

Reasons for the Ohio, Iowa, Buffalo Merger of 1930:
Practical vs. Confessional

A Term Paper
Presented to
Professor Fredrich
Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Course
Church History 376

by
Philip Strackbein

April 9, 1979

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

When two or more church bodies or synods want to join together or merge, one of the basic questions they have to ask themselves is, why? And so it was with Ohio, Iowa, and Buffalo. We might say right away at the outset that according to appearances and according to what they themselves claimed and undoubtedly also believed, the main reason for the merger of these three synods was that they appeared to have doctrinal and confessional unity. They therefore also wanted to unite themselves together into one body.

What one doesn't see at first glance, however, is the fact that many practical questions were also involved. The purpose of this paper is to determine whether in the final analysis the practical considerations didn't perhaps outweigh the matters pertaining to doctrines and confessions. If this is the case, then perhaps they were not building on as solid a foundation as they thought.

As was mentioned before, according to appearances the main reason for merger was confessional unity. This can be seen most clearly in the struggle simply to establish fellowship between Ohio and Iowa. It took thirty-five years to attain this goal and the reason it took so long was because there were some confessional matters that had to be straightened out. By 1907, Iowa was ready for fellowship with Ohio, and in 1910, Ohio had declared full agreement with Iowa on all essential matters of faith. Yet Ohio still

hesitated on fellowship because Iowa was too friendly with the General Council. It wasn't until 1918, when the General Council joined the ULCA, that Ohio finally voted unanimously "that such fraternal relations now exist between us and the Iowa Synod as necessarily imply the mutual recognition of pulpit and altar fellowship."¹

Fellowship was apparently thus based on doctrinal and confessional unity which was apparently also the reason why almost immediately they wanted to take the next step and try to obtain also organic union of the synods. Unity of faith and in the doctrine of the Scriptures was taken for granted in any attempt at merger and was a very important characteristic of the Lutheran philosophy of church union that these synods held. After 1918, the synods were convinced that the condition for which the Lord prayed in His high-priestly prayer, "that they may be one," already existed among them even while they continued as separate bodies.

The question to be considered next was whether there were any additional reasons why they should unite into one organic body as well. Of what advantage would organic union be? Would the synods be able to fulfill their tasks in the world more effectively as they were or in a merged church? This is where the practical considerations came in as M. Loy clearly states: "Organizational unity is an adiaphoron, to be determined largely by practical considerations; unity of faith is the essential, must always be the primary goal among all Christians, especially among churches in their interrelationships, and must always be present before any

suggestions for external union can be given serious attention."²

Peter Kluepfel was one of the first and also one of the most influential people who were pushing the merger. Through personal contacts, speeches, and articles he brought the case for merger to the attention of fellow pastors and laymen in the northern Ohio area. Some of his main arguments can be found in his speech to the Eastern District of the Iowa Synod at Toledo in June, 1919.³

The greatest specific advantage of union, according to Kluepfel, was the better use of men and money and elimination of waste through reduction of duplication and competition on the congregational level, in educational institutions, publishing houses, and periodicals. Anticipating the charge that the merged body would be too big and clumsy to do its work well, he compared the proposed church with the Missouri Synod and found that Iowa-Ohio wouldn't be half as large. "If any synod has been efficient and has done its work well, it surely has been the Missouri Synod, whatever you may otherwise think of the 'Missourians.'"⁴ He felt that by joining together, Iowa and Ohio might come close to attaining the efficiency of such a group as the Missouri Synod.

Another advantage had to do with the position of the two synods in American Lutheranism. With liberal Lutherans joined in the United Lutheran Church and "hyper-Lutherans" in the Synodical Conference, "why should not the two synods of Ohio and Iowa which are holding the golden middle way, and

represent a conservative, safe and sane Lutheranism...unite and thus strengthen their cause and...occupy a commanding and influential position in the council of synods and churches?"⁵ Fear of being walled in by larger synodical bodies wasn't very often clearly expressed by those who favored merger, but it was often there in the background.

