

THE WISCONSIN SYNOD'S
ILL-TIMED AND ILL-RECEIVED
PEACE PROPOSALS

Curt Grube
Senior Church History
Section A
April 2, 1980
Professor Fredrich

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

THE WISCONSIN SYNOD'S ILL-TIMED AND ILL-RECEIVED PEACE PROPOSALS

In the late 1920's and early 1930's a group of men removed themselves or were removed (depending on whose story you read) from the Wisconsin Synod. This group came to call themselves the Protes'tant Conference. This issue remained basically unresolved, especially as far as they were concerned. In the late 1950's and early 1960's the Wisconsin Synod made some new efforts to resolve the matter and re-establish fellowship with them. There were problems on both sides in settling the matters. The Synod was, humanly speaking, by this time deeply involved with a much more serious breach of fellowship with the Missouri Synod. The Protes'tants, however, seem by this time more concerned with polemics and their own self-righteousness than any reconciliation.

In a meeting of the Wisconsin Synod Union Committee (hereafter referred to as UC) of October 21, 1958, the first official motions were made to heal the breach between the synod and the Protes'tant Conference. The committee felt that a "reconciliation with the Protestant (sic) Conference might be possible, particularly since quite a number of years separates us from the heat of the controversy. This resulted in the following motion: 'That District President Sitz in the name of the Union Committee approach Pastor Beitz in the

interest of a reconciliation with the Protestant (sic) Conference,"¹ This approach was made.

By December of 1958 the Protes'tant Conference had published a response. At the outset the Protes'tants claimed that the issue that divided them and the Synod was not personal or divergent interests. "The real issues have been the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith."² The article goes on to call the Synod's proposal "so brief and faint, without root or branch as it were, that it is impossible to guess with what contingencies it may be fraught."³ They are right that the initial proposal was brief and faint. But that is the inherent nature of any opening proposal. However, for the protes'tants to call the proposal without root or branch is quite a judgment on their part, and an unfair judgment in this author's opinion.

The article proceeds to spend several pages recounting the story of Joseph, in which they rather obviously are trying to parallel themselves with Joseph, who remained faithful to God, and the Wisconsin Synod with his erring brothers. The story is continued such that Moses is allied with the Protes'tants and once again the Wisconsin Synod is "the children of Israel who rebuffed him from his first utterance."⁴ The article concludes with the harsh indictment that "you synod people have silently instructed an entire generation to sneer at the unsearchable riches of Christ as they have been uncovered by a vanishing class of teachers."⁵

It seems from this response by the Protes'tant Conference

that they are primarily concerned with their own righteousness. There is never once a mention that they will meet with the Synod UC on the matter. There is never expressed any hope that the matter will ever be resolved. Throughout the whole article there is only one small indication that the Protes'tants would be glad to consider themselves one with the Synod, providing the matter could be resolved.

This onslaught by the Protes'tants was continued in January through the pages of Faith-Life. There they stated "A Scriptural precedent to the Synodical Peace Proposal' in the December issue of Faith-Life...is to constitute the Conference's response to the Union Committee...."⁶

The January issue again states their doubt as to the sincerity of the UC proposal. The Protes'tants call it a surprise, vague, brief, and inviting speculation. They also said recent correspondence with men of the Synodical Conference "gave us not even a hairbreath of hope and desire for reconciliation was widespread or, if their theology is deterministic that a reconciliation is even a remote possibility."⁷

Their comments about the lack of widespread support for the reconciliation may be founded, for if one looks at the Synod proceedings of this time, one notices the small portion of time and space devoted to the issue. The January article goes on in an encouraging note that they will "do the truth... express our joys and hopes...our fears and perplexities as honestly as we can, and then to let the matter rest in the Lord's hand for further development."⁸

However, the January article concludes with some more vindictive accusations that this move by the UC may be just a ploy. The Protes'tants might here too be faulted, for as letters included in the January Faith-Life indicate, it was December 5, 1958 before anyone from the Protes'tants had responded to the original UC proposal introduced in October of 1958.

