

Fellowship Examined:

Wisconsin and the CIO's Formation

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

Senior Church History
April 1, 1979
Jonathan Schultz
Jonathan Schultz

The CLC is an ultra-conservative body formally organized in January, 1961, at Sleepy Eye, Minnesota, by congregations and clergymen that had withdrawn from the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, the Evangelical Lutheran Synod, and the Orthodox Lutheran Conference because of dissatisfaction with an alleged lack of doctrinal discipline in the Synodical Conference.¹

To the casual reader this brief statement might aptly summarize the period of history that lead to the Church of the Lutheran Confession's founding. It hardly begins to touch, however, the controversy during the mid-fifties that prompted pastors, professors, teachers, and congregations to leave the Wisconsin Synod. To get a real taste of the tension and emotion that ran high during those years, this paper intends to examine the issue at stake. It aims to explore the fellowship views prevailing among those who left Wisconsin as well as the position maintained by the Wisconsin Synod.

At Wisconsin's convention held in Watertown from August 5-12, 1953, the motion prevailed to refer the following proposal to a special convention:

We find that the LCMS has left the scriptural position of the Synodical Conference in the matter of Scouting, of prayer-fellowship, of Chaplaincies, and the Common Confession... We find that Scripture instructs us Romans 16:17 that we should avoid such who have caused division and offences contrary to the doctrine that we have learned. I therefore recommend that the Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, in obedience to God's command and in the hope that our action may still achievewhat all other efforts have failed to accomplish, herewith declares that it is now not in

¹F.E.Mayer, The Religious Bodies of America (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1961), p. 190.

fellowship with the ICMS.²

At the special convention held on October 8 and 9, the Synod adopted the declaration "that the ICMS has brought about the present break in relations that is now threatening the existence of the Synodical Conference and the continuance of our affiliation with the sister synod."³ This "break" had been developing since 1938. From 1872 until 1930 the Wisconsin and Missouri Synods had worshipped and worked side by side in unity in doctrine and practice. In 1938 a change became noticeable. The Missouri Synod declared that its Brief Statement, together with the Declaration of the ALC were to be regarded as doctrinal basis for future fellowship between those two church bodies. The ALC adopted the same resolution, adding, "that we are firmly convinced that it is neither necessary nor possible to agree in all non-fundamental doctrines."⁴ We include the chart below to summarize the friendly overtures between Missouri and the ALC from 1938 to 1953.

1938: Missouri's St. Louis Resolutions join its Brief Statement with the ALC's Doctrinal Declaration as a joint settlement of past differences.

ALC's Sandusky Resolutions view the Brief Statement "in light of" their own Doctrinal Declaration.

1939: ALC's Pittsburgh Agreement concedes to the UIC on Inspiration.

1941: Missouri's Fort Wayne convention instructs its Committee on Doctrinal Unity to prepare a single document of agreement with the ALC.

²Proceedings, Thirty-second Convention, Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, August 5-12, 1953, p. 105

³Continuing in His Word, 1938-1953 (Issued by the Conference of Presidents of the Joint Synod), p. 1.

⁴Ibid, p. 1

Missouri begins joint work with the ALC in relief of missions and establishment of service centers.

1943: Wisconsin appeals to Missouri to halt its negotiations with the ALC because of the false basis underlying those negotiations.

1944: Missouri and ALC publish a single document, the Doctrinal Affirmation.

Missouri abandons its former position on Scouting.

1946: The ALC withdraws the Doctrinal Affirmation, despairing of union by such confessional statements.

1947: ALC's commissioners issue a "Friendly Invitation" to renew negotiations, contending for an "allowable and wholesome latitude of theological opinion on the basis of the teachings of the Word of God."

Wisconsin adopts its theses on Scouting.

1950: Missouri and the ALC adopt the Common Confession.

1951: Wisconsin rejects the Common Confession as "inadequate" and creating a "basically untruthful situation."

1953: Wisconsin declares the existence of a break with Missouri and takes steps to heal the breach if at all possible.⁵

Missouri's relationship with the ALC finally precipitated Wisconsin's declaration in its 1953 convention. To more and more men in Wisconsin, the time for action to suspend fellowship was drawing near. At the 1955 convention the Standing Committee in Matters of Church Union entered its report. The Preamble read,

A church body which creates divisions and offenses by its official resolutions, policies, and practices not in accord with Scriptures also becomes subject to the indictment of Romans 16:17-18. The LCMS has by its official resolutions, policies, and practices, created divisions and offenses both in her own body and in the entire Synodical Conference. Such divisions and offenses are of longstanding.⁶

⁵ Ibid, p. 8.

