the admonition that has been practiced, or rather the rejection of such admonition furnishes a firm and valid reason for now applying Romans 16. It is this rejection of admonition that has made the identification not only possible but positive. Now one can "mark" with certainty.⁵⁴

1963 - Words!...Actions?

In 1963, Wisconsin was again met with the charge that she clearly identified the Missouri Synod as an errorist but did not take the steps to avoid her.

Continued contact with the leaven of error in Missouri...polluted the Wisconsin position also. Wisconsin found itself compelled by criticism from within its own body to justify its grounds that recognition of a church as a "causer of divisions and offences" is not yet sufficient Scriptural grounds for separation.⁵⁵

Coupled with this repeated charge are now the charges of continued "ostentatious displays of togetherness." At this time, the Wisconsin Synod was effecting the dissolution of the Synodical Conference

and had yet to remove some of the aged ties with Missouri such as the joint WTMJ broadcasts and Bethesda work in Watertown, Wisconsin.

Positively, we can note an article written by Prof. Reim which looks to Wisconsin as a leader among the conservative Lutherans.

...who in spite of unresolved issues that lie between us will not admit to feeling a certain surge of pride over our former brethren who have found it within themselves to take this decisive action.⁵⁶

1964 - Bright Beginning...Dark Ending

1964 seemed to begin on a very bright note. With the Missouri association out of the picture, the two groups hoped to gain clarity on the issues in a January meeting. The Wisconsin representatives reviewed the CLC's statement on church fellowship, Concerning Church Fellowship, and concluded that there was nothing theologically in that statement to which they objected. Taking up the discussion of the 1962 article by Reim which we looked at earlier, the Wisconsin men tried to demonstrate that the positions assigned to them were positions which they did not hold.

The matter of the identification of a false teacher as such again seems to be the issue.

With the CLC, the Wisconsin Synod has but one issue.... The matter is not difficult. It has to do with the difference between the enlightening of the Holy Spirit to see truth and error and the attempt on the part of man to fathom the depth of one's disobedience. The one is the work of the Holy Spirit.... The other has never been given to man.⁵⁷

Thus the mere fact that Wisconsin cited agreement with their fellowship statement meant little. The CLC representatives now wanted to review the years 1955, 1956, 1957 and 1959 to show where the Wisconsin Synod had been in error and point to official statements that reflected that error. Well again at least some progress had been made.

But this somewhat bright beginning is beclouded by a Northwestern Lutheran statement which roused the ire of the CLC. In the August 9 NWL, the Dakota-Montana District report contained this statement:

...when a church body has "accused us of false doctrine and disobedience to God's Word," has "neither proved nor retracted these accusations," has fortified its accusations "by founding opposition altars" and has by these acts "perturbed souls and blasphemed the Gospel," we hold that "negotiations toward recognition should not be begun or continued under these conditions."⁵⁸

Both this statement regarded as slander by the CLC and the now growing disagreement over whether history or principle should be discussed brought the discussions to a standstill in 1964.

CHAPTER SEVEN: 1965 - 1969 Procedural Approaches and Difficulties

1965 - The "New" Approach

1965 begins the search for a new approach to the whole matter, one which would be agreeable to both parties. At the 1964 meeting, the CLC representatives expressed the need for a joint review of the history 1955 - 1961. In May of 1964 the "Report to the Nine Districts" states:

...a joint review of 1955 - 1961 would not serve a wholesome purpose.. This, of course, doesn't intend to mean that official pronouncements of a church body and its history can be ignored when evaluating its confessional position. However, our commission had in mind that your evaluation of our Synod's resolutions, actions and official interpretations...became the basis for the very issues which led to the separation between many of the present members of the CLC and our Synod...and that a restudy or re-examination of these years would seem to hold little promise of a more fruitful discussion at this time.⁵⁹

The door had been closed on the Missouri issue. And the commission felt such a review would only open up the battle wounds which had just begun to heal.

On April 6, 1965 a letter from President Naumann to President Paul Albrecht makes this overture.

In the interest of correctly understanding the answer, we consider a review of the background and history of our discussion to be imperative.

That certainly sounds like a turn around and a new approach, but is it? When you check the guidelines proposed for such a discussion and especially number two, you will see, as the CLC quickly observed, that this "new" approach gave no ground.

1. Submission to the authority of the Word.
2. ...that your board also understands that the need for an objective discussion of the basic principles in question renders premature any discussion of grievances inasmuch as that might becloud the issues.

3. Individual cases must be handled by those in whose jurisdiction their evaluation properly belong.
4. Reports are to be published only with the consent of both synods.⁶⁰

So ended the 1965 effort and the "new" approach.

1966 - 1967 "Persistent Errorist"

By this time a special meeting was necessary just to find a proper procedure. On March 1, 1966 such a meeting was held to seek satisfactory premises on which to base and guide the discussion. By December 19, 20, 1966 both camps met again in Milwaukee to discuss "Church Fellowship." As I understand it, the meeting chiefly discussed the question of identifying a false teacher as such. The Wisconsin report states:

It was contended by the CLC representatives that "Persistent adherence" to error despite admonition is not the criterion by which we judge whether we are to mark and avoid....

...the only prerequisite, according to the CLC representatives, for applying the "avoid" of Romans 16:17 is to ascertain whether a person or group is causing divisions and offences.⁶¹

This answer did little in the way of removing the questions at hand so the CLC was presented with three questions for consideration:

1. What role does Scripture apply to admonition in dealing with a weak brother?
2. What is your view of poiountas (Rom. 16:17) in light of your objection to "persistent?"
3. Would a discussion of Walther's Thesis III. Open Question help?⁶²

The letters which close out the year express a persistence of their own and reflect a drone which will become characteristic of all correspondence exchanged.

Aug. 14, 1967 ~~Albrecht~~ to ~~Naumann~~

The Board of Doctrine agrees to engage in a discussion with with the WELS Commission on the significance of the present participle poiountas of Romans 16:17, and on the meaning of "ascertain"(see above) with the understanding that the discussion allow for necessary

references to relevant official resolutions and declarations.

Aug. 14, 1967 Naumann to Albrecht

Our Commission on Doctrinal Matters continues to assert that such a procedure is improper. It contends that when a charge is raised that a church body has deviated in any field from Scriptural principles or even that its statements of principle in this field leave room for error, it is the duty of those raising the charge to define the particular deviation.... Only when agreement on principle has been reached has a criterion been set on which past actions and pronouncements could be profitably reviewed and evaluated.

Prof. Lawrenz put it this way. These men had "burned their bridges." That will color the way in which they view the history when they were part of the Synod. At the same time, it will rule out an objective view of what happened between Missouri and Wisconsin after they had left. The one hope for effective discussion lay in achieving agreement in principle. Once that had been reached both could take an objective look at the history, since both would then be working from common ground.

1968 - 1969 "Weak Brother...False Teacher"

The exchange of correspondence continued through the beginning months of 1968. Both sides continued to insist on their own procedure, Wisconsin demanding that they define their charge of false doctrine. In April, a letter addressed to the Doctrinal Commission of Wisconsin attempted to do just that, define the deviation. Basically the letter charges the Wisconsin Synod with failure to make a proper distinction between a weak brother and a false teacher. Note again the question of identification of a false teacher as such is the key. Their objection is to the sentence with which you are now quite familiar.

We can no longer recognize and treat as Christian brothers those who in spite of admonition persistently adhere to an error in doctrine or practice, demand recognition for their error, and make propaganda for it.⁶³

In their letter the CLC contends:

By thus taking a procedure which is prescribed for dealing with a brother who sins in weakness and applying it to the situation created by activities of false teachers and their adherents, the WELS document violates the directive of Rom. 16:17,18 and defeats a stated purpose of that passage, namely, that such causers of divisions and offences are to be avoided.

This is followed by a section of history written from their perspective which says Wisconsin identified the LC-MS conclusively as a false teacher in the 1950's, but failed to obey the Lord's command to avoid. Thus on the basis of that history they charge the Synod with carrying out a "protracted" course of admonition and confusing the procedure of handling a weak brother with that of handling a false teacher.

On September 6, 1968 a reply was mailed. First of all Wisconsin again chides that there will be no evaluation and discussion of that history without consensus agreement in principle. Secondly they ~~take~~ take up the matter of identifying a false teacher.

We still hold that the use we make of the passages concerning weak brethren in our "Statement on Church Fellowship" is Scriptural and that the CLC's definition of a weak brother, as restricted to those who ignorantly or inadvertently and privately embrace error is too narrow and does not do justice to the Scripture passages guiding us in our dealing with weak brethren (e.g. Acts 15:5ff).⁶⁵

Finally the Wisconsin reply again states that the CLC is charging the Synod with a position which is not held. Wisconsin had never officially applied any part of Romans 16:17 to the LC-MS until 1961.

The real questions which call for an answer are these: when is a church body to be acknowledged and when can it be known as engaged in the teaching of error and unscriptural practice? When is a course of admonition protracted and thus no longer warranted? These are matters of judgment as Dr. Walther also indicated in his Thesis on Open Questions of 1868. THESIS III: Even if an open error against the Word of God has infested a whole church body, this does not in itself make that church body a false church, a body which an orthodox Christian or the orthodox church would abruptly have to sever relations.

THESIS VIII: The church must take steps against any deviation from the doctrine of the Word of God, whether this be done by teachers or so-called laymen, by individuals or by entire church bodies.⁶⁵

A response from the CLC defended and reaffirmed their April letter and its charges. They said that history had only been introduced to "confirm and illustrate" the false position of Wisconsin. That position was again noted by showing the change of wording in "Church Fellowship" when compared with the Lawrence essay of 1954 (Cf. p. 12f). The essay says a false teacher is one who persists "in spite of earnest admonition." "Church Fellowship" says a false teacher is one who persists "in spite of patient admonition."

The word "patient" introduces a new and quite different element into the thought, particularly in the framework of the debates and resolutions of Synod between 1955 - 1961.⁶⁶

And finally, their letter concludes that they see no conflict with Walther and the theses mentioned.

As 1969 rolls around, it was becoming increasingly evident that discussion was getting nowhere. An August 5, 1969 invitation from Wisconsin to discuss "weak brother and persistent errorist" was declined. A report to the 1969 Wisconsin Synod Convention contained news of the stalemate.