The whole matter seems to lie dormant until the April issue of Faith-Life, where one article by M. A. Zimmermann reproaches the UC. The article claims that the Protes'tants have bared their souls and discussions in regard to the reconciliation. However they are upset that "the CUC...thus far has not opened its conference doors to let us hear everything pro and con that they discussed in regard to their original approach to us and in regard to their reactions to our discussions."⁹

Faith-Life introduces a further cloud into the reconciliation problem in April of 1959, when it brings up the problem of Joel Hensel. Joel is the son of Paul Hensel, editor of Faith-Life. Joel had applied as a candidate to the ministry in the Missouri Synod. However, the Wisconsin Synod had blocked his acceptance because of his Protes'tant fellowship declaration, which declared he was one with them. After urging that the Joel Hensel issue be resolved before the reconciliation issue can be considered, the article closes deploring the fact that the Protes'tants have heard nothing more from the UC since the Protes'tants' December reply to the

UC's October proposal. This delay on the part of the UC is somewhat to be expected since the Wisconsin Synod convention would not meet until August 1959.

The next action was taken by the Wisconsin Synod at its August 1959 convention. As has been stated before, the main thrust of this convention, especially for the UC, was how to deal with the Missouri matter. However, one can see where the Protestants may have had a legitimate feeling of doubt about how sincere the Synod's reconciliation efforts were. There is only a small portion of the UC's report devoted to the matter, and in that report the only thing they say is that in an October 21, 1958 meeting it was moved, "That District President Sitz in the name of the Union Committee approach Pastor Beitz in the interest of reconciliation with the Protestant (sic) Conference."¹⁰ They go on to mention that the Protestants have responded and "The Synod may want to express itself on this matter."¹¹ That, in this author's opinion, is half-hearted concern at best.

By December of 1959, another large portion of Faith-Life is devoted to the reconciliation efforts. It seems that the Protestants felt that they had made an adequate initial response to the October 1958 UC proposal, and were now waiting for a response from Synod. If one were to fault the Protestants at this point it would be their continuing self-righteous attitude, instead of some sincere seeking of reconciliation on their part.

In the December 1959 Faith-Life, several pages are

taken up with correspondence between the Protes'tants and the UC on the proposal. That correspondence indicates that on September 1, 1959, the UC submitted to the Protes'tants a resolution from the Synod's convention. This resolution stated that: 1. Individual efforts had been put forth to resolve the Synod - Protes'tant problem, 2. The Synod had received information about the Joel Hensel problem, and, 3. "Resolved, that we encourage the Union Committee of the Wisconsin Synod to seek a speedy and God-pleasing settlement of the whole issue."¹²

The next letter, dated September 21, 1959, indicates that a synod subcommittee had been set up, with Pastor Sitz as chairman. The reply from one of the Protes'tants to Pastor Sitz points out the fact that the Northwestern Lutheran failed to report to Synod members any of the proceedings regarding the reconciliation efforts. This leads the letter's author, E. E. Sauer, to legitimately say, "These omissions make me wonder whether the peace proposal is considered in some quarters to be too insignificant to be reported to synod and whether the policy of totschweigen should even at this juncture be observed toward the Protes'tants."¹³ The letter closes with a comment about the favorable response the reading of Professor Koehler's essay presented that summer at the convention. But then he calls it a Herod - John situation. He claims the Synod is playing Herod--periodically parading out John (Professor Koehler), but after gladly hearing him each time, sending him back to the dungeon. That is quite

a judgment of the Synod!

In the January 1960 issue of Faith-Life, there are several pages devoted to further replies to the UC proposal. The first letter, from Pastor Beitz himself, is full of bitterness: "But there is more involved than we protes'tants. What your hell-born resolutions have done these thirty odd years to thousands in Wisconsin Synod Israel stinks and cries to high heaven for vengeance....I dare take it for granted that your overtures for reconciliation are born out of faith on your part....Synod has made merchandise of these souls. You cannot undo the wrong of the last three decades...."¹⁴ Pastor Beitz goes on to call for the clearing of the names of all the people that had been implicated by the Synod in the Protes'tant controversy. He also says that "Likewise, the scandalous 'Gutachten' will have to be repudiated, plus all the brood it has hatched out in its dirty nest."¹⁵ Pastor Beitz concludes that he feels a committee would be of no value. What has to happen is that the Synod has to clear the wrongs of the past. Then, he feels they will have a common ground from which to discuss. In other words the Protes'tants are back to the same old point, that they are right and the Synod was and is still wrong. When the Synod confesses and repents then all will be well. Needless to say, it is difficult on the part of the Synod to approach a group which comes with the prejudices.