⁶ Reports and Memorials, Thirty-third Convention, Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, August 10-17, 1955, p. 85.

4

A resolution calling for a recessed session of the convention passed. This convention, recessed until 1956, was to take final action to terminate fellowship with Missouri, pending the outcome of Missouri's 1956 convention.

So in 1955 the Wisconsin Synod recognized that its sister synod was creating the divisions and offenses that Romans 16:17 addresses. But it hadn't acted to "avoid" Missouri. Some thought it had failed to carry out Paul's injunction in the last chapter of Romans. Professor Reim, the seminary President, submitted his feelings in the form of a letter to the synod convention of 1955. He disclosed,

The decision of the Synod to continue its fellowship with the LCMS pending a vote to follow the convention of that body in 1956 (even while recognizing that there is full reason for a separation now) compels me to declare that I can continue in fellowship with my Synod only under clear and public protest. I hope and pray that the eventual decision concerning our relations with the LCMS will be such as to remove the occasion of this protest.⁷

Professor Reim also submitted a statement of resignation from his position as Secretary of the Standing Committee on Matters of Church Union, as well as from his office of seminary President and Professor. By unanimous vote the convention expressed its confidence in Professor Reim as Secretary of the Church Union committee. The same vote requested the seminary's Board of Control not to accept his resignation.

Although Professor Reim still served in the Wisconsin Synod, he had expressed a spark of sentiment that would kindle a roaring blaze. At the 1956 convention the Church Union Committee suggested that the 1955 resolution to terminate fellowship be held in abeyance until

⁷Ibid, p. 87.

the 1957 convention. The convention concurred with this suggestion. In 1957 the Floor Committee on Union Matters, on the basis of Romans 16:17-18, resolved to suspend fellowship with the LCMS. This motion failed to pass by sixteen votes. (Sixty-one voted for it, seventy-seven voted against it.) Instead, the convention resolved to "continue our vigorously protesting fellowship over against the LCMS, because of the continuation of the offenses with which we have charged the sister synod, Romans 16:17-18."⁸

Again the resolution to "avoid" had not passed. The close vote reveals that strong pressure was building up to break with Missouri. A variety of memorials advocated the break. The following memorial, submitted by the Nebraska District Pastoral Conference, typifies the feelings of many who attended the convention:

The LCMS in its St. Paul Convention of 1956 passed specific resolutions which show that the sister synod's position on issues such as Scouting, military Chaplaincy, and prayer-fellowship has not undergone any change...Therefore, since the LCMS tolerates, advocates, and persists in error, and since it is obvious we are no longer walking together, we urge our Synod to carry out the above-mentioned Saginaw resolution (the 1955 resolution to terminate fellowship).⁹

An ever-widening breach was appearing within the Synod. On the convention floor the delegates rallied with those of like opinion. The Synod's refusal to act precipitated discontinuance of fellowship by Professor Reim, M.J. Witt, and Winfred Schaller. Paul Albrecht admitted that he couldn't fellowship with those who advocated the Synod's position.

⁸ Proceedings of the Thirty-fourth Convention, the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, August 7-11, 1957, p. 144.

⁹ Ibid, p. 137.

By 1959 some of its members actually accused the Wisconsin Synod of disobedience to God's Word. One memorial to its convention urges,

We plead with you, the elected delegates of Synod, in whom lie the official decisions and work of Synod, to restore order and unity out of the chaos and divisions that have been created both inwardly and outwardly, both spiritually, and physically, in our Wisconsin Synod, by our Synod failing to heed God's Word in regard to marking and avoiding the ICMS as causers of divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrines of Scripture.¹⁰

Another memorial, entitled "A Call for Decision," attached a document sent to all pastors and teachers regarding fellowship. This document, "A Report to the Protest Committee," had been drawn up by Professor Lawrenz and adopted by the Church Union committee as its own. The statement under consideration reads, "Termination of church fellowship is called for when you have reached the conviction that admonition is of no further avail and that the erring brother or church body demands recognition for their error."¹¹ The "Call for Decision" branded this statement "false and unscriptural."¹² Thirty men signed the "Call." The Synod in its convention disavowed these serious charges. But could it negate the sincere feeling among the signers that their Synod was in error?

