

GREEN BAY PLUS 10: THE IMPACT OF THE PROTES'TANT  
CONTROVERSY AT ST. PAUL, GREEN BAY

Stephen M. Luchterhand .

April 30, 1991

Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library  
11831 W. Seminary Drive. 6EW  
Mequon, Wisconsin

It is always a tragedy when a pastor and a congregation are separated from one another because of controversy. Such separations may occur because of mistakes on the part of the pastor or misunderstandings on the part of the congregation. Quite often both pastor and congregation are party to the deterioration and termination of this special shepherd-flock relationship. Whatever the underlying causes of such a controversy might be, once the situation is dealt with, it is assumed that life goes on as normal. The sequence of events usually runs something like this: Undivided attention is focused on the problems and controversy at hand; the matter is resolved by the pastor taking a call out of the area or by the termination of the pastor's call; a new pastor is called...case closed, end of story.

But to end the story of a critical (albeit controversial) part of a congregation's history at this point overlooks one very important aspect of the account, namely, the impact of the controversy. The aftermath of such an upheaval in a congregation is a very critical time. Souls hang in the balance, hurts must be healed, divisions must be dissolved. Hence the title of this paper; Green Bay Plus 10: The Impact of the Protestant Controversy at St. Paul, Green Bay. Ten years ago, on February 16, 1981, the members of St. Paul voted to remove Pastor Robert Christman as their pastor following many months of controversy. The vote was 82-75, revealing a divided congregation and indicating that much healing would be needed. In order to examine the full impact of this controversy, it will be necessary first to briefly summarize

and analyze the events leading up to Christman's removal. Once this foundation is laid, an assessment of the controversy's impact on several areas will be presented.

#### HISTORY AND ANALYSIS OF THE CONTROVERSY

"It is said that where there is smoke, there is fire. I saw ~~lots~~ <sup>lots</sup> of smoke but felt I was unable to really locate the fire."<sup>1</sup>

This comment by a member of St Paul's accurately describes the frustration involved in coming to grips with the Protes'tant controversy which culminated in the expulsion of Pastor Robert Christman from the WELS Ministerium in February, 1981. It is indicative of all of Protes'tant history. Since the history of the controversy is well-documented by Dan Kelm in his paper, Green Bay and the Protes'tant Controversy Today, and especially by Christman himself in well over 100 pages of subjective and introspective narrative in the pages of Faith-Life magazine (Vol. IV, #1, Jan/Feb, 1982 - Vol. LVI, #3, May/June, 1983), what follows is a brief history and analysis of the Green Bay affair essential for an examination of the controversy's impact.

Christman's interest in the Protes'tant Conference began early in his ministry. He began reading Faith-Life shortly after arriving at his first call in Tuscon, Arizona, in 1968.<sup>2</sup> Interest grew into affinity for the Protes'tant cause and he began attending Protes'tant conferences in the early 1970s. It should be noted that attendance at such conferences is not wrong in and of itself. But fellowship with such a group that is not in fellowship with the WELS is a different matter. As time went on, Christman identified himself with the Protes'tants, an action ultimately

leading to his dismissal.

Christman's Protes'tant connection came to light during a four-hour meeting with the Seminary faculty on November, 1, 1977. He met with the entire faculty except for Professor E.C. Fredrich, who had a conflicting obligation. The occasion of the meeting was the Seminary's denial of admission to a young Protes'tant and graduate of Northwestern College, Carl Springer. The meeting quickly turned into a discussion of the Protes'tants and of doctrinal matters related to Protes'tant preaching. Christman left the meeting under the assumption that he had made his case and that "his fellowship with the Protes'tants had been tacitly approved."<sup>3</sup> Three years later, in his document "Timely Questions Answered," he claimed that the Seminary faculty supported him in his fellowship with the Protes'tants.<sup>4</sup> The Seminary faculty, however, tells a different story. According to several faculty members present at the meeting, Christman denied the charges that he was fellowshiping with the Protes'tants.<sup>5</sup> In fact, according to Professor Carl Lawrenz, Christman did not clearly state his position. He appeared to be "meek and non-committal" in the meeting, not the valiant champion of the Protes'tant cause he claimed to be at the time and, indeed, eventually became.<sup>6</sup>