Some people argued that the synods shouldn't merge because the right time had not yet come, but Kluepfel replied to this:

As to things taking their own natural course, while we are watching and waiting, and letting God bring about a union, that sounds very piously, but after all is nothing but talk....Matters which depend on, and conditions which are brought about by our actions under the guidance of the Spirit which leads into all truth, require more than watching and waiting and praying...They require action. Something must be done, and we must do it. We are God's servants; we are His co-workers. God uses us to carry out His plans. And if we establish a union according to His word and will, it is a God-made union....So after all the question is simply this: Are the members of the Ohio and Iowa synods willing to do what other Lutherans have done when they found out that they were one in spirit, in faith and practice, namely, merge into one greater body, or do we wish to plod along the best we can in single file, as separated bodies, as we have been doing in the past?⁶

After a great deal of discussion on Kluepfel's persuasive arguments the Eastern District of the Iowa Synod passed the first official resolution pertaining to organic union:

"Resolved, that our District urge the Executive Board of Synod to cooperate with the Executive Board of the Synod of Ohio in preparing a detailed, workable plan for organic union of the synods of Ohio and Iowa, this plan to be

submitted to the next convention of our general body."⁷

Within a short time other districts and conferences were considering the merger, with very similar results. A joint conference of Iowa and Ohio pastors at St. Paul, Minnesota, on March 26, 1920, urged not only that officials of the synods give attention to merger, but called upon all 1920 spring conferences to pass resolutions favoring the merge.⁸ Before the synodical convention of 1920 two districts and five conferences of the Iowa Synod had gone on record in favor of merger.

The most unqualified appeal for complete merger was an article by C.B. Gohdes, published a few weeks before the 1920 conventions, in the Kirchliche Zeitschrift-Theological Magazine. Gohdes was convinced that the future life and effectiveness of both synods depended completely on immediate union. He therefore admonished those whose caution had stopped the movement toward such a merger in the past and threatened to slow it down again. He didn't think continued disunion was a sin in itself, but he called it a destructive division because it would hinder effective work of the synods, especially in the educational field. On the other hand, the joining of the synods could make possible the development of a really excellent Lutheran school. "A Lutheran Amherst or Oberlin is possible for us. We need it! But never while fence repairing is the chief feature of synodical polity."⁹

Other arguments for merger that Gohdes stressed included greater efficiency through greater size, the publication of

better literature, the ability of a larger church with greater financial ability to train talented young men for professorships in its schools, and the possibility of better care for retired and disabled pastors. He also pointed out that as separate synods there was always an overlapping of Ohio and Iowa congregations in certain areas, which had led to conflict and the inevitable charge of proselyting. He felt that union of Iowa and Ohio was the surest and easiest means to eliminate this conflict.

After indicating the many common interests of the two synods Gohdes concluded with this appeal:

If Ohio cannot effect a union with Iowa, it might as well admit paralysis of the function that makes for healing the wounds of the divided body of our fair Church! The very geographic situation makes for organic union. Wherever Ohio is weak, Iowa is strong. Wherever Iowa is weak, Ohio is strong. One year after fusion it would be hard to point out at conferences and synods who is of Ohio and who of Iowa. The backbone of either is molded in the conservative die, and the one will strengthen the other....Should the two synods of Ohio and Iowa unite, the effect will be for either the anticipation in the present of half a century's growth and fruitage....

Before us lie two roads. The one for either synod is that of a virtual religious denomination without excuse for being one and without the strength to make itself felt in the land and the world through schools, missions, and literary productions in keeping with the rising standards of the present day. Obscurity and enfeeblement will be the harvest of present irresoluteness and prejudice. The other is that of a body possessed of power commensurate with its tasks, of a leader helping to effect the larger consummation bound to come in God's own time--respected and followed because, in the appointed day, it did not fail to act with wisdom and decision when the conditions of union divinely set forth were given. There is no other alternative! It is merge or submerge!¹⁰

It can be plainly seen that there were many good and practical reasons for the two synods to merge. And there were men who recognized these practical advantages and proclaimed them for all they were worth in order to accomplish the goal they were after. These men did not go unheard and it wasn't long before the merger idea spread and took hold. Men like Carl E. Linder called upon the clergy to show greater interest, to be better informed, and to insist on quick committee action. Such pressure brought results. In February, 1922, President Schuette of Ohio informed President Richter of Iowa that an Ohio committee was ready to meet. From the resulting discussion of April 18 in Chicago came the resolution,

