

One Born Out Of Due Time

Marcus Albrecht

and

The Protestant Conference

by Michael J Albrecht

Senior Church History

Prof. E. C. Fredrich

May 1982

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

P R E F A C E

or

What this paper is not

It is not my intention to summarize or analyze the events of the '20's and '30's that led to the formation of the Protestant Conference of the Wisconsin Synod (several of the papers listed in my bibliography have already covered that ground) although I will be assuming a certain familiarity on the part of the reader with the Vorgeschichte. If the history of the Wisconsin Synod properly begins with the Thirty Years War, then we can hardly isolate the present situation from its historical antecedents as though it were the chicken that never saw the inside of an egg.

Nor is it my intention to present a comprehensive biography of my uncle Marcus from birth to the present. Again, there is no doubt in my mind that a thorough review of life in the Bowdle parsonage would provide valuable insight into why Marcus grew to be the man he is today. Likewise, I would love to know a lot more about campus life at NWC in the mid-1940's and about the atmosphere and attitudes that prevailed here at the seminary during the late '40's. But for various reasons, the scope of this paper will be somewhat limited.

I am not even particularly interested in all the gory details of Marcus' expulsion from the Dakota-Montana District. No doubt much could be added to the two primary documents preserved in Faith-Life. (I refer to the "Centennial Letter" (cf. Appendix A) and the "Akaska Stenographic." (cf. Appendix B)) But for my purposes, a somewhat superficial recounting of the facts of the case should prove sufficient.

I appreciate the fact that each of the men who today make up the Protes'tant Conference has his own story to tell. And there is quite a diversity apparent to anyone who takes the time to browse through the back issues of Faith-Life. But the thing that strikes me is that there is also a common thread running through their various and varied histories.

Without exception, the Protes'tants I've had the pleasure of getting to know have been men of obvious ability and humble faith. (A rare combination these days.) I count it a privilege to be able to call them my friends. (And relatives.) In the case of my uncle, my respect and love developed long before I knew he was a Protes'tant. (In fact, long before I even knew what a Protes'tant was.) And that is a large part of the reason why I chose to write on this topic.

Since my uncle Marcus' suspension in 1950, there have been a number of other tragic cases of men who were expelled from our synod for refusing to deny the right hand of fellowship to the men who had previously been kicked out of our synod. And if we simply continue on our present course, I see no reason why we should expect that Floyd Brand and Rob Christmann will be the last. Reexamination of our reasons for denying full fraternal fellowship to the Protes'tants is long overdue. The simple fact that they are still with us and that Faith-Life has continued to roll off the presses for more than half a century now ought to be enough to convince us that they are not simply going to die out.

I'm convinced that most of the members of our synod today who have heard of the Protes'tants do not expect to see a reconciliation with them. Such pessimism easily becomes self-fulfilling prophecy. And that is the tragedy. My thesis is that a reconciliation is possible because with God all things are possible. That may sound

naive, but perhaps that sort of "naivete" is what the present situation requires.

I think any reconciliation which God may see fit to bring about is likely to begin with a thorough and objective (to the extent that is possible) reexamination of the reasons for the suspensions of the men who are still alive. Such reexamination will no doubt uncover sins on both sides of the barrier, but sincere repentance and conscientious prayer (e.g. the fifth petition) will move God to break down the barrier between us. And then perhaps we can begin more fully to appreciate what I see as the common thread running through the tragedies which have plagued us since 1950: the voice of conscience which has told each man in his particular situation that he must take a stand -- regardless of the consequences to his ministry, his family, his reputation. In each case from Akaska in 1950 to Green Bay in 1981, sincere Christian men have done what they felt conscience-bound to do because each of them was genuinely afraid for his own soul's salvation. Each might well have said, "Here I stand. I cannot do otherwise. God help me. Amen."

One Born Out of Due Time

Ever since I can remember, it has been customary in our family to find a mutually convenient date during the summer to get together with my uncle Marcus and his family. Every other summer we make the trip to Mindoro and in the alternate years Marcus' family comes to our home in Neenah. We eat more than we really need and then sit around the table and talk until someone reminds us that we have to get in a round of miniature golf before we eat again. After eighteen holes, we eat again and talk some more and then usually sometime after dark the members of the visiting family finally pile reluctantly back into the car for the long drive home.

This annual ritual as well as other occasional contacts at weddings and graduations and funerals quite naturally down through the years built a warm love and an honest respect for my uncle in my heart. I don't recall exactly when I first heard that he was a Protes'tant, but I do know I was young enough that I simply accepted that fact without pursuing it. It was years before it even occurred to me to ask who the Protes'tants were.

When I went away to college, I still didn't know much about the Protes'tants beyond the fact of their existence. One of my classmates turned out to be Carl Springer. As I played sheephead and chess with Carl (and almost always lost) he and I became friends. I still have vivid memories of more than one late night spent in North Hall. Carl was (and is) an amazing person, and one of the things that amazed me personally was that he knew some of my relatives. He knew Uncle Marcus and Uncle Henry and Uncle Victor even better than I did it seemed. And I wasn't sure why or how.

In our sophomore year at Northwestern, our class decided to run Carl as our candidate for UMOC. The time and effort expended by so many members of our class during that campaign were a special tribute to the admiration and respect Wunderkind had earned from all of us. In the course of four years some of us found out that Carl was a Protes'tant, but he almost never talked about it. We noticed when Carl was not permitted to preach for evening chapel. But noone objected to him playing the organ for our chapel services. Nobody kept him from singing in the chorus either, but he was not permitted to speak for the chorus when they went on tour -- despite the fact that the members of the chorus had elected him president. His talents were many and manifest, and when we got to be seniors it was taken for granted that he would be the editor of the Black and Red. He was, and he served with distinction. And so after four years at Northwestern (the birthplace of the Protes'tant Controversy ?!) all the more I knew about the Protes'tants was that I had another good friend who was one.

Mike Hanke was another of the friends God gave me during my time at Northwestern. Mike never did graduate from NWC, but he and I remained friends after he transferred to DMIC and after he graduated from DMIC and was called to St Paul congregation in Green Bay. At the time, I'm sure neither Mike nor I ever dreamed that we would one day see each other at a meeting of the Protes'tant Conference.

In each case, these personal friendships laid a foundation for me which made a difference when I finally started to find out more about the Protes'tants. Had I never known any of these men personally, I might well have been immediately turned off by some of the criticism published in Faith-Life as so many of my friends in WELS have been. But as it is, my personal respect for

men like my uncle Marcus caused me to hesitate to pass judgment without first digging a little deeper into the circumstances to see why such strong language might be justified.

I am not the only WELS man to dig into the Protes'tant story who has come away with a genuine respect for these men and their unswerving stand. In his magnum opus Mark Jeske said,

there is much about the individual Protes'tants which can be admired. They were men of strong convictions who honestly felt that they were right, that they had been cruelly wronged by the Synod. They were consistent -- they stuck to their guns to the point of losing synodical membership, and sometimes their congregations and ministries. Their appreciation for theological literature outshone that of WELS for some time. In addition, these men were not run-of-the-mill pastors -- they were gifted, highly intelligent writers and thinkers, and their articles, though sometimes abrasive and cheap, were never dull. One almost wishes that the Northwestern Lutheran would more often feature a writing style with that kind of crackle and incisiveness. 1

In a similar vein, J Meyer (the one in Florida who is still alive) points to blessings which have come to us through the Protes'tants and Faith-Life.

I believe the correct and proper name of the organization is still "The Protes'tant Conference of the Wisconsin Synod," its purpose to preserve the "Wauwatosa Gospel" and warn the Wisconsin Synod of the Judgments of God; and its main contribution, making some of Koehler's valuable material available through the pages of Faith-Life. While a reconciliation between the Wisconsin Synod and the Protes'tant Conference has not been effected, we ought to gratefully acknowledge the contributions these erst-while brethren have made. The translation of Gesetzliches Wesen was made by a man in the Protes'tant Conference. Our translation of Koehler's Galatians was made by Protes'tant E.E. Sauer. The publishers of Faith-Life, who originally printed it, readily gave permission to Northwestern Publishing House to print it in book form. The most comprehensive history of the Wisconsin Synod is that of J. P. Koehler, printed by the Protes'tant Conference. Is it too much to hope that more of the material available to previous generations may yet become available to us?

Is it too much to pray that in the hands of a gracious Savior one of the darkest periods of our synod's history may yet be brightened by a real understanding and reconciliation between the Wisconsin Synod and the few remaining Protestants? 2

In the late 1950's the synod and particularly the West Wisconsin District did review the events of the '20's and '30's and the result was adoption of a resolution by the West Wisconsin District which lifted the original suspensions. More about that later. I only mention it here because it led to a delegation of three WELS men attending a meeting of the Protestant Conference. One of them was Harold Wicke who remarked on the floor that he had felt uplifted when reading devotional articles in Faith-Life. He then went on to say,

I find in those devotional articles, regardless of who the men among you were who wrote them -- because many of the names are just names to me, no more -- I found in them a spirit that preaches and teaches the way I would want to have my Lord say that I teach and preach His Word. So that your positive thing there concerning the Gospel of Jesus Christ -- I there feel something in which I quickly agree with you. I don't feel any difference there whatsoever. Naturally I have not read all of it. I have not heard you preach, except for Pastor Uetzmann once at a funeral. I'm unacquainted with you otherwise. But what I read there in those devotional articles was something that I felt at home with. 3

Pastor Victor Prange was also one of the men who attended one session of the Protestant Conference and who expressed a desire to return. In a letter to Pastor Louis Mielke, Pastor Prange said, "Throughout my study of the Protestant Controversy the feeling came over me again and again that had I been living in the days when the struggle began, I would have been with the Protestants." 4

My point in adducing the preceding testimonials is that while my ties of blood and friendship are in large part responsible for my sympathetic bias overagainst the Protes'tants, other men who are without such connections still see something admirable and worthy of further investigation in these men.

That brings me to my uncle Marcus' story which I will pick up in the Fall of 1941 when he began his freshman year at Northwestern. His roommate was a sophomore by the name of Donald Ortner. Ortner had a special interest in music and enough money to have his own personal organ right in the dorm. The year before Marcus came to Watertown, Ortner had through his interest in music become friends with Ralph Gehrke, who graduated from Northwestern in the spring of 1941. Gehrke had been impressed by the articles J. P. Koehler had written for the old Quartalschrift concerning the Lutheran chorale as an artform and an outgrowth of the Gospel. Gehrke recommended that Ortner read some of the back issues of the old Quartalschrift. And thus when Marcus came to college the next Fall his roommate was reading Koehler with such enthusiasm that Marcus became curious enough to begin reading Koehler for himself.

In the Fall of 1943 as Marcus returned to Watertown for his junior year, he first met Philemon Hensel. Hensel transferred to Northwestern from the university at Madison and joined Marcus' class as a junior. His father, Paul Hensel, was a Protes'tant pastor who served a congregation in Valders, near Manitowoc. The elder Hensel was one of the men who had not been abandoned by his congregation when fellowship with men who had already been ousted became a matter of discipline on the district level. (At least the congregation at Valders refused to terminate his call. The same was not true of the congregation at Liberty.) Phil Hensel was a man to whom God had given outstanding abilities,

and that fact quickly became evident to his classmates. (Much as Carl Springer's manifest talents impressed the members of my class some thirty years later.) Marcus and Phil learned to know and respect one another, but they did not immediately become "best friends." Marcus admired Phil, and I have no doubt that the feeling was mutual.

One thing Marcus and Phil did do together before graduating from Northwestern was travel to Neillsville to visit J. P. Koehler who was living in his son's home there. By this time Koehler had started to feel the effects of advancing age; his hearing was no longer very sharp. But he graciously sat and talked with the young students for about an hour. (auf deutsch, of course.)

Due to the fact that World War II was raging and the draft board had to be contended with, Northwestern was operating on an unusual calendar. The class of 1945 graduated in March and then went home for the Easter break. In April, they began their first semester at the seminary in Thiensville. Marcus was accepted at the seminary without any trouble. Phil had a rougher row to hoe. (Some of the details of the negotiations that were held before Phil was accepted as a guest student at Thiensville are given in his article "Farewell to Thiensville" in the June 1952 issue of Faith-Life.)

During his first two semesters at the seminary, Phil refrained from preaching in any pulpit because it was a generally observed rule that first year homileticians did not preach anywhere but in class. When summer came, one student after another was called away from the seminary to do supply teaching in Christian Day Schools of the synod. Phil explains,

A call came from Hoskins, Nebraska, to which no one responded. Every day, for some time,

Prof. Meyer asked the class for volunteers. There was none. The candidate duly called to the post had turned it down at the last moment, leaving destitute the little parochial school already in straits because of many opponents within the congregation. Prof. Meyer had promised the pastor he would send a student. At length I volunteered to go, unmindful of the quandry Prof. Meyer would be in. Again he enjoined me not to preach for any pastor, and, with my ready compliance with this demand, since Prof. Schaller had advised his first year homiletics class not to preach until they were second year men, and since I did not feel equal to preaching, again stating this expressly, he sent me to Hoskins. 5

Phil spent eight and a half months teaching in Hoskins, and then in August of 1946 the class reassembled at Thiensville to continue their studies. Phil never once raised the issue of the Controversy in class and he never spoke of it to his classmates in the dormitory unless directly asked. Matters came to a head in early October, however, when Phil's father asked him to preach at Valders. Phil accepted the invitation and informed Prof. Meyer of his intention to do so. That was the end of his sojourn at our seminary. The notice of his release was dated Oct. 11, 1946.

