

ELS "THE MOST REACTIONARY SPLINTER GROUP OF LUTHERANISM IN
AMERICA," OR A SYNOD IN THE MAINSTREAM OF LUTHERAN LIFE?

Professor Fredrich
Senior Church History

Gary Brown
May 13 1977

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

ELS "THE MOST REACTIONARY SPLINTER GROUP OF LUTHERANISM IN AMERICA," OR A SYNOD IN THE MAINSTREAM OF LUTHERAN LIFE?

A great deal could be determined about the doctrinal convictions of various Lutheran groups by how they answer the above question. Because of its testimony and actions, the ELS has established a reputation. Many "Lutherans" think of the ELS as being; divisive, unyielding, and loveless. However, to those Lutherans who hold the Bible as their only guide for doctrine and practice, the answer is quite different. They know that the ELS is in the mainstream of Lutheran life. Actually, the ELS did not break away from the fellowship of the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod. Rather, the Missouri Synod because of its indifference to God's Word and its unionistic practice made it impossible for the ELS to continue in such a fellowship. The Missouri Synod did not live up to its pledge to the ELS made in 1917. The purpose of this paper will be to set forth some of the basic causes for the break of fellowship between the ELS and Missouri Synod.

The ELS emerged from the doctrinal controversies of election and conversion within the Norwegian Synod (1880's). The Norwegian Synod had been established in 1853. At that time the Norwegian Synod was in doctrinal fellowship with the Missouri Synod. In 1857, Pastors Jakob Aall Ottesen and Niles Brant went to St. Louis asking the Missouri Synod for help in training students for the ministry. There was a close relationship between the two synods until 1917. In 1917, the Missouri Synod terminated its fellowship with the Norwegian Synod because of

its "The Settlement" (of the election controversy). "The Settlement" was a compromise which violated the doctrine of grace alone. Only a small confessional group did not agree with "The Settlement." This group became the ELS. The ELS was admitted into the fellowship of the Missouri Synod in 1920:

1. Resolved, that the Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church (ELS) be accepted as a member of the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America.
2. That we welcome these brethren with great joy, encourage them in their fight for the truth, and wish them God's richest blessings for the future.
3. To our great sorrow we are compelled to state that the Synod for the Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Church of America (old Norwegian Synod), by holding fast to the Opløser and its union with the other two Norwegian synods in "The Norwegian Lutheran Church of America," has severed its bond of faith and church-fellowship with the Synodical Conference. (Proc. . . . Syn. Conf., 1920, p.23).

Fifteen years after Missouri made its pledge in the Synodical Conference to the ELS a concern developed among them. The ELS was concerned about the Missouri Synod's acceptance of an invitation from the United Lutheran Church in America (ULCA) and the American Lutheran Church (ALC). The ULCA was a union of the following synods; General Synod, General Council, and the General Synod South. The ALC consisted of the; Joint Synod of Ohio, Iowa Synod, and Buffalo Synod. The ELS was especially disturbed because of the ALC. The ALC was the group they had left because of the election and conversion controversy. The Missouri Synod defended its action by saying:

5. Whereas, our Synod has always recognized the desirability of the conservation and promotion of the unity of the true faith . . . and a united defense against schism and sectarianism . . .; and

6. Whereas, God-pleasing, Scriptural external union and cooperation is based upon internal unity, oneness in faith, confession, doctrine and practice; therefore be it
7. Resolved that we declare our willingness to confer with other Lutheran bodies on problems of Lutheran union with a view towards effecting true unity on the basis of the Word of God and the Lutheran confessions; 1

However that answer could not calm the fears of the ELS. The Rev. J.E. Thoen stated his doubts in the "Lutheran Sentinel" saying:

IPeter 3:15, But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meakness and fear. Is the condition we are now confronted with such that we are required to give heed to the admonition of the apostle in this respect and 'be ready always to give an answer?' Do the churches which have resolved to ask us to meet them through committees ask us for the reason of the hope that is in us? They do not intend to ask us for that. It isn't necessary. They know already what the reason for our hope is. We have told them long ago and recently, and they have not regarded it as a good reason nor sufficient. They insist we must add something, like they do. And when we say we can not add anything, for the reason of our hope is based entirely and solely on the merits of Christ, then they would say to us: 'Let us forget about all that now. The times are so evil that we need to stand together, to work together against sin and unbelief in the world and cooperate in practical things for the welfare of the Lutheran Church.' ... Isn't plain that the apostle's admonition does not apply to the present situation and that we are not bound to be ready to give answer to such proposals? 2