In Wisconsin's struggle to deal with Missouri's errors, a new dimension had developed. A split grew between those who wanted to continue

¹⁰Proceedings of the Thirty-fifth Convention, the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, August 5-12, 1959, p. 183.

¹¹Ibid, p. 210.

¹²Ibid, p. 210.

testifying before breaking fellowship with Missouri and those who felt that it was high time to "avoid" Missouri. In 1957 Pastor Paul Nolting delivered an essay to the New Ulm Pastoral Conference. It concisely summarized the position of the group of men who objected to continuing fellowship. He notes that in 1955 the Synod used Romans 16:17 to identify Missouri as causing divisions and offenses. He adds, "If the offenses are defined and described by Romans 16:17, then Paul's admonition in Romans 16:17 should have been applied rather than his admonition in II Thessalonians 3:14-15."¹³ Nolting treats the passage exegetically. He stresses that Paul states simply, "mark and avoid," not, "mark, admonish, and then avoid." He adds, "Where in God's Word does God give us the right to disobey now because of the possibility of a change in the future?"¹⁴ He further felt that the Synod was basing its action on human judgment. It had marked Missouri, but it waited with the avoiding until it could judge Missouri's reaction. In retrospect, he says in his pamphlet, Mark... Avoid,

The situation called for careful observation of existing facts, followed by the action of obedience. The WPLS converted that situation into one that called for evaluation of the effectiveness of admonition over an extended period of time, with the final decision reduced to an exercise of human judgment by a majority of delegates at a given convention.¹⁵

The heart of the issue then revolved around the following line of thought: Some in the Synod felt that it was disobeying God's command in Romans 16:17. They accused it of elevating human reason and judgment above

¹³ Paul Nolting, "Romans 16:17" (Essay delivered at the New Ulm Pastoral Conference, September 25, 1957), p. 1.

¹⁴ Ibid, p. 15.

¹⁵ Paul Nolting, Mark... Avoid: Origin of the GIC (Printed in West Columbia, South Carolina, 1970), p. 10.

a clear passage of Scripture.

The arguments of those who advocated an early break sound convincing. They are based on Scripture, and who among WFLS pastors, teachers, or theological students would want to argue against God's Word? This author must admit that when he reviewed the CIC viewpoint, he was on the verge of concluding that the Synod erred during those tumultuous fifties' conventions.* But we have seen only one side of the coin. Before we can make a proper evaluation, we must look at the fellowship position that the Synod maintained on the basis of Scripture.

To introduce Wisconsin's position, permit me to cite an essay at the 1955 EIS convention. Rev. Ahlert Strand noted, "There are passages in the Bible which our respect for their authority compels us to view simultaneously with Romans 16:17."¹⁶ He was referring to Galatians 6:1 and Ephesians 4:2-3. He touched home by continuing, "Before God can I honestly say I have done all that lies in my power to help the weak and encourage the steadfast in my sister synod?"¹⁷ Wisconsin Synod men must have applauded Strand, for they were dealing with Missouri from this same vantage point.

In a memorial to the 1959 convention, C. Nommensen pleaded with his synod to deal in love with Missouri. He intended to support

¹⁶ Theodore A. Aaberg, A City Set on a Hill (Mankato: Board of Publications, WLS, 1968), p. 192.

¹⁷ Ibid, p. 192.

* After reviewing the Synod's position, the author recognized that it based its stance on the total context of Scripture regarding admonishing a brother. So he silenced his guilt feelings about the Synod's failure to act. His sentiment to date is that he feels fortunate to have been enjoying his childhood during those years and not debating on a convention floor!

Lawrenz's statement, "Termination of church fellowship is called for when you have reached the conviction that admonition is of no further avail and that the erring brother or church body demands recognition for their error." He cites the general principle that God wants Christians to do everything in their power to regain erring brothers. Leviticus 19:17, Matthew 18:15, Galatians 6:1, Luke 17:3, II Timothy 2:24-25, 4:2, I Thessalonians 5:14, and Titus 3:10 serve as his scriptural testimony.