A second letter to the UC is from M. A. Zimmermann. In the letter he comments on the reading of Koehler's "Gesetzlich Wesen Unter Uns" at the 1959 Saginaw Convention. "Surely your

Curt L. Grube

hearts must have smarted in the realization that you banished this prophet of God from your midst....and yet not one among you arose then and there to clear his own soul openly in your own assembly and before the entire church and world by confessing his own and synod's guilt in this matter."¹⁶ The letter again states the Protes'tant claim tha the Synod must repent and that a committee will only lead to a point where "the last shreds of the truth are hopelessly lost in the chaff."¹⁷ The writer cannot see the point of the UC meeting "to clear away some of the obstacles."¹⁸ They feel that all of their doctrines and positions have been "frankly and thoroughly discussed in Faith-Life,"¹⁹ through the years. The writer also states that it was the Synod which imposed the suspensions, so the Synod is the only one who can remove them. On these last two points the Protes'tants, one feels, have a valid argument. They certainly have made their doctrine, positions, and points clear through the pages of Faith-Life, the official voice of the Conference. And they are right--the Synod is the only one who can lift the suspensions. If the Protes'tants were to acknowledge that the original suspensions were proper, or if they were to compromise their position and admit that they have been wrong all along, they would only be confirming the decision to remain outside of Synod's fellowship.

In the February 1960 issue of Faith-Life, in a letter addressed to the UC, Paul Hensel again deploras the use of a committee to settle the issue. "Secular things are settled by committees. Theology is wrought with the Bible in hand at

the study table, and recorded in order for all to read."²⁰ Of course he feels the Protes'tants have done that in the pages of Faith-Life, and one tends to agree with him. They have stated their position. He then makes an interesting statement. Its harmony with other Protes'tant statements is in question. "We seek no redress for the wrongs done us, no abject apology on your part, no appeasing concessions of any kind.... we seek but the Word of God from you, the Amen to our testimony...."²¹ Here we are at a loss to see, nor does the writer point out specifically where the Synod has failed to speak the Word of God.

The writer goes on, giving "samples of legalistic arts and practices current among you today."²² His samples include things like the failure to give the Protes'tants' E. E. Sauer a biographical sketch in his translation of Koehler's commentary on Galatians. He also cites the Synod's periodical for failing to report the Protes'tant matter at the Synod convention. He also claims that from the beginning of the stir in the 1930's the Synod's periodical had been remiss in reporting the controversy. He goes on to make the legitimate complaint that since the October 21, 1958 committee meeting the Synod has offered nothing more. But then the Protes'tants haven't either, except for the polemical rhetoric that they have stated their case. Further points are the situation of candidate Hensel's being blocked from service to the Missouri Synod because of Protes'tant affiliation. Also, at a Wisconsin Synod congregation in Wayne, Michigan, Pastor Gerhard Press

had warned a prospective teacher to discontinue his fellowship with the Protes'tants if he were to accept a call to teach there. The candidate returned the call.

The March 1960 issue of Faith-Life includes an interesting letter from Marcus Koch. He claims that the obstacle that prohibits him from even starting discussions is "untruthfulness" on the part of the Synod. He claims that the Synod has lied to its people, saying the Protes'tants separated themselves, when in fact he feels the truth is they were forced out. He then goes into an elaborately documented story of all the lies that were told involving the Watertown thievery case. His story about Watertown makes a pretty good case for himself yet one would like to read more on the story from both sides before making a judgment so severe as his.

The April 1960 through June 1960 issues of Faith-Life are devoted to trying to clarify the original split of the 1930's. Included is much of the original correspondence. The Protes'tants still seem to be trying to prove their own self-righteousness.

The July-August 1960 issue contains the entire original "Gutachten." There is also a response to a letter from a Wisconsin Synod pastor to the Protes'tants about the way they had reacted to the UC proposals. In the Wisconsin Synod pastor's letter he had pointed out that the Protes'tants didn't really want reconciliation, but only wanted to glory "in your own little Golden Age of the past."²² In the Protes'tants' response to the letter they reaffirm that they

indeed feel "The fact of the matter is that J. P. Koehler is the only theologian of genuine greatness in the Wisconsin Synod tradition."²³ That is a judgment not readily agreed to.

All but four of the thirty-one pages of the September-October issue of Faith-Life are devoted to "The 'Gutachten' in Light of the Wauwatosa Gospel." This is a very thorough treatment of the 1928-30 dissention between the Protestants and the Synod. Of course it is presented from their side of the issue and seems to be yet another attempt to prove their own righteousness and shame the Synod.