Since an organic union of the two synods of Iowa and Ohio seems desirable, unless practical considerations should present obstacles, we recommend that for an inquiry into the entire situation, each synod appoint a committee of the qualified men of their respective publication, missionary, and institutional boards. This committee shall discuss thoroughly the pros and cons of such an organic union and make a written record of the findings...to be referred to the intersynodical committee already existing for further discussion and recommendation.¹¹

After Ohio officially endorsed this recommendation in 1922, the path for decisive action had been cleared. A questionnaire sent by the Fremont(Ohio) Local Conference to all pastors of the two synods showed that 97 per cent of those from Iowa who had responded were in favor of union, a few were uncertain, the rest opposed. Of the Ohio replies, 95 per cent were in favor and a few strongly opposed. There

were also quite a few who didn't respond at all.¹²

By 1924, the merger sentiment had skyrocketed. From beginning to end the reports were favorable to merger and optimistic regarding prospects for the new synod.¹³ There were a few, including President Schuette who were a little but cautious. With his eye on the National Lutheran Council, Schuette advised Ohio to "make haste slowly" in coming to a decision lest it rashly damage Ohio's intersynodical relationships.¹⁴ The convention as a whole, though, didn't share Schuette's caution and unanimously approved a motion to refer the matter to the districts, where every congregation had a voice and a vote, for discussion and decision. A second motion, proposed immediately after the favorable vote on the first, instructed the president, in case the districts should vote in favor of merger, to try "to arrange for a meeting of both synods two years hence at the same time and place" so that "after attending to their own business, the two bodies may then organize the new body."¹⁵ This was also unanimously approved. Later C.C. Hein commented that, if a vote on actual merger had been taken in 1924, 95 per cent would have voted for it.¹⁶ Hopes were very high. Complete merger in two years was regarded as a definite possibility. And why not? What could possibly be wrong with it?

To all outward appearances, nothing was wrong with it. They had spent 35 years in coming to doctrinal and confessional agreement and now all practical considerations also said go. The question is whether everything was really as good as it

appeared to be. Had they really solved all their doctrinal and confessional differences when they entered into fellowship with each other, or had they simply been able to come up with a finely structured wording which concealed some differences which might have still been lurking underneath the surface? Had the gloriousness of the proposed new synod and the vociferous and urgent demands and the practical arguments of those pushing the merger perhaps blinded many and swept them up into the current causing them to move forward recklessly without really examining carefully where they were going? Having been thus swept off their feet, would they even be able to stop if some serious obstruction, such as a clear doctrinal difference which was lurking beneath the surface, should rise up in front of them?

Before we try to answer these questions, let's see what the thinking of some of these men who were caught up in the current was like. President Richter of Iowa seemed to be one such man.

He was willing to continue committee work even though he had no official instructions to proceed, in the knowledge that the majority of his synod approved. In fact, it was his hope that all details of the merger might be worked out before the 1926 conventions, that a detailed plan might be presented and approved, and that merger could be approved and consummated by the 1926 conventions. Richter, now seventy-four years old, had made up his mind to retire at the 1926 convention, having held the highest office of his synod for twenty-two years. Once the decision to retire had been definitely made, he threw all his influence behind the cause of immediate merger, knowing that the moment of his resignation would be an opportune time for Iowa's decision and possibly for merger itself.¹⁷

It's clear that Richter was no longer looking to the right or to the left but had his eyes and all his energies fixed on one goal. Anything else that got in the way would simply be disregarded or explained away.

At this same time Hein was the new president of the Ohio Synod and he was cautiously groping his way through his new responsibilities. As a result, he felt that little more could be done before the 1926 convention than to take a vote on merger in the districts. No further work on a plan of union or solution of the legal problems of merger could be attempted without specific authorization from the next synodical conventions.¹⁸ Hein wrote these views in a letter to Richter, which Richter then shared with Iowa members of the "pros and cons" committee. The reading of the letter brought a heated reply from Karl Ermisch, a member of the committee, who was also one of those who had been swept blindly into the current headed for merger. Parts of Ermisch's letter will be included here because it explains Richter's new anxiety over immediate merger, and because it is a ringing, almost impudent summons for Hein to fall into line with Richter's plans:

May I speak very plainly? Through your refusal to take up Dr. Richter's proposal you have endangered the unification....If the merger is to take place it must be next year, if Dr. Richter steps down. Thus it is necessary that preliminaries be started now so that a perfect plan can be presented to the synods....Dear friend, for the sake of this great thing take up this proposal. You surely can find a way to retract your refusal. Please, please do it....It has been placed in your hands to effect this (merger)....You will write to Dr.