A common characteristic of Protes'tants is a fervent opposition to programs, especially programs put out by the synod. Christman voiced his opposition to structured evangelism in his essay, "Why TAS-type Evangelism is Contrary to the Gospel," which was published on September 29, 1977, just weeks prior to his meeting with the Seminary faculty. He accuses the TAS-type evangelist of coercion,<sup>7</sup> claiming on the basis of 1 Pe 3:15 that believers

are to passively wait to respond to an unbeliever's unsolicited inquiry about Christianity.<sup>8</sup> This provoked heated discussion, and attempts were made by the Northern Wisconsin District Praesidium to deal with Christman's charges through the district evangelism committee and through personal contacts and correspondence. Wanting to publicize his cause and the errors that he felt were inherent in TAS, Christman penned "An open letter to the WELS Northern Wisconsin District Praesidium," sending copies throughout the district (Dec. 5, 1979).

This excursion into evangelism methods is really a sidepoint to the Christman story. It does, however, show his refusal to work within the established parameters of synod procedure. His opposition to TAS-type evangelism shows his tendency to make charges without sufficient backing, and to make sweeping condemnations of the synod and its work.

The events up to this point serve as the preliminaries to the controversy at St. Paul. October, 1980, marks the beginning of the chain of events directly responsible for the turmoil at St. Paul and Christman's ouster four months later. Oddly enough, Green Bay was not yet the setting. St. John's Church of East Bloomfield (about 25 miles west of Appleton) ousted its pastor, Floyd Brand, for fellowshiping with Protestants. At a congregational meeting presided over by Northern Wisconsin District President Carl Voss on October 13th, Christman came to Brand's aid and made it publicly known to Voss that he stood with the Protestants.<sup>9</sup> Three days later, Brand was ousted.

Christman began to burden St. Paul congregation with his opposition to the East Bloomfield case and his perennial distaste

for synod machinery the day after his encounter with District President Voss at East Bloomfield. Rather than take up his grievance directly with Voss and the Praesidium, Christman detailed the events of the previous night at St. Paul's church council meeting on the 14th.<sup>10</sup> Not knowing what else to say, one of the men finally said, "Well, we'll have to wait and see what the synod does next."<sup>11</sup>

One week later, Christman did write Voss a letter. It can be summed up in this way: charges, charges, and more charges - all without substantiation. As the letter has been published in Faith-Life, a few excerpts will suffice to show the non-evangelical, venomous spirit of Christman's diatribe:

As I (Christman) grew deeper into the Scripture...you (Voss) became more firmly entrenched in the machinery of Synod. As my eyes opened wider to the Word, your commitment to the organization claimed more and more of your devotion...Neat little categories have become your hallmark, with the lines being drawn to serve self and Synod..."<sup>12</sup>

It would be an understatement to say that the letter is filled with heart-judging. It makes one ill to read such a heartless, unwarranted attack.

On Sunday, November 9, Christman read from the pulpit his letter to Voss as well as Voss' reply, thus crossing the point of no return in burdening the souls and consciences of the people of St. Paul with his crusade against the synod. He accused synod officials of having the spirit of antichrist, claiming they put the synod first, making it an idol: "In fact, the spirit is this, you stick with me and you'll be all right, even without Jesus Christ."<sup>13</sup>

Events began picking up steam, unfortunately. The following

Sunday, Christman distributed his document, "Some Timely Questions Answered." Kelm summarizes its content:

In it he publicly acknowledged his Protes'tant fellowship, claimed synodical approval of his actions, objected to the Brand ouster, accused Synod of false doctrine, of being under "divine judgment," of being "given to expediency rather than principle, to convenience rather than conscience, to self-preservation rather than what is judged to be obedience to God," and of displaying "the spirit of antichrist." 14