The November 1960 issue of Faith-Life brings up the point that despite what was resolved in the May Synodical Council meeting, it was never mentioned just who would review the past suspensions. They also state that the reason for devoting so much of the last issue to the problems of the late 1920's and early 1930's was so that the reviewers of the issue would have adequate information. An article by Marcus Albrecht brings up the same old point, "If the reconciliation Committee wants fellowship with us, they will have to read our literature and see what is within us. They will have to criticize or commend it before the Church. This would be the beginning of fellowship. Any other course is politics."²⁴ The December 1960 issue of Faith-Life contains nothing of the issue.

When we look to the Wisconsin Synod for reactions to the issue during this period, we see a noticeable lack of response. The only official response is found in the 1960 report to the districts which simply stated the three points

the June 1960 Faith-Life issue reported. The points are as follows:

First, and fundamentally, as Christians, we must ask, What is right before God? On this principle we must stand regardless of any other consideration.

Secondly, we deem it proper that the suspensions of thirty years ago be reviewed.

Finally, if they be found righteous, they must be upheld; or if they be found unrighteous, or even uncertain, they must be lifted.²⁵

While it is debatable, it seems a good reason, not an excuse. The Synod is dealing with the much bigger problem of the Missouri Synod troubles, which would come to a head in one year. Yet one can't but help feeling the Protestants' frustration at lack of action over a proposal supposedly made in good faith. Equally absent besides an official response on the part of the Synod is the lack of individual response by Synod pastors, which I'm sure Faith-Life would have exploited had the letters come to them. There is one peculiar letter from Pastor Sitz to Pastor Beitz to the effect that the UC is looking for a special written invitation to attend a Protestant Conference convention. This seems a little strange, to be looking for a separate written invitation, especially after they had been invited through the pages of Faith-Life, the official voice of the Protestants. It is also interesting to note that Pastor Sitz addresses this and one earlier correspondence to Pastor Beitz, an old friend, instead of proper channels, such as to the editor of Faith-Life.

Back to the issues of Faith-Life for the year 1961. Maybe not so strangely, there is nothing said of the UC proposal

problem until the August 1961 issue. I say this is not so strange because the Synod has done little or nothing since its original proposal, while the Protes'tants have certainly poured out their hearts on the issue profusely for the whole year of 1960. The August 1961 issue of Faith-Life contains a letter from M. A. Zimmermann to Pastor Sitz. Pastor Zimmermann points out how Pastor Sitz was one of the original objectors to the way the Synod handled the Fort Atkinson suspensions in the 1930's. Pastor Zimmermann questions how by 1935 as Pastor Sitz is rising to leadership in the Synod he can change and now side with the Synod.

The August 1961 issue of Faith-Life contains a very sad note of polemics, I feel. In one small column on the last page is reported the landmark split between the Missouri and Wisconsin Synods. As a means of reporting it, Faith-Life only uses a quote from the Milwaukee Journal, followed by a shameful "EDITORIAL NOTE.-- Thus the two-decade-long struggle in the Synodical Conference between church imperialism (Missouri) and orthodoxist intellectualism (Wisconsin) has ground to a temporary halt. Both sides will go their separate ways, both will become more worldly and thus net Satan the same dividends. But Wisconsin's troubles are not over. - HK"26 With such an attitude among the Protes'tants I find it hard to muster much desire to seek a reconciliation.

We should break here and look at what action the 1961 Synod convention took on the Protes'tant issue, since the Synod has been all but silent since its last convention.

Although the resolution is weak and still doesn't say much, I feel it is commendable in light of all the other heart-rending union matters before the convention that year. What follows is the entire committee report.

COMMITTEE ON PROTESTANT MATTER

Your committee, charged by the Synod with a review of the Protestant (sic) matter of 30 years ago and encouraged by the several Districts to carry on, wishes to report the following:

1. We have reviewed the proceedings of the Western Wisconsin District of 1926 to 1934, 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 the 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.

E. A. Sitz K. F. Krauss R. Mueller Im. P. Frey²⁷

By 1961, it seems that the Protestants feel they have said their peace in 1959 and 1960, and now despite the new

Curt L. Grube

proposal of the 1961 convention they have nothing more to say. In fact Faith-Life did not even report the 1961 convention proposal to its readers.