Because of past experiences with the devices of false teachers, they felt that it was necessary to express their concern. They did not consider this a sin on Missouri's part. However, they gave a strong warning in 1936 by publishing, "Unity, Union, and Unionism." It warned the Missouri Synod that:

We who have observed at close range and studied the history of the efforts made to bring the Norwegian Lutherans into agreement by means of comitrrd are constrained to say, when asked to follow this method again: 'Vestigia Terrent' (the footsteps terrify). We are afraid of history repeating itself, and therefore consider it a God-given

duty to sound a warning to all earnest defenders of the truth against exposing the true welfare of the Church of Christ to the dangers involved in this procedure. (Report . . . ELS, 1963, p. 47).

The ELS' concern for the Missouri Synod was augmented after Missouri met with the ALC in 1938. The doctrinal statement of the ALC was the "Declaration." The doctrinal statement of the Missouri Synod and of the Synodical Conference was the "Brief Statement." The ALC would not adopt the "Brief Statement" by itself. They also wanted the Missouri Synod to adopt the "Declaration together with the "Brief Statement." Missouri's Resolutions of 1838 allowed the ALC to use the "Declaration" and the "Brief Statement." The ALC did not want to be pinned down by one accurate doctrinal statement. They wanted flexibility. Later events proved that the ELS had assessed the ALC's attitude properly. The ALC had no meaningful desire to change. The Sandusky Convention proved that fact when it made no attempt to conform to the doctrinal clarity of the "Brief Statement." Another example of their disregard for the Missouri Synod and its "Brief Statement" was its agreement with the ULCA, called the "Pittsburg Agreement." 1940.

In the years of 1939-1940, the ELS and Wisconsin Synod warned Missouri of the possible problems in seeking fellowship with the ALC. Their recommendations to the Missouri Synod are summed up below:

1. Keep in mind the unionistic spirit of the ALC.
2. We can not agree with the "Pittsburg Agreement."
3. Need doctrinal documents which have clarity-thesis, antithe
4. One document instead of two, the "Brief Statement."
 - a) Missouri "Brief Statement."
 - b) ALC "Declaration."
5. Church practice must conform to doctrine.
6. Do not enter fellowship with ALC until all problems are cleared up- informing us of all agreements.

The 1941 Fort Wayne Convention (Missouri Synod) seemed to be one of contradiction. The Committee on Lutheran Union recognized that there were problem areas, but it thanked God for the great strides to Lutheran Unity. However, after they gave their report to the convention, the delegates thank God for, "whatever progress by the testimony of His truth has been accomplished in the direction of doctrinal unity." Proc. LC-MS, 1941 p. 301. The ALC would not accept the "Brief Statement" except in the light of the "Declaration." The ALC also differed in the doctrines of election and conversion.

In 1944, the ELS felt it was necessary to reprimand the Missouri Synod. They did not want the Missouri Synod to place the "Declaration" on a par with the "Brief Statement." The ELS had misgivings about the "Declaration." The ELS had sensed a change in the Missouri Synod and yet not a change as much as indifference to unclear statements for Scriptural doctrine. The ELS feared that the Missouri Synod would join the Lutheran group which the ELS could never join because of its false teachings on election and conversion. Because of this unionistic trend, President Norman A. Madson said, "The spectre of unionism is still hovering over us, and it is just as well that we look facts in the face, and not imagine a vain thing- that the Synodical Conference cannot be destroyed."³

More reasons for fear developed in 1944 at the Missouri Synod's Saginaw Convention. Missouri changed their attitude

towards joint prayer. Before the Missouri Synod taught that any and every prayer with a group of different fellowship was wrong, but at this date it was stated that joint prayers were permissible when asking for God's help to settle doctrinal differences. The problem was not so much the principle by itself, but rather its tendency. Such an action, at such a time, without informing the ELS or WELS ahead of time, caused a stir in the Synodical Conference. It appeared that the Missouri Synod was not changing the ALC, but rather that the ALC would weaken Missouri's stand on fellowship. On the other hand, the liberal Lutheran groups were encouraged by such an act because they would say, "At least Missouri will pray with us at certain occasions." It probably would have been better for Missouri not to pray. By not praying, they would have clearly shown that they were not of the same fellowship. However, there was even a greater problem. Missouri also gave toleration to the Boy Scout organization in this convention. The committee stated:

Accordingly, your committee believes that the matter of scouting should be left to the individual congregation to decide and that under the circumstances Synod may consider her interests sufficiently protected. (Proc. . Sag. 1944, p.257).