The flurry of activity continued with many letters, meetings, and phone calls. Voss met with Christman to discuss the controversy in December, but there was no progress. Two congregational meetings were held on January 12th and January 19th. Christman tried to make East Bloomfield and synod's actions the issue. District President Voss tried to limit the discussion to the issue as it affected St. Paul congregation and Christman's ministry there. The January 12th meeting was especially difficult as Christman had invited a number of Protes'tants, many of whom spoke at length.<sup>15</sup> (For a lengthy, but fascinating transcript of that meeting which includes many of the Protes'tants speaking about their history and their association with the WELS, refer to Faith-Life, Vol. LV, #5, Sept/Oct 1982, pp. 14-35.) Christman failed to convince the majority that he was in the right, while Voss was unable to get Christman to recant his charges and to disassociate himself from the Protes'tants.

No doubt overwhelmed by the rapid turn of events since October, at its January 19th meeting, St. Paul congregation "passed the buck" by tabling the whole matter in order to wait for synod's decision on the matter. After a meeting between Christman and the district officials on February 3, 1981, the Praesidium wrote a letter to St. Paul congregation declaring Christman out of

fellowship with the WELS. This placed the onus on the congregation. On February 16, 1981, St. Paul congregation, acting upon the district letter, voted to remove Christman as its pastor by a narrow margin, 82-75.

#### THE IMPACT OF THE CONTROVERSY

As was stated previously, to end the story here would be to ignore "the rest of the story," as Paul Harvey puts it. This would then also make for a short Church History paper. God in his grace saw to it that St. Paul Lutheran Church and School remained in the WELS. With the healing balm of his Word he has worked to heal the damaging impact of the controversy over the last ten years. It is useful to examine the impact of the controversy in the following areas: 1) Robert Christman and his ministry at St. James congregation, 2) The Protes'tant Conference, 3) Synodical, and 4) St. Paul congregation.

#### THE IMPACT ON CHRISTMAN AND ST. JAMES

Despite the fact that his expulsion from St. Paul Ev. Lutheran Church left him without a call or a congregation to minister to, Robert Christman did not rest. The following Sunday, February 22, Christman led approximately 200 people from St. Paul's in worship at the local YWCA. The group which followed Christman was extremely zealous and dedicated to the cause. After the service, the group began to organize itself and eventually chose as the name of their congregation - St. James Evangelical Lutheran Church.<sup>16</sup> St. James was a church without a permanent home for 15 months, conducting worship at the YWCA, the Norwood School



gymnasium, the First Assembly of God church building, and back at the YWCA before finally purchasing a church building which previously belonged to the Beth Haven Baptist Congregation.<sup>17</sup>

Christman began conducting services there on July 31, 1983. The dedication of the church and school took place on Sept. 25, 1983.<sup>18</sup>

The fact that St. James began a school is an indicator that the controversy had a major impact on St. Paul's Lutheran elementary school. Three of the nine school faculty members at St. Paul left and joined St. James, comprising the faculty of their new school. Another teacher resigned at the end of the 1980-81 schoolyear. Teachers Michael Hanke, Melvin Koss, and Christine Lincoln were relieved of their teaching duties at St. Paul and were called by St. James congregation to begin their school. Each teacher felt compelled to add their insights into the controversy in Faith-Life, although only Hanke discussed the issues in question in detail. In short, Hanke views synod's handling of the controversy as irresponsible and facilitated by "veiled circular reasoning" and by the "Catch-22s" of synod, especially the issue of fellowship with Protestants.<sup>19</sup>

45 children left St. Paul's school as a result of the controversy and it can be assumed that approximately that many<sup>20</sup> began attending St. James school. Christman is not in the habit of head-counting, thus it is not possible to know just how many attend St. James church and school today. He does claim membership of about 200 souls, relatively the same number as when St. James began.<sup>21</sup> He did not mention the school. It is known that two of the original three faculty members no longer teach there. Mr. Koss stepped down from his teaching position after a couple

of years, while Miss Lincoln stayed for only 1 or 2 years before returning home.<sup>22</sup> It is thought that she is teaching in the WELS again, although it was not possible to confirm this fact.<sup>23</sup>