By February of 1962, a new disturbance between the Protes'tants and the Wisconsin Synod has arisen. This time it is in regard to a Pastor Gerald Hinz of the Dakota - Montana District. He had declared himself in sympathy with the Protes'tant cause from what he had read of the matter in Faith-Life, his discussions with Pastor Sitz during his vicarship, and with Professor Blume while at the seminary. After some of what Faith-Life would consider politics, Pastor Hinz resigns from his congregation. This issue continues to fill the pages of Faith-Life until May of 1962, when they once again reiterate their cry of "Come on, Synod, show us where we are wrong. We've shown you where we are right." "There once was a man who had the seat of his trousers ripped out by the fangs of a bulldog and was standing with his backside against the house, adjusting his tie, buttoning his coat, and politely greeting the pedestrians as they passed by, and saying within himself: 'You can wait a long time before I exhibit the "other side."'"²⁸

Finally by August of 1962, the whole UC peace proposals come to a head. Through the initiation of the Protes'tants, the original UC proposals are a dead issue. Rather now, they choose to begin a new tirade over the suspension of Pastor Gerald Hinz. Without side-tracking to this issue; briefly, it was a case of Pastor Hinz, a graduate of two years, declaring

his fellowship with the Protes'tants. The end result was his resignation from the Wisconsin Synod. The Western Wisconsin District of June 11-14, 1962 had resolved:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE NO. 16
ON THE PROTES'TANT MATTER

Subject: Report of Committee No. 16:
Protes'tant Study Committee Report.

Whereas, In response to the overture of the 1961 General Synod Convention (Proceedings, p. 195) relative to the Protes'tant matter, therefore be it

Resolved, that the Western Wisconsin District's suspensions of members of the subsequently formed Protes'tant Conference be removed because of the reasons advanced by the Synod's Committee on Protes'tant Matters (Proceedings, 1961, p. 195): "resolutions . . . clouded over with uncertainties"; their "scope in doubt"; "the vote 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 the 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 PROTES'TANT CONTROVERSY AND THE RECENT RECONCILIATION EFFORTS:

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

"B. That pastors, teachers, and laymen be encouraged to study the issues involved and seek to reestablish contact with the Protes'tants 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 Protes'tants to regard these resolutions as a sincere and earnest effort

Curt L. Grube

on the part of this District to heal the breach between us."

E. E. Kowalke, Chairman	H. C. Oswald, Secretary
H. C. Nitz	W. W. Gieschen
Bruce Schlueter	Harvey Naumann
	Ralph Herold
	Elmer Behrens 29

A copy of these resolutions was forwarded to the Protes'tants. They were received with the by now expected reaction. "The actions of the District, both of 1927 and 1962, are superficial, ignore the facts of life, and lack deep spiritual roots."³⁰

It is in the last paragraph of Paul Hensel's article that the UC proposals are put to rest by the Protes'tants. "Do not speak to us any more about becoming acquainted and about healing wounds so long as the Dakota - Montana edict stands. The suspension of Hinz is now the issue. It is the only issue."³¹ With these final words the Protes'tants have by their own choice spurned the UC peace proposals in a note of polemic finality.

However, one month later, in September 1962, Paul Hensel is ready to react to the actual lifting of the suspensions. It seems strange that a group who had said before that they did not want a big show of being sorry on Wisconsin's part can now, after the suspensions have been lifted, say about the Synod, "... and no one waxed hot with Phinehas, nor prostrated himself in anguish and humiliation with Joshua before the ark of the covenant at Ai....The non-chalance in which the fences are fixed fills us with misgivings and apprehension."³²

By October of 1962, Protes'tant antagonism had risen to

full heat. First in that issue of Faith-Life is a letter from Pastor Hinz, doubting the sincerity of the Synod's actions. Later in the issue comes a letter written by Pastor Beitz, containing a sharp attack.

Ever since the black page of the Gutachten have appeared, and synod committed itself to it and hailed it as its own, you all have joined in on this synodical game of politics: evading the issue in order to save face. And the devil all along laughed up his sleeve. Nor can your plaster of synod or district resolutions be pasted over the cancer synod is suffering from....³³

If you desire peace of mind with God, as well as true peace and fellowship with your fellowmen—which is based upon peace with God—repentance will be necessary. Let us not kid ourselves, it can be brought about no other way.³⁴

The November 1962 issue of Faith-Life contains a long report on the Protes'tant June 30-July 1, 1962 conference. This is the conference in which Wisconsin Synod pastors Harold Wicke, Victor Prange, and Waldemar Gieschen personally attended and presented the 1962 Western Wisconsin District resolutions. During this Protes'tant conference the three from Wisconsin Synod were, to put it politely, interrogated as to how their consciences can rest with what the Synod has done, especially in the Pastor Hinz case. The conference report is continued in serial fashion through the February 1963 issue. Otherwise nothing more is said of the whole peace proposal situation.