Marcus remained at Thiensville and eventually graduated in 1948. His first call was to a dual parish at Akaska and Tolstoy in South Dakota. The family connections at this point are very interesting. Marcus' father Paul was the president of the Dakota-Montana District and was serving St John congregation in Bowdle (only about 30 miles from Akaska.) Paul had previously served the congregation in Tolstoy himself and that is where Marcus' brother Jerome (my father) was born. So when Marcus was ordained and installed, his was not an unfamiliar name to the members of his new congregations.

A synod-wide centennial celebration was planned and announced

for the summer of 1950. By this time Marcus had had time to do enough reading in Faith-Life to become convinced that he had to declare himself publicly to be in support of the Protes'tants. He felt conscience-bound to disassociate himself from the action of his synod over against his brothers in the Protes'tant Conference. He could see no reason why he should deny the right hand of fraternal fellowship to men who had been ousted on the basis of the Gutachten. In a lengthy letter to the members of his two congregations, he tried to explain his deepseated convictions.

Some of you, at least those of you who get the church papers, may have wondered why our congregation did not celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Wisconsin Synod. The reason is that it would have been a mockery, such a service would have been hollow and empty unless you had known what I am about to tell you. At the time of such an anniversary it is proper and necessary to look back into the past, to see where we are, where we came from, how come we are where we are, and in what direction we are going. The Wisconsin Synod in its official pronouncements and publications did look way back but seems to have forgotten what happened about 25 years ago when it lost around forty pastors, professors and teachers and a number of congregations. It seems to have forgotten the time when it was in an uproar for at least ten years. Because the Wisconsin Synod still won't face the facts of this so-called Protest and Controversy, which broke into the open about 25 years ago, I could not preach to you about the celebration of its Centennial. Its one-hundredth anniversary cannot be celebrated in a God-pleasing way when Synod forgets all about its sins of the past, makes no or only passing mention of them, and makes no move to repent, to right the wrongs which it committed. And for me to be honest with you I can no longer be silent about these sins and make believe they do not exist, or make believe they make no difference, for the sins of the fathers are visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generation. What happened 25 years ago does have its effect on us, whether we realize it or not. 6

Marcus then goes on to recount some of the events of the

original controversy in an attempt to help his people understand where the Protes'tants came from and who they are. (cf. Appendix A)

At this point, Marcus had not yet gone to conference with the Protes'tants; he hadn't even met many of them. But his conscience had been stirred by what he had read in Faith-Life. His personal study of the Word had not shown him any Gospel other than what he heard from the Protes'tants. And it is in that light that I think we have to read the following two paragraphs from his Centennial Letter. The language is strong (but I would not say malicious) because it flows from a deeply troubled conscience.

Only because of my youth and inexperience and because of my own unbelief have I not openly stood with the ousted men before. But from my own study and experience I am convinced that Synod's charges against these men are false, that they are not false teachers and slanderers, but, though sinful and erring, real men of God, real Bible students, real warriors, the like of which Synod has none. They are my teachers and from what they say and write I live. They are my spiritual fathers, and all I have or know when it comes to the Gospel I have from them. From the men in Synod I have learned little that is worthwhile. In the Wisconsin Synod I feel like a stranger. There is a constant undertone of disagreement. I owe my spiritual life to the ousted men, they showed me myself, and above all they showed me the Saviour as I had never seen Him before. How can I turn my back on these men! I can't and still be saved. I can't and still say that what they have taught me means anything to me.

They are my brothers in Christ, whom I dare not deny if the Gospel is to mean anything to me. And to declare this publicly I will preach for them and commune with them. I can't do otherwise. I can't make believe the things of the controversy did not happen and that these men did not live and write. For me to turn my back on them is an ugly and unnatural thing, is stabbing them in the back, is biting the hand that has fed me and still feeds me. If I deny them, I live the lie and damn myself. I deny the Saviour. I can't like the priest and the Levite coolly walk by these wronged men who are not only my neighbors but my teachers and my brothers in Christ. Their suspensions from Synod are not of God and

don't stand before the Saviour. How can and
how dare I honor these suspensions? 7

Such words tend to travel quickly, and it wasn't long before Pastor Herbert Lau, the first vice president of the district came to see Marcus. He expressed shock and dismay that Marcus had raised the issue in his congregations. After about half an hour Marcus agreed to write an appendix to his letter to correct a few inaccuracies and to clarify certain points that might have been misunderstood.

Soon a difference of opinion arose among the pastors of the area as to whether or not it was proper to preach in Marcus' pulpit. One man refused, while another accepted. The man who accepted was immediately contacted by two brothers. Another meeting was arranged, this time involving both Rev. Lau and Pastor W. T. Meier, the second vice president of the district. (For obvious reasons Marcus' father was not participating in the official discussions, although he and his son did have several long talks over the kitchen table.) They convinced Marcus to agree to refrain at least temporarily from practicing formal fellowship with the Protestants. He didn't want to appear stubborn, so he agreed to wait and see what would come out of their upcoming meeting in Milwaukee.

At the Western Pastoral Conference which was held at Mandan, North Dakota, the question came up again and after lengthy debate a resolution was passed requesting the brethren not to practice altar or pulpit fellowship with Marcus. This was not supposed to imply that they no longer regarded him as their brother. They merely wanted to avoid the confusion created when one man would accept an invitation to preach in Akaska after another man had declined the invitation. Certain members of the faculty at Mobridge were particularly concerned about such confusion.

Soon thereafter at a Study Club meeting in Mobridge, the subject of the hardening of hearts came up. Marcus said that hardening takes place in general in all areas of life and that it happens in the church when we despise the Gospel. Others objected to this idea and said it was sinful judging of hearts to say that the church lies under God's judgment of hardening.

The Protestant Conference was scheduled to meet on the last day of October and the first day of November in 1950. For the first time, Marcus attended. He told his story as far as it had unfolded up to that time. Louis Mielke (Marcus' father-in-law to be) comments,

We heard a brief, unrehearsed story, told by a young pastor in open-hearted free spirit, which showed neither scheming design, nor even legitimately planned attack, but grew out of deepseated convictions and of a conscience bound by the Gospel. 8

A little less than a month later, on November 29, 1950, a joint meeting of the Akaska and Tolstoy congregations convened at the church in Akaska at 8 PM. Pastor Lau was present to present the case against Marcus. He began by reading a prepared statement.

November 29, 1950
In a public statement, Rev Marcus Albrecht of Akaska, South Dakota has declared: "They* are my brothers in Christ, whom I dare not deny, if the Gospel is to mean anything to me. And to declare this publicly I will preach for them and commune with them."

Since Rev Marcus Albrecht insists that this is his position even now, and that he cannot change it, we, the presidium of the Dakota-Montana District, are compelled to announce that fraternal relations between him and us have been broken.

(Signed) Herbert Lau, 1st Vice-President
W. T. Meier, 2nd Vice-President
Dakota-Montana District

*The members of the Protes'tant Conference,
who are not in fellowship with the Wisconsin
Synod. 9

Pastor Lau informed the meeting that Marcus had asked for two weeks to consider whether to resign or to let the congregations vote on whether to retain him as their pastor. Lau explained that if Marcus would resign, no vote would be necessary, and that might prevent a scism. The ensuing discussion centered around the question why it was necessary to choose between their pastor and their synod. The explanation that Marcus could not practice fellowship with both the Protes'tants and the synod did not seem to satisfy very many of the voters. Finally Lau attempted to explain his objections to the Beitz paper. He said,

While this paper contained much that was acceptable, it on the other hand also contained statements of a nature that were taken as slander and a judging of hearts. I do not have the Beitz paper with me this evening so I cannot quote. 10

When Marcus offered to fetch a copy of the Beitz paper for him, Lau declined. The next speaker then said, "I don't think he has explained anything more than he did before. As far as I can see, he has explained nothing." ¹¹ Further fruitless discussion followed (cf. Appendix B) and then the question arose as to who should preach the next two Sundays while Marcus was deciding whether or not to resign. Marcus saw no reason why he should not fill the pulpit himself, but Lau insisted that would cause offense in neighboring congregations. Marcus pointed out that by denying him his pulpit they would in reality be making the decision which they had agreed to postpone for two weeks. Lau didn't see it that way; he said the congregations would be endangering their own

relationship to the Synod if they permitted Marcus to preach, since the statement he (Lau) had read to them at the beginning of the meeting had already declared Marcus to be out of the synod. No matter how the vote might go, and no matter when they might decide to take their vote, one thing they could not change was the fact that Marcus was no longer a member of the district or the synod. If they chose to retain Marcus as their pastor, that would also be a decision to cut themselves off from the rest of the district and the synod. Pastor Bast of Mobridge was asked to preach the next two Sundays. It was agreed to meet again in two weeks and then the meeting was adjourned. But for all practical purposes, Marcus' ministry in Akaska and Tolstoy had come to an end. The official announcement appeared in the Dec. 31, 1950 issue of The Northwestern Lutheran.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Rev Marcus Albrecht has declared himself in fellowship with the Protes'tant Conference. We are therefore compelled to announce that fraternal relations between him and us have been broken.

HERBERT LAU, 1st Vice-President
W. T. MEIER, 2nd Vice-President
Dakota-Montana District 12

Marcus left South Dakota and went to Manitowoc where he moved in with his ungle Victor who was a member of Pastor Uetzmann's Protes'tant congregation. However, it wasn't long til Marcus was called to teach in the Christian Day School at Mindoro. At that time the dual parish at Burr Oak and Melrose was being served by Pastor Martin Zimmermann. Marcus was installed as teacher in the school on July 22, 1951. He preached occasionally and even had several of his sermons printed in Faith-Life.¹³ He began to attend meetings of the Protes'tant Conference on a

regular basis and was eventually designated secretary of the group. His first Conference Report summarized the discussion at Neillsville which took place November 5-6, 1953. ¹⁴

This might be the place to say that the sermons and conference reports referred to above ought to serve as an antidote to the rather generally held perception of the lives and ministries of the individual Protes'tants. It is in a way understandable that the impression many WELS men have of the Protes'tants is a quite one-sided and restricted picture. Marcus and his fellow Protes'tants spend most of their time and effort in carrying out ministries to God's people. They study the Word and seek to apply it to themselves and their congregations. Their criticism of the Wisconsin Synod is not some sort of daily preoccupation which prevents them from doing positive, constructive work for the Lord and His Church. It is incomplete and thus incorrect to view their reason for being as entirely or even primarily negative. The Wauwatosa Gospel is a very positive and powerful force in their ministries and lives. They do not get together at their meetings simply to spit poison at us; their conferences are devoted to Bible study, prayer, and Christian fellowship in the full and rich significance of the term.

In July of 1953, Faith-Life printed a series of letters which had passed between Prof. Kowalke and Marcus Koch, a member of Pastor Uetzmann's congregation in Manitowoc. Dr. Koch wanted to know whether his son Alfred could be allowed to enroll at NWC. Kowalke stated that membership in the Protes'tant Conference did not automatically disqualify the applicant, although there was some question as to the availability of space in the dormitory. Kowalke did say that "our experience with boys from the Protes'tant Conference or who sympathized strongly has been none too happy." ¹⁵ This oblique reference prompted Koch to write back and ask, "Am

I to read between the lines? That says an awful lot and yet says nothing! What am I to infer? What do you mean?" 16

Kowalke's response contained an obvious reference to Marcus, but again without using his name.

One student was reported to have said publicly that in his four years at Watertown and three at Thiensville he never learned any Gospel there. If correctly reported, he gave us a bad name. That was not a happy experience. 17

This provoked the following comment from Marcus:

If he is really concerned, as director of the institution, about it having been given a bad name and thinks that what I said really did that, why does he not protest in public against the public statement he thinks is slanderous and label it as an untruth? Why let it float around, untouched and unwarned against, if it is giving his school a bad name? Or he could at least make an effort to reach the author of the statement to ask him for an explanation or to take him to task. But he does not. Instead, he repeats, as he must, gossip.

As far as I know, what I said gave only me, not Northwestern or Thiensville, a bad name in the Wisconsin Synod. That I have given the schools a bad name is illusory and a wry joke, because the man who tells it is serious and deceives himself into thinking he speaks grave things. 18

The foregoing seems to be typical of what little communication has passed between synod officials and the Protestants during the past thirty years or so. Men like Kowalke appear to be quite apprehensive at the prospect of dealing with one of the Protestants on a one-on-one basis, while the Protestants then find it hard not to view such uneasiness as evidence that we find it difficult to explain or defend past synodical action overagainst the Protestants and men who declared their sympathies for the Protestants.