As for Christman himself, he continues to minister to St. James congregation. One change that has taken place over the ten years since the controversy is that Christman now seems to be more willing to identify himself as a Protes'tant. After his removal from office, Christman stated that he was not a Protes'tant, despite his fello<sup>u</sup>ship and shared beliefs with the Protes'tants.<sup>24</sup> He now calls the controversy "a part of the whole of our (Protes'tant Conference) telling history."<sup>25</sup> Perhaps this has happened because he had no other choice. Christman also holds to the Protes'tant line that the Protes'tant Conference is really a part of the WELS when he writes to this writer about his "expulsion from our Wisconsin Synod."<sup>26</sup> When asked about his view of the spiritual impact of the entire affair, Christman warns that one must be aware of the Scriptural consequences of confessing or denying truth.<sup>27</sup> Rather than answer the question with specifics, he warns and speaks to hearts, as he did during the controversy. Ten years after his expulsion from St. Paul, Robert Christman maintains the rightness of his cause and of his actions.

#### THE IMPACT ON THE PROTES'TANT CONFERENCE

The Christman controversy also affected the Protes'tant Conference, the small group which originated in the late 1920s, and which also publishes Faith-Life. It is probably more correct to say that the Protes'tants used the controversy to do some "affecting" of their own. Incidents involving Protes'tants

surface "every ten to fifteen years,"<sup>28</sup> and the Conference used the Green Bay affair to publicize their story and cause. Christman's assessment of the impact on the Protes'tants implies quiet and thoughtful reflection on their part: "The Protes'tant Conference was moved to thank God with humility. For a while it seemed to have added a special encouragement to them in their calling. Now it is but a part of the whole of our telling history."<sup>29</sup> While this may be true in part, it hardly reflects the entire story of Protes'tant reaction.

The Protes'tant Conference sought to capitalize on the Christman affair. While the waters were still rippling over the controversy, the publishers of Faith-Life sought to influence as many people as possible within the WELS. That this is their clear intent can be seen from the following statement which appears in the same issue as the first installment of the Christman story:

The numbers of Faith-Life offering "The Green Bay Story" (and, beginning next time, Floyd Brand's story) are being sent to the teachers and pastors who served as voting delegates at the 1981 Prairie du Chien convention of the Wisconsin Synod, to people named in the accounts, and to certain others selected by Teachers C. Lincoln, M. Hanke, and M. Koss and by Pastor F. Brand. 30

The opening paragraphs of Christman's account show that he and the Protes'tants wished to widen the Protes'tant audience and to continue to attack the synod. Loaded words set the stage for Christman's invective against all who wronged him in the controversy:

What follows is the story of how I came to be put out, a story untold at last summer's Synod Convention in Prairie du Chien, where I was denied my right of appeal, and untold in the Synod's official magazine, "The Northwestern Lutheran," which to date has not printed so much as a notice of my change in status. 31

And again:

Here allow me a special word to the sincere and honest reader. Do not be surprised to hear that while you are studying my account, others are throwing it into the wastebasket unread. The mere fact that it appears in the pages of Faith-Life is all some have to know. Let them be. Let them publish each other's obituaries in their own proper journals (Matt. 8:22). As for you, follow Christ. And that means distinguishing the voice of the Good Shepherd from the voice of hireling-strangers. 32

It is easy to see that the Protes'tant Conference used the Green Bay affair to call synod to repentance and to publicize its own story in the same way it always has since its inception. That they chose to accuse and make slanderous charges by taking the matter to hundreds of people not directly involved smacks of conscience-burdening and sensationalism. The Protes'tant Conference remains true to its unfortunate beginnings.