...they (CLC) deem it urgent that both sides submit to the need for restoring unity by frank and honest confrontation with the truth, historical as well as Scriptural, without further recourse to unrealistic procedural reservations which have proved to be obstacles to prompt attainment of God-pleasing objectives to our discussion.⁶⁷

CHAPTER EIGHT: 1970 - 1971 The CLC's New Campaign

The advent of the 1970's saw a continuation of the stalemate over procedure. The CLC was convinced that the only way Wisconsin would see her error is by having it pointed out to them in history. The Wisconsin correspondence demands a discussion of principle first, maintaining that history was subject to interpretation and bias and thus not a suitable basis for discussion. I will spare you the agony of the details of the exchanges, but this letter from President Naumann to President Reim of the CLC shows that Wisconsin may now consider this an historical and not a theological dispute.

You will recall that many of the pastors and members now constituting the CLC were still members of our own Synod for varying periods of time after the 1955 Saginaw Convention. You also realize that all of us were restudying the entire question of fellowship and were struggling for clarity of expression during those years. Now did the various evaluations of the situation in which our Synod found itself agree. (emphasis mine) In fact these evaluations were poles apart.

It is our concern now to determine whether our present confessional positions on the doctrine and practice of fellowship agree. We are convinced that this must come before any further discussion of the historical events or the pronouncements made between 1955 - 1961. Do you consider it Christian and brotherly to reject a Synod's confessional position, which agrees in its formulation with the propositional truth of the Holy Scriptures, and to call that confessional position false because it did not in every instance during a period of stress and strain ten or fifteen years ago formulate every sentence of its articles, reports, and resolutions with perfect accuracy?⁶⁸

"Mark...Avoid"

Perhaps frustrated by Wisconsin's continued refusal to allow historical evidence which the CLC considered essential, the Coordinating Council of the CLC published a document written by Pastor Paul F. Nolting entitled "Mark...Avoid:" Origin of the CLC. This October publication

approved by the Praesidium and the Board of Doctrine tells the story of the 1950's as they saw it and seeks to identify the reason the bodies remain apart theologically. A brief look at this publication will again reveal that concern for the flock emphasis. And it will also show again that disagreement about the history and disagreement about what they disagree about theologically are the real issues.

In this publication, the CLC charges that the Wisconsin Synod members progressively weakened their stand and testimony over against the Missouri Synod. The previous history in this paper is cross referenced for your convenience.

The Wisconsin Synod reacted to Missouri's error immediately-- though somewhat inadequately--in its 1939 Convention. About a decade and a half later this testimony against errorists was weakened when it changed into a process of admonishing weak brethren.⁶⁹ (cf. pp. 3-14)

The 1955 Saginaw Convention of the WELS unanimously indicted Missouri (in the preamble). When the same convention postponed action on the resolution to "terminate our fellowship with the LC-MS" until a recessed convention the following year, the WELS was publicly charged with disobedience by many of its own members, both clergy and lay members.⁷⁰ (cf. pp. 14-16)

The 1956 convention tried to silence the charges of disobedience by resolving to "hold the judgment of our Saginaw resolution in abeyance." It was reasoned that if the Synod had not officially "marked" Missouri as a causer of divisions and offences, she could not be accused of failing to "avoid" Missouri.⁷¹ (cf. pp. 16-18)

(1957) So the convention was left with no resolution regarding the synod's relation with Missouri. A hastily drawn resolution was adopted--to continue "vigorously protesting fellowship with Missouri." But the Word of God on which the resolution was based called for termination of fellowship--Rom. 16:17,18. An artificial and unconvincing "official interpretation" became necessary to make this obvious disobedience appear to be obedience.⁷² (cf. pp. 19-21 & 24,25)

(1957 + 1959) Testimony for the Truth and against the errorists and their error was now looked upon as being "admonition" directed against an erring or weak brother.⁷³

From these passages it becomes clear that the CLC does not view the historical events in the same way Wisconsin does. Recall again the

confusion of that period and you'll be able to see that why such differences in understanding could develop, especially among men who had different presuppositions: emphasis on flock or brother. The CLC is convinced that the official proceedings of Wisconsin "exhaustively marked" Missouri as an erring church without taking steps to avoid her. Thus she changed her early testimony against error to admonition. (cf. p.7)

The second part of this booklet reveals a second area of disagreement, for they disagree about what they disagree about theologically. Nolting states:

The disagreement revolves about the problem of identifying people as errorists when they arise among brethren. The WELS seems to contend that the disagreement is a matter of human judgment as to when the conviction is reached that those who have introduced error come under the indictment of Rom. 16:17. The CLC contends that the disagreement is not a matter of human judgment as to when but rather a disagreement as to how a person or persons are to be identified as such....⁷⁴

I don't think that the distinction between "when" and "how" is very helpful at all. Both really treat the "how" aspect of identifying a false teacher; Wisconsin by judging the motive behind the error and the CLC by seeing the error itself. But now the Wisconsin representatives have really begun to question whether that disagreement on paper is disagreement at all. Could it be that the only thing that stands between them is their differing interpretation of the history? Consider this statement and judge for yourself.

The Romans passage does not speak at all of admonition, for the important point is that those teaching and preaching otherwise than God's Word teaches be avoided--isolated--for the protection of the flock. Concern for the errorist is a secondary matter. In actual situations that arise admonition may be involved in the "marking" to the extent that it is necessary to ascertain whether one is, in fact, dealing with persons who are "causing

divisions and offences" in the church or with such as have inadvertently fallen into error.⁷⁵

For what it is worth, a third party observer, Prof. G. Reichwald, of the ELS, viewed this booklet as a defense of their separation based on historical and not theological grounds.

...the overall tone of the pamphlet is negative. Since it is a justification of the continued separate existence of the CLC, there is no real attempt in the pamphlet to bridge the gulf between the CLC and WELS...but rather to dig it deeper.⁷⁶

1971 - "An Unwarranted Dilemma"

To date, all attempts to discuss the issues which lay between the synods had failed. But continued letter writing and communications resulted in a meeting planned for 1972. In preparation for that meeting, Pastor G. Sydow had drawn up nine points for discussion which were published in a 1971 copy of The Lutheran Spokesman. His article, "An Unwarranted Dilemma," was studied by a subcommittee of the Wisconsin Commission on Doctrinal Matters and an evaluation was drawn up.

Pastor Sydow called the in statu confessionis which Wisconsin declared in 1953 a "business as usual proposition."⁷⁷ He also adds that Wisconsin's method of identifying a false teacher leads to an "admonition--persistence syndrome"⁷⁸ The Wisconsin evaluation responds in this way:

How can the words "in spite of admonition persist" be spoken of and rejected as an "admonition--persistence syndrome" in the light of Titus 3:10? Did not the policy and practice of St. Paul in dealing with errorists in Corinth and in the Galatian congregations reflect the principle enunciated in the Titus 3 passage? Is not the goal of dealing with the errorists the winning back of the errorist, not primarily the separation from the errorist?⁷⁹

Since the points in the article were never discussed in the 1972

meeting, you may be interested in what they were and what the Wisconsin committee thought of them. I have reprinted the 9 points below and following each you will find the Wisconsin response.

- #1. When error arises an immediate distinction is made between a weak Christian and a false teacher, and each is handled differently.⁷⁸

WELS: Is an "immediate distinction between a weak Christian and a false teacher always possible? Does such immediate categorization take precedence over and preclude admonition? ⁷⁹

- #2. In both cases, if what appears to be error is a matter of inadvertence, careless or unintentional speaking, the matter is settled.⁷⁸

WELS: "In both cases" -- This applies to weak brethren and to inadvertent error on the part of a teacher, but does it also apply to a false teacher? There seems to be some unclear thinking here.⁷⁹

- #3. In the case of a weak Christian procedure of patient admonition is called for.⁷⁸

WELS: We agree heartily with this point and would only raise the question whether pastors, teachers, and professors who err in a moment of weakness are included here or whether they fall into the case cited in point No. 8.⁷⁹

- #4. In the case of a false teacher (those causing divisions and offenses, thereby deceiving the simple) prompt isolation and identification by severance of fellowship is called for.⁷⁸

WELS: "Identification of a false teacher by "prompt isolation and severance of fellowship" is heartless, legalistic judging of hearts.⁷⁹

- #5. In dealing with a false teacher, protecting the flock, is the essential. By its very nature, dealing with a false teacher will take on the characteristic of admonition, but this is incidental.⁷⁸

WELS: Calling the admonitory characteristic of dealing with a false teacher "incidental" shows how arbitrary and legalistic the identification of a false teacher by isolation and severance of fellowship really is.⁷⁹

- #6. In dealing with a false teacher, because of our finite nature time will pass, but time and element in "persistence" dare never be used as a justification for unionism.⁷⁸

WELS: "Time will pass." Here is an admission that even in their midst dealing with a false teacher must be flexible. It should therefore be possible for the CLC to understand why it took six years to sever our fellowship with the LC-MS. Our dealing with the LC-MS from 1955-1961 was not used as a justification for unionism. Actually the practice of fellowship was discontinued long before the official severance by many of us. This is what we meant by "vigorously protesting fellowship."⁷⁹

#7. This distinction between dealing with a false teacher and a weak Christian is clearly evident in the letter to the Galatians. The false teachers are summarily condemned; the misled Christians patiently dealt with. Scripture nowhere deals patiently or gently with a false teacher. In keeping with "deceiving the simple" is the passage that has to do with "offending, offending one of these little ones which believe in me." Of those guilty it is said, "it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and the he were drowned in the depth of the sea."⁷⁸

WELS: Paul withstood Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed. Barnabas also was carried away with the dissimulation of other Jews. But Paul did not sever fellowship with either Peter or Barnabas. Scripture deals patiently (if not gently) with false teachers to win them again for the truth. II Timothy 4:16 prays for those who preach Christ of contention.⁷⁹

#8. Pastors, teachers, professor who err, by the very nature of their public ministry, fall into the category of false teachers.⁷⁸

WELS: Pastors, teachers, and professors who err are ipso facto false teachers according to this statement. Can they never be weak brethren?⁷⁹

#9. Resolutions containing error adopted by conventions, conferences and congregations, by the very nature of their public status fall into the category of false teaching.⁷⁸

WELS: "Resolutions containing error adopted by conventions" is a judgment (right or wrong) prejudging the action of our Synod.⁷⁹

CHAPTER NINE: 1972 - The Final Meeting

The question of procedure which had kept the two synods from meeting now seemed to be solved. An apparent compromise was reached which allowed for the study of the terms "weak brother" and "false teacher" in the area of admonition, as well as the admission of historical evidence as was deemed necessary.

The meeting took place July 18,19 at the Administration Building in Milwaukee. The CLC was represented by E. Reim, E. Albrecht, C.M. Gullerud, G. Barthels, G. Sydow, and G. Radtke. The Wisconsin delegation consisted of O.J. Naumann, O. Siegler, B. Hoenecke, C. Lawrence, W. Franzmann, H. Vogel, F. Nitz, H. Wicke, E. Scharf, E. Sitz and M. Janke.