Richter today, won't you, and send it tomorrow?... You will think: 'That fellow is just like a woman--can't wait!' Go ahead and mock me a little bit. If only something comes of the merger. That is the important thing.¹⁹

Richter and Ermisch weren't the only ones putting on the pressure. The Texas, Eastern, and Iowa Districts of the Iowa Synod were also demanding immediate merger plans.²⁰ Whether it was due to all the pressure, or whether it was due to the fact that Ohio's district presidents gave him the assurance that the districts would support the merger,²¹ Hein altered his view by approving the idea of detailed committee work before the 1926 convention and he made arrangements for an August 6 meeting of Iowa and Ohio representatives to develop a common plan of procedure.²² The result of that meeting was that a Joint Commission was appointed to take charge of preliminary work, to devise the instruments of merger, and to publish the resulting plan in pamphlet form before the 1926 conventions.²³ When an actual vote was taken by the districts, in each synod only six votes were cast against merger.²⁴

At this same time, a third party also became interested in the possibility of merger. The Buffalo Synod had been building a bond of friendship with Iowa and also partly with Ohio. It was no real surprise, then, when Karl A. Hoessel, president of Buffalo sent a request to Richter and Hein that the Buffalo Synod be included in the merger. Without going into detail, the Buffalo Synod was welcomed wholeheartedly and invited to send representatives to all planning sessions.²⁵

From the evidence presented so far, it appears that due almost entirely to practical advantages, the sentiments of almost everyone, of some to a greater degree and of others to a somewhat lesser degree, were in favor of merger as soon as possible with as little hassle as possible.

With these thoughts in mind, we now raise the question again - Had the favorable light of the practical advantages and the strong arguments of the pushers perhaps swept everyone off their feet? Would they even be able to stop now if some serious obstruction, such as a clear doctrinal difference which was lurking beneath the surface, should rise up in front of them?

In many cases that might be a pretty big "if," but in this instance, such a doctrinal difference did indeed rise up in the form of the Inspiration Controversy of 1926. It almost seems as if this controversy arose as a test of the principles of unity that the synods involved were employing, because the real difficulty arose at the exact time when merger seemed most sure. Another interesting point is that to the complete surprise of many, the difficulty was on a doctrine which for a long time was considered the greatest single point of unity among conservative Lutherans.

The part of the controversy that effected the merger situation came up in the paragraph on the Scriptures which appeared in the Joint Commission's proposed constitution for the new Synod. The paragraph read: "The Synod accepts all the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments as

the inspired and inerrant Word of God and the only source, norm and guide of faith and life."²⁶

The problem appeared to be with the words "inspired and inerrant." As soon as copies of the proposed constitution were distributed to Iowa pastors, Prof. M. Reu of Iowa voiced his opposition to them. Because the proposed form elevated belief in the absolute inerrancy of the Scriptures to an article of faith, Reu insisted that Iowa should refuse to accept it. He said,

I could wholeheartedly approve the statement: "The Scripture is the inspired Word of God and the only and inerrant source, guide and norm for Christian faith and life." This I would defend to my last breath against any opponent in Germany or here, as God would give me grace. For the testimony of the Scriptures would support me....But Scripture itself does not say that it is inerrant in all other things that neither directly nor indirectly pertain to faith and life; therefore, I cannot elevate such a claim to an article of faith or a confessional paragraph. If I did, I would exclude from church fellowship those who say that this or that historical reference is incorrect or questionable. I myself hesitate to say this, especially since so many difficulties have been solved in the last decade.... Nor will I allow myself to be driven to a position narrower than Scripture itself requires. Although I personally may reconcile this or that historical difficulty, yet I dare not build my own or anyone else's faith on it, lest I build upon a human interpretation. This change grieves me deeply.²⁷

The Iowa Synod on the whole was in agreement with Reu, so at their convention in 1926, they proposed that the wording in the constitution be changed from "inspired and inerrant Word of God" to "inspired Word of God and the inerrant and only source, norm and guide of faith and life."²⁸ The vote taken was a unanimous 128-0 in favor of the change.²⁹

After this, the motion was made and carried to approve organic union with Ohio and Buffalo on the basis of the recommended changes.³⁰

The reaction of Ohio was that the Iowa form appeared to be a concession to German and American modern theology which wanted to affirm the inspiration of the Biblical "essentials" but to deny the inspiration of the rest of Scripture.³¹ Ten days after Iowa's requested change was submitted, Hein came to a decision on the request. He wrote to Ermisch, "Ohio is absolutely one. It seems to consider a change in the constitution under present conditions a denial of the truth."³² It is evident, then, that Ohio, or at least Hein and the faculties, were convinced that the total inerrancy of the Bible belonged in the area of essential doctrines.