Marcus' explanation for this state of affairs gets at a very fundamental question: Herzensrichterei. This is a charge which goes back to the days when the Beitz paper first burst upon the scene. Marcus comments,

Unconditional rebuke, as offered to the Synod by the Protes'tants, is never publicly offered to the Synod from any other source. When it was offered, it was never accepted but rejected with rebellion, because bowing to rebuke is tantamount to confession of sin. The Synod, a la Kyrie Eleison Synod (1929), although unafraid to admit a general guilt on the basis of our common humanity, will not take a specific rebuke without excusing herself in some way or to some degree. She is willing to share, not bear, the blame. She will admit to the danger of fleshliness, indifference, churchianity, nepotism, imperialism, legalism, and confess these things are all bad and even sort of present someplace, perhaps, in the body general, but, Ichabod, thou art the man, unconditional, personal guilt -- no! 19

Along these same lines, I can recall a conversation with Carl Springer during our college days in which we discussed the question whether it is proper for present-day believers to pray the imprecatory psalms. Carl was not ready to issue a blanket statement to the effect that we ought never pray them.

Very closely bound up with this issue is the contention that Synod often seems to be regarded as some sort of sacred cow to be honored and defended without necessarily investigating all the facts or even considering the possibility of Menschenherrschaft.

Only the man with a conscience, who has fought the devil in his own bosom and seen the Power of Darkness at work in the Synod, will understand these things. Anyone else reflexively rises to the defense of Mother Synod, as if she were a sacred cow that dare not be touched, lest the Father in heaven pour down fire and brimstone. And just as naturally he contemns the critic as radical, over-emotional, fanatical, or stubborn, even imputing to him ulterior motives as, e.g., a martyr complex or a desire for notoriety. But whether he is defending the

Synod or vilifying the critic, he does it all without understanding, because he is out to preserve the status quo and avoid the change, the repentance, the total inner and outer reorientation in spiritual and synodical matters which the acceptance of this preaching would necessitate... 20

Such statements leave most WELS men with little or no hope for a reconciliation with the Protes'tants. While that is in a way understandable, there is another side which many WELS men are unaware of because they have looked no further into the matter. I think many of my brethren in WELS have the impression that the Protes'tants want every single member of our Synod (or at least every single pastor) to sit down and devote enormous chunks of time to a thorough reading and digestion of all the complex and detailed cases documented in the back volumes of Faith-Life. Perhaps they would be surprised to read the following statement from the pen of Martin Zimmermann. (It is particularly interesting to note that this article which makes reference to the Elroy Declaration was originally printed in the June 1940 issue of Faith-Life and then at the request of a reader appeared again in March of 1959.)

...two members of Immanuel's Congregation pleaded with Synod's representatives and with the Protes'tants in God's Name to halt this bitter battle and to make peace. They contended that it is humanly impossible after these many years to settle this controversy, and they counseled that a cross be stricken through this blotch in our history, that the two factions come together, let bygones be bygones, begin from scratch, and honestly endeavor once more to work together in harmony and peace. Such pleading cannot and dare not be ignored by our opponents, nor by us, unless we have utterly hardened ourselves against every reasonable approach to a peacable settlement. In fact, this appeal to strike a cross through the whole sorry mess and begin from scratch originally

comes from the Protes'tant group. It is the very suggestion contained in the Elroy Declaration. And Faith-Life, too, has made it repeatedly these many years. I myself also made this suggestion to the Peace Committee in 1930: To lift all the suspensions, call the Protes'tants in, and discuss their grievances. 21

I have included the text of the Elroy Declaration as Appendix C because it has often been regarded as an official confessional document which stands in the way of reconciliation. Ironically, the original intent of the Elroy Declaration was to spell out what needed to be done in order to clear the way for a meaningful reconciliation. Furthermore, the Protes'tants themselves never elevated it to the status of a corporate confession. Marcus told me that he regards it as a statement of the men who signed it and not as something he had to subscribe to in order to become a full member of the Protes'tant Conference.

When the Elroy Declaration was printed in Faith-Life in August of 1929, one of the men who had signed it, Paul Hensel, also provided a commentary on the historical background of the document and the intent of its contents. His explanation of point 4 is particularly illuminating.

Point 4 reads: "Over against you we unreservedly subscribe to Beitz's Paper and intend to adhere to it."

In the April 1, 1928 issue of the Northwestern Lutheran (page 106) we find a poor translation of this point. The writers overlooked the phrase "Innen gegenueber." We mean to say: Over against you gentlemen of the W. W. District, after you have done what you did, and not made good, we hold Beitz's Paper, together with its imperfections as to form and contents, with all its misplaced commas, periods, dashes and what not, to be perfect and unchangeable. It is our book of confession. It is inspired. It is our Bible. It is one and all to us. We would not yield one comma, not a flyspeck to you. It is sacred. You men first straighten out the havoc you

have wrought in the church, and then we'll talk again. "Ihnen gegenueber unumwunden." That is what we mean and that's the end of it "Ihnen gegenueber."

In fact, no one has a right to offer any criticism on this paper whatsoever, nor will he be able to say anything worth while listening to, until he admits to himself that we all needed just this shaking up. Your salt will not regain its lost seasoning power until you swallow this bitter cup.

Quit slandering Beitz by accusing him of slander, when he declares God's Word to you. Quit quarreling about the doctrine of repentance, and repent! Then you will again get your bearings and get the doctrine straight too, and understand him besides. Then we say to you: "No, that message is not inspired, is not our book of confession, nor our Bible, it is not a classic and can bear retouching like any workday sermon preached from our pulpits. We do not harp on words. Not at all. There is nothing in that."

Since the Beaver Dam days the Protes'tants have invited discussion on what they styled "hoehere Fragen" and delight in nothing more than in studying God's Word together with kindred souls. The Elroy Declaration therefore is not, as some suppose, a hindrance to a possible understanding of the two factions. It makes impossible a patched up, man-made, good-for-nothing compromise. It does point the way to an honest, godly settlement. 22

Against that background, it is interesting that the effort on the part of the West Wisconsin District and the Synod in the late '50's and early '60's was in large part intended to be a reaction to the Elroy Declaration.

The initiative came from the Union Committee in the form of a resolution and notice which appeared in the December 1958 issue of Faith-Life. (I could find no mention of it in The Northwestern Lutheran.)

NOTICE

The following notice was handed to Pastor W. F. Beitz soon after October 21:

Tuesday afternoon, October 21, 1958

Motion passed: that DP (District President) Sitz in the name of the Union Committee (all district presidents, president general, and Seminary faculty) make an approach to Pastor Beitz in the interest of reconciliation with the Protes'tant Conference.

A. Schuetze, Sec. 23

A few days after he received this notice, Beitz sent copies to each of the other Protes'tants so that they would know about it when they came to Neillsville for the fall meeting which was scheduled for November 6-7. Marcus' conference report describes their reaction thus:

There was joy in our camp over this resolution. The hope of reconciliation with our enemies lies at the heart of faith, for the sake of God's reconciling us, His enemies, unto Himself in Christ. There was a modest directness in the manner in which the proposal reached us; and there flickers, here and there, from all we could gather, a half awareness that the weal and woe of the Wisconsin Synod are somehow interwoven with the life and times of John P. Koehler, the theologian whom they scorned, and the other people of the Protes'tant Conference, whose fellowship they spurned. 24

Beyond that, however, the Protes'tants were puzzled as to just what they should make of the brief notice. Marcus describes their mixed emotions.

Suddenly to be confronted with these few lines, after years of official silence, was a surprise. By their vagueness and briefness they invited speculation and led to questions none of us could answer. Working with the bare words of the resolution and whatever other fragmentary information we had, we spent the greater part of a day attempting to come to terms with the UC proposal, in so far as that was at all possible. 25

Much of the speculation centered on how to proceed and what to look for or hope for from the Union Committee and the Synod.

A speaker was reminded of Karl Koehler's statement: Put an X through the whole affair and start from scratch. It is assumed he meant that both parties let the Word heal in the course of time by a restudy of the issues; that the Synod should lift the suspensions, and that they, with us, occupy themselves with what brought the rift about. Such action could take different forms. It could mean absorption in certain key articles of the old Quartalschrift, in Paul Hensel's "Die Verstockung Israels," in the doctrine of sanctification and of the Church, not merely in a theoretical way, but to the extent in which these play a role in the matter of unionism and the case of Joel Hensel today. In this way a reconciliation could develop, if there is to be one in this life. We want to be delivered from the body of this death. If they are approaching us in the same spirit, then we are, in a sense, already reconciled and will go into the issues. 26

And yet in order to avoid any misunderstanding, Marcus goes right on to explain what that does not mean.

We don't look for an official statement from them saying: We have sinned. It isn't necessary either as far as we are concerned provided the personal attitude of the men involved is an outgrowth of faith and as such is imbued with a consciousness of sin freely and privately communicated to the Lord. When that is the case, the entire demeanor is stamped with genuineness and yearns for and welcomes fellowship with other sinners who have similarly laid themselves bare before the Lord and in like manner have been forgiven by Him. Such an attitude is sufficient and far more valuable than any official confession of sin passed in solemn conclave. 27

The 1959 Synod Convention was held in Saginaw and heard an English translation of J. P. Koehler's "Gesetzlich Wesen Unter Uns" which was largely the work of Alex Hillmer, one of the Protes'tants. The Northwestern Lutheran reported,

A Voice From the Past Speaks Again

One of the high points of the Convention certainly was the essay "A Study of the Essay by Prof. John P. Koehler 'Gesetzlich Wesen Unter Uns.'" The essayist, Pastor Waldemar Gieschen, wisely confined himself to brief introductory and closing remarks and an explanatory word added here and there. For the rest he let Prof. Koehler speak to us through an English translation. And though this theologian wrote in our theological quarterly some forty years ago, yet he speaks to us with force today. He "hit home" many a time as he showed how means and methods born of the Law and not of the Gospel were manifesting themselves in our Synod in his day. We said to each other: "How timely this is!" We also were aware that the call to repentance sounded a generation ago was coming to us today. 28

This report prompted the following comment in a letter from E. E. Sauer to E. Arnold Sitz.

It struck me that the date of the Saginaw Convention (August 5-12, 1959) marks almost to the day the thirtieth anniversary of the resolution and announcement by the Seminary Board and by Synod (August 15, 1929) "that no further blessing can rest upon Professor Koehler's labors at our Seminary" ("dass Professor Koehler nicht laenger im Segen an unserm Seminar arbeiten kann").

Reports tell us that this year Professor Koehler's essay made a deep impression at synod, enlightening and edifying many, if not all. Readers of the reports felt gratification at the way the essay was received.

This means, does it not, that the delegates recognized that this essay conferred a blessing upon them. With this recognition and acknowledgment they, in my opinion, refuted the statement of August 15, 1929. Under the influence of their spiritual experience they may not have realized the full import of their joy and their words, but neither did Peter at one time under a similar joy know what he was saying (MK 9:33) and even Saul was "also among the prophets" (I Sam 10:11-12).

It means furthermore, it seems to me, that Synod has now undermined the foundations of other pronouncements of a similar nature.

If Synod realizes the nature and extent of what happened at Saginaw, the official reconciliation with the Protestants is only a matter of course. 29

The next official step was the appointment of a special subcommittee of the West Wisconsin District which consisted of Harold Wicke, chairman and Gerhard Fischer and Victor Prange. This committee made a sincere effort to delve into the details and documents of the original cases in an attempt to evaluate the action of the district in imposing the original suspensions. Wicke produced an English summary of the pertinent minutes and resolutions of the West Wisconsin District and the General Synod in the early years of the controversy. He also did a review of the Gutachten. Fischer did an English summary of the work of the original Peace Committee which had disbanded in 1933 with the resolution that "the West Wisconsin District of its own free will and accord reconsider the Watertown Resolutions and the suspensions in the Fort Atkinson cases." ³⁰ And Prange did a brief summary of the early history of the controversy as reported in Faith-Life, as well as a review of the Beitz Paper.

When the Union Committee reported to the 1961 Synod Convention in Milwaukee, they quoted the recommendation of the Peace Committee from the 1933 convention and suggested that the West Wisconsin District restudy the original suspensions. (Cf. Appendix D) This then led to the adoption of a resolution at the 1962 West Wisconsin District Convention "that the Western Wisconsin District's suspensions of members of the subsequently formed Protestant Conference be removed..." ³¹ (Cf. Appendix E)

For myself, I have no doubt that this action was (in the words of the resolution) "a sincere and earnest effort...to heal the breach." It was an important and necessary first step. But there

were no doubt a lot of people voting in 1962 who knew little or nothing about what they were voting about. (As had been the case at the November 1927 convention when the suspensions were first imposed.) And thus the Protes'tants wanted to see whether such a resolution would really change anything.

There was an incredible irony in the fact that the very same issue of The Northwestern Lutheran which contained the announcement of the lifting of the suspensions by the West Wisconsin District also contained "A Sad Note" in the report on the convention of the Dakota-Montana District. "The convention confirmed the suspension of Pastor G. Hinz, which had been announced by the Praesidium some time ago." ³² It had been the November 19, 1961 issue of The Northwestern Lutheran which had carried the notice from the Dakota-Montana Praesidium that Hinz had been suspended "for cause." The unidentified "cause" was his Protes'tant sympathies.