The first question these men took up dealt with the manner of handling an individual who had fallen into error. At this stage both groups apparently agreed upon the procedure to be followed and so the discussion moved on. The next question dealt with the manner of handling a church body with which you were in fellowship that had fallen into error. Are there grounds in Scripture for an in statu confessionis?

Wisconsin maintained that such a state of confession was both Scriptural and necessary.

1. In order to offer opportunity for determining what the confessional position of the group for which it must be held responsible really is (this may be necessary because of mutually exclusive statements, pronouncements, resolutions made in such a group; because of conflicting positions contending for mastery in this group, one or the other which may for good reasons be considered to be only temporarily in control).
2. To offer opportunity to bring Scriptural testimony against the error infesting the group to those brethren who are

not themselves advocating and propagandizing the errors before treating such brethren as responsible partakers of the error or false practice infesting their group.⁸⁰

The CLC on the other hand stressed the need to separate so that the flock at home might not be polluted with the error. They then see no room for such a state of confession.⁸⁰ The passages such as Titus 3:10 and II Thessalonians 3:14,15 which urge us to admonish one in error are to be carried out after the "avoid" of Romans 16:17 has been followed. "What program dare one substitute for the Lord's avoid?"⁸⁰

The representatives then began to question whether their earlier agreement in dealing with an individual in error was as certain as it had appeared. The CLC representatives felt that they had made their testimony and both groups agreed that the discussion was again becoming repetitious. So the last meeting came to an end without resolving the issues, or even leaving the door open for continued discussions.

CHAPTER TEN: 1973 - 1982 The Wind Down

Since that last meeting in 1972, the whole matter has gradually faded from mention in both synods. In 1974 the CLC was troubled by a dispute over the Third Use of the Law. That was resolved in 1976, but in that same year another question of unionism arose. This time the dispute was not with the Wisconsin Synod but with two insurance companies: A.A.L. and Lutheran Brotherhood. The feeling of the majority was that holding policies with companies which contribute to heterodox projects and church bodies is a violation of Rom. 16:17. That issue is still under discussion in their body today.

About the only thing I am aware of in these past years that has caused any volume of ink to be spilled was an article by Prof. E.C. Fredrich in the Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly. In July of 1977, the article entitled "Interchurch Relation In Recent Years" contained this plea.

We ought to do all in our power to help prevent that solidification (of our division) into perpetuity. It should be remembered that back in the 1940's and early 1950's it was Missouri that erred, neither the present members of the CLC nor Wisconsin. Somehow, however, between these two a conflict ensued.⁸¹

Of course, this claim that neither had erred evoked a rerun of the issues in the December Journal of Theology, "One Man's View, or How WELS Sees Us?"

In a piece of personal correspondence dated Sept. 20, 1979, Prof. C. Lawrenz indicated that the "initiative for the resumption of discussion...would need to come ~~from~~ the CLC" They had said in the 1972 meeting that their testimony had been given and that further discussion would not be worthwhile.

This writer, in personal interview with the President of the CLC,

has learned that a desire to resume talks does exist and that the desire has been communicated to the Wisconsin Synod. Whether or not such talks will resume in the near future is uncertain. Unfortunately the words of Prof. Reichwald which seemed so fitting in 1961 also seem just as fitting now in April of 1982.

This wound in the Lutheran church shows no sign of healing.⁸²

CONCLUSION:

Now that we have completed our look at the history, perhaps we can return to the question in the title of this paper--To Whose Glory? If this separation is merely an argument over historical interpretation and over the wording of theological statements, such a separation based on pride would certainly be self-glorifying. On the other hand, if this separation is due to true theological differences, then that would be quite a different matter. In my interviews with the Chairman of the Commission on Inter-Church Relations, Prof. C. Lawrenz, and with the President of the Church of the Lutheran Confession, Pres. E. Albrecht, vastly different opinions were expressed.

Prof. Lawrenz maintained that although there were apparent differences in doctrinal stand on paper, as noted by the CLC, he had really observed no difference in practical application of their doctrine. Thus he is of the opinion that the disagreement which separates us is that of historical interpretation. Prof. Lawrenz also expressed the hope that the pastors of the next generation might be able to sit down and examine the doctrinal positions without the bias both have of previous history.

On the other hand, in my interview with Pres. Albrecht, I was given a publication entitled "The Doctrinal Difference Between the CLC and WELS." The paper begins with a review of the history, again raising the charge that the Synod identified the Missouri Synod as a false teacher without separating from her in 1955. The pamphlet continues by pointing out that this erroneous doctrine of church fellowship still existed in 1972 at the last meeting. In the following,

I think you will again see the two question which we have traced through the history are still considered by the CLC to be the issue.

...the WELS representatives held to the view that conditions may call for a delay of termination of fellowship from a fellowship infected with error. This they called a condition of in statu confessionis (state of confession). One of the purposes of continuing in such a state was to serve in extricating those brethren who were protesting against the errors of their church body.

On the other hand, the CLC representatives insisted that when a church body is infected with error, then God's Word calls for separation and allows for no delay. To delay this matter on the basis of the argument that separation should be postponed until it is evident that admonition is no longer heeded or received, places the whole matter into the area of human judgment instead of letting the Word of God speak to us and then acting in obedience to it. The latter is indeed an act of love to the erring as well as a protection against the leavening influence of error which would infest us if we did not separate when God calls upon us to do so.⁸³

Pres. Albrecht indicated to me that the whole problem of our fellowship boils down to one point. How do you identify a false teacher as such who must be avoided? The CLC maintains that it is just a matter of "seeing" the error and reacting to it, and not a matter of using human judgment. In practice, the two camps will initially operate in the same way, carrying out their admonition when error arises in the fellowship. However, if it is just a matter of seeing then all ought to come to the conclusion at the same time. When asked why all the CLC men did not leave the Wisconsin Synod at the same time then, the answer will be that it was a matter of sin on their part, but a sin which they have repented of.

Since I was still having difficulty understanding how human judgment could be kept out of the matter, I asked Pres. Albrecht if we could briefly review their dealings with the men involved in the Third Use dispute in the CLC (1974). He told me that once the problem developed

a study was conducted and discussed with those involved. As he recalled both men left the synod before further action was necessary. Then I questioned him on a hypothetical basis. If you have a man who says in weakness, "There is no Third Use of the Law," and a man who says exactly the same thing but does so in unmoved conviction, how do you determine the difference merely by seeing the external action? Would this not require a use of one's sanctified Christian judgment? His answer was "no." The man who was the true errorist would reveal himself to be so without you making any type of human judgment.

It has become abundantly clear to me after this study that a real difference in presupposition caused the initial divisions. The CLC men strongly emphasized the concern for the flock and the Wisconsin men emphasized the concern for the weak brother. Such a difference in emphasis is certainly not divisive. However that difference led these two groups of men to view the events and resolutions of the Wisconsin--Missouri strife in a radically different manner. The same difference also led them to what is at least on paper different indications of when Romans 16:17 must be applied. Are those differences on paper truly indicative of different doctrinal positions? Perhaps you have come to your own conclusion already. As for myself, I still am unable to see how the plain seeing apart from the use of sanctified Christian judgment will permit you to identify an errorist as such. But I am able to see that the only hope for resolving this question is study of the Word of God and joint discussion of what he tells us there. And given our Old Adam and Satan's joy at seeing the church divided, those who demand continued separation would do well to ask, "To whose glory does this rift continue?"

APPENDIX A: Directory of Pastor and Teachers who had identified themselves with the Lutheran Spokesman, 1958

L. Bernthal*	Clarkston, Washington
N.R. Carlson*	Denver, Colorado
R. Dommer*	Spokane, Washington
G. Fischer*	Mankato, Minnesota
W. Karnitz*	Spokane, Washington
R. Kuehne	Winter Haven, Florida
R. Mackensen*	Warrens, Wisconsin
T. Pederson	Lyons, Nebraska
G. Radtke*	Mankato, Minnesota
E. Reim*	Rhineland, Wisconsin
W. Schaller*	Cheyenne, Wyoming
F. Tiefel*	Hachiman-Dori, Shibuya-ku, Tokyo Japan
M.J. Witt*	Spokane, Washington
I. Zarling*	Spokane, Washington

M. Garbrecht	Mankato, Minnesota
V. Gerlach	Mankato, Minnesota
L. Greening	Cheyenne, Wyoming

* Indicates former pastor of the Wisconsin Synod.

APPENDIX B: The Leadership and Membership of the Newborn Church of the Lutheran Confession (Lutheran Spokesman Nov., 1961)

OFFICIERS OF THE CLC

President	Rev. Paul Albrecht
Vice-President	Rev. M.J. Witt
Secretary	Rev. Paul Nolting
Moderator	Rev. C.M. Gullerud

BOARD CHAIRMEN

Trustees	Rev. C. Albrecht
Treasurer	Mr. O Noeldner
Board of Doctrine	Prof. Ed. Reim
Board of Missions	Rev. H. Rutz
Board of Education	Prof. M. Galstad
Board of Regents, Immanuel Lutheran College	Rev. Rollin Reim

IMMANUEL LUTHERAN COLLEGE

Seminary Dean	Prof. E. Reim
College Dean	Prof. Paul R. Koch
High School Principal	Prof. R. Dommer

RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS

Journal of Theology	Prof. E. Reim, Editor
The Lutheran Spokesman	Rev. W. Schaller, Editor

+ + + + + + + + + + +

ROSTER OF CLC PASTORS AND PROFESSORS

| | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Abrams, Otto R. | Minneapolis, Minn. |
| Albrecht, Christian* | Watertown, S. Dakota |
| Albrecht, Egbert* | Manchester, Wis. |
| Albrecht, Paul* | Bowdle, S. Dakota |
| Barthels, George* | Red Wing, Minn. |
| Bauer H.P.* | North Platte, Nebr. |
| Becker, Gerhart | Ponsford, Minn. |
| Bernthal, L.G.* | Clarkston, Wash. |
| Boniek, Elmer* | Grand Blanc, Mich. |
| Brandle, Karl* | Lake City, Minn. |
| Clement, Arthur J.* | Flint, Mich. |
| De Rose, Daniel C.* | Denver, Colo. |
| Dommer, Prof. Robert* | North Mannato, Minn. |
| Duehlmeier, H.C.* | Sanborn Minn. |

*Indicates former pastor of the Wisconsin Synod.

| | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eckert, Otto J.* | Saginaw, Mich. |
| Eibs, M.H.(?) | St. Paul, Minn. |
| Erhart, J.B.* | St. Louis, Mo. |
| Falk, Orrin(?) | Red Wing, Minn. |
| Fremder, A. | Phoenix, Ariz. |
| Galstad, Prof. Martin*- | Mankato, Minn. |
| Geiger, Adalbert* | Cambridge, Wis. |
| Gerlach, Vernon | Phoenix, Ariz. |
| Grams, Leland* | Faulton, S. Dak. |
| Greve, Vernon* | Lemmon, S. Dak. |
| Gullerud, Arvid | Eau Claire, Wis. |
| Gullerud, C.M. | Mankato, Minn. |
| Gullerud, David | Mankato, Minn. |
| Gurgel, Roland(?) | Phoenix, Ariz. |
| Hallauer, Elton* | Hancock, Minn. |
| Hallauer, Kenneth* | Mission, S. Dak. |
| Hanel, Daniel- | Missoula, Mont. |
| Harms, Norman | Mankato, Minn. |
| Hawley, Richard(?) | Phoenix, Ariz. |
| Johannes, John(?) | North Platte, Nebr. |
| Karnitz, W.O.* | East Wenatchee, Wash. |
| Koch, Paul G. | La Crosse, Wis. |
| Koch, Prof. Paul* | Mankato, Minn. |
| Kuehne, Clifford | Hecla, S. Dak. |
| Kuehne, Richard | Winter Haven, Flor. |
| Lau, David | Milwaukee, Wis. |
| Lau, John* | La Grange, Ill. |
| Mackensen* | Bangor, Wisc. |
| Naumann, Bertram* | Marquette, Mich. |
| Nolting, Paul F.* | Sleepy Eye, Minn. |
| Olmanson, Keith | Eau Claire, Wis. |
| Pelzl, James* | Pullman, Wash. |
| Gerhard, Pieper* | Fond du Lac, Wis. |
| Radtke, Gordon- | Mankato, Minn. |
| Reed, Harland* | Rochester, Minn. |
| Reim, Prof. Edmund* | Mankato, Minn. |
| Reim, Norbert* | Seattle, Wash. |
| Reim, Robert* | Spokane, Wash. |
| Reim, Rollin* | New Ulm, Minn. |
| Roehl, Prof. Ronald | Mankato, Minn. |
| Rutz, H.E.* | Jamestown, N. Dak. |
| Schaller, Prof. Egbert* | Micollet, Minn. |
| Schaller, Ralph E.* | Coloma, Mich. |
| Schaller, Winfred* | Cheyene, Wyo. |
| Schierenbeck, Lester* | Austin, Minn. |
| Schmelzer, Edwin* | Mankato, Minn. |
| Schuetze, Waldemar* | Fond du Lac, Wis. |

* Indicates former pastor of the Wisconsin Synod.

? Unconfirmed former pastor of the Wisconsin Synod.

| | |
|-------------------|------------------------------|
| Sippert, Albert*- | North Mankato, Minn. |
| Sydow, Gilbert* | Ellensburg, Wash. |
| Thurrow, Carl* | Lamar, Colo. |
| Tiefel, Fred* | Dori Shibuya-ku Tokyo, Japan |
| Tiefel, George* | Stambaugh, Mich |
| Tiefel, Victor* | Denver Colo. |
| Ude, Ruben | Okabena, Minn. |
| Wiedenmeyer, Wm.* | Phoenix, Ariz. |
| Witt, Herbert* | Valentine, Nebr. |
| Witt, M.J.* | Spokane, Wash. |
| Zarling, Ivan H.* | Spokane, Wash. |

* Indicates former pastor of the Wisconsin Synod.

APPENDIX C: Wisconsin Resolutions Concerning the Missouri Synod 1953.
(Wisconsin Proceedings, 1953 pp. 104,105)

1. That we declare the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod
 - a) by reaffirming its acceptance of the Common Confession as a "settlement of past differences which are in fact not settled" Proc. 1951, page 146), and
 - b) by its persistent adherence to its unionistic practices, (the Common Confession, joint prayer, scouting, chaplaincy, communion agreement with the National Lutheran Council, cooperation with unorthodox church bodies in matters clearly not in the field of externals; negotiating with lodges and Boy Scouts of America with the plea that this gives opportunity to bear witness, under the same plea taking part in unionistic religious programs and in the activities of unionistic church federations; negotiating for purposes of union with a church body whose official position it is that it is neither possible nor necessary to agree in all matters of doctrine and which contends for an allowable and wholesome latitude of theological opinion on the basis of the teachings of the Word of God)has brought about the present break in relations that is now threatening the existence of the Synodical Conference and the continuance of our affiliation with the sister Synod.
2. That we without delay make this declaration known to the President of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, to the President of the Synodical Conference, and to the other Presidents of the constituent synods.
3. That we herewith approve the Protest* agreed upon by our representatives immediately following the St. Paul convention of the Synodical Conf., 1952.

*Since it is God's will that the trumpet do not "give an uncertain sound" (I Cor. 14:8), and since a faith that is not ready to confess in clear and unmistakable terms "creates a basically untruthful situation,"

We, therefore, declare, in order to guard our own faith and to remain true to our God, that though we do not as this time disavow our fellowship with the Missouri Synod in the Synodical Conference, yet, because the confessional basis on which the synods of the Synodical Conference have jointly stood so far has been seriously impaired by the Common Confession, we continue to uphold our protest and to declare that the Missouri Synod by retaining the Common Confession and using it for further steps toward union with the ALC is disrupting the Synodical Conference. Thus while we await a decision by our Synod in this grave situation we continue our present relationship with the Missouri Synod only in the hope that it may still come to see the error of its way.

Hence we find our selves in a STATE OF CONFESSIO (theologically expressed, IN STATU CONFESSIO).

We hope and pray that the truth may prevail and that God in His grace may avert the threatening disruption of the Synodical Conference.

APPENDIX D: Wisconsin Preamble and Resolutions Concerning the
Missouri Synod, 1955.
(Wisconsin Proceedings, 1955 pp. 84-86)

Preamble

For years our Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States has patiently admonished the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod in the fear and love of God, seeking to win her from the path that leads to liberalism in doctrine and practice.

We of the Wisconsin Synod in our convention of 1953 with heavy hearts had to declare that the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod by reaffirming its acceptance of the Common Confession and by its persistent adherence to its unionistic practices "has brought about the present break in relations that is now threatening the existence of the Synodical Conference and the continuance of our affiliation with the sister Synod."

Without entering upon the question of whether the present charges of our Synod against the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod do not already constitute the accusation of false doctrine, we believe that it should be reiterated in no uncertain terms that a specific charge of false doctrine is not a Biblical prerequisite for separation from a church body. A church body which creates divisions and offenses by its official resolution, policies, and practices not in accord with Scripture also becomes subject to the indictment of Romans 16:17-18. The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod has by its official resolutions, policies, and practices created divisions and offenses both in her own body and in the entire Synodical Conference. Such divisions and offenses are of long standing.

RESOLUTIONS

Out of love for the truth of Scripture we feel constrained to present the following resolution to this convention for final action in a recessed session in 1956.

RESOLVED, that whereas the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod has created divisions and offenses by its official resolutions, policies, and practices not in accord with Scripture, we, in obedience to the command of our Lord in Romans 16:17-18, terminate our fellowship with the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod.

We recommend this course of action for the following reasons:

1. This resolution has far reaching spiritual consequences.
2. This continues to heed the Scriptural exhortations to patience and forbearance in love by giving the LC-MS opportunity to express itself in its 1956 convention.

APPENDIX E: Wisconsin Resolution Concerning the Missouri Synod, 1956.
(Wisconsin Proceedings, 1956 p. 60)

I.

Even though we deplore the fact that the question of unionism and the controversial issues listed in our Synod's 1953 resolutions in themselves still remain unresolved, yet

WHEREAS, The resolution of the LC-MS, declining membership in the Lutheran World Federation, is an excellent statement of Scriptural principle and policy, and lays a better basis for a discussion of the principles of church fellowship and their application; and

WHEREAS, The LC-MS resolved "that hereafter the Common Confession (Parts I and II) be not regarded or employed as a functioning basic document toward the establishment of altar and pulpit fellowships with other church bodies"; and

WHEREAS, We understand this to mean that thereby the LC-MS's 1950 resolutions concerning the Common Confession has been set aside...; and

WHEREAS, The LC-MS recommended that committees preparing future doctrinal statements take note of the suggestion to make fuller use of antithetic statements; and

WHEREAS, The LC-MS gratefully acknowledges "every fraternal expression of concern and guidance in matters of doctrine and practice" from brethren in the Synodical Conference; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That we concur in the suggestion of our Standing Committee on Matters of Church Union to "hold the judgment of our Saginaw resolution in abeyance" until our next convention; and be it further

RESOLVED, That our Standing Committee on Matters of Church Union continue to evaluate any further developments in these matters.

APPENDIX F: Wisconsin Resolution Concerning the Missouri Synod, 1957.
(Wisconsin Proceedings, 1957 p. 144)

The following resolutions pertaining to matters of Church Union were adopted by the Convention:

WHEREAS, our Synod, after long and patient debate, voted not to suspend fellowship with the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod at this time, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that we continue our vigorously protesting fellowship over against the LC-MS, because of the continuation of the offenses with which we have charged the sister synod, Romans 16:17,18, and be it further

RESOLVED, that we continue our doctrinal discussions with the union committees of the synods of the Synodical Conference in an effort to restore full unity on the basis of the Word of God, and be it finally

RESOLVED, that we ask our Standing Committee on Matters of Church Union to keep the membership of our Synod informed concerning the progress of these discussions.

(Note: Our protesting fellowship is to be carried on in accordance with the Scriptural injunction in II Thessalonians 3:14 and 15, as the Synod resolved in August 1956. See Proceedings, Recessed Session, Thirty-third Convention, Watertown, Wisconsin, August 21-23, 1956, Report of Floor Committee No. 2. The reference to Romans 16:17,18, was made, not to define our fellowship, but only to explain the use of the word "offenses." O.J. Naumann.)

A REPORT TO THE PROTEST COMMITTEE

The Standing Committee on matters of Church Union shares the deep concern of the Protest Committee for all the brethren in our midst who have been led by their consciences to protest the 1957 resolution of our Synod concerning our relations with the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod, and who consequently are also in protest against the continued discussions which the Union Committee is carrying out in the joint meetings of the doctrinal unity committees of the Synodical Conference.

We would like to remove what troubles the protesting brethren and allay their apprehensions, so that they might again be able to stand shoulder to shoulder with us in upholding our testimony on the divisive issues which have arisen between our Synod and the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod. We feel the deep urgency for this all the more keenly because we are convinced that we still have a common stand with all the protestors on the issues themselves; thus we long for an understanding with them.