So there was a clear and recognized difference and the principles of unity quoted earlier were about to be tested, namely, that "unity of faith is the essential, must always be the primary goal among all Christians, especially among churches in their interrelationships, and must always be present before any suggestions for external union can be given serious attention."³³ How high had the merger fever risen? One thing that will have to be mentioned is that neither synod immediately gave in to the temptation that must have been there to simply yield to the other so that the merger would go through. And as a result, the merger was postponed in favor of discussing the matter thoroughly.

We would have to say, too, though, that in conformance to their principles on organic unity, one side or the other would have to make a serious change in their doctrinal position on inerrancy before they could even begin talking about merger again.

That, however, is not what actually happened, which we can see from the action of the Iowa convention of 1928. What they did was find a way to clear the path for merger without changing their original position by adopting the following statement:

- I. In regard to the attitude toward the Scriptures.
 In view of the present situation we deem it necessary that Synod adopt a clear and unequivocal declaration concerning the doctrine of the inspiration and inerrancy of the Scriptures as we now have them and the true sense of its own confessional paragraph.
 We therefore move the adoption of the following declarations:
 - 1) Synod today as always confesses the old Lutheran doctrine concerning the inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible, as this doctrine again and again has been presented in its publications.
 - 2) As a brief and unequivocal summary of the same, we adopt as our own the words of Dr. S. Fritschel:
 - a) The Scriptures are the Word of God in both content and form in the full and proper meaning of the term.
 - b) This statement refers to all their parts; it is not feasible to differentiate between inspired and non-inspired contents, between divine and human elements, between the Word of God and the words of men.
 - c) The fact of the divine origin and character of the Scriptures also establishes the other fact of their inerrancy.
 - 3) When we confess the inerrancy of the Bible as we now have it, we do not maintain that there are no errors of transcription, different readings, omissions or minor additions to the original text, or that there are no passages which to us seem to be contradictions or discrepancies, which, however, do not affect the interests of salvation and faith.
- II. In regard to the merger.
 - 1) Synod again declares its willingness to enter

into a merger with the synods of Buffalo and Ohio.

2) In view of the present situation, be it resolved:

a) That we do not insist on the formulation adopted at Dubuque, Iowa, in 1926...and that our representatives shall not be bound by this particular formulation.

b) That Synod declares: Whatever phrasing of the confessional paragraph of the constitution fully expresses the doctrine contained in the above declaration in regard to the Bible will be acceptable....³⁴

Really, in essence these resolutions were simply worded with extreme care in order to get the vote of the greatest possible number of delegates.³⁵ Ohio should have seen this and should have known better than to accept such resolutions, which really bypassed the essential issue, as an indication of reestablished unity of faith and doctrine. They should have seen that the very question of inerrancy simply brought to the fore the fact that Iowa had a less rigid stance on many doctrinal views and that they had a broader confessional basis than Ohio. On a matter as important as the inerrancy of Scriptures, no leeway should have been given whatsoever. It's true that Hein was still pretty skeptical, but the Ohio convention of 1928 as a whole didn't share this mood. The important thing for them as it apparently was for Iowa, was to get the merger through. This can be seen by the fact that in many of the subcommittees merger was discussed and in fact, many of their resolutions began with the words, "In view of the pending merger..."³⁶ Merger indeed seemed to be the underlying thought at all times.

The fact that Iowa had really not changed its essential position can be seen by the fact that shortly after doctrinal

unity had been once again formally declared, Reu once again brought up some objections as to the form of the confessional paragraph concerning inerrancy. And what finally came of it? Apparently in order not to show any hard feelings, and since doctrinal agreement had been formally declared, a final form of the paragraph on inspiration that was adopted for the constitution of the synod was so similar to the form that Reu had suggested in 1926 that there was no essential difference: "The Synod accepts the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament as the inspired Word of God and the only infallible authority in all matters of faith and life."³⁷ A more lengthy explanation was included in a footnote in the appendix, but at the last minute Reu et al even tried to get this out of the constitution.