In 1944, another problem caused strained relations between the Missouri Synod and the ELS. Some fortyfour members of the Missouri Synod published "A Statement," which was a pamphlet sympathetic to the ALC. It encouraged members of the Missouri Synod to change its doctrine and join the ALC. By 1946, President

J.W. Behnken had done his best to stop the influence of "A Statement." Although "A Statement" was condemned by Missouri, there was no discipline to those who wrote the pamphlet. They remained members in good standing. Not only had this incident caused the ELS to mistrust the Missouri Synod, but also its lack of discipline had added salt to the wound.

In 1947 the ELS had a champion in the person of Professor J.A.O Preus Jr. He had attended Luther College in Iowa and Luther Seminary in St. Paul. He with his brother Robert left the ELC to join the ELS. He left for doctrinal reasons. In 1948, he wrote a pamphlet entitled, "What Stands Between?" His presentation attacked three main problems; the wrong attitude towards God's Word- election, conversion, original sin, justification, Antichrist, and creation, unionism because of the lack of synodical discipline, and loose church practice. From the words of his sermon, it can easily be seen that the ELS from 1948 on would view all of Missouri's actions even under closer scrutiny. J. Preus preaches:

In ICor. 1:10 Paul admonishes, 'Now I beseech you, brethern, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgement.' This one verse of Scripture clearly shows what God wants us to do in this matter. First, we are to 'speak the same thing!' That does not mean 'almost the same thing,' of 'the same thing on fundamental doctrines,' but it means what it says, 'the same thing.' . . . It is argued that no two individuals, to say nothing of two church bodies, can ever arrive at this goal. If that were true, what then are we to do with passages like Acts 4.32. . . Likewise the exhortations to unity in Rom. 15.5-6. Phil. 1.27, 2.2 and elsewhere show that such a state can and should exist among Christians. . . The second point that ICor. 1.10 teaches is that we are to 'speak the same thing,' before the 'divisions' among

us can be removed. In our day many are trying to heal the divided state of Christendom by first removing the divisions and then speaking the same thing. This is really the definition of a unionist, one who seeks to remove the divisions of the Church before first removing points of doctrine which have caused the divisions . . .

And finally, ICor. 1.10 shows that this agreement and removing of divisions must be sincere, from-the-heart action. We are to be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment. There is to be no hypocrisy, no equivocation, no double talk, no generalizing; but rather a sincere, genuine, agreement both in word and in content. Not only does God tell us in positive language what kind of church fellowship He desires, but also in very clear language He tells us that we are definitely to avoid false teachers and those who denying the Word of God, do not 'continue' in it. In Mt. 7.15 Christ warns us, 'Beware of false prophets.' Here again, if we are to be faithful to the Word, we must take this verse at its face value. Many have attempted to show that this and other verses do not apply to erring Christians but only to heathen. They have failed to prove their point. The verses themselves, as well as the many passages elsewhere in Scripture dealing with the importance of loyalty to the Word, show that, not only heathen, but also erring Christians are referred to in Mt. 7.15 and other verses under discussion, such as Rom. 16.17, Tit. 3.10, etc . . .

From these verses we can easily see that God forbids those who have the truth of His Word to become partakers of the sin of false doctrine by compromising or denying the truth in any way. To practice church fellowship with those who openly and persistently teach and practice contrary to God's Word is to become a partaker of their evil deeds . . . Our refusal of the hand of fellowship must always be in love, a love for God and His Word, a love for the errorist who, we pray will repent, a love for our won salvation and that of our fellow believers . . . (Report . . . ELS, 1948, pp. 31-56).