This longing arises, first of all, out of a deep fraternal concern for our protesting brethren, whose continued fellowship is not a light matter with us. But our longing for an understanding arises likewise out of a deep need of our own, as members of our Synod's Union Committee in pursuing the responsibility which our Synod has placed upon us of continuing our discussions with Missouri. For as we continue our effort to break through with our stand on the issues in the Synodical Conference we would appreciate the full support also of our protesting brethren, instead of having our testimony weakened in the eyes of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod by the appearance that there is no longer harmony and unity in our midst on the stand that we represent over against Missouri. Moreover, we deplore any needless disharmony in our own midst that would discourage and arrest a growth of understanding in our own Synod concerning the divisive issues present in the Synodical Conference, concerning their continued seriousness, and concerning the great need of resolving them.

Because of these considerations we would plead with our protesting brethren that they would give full thought to what we in turn feel constrained by our conscience to say in respect to some of the main points of their protests.

I

WHAT WAS THE IMPORT OF OUR SAGINAW RESOLUTION?

One point that seems to be basic in the protests of a great number of brethren is this that they are convinced that our Synod was disobeyed to the Word of God in holding the vote on the Saginaw resolution up for a year. It is their conviction that the Synod placed the Missouri Synod under the judgement of Rom. 16:17f. by the unanimous adoption of the preamble and then arbitrarily postponed for a year the avoiding which should certainly follow immediately when an individual or a body has been placed under the judgment of Rom. 16:17f. We can understand that the conscience of anyone who thinks of the Synod's action at Saginaw in this manner would be troubled.

We plead, however, with the protesting brethren who hold this view to face the question anew: Did our Synod at Saginaw conclusively put the Missouri Synod under the judgement of Rom. 16:17f.?

As a Synod we indeed stated in the preamble that on the basis of all the fruitless, official discussions with Missouri, its past convention resolutions, and the final Lutheran Witness articles of President Behnken, Rom. 16:17f. would have to be applied. Yet the Synod resolved not to vote, not to reach a decision on this resolution, until the Missouri Synod had had another opportunity to speak in delegate convention. Our Synod wanted to be sure whether the added testimony which had been brought on our part during a period of three years had not made an impact on the Missouri Synod at large, even though it had not changed the stand of the Praesidium, and of the Missouri Synod's official representatives with whom our Union Committee had had an opportunity to deal. Our Synod was not willing to put the Missouri Synod under the judgment of Rom. 16:17f. until it had also heard the official stand of that Synod over against our charges reconfirmed by another delegate convention.

What our Synod therefore held in abeyance at Saginaw was not merely the "avoiding," the breaking of Fellowship, enjoined in Rom. 16:17f. but also the conclusive application of the very judgment of this passage, namely the judgment that the Missouri Synod was persistent in causing divisions and offenses. Not merely the judgment expressed in the resolution and the action recommended by it, but also the judgment expressed in the preamble was held in abeyance, pending the examination of the added bit of evidence desired by the majority of our Synod's delegates, namely the answer of the subsequent Missouri Synod Convention upon our charges.

Who would want to say that the Saginaw resolutions did not leave room for greater clarity? But those who were there know the lengthy debate and discussion that was devoted to the problem and are conscious of the fact that the final decision was made in the closing hours of the convention. Thus they understand that there was no opportunity for editorial revisions in the interest of full clarity. The above interpretation given to the Saginaw resolutions is the only one that can make any sense. This was therefore also the official interpretation that was given to them by our Praesidium, by our Union Committee in its St. Paul report, and by our subsequent synodical convention at Watertown.

Now we need to remember that when we found unclarities in the wording of the Missouri Synod resolutions on the CC in 1950, the very resolutions that we were asked to evaluate, and that when we met with different interpretations on the part of Missouri Synod constituents, we operated exclusively with the official interpretation given by its Praesidium, its Doctrinal Unity Committee, and its subsequent conventions. We need to do the same thing in respect to our own synodical resolutions. When, upon our Union Committee's evaluation of the Missouri Synod's St. Paul convention resolutions, our Synod at Watertown took up the Saginaw resolution anew, it resolved to hold the judgment of our Saginaw resolution in abeyance until the next convention, not merely the matter of breaking fellowship.

At our convention at New Ulm in 1957 our Synod again held the judgment of Rom. 16:17f in abeyance. Neither at Saginaw, not at Watertown, nor at New Ulm, did our Synod vote on whether it wanted to be obedient to Rom. 16:17f. No synod of Christians could presume to vote on such a matter. It did vote on the question whether in the Missouri Synod we have a church body falling under the indictment of Rom. 16:17f., which calls for a breaking of fellowship.

We earnestly feel therefore that there need not, and there should not, be a division between us on this point. We are ^{not} finding fault with those who at Saginaw did not understand the resolutions in this way, who were earnestly troubled, and who therefore felt constrained to express this in the form of a protest. But a synod does have a right to interpret its resolutions through its praesidium and through its subsequent conventions; and the nature of a resolution that it has previously passed will from time to time make it necessary for a synod to exercise that right, so that there may be clarity; and we shall want to welcome that clarity, even though we may personally feel that another interpretation had better warrant than the one that has officially been given and that now obtains.

II

IS THE APPLICATION OF ROM. 16:17f. TO THE MISSOURI SYNOD SIMPLY A MATTER OF OBEDIENCE TO THE WORD OF GOD?

Others among our protesting brethren may be ready to grant the previous point that on the basis of the official interpretation which now obtains both the preamble and the resolution of the Saginaw report were held in abeyance. They question, however, whether our Synod at Saginaw, or at the two subsequent conventions, had any right to hold that judgment in abeyance. They question whether the matter of applying Rom. 16:17f. to Missouri leaves room at all for any human judgment, and thus whether it could properly be put to a synodical vote in the ordinary sense in which such a vote calls for the expression of a human judgment. For them the application of Rom. 16:17f. to the Missouri Synod is simply a matter of obedience to the Word of God. Hence they are inclined to think of the synodical vote in terms of a confession which merely expressed willingness or unwillingness to be bound by God's Word. Since they see an unwillingness to be bound by the Word of God, though not necessarily a conscious one, in the majority vote of our Synod, they have been led to protest against it.

In view of their conception of the import of the synodical vote that was taken, we can indeed understand their protest. Yet, here again we plead with our protesting brethren to face the question: Is there not an area of human judgment involved before a Christian comes to the conviction concerning a brother who has fallen into error that he can no longer treat him as a weak brother, to whom he owes further patient admonition, but that he must now be treated as a persistent errorist, from whom the Lord bids him to withdraw all further fellowship? Yes, we ask them to face the question: Is there not an area of human

judgment involved before a church body comes to the conviction concerning a sister synod which has become involved in error of doctrine or practise that it is now no longer to be made the object of further patient admonition, but that it is now to be treated as a persistently erring church body, with whom further fellowship must be terminated.

The fact that an individual or a church body has fallen into an error of doctrine or practise, or even the fact that the individual or the church body still defends that error of doctrine or practise, is not yet in itself a reason for terminating church fellowship. Rather both facts may still be inducements for practising this fellowship most vigorously in efforts to overcome the error and its defense. Termination of church fellowship is called for when you have reached the conviction that admonition is of no further avail and that the erring brother or church body demands recognition for their error.

We will surely all grant that when we deal with an individual erring brother in our congregational work, we know of no simple mechanical formula by which we can come to the conviction that he now ceases to be a weak brother and must be regarded and treated as a persistent errorist. We know that we can come to such a conviction only by earnest and prayerful use of our Christian judgment in evaluating all the details and factors of the case. We also know that if a whole congregation is to reach a decision as to what to do with such an erring brother, they must jointly come to the conviction by the use of their Christian judgment that everything that can be done in the way of admonition has been carried out and that therefore there is nothing left but to part ways with him. Even so, they are not all likely to come to this conviction at one and the same time. Surely then when a church body has become involved in error, a church body in which there will always be a number of different trends in evidence and striving for mastery, one trend supporting the error and fostering it, another still testifying against it, it will take an even richer exercise of Christian judgment to come to a decision in the matter. If not only an individual is to come to a conviction concerning such an erring church body, but a whole synod of Christians is to come to that conviction and is to express it jointly, all involved will have to exercise their Christian judgment. Here again it is not at all likely that they will all come to this conviction at quite the same time. All these considerations will be kept in mind in dealing with erring individuals and church bodies.

This is what our Synod sought to do at Bethesda, at Saginaw, at Watertown, and at New Ulm. In each case the majority of our synodical delegates, while recognizing the divisive nature of the issues, were not yet able to come to the conviction that everything had been done in the way of patient admonition and that the Missouri Synod must now be treated as a persistently erring church body, henceforth to be avoided. Those voting in the minority, and others who did not happen to have voting rights at the conventions, did not share that judgment, and no one can deprive them of their right to their own judgment.

Yet to become unwilling to abide by the prevailing judgment, they would have to be convinced in their own conscience that they could bring and did bring conclusive proof that the judgment which had prevailed was necessarily wrong and sinful. For if their own judgment had prevailed, they, too, would have expected those who had not yet come to the

conviction that a termination of fellowship was called for, to abide by the prevailing judgment or to be firmly convinced in their own conscience that they could and did offer conclusive proof that a severance of fellowship at this time was wrong and sinful.

We dare never forget that it is the Lord who has also drawn us together with other Christians in congregations and synods, and that in dealing jointly with those with whom the Lord has drawn us together we cannot simply foist our judgments, no matter how correct we may think they are, upon our brethren, nor can we break away from our brethren if our judgments are not shared by them when we think that they ought to be shared, as long as there is no open disobedience to God's Word in evidence on their part. From what has previously been said, it should be needless to say that it is a different matter when one is convinced that he can conclusively show that the prevailing judgment which he is asked to endure is clearly wrong and sinful.

III

WAS THERE ANY WARRANT FOR HOLDING THE JUDGMENT OF THE SAGINAW RESOLUTION IN ABEYANCE AFTER THE ST. PAUL CONVENTION?

Granting even the previous point, our protesting brethren may probably ask: Was there anything in the answer of Missouri at their St. Paul convention that warranted holding the judgment of Rom. 16:17f. upon the Missouri Synod in abeyance at Watertown, and again at New Ulm?

At Saginaw our Synod had stated in its preamble that all the evidence before us at that time through the Missouri Synod's past convention resolutions, and the stand of its official committees and its praesidium, would necessitate our placing the Missouri Synod under the judgment of Rom. 16:17f. Hence the past forums of discussion were discontinued, and a resolution to terminate fellowship was drawn up to be acted upon after having received the answer of another delegate convention of the Missouri Synod.