To Marcus and his fellow Protes'tants this was evidence that the lifting of the suspensions had not really changed anything. Besides, the resolution removing the suspensions contained a note which said, "This resolution refers only to corporate actions of the Western Wisconsin District." In other words, the suspension of Hinz and the specific disclaimer included in the West Wisconsin resolution combined to make it very clear to my uncle that his suspension was still very much in force.

The Protes'tants were officially notified of the action of the West Wisconsin District in a letter written by Elmer J. C. Prenzlow to Paul Hensel. That the district itself was not exactly clear on the extent and implications of what it had done was evident from Prenzlow's saying, "Since I was not quite sure to whom I should send this I have addressed it to you, as editor of Faith-Life, asking you to forward it to the proper individual or individuals." ³³

Paul Hensel wrote a lengthy letter in response in which he said,

it is not at all clear whether lapses in ethics or merely errors in procedure are conceded. In other words, I do not find sin and repentance mentioned nor implied.

Furthermore, we ask, how can responsible Christians revoke a disciplinary statute, enforced to the letter over a period of 35 years, hounding even the second generation of those who refused to bow to its demands, how, we repeat, could they in good conscience overthrow so deeply entrenched and time-honored a dogma, in well-nigh complete ignorance of the Protes'tant history... and then subsequently, after the suspensions had been rescinded, encourage the delegates to study the issues involved? Isn't it customary to study the issues involved before you vote on them?...The actions of the District, both of 1927 and 1962, are superficial, ignore the facts of life, and lack deep spiritual roots. 34

Perhaps Marcus' reaction to the lifting of the suspensions will be best illustrated by quoting from a letter which he wrote to Henry Paustian in January of 1963. Paustian had written first. His letter said in part,

I have a very fine family living not too far from your church, and they have discussed with me the possibility of seeking membership there. They realize that we are not in fellowship. This is a matter of some concern to them, naturally, but they have heard the report or rumor or whatever it should be called that you have been considering a return to fellowship with us. I don't know the source of their information, but can personally say that it would bring much joy to my heart to have this report verified. While I do hesitate somewhat to ask this, Marcus, would you, for the sake of these members of mine, be so kind as to write me, so that I will know where we stand? 35

I'd like to quote Marcus' reply at some length so that he can speak for himself about how he views the lifting of the suspensions.

We have heard the rumor, too, that Burr Oak is going to rejoin the Wisconsin Synod. It originated in Bangor, if you want to track it down, not here. Must you and I deal in rumors!

What set the rumor winging? Could it be your own Western Wisconsin District resolutions of the past year lifting the suspensions of the Protestants? If they started this rumor on its way, they can finally be credited with doing at least something and having some sort of connection with life, although still not with Life.

Why don't you tell the _____, for you must be writing about them, about the resolutions? Why don't you honor your own resolutions and begin to show that they mean something and are not mere wind, pious, sincere, unanimous, wholehearted wind? Why do you expect the _____ to honor the suspensions you have lifted? Or aren't the suspensions lifted? I must say I have had no concrete assurance of any kind that they are, except that the WWD says they are. Your letter is surely no assurance that the resolutions mean anything, if for no other reason than this, that when you, a member of the WWD, write to me, a Protestant, you don't even allude to the resolutions but say instead, "They realize that we are not in fellowship." When the suspensions were originally imposed, they had teeth and they bit, and they were still biting in Dakota-Montana as recently as 1961-62. Cf. the case of Gerald Hinz. But the most recent resolutions of the WWD re the Protestants seem to be only words, arid, disembodied sounds.

You want me to write to you so that you know where we stand. Has that just happened that you don't know where we stand? You once did. If I was correctly informed at the time, about ten years ago you served on a committee in New Ulm that dealt with Leigh Jordahl who was casting doubt on the righteousness of the suspensions of the Protestants and doing so, partly at least, because of the suspension in 1950 of a Wisconsin Synod pastor in South Dakota, namely me. At that time the committee upheld the suspensions. So that gives me an idea of where we used to stand and shows that once upon a time you acted as if you knew, too. Then this past summer you, with the rest of the District, passed the resolutions lifting the suspensions, and now you don't even mention these resolutions and write as if they don't exist. So where do we stand? It is, to say the least, confusing.

Is it a sin for _____ to join the Burr Oak congregation? Do they think that? Do you make them feel that? Have you no fear of binding them with the commandments of men and the traditions of the elders, with suspensions you impose, confirm, lift, and then ignore? Have you tried to tell the _____ why we are "not in fellowship," since, according to you, that is the situation; and if you have, what did you tell them? This would help us see where we stand. 36

Conclusion

I for one am able to sympathize with my uncle's consternation. It seems there are a lot of unanswered questions that nobody is anxious to try to answer. As John Meyer says, for example, "This question, then, remains unanswered to this day, as far as I know: 'If a member of the Protes'tant Conference should attend my church and desire to receive Holy Communion, could I commune him?'" 37

(By the way, some sort of answer was somehow arrived at in at least one case several years ago when a girl from a Protes'tant congregation was attending the university at Eau Claire and going to services at the WELS congregation in Eau Claire. Without any explanation as to why, she was simply denied the sacrament, and my brother was seriously offended.)

From my vantage point, the problem today seems to be that we are for some reason afraid to deal with the questions that lurk beneath the Brand and Christmann cases. It is a simple and superficial approach to the problem to kick people out for fellowshipping with people we aren't in fellowship with. But why are we not in fellowship with the Protes'tants?

Prof. Lawrenz explained to me that the lifting of the suspensions was intended to comply with the stipulations set down in the Elroy Declaration, but the lifting of the suspensions did not mean that full fellowship was thereby restored. He seems to think the next step is up to Marcus and his fellow-Protes'tants. But I think the foregoing description of Marcus' view of some of the events that have occurred since 1962 ought to make it clear why Marcus doesn't see much point in asking for some sort of a hearing. How can we expect to make any meaningful progress toward a reconciliation when neither side seems to be sure just where we stand right now?

The only way reconciliation is ever going to become a reality (humanly speaking) is by opening up communication and then continuing to talk to each other. If we ignore them, they are not going to go away. If we don't come up with some kind of serious answer as to why full fraternal fellowship between us is still impossible, we're going to have to kick out more good men whose consciences will not be satisfied with the standard "you can't fellowship with a group we're not in fellowship with."

If we are going to come to any kind of understanding with the Protestants, we are going to have to forget about such procedural matters as whose turn it is to make the next move. We're bigger than they are; why don't we simply go to them and ask each of them individually what his grievances are? And before we react one way or the other, let's spend a long time listening so we can be certain we have really understood them correctly.

God answers prayer. Do we have not because we ask not? We must constantly and conscientiously wrestle with God in prayer that He would pour out His Spirit upon us and grant us the needed patience, humility, and love. There can be no doubt that true reconciliation is possible, because with God all things are possible. May He grant us to grapple with the "hoehere Fragen" in a spirit of patience and hope. And may the wounds which we have opened and reopened these past fifty years finally be healed, so that we may all rejoice together in the faith and life to which our Lord has called us.

The Wisconsin Synod
Protest Library

Pastor Marcus Albrecht's
CENTENNIAL LETTER
plus
APPENDIX

FAITH-LIFE Supplement
February 1951

Written for the Congregations at Akaska & Tolstoy, S.D.

(LETTER)

SOME of you, at least those of you who get the church papers, may have wondered why our congregation did not celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Wisconsin Synod. The reason is that it would have been a mockery, such a service would have been hollow and empty unless you had known what I am about to tell you [1].

At the time of such an anniversary it is proper and necessary to look back into the past, to see where we are, where we came from, how come we are where we are, and in what direction we are going. The Wisconsin Synod in its official pronouncements and publications did look *way* back but seems to have forgotten what happened about 25 years ago when it lost around forty pastors, professors and teachers and a number of congregations. It seems to have forgotten the time when it was in an uproar for at least ten years. Because the Wisconsin Synod still won't face the facts [2] of this so-called Protest and Controversy, which broke into the open about 25 years ago, I could not preach to you about the celebration of its Centennial. Its one-hundredth anniversary cannot be celebrated in a God-pleasing way when Synod forgets all about its sins of the past, makes no or only passing mention of them, and makes no move to repent, to right the wrongs which it committed. And for me to be honest with you I can no longer be silent about these sins and make believe they do not exist, or make believe they make no difference, for the sins of the fathers are visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generation. What happened 25 years ago does have its effect on us, whether we realize it or not.

Let me tell you about just a few of the things that happened in the Wisconsin Synod about 25 years ago so that you can begin to appreciate why I am telling you these things and what these things have to do with us.

It was in 1926 that a pastor, Rev. Wm. Beitz, seeing the things in the Wisconsin Synod that were not the way they were supposed to be, seeing how Synod was going down hill and becoming more and more wrapped up in the things of the flesh, noticing how Synod was thinking and acting and feeling according to the flesh rather than the Spirit and wanting to warn the Synod he loved, wrote a paper [3]. In this paper prepared for a conference at the conference's request he preached a sharp sermon of repentance, finally doing only what every faithful pastor does in his own congregation. He brought to a point things that had been talked about in Synod for the preceding 25 years. He painted a sharp and telling picture of the sins of the Wisconsin Synod, showing how both pastors and laymen were just going through the motions, through the forms, how we were more concerned about building up the outward organization than the real church of the Saviour. He described politics in the church, the abuse of the call, the laziness of the clergy, the spiritual ignorance of the laity, the lack of love and decency in the Synod, the terrible ignorance and indifference of people and preachers over against the Bible, which they called the Word of God but used little.

APPENDIX

This is the promised appendix to the mimeographed letter which I sent you . . . [Numbers] . . . refer to my letter. F-L stands for FAITH-LIFE . . .

[1] Unless I had told you what I am about to tell you. But I didn't think that could be done best in a sermon. A letter to each member seemed a more efficient way of broaching the matter. Then too, each member and the District officials have what I want to say on black and white, where they can read, mark, and inwardly digest it.

[2] The Wisconsin Synod has not as yet faced the facts of the Controversy nor got at the facts. There have been numerous committees, there has been much talk, there has been much concern about procedure and much ado about technicalities, but the fact still stands: *Wir sind nicht an die Sachen herangekommen.* Cf. F-L, Vol. 1 **13:4ff, 16:1ff, 21:1ff, 22:1ff. This goes too for the Peace Committee and its work. Cf. F-L, Vol. 3 **5 opposite p. 4 and especially p. 10-12, 7:14-15, 9:6-8, 11:12-14, 13:7-8, 15:5-9, 17:10-11; Vol. 4 **9:11-15, 11:14-16; Vol. 6 *6:14-15.

[3] In his own way he stated what had been said before. Cf. *The Wauwatosa Gospel, Which is It?* by Paul Hensel.

Gesetzlich Wesen Unter Uns, J. P. Koehler, *Quartalschrift* 11, 4, 231ff.

Menschenherrschaft in der Kirche, A. Pieper, *Quartalschrift* 8, 1, 30ff.

Unsere Schuld am Weltkrieg, *Quartalschrift* 15, 1, 1ff.

Unser Uebergang ins Englische, *Quartalschrift* 15, 4, 1ff.

Die Heiligung geschieht nicht mit Hurra, *Quartalschrift* 17, 4, 279ff.

The Various and Numerous Articles on the *Gemeindeglied* by Koehler in the *Quartalschrift*.

Practically anything written especially by Pieper or Koehler in the years 1904-25 refers directly or indirectly to the decline and decay of church life and what must be done to halt it.

[4] I am satisfied that what Beitz wanted to say in his paper is clear, that is, it is clear to me. It was really nothing new but rather his restatement in his own way of his own observations, which coincided with the viewpoint he had received at the Seminary. What he said is very clearly stated in the following:

The German Translation of his Paper by Paul Hensel. *The Wauwatosa Gospel, Which is It?* by Paul Hensel. The Witness, Analysis, and Reply by J. P. Koehler, F-L, Vol. 3 *13:beginning opposite p. 4.

And the following F-L references: Vol. 3 *5:3-6 — Zimmermann's Analysis; Vol. 1 *11:2-6. Cf. also Vol. 3 **15:6-7, 17:7-8; Vol. 6 *6:14-15.

His paper gives one his panoramic view of church life and church work in all its phases. He doesn't deal in harmless generalities but speaks concretely, in pictures to illustrate what he is aiming at. He gives examples from all different areas of church activity to illustrate

He showed the difference between "churchianity" and Christianity. He accused all, not only the laypeople or only the pastors, rightfully of sin, of the sin of unbelief, of slipping, and of being swallowed up by the flesh, showing the weaknesses of our preaching and of our congregational life, of the teaching in our schools and in confirmation instructions. And the things he said were true [4].

But what he said was really nothing new to the pastors of the Synod, for the professors at the Seminary had been pointing to these same things for many years in public writings and in the classroom, but as is always the case with a sharp and true call to repentance there was opposition [5].