#### THE IMPACT ON THE WISCONSIN SYNOD

The Green Bay controversy also had impact on the Wisconsin Synod as a whole and in part. The chief reasons that the controversy impacted on synod with such a great degree of success are the distribution of the Christman story via Faith-Life and the fact that it involved the Protes'tants. The circulation of Christman's story prompted much discussion and renewed old arguments and debates over the issues which have stirred the hornets' nest between the Protes'tants and the WELS for over 60 years.

The fact that the Green Bay affair renewed interest about the Protes'tants with the synod can be attributed to the Faith-Life distribution. Professor E.C. Fredrich of the Seminary toured the lecture circuit, delivering conference papers to interested gatherings and conferences. In one case, the controversy aroused

interest in past Protes'tant dealings within the Minnesota district.<sup>33</sup> The Metro-North Pastoral Conference of Milwaukee heard a paper delivered by Pastor Cleone Weigand entitled "The Protes'tant Conference Today" which attempted to get a handle on the Protes'tants within the context of this renewed interest. In contrast to the typical Seminary senior in 1991 who has only dim knowledge of the Protes'tants, if that much, it would seem that anyone who had his ears open ten years ago would have certainly heard of the Christman controversy.

It goes without saying that the greatest synodical impact of the controversy was felt in the Northern Wisconsin District. It was there that the rumblings of controversy had been felt for several years prior to the events surrounding Christman's expulsion. The controversy required much time and energy from the district officials, especially from District President Carl Voss. While he was occupied with the East Bloomfield and Green Bay cases, it follows that other work related to Gospel ministry would have had to fight for less available time and effort. Voss, however, would be the last to concur with this analysis. In his estimation the controversy's impact on the district has been "very negligible."<sup>34</sup> At most, "Christman seems to have gained the recognition of a few others in synod who to one degree or another found him sympathetic to their causes while they were being dealt with."<sup>35</sup>

On a synod-wide basis, many opposed TAS-type evangelism and other programs because of distrust for the synod. While it is good to warn against improper use of programs in the church, as Christman did, it is unwise to make unsubstantiated charges and

to condemn, as Christman also did. Programs such as TAS, stewardship drives, and spiritual renewal are very useable and profitable. They are wrong when the people who use them put their faith in the programs rather than in the Word. Voss sees this as an overall impact of the St. Paul controversy:

Its overall impact is to make us ever more cautious about rushing into programs for the church's use without giving them careful, considered thought in the light of Scripture principles, making sure that we use programs that result from an application of those principles, rather than arranging for programs and then looking for a few Bible passages that we feel will give credence and legitimacy to the programs.<sup>36</sup>

#### THE IMPACT ON ST. PAUL CONGREGATION

The impact of the controversy at St. Paul Ev. Lutheran Church was immediate and painful. Approximately 300 souls left the congregation after Christman was voted out, with about 200 of them joining Christman at St. James congregation. Current WELS statistical reports show that membership at St. Paul's has never rebounded numerically from the loss as membership hovers around the 1,000 souls that remained at St. Paul ten years ago. Pastor Roy Rose, who has guided St. Paul congregation with a steady hand ever since the controversy, reports other details:

Currently we have about 10 souls in our membership who returned to us over the years. We have had perhaps a half dozen others who returned, but later left again for one reason or another. <sup>37</sup>

At the time of Christman's ouster, the school had approximately 190 children enrolled. About 45 students were lost to the controversy and enrollment dropped sharply to less than 100 by 1984 due to other problems.<sup>38</sup> Numerically, the school remains at or below the 100 number, but has become much healthier in the past few years.<sup>39</sup>

Numbers only tell a part of the story. St. Paul congregation suffered extensive emotional and spiritual impact as a result of the controversy. The 82-75 vote was by no means decisive. It shows that the congregation was torn over the whole affair. One reason that such an impact was made was that "Christman was respected as an erudite, learned person, gifted intellectually and scholastically."<sup>40</sup> Many at St. Paul's speak of families split over the controversy, unable to see each other's point of view. The split could be seen within the organizations of the congregation as the opposing sides would sit on opposite sides of the room.<sup>41</sup>