After evaluating pertinent St. Paul resolutions of the Missouri Synod as they pertained to membership in the Lutheran World Federation, to the CC, and to Intersynodical Relations, the majority of our Union Committee, including some who at Saginaw had strongly advocated a break, recommended to our Synod "not to close the door to further discussions at this time" but prayerfully to await the outcome of added efforts at attaining unity in the issues, efforts for which the Missouri Synod had pleaded in its convention resolutions, and in the meantime to hold our Saginaw resolution in abeyance (Proceedings, Recessed Session of the 33rd Convention, 1956, pp. 52-57).

Through the St. Paul convention a change had been brought about in one of the divisive issues listed in our Saginaw report, namely in the CC. Our Union Committee stated in its St. Paul evaluation that the pertinent resolution of the Missouri Synod had in essence supplied the action which our Synod had specifically requested in its objections to the Missouri Synod's 1950 resolutions on the CC. What was meant was this that the Missouri Synod had set the CC aside as a settlement of

the past controversies between the Missouri Synod and the ALC in the doctrines treated therein.

Our Synod at Watertown let this change in the status of the CC be one of the factors that induced it to hold the Saginaw resolution in abeyance until the next convention. Yet our Synod did so pending further confirmation on the part of the Missouri Synod that our Synod's evaluation and understanding of the pertinent resolutions were correct.

Our Synod at Watertown indeed admitted that in the practical issues, all of which involved a unionistic trend, there had not yet been a change evident in the Missouri Synod's stand. It was, however, heartened by the Missouri Synod's earnest plea to discuss these matters anew, and this all the more since the Missouri Synod had made a fine expression of fellowship principles in declining membership in the Lutheran World Federation.

In the interval of a year between our recessed convention at Watertown and our 1957 New Ulm Convention, the Synodical Conference had established a new form for the renewed discussion of the controversial issues, namely, the forum of the doctrinal unity committees of the four constituent synods. This joint committee had set up a mutually satisfactory program for discussing the issues. It had not found it possible to establish as a common premise that all the issues which we had listed in our charges against the Missouri Synod were in their very nature divisive, since in several instances that in itself seemed to be a point of controversy. It had, however, pledged mutual willingness to come to grips with all the controversial issues without equivocation or evasion.

The actual discussion of the controversial issues had not yet progressed far enough at the time of the New Ulm convention to permit any conclusive judgment as to whether they would be successful. The presentations on Scripture, Revelation, Inspiration, to the extent that they had been discussed, seemed to hold out the promise of agreement.

Upon our Union Committee's request the Missouri Synod Praesidium had supplied answers to further questions concerning the import of a number of St. Paul resolutions of the Missouri Synod, also those affecting the CC. At the time of our New Ulm convention our Union Committee felt that even these answers still left something wanting in full clarity. The majority of our Union Committee was, however, of the opinion that these answers did sustain our Synod's evaluation of the Missouri Synod's CC Resolutions at St. Paul, while a minority in our Union Committee did not find itself able to share this opinion. On the other hand there were a number of endeavors in which official committees of the Missouri Synod were currently active, particularly in connection with the Lutheran World Federation Convention, which seemed to point to a continuation of a unionistic trend and raised grave apprehensions in the minds of our delegates at New Ulm. Still the majority of our representatives at the New Ulm Convention were of the conviction that not enough had happened since Watertown to warrant reversing the resolution passed there to hold the Saginaw resolution in abeyance.

IV

WHAT JUSTIFICATION IS THERE FOR CONTINUING OUR DISCUSSIONS WITH MISSOURI NOW?

Some of our protesting brethren, who are still willing to let the New Ulm decision of our Synod stand, although it did not represent their own judgment, nevertheless ask: What have the subsequent meetings of the joint union committees revealed that still justifies a continuation of the discussions?

As far as the CC is concerned, we have, in the opinion of the Union Committee, received further assurance in the meantime from the Missouri Synod Praesidium that the St. Paul resolutions on the CC do mean that the CC is no longer to be regarded or employed as a settlement of the controversies that existed between the ALC and the Missouri Synod. It was explained that not merely the fact that the ALC may soon cease to exist as a separate church body, but also the fact that the ALC has been willing to settle for the unacceptable United Testimony of Faith and Life in merging with the ELC and the UELC has led the Missouri Synod to conclude that the CC would now no longer be adequate as a settlement of the past controversies and hence can no longer serve as a functioning document for establishing church fellowship with anyone.

Our Union Committee did not feel a need of pressing for an answer to the question whether the Missouri Synod is now also ready to admit that the CC also at no time during 1950-1957 was an adequate settlement of the past controversies. It is our conviction that what our Synod was concerned about since 1950 was this that the CC had official status in Missouri as a settlement of the past controversies in the doctrines treated therein. As long as that official status of the CC obtained, we were conscience bound to testify concerning the inadequacy of the CC as such a settlement, lest the confessional stand of the Synodical Conference on the pertinent doctrines be undermined and made uncertain. If the CC now no longer has that official status of a settlement of the past controversies between the ALC and the Missouri Synod, the inadequacy of the CC ceases to be a controversial issue in this respect.

There is, however, still this fact to be considered that the status of the CC in the past, with its inadequate statements, could have weakened and undermined the Scriptural understanding of the doctrines involved in our own circles and also made it unclear to those outside of our Synodical Conference circles whether this body as a whole still holds to the full Scriptural position on these doctrines as this was true in the past. For this reason it remains a vital part of the program of the Joint Union Committees to set up, both thetically and antithetically, a detailed joint confession on these articles, e.g. inspiration, justification, conversion, election, Antichrist, Church and ministry, articles concerning which we held that they had not been set forth adequately in the CC. We feel that this method will do more to reestablish within and without our circles just where the Synodical Conference stands confessionally on these

8.

doctrines than would even a resolution of a Missouri Synod Convention stating that the CC was an inadequate settlement in 1950.

Our Joint Union Committees are ready to present such a comprehensive joint confession on Scripture and Inspiration to the August convention of the Synodical Conference and are convinced that it speaks clearly in all the matters not adequately covered by the pertinent treatment in the CC. Our Union Committee has hope that similarly satisfactory joint statements on other doctrines involved in the CC issue can be drawn up.

In the Scout issue the extensive discussions of the Joint Union Committees have not yet progressed beyond this that the points of agreement and the points of disagreement have been drawn up and will be presented in a further report to the Synodical Conference. Also here the mutual pledge to come to grips with the issues without evasion or equivocation has been in evidence in the discussions.

The area of fellowship principles and fellowship practice, involving also the issue of Church and ministry, remains to be taken up. Our Synod has repeatedly asserted at its various conventions that it sees a unionistic trend at work behind all the controversial issues that have arisen between it and the Missouri Synod. Since our Union Committee also agrees with this view, it is also of the opinion that our real work of resolving the issues will face us as we come to grips with the matter of fellowship principles and the issues of Church and ministry, and that, until we have thoroughly discussed these matters and are able to evaluate the outcome, it will be impossible to come to any definite convictions concerning our future fellowship relations with the Missouri Synod. It is my opinion that until that time the members of the Union Committee would not feel free in their conscience to terminate these discussions, now that they have been initiated and carried on with an evident willingness to come to grips with the issues.

(This report was drawn up for the Protest Committee upon the request of the Standing Committee on Matters of Church Union. On June 16, 1958, it was sent to the Protest Committee without a previous opportunity of presenting it to the Committee on Matters of Church Union for approval. On October 21, 1958, the Union Committee, however, reviewed this report and adopted it as the report of the Committee. The Union Committee also resolved to have copies of this report prepared and sent to all pastors and male teachers throughout the Synod.)

Carl Lawrenz, Chairman of the
Executive Committee

APPENDIX H: Memorial: A Call For Decision
(Wisconsin Proceedings, 1959 pp.209-211)

Brethren:

Under date of June 27, 1958, a letter signed by the members of the Protest Committee, Wisconsin Synod, was addressed to the "Protesting Brethren of the Ev. Luth. Joint Synod of Wisconsin and other States."

The letter was in large part based upon, and contained an endorsement of, a document which accompanied it and which was subsequently sent to all pastors and teachers of our Synod under the title, "A Report to the Protest Committee."

The latter document, under Section II, third paragraph, page four in our copy, the following sentence appeared:

"Termination of church fellowship is called for when you have reached the conviction that admonition is of no further avail and that the erring brother or church body demands recognition for their error."

This statement is basic to the entire issue which called forth the document. We hold that it is false and unscriptural, and that the argument based upon it is rationalistic and untenable. We ask the Synod to disavow it.

For the purpose of clarifying our objection, we submit the following as a true and correct statement of the doctrinal issue involved:

Termination of church fellowship is called for when Scriptural correction has been offered and rejected and the erring brother or church body have continued in their error despite admonition. This is the perisistence which distinguishes an errorist (Rm. 16:17,18) from an erring brother (Galatians 2:11-14).

* * * * *

We reject as unscriptural any interpretation or application of Romans 16:17,18 which expressly or by implication equates the action required by this passage with that enjoined in Matthew 18:17; I Cor. 5:11-13, or any other passage of Holy Writ dealing with excommunication. The perisistence implicitly defined in Romans 16:17 is not to be measured by the impenitence of those who persist, but by the fact of their persisting; and the word "avoid" is not identical in meaning, scope or direction with the term "excommunicate." It is manifest that one cannot excommunicate an entire church body, or declare it to be impenitent.

In consequence, we also reject the principle which accords to human judgment the task of determining when Romans 16:17,18 applies "conclusively" to an individual or a church body, and requires "a conviction that admonition is of no further avail." No such provision is to be found in the text. It is imported from passages dealing with the gaining of an impenitent sinner and is utterly irrelevant here. To adduce it is in violation of accepted principles of Bible interpretation. In Romans 16:17,18 the sole responsibility of human reason is to recognize the fact that the erring one continues in his error while rejecting previous admonition.

We reject the notion that the action required by Romans 16:17,18 depends upon clairvoyance, namely the ability to determine the future fate of admonition. One who persistently causes divisions and offenses is marked, not when we are convinced "that admonition is of no further avail," but when the evidence shows that despite admonition the erring has persisted and does persist in holding to his error. The text demands Christian awareness, not divination. "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law" (Deut. 29:29).

We affirm that a rejection of admonition is the equivalent of a demand for recognition or error. We disavow as sophistry any effort to restrict the concept of persistence to an instance where a formal demand for acceptance of error is made. The text speaks of cases where, Scriptural admonition having been disallowed, the error continues to be propounded and practiced.