Rev. Beitz with his paper brought all these things, which were a matter of public record, to a point in a sharp and uncompromising way, and his paper unmasked the disunity and the sin of Synod, the behind-the-scenes growling and grumbling. Before the Beitz paper appeared, there had been much murmuring against what the Seminary professors were saying, but his paper now brought the opposition into the open.

The opponents of Rev. Beitz and of what he stood for were in the majority, and by opponents I mean those who were outspokenly opposed to him and those who just rode the fence, who just wanted to close their eyes to the whole thing and make believe nothing was happening. The men in the West Wisconsin District, where the paper was first read, were the first ones to speak up against Rev. Beitz and his paper and accused him of judging hearts, of slandering the pastors and the professors in the Synod, and of teaching false doctrine [6]. To back up these charges the officials of the West Wisconsin District asked the Seminary Faculty for their opinion of the paper. And then some of the members of the Faculty, which no longer was in agreement with its former writings and sayings, published a review of the paper, sending it throughout the Synod and upholding the officials of the West Wisconsin District. This review by some of the Faculty members was written without any of the Faculty members seeing Rev. Beitz, talking to him, or asking him what he meant. He was given no hearing. This review, called the *Gutachten*, is shot through with inaccuracies, misinterpretations, and even mistranslations. It is a terrible thing to read because of its devilish logic and its blindness [7]. And then before most people had a chance to read the Beitz paper, the review of it by the Seminary Faculty was sent to all the pastors and teachers in the Synod so that many read a condemnation of the paper before they had a chance to read the paper itself [8]. And the Seminary Faculty today still stands behind the substance of this lying, monstrous misinterpretation. They still peddle the *Gutachten* although it has been shown up time and time again; they still stand by it, although it is a lie.

Now then after everybody concerned had heard much gossip about Rev. Beitz and had read a condemnation of his paper before they read the paper itself, Rev. Beitz was called on the carpet. A special meeting was called. After much wrangling he was finally asked to read his paper, to defend and explain it, but when he tried to explain his paper and defend himself against the charges brought against him, he was unmercifully interrupted, he was given only a short time, and he was made fun of, although he confessed his full agreement with all the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church and even read a part of them in his defense against the charge of false doctrine. And then Synod without further ado insisted on taking a vote, although many at

and substantiate what he says and to preach repentance as it should be preached. Such concrete, hard-hitting, and unevasive preaching is to my notion *schriftgemaess* and most praiseworthy. The preaching of general repentance for general sins too often means, nothing is repented of by anybody and is generally as harmless as a baby butterfly and about as helpful for sanctification.

[5] Cf. the references under [3]. Cf. also F-L, Vol. 3 *2:opp. p. 6, especially the first three columns, and confer Vol. 3 *23:6ff.

[6] Re the origin and first treatment of the Beitz paper. Cf. F-L, Vol. 2 **11:6-8, 12:7, 13:7-8, 14:7-8.

[7] Cf. F-L, Vol. 1 *11:2-6; Vol. 2 **3:2-4, 8:3-5, 10:8-12; Vol. 3 *5: p. 3 of Zimmermann's Declaration to p. 6 of the same. Cf. also the references under [4].

[8] Copies of the Beitz Paper were sent out. How many I don't know. They were sent out without Beitz's consent or knowledge by the "REAL PRESS," REAL standing for Robert E. Ave-Lallemant.

[9] Cf. F-L, Vol. 1 **5:2-9, 6:2-11; Vol. 2 *9:6-14; Vol. 3 **15:6-7, 17:7-8; Vol. 6 *6:14-15.

[10] Correction. Beitz did not lose his congregation as an immediate result of the Watertown Meeting.

[11] Add: and who will not for conscience sake honor the suspensions, which he considers invalid.

[12] Even if Synod has not officially accepted the *Gutachten* and officially okayed the dealings against the Protestants, yet practically it has, since it does nothing about those who have accepted the *Gutachten* and okayed or participated in the dealings with the ousted men, and since no one in General Synod has protested against, e.g., the Baraboo Resolutions and the Report to Immanuel's. The Districts that okayed these evaluations and histories of the Controversy are both in good standing and under no fire from General Synod, as are the individuals who produced these evaluations. For references to the Baraboo Resolutions cf. F-L, Vol. 6 *11:1, 12:3b; Vol. 7 *5:7-11; Vol. 8 *10:3ff and 10-13; Vol. 9 *9:1ff. For the Report to Immanuel's cf. F-L, Vol. 11 **7:1ff, 8:8-16; Vol. 12 **2:7-11, 3:8-11, 4:7-13, 5:12-14.

[13] Cf. the references under [15].

[14] I consider it that, namely sin. If it weren't sin and so from the kingdom of darkness and a lie, why make such a fuss. Re the word "crippling" cf. F-L, Vol. 1 *6:11. For an extended consideration of this thought and much more fine reading besides cf. Vol. 3 *1:3ff.

[15] Cf. the F-L Protest Library (bound with the regular numbers of F-L and easily found in the indices to the various volumes), in which many of the men have written up their histories with documentation. The reading of practically any of these histories, and especially those of Hensel, Zimmermann, Hass, H. Albrecht, to mention those with which I am best acquainted, substantiates what I say [in these lines]. To the above should be added Gruendemann's story.

[16] Some are shocked at this language. Yet pretty words don't describe sin. Sin is ugly, and its description demands ugly, yes, even at times, furious words, for the Christian isn't neutral, isn't "as placid as an oyster" over against sin but hates it. And so he doesn't use the language of a tea party or a diplomatic note or even of a standard "whereas in" synodical resolution. Those people who are always so polite over against sin make one think they have never really seen or felt sin and have hardly protested against it or been repulsed by it or hated it.

Professor Meyer said at the 1927 Watertown Meeting that "his Old Adam was even blacker than Beitz had painted him but thanks to God, he, Professor Meyer, was

this meeting were not ready to vote and said so. But the resolution was passed to accept the Seminary Faculty's interpretation of the Beitz paper and to reject the paper itself because it judged hearts and contained false doctrine. And the additional resolution was passed to regard all such who agreed with the Beitz paper and continued to hold to it as having severed relations with the Synod [9].

So Beitz was kicked out and lost his congregation [10]. And all those who claimed he was unfairly treated, that Synod was sinning in simply disregarding what he said and cruelly expelling him were then, to make a long story short, also kicked out.

That is the Synod's policy, to put out any pastor who preaches for or communes with any of the ousted men, to put out any pastor who calls them his brethren [11]. In fact, the Synod yet today forbids any of its pastors to preach for or take communion with the suspended men.

So then the Synod turned a deaf ear to this call to repentance, which it needed, and instead accepted as its own a terrible misinterpretation of the Beitz paper [12]. And then it kicked the men out who talked up against such ungodliness and stood up for what they believed [13].

Synod's action is from the kingdom of darkness and is a lie. And the Synod still upholds that lie, which is crippling it [14]. It refuses to see its sins in this matter and to repent of them. It stands by the *Gutachten* and the suspensions, although it doesn't seem to know exactly what it means by suspension and although it is far from agreed on the correctness and fairness of the *Gutachten*. Still the Synod blackened faithful preachers of the Word by calling them false prophets, deprived these men of their congregations, violated divine calls, and caused these men great bodily hardship [15].

Synod's action as a whole was ungodly and was wrong [16]. By its behavior in the controversy it proved the charges Rev. Beitz brought; it showed its fleshliness, its stiffness, and its inability to understand; it showed its ignorance of Scripture; it branded itself as a cheap politician and betrayed its hardheartedness [17].

The ousted men, even though imperfectly, stood for the Truth, told the Truth, and lived the Truth. But the Wisconsin Synod couldn't understand them, wouldn't understand them, cast suspicion on them, gossiped about them, spread false stories about them, and finally kicked them out. The Synod ousted them because she could not stand to hear the truth and was too lazy and too indifferent to try [18].

Only because of my youth and inexperience and because of my own unbelief have I not openly stood with the ousted men before. But from my own study and experience I am convinced that Synod's charges against these men are false, that they are not false teachers and slanderers, but, though sinful and erring, real men of God, real Bible students, real warriors, the like of which Synod has none [19]. They are my teachers and from what they say and write I live. They are my spiritual fathers, and all I have or know when it comes to the Gospel I have from them. From the men in Synod I have learned little that is worthwhile [20]. In the Wisconsin Synod I feel like a stranger. There is a constant undertone of disagreement [21]. I owe my spiritual life to the ousted men, they showed me myself, and above all they showed me the Saviour as I had never seen Him before. How can I turn my back on these men! I can't and still be saved. I can't and still say that what they have taught me means anything to me.

They are my brothers in Christ, whom I dare not

not so." F-L, Vol. 1 *6:3a. (This was quoted to me too by a professor at one of our schools.) What I want to get at is what *was* Beitz describing, what *am* I describing? It certainly is the Old Adam, but remember, you are your Old Adam. He is not a stranger outside you. He is you. What describes your Old Adam describes you; what fits him fits you.

When one preaches repentance, one doesn't say, "Of course, I am talking about your Old Adam." Everybody can crawl out from under such preaching and escape unscathed. After all, what is it that condemns a man, if it isn't the sin, the unbelief of his Old Adam? Cf. also the remarks under [14].

After you have read and assimilated all the previous references, I think you will no longer be shocked by the words I use.

[17] Especially the word "politician." Some accuse me of slander here. Then what I say must be proved to be untrue and/or to spring from a heart that is full of evil hate over against the Wisconsin Synod. I speak here of politics in the sense that Karl Koehler defines in F-L, Vol. 3 *15:8a. There is another more extensive discourse on the word "politeia" but I can't find it. So this one will have to do for now. [Reference is to F-L, Vol. 8 *5:11b-12a].

[18] You may counter with how you personally tried and how it hurt you personally to see these things happen. That can be, and still I feel that the basic reason for Synod's ousting these men is a refusal to bow to the truth. I am not judging any individual's motives. I am just trying to describe and analyze a given, general situation, trying to discern a sign of the times. I use the words "lazy and indifferent" because that is my impression from the gigantic ignorance I have encountered when it comes to things Protestant. Forty men can be ousted, Synod can be in an uproar for a number of years, and still many Synodical pastors know very little about the whole thing, what they know is second hand at best, and then some men even excuse themselves for not knowing more but make no effort to know more. Still these men judge the matter, judge my stand, too, in the matter, and listen and contribute to gossip rather than getting at the facts.

[19] I conclude this from my personal association with a number of the ousted brethren and from their voluminous and excellent writings, if you will, apart from the immediate Controversy. F-L is filled with topnotch theological literature. To enumerate a few of these writings at random, Our Master Mission, The History of the Wisconsin Synod, commentaries on Ephesians and John, and in recent years the start of necessary translation work, outstanding exegeses of Rom. 17:16-20 and John 8:31-33, and an almost complete commentary on Genesis, a commentary on the whole Bible — *Die Verstockung Israels*, hymn studies and translations, work in the liturgy, book by book Bible studies, perceptive comments on the status of World Lutheranism and especially American Lutheranism, etc. By their fruits ye shall know them. What has the Wisconsin Synod produced in this field? To my knowledge nothing outstanding, some things middling, and some even less than mediocre, especially when one was led to hope they would be something special — I mean the Lutheran Hymnal and the Wisconsin Synod Sunday School Course.

[20] These statements so far have drawn the most fire. Why there should be so much excitement about them and comparatively little discussion of the issue, around which these statements cluster, is also revealing. I admit here, namely [in these lines], to an unclear over-

deny if the Gospel is to mean anything to me. And to declare this publicly I will preach for them and commune with them. I can't do otherwise. I can't make believe the things of the controversy did not happen and that these men did not live and write. For me to turn my back on them is an ugly and unnatural thing, is stabbing them in the back, is biting the hand that has fed me and still feeds me. If I deny them, I live the lie and damn myself. I deny the Saviour. I can't like the priest and the Levite coolly walk by these wronged men who are not only my neighbors but my teachers and my brothers in Christ. Their suspensions from Synod are not of God and don't stand before the Saviour. How can and how dare I honor these suspensions.

Why do I tell you these things? I tell you these things to be honest with you and to speak the truth to you. A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump, and I can see how my dishonesty with you in not telling you these things before has blighted my work among you. It has crippled my own spiritual life and is crippling the life of the congregation. My dishonesty in this matter gives all my work in your midst the tinge and the flavor of dishonesty. It acts like a little lump of dye in a tub of water, or, as St. Paul puts it, a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.

My dishonesty with you has robbed me of much energy and devotion which the ministry demands. It has taken from me the joy of Gospel preaching. It has made me unable to do my work as it should be done.

So, not to harm you further and myself I tell you these things.

If any of you want more information or just want to talk this whole matter over, please come to see me personally. I can then give you the documents of the controversy. You can then read for yourself the things I have told you and can form your own opinion and don't have to take my word for these things. And if you desire it, we can also have a special meeting or meetings.