Citing II Timothy 4: 2, he argues,

This passage can serve as a concise epitomization of what the Scriptures teach us concerning the admonition which we owe to an erring brother before we terminate fellowship relations with him. Such admonition is to be carried out 'with all possible instruction.' We are to do everything we can to enlighten our brother, to put across to him the Scriptural correctness of our testimony and the incorrectness of his own position or activity. In some cases, the nature of the offense or the attitude of the offender may leave little place for instruction. Then again, a very long period of time may elapse before we have fulfilled this Scriptural requirement. But in every case, only when we have done everything possible to instruct the brother concerning his error, can we feel conscience-free to terminate fellowship relations with him.¹⁸

In view of Scripture, then, Nommensen pointed out that God desires Christians to admonish with all possible instruction before parting ways. On the basis of II Thessalonians 3:14-15 he reminded the convention,

Admonition is a brotherly duty, to be carried out before the bonds of fellowship have been severed. In that particular case, even though normal fellowship activities were to be suspended, nevertheless, exclusion from the congregation and severance of the outward fellowship relation was not involved. Rather, for the express purpose of continued admonition, the offenders were still to be recognized and regarded as brothers in the faith instead of as the enemies that excluded sinners or errorists would be.¹⁹

¹⁸1959 Proceedings, op. cit., p. 187.

¹⁹1959 Proceedings, op. cit., p. 188

Citing Titus 3:10, Nommensen pointed to one extreme of admonition. It might be short and brief since a person might not listen to instruction from God's Word (as verse 11 indicates). He refers to Galatians 6:1, on the other hand, to explain that admonition might be a long, on-going process. The aim in this admonition is, of course, to restore the brother.

After noting these extremes, Nommensen remarks,

Somewhere between these extremes will lie the majority of cases with which the average Christian must deal. God does not tell us precisely where. He has given us the basic principles; He has indicated the extremes. Beyond this, He has left it to sanctified Christian judgment to apply these principles to each specific case. Christian judgment is necessarily involved. It cannot be said beforehand, 'If the brother has not repented after so and so many hours of admonition, we must terminate fellowship.' Yet this is precisely what would have to be said, if there were no place for Christian evaluation and judgment...²⁰

Nommensen thus indicates that God placed a responsibility on Christian judgment in dealing with erring brothers. Only in this way will each individual case receive full consideration. He fittingly concludes,

When brothers become guilty of teaching or upholding error, we are to admonish with all possible instruction and longsuffering before we terminate fellowship relations... We would not, we could not terminate fellowship relations until we had reached the conviction that further attempts to put our convictions across would under the circumstances be of no avail.²¹

Perhaps his most pertinent statement is the following:

Our admonition is to be characterized by 'all possible longsuffering.' Longsuffering is a fruit of love (I Cor. 13:4,7). And love for our brother will not permit us

²⁰1959 Proceedings, op. cit., p. 189.

²¹1959 Proceedings, op. cit., p. 190.

to grow weary in our admonitions, simply because of irritations that may arise during the course of our admonition. Only if these irritations constitute a definite rejection of our fullest possible admonition on a given point, can they be considered a just cause for terminating fellowship relations. (If they clearly show, e.g., that the brother will not permit himself to be instructed further on that point, this would constitute a definite rejection of our fullest possible admonition under the circumstances.)²²

When the brother refuses to be instructed further on the basis of Scripture, when he rejects your position, then your further admonition would be useless. Then you will declare that union does not exist by terminating fellowship.

Nommensen was echoing the same scriptural emphasis Lawrenz pointed to in his "Report to the Protest Committee." This report has been published along with Lawrenz's comments in a booklet entitled Church Fellowship. Lawrenz had noted in his "Report" that Christians are all weak in one way or another. Yet he stresses,

Weakness of faith is in itself not a reason for terminating church fellowship, but rather an inducement for practicing it vigorously to help one another in overcoming our individual weaknesses. In precept and example Scripture abounds with exhortations to pay our full debt of love toward the weak.²³

Lawrenz also draws attention to Paul's dealings with weakness in understanding God's truth. On the basis of Acts 1:6, the Galatians and the Judaizing error, the Colossians and the Jewish-Gnostic error, I Corinthians 15, I Thessalonians 4:10-12, 11, II Thessalonians 3:6, 14-15, and Acts 15:5,6,22, and 25 he makes the point, "Note how in all these cases Paul patiently built up the weak faith of these Christians

²²1959 Proceedings, op. cit., p. 167.

²³Carl Lawrenz, Church Fellowship (Presentation of the Commission on Doctrinal Matters, 1958), p. 4.

with the Gospel to give them strength to overcome the error that had affected them."** The principles, then, that directed the Synod in its relationship with Missouri, were on the one hand, the debt of love and admonition God wants His children to pay the erring brother, and on the other hand, God's clear injunction to avoid those who adhere to false teaching.