By 1950 fuel was added to the fire, when the Missouri Synod and the ALC adopted their joint effort, the "Common Confession." The "Common Confession" was a very poor confessional statement. It had major difficulties in the areas of Scripture, justification conversion, and other ALC aberrations. Both the ELS and WELS rejected it. They also warned Missouri. It seemed the the concern of the ELS were coming true. Missouri was now close to the group they had left in 1917. It must have seemed to the ELS

that the demon of unionism would leave Missouri for a while, but then going out into the wilderness it would return into Missouri sevenfold. The consciences of many ELS members were disturbed. They thought how long can we remain in fellowship with Missouri before we endanger our souls. George Lillegard also shows how serious of a matter this was to the members of the ELS in Faith of Our Fathers:

There are signs that the Synodical Conference no longer stands united on such issues as those discussed above. It may be that the great majority of Lutherans in this country will join hands with those who want more liberty in matters of doctrine than the Bible allows. It may be that our "little Norwegian Synod" will become more than ever before an anomaly in the Lutheran ranks. 'It has no right to exist,' - this was the judgment passed upon it at the time of its birth as a re-organized Norwegian Synod in 1918. It represents only a stubborn remnant, cast in hard, unbreakable molds, of a Lutheranism which has lost touch with the main stream of Lutheran life and thought, - so say 'representative leaders' of the church today. It has no future. The world passes it by unnoticed. It can 'make no impact on society,' nor can it hope to become anything more than a dying remnant, clinging to out-molded ideas which had vitality for an earlier age but are without relevance to the 'atomic era.'

Some may ask: Why, then struggle against the mighty tide of unionism, indifferentism and latitudinarianism which seems to have engulfed the Church of the Reformation to such a large extent today? The answer is given in the documents included in this Centennial Volume and in the Synod History, "Grace for Grace." These make it clear that the Norwegian Synod has been, and is, contending for doctrines of Holy Writ, which it has no right to sacrifice on the altar of a unionistic peace. We are bound by the Word of God. That word teaches us to look away from 'majorities' and prevailing winds and currents of doctrine and to stand alone, if need be, against both emperor, Pope and the hydra-headed mob. . . . So we shall not marvel if there should be but few churches that contend for the whole truth of God's word and refuse to compromise with error in any form. . . .

May the Lord of the Church keep us faithful to His word through these latter days of the world whether there be many or few that stand with us, so that we shall not fall under the curse of those that 'trust in man and make flesh their arm,' Jer. 17.5., but will say: 'Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is.' Jer. 17,7. 4

Because there was no evidence of any change in the Missouri Synod during the 1954 Synodical Conference Convention, the ELS was frustrated. The majority of the Synodical Conference, the Missouri Synod, did not even consider the ELS's admonishments to them. The ELS had been speaking to a brick wall. Out of frustration, President M.H. Otto of the ELS told the delegates to the ELS Convention:

Because there has been no tangible evidence of improvement in our relationship with the said sister-synod, (Missouri), despite our repeated pleas and protests relative to the issues that have been dividing us, our Synod is at this convention faced with the critical question of how it can or dare continue having any further association with this body with whom we had in former years stood shoulder to shoulder on these very same issues. 5

The Doctrinal Committee who had Prof. G.O. Lillegard and Dr. J.A.O. Prues Jr. as members, condemned the Missouri Synod because of its 1938 Resolutions, its attempts at the "Common Confession," and its 1944 Resolutions stating:

The time has come when we must testify by action against unionism which has become so common in Synodical Conference Circles. To continue the argument by word and pen will be more likely to aggravate than to resolve our differences. 6

The 1955 ELS Convention resulted in a suspension of fellowship from the Missouri Synod declaring:

1. That we declare on the basis of Rom. 16,17 that fellowship relations with the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod are suspended and that the exercise of such relations cannot be resumed until the offense have been removed by them in a proper manner.
2. That we declare our desire to maintain and establish fraternal relations with those synods, congregations, and individuals who are of one mind and spirit with us in matters of Christian doctrine and practice.
3. That we authorize our Synodical officers to inform the proper LC-MS and Synodical Conference officers concerning our action and to attend to whatever problems may

arise in connection with our Synodical Conference work. 7

The President of the Missouri Synod was surprised. In a haughty way he denied all of the ELS's charges. He did not show any sincere concern. Nor did he realize the seriousness of his Synod's trouble. The 1955 edition of the "Lutheran Witness" will now be quoted:

Our Reactions. We are shocked. We are saddened beyond words. Of course, if the Norwegians and the Wisconsin Synod decide to suspend or terminate relations of fellowship with our Synod and thereby sever relations with members of the Synodical Conference, we cannot prevent it. However, it must not and cannot be done on the basis of the charges made. We do not admit the charges. On the contrary, we emphatically deny them. Upon confirmation that the "Preliminary Report" of the Wisconsin Synod's Committee is correct, I wrote to President Oscar J. Naumann: 'I realize that if your church body wishes to withdraw from the Synodical Conference, there is nothing we can do to prevent it. Much as it would hurt us to see you sever bonds of fellowship, we know that we cannot compel you to remain within the Synodical Conference. However, we are not admitting the charges which you have made. If anyone brings such serious charges as you do, he must furnish convincing proof. You on our part have not done this. Let any silence on our part be interpreted as an admission. If you want to go on record at once and say that we by no means admit the charges which you have now printed and which you are presenting to your convention.'

This applies to charges made by the Norwegian Synod. It is one thing to make charges; it is another to furnish convincing evidence from the Word of God. The latter definitely is lacking.

Another Section of Norwegian Resolution. These words can mean only three things: 1) The Norwegian Synod people attempt to place the blame for the uncalled-for drastic action on the shoulders of our Synod. We refuse to assume the blame and emphatically deny this accusation. 2) They seek to persuade some of our people to enter their camp, even for a 're-alignment of Lutherans faithful to the Lutheran Confessions,' and all this on the basis of the bold statement: 'It is our firm conviction that we and those who stand with us represent the Scriptural principles and spirit of the Synodical Conference, and that it is the Lutheran Church---Missouri Synod which has departed from them.' We deny this charge. It is a loveless misstatement of facts and a glaring and deceptive misrepresentation of

of the situation. 3) They wish to continue fraternal relations with certain people in our Synod. With whom? With such as agree with them. They themselves, of course, will determine who these people are. This is outright 'selective fellowship.' I recall that some years ago, when the American Lutheran Church decided on selective fellowship, it was roundly condemned. Why, then, is it right now? Does it depend on who practices it? According to information given us, the American Lutheran Church has not found it workable and in the best interest of unity and fellowship. We hold that selective fellowship, regardless of who practices it, is neither right nor workable. It will result either in legalistic practice or in difference in doctrine and practice, and will cause confusion and chaos in the church. It is surprising indeed that such a resolution was adopted.

Let us remember also --- and I say this with deep regret and heartfelt sorrow--- that our Synod is not a perfect church body. There have been instances where someone has said or written something which is not in full accord with God's Word, or where someone has become guilty of practice contrary to the Word of God. Wherever this has happened, and irrespective of who is guilty, we have reason to repent, to seek forgiveness, and to practice evangelical discipline. I can assure our readers that such discipline has been practiced today by the proper officials. This discipline perhaps is not always done just in the manner in which some would have it. Nor is it publicized and broadcast, as some would like to see it done. However, it is being done. Our District Presidents and our circuit Visitors are faithful and conscientious in the performance of their duties. 8

The Wisconsin Synod met latter that year in Saginaw Michigan, August 10-17. The ELS thought that the Wisconsin would also break fellowship with the Missouri Synod. The Floor Committee on church union asked the convention to consider such a split. However, the convention decided to wait and be patient with the Missouri Synod. It was noted that if Missouri would continue unionistic practices, a split would be necessary:

It should be noted that the resolution cites Romans 16:17-18 as the reason and basis for the action advocated in the resolution. The passage reads: 'Now I beseech you brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrines which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good works and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.' By applying this Word

of God to the present situation, the Wisconsin Synod declares publicly that it will and must, in obedience to the Lord, terminate fellowship with the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod if there is no concrete evidence of a substantial change in the situation. 9

The ELS accepted the Wisconsin Synod's decision. The ELS said that they wanted to have close ties with all who confessed the truth. The ELS and the Wisconsin Synod were agreed that the Missouri Synod practiced unionism, but the difference was in the time to leave. A phrase from the "Northwestern Lutheran" points this out:

The preamble, which reiterated the 1953 charges of our Synod and applied Romans 16:17-18, was unanimously adopted. All were firmly convinced and fully agreed that the charge of unionism against the Lutheran--Church Missouri Synod was valid and that the Romans passage is applicable, even though some could not agree that action be deferred until the next meeting of that synod. Convention delegates were cheered when Pastor Julian Anderson of the Norwegian Synod, which in June suspended fellowship with the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod on the basis of Romans 16:17-19 declared his belief that there was essential agreement between his and our Synod, even if the resolutions were not identical. 10