GOD THE FATHER, SON AND HOLY GHOST,
BE THOU OUR STAY;
OH, LET US PERISH NEVER!
CLEANSE US FROM OUR SINS, WE PRAY,
AND GRANT US LIFE FOREVER.
KEEP US FROM THE EVIL ONE;
UPHOLD OUR FAITH MOST HOLY,
GRANT US TO TRUST THEE SOLELY
WITH HUMBLE HEARTS AND LOWLY.
LET US PUT GOD'S ARMOR ON,
WITH ALL TRUE CHRISTIANS RUNNING
OUR HEAVENLY RACE AND SHUNNING
THE DEVIL'S WILES AND CUNNING.
AMEN, AMEN, THIS BE DONE;
SO SING WE, HALLELUJAH! AMEN.

have trouble laying your hands on a set, I will be glad to help make one available to you upon your request.

It would seem to me that it is now your business to investigate and to show me my sin; and if you insist I should resign from the ministry or that my congregations must drop me (unless they no longer want me and have lost confidence in me, and then it would be a matter between the congregations and me, not the congregations and Synod), then you must show the congregations my sin, why it is wrong for me to treat the Protestants as my brothers.

Truly yours,
MARCUS ALBRECHT
Akaaka, S. D. October 13, 1950.

statement, which came out as it did undoubtedly because what I wrote in the letter was not only the fruit of a decision a long time ripening but also the fruit of an act of desperation — one fears one will never be able to stand up for what one believes is right.

The point I wanted to make is the great debt I owe the Protestants and the old *Quartalschrift* and that in turn is a reason why I say in the next paragraph of the letter I cannot turn my back on these men. From them came my impetus to study and learn and even to preach. What I value most in my theology is what I have gleaned from F-L and the old *Quartalschrift*.

Of course I learned something, yes, something about the Gospel, too, from the men in Synod. And I appreciated it. And I still appreciate it and am glad for it when they re-echo the old *Quartalschrift* or sparkle with a flash of what they learned at the feet of Wisconsin's great theological trio — Pieper, Schaller, and Koehler.

[21] As long as I did not declare myself, I felt like a liar over against the Wisconsin men, felt I wasn't making a clean breast of how I felt and stood toward the Wisconsin Synod. So I felt uneasy and a stranger, with the thought in the back of my mind, "I won't be in Synod long. The men that greet me today and whom I greet, tomorrow will cold-shoulder me." Because of the Protestant Controversy there was an undertone of disagreement and the thought, "Do I really agree with these men who stand so differently than I do toward the Protestants?"

And I don't agree either with the current interpretation and use of Rom. 16 or the general viewpoint on unionism, which is a problem solved and easily so as soon as one quotes Rom. 16. That settles it. Nor do I feel at home with the private panning of Missouri while these same people still publicly play footsie with Missouri. I am much more in sympathy with Karl Koehler's interpretation of Rom. 16, the remarks made by Paul Hensel in "Garlic" on Rom. 16 and the whole subject of unionism, and those made by Mielke in F-L, Vol. 23 *9:14b.

In regard to F-L's hard language I would ask you to read in F-L, Vol. 6 *3:10ff, Vol. 8 *12:11ff, Vol. 9 *12:10.

In regard to the charge that my viewpoint has grown out of biased source material — I have lived in the Wisconsin Synod for 26 years, gone to its schools, listened to its preachers, read its publications. The air I breathe has been Wisconsin. Wisconsin has had 26 years to mold and bias me. In addition I have had numerous private conversations regarding this matter and some letters from Synodical pastors, in which letters the writers tried to "straighten me out" and gave me their size-up of the controversy. Then too F-L is an exceptionally accurate and complete record of the whole matter, as any one who has read it knows, and contains all the pertinent and necessary documents, letters, resolutions, etc. And its columns are still open to any one who has a correction or addition to make. Any charges against the Protestants brought by Synodical men, any reason given by them for standing as they do in the Controversy, I have found in F-L. No one has told me anything in regard to the Controversy which I hadn't or didn't later find in F-L.

The references I list are not the only ones I could have given, but there probably are already too many, and that is why I did not use more.

If you don't have a complete set of F-L or access to one, the Seminary Library has one and so does, it seems I was told, the Northwestern College Library. Under circumstances my set, too, would be available. If you

The Wisconsin Synod
Protest Library

Akaska Stenographic

FAITH-LIFE Supplement
April 1951

Minutes of the Meeting of the Members of Zion Lutheran Church of Akaska and St. James' Lutheran Church of Tollstoy, S.D., Held November 29, 1950, at 8:00 o'clock P. M. in the Church at Akaska, S. D.

MEETING was called to order by Rev. Marcus Albrecht, who immediately asked for nominations for some one to act as chairman of the meeting. The names of Edward Eiteneier, Rudolph Heier and Karl Kuehl were nominated. On motion made, seconded and carried Karl Kuehl was elected to act as Chairman of the meeting.

The chairman then asked that Rev. Lau present to those present the case of the Wisconsin Synod against Rev. Marcus Albrecht.

Rev. Lau: As Rev. Albrecht has indicated, we through him, sent you a brief note telling you that we felt he should resign from this congregation. You asked for an explanation of that note. I should at this time like to read you the following declaration:

November 29, 1950

In a public statement, Rev. Marcus Albrecht of Akaska, S. D. has declared: "They* are my brothers in Christ, whom I dare not deny, if the Gospel is to mean anything to me. And to declare this publicly I will preach for them and commune with them."

Since Rev. Marcus Albrecht insists that this is his position even now, and that he cannot change it, we, the presidium of the Dakota-Montana District, are compelled to announce that fraternal relations between him and us have been broken.

(Signed) Herbert Lau, 1st Vice-President
W. T. Meier, 2nd Vice-President
Dakota-Montana District

*The members of the Protestant Conference, who are not in fellowship with the Wisconsin Synod.

We feel, Mr. Chairman, that if any further explanations are required, I would pause here to let these questions arise.

Chairman asked if there were any questions. Mr. Lau asked to continue.

Rev. Lau: I would like to continue. After we have made this declaration or announcement, the question arises naturally as to Rev. Marcus Albrecht's position in his congregations here and the relationship of the congregations to him, as well as to us who represent the Dakota-Montana District of the Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States. We have asked Rev. Albrecht to resign, not once, but several times, and in the last discussion that was had with him, he has now asked for two weeks time in order to arrive at his final decision, and by that I mean he will then have to resign, or either resign or not resign. We granted this two weeks time for him to arrive at his decision and suggest that the congregations concur in this extension of time. I think that is all I have to say at the moment.

Chairman requested remarks and questions.

Leo Roesler: Mr. Chairman, we asked these men to come here and explain to us what is wrong that they asked for his resignation. So far, I do not understand just what is wrong and I don't know whether the others do or not but I don't think it has been explained.

Max Weiss: I for another ask for an explanation. When they go so far as to say he was a false prophet. Why?

Chairman: If there are no other questions, would Mr. Lau give us a more definite reason.

Rev. Lau: In view of the fact that Rev. Albrecht has asked for two weeks more time to consider whether or not he will resign from the congregation, I wonder whether or not it is necessary to enter upon a discussion of these matters at this time. Naturally, if the congregation so desires, we shall not refuse, but, as I say, this request for more time on the part of Rev. Albrecht has changed the picture somewhat.

Henry Eiteneier: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know why that should make any difference. I would like to know why now that you are asking him to resign.

Chairman asked for other remarks.

Gust Weisz spoke in German (approximately: sollen Vertrauen zu der Synode haben).

Henry Eiteneier: I would like to know why he should be ousted. He is our minister and we want to know why. Since we have the men here, I don't think, even though Rev. Albrecht has been asked to resign apparently without reason.

Leo Roesler: I think it would be proper to know whether or not this two weeks will make any difference to the law (to Rev. Lau?) or whether it makes any difference to us.

Rev. Lau: I see that the statement I made before was not understood. (Mr. Lau read the statement again.) That is a quotation taken from the statement received by members of the congregations, by Rev. Albrecht, by the officials of the Dakota-Montana District and also by the various other people. That is his statement, issued over his signature which was written some time in July or August. (He read more of the statement.) Since Rev. Albrecht insists that this is his position even now and that he cannot change it, that position he feels in conscience bound to abide by that, therefore, we the presidium, meaning the officials of the Dakota-Montana District, are compelled to announce that fraternal relations between him and us have been broken. In other words, we are here declaring that fraternal relations between us and Rev. Albrecht are over for the reasons given. His position as far as we are concerned therefore will not change whether or not he resigns.

Henry Eiteneier: This statement is still no better than we had before.

Max Weiss: What is the objection? What have they done? We are told to love one another and I do not see what we have done that isn't right.

Ben Berg: Is that from something that happened years ago.

Rev. Lau: I hoped to avoid this discussion and I repeat that if it is wished by the congregation, we will discuss it, but when one or two only ask for that, I hesitate.

Wm. Schilling: I don't think that we should go into that at all as it would take years to settle the matter. I think these ministers know more about the matter than we do anyway.

Henry Eiteneier: Since our minister is involved in that, we have to know what is the matter and not an underhanded deal as it looks to me.

Chairman: Then you want this matter discussed thoroughly?

Ben Berg: I make a motion that we vote whether or not we will go into the matter and vote a secret ballot.

Motion seconded and carried. (Ballots passed out, the vote taken and recorded as 18 for open discussion and 7 opposed.)

Chairman asked for an open discussion of the matter.

Rev. Lau: I hoped to avoid this not because we wish to refuse to discuss the issues but simply because we did not want to place the congregation in a position that it must take sides for Rev. Albrecht and against the Wisconsin Synod or vice-versa, but you have spoken. When Rev. Marcus Albrecht, in the latter part of July issued the declaration of which I have already spoken and which was sent to you, there certainly can be no question but what it occasioned considerable surprise and comment, not to say consternation, in the minds of the members of his two congregations. In his declaration he accused the Wisconsin Synod of which both he and his congregations were members. He accused the Wisconsin Synod of a very serious sin in regard to the so-called Protestant Controversy, which had occurred about twenty-five years ago. I don't know how many

of you older men remember from your own memory what happened at that time. You would have to wrack your memory considerably in order to recall even a few of the details. As far as the younger men in the two congregations are concerned, who have now grown up in the twenty-five years and have become members of the church, they could have no knowledge of that controversy at all. In throwing a matter of this kind into congregations which were uninformed, as they actually were, we must conclude that Rev. Albrecht must have had very compelling reasons. Certainly no pastor is going to do that and cause a disturbance of that kind, unless he felt he had good, compelling reasons. In the declaration which Rev. Albrecht sent to you he states those reasons, reasons which to him seemed compelling enough. Some of the history you will find in the statement itself. That is the Beitz Paper in 1926. If I repeat some of those things, I hope you will not think it superfluous. It was in 1926 that Rev. Beitz of the West Wisconsin District of our Synod prepared a paper entitled "The Just Shall Live by Faith." While this paper contained much that was acceptable, it on the other hand, also contained statements of a nature that were taken as slander and a judging of hearts. I do not have the Beitz Paper with me this evening so I cannot quote. Rev. Albrecht in his statement has given further developments. Here I think I should probably say that it was inevitable that the West Wisconsin District of our Synod would have to act on this and they did act after long debating. Rev. Beitz was suspended by the West Wisconsin District and others also held to it. I could probably add here that a number of years later our own District had one case in which partly at least the Protestant Controversy played a part and this man was also suspended from our midst. It is our understanding in the Wisconsin Synod that one district respects the actions of another unless it is very clear that grievous sin was committed and for that reason, since the other Districts could not be so informed as the involved District, there is no way of determining the action, whether that action was wrong or not. I noticed Rev. Albrecht raised his hand. Was there a question of fact?

Rev. Albrecht: I could give you a copy of the Beitz Paper if you want it now.

Rev. Lau: No.

Henry Eiteneier: I don't think he has explained anything more than he did before. As far as I can see, he has explained nothing.

Chairman: Rev. Lau, you have heard Mr. Eiteneier. Would you have any more explanation to make?

Rev. Lau: Mr. Chairman, I don't know exactly what the gentleman means—I have given no explanation. Rev. Albrecht from his declaration, it is evident that Rev. Albrecht knows that the suspension of Rev. Beitz and others was sinful. This contention of his is based upon the information which he has from only one party to the controversy. In order to form the true picture of the entire controversy, one would have to know the entire background history as well as the development of the controversy itself. Now how this background can be arrived at today is a question. In answer to this question—the wrong of which we accuse Pastor Albrecht, the grounds for which we ask him to resign—is that he has declared that he will practice fellowship with men who are not in fellowship with our Synod.

Chairman: Does that answer your question?

Henry Eiteneier: No. He hasn't said yet what he has done wrong. Why don't he say what the sin was? What are they afraid of?

Leo Roesler: Would this two weeks extension make any difference? As I understand it, as far as Mr. Albrecht is concerned, they are through. What would the two weeks benefit anyone?

Rev. Lau: The point is that then if Pastor Albrecht would resign, the congregations would not have to take that vote; otherwise it would be kind of necessary—with its offences, with its consequences. That is why, Mr.