In its dealings with Missouri, Wisconsin evidenced its strong love for its wayward sister. It devoted great efforts to patiently admonish Missouri. In 1953 President Brenner had sent a letter to the LCMS convention at Houston. This letter pleaded with the convention to rescind an earlier resolution to accept the Common Confession. It also urged Missouri to suspend doctrinal discussions with the ALC. Wisconsin's 1953 convention itself adopted the Floor Committee on Church Union's recommendation to "prevail upon the President of the Synodical Conference to arrange a program for the convention in 1954 that would devote all its sessions to a thorough discussion of our declaration in Point 1 (namely, that Missouri brought about a break in relations by its unionistic practices) and of the doctrinal issues involved." 24

The 1955 convention resolved to end fellowship after giving the Missouri Synod a chance to express itself in its 1956 convention. The Standing Committee on Matters of Church Union was to evaluate any further development in Missouri's stance. So Wisconsin was willing to keep on dealing with Missouri as long as that synod was willing to continue to consider the points advanced from Scripture. A report from the synod's Protest Committee, submitted to the 1957 convention, reveals Wisconsin's position at this time. It reads,

24 1953 Proceedings, op. cit., p. 105.

* Lawrence, op. cit., p. 5

Let it not be forgotten that there had been ample and clear testimony on the part of our Synod over a period of years, nor let it be forgotten that in resolutions of earlier conventions our Synod did speak the kind of language concerning the gravity of the issues involved and concerning the interpretation and application of Romans 16:17,18 which gave the protesters reason to expect final action at Saginaw. On the other hand, the Committee, while pleading with the protesters that they patiently and prayerfully continue with the Synod to help solve the problem before us, though they have given no indication of their intentions otherwise, would plead also that they earnestly weigh their accusation against the Synod that it has sinned in having resolved to hold the break with Missouri in abeyance. While it may be true that in the area of timing and human judgment, which many in our circles feel exists in the matter, some error may have occurred on the part of the Synod, yet we would plead that the protesters in charity trust that there was an honest uncertainty at Saginaw concerning Missouri's having received ample opportunity in convention to react to the testimony which our Synod had given since Missouri's 1953 convention...²⁵

In 1957 a motion to terminate fellowship failed to carry by sixteen votes. A slim majority still urged further admonition. So the Synod resolved to continue doctrinal discussions in an effort to restore unity, but to continue its vigorously protesting fellowship over against the LCMS.

During this period of strife while Wisconsin was trying to show Missouri the error of its ways, Wisconsin wanted to make its confession clear. It publicly disavowed Missouri's actions and statements which were inconsistent with Scriptures. It emphasized its confessional stance by "vigorously protesting fellowship." On a one-on-one basis, Wisconsin Synod congregations would warn Missouri Synod congregations by refusing to deal on a fellowship basis with those Missouri congregations that were walking in the error of the official Missouri position. Communion fellowship, pulpit fellowship, prayer fellowship, and transferal of membership were all affected by Wisconsin's vigorous protest.

²⁵ 1957 Proceedings, op. cit., p. 147.

An example from Goodhue, Minnesota, typifies the implications of Wisconsin's vigorously protesting fellowship. The Principal of St. John's, Goodhue, was asked to speak at a PTS meeting of the Missouri congregation in Hay Creek. St. John's Principal, Mr. F.W. Schultz, Jr., agreed to present a topic at the PTS meeting. However, he informed the Hay Creek principal that he would have to conclude his presentation with a statement disavowing any agreement with Missouri Synod's errors. Since this might have left a sour taste at the meeting, Mr. Schultz was asked not to attend.

In the same area, a spelling bee was dropped due to Wisconsin's vigorously protesting fellowship. Annually two Wisconsin Synod schools, St. John's in Red Wing and St. John's in Goodhue, got together with two Missouri Synod schools, at Hay Creek and Belvedere. In 1956 the spelling bee was scheduled for Belvedere. An agenda for the day was published prior to the bee. For the first time in the bee's history, the day was to open with a devotion and a prayer. In keeping with Wisconsin's fellowship principles, the Red Wing and Goodhue schools refused to participate in the bee. We see then how this vigorously protesting fellowship was carried out on the grass roots level. Wisconsin's intentions remained, however, to try to convince Missouri of its errors.