We herewith implore our Synod to recognize both the Scriptural validity of this our confession and the untenable nature of the "termination of fellowship" thesis advanced by the Synod's Protest Committee. We affirm that the document entitled "A Report to the Protest Committee" is in its nature and content divisive, despite its conciliatory tone, because it does violence to clear Scripture. In its historical presentation, the Report distorts plain, documented facts relative to the action of the Saginaw Convention of 1955. We consider this distortion of historical facts to be a lesser offense, however, than the abuse of Scripture upon which it is based. Against this we are bound to contend for the truth.

APPENDIX I: Wisconsin Resolution No. 1 Concerning
the Missouri Synod, 1961.
(Wisconsin Synod Proceedings, 1961, pp. 197-199)

WHEREAS, The Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod has lodged many admonitions and protests with the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod during the past twenty years to win her from the path that leads to liberalism in doctrine and practice...., and

WHEREAS, Our admonitions have largely gone unheeded, and the issues have remained unresolved, and

WHEREAS, Many of the policies and practices which called forth our admonitions were in the field of fellowship, and

WHEREAS, The 1959 Convention of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod therefore gave its Commission on Doctrinal Matters the directive "to continue and accelerate the discussions in the Joint Union Committees to bring about complete unity of doctrine and practice in the Synodical Conference . . . to continue its efforts in the Joint Union Committees until agreement on doctrine and practice has been reached, or until an impasse is reached and no such agreement can be brought about" (Wisconsin Synod Proceedings, 1959, p. 195), and

WHEREAS, The Commission has faithfully carried out this directive but now regretfully reports that differences with respect to the Scriptural principles of church fellowship--differences which it holds to be divisive--have brought us to an impasse, and

WHEREAS, Our Commission's Theses on Church Fellowship are not to be considered a formal confessional document...., and

WHEREAS, The substance of these Theses is an expression of the Scriptural principles on which the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod has stood and which have guided it in its practice for many years...., and

WHEREAS, In the Statement of the Overseas Committee, FELLOWSHIP IN ITS NECESSARY CONTEXT OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH, we have found nothing to warrant any modification of our position on church fellowship, and

WHEREAS In the new forum suggested by the Overseas Committee and adopted by the Synodical Conference we see no avenue leading to the removal of the difference in regard to church fellowship principles which now exists between the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod and our Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod, and

WHEREAS, The doctrine of the Church has not been slighted in the intersynodical discussion in the past...., and

WHEREAS, The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod has not retreated from the unscriptural position long held by it and also expressed in the THEOLOGY OF FELLOWSHIP, Part II, but continues to defend that position and carries on fellowship practices which conform to that position...., and

WHEREAS, We recognize our sacred trust and the obligation to "confess the faith once delivered unto the saints," and also to give vigorous testimony on Church Fellowship before the church and the world; be it

RESOLVED, a) That we now suspend* fellowship with the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod on the basis of Romans 16:17,18 with the hope and prayer to God that The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod will hear in this resolution an evangelical summons to "come to herself" (Luke 15:17) and to return to the side of the sister from whom she has estranged herself, and be it further

RESOLVED, b) That under conditions which do not imply a denial of our previous testimony we stand ready to resume discussions with the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod with the aim of reestablishing unity of doctrine and practice and of restoring fellowship relations, these discussions to be conducted outside the framework of fellowship, and be it further

RESOLVED, c) That we are not passing judgment on the personal faith of any individual member of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, but that we are addressing the stern admonition required by love to the LC-MS as a corporate body, and be it further

RESOLVED, d) That we are ready to continue our support of the joint projects carried on by the Synodical Conference and by groups within the Synodical Conference until we can adjust to the new conditions brought about by the suspension of fellowship with the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, and be it further

RESOLVED, e) That we call upon all our members to manifest the understanding, consideration, and patience of love during this period of change and adjustment. (We also direct attention to the fact that this Convention has already taken note of the problems that will arise and has approved a study committee that would supply helpful counsel and guidance; and be it further

RESOLVED, f) That the action taken in our resolution of suspension does not apply to our fellowship relations with the Ev. Lutheran Synod, the Synod of Ev. Lutheran Churches, the Ev. Lutheran Church of Australia, the Ev. Lutheran Church of England, the Ev. Lutheran Free Church, the Ev. Lutheran (Old Lutheran) Church, and the Igreja Evangelica Luterana do Brasil, as well as any other church bodies outside of the Synodical Conference with whom we have been in fellowship, and be it further

RESOLVED, g) That we declare our desire to discuss the principles of church fellowship further with the church bodies that were represented by the members of the Overseas Committee, and that we initiate such steps as might be necessary to carry out such further discussions, and be it further

RESOLVED, h) That we encourage all who are of a like mind with us in this matter to identify themselves with us in supporting the Scriptural, historical position of the Synodical Conference, and be it further

RESOLVED, i) That the president of our Synod transmit copies of this report to the president of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, to the presidents of the Ev. Lutheran Synod and of the Synod of Ev. Lutheran Churches, and to the president of the Synodical Conference, and be it finally

RESOLVED, j) That the resolutions adopted by this Convention constitute an answer to the letters and memorials which we have received on this matter.

ACTION BY CONVENTION: The Resolution adopted, 124 to 49.

* The word "suspend" as used in the resolution has all the finality of termination during the duration of the suspension, but contains the hope that conditions might some day warrant the reestablishment of fellowship.

APPENDIX J:

THE CHURCH OF THE LUTHERAN CONFESSION
STATISTICS

| YEAR: | ORDAINED PASTORS | CONGREGATIONS | SOULS |
|-------|------------------|---------------|-------|
| 1958* | 21 | ? | ? |
| 1959* | 21 | ? | ? |
| 1960* | 44 | ? | ? |
| 1961 | 70 | 58 | 8128 |
| 1962 | 62 | 61 | 8992 |
| 1963 | 69 | 60 | 8252 |
| 1964 | 67 | 58 | 8665 |
| 1965 | 63 | 59 | 8728 |
| 1966 | 63 | 59 | 8728 |
| 1967 | 66 | 51 | 6028 |
| 1968 | 77 | 59 | 8958 |
| 1969 | 69 | 49 | 9255 |
| 1970 | 69 | 51 | 9399 |
| 1971 | 70 | 69 | 9614 |
| 1972 | 71 | 72 | 9490 |
| 1973 | 72 | 72 | 9679 |
| 1974 | 72 | 72 | 9667 |
| 1975 | 75 | 73 | 9790 |
| 1976 | 77 | 74 | 9817 |
| 1977 | 78 | 72 | 9688 |
| 1978 | 78 | 72 | 9688 |
| 1979 | 65 | 72 | 9340 |
| 1980 | 71 | 76 | 9426 |

* Indicates number of free conference attendance before CLC formation.

END NOTES

- ¹Missouri Proceedings, 1938, p. 231.
- ²ALC Proceedings, 1938, p.7.
- ³Wisconsin Proceedings, 1939, p.60.
- ⁴Wisconsin Proceedings, 1949, p.110f.
- ⁵Wisconsin Proceedings, 1949, p.111.
- ⁶J.P. Meyer, "Prayer Fellowship: IV" Quartalschrift Vol. 47 No. 2 (April, 1950), p.131.
- ⁷Wisconsin Proceedings, 1951, p. 136.
- ⁸Wisconsin Proceedings, 1951, p. 147.
- ⁹E. Reim, "As We See It--A State of Confession" NWL Vol. 39 No. 18 (Sept. 7, 1952), p. 282.
- ¹⁰F.E. Blume, "A State of Confession" NWL Vol. 39 No. 22 (Nov. 2, 1952), p.345.
- ¹¹Wisconsin Proceedings, 1953, p. 103.
- ¹²E.C. Fredrich, "The Great Debate With Missouri" WLQ Vol. 74 No. 2 (Apr. 1977), p. 163.
- ¹³Wisconsin Proceedings, 1953, p. 105f.
- ¹⁴E. Reim, "As We See It--The Question Before the House" NWL Vol. 40 No. 18 (Sept. 6, 1953), p. 286.
- ¹⁵I. Habeck and K. Krauss, "Wisconsin--Missouri President's Conference" NWL Vol. 41 No. 3 (Jan, 1954), p. 41
- ¹⁶C. Lawrence, "The Spiritual Principles Concerning Church Fellowship" Quartalschrift Vol. 51, p. 277.
- ¹⁷Lawrence, p. 282.
- ¹⁸Lawrence, p. 290f.
- ¹⁹Lawrence, p. 285.
- ²⁰Wisconsin Proceedings, 1955, p. 10.
- ²¹Wisconsin Proceedings, 1955, p.13.
- ²²E.C. Fredrich, "The 33rd Synod Convention" NWL Vol. 42 No. 18 (Sept. 4, 1955), p. 278.

- 23 Fredrich, p. 277.
- 24 E.E. Kowalke, "Romans 16:17,18," 1956.
- 25 Wisconsin Proceedings, 1957, p. 15.
- 26 Wisconsin Proceedings, 1957, p. 137f.
- 27 Wisconsin Proceedings, 1957, p. 147.
- 28 Wisconsin Proceedings, 1957, p. 145.
- 29 Rev. L. Schierenbeck, "A Study of the Scriptural Teaching Concerning Excommunication and Termination of Fellowship Their Relation To Each Other and Their Application," 1961.
- 30 Minnesota District Proceedings, 1958, p. 52
- 31 Dakota-Montana District Proceedings, 1958, p. 24f.
- 32 C. Lawrence, "A Report To The Protest Committee," 1958.
- 33 E. Reim, "An Open Letter To the Protest Committee," Oct. 29, 1958.
- 34 "Forward," The Lutheran Spokesman, June 1958, p.2.
- 35 N.R. Carson, The Lutheran Spokesman, Dec. 1958, p.15.
- 36 "A Call For Decision," 1959 (Appendix H).
- 37 The Lutheran Spokesman, Oct. 1959, p. 4.
- 38 Report To The 9 Districts, May 1960, p.31.
- 39 "Theology of Fellowship--Part II," 1960, p. 5.
- 40 Report To the 9 Districts, May 1960 p.33.
- 41 "History of the CLC," p. 11.
- 42 Paul F. Nolting, "The Deepening Wedge of Error," 1960.
- 43 "Entrenched In Unionistic Practices," p. 24.
- 44 Wisconsin Synod Proceedings, 1961, p. 193.
- 45 Wisconsin Synod Proceedings, 1961, p. 193.
- 46 Concerning Church Fellowship, 1961, p. 22f.
- 47 Concerning Church Fellowship, 1961, p. 28.
- 48 G. Sydow, "The Second Annual Convention," The Lutheran Spokesman Vol. 4 No. 4 (Sept. 1961) p. 13f.