Chairman, we have wanted to postpone this discussion, in order to give the Pastor the time he has to definitely make up his mind. If he decides in those two weeks that he cannot resign, then the issue, we thought, would have to be faced. We are back exactly to what I wanted them to prevent in the first place.

Henry Eiteneier: We want to know why our minister should resign if he did not do anything wrong. As far as I can see, he did not explain that part and that is what we want to know.

Rev. Meier: Mr. Chairman, in all fairness to that spoken ably, we would tell him other church are not in fellowship with us. Perhaps he would accept our word that he is no longer in fellowship with us. I am no longer in fellowship with you. That is what I am trying to tell you, that those are no longer in fellowship with us and we therefore asked that he resign. (Rev. Meier spoke so fast the stenographer did not get all that he said.)

Rev. Albrecht: I don't know whether I should ask this, but if I should offer my resignation, would that be a solution? Would it be accepted? If it would be accepted, I would take that to mean that you no longer have enough confidence in me that I should be your Pastor and I would then leave as soon as possible.

Chairman: Are there any other questions?

Rev. Meier: I do believe that if Pastor Albrecht would resign and if that resignation would mean anything to him, it would certainly mean to the congregations this "that I am no longer one with you, that I am not in fellowship with you."

Rev. Albrecht: I think you should explain that word fellowship. I know what you mean but that is not being understood. I can't explain what you mean; you are here to do that.

Rev. Meier: They are no longer one in teaching and practice. In other words, you can understand that you and the Catholic Church are not in fellowship with one another. That means you don't believe the same as the Catholic Church and that is what we mean when we say we are no longer in fraternal relationship. That is as simple as I can state it.

Martin Trefz: I would like to know what wrong he has taught us in his sermons?

Rev. Lau: We have not said Rev. Albrecht has preached false doctrine.

Chairman: As I understand, we would not be in fellowship, with Rev. Albrecht as pastor.

Max Weiss: He has preached nothing wrong or out of the way.

Edward Stabbe: I make a motion we should leave this matter until the congregations vote whether he shall resign or not. Then the congregation will have to vote as to whether he shall resign and go out of the Synod and have it come to a vote as to whether he shall resign now or in two weeks.

Chairman: The motion is whether we should vote immediately or grant the two weeks. If the majority decide to wait two weeks, we will be forced to vote. (Motion seconded.)

Rev. Lau: I wonder if I understand the motion. Is the congregation ready to take that action now? I want to raise the question because this gentleman spoke of whether or not Rev. Albrecht would be a member of the Synod in two weeks.

Edward Stabbe: If he resigns, does he not get out completely?

Rev. Lau: As I said before, whether or not Rev. Albrecht resigns, that does not change the status between us and him. Fraternal relations between us and him have been broken. We are announcing that to you and for that reason that question certainly cannot be settled in two weeks.

Rev. Albrecht: I should just like to explain. I am no longer a member of the Wisconsin Synod so that cannot come up for a vote, and we understood you to say that you did not mean that.

Edward Stabbe: I would like to find out if we would

remain in the Synod if Rev. Albrecht should resign. What would the status of the church be if Rev. Albrecht resigns?

Rev. Lau: You are entitled to that information and I shall give it to you. If the congregation decides that Rev. Albrecht is to remain its pastor, then it too is out of fellowship with us of the Wisconsin Synod. Certainly if its pastor is out of the Synod, the congregation by retaining him will be out of the Synod because the congregation would be then saying that it too considered the members of the Protestant Conference its brethren, who are not one with us.

Chairman: Does everyone understand this matter now or are there any more questions? Is everyone satisfied with the discussion that we have had and what is your wish?

Christ Heier: As much as I can understand, there is nothing left for us to decide, with Albrecht we are out and if we decide with the Synod, then Mr. Albrecht is out.

Ben Berg: Would they give us more chance to wait two weeks and then vote, than voting tonight?

Rev. Albrecht: I would like to remind you of this, that we asked a stenographer here tonight so that there would be a record for you to study so that you could decide then, and not tonight after just listening. If you still want to decide tonight, that is your business.

Wm. Schilling: I think we have no choice. We will have to let Rev. Albrecht go or be out of the Synod.

Edward Stabbe: I think the only thing to be gained is that more members would be notified and we want to give everybody a chance.

Member: They had the chance tonight as the meeting was announced and they should have been here. It can be just as well settled tonight.

Leo Roesler: It doesn't seem to me that the Wisconsin Synod is making a good effort to be fair to those who have belonged to the Synod and another thing in our congregation, those who have been the most faithful are those that now are going to have to make the decision. I have not belonged too long and it won't make a lot of difference to me whether I belong after this.

Max Weiss: I do not know any more than when I came here and we are not in fellowship and I don't know why. If they put him out, or kick him out, I am out. (He left the meeting. Also two others.)

Rev. Lau: I am sorry that the issue has been raised as to the constitution. (Ben Berg had said that according to the constitution the property belongs to those who stick with Synod, even if they are a minority. This is added to the minutes by M. Albrecht.) This thing should be decided on the basis of what is right and wrong and to simply now say the constitution is used as a club is not right.

Edward Stabbe: I make a motion to adjourn for two weeks.

Member: What good would that do?

Edward Stabbe: It might cool off a few of the hot heads.

Edward Eiteneier: There is two things. The Synod has given Rev. Albrecht two weeks to resign, why should we not give him the same chance? We did not come here to decide. Motion seconded.

Rev. Meier: I have been asked to inform you that during these two weeks you ask someone else to be your pastor. Our position is that you will ask one of the membership pastors to serve.

Rev. Albrecht: I thought you might say that tonight but I feel that if the congregation should do that, then they have asked some one else already and they have already made their decision.

Rev. Lau: I don't believe that Rev. Albrecht's position would be jeopardized in the least. This would be a temporary arrangement which would only be for two weeks. If, in the two weeks, he decides to resign, no harm has been done and if he has decided in two weeks not to resign, he still is here, and the question then, of course, will have to be settled. In the meantime, I do not feel that he is being harmed if some one else takes over the services.

Rev. Albrecht: I wonder too if I would be harming anyone if I should continue to preach those two weeks. What possible damage would that do to anyone?

Rev. Lau: It could possibly do this—that the congregations here would have jeopardized their standing in the Wisconsin Synod.

Rev. Albrecht: You mean by that that they would have hurt their position in the Wisconsin Synod and they would be more likely to go out. That it would hurt their position with the Wisconsin Synod?

Rev. Lau: We have declared that Rev. Albrecht is no longer a member of the Wisconsin Synod and if he continues to occupy the pulpit here during the two weeks, the congregation has thereby committed itself to him in offense to the neighboring congregations and also the neighboring pastors.

Chairman: Any other remarks or questions? You heard what Rev. Meier said about having some other pastor to serve you the next two weeks.

Member: What after the two weeks? After the two weeks are up, what comes after that? What do we do?

Rev. Lau: If Rev. Albrecht resigns, of course, you will be given an opportunity to elect yourself a pastor from the Wisconsin Synod as is customary.

Edward Eiteneier: He is not to occupy the pulpit any more after he resigns? He would not dare to preach?

Rev. Lau: Rev. Albrecht would not "dare to preach after two weeks." I would not use the word "dare."

Rev. Albrecht: I believe you do not mean two weeks, but you mean from right now I should not stand in this pulpit.

Rev. Lau: Yes, sir. After two weeks, we ask you to resign or you will not.

Rev. Albrecht: If you would take that step and call some one else in now, what do you think I would think? Or doesn't that make any difference? I don't see how that can cause any damage.

Rev. Lau: To me it would simply mean that your continuance to serve here is held in abeyance and that the congregation must finally take action. He would not be serving the congregation and (that) would do no harm.

Rev. Albrecht: You mean that I should not teach in the school tomorrow, make no sick calls, and not practice with the children on Saturday afternoon or for school on Saturday morning.

Christ Heier: Was there not a motion before the house that he should be given the same chance for two weeks the same as the Synod gives him two weeks?

Chairman: Should we have any further discussion on this while the pastors are here to answer questions? Are there any further questions? Is everybody satisfied that we should vote on the resignation now?

Rev. Albrecht: Is this correct? There does not seem to be a general understanding as to why I should not serve for the two weeks. This seems to me to be the reason. You are still members of the Wisconsin Synod and I am not. That is the reason for their suggestion.

Chairman: Shall we have a motion for adjournment or more discussion?

Christ Heier: Rev. Lau and Rev. Meier, could not we have a chance to stay in the Synod if we retain Rev. Albrecht?

Rev. Lau: Pastor Albrecht is no longer one of us. You can understand how the other neighboring pastors feel. We permit him who is no longer a member, you can see that gives offense and misunderstanding and that is the reason why we suggest that some one else be given a chance to serve you.

Christ Heier: We did not know about the two weeks limit until tonight.

Rev. Lau: This was a development of the last two days, this two weeks concession.

Rev. Albrecht: The matter of the two weeks does not seem to be clear, I asked for the two weeks because I was afraid that if I insisted that you have to oust me that there would probably be too many votes that would be sinful and by that I mean votes that would be purely personal and not votes that could really stand. You

might vote "we did not like him and so we will let him go" and others might vote for him to stay, and I did not like to see it decided on that. It was because I feared that the vote would be taken for these reasons and I too would like to think about it a little while yet. A pastor told me there is no more terrible sin that a congregation can commit than to oust its pastor. It is a serious thing and that is why I hesitated to force you to a vote, for fear you would be voting, say, just out of wrong reasons. I am just as mixed up, or do you understand why I ask for the two weeks?

Chairman: I think we understand.

Rev. Albrecht: In other words, if I thought it better for the congregation simply to leave, then I would do that. If I thought there would be less sin in that than in your voting, and I am afraid there would be quite a bit of sin in your voting, and I am not totally convinced that there would not be sin in my just going and that is why I asked for two weeks. Don't think I like to be here wondering whether I am going to fall in the fire or whether some one is going to pick me off. Those two weeks are not going to be fun for me. It would be much easier to force you to a vote tonight, to break the congregation apart and you could see tonight that that could be done. You realize that the congregation could be broken apart. I don't want to say any more unless I am asked to. I thought I could explain what the two weeks were supposed to be for.

Chairman: Any further questions in regard to Mr. Albrecht's remarks?

Rev. Meier: I feel that in all fairness it should be stated as to who brought this situation about. We tried to plead with Pastor Albrecht. He is asking for the two weeks and I certainly feel that if that would have been me, I would have told the congregation, "Brethren, I am no longer (one) with you" and I would therefore have tendered my resignation.

REV. ALBRECHT: If there is a little lull, I just want to find out if you want these minutes mimeographed and sent to you. I took it for granted before the meeting started but I want to know whether you still want that. Should I send a copy to each voting member of both congregations? I intended to do that but I wondered if you would think it necessary to go to that expense. It will be your expense.

REV. LAU: The question of minutes has arisen. I would like to ask a question about it. Are these minutes going to be the property of the congregation? Is this where they stay within the confines of the congregation?

REV. ALBRECHT: Do you mean to say that anybody outside of the congregation should not be allowed to look at these minutes? People outside might wonder why I have left. I think the minutes are important and I would feel absolutely free to show the minutes to anybody interested in seeing them, if anyone is interested in knowing about this whole matter.

REV. LAU: I can see that this meeting tonight is a joint meeting between the congregations and the representatives of the Dakota-Montana District and for that reason these records and the matter of the stenographer should have been a matter upon which both parties agreed. Since the meeting is a joint one, should not both parties to the joint meeting have a say as to how the minutes are to be used? If I have had any experience in these things, these minutes can be misconstrued, and without reflecting on the stenographer and with the best of intentions, I think the matter can be misconstrued.

CHRIST HEIER: The records should stay in the congregation and not be reprinted.

ALBERT KULM: Maybe by having the minutes printed, you could make the congregation two-sided. People who are not here would read them and have a different opinion.

REV. ALBRECHT: Do you mean that the minutes be sent to only the persons who were here? There will be less misunderstanding with the minutes sent out than if we just go out and say what we remember.

REV. MEIER: I perfectly agree that these minutes should remain the property of the congregations. Do you send all of your minutes to all members? Do you mimeograph those and send to your members? We do not do that in our congregation.

REV. ALBRECHT: Yes, they are sent out. They are unofficial and are used by the secretary as an aid to him.

CHAIRMAN: Any more discussion? Is there a motion that we vote as to whether or not the minutes be printed or not printed?

MEMBER: It was decided at our last meeting that they be kept and read.

REV. ALBRECHT: I do not know why everyone should be scared of having an outsider read this. Ordinarily this would be sent to each member of the congregation, but if they do not wish to print any more than that, they should say so.

CHAIRMAN: At our last meeting we decided that every member was to have a copy. Motion made and seconded that no copies be made of these minutes and that it shall only be recorded in the minutes of the secretary of the church board. Majority vote was "No."

CHAIRMAN: The "no's" have made it necessary to have printed copies.

REV. ALBRECHT: Might I ask why we should be afraid to keep a copy?

ALBERT KULM: I am afraid that if we go on like we have we will have no congregation and more and more may walk out.