The Wisconsin Synod did not break fellowship with the Missouri Synod until 1961, five years latter than the ELS. However, in 1956, the Wisconsin Synod adopted a "protesting fellowship" policy. The Wisconsin Synod and the ELS joined in the Synodical Conference's efforts to end the difficulties of the Missouri Synod's practice. This group was called, the Joint Committee. Some of the ELS membership withdrew from the ELS because of their participation in the Joint Committee. The group that left the ELS feared that the ELS was unionistic for such an effort. However, the ELS participated in this effort because they knew the sincerity of the Wisconsin Synod in teaching God's Word.

They

Although *did* try to solve their problems in the Synodical Conference, their attitude towards unionism did not change. The Missouri Praesidium accepted the invitation of the NLC (LCA and ALC) against the wishes of the 1959 Synodical Conference Convention. The Missouri Synod had promised the Synodical Conference Convention that they would honor such wishes, but later there was a change of mind because of a bad public press. Another cause for concern was an essay "Theology of Fellowship." Although it stated a fine principle in one place, its application was poor. It should be noted that joint prayer was now permitted even for social or civil functions. The ELS and the Wisconsin Synod realized that Missouri had not made a proper effort to solve any differences. Both the ELS and the Wisconsin Synod left the Synodical Conference in 1963.

From the history sketch presented, one can see that the ELS was not a reactionary group. Their early concerns became real problems. The ELS left the Missouri Synod in 1955 because of Missouri's hard nosed attitude against the ELS charges. Jacob Preus and Robert Preus demanded it. The ELS withdrew in 1955 out of love for God's Word and for the sake of their consciences. In spite of their "champion," Jacob Preus's departure to Missouri for a professorship, they remained firm. Yet, after their departure from the Missouri Synod, The ELS cooperated with the Synodical Conference sharing the hope with the Wisconsin Synod that the Missouri Synod would correct its problems. The ELS did not bear a

grudge against the Wisconsin Synod for not breaking off fellowship with Missouri in 1955, but realized that no real timetable could be established for such an action. ELS's reason for "selective" fellowship was that they had no intentions to break away from those who confess the truth. The Wisconsin Synod from 1956-1961 decided upon a protesting fellowship. The manner and the time were different, but the aim was the same not only to say and teach the truth, but also to obey the truth.

The ELS was not a reactionary group. The Missouri Synod did not live up to its pledge of proclaiming God's Word in truth. When it was warned, it did not heed. When it was admonished, it did not change. When it sought fellowship (ALG), it ruined true fellowship (Synodical Conference). Although the ELS and the Wisconsin Synod are no longer in fellowship with the Missouri Synod, they hope to again be friends. They pray that the Missouri Synod will again have the same confessional principles and practice which they had at the beginning of the Synodical Conference. They hope that someday they will be able to unite again in fellowship with the Missouri Synod and join in a hymn of thanks to God, but the ELS and the Wisconsin Synod know history. Yet, they also know of God's power in His Word.

E N D N O T E S

¹Theodore A. Aaberg, A City Set on a Hill (Lake Mills: Graphic Publishing Company, Inc., 1968), p.134-135.

²Ibid., p. 136.

³Ibid., p. 154.

⁴George O. Lillegard, Faith of Our Father (Mankato: Lutheran Synod Book Company, 1953), p. 161-162.

⁵Op. Cit., Aaber p. 190.

⁶Op. Cit., Aaber p. 190.

⁷Op. Cit., Aaber p. 190.

⁸John W. Behnken, "Lutheran Witness" 1955 p. 278-279.

⁹"Northwestern Lutheran" september 4, 1955 p.277.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Aaber, A. Theodore. A City Set on a Hill. Lake Mills: Graphic publishing Company, Inc., 1968.

Lillegard, O. George. Faith of Our Father. Mankato: Lutheran Synod Book Company, 1953.

other---

"Lutheran Witness" Concordia Publishing Co., St. Louis. vol. 74 August 2 1955 pp. 6,7.

"Northwestern Lutheran" Northwestern Publishing Co., Milwaukee. vol. 42 no. 18 September 4 1955 p. 277.