Whether or not it was true, there was a strong resentment toward Christman on the part of many of the people who remained at St. Paul. There were those that felt Christman orchestrated events and actively built up support for his cause. It was felt that if he truly believed in what he said, he would have confessed his disagreement with the WELS, resigned, and started a new church. Because Christman chose the path that he did, some people felt that he was really interested in keeping the church and its property more than clinging to what he felt was the truth. At the January 19th meeting, the late Melvin Croll, a former WELS pastor, urged Christman to resign rather than break up St. Paul congregation and do further harm to it.<sup>42</sup> Christman would surely deny any such motivation, but the mere hint and appearance of it caused much resentment among the congregation.

As a proponent of the Protes'tant preaching of repentance, Christman relied heavily upon the Law in his preaching and this became more noticeable as the controversy heated up. One member

of St. Paul lamented, "I find it very disheartening...when I have to go home and I have to say, 'Where is my Gospel? What happened to my Gospel?'"<sup>43</sup> After one of Christman's sermons, a 9th grader asked, "Is it wrong to feel sure you'll be in heaven?"<sup>44</sup> A spiritual vacuum of sorts had been an ongoing impact of the controversy, at least during the final months, and needed to be replaced with a proper balance of Law and Gospel.

A spiritual problem can be seen in the economics of a congregation. Such was the case at St. Paul. Pastor Rose sums up the economic impact in this way:

The economic impact on the congregation was tremendous. Not only did plans for a gymnasium to be built in 1981 have to be scrapped, but within a few years an \$80,000 operating debt had accumulated. Very stringent measures were used in the mid-80's to get this down to the \$34,500 operating debt we now carry. We have no debt on our buildings, as they were all paid for prior to 1981. Plans now are to try and build the gym within the next few years if there is substantial support for the project. 45

The matter of building a gym has indeed resurfaced, but a recent meeting showed that there is still an underlying current of division within the membership, be it real or perceived. When discussing the building program, a young man stood up and declared, "What we need to get us back together" is a project like this.<sup>46</sup>

Perhaps the most subtle impact of the controversy on St. Paul congregation was the separation and alienation from synod ~~which~~ <sup>which</sup> it had undergone. Christman's objections to synodical programs led to ignorance within the congregation about synod and synod activities. Synod school concerts in the surrounding area were not announced in the bulletin. St. Paul had no evangelism committee or stewardship committee due to Christman's dislike for anything that hinted of synod. Christman also discouraged having



a LWMS group at St. Paul because they helped in too many Home Mission endeavors.<sup>47</sup> This separation from synod was subtle but gradual and was especially noticed after Christman's dismissal. Shortly after Rose arrived as the new pastor, the NWC male chorus sang at St. Paul's and, in the words of one St. Paul member, "was a symbol to me that St. Paul was back in the WELS."<sup>48</sup>

Where does St. Paul Ev. Lutheran Church stand today, ten years after the Protestant Controversy involving Robert Christman? By all accounts, the congregation has healed at least outwardly. The controversy is rarely mentioned and reminders are served only when members attend confirmations or funerals for friends or relatives between St. James and St. Paul. The congregation received much good publicity in 1983 when TV stations covered St. Paul's centennial.<sup>49</sup> Many new members have joined St. Paul who know little or nothing of the controversy, and this has helped the healing process. Three years ago, the congregation called its second pastor, a sure sign that it is looking to the future.

Today, St. Paul congregation is a church that has learned not to take God's blessings for granted, instead, to appreciate them all the more considering the fact that the people almost lost the entire property. Pastor Rose summarizes his view of St. Paul today:

Overall, despite some continuing "shock waves" and setbacks related to the split, the past ten years have been years of blessing in which God has kept His promise, "Fear not, for I am with you, be not dismayed for I am your God. I will strengthen you, and I will help you. Yes, I will uphold you with my righteous right hand." (Is 41:10) 50

The Lord's guiding and healing hand has been at work, advancing his Kingdom through his servants at St. Paul Church in Green Bay.