REV. ALBRECHT: Don't you think people are going to hear that three have walked out?

CHAIRMAN: I personally don't see that it would hurt to send the minutes to the congregation.

CHRIST HEIER: I would not be against having it sent to the members of the congregations but not outside of the congregation. I would not want it to go out of the congregation.

CHAIRMAN: Any more discussion on the printing of the minutes?

REV. ALBRECHT: As I remember it, we have two matters that should be decided for tonight. One is what you want to do for a pastor for the next two weeks and the other is whether or not you want copies of the minutes sent to the members.

Here followed more discussion. Edward Eiteneier stated the vote as shown in the former meeting. The motion to have the minutes printed and sent to the members was allowed to stand.

Chairman: What are we going to do about a pastor for the next two weeks?

Wm. Ballensky: The Rev. can serve us for the next two weeks the same as he has in the past.

Edward Eiteneier: I don't see what difference two more weeks would make.

Rev. Lau: Rev. Albrecht has been with you four months after this matter came up but the final outcome of the thing has just developed.

Chairman: Shall we decide on a different pastor or should we not?

Wm. Schilling: Make a motion that Rev. Bast at Moberge be called and see if we can get him to preach for the next two weeks. Motion seconded and carried.

REV. ALBRECHT: I would like to ask a practical question. I am in the middle of work on the Christmas service, shall I throw it in the waste basket? I take it that means I am not to appear in the school room and the children will miss out on the two weeks.

After more discussion —

Edward Stabbe: I would like to know, if a minister from Moberge could not continue with the children, would it be all right for Rev. Albrecht to continue with the children?

Rev. Lau: That would be very inconsistent—that he can't preach but can take care of the children. It is inconsistent. I can see some of the difficulties that would arise at this particular season of the year and my suggestion would be that the vacancy pastor could be given the material prepared. That would be a walk out, I think, and would be perfectly proper.

Rev. Albrecht: You seem to be agreed to get Rev. Bast. I am willing to give him the material that I have and maybe the Saturday school could be skipped for two weeks and he could have the Sunday services but he should know that he has these things to take care of.

Motion made, seconded and carried that you see to it that we have a pastor here, and that we make application for a pastor.

Rev. Albrecht: Is the congregation going to ask Pastor Bast to serve them for the next two weeks or do you expect me to do that?

Chairman: We should contact Rev. Bast first and then let Rev. Lau get one if he can't come.

Rev. Lau: Then I would want to know just as soon as possible.

Chairman: We should get word out to the congregation in time for services. Motion made, seconded and carried that services be held at the same time, that is, at 10:30 and at 2:30.

Christ Heier: We should decide when we will have our next meeting.

Rudolf Heier: It should automatically be in two weeks.

Motion made, seconded and carried that the next meeting be held in two weeks from tonight.

Motion made, seconded and carried that the meeting be adjourned.

THE ELROY DECLARATION.

Elroy, Wis., den 16. Dezember 1927.

An die Allgemeine Synode von Wisconsin,
Insbesonderheit an den West-Wisconsin-Distrikt,
Zu Händen des Zwölfer-Komitees!
Brüder!

Als Antwort auf die jüngst erhaltenen Einladungen zu einer Besprechung der bestehenden Differenzen in der Christwoche set Ihnen folgendes mitgeteilt:

Wir, die Unterzeichneten, weigern uns forthin energisch, mit irgendeinem Komitee der Allgemeinen oder der Distriktsynode zu verhandeln oder vor einem solchen Komitee zwecks Mitteilung weiterer Information zu erscheinen,

1. da wir mit unserer durch die traurigen Wirren vielfach vernachlässigten Arbeit zu Hause vollauf in Anspruch genommen werden und wir im Licht der Vergangenheit alle weiteren Verhandlungen als nutzlos und zeitverschwendend ansehen müssen;
2. da das Zwölfer-Komitee alle-nötige Information zur Beurteilung der Fälle schriftlich in Händen hat oder doch andernfalls hätte haben können, wäre die Synode auf die im Material unterbreiteten Empfehlungen eingegangen;
3. da die Synode in Watertown wie auch in Beaver Dam unerhörte Gottlosigkeiten begangen oder doch stillschweigend geduldet hat;
4. da wir uns Ihnen gegenüber unumwunden zu Beizges Schrift bekennen und bei derselben zu verharren gedenken.

Wir werden nur dann uns bereit finden, uns zu stellen, wenn die in Beaver Dam und Watertown gefassten Beschlüsse, welche übereilt und forciert waren, rückgängig gemacht werden, alle Fälle von Anfang an wieder aufgerollt werden und die Synode hierdurch eine ganz andere Gesinnung an den Tag legt, die zu der Hoffnung erspriehlicher Verhandlungen berechtigt. Es zeichnen die Leute, deren Namen Sie auf separaten, beigelegten Bogen aufzeichnet finden:

Wir unterzeichnen als solche, die in Beaver Dam und Watertown beteiligt waren:

| | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| J. H. Abelmann. | O. Hensel. | W. F. Boitz. |
| Phil J. Schroeder. | Paul Lutzke. | E. Abelmann. |
| G. A. Kraus. | W. Motzkus. | W. E. Bodamer. |
| | Robt. E. Ave-Lallemant. | |

Fred W. Krohn, Wisconsin Rapids, Wis.

Wir unterzeichnen als solche, die in Watertown waren:

| | | |
|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Paul Hensel. | Frank Bergwardt. | Edward F. Dunzoy. |
| Herman Knuths. | Gerhard Gieschen. | W. H. Oehlern. |

Wir unterzeichnen als solche, die in Watertown beteiligt waren:

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| O. Kehrberg, Mesinee, Wis. | E. G. Schoenherr, Globe, Wis. |
| Wm. H. Parisius, Naugart, Wis. | Ferd. Grap, Globe, Wis. |
| | G. E. Grap, Globe, Wis. |
| A. C. Knief, Wis. Rapids, Wis. | Ed. Wendorf, Wilton, Wis. |
| H. W. Limp, Wilton, Wis. | W. E. Tewa, Wilton, Wis. |
| F. A. Birkholz, Wilton, Wis. | Herman Birkholz, Wilton, Wis. |
| | Wm. Brandau, Wilton, Wis. |

Wir unterzeichnen als solche, die in Beaver Dam beteiligt waren:

Aug. P. Penn.

Resolution on the Protestant Matter

At the 1959 convention of our Synod a resolution was adopted "That we encourage the Union Committee of the Wisconsin Synod to seek a speedy and God-pleasing settlement of the whole issue," that is, the Protestant matter of 30 years ago. In 1960 most of the District conventions encouraged the committee of four men which had been appointed to carry on with the review which they had begun. This year their report lay before the Convention (Reports and Memorials, pp. 103, 104). Their report read:

1. We have reviewed the proceedings of the Western Wisconsin District of 1926 to 1954, the minutes of the Western Wisconsin District of the same years, the proceedings of the Synod, particularly of 1933 and 1935, and statements of the Peace Committee to the Synod.
2. The evidence shows that the action taken on the 1927 resolutions of the Western Wisconsin District at Watertown was clouded over with uncertainties.
 - a) The scope of the resolutions was left in doubt, for it was said on one hand that the suspensions were excommunications, on the other hand that they were not.
 - b) The vote taken on the Watertown resolutions was not unanimous.
 - c) As to the interpretation put on the resolutions, they have remained unclear and received various interpretations.

After having considered all the angles available, your committee comes to the conclusion that the Synod should reaffirm the resolution adopted by the Synod in 1933, to wit:

"Resolved, that it be the sentiment and understanding of this body that the West Wisconsin District of its own free will and accord reconsider the Watertown Resolutions and the suspensions in the Fort Atkinson cases."

The adoption of this report does not mean a judgment on the Western Wisconsin District action of that time. Resolution p. 114.

The Floor Committee on Union Matters offered a resolution to the Convention that the entire report of the review committee be adopted. This resolution was adopted.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONVENTION ACTION

WESTERN WISCONSIN DISTRICT

SUBJECT: REPORT OF COMMITTEE No. 16:
PROTESTANT STUDY COMMITTEE REPORT

In response to the overture of the 1961 General Synod Convention (Proceedings, p. 195) relative to the Protestant matter; be it

Resolved, That the Western Wisconsin District's suspensions of members of the subsequently formed Protestant Conference be removed because of the reasons advanced by the Synod's COMMITTEE ON PROTESTANT MATTERS (Proceedings, 1961, p. 195): "resolutions . . . clouded over with uncertainties"; their "scope in doubt"; "the vote on . . . the resolutions . . . not unanimous"; "interpretation put on the resolutions . . . unclear and . . . various."

Note: This resolution refers only to corporate actions of the Western Wisconsin District; and be it further

Resolved, That proper notification be made of this action; and be it further

Resolved, That we adopt the suggestions brought forward by the PRELIMINARY COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO STUDY THE PROTESTANT CONTROVERSY AND THE RECENT RECONCILIATION EFFORT:

"A. That the District Praesidium appoint a group of individuals to attend the next conference of the Protestants.

"B. That pastors, teachers, and laymen be encouraged to study the issues involved and seek to reestablish contact with the Protestants on an individual basis.

"C. That all of us pray for the day when mutual confidence will be restored and we again share in the outward fellowship of faith.

"D. That we urge the Protestants to regard these resolutions as a sincere and earnest effort on the part of this District to heal the breach between us."

(Signed)

E. E. Kowalke, Chairman
H. C. Oswald, Secretary
H. C. Nitz
W. W. Gieschen

Ralph Herold
Bruce Schlueter
Harvey Nauman
Elmer Behrens

ELMER J. PRENZLOW, JR., Secretary
Western Wisconsin District

JULY 15, 1962

E N D N O T E S

1. Mark Jeske, "A Half Century of Faith-Life" p.75
2. J. Meyer, "The Historical Background Which Led to the Formation of the Protes'tant Conference" p.15
3. Marcus Albrecht, "Conference Report" in Faith-Life Jan 1963 p.6
4. "Appendix: Correspondence Victor Prange -- L. E. Mielke" in Faith-Life May 1964 p.13
5. Philemon Hensel, "Farewell to Thiensville" in Faith-Life June 1952 pp.8-9
6. Marcus Albrecht, "Centennial Letter" Faith-Life Supplement Feb 1951 p.1 (following p.6)
7. Ibid. pp.3-4
8. Louis Mielke, "Conference Report" in Faith-Life Feb 1951 p.6
9. Marcus Albrecht, "Centennial Letter" Faith-Life Supplement Feb 1951 p.1 (following p.6)
10. Ibid. p.2
11. Ibid.
12. The Northwestern Lutheran Dec 31,1950 p.428
13. Marcus Albrecht, "What Asaph Learned in the Sanctuary of God" Faith-Life Jan 1955 pp.4-5 and "The Power of the Lord Was Present to Heal Them" Faith-Life Nov 1956 pp.4-7
14. Marcus Albrecht, "Conference Report" in Faith-Life Dec 1953 pp.13-15
15. "In Our Midst The Koch-Kowalke Correspondence" Faith-Life July 1953 p.8
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. Marcus Albrecht, "Comment on Koch-Kowalke Correspondence" Faith-Life July 1953 p.10
19. Ibid. p.12
20. Ibid.
21. M. A. Zimmermann, "In the Interest of Peace" Faith-Life March 1959 pp.10-11
22. Paul Hensel, "What About the Elroy Declaration?" Faith-Life August 1,1929 p.5

23. Faith-Life December 1958 p.16
24. Marcus Albrecht, "The Conference Report on the Reconciliation Offer" Faith-Life Jan 1959 p.13
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid. pp.13-14
28. The Northwestern Lutheran Sept 13,1959 p.294
29. "Further Protestant Replies to the Union Committee Proposal" Faith-Life Dec 1959 p.14
30. "Report of the Twenty-second Meeting of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States held at St Matthews Evangelical Lutheran Church Milwaukee, Wisconsin August 2-9, 1933" p.114
31. The Northwestern Lutheran July 15,1962 p.221
32. Ibid. p.217
33. "Who are the Proper Individuals?" Faith-Life Aug 1962 p.9
34. Ibid. pp.9-10
35. "Synod Theology Exploded" Faith-Life April 1963 p.12
36. Ibid. pp.12-13
37. Meyer, op. cit., p.11

In Place of a Bibliography

It is a fairly simple matter to glean from the endnotes which particular articles from Faith-Life and from The Northwestern Lutheran I have quoted directly. Many other articles provided valuable background material.

In addition, I made more use of the papers by John Meyer and Mark Jeske than might seem to be the case from perusing the endnotes. As I said in the preface, the events of the late '20's and early '30's which led to the formation of the Protes'tant Conference are vital Vorgeschichte to my topic.

In many places I have simply relied upon my memory of conversations I've had over the years with my uncle and with Carl Springer and with other friends and relatives who are in some way connected to this story. In that connection I would like to thank my uncle Marcus for inviting me to attend conference as his guest. It was a truly memorable and enjoyable experience and I learned much from all of the people I talked to there which helped to make this a better paper. I accept full responsibility for any errors of fact which may have been the result of a faulty memory.