In conclusion, it seems to be pretty obvious to me that in the last analysis, the Ohio, Iowa, Buffalo merger of 1930 came about more because of the weight of the practical advantages than because they were united in faith and doctrine. This in turn I believe is ^{one of} the reasons why the new American ^{of 1930} Lutheran Church went over into the more liberal camp of Lutheranism.

End Notes

- ¹ Ohio Minutes 1918, p. 140
- ² M. Loy, The Christian Church in its Foundation, Essence, Appearance, and Work (Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1896), p. 125.
- ³ P. Kluepfel, Would it Be Desirable that the Two Synods of Ohio and Iowa Should Be Organically United and What Would Be the Advantages of Such an Organic Union? (Privately printed, 1919), p. 5.
- ⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶ Ibid., pp. 6,7.
- ⁷ Ibid., p. 1.
- ⁸ H.C. Ziehe, A Centennial Story of the Lutheran Church in Texas (Seguin, Texas: South Texas Printing Co., 1951-1954), II, p. 113.
- ⁹ C.B. Gohdes, "Merge or Submerge," Kirchliche Zeitschrift-Theological Magazine, Vol 44 (1920), p. 412.
- ¹⁰ Ibid., p. 417f.
- ¹¹ Ohio Minutes 1922, p. 130.
- ¹² Carl E. Linder, "The Issue Between Ohio and Iowa," Pastor's Monthly, Vol. 1 (1923), p. 734.
- ¹³ Ohio Minutes 1924, pp. 140-143.
- ¹⁴ Ibid., p. 8.
- ¹⁵ Ibid., p. 166.
- ¹⁶ C.C. Hein - F. Richter (Jan. 8, 1925), Ohio Merger File, American Lutheran Church Archives.
- ¹⁷ K. Ermisch - C.C. Hein (Feb. 19, 1925), Ohio Merger File, American Lutheran Church Archives.
- ¹⁸ C.C. Hein - F. Richter (Jan. 8, 1925).
- ¹⁹ K. Ermisch - C.C. Hein (Feb. 19, 1925).
- ²⁰ C.C. Hein - K. Ermisch (Aug. 31, 1925), Ohio Merger File, American Lutheran Church Archives.

- ²¹ Ibid.
- ²² These arrangements are found in the Ohio Merger File.
- ²³ C.C. Hein - Karl A. Hoessel (Aug. 31, 1925) Ohio Merger File, American Lutheran Church Archives.
- ²⁴ C.C. Hein - F. Richter (Oct. 24, 1925), F. Richter - C.C. Hein (Oct. 26, 1925), Ohio Merger File, American Lutheran Church Archives.
- ²⁵ C.C. Hein - K.A. Hoessel (Aug. 31, 1925) Ohio Merger File, ALC Archives.
- ²⁶ Constitution and By-laws for the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of America: Rules and Regulations for the Synodical Boards and Recommendations of the Joint Commission (Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1926), p. 8.
- ²⁷ M. Reu - C.C. Hein (May 28, 1926), Ohio Merger File, ALC Archives.
- ²⁸ Iowa Minutes 1926, p. 31.
- ²⁹ "Iowa Synod Minutes 1926," Session II, p. 1.
- ³⁰ Iowa Minutes 1926, p. 72.
- ³¹ H. Ernst - C.C. Hein (Sept. 20, 1926), Ohio Merger File, ALC Archives.
- ³² C.C. Hein - K. Ermisch (Oct. 23, 1926), Ohio Merger File, ALC Archives.
- ³³ Loy, op. cit., p. 125.
- ³⁴ Iowa Minutes 1928, p. 149f.
- ³⁵ C.H. Graening - C.C. Hein (July 8, 1930), Ohio Merger File, ALC Archives.
- ³⁶ Ohio Minutes 1928, p. 19, p. 175.
- ³⁷ Memoranda of Meeting of Joint Synod Representatives on the Merger Commission, Nov. 6, 1929, Ohio Merger File, ALC Archives.

Note: The above sources were gathered and used by Fred W. Meuser in his book: The Formation of the American Lutheran Church. Columbus Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1958.