- ⁴⁹Glenn Reichwald, "CLC Convention" Lutheran Synod Quarterly, Vol. 2 No. 1 (1961), p. 31.
- ⁵⁰C.M. Gullerud, "Where Do Things Stand Now?" The Lutheran Spokesman Vol. 5 No. 5 (Oct. 1962), p.9.
- ⁵¹"A Report--Wisconsin and CLC," The Lutheran Spokesman Vol. 5 No. 6 (Nov. 1962), p. 19.
- ⁵²E. Reim, "Admonition and Romans 16," Journal Of Theology Vol. 2 No. 5 (Dec. 1962), p.5.
- ⁵³E. Reim, p.6.
- ⁵⁴E. Reim, p.8.
- ⁵⁵Paul F. Nolting, "The Place of Compromise In the Church," Journal Of Theology Vol. 3 No. 1 (Feb. 1963), p.18.
- ⁵⁶E. Reim, "Panorama--Wisconsin Alone?" Journal Of Theology Vol. 3 No. 4. (Oct. 1963), p. 33.
- ⁵⁷G. Sydow, "The Things That Come To Pass" The Lutheran Spokesman Vol. 6 No. 8 (Jan. 1964), p. 14.
- ⁵⁸R.A. Fenske, "The Dakota-Montana District Convention" NWL Vol. 51 No. 6 (Aug. 9, 1964), p.254.
- ⁵⁹Reprot To The 9 Districts, May, 1964.
- ⁶⁰CLC Proceedings, 1965, p. 12.
- ⁶¹Wisconsin Synod Proceedings, 1967, p. 279.
- ⁶²Wisconsin Synod Proceedings, 1967, p. 280.
- ⁶³"Church Fellowship."
- ⁶⁴Correspondence CLC to Wisconsin April, 1968.
- ⁶⁵Correspondence WELS to CLC Sept. 6, 1968.
- ⁶⁶Correspondence CLC to WELS Nov., 1968.
- ⁶⁷Wisconsin Synod Proceedings, 1969, p. 149.
- ⁶⁸Corresponence Naumann to Reim June 1, 1970.
- ⁶⁹Paul F. Nolting, 'Mark...Avoid--Origin of the CLC, Oct. 1970, p.5.
- ⁷⁰Paul F. Nolting, p.7.
- ⁷¹Paul F. Nolting, p.7f.

- ⁷²Paul F. Nolting, p.8.
- ⁷³Paul F. Nolting, p.8f.
- ⁷⁴Paul F. Nolting, p. 12.
- ⁷⁵Paul F. Nolting, p. 15.
- ⁷⁶Glenn E. Reichwald, "CLC Review" Lutheran Synod Quarterly Vol. 11
No. 2 (Winter '70-71), p. 37.
- ⁷⁷G. Sydow, "An Unwarranted Dilemma" The Lutheran Spokesman Vol. 14
No. 1 (July 1971), p. 12.
- ⁷⁸G. Sydow, p.13.
- ⁷⁹"An Evaluation of the Editorial in The Lutheran Spokesman of July, 1971
by Pastor G. Sydow Entitled "An Unwarranted Dilemma," Jan. 1972.
- ⁸⁰Wisconsin Minutes of the WELS--CLC Meetings on July 18,19,1972.
- ⁸¹E.C. Fredrich, "Interchurch Relations in Recent Years," WLQ
Vol. 74 No. 3 (July, 1977), p.239.
- ⁸²Glenn E. Reichwald, "CLC Convention" Lutheran Synod Quarterly
Vol. 2 No. 1 (1961), p.31.
- ⁸³C.M. Gullerud, "The Doctrinal Difference Between the CLC and WELS,"
1978.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Wisconsin Publications:

- A. The Northwestern Lutheran
- B. Quartalschrift and Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly
- C. Proceedings
- D. Miscellaneous Documents

II. CLC Publications:

- A. Journal of Theology
- B. The Lutheran Spokesman
- C. Proceedings
- D. Miscellaneous Documents

III. Correspondence

IV. General Data, Papers, and Interviews

* * * * *

I. Wisconsin Publications:

(A.)

Blume, E. "A State of Confession," Vol. 39 No. 22 (Nov. 2, 1952), p. 345.
NWL

"Doctrinal Matters," Vol. 52 No. 19 (Sept. 19, 1965), p. 295
NWL

Fenske, R.A. "The Dakota-Montana District Convention," Vol. 51 No. 6
(Aug. 9, 1964), p. 254 NWL

Fredrich, E.C. "The 33rd Synod Convention," Vol. 42 No. 18 (Sept 4, 1955), p. 278.
NWL

Habeck, I & Krauss, K. "Wisconsin--Missouri President's Conference," NWL,
Vol. 41 No. 3 (Jan. 1954), p. 40ff.

Reim, E. "As We See It--A State Of Confession," NWL, Vol. 39 No. 18
(Sept. 7, 1952), p.282.

Reim E. "As We See It--The Question Before the House," NWL, Vol. 40
No. 18 (Sept. 6, 1953), p. 286.

(B.)

Fredrich, E.C. "The Great Debate With Missouri," WLQ Vol. 74 No. 2.

Fredrich, E.C. "Interchurch Relations In Recent Years," WLQ Vol. 74 No. 3.

Hoenecke, G. "News and Comments," WLQ Vol. 69 No. 4.

Lawrence, C. "The Spiritual Principles Concerning Church Fellowship,"
Quartalschrift, Vol. 51.

Meyer, J.P. "Prayer Fellowship: IV," Quartalschrift Vol. 47 No. 2.

(C.)

Proceedings of the Joint Ev. Lutheran Synod of Wisconsin and other States
1939 - 1959.

Proceedings of the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod 1961 - 1981.

Proceedings of the 21st Biennial Convention of the Minnesota District 1958.

Proceedings of the 19th Biennial Convention of the Dak.-Mont. District 1958.

Report to the Nine Districts May 1960 and May 1964.

(D.)

A letter addressed to the Synod pastors on Romans 16:17,18. Nov. 21, 1957.

"A Report to the Protest Committee," 1958 (Appendix G).

"Entrenched In Unionistic Practices."

"Church Fellowship," the theses which can be found in Wisconsin Synod
Proceedings, 1961, p. 190ff.

The Doctrinal Commission's evaluation of Pastor Sydow's J1 1971
article, "An Unwarranted Dilemma."

The Subcommittee of the Doctrinal Commission's report on Mar. 10, 1972
meeting with CLC.

WELS minutes of the J1. 1972 meeting with the CLC.

II. CLC Publications:

(A.)

(E.S.) "Matthew 18:17 and Excommunication," Journal of Theology,
Vol. 1 No. 3.

Nolting, Paul F. "The Place of Compromise in the Church," JoT, Vol. 3 No. 1.

Reim, E. "Admonition and Romans 16," JoT, Vol. 2 No.5.

Reim, E. "Panorama--Wisconsin Alone?," JoT, Vol. 3 No. 4.

(B.)

"A Report--Wisconsin and CLC" The Lutheran Spokesman, Vol. 5 No. 6 (Nov. 1962), p. 19.

Carson, N.R. The Lutheran Spokesman, Vol. 1 (Dec. 1958), p. 15.

Carson, N.R. L.S., Vol. 2 (Oct. 1959, p. 4.

"Forward," L.S., Vol. 1 (June, 1958), p.1f.

Gullerud, C.M. "Where Do Things Stand Now?" L.S. Vol. 5 No. 5 (Oct. 1962), p. 9.

Sydow, G. "The Second Annual Convention," L.S. Vol. 4 No. 4 (Sept. 1961), p.13f.

Sydow, G. "The Things That Come To Pass," L.S. Vol. 6 No. 8 (Jan. 1964), p. 14.

Sydow, G. "An Unwarranted Dilemma," L.S. Vol. 14 No. 1 (July, 1971), p. 12f.

(C.)

Proceedings of the Church of the Lutheran Confession 1962 - 1978.

(D.)

Concerning Church Fellowship , 1961. (CLC Book House, New Ulm, Minn.)

"Mark...Avoid" Origin of the CLC, 1970.

Statement of Faith and Purpose of the CLC, 1969.

This Is Your Church .

III. Correspondence: (chronological)

Nov. 10, 1958 Martin Galstad to the Protest Committee.

Oct. 13, 1958 Robert Reim to the Protest Committee.

Mar. 17, 1959 Prof. Lawrence to Rev. Reim

Nov. 5, 1965 Paul Albrecht to O.J. Naumann
Apr. 17, 1967 Paul Albrecht to O.J. Naumann
Sept. 6, 1968 O.J. Naumann to Paul Albrecht
Nov. 1968 CLC Board of Doctrine to WELS Commission on Doct. Matters
Apr. 28, 1970 O.J. Naumann to Pres. Reim
May 21, 1970 Pres. Reim to Pres. Naumann
June 1, 1970 Pres. Naumann to Pres. Reim
May 9, 1972 Prof. Lawrence to Pres. Gullerud
Mar. 14, 1971 Pres. Naumann to Pres. Reim

IV. General Data, Papers, and Interviews:

Gullerud, C.M. "The Doctrinal Difference between the Church of the Lutheran Confession and the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod." Presented to The Wisconsin Pastoral Conference Oct. 18, 1978.

Hefti, Roy. "What Separates Us Now?" 1979.

"History of the CLC," 1976(?).

Kowalke, E.E. "Romans 16:17-18," April 1956. Presented to the 1956 Wisconsin Synod Convention.

Nolting, Paul F. "The Deepening Wedge of Error," 1960. An article in the 1960 Yearbook of Grace Ev. Luth. Church of Sleepy Eye, Minn.

Nolting, Paul F. "Theses and Antitheses on Romans 16:17," 1957.

Nolting, Paul F. "Lest We Forget," 1965. An article in the 1965 Yearbook of Grace Ev. Luth. Church of Sleepy Eye, Minn.

Reichwald, Glenn. "CLC Convention," Lutheran Synod Quarterly, Vol. 2 No. 1 (1961), p. 30f.

Reichwald, Glenn. "CLC Review; 'Mark...Avoid,'" Lutheran Synod Quarterly, Vol. 11 No. 2 (Winter '70,71), p. 35ff.

Reim, E. "An Open Letter To The Protest Committee Wisconsin Synod," Oct. 29, 1958.

Schierenbeck, L. "A Study of the Scriptural Teaching Concerning Excommunication and Termination of Fellowship: Their Relation to Each Other and Their Application," 1961. Presented to the CLC conventions:
Jan. 24-26, 1961 Sleepy Eye, Minn.
Aug. 23-25, 1961 Spokane, Washington.

I would also like to acknowledge the efforts and time of the men who graciously allowed themselves to be interviewed for this paper.

Prof. E.C. Fredrich March 11, 1982
Pres. E. Albrecht (CLC) March 15, 1982
Prof. C. Lawrenz April 12, 1982