In the months following February 1963, the peace proposal issue seems to be dying a natural death. In the May 1963 issue however, seven full pages are devoted to a capsule review of the whole Protes'tant controversy. This is done in response to John Meyer's obituary in the January 1963

Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly for ex-president John Brenner.

The June 1963 issue is filled with "A Review of Synod Suspension History." Once again the conclusion is that they appreciated the suspensions being lifted and the attempts at reconciliation, but to see if the Synod really means what it says, "Let the Western Wisconsin District give it a trial by reinstating Pastor G. Minz."³⁵ Throughout the rest of 1963 there is no mention of the peace proposal.

The 1963 Wisconsin Synod Convention was taken up mostly with problems surrounding the Missouri Synod break. There is one small paragraph in the UC report regarding the Protes'tant matter. It is reported that the Western Wisconsin District did lift the suspensions of 1927. However,

The reaction of the Protes'tant Conference to the action of the Western Wisconsin District and the visit of the pastors named above as reported by their³⁶ magazine Faith-Life, proved sadly disappointing.

With this well-put comment the Synod seems to agree that the matter be put to rest.

As stated in the introduction, there were problems on both sides of the issue which may have doomed these peace efforts from the start. One can understand the Protes'tants' frustration and doubting of sincerity, as one waits for the Synodical wheels to grind out its resolutions. Yet, one finds it much easier to feel the Synod's frustration of having to deal with the much larger heart-rending Missouri Synod problem during these years. One can also feel the Synod's legitimate

offense of the Protes'tants' polemics and whole manner of handling the matter. As Reinhart J. Pope said in a letter to the Protes'tants: "For this reason I feel that they are wrong in expecting Synod to settle the controversy on their terms and theirs alone. They too will have to answer for an arrogant, scornful, and disparaging attitude."³⁷ Pastor Pope has really summed up this whole issue masterfully, when back in April of 1960 he wrote to the editor of Faith-Life: "Perhaps you had better go the last step and label the whole Wisconsin Synod the Antichrist. Then you can pull the bushel back over your heads and bask in the light of the Wauwatosa Gospel."³⁸

FOOTNOTES

Key: FL = Faith-Life, Paul Hensel, editor
RND = Report to the Nine Districts of the Wisconsin Synod
SP = Official Proceedings of the Wisconsin Synod Conventions
WWD = Official Proceedings of the Western Wisconsin
District Conventions
WLQ = Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly

- 1) SP, 1959, p. 170.
- 2) FL, December 1958, p. 2.
- 3) Ibid.
- 4) Ibid., p. 11.
- 5) Ibid., p. 12.
- 6) FL, January 1959, p. 13.
- 7) Ibid.
- 8) Ibid.
- 9) FL, April 1959, p. 6.
- 10) SP, 1959, p. 170.
- 11) Ibid.
- 12) FL, December 1959, p. 13.
- 13) Ibid.
- 14) FL, January 1960, p. 12.
- 15) Ibid., p. 13.
- 16) Ibid.
- 17) Ibid., p. 14.
- 18) Ibid.
- 19) Ibid.
- 20) FL, February 1960, p. 9.
- 21) Ibid.
- 22) Ibid., p. 10.
- 23) FL, July-August 1960, p. 23.
- 24) Ibid.
- 25) FL, November 1960, p. 11.
- 26) RND, 1960, p. 32.
- 27) FL, August 1961, p. 16.
- 28) SP, 1961, p. 195.
- 29) FL, May 1962, p. 14.
- 30) WWD, 1962, pp. 48-9.
- 31) FL, August 1962, p. 10.
- 32) Ibid., p. 11.
- 33) FL, September 1962, p. 15.
- 34) FL, October 1962, p. 15.
- 35) Ibid., p. 10.
- 36) FL, June 1963, p. 16.
- 37) SP, 1963, p. 212.
- 38) FL, October 1962, p. 10.
- 39) FL, April 1960, p. 7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hensel, Paul. Editor, Faith-Life, Vol. XXI No. 1 (1958)-
Vol. XXXVII No. 12 (1964).

Official Proceedings of the Western Wisconsin District of
the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, Biennial
Convention, (1958,60,62,64)

Official Proceedings of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran
Synod Biennial Convention, (1957,59,61,63,65)

Report to the Nine Districts of the Wisconsin Evangelical
Lutheran Synod. (1960,62,64)