In 1959 the Church Union Committee reported that Missouri's Doctrinal Unity Committee had shown a receptive attitude towards its testimony. Again the Synod maintained fellowship, but still on a vigorously protesting basis. Not until 1961, when the Church Union Committee reported that the Missouri Synod had not retreated from its unscriptural position, did the Synod vote to suspend fellowship with Missouri. But again it resolved, "That under conditions which do not imply

a denial of our previous testimony we stand ready to resume discussions with the ICMS with the aim of reestablishing unity of doctrine and practice and of restoring fellowship relations."²⁶

We see then how the Wisconsin Synod tried to deal with Missouri on the basis of Scripture's total input. It never denied that Scripture was the one and only guide during the fellowship fray. Viewing its efforts to admonish its sister synod in love, this author cannot fault the Synod. Nor can he agree with the accusations that it had disobeyed Romans 16:17.

To this date the CLC accuses Wisconsin of unscriptural practice. Pastor Paul Albrecht writes, "Wisconsin continued to practice church fellowship with Missouri long after she had recognized Missouri as a causer of divisions and offenses contrary to the the doctrine, under the plea that she had not yet reached the conviction that further admonition would be fruitless."²⁷

The CLC also contends that the Wisconsin Synod deviated from the authority of Scripture. The Church owes Scripture unconditional obedience. But Albrecht faults Wisconsin by stating, "The manner in which Wisconsin has these past years dealt with Romans 16:17-18 is a clear deviation from the above teaching of Scripture."²⁸

The pamphlet, Concerning Church Fellowship, further castigates Wisconsin's

²⁶Proceedings of the Thirty-sixth Convention, Wisconsin Evangelical Evangelical Lutheran Synod, August 8-17, 1961, p. 199

²⁷Paul Albrecht, "What Separates the CLC from Wisconsin?" (New Ulm: CLC Book House, 1962), p. 9.

²⁸Ibid, p. 10.

position by remarking,

We further reject the teaching that errorists and their followers are to be avoided only when they no longer listen to admonition, or that we are to remain in fellowship with errorists as long as we think there is hope that they may give up their errors. ²⁹

These issues still separate the CLC from Wisconsin today. The CLC accuses Wisconsin of failing to obey Scripture in its dealings with Missouri and of false doctrine in not recognizing Scripture's authority. It also disagrees with Wisconsin's insistence on dealing with a false brother by admonishing him until he refuses to listen to Scripture's teachings. It considers Wisconsin's fellowship stance contrary to the Bible.

Already in 1953 Wisconsin had identified Missouri as causing divisions and offenses. "Why hadn't it carried out the injunction to avoid?" many were asking. This author asked the same. He objectively viewed the position of those who left the Synod. Their position seemed sound. He viewed the total scriptural picture regarding dealing with an erring brother. Scripture vindicates Wisconsin's position. We deal in love with a brother. We admonish him as a brother. When the brother no longer agrees to listen to sound words of Scripture, then we avoid him.

The whole uproar within the Synod centered on the application of Romans 16:17. The Synod recognized that Missouri was advocating false doctrine. It identified that false doctrine as something causing divisions and offenses, as any false doctrine does. It carried out its responsibility fully to admonish. Finally, it "avoided" Missouri when by its refusal to listen to Scripture, Missouri evidenced that it was no longer a brother. God grant Wisconsin Synod pastors and teachers the patience and obedience to continue to carry out His will as expressed in His Word.

²⁹Concerning Church Fellowship (New Min: CLC Book House, 1961), p. 12.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aaberg, Theodore A. A City Set on a Hill. Mankato: Board of Publications, ELS, 1968.
- Albrecht, Paul. "What Separates the CLC from Wisconsin," New Ulm: CLC Book House, 1962.
- Concerning Church Fellowship. New Ulm: CLC Book House, 1961.
- Continuing in His Word, 1938-1953. Issued by the Conference of Presidents of the Joint Synod.
- Lawrenz, Carl. Church Fellowship. Presentation of the Commission on Doctrinal Matters, 1958.
- Mayer, F.E. The Religious Bodies of North America. St. Louis: Concordia, 1961.
- Nolting, Paul. Mark and Avoid... Origin of the CLC. Printed in West Columbia, South Carolina, 1970.
- Nolting, Paul. "Romans 16:17" Essay delivered at the New Ulm Pastoral Conference, September 25, 1957.
- Proceedings from the following Wisconsin Synod conventions:
- August 5-12, 1953
 - August 10-17, 1955
 - August 7-14, 1957
 - August 5-12, 1959
 - August 3-17, 1961