## ENDNOTES

1. Dale Wierschke, Letter, April 16, 1991. (Member of St. Paul's)
2. Robert Christman, "The Green Bay Story: My Loss and My Gain," Faith-Life, Vol LV, #2, March/April 1982, p. 18.
3. Dan Kelm, "Green Bay and the Protes'tant Controversy Today," p. 2.
4. Robert Christman, "Some Timely Questions Answered," (Nov., 1980) p. 2.
5. Kelm, op. cit., p. 2.
6. Roy Rose, Letter, March 19, 1991.
7. Robert Christman, "Why TAS-type Evangelism Is Contrary to the Gospel," (Sept. 29, 1977) p. 2.
8. Ibid., p. 1.
9. Christman, "The Green Bay Story..." Faith-Life, Vol. LV, #2, March/April 1982, p. 26.
10. Ibid., Vol. LV #3, May/June 1982, p. 5.
11. Ibid., p. 6.
12. Ibid., p. 7.
13. Wierschke, op. cit.
14. Kelm. op. cit., p. 4.
15. Christman, "The Green Bay Story..." Faith-Life, Vol LV, #5, Sept/Oct 1982, p. 14ff.
16. Ibid., Vol. LVI, #2 , March/April 1983, p. 15.
17. Robert Christman, "A Brief History of St. James Evangelical Lutheran Church," Faith-Life, Vol. LVI, #6, Nov/Dec 1983, p. 24.
18. Ibid., p. 23.
19. Christman, "The Green Bay Story..." Faith-Life, Vol. LVI, #4, July/August 1983, p. 23.
20. Rose letter, op. cit.
21. Robert Christman, Letter, March 11, 1991.
22. Rose VanCalster, Letter, April 11, 1991. (Member of St. Paul's)
23. Ibid.

24. Kelm, op. cit., p. 15.
25. Christman, Letter, op. cit.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid.
28. E.C. Fredrich, "The Protes'tant Controversy," May 1, 1984, p. 1.
29. Christman, Letter, op. cit.
30. Editor's note, Faith-Life, Vol LV, #1, Jan/Feb 1982, p. 3.
31. Christman, "The Green Bay Story..." Faith-Life, Vol. LV, #1, Jan/Feb 1982, p. 12.
32. Ibid., p. 13.
33. Fredrich's previously mentioned essay, "The Protes'tant Controversy," was written to address these concerns.
34. Carl Voss, Letter, March 19, 1991.
35. Ibid.
36. Ibid.
37. Rose Letter, op. cit.
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid.
40. Voss Letter, op. cit.
41. VanCalster Letter, op. cit.
42. Faith-Life, Vol. LV #6, Nov/Dec 1982, p. 28 - transcript of January 19, 1981 meeting.
43. Faith-Life, Vol. LV #5, Sept/Oct 1982, p. 34 - transcript of January 12, 1981 meeting.
44. Wierschke Letter, op. cit.
45. Rose Letter, op. cit.; with Wayne Petersen, St. Paul's church council member at the time of the controversy.
46. Taken from an interview with Wayne Petersen, a member of St. Paul's church council at the time of the controversy.
47. Wierschke Letter, op. cit.
48. Ibid.
49. Rose Letter, op. cit.
50. Ibid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Christman, Robert. "A Brief History of St. James Evangelical Lutheran Church." Faith-Life, Vol. LVI, #6, Nov/Dec 1983, pp. 23-24.
- Christman, Robert. "The Green Bay Story: My Loss and My Gain." Faith-Life, Vol LV, #1, Jan/Feb 1982 - Vol LVI. #3, May/June 1983.
- Christman, Robert. "Some Timely Questions Answered." (Nov. 1980)
- Fredrich, E.C. "The Protes'tant Controversy." May, 1, 1984.
- Kelm, Daniel. "Green Bay and the Protes'tant Controversy Today" April 13, 1981.