Missouri's Twin Traumas
II. The Seminex Crisis (1974–)

by Jon Diefenthaler

Abstract

The 1974 "Walk Out" of faculty and students at Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, resulting in "Seminex," may be viewed as the second of twin traumas in the history of the Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod. Evidence that it has served to reinforce some effects of the trauma of the "Stephan crisis" of 1839 appears in post-Seminex assessments of the decades following World War II as a time in which the LCMS progressively drifted away from its "orthodox" religious heritage. Lasting effects of this pair of traumas can be seen in various efforts to safeguard Missouri's brand of Lutheran orthodoxy and to reaffirm C.F.W. Walther's insistence upon complete unity in doctrine and practice for any type of ecclesiastical fellowship. Equally telling is the tendency of post-Seminex Missouri to identify itself with features of the cultural backlash in American society in response to the tumultuous 1960s, one that has led to its retreat from addressing contemporary social justice issues and to seeing itself instead as a righteous remnant under siege in a hostile American environment.

On the final day of the 2023 Convention of the Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod (LCMS) in Milwaukee, the delegates on a nearly unanimous voice vote adopted Resolution 4-07, "To Give Thanks for Preservation of the Gospel in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod." Its purpose was to encourage the Synod's members to observe the fiftieth anniversary of the "Walkout" of students and faculty members at the St. Louis seminary on February 19, 1974. In addition to two volumes being published through Concordia Publishing House (*Seminex in Print: A Comprehensive Bibliography* and *Rediscovering the Issues Surrounding the Concordia Seminary Walkout*), as well as other forthcoming books, the resolution suggested that members of the Synod "study this period in our history" with the aid of these resources as well as "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles," a key document that added fuel to the

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY Volume 39 (2025): 185–212

crisis that swept through the LCMS and contributed to a schism in 1976.[1] Hence, this conclusion to a two-part study on the history of the LCMS will highlight Seminex as a second trauma that has reinforced the lasting effects of the Stephan crisis that occurred within the first year of the arrival of its immigrant forebears.[2]

Two Different Views of the Post-War LCMS

Any attempt to understand the Seminex crisis of the 1970s as a second and reinforcing trauma with lasting effects upon the LCMS must begin with the differing assessments of the two and half decades of its history following World War II. From a pre-Seminex vantage point, these were the best of times for this immigrant church body. Between 1945 and 1970, the baptized membership nearly doubled to an all-time high of 2.8 million, as their congregations reaped the benefits of America's post-war return to religion. The weekly radio broadcasts of "The Lutheran Hour," initiated by Walter A. Maier in the 1930s, were bringing the LCMS to the attention of the broader public. In parts of the country beyond the Midwestern LCMS strongholds, new mission congregations were being planted in unprecedented numbers. The Synod's foreign mission efforts were also expanding, most notably in the Far East and in West Africa. The future looked even brighter because Missouri's parochial schools and Sunday schools were filled with the baby-boomer children of member congregations, and the best and the brightest of them were being encouraged by their families and pastors to become professional church workers.[3]

In addition, there were signs that this body of Lutherans was becoming more ready to step out of its self-protective immigrant cocoon and to reconsider its role on the American church scene. World War II and the human needs that became more apparent in its aftermath, particularly in Europe, were creating fresh opportunities for Missouri to cooperate with the Lutheran church bodies belonging to the National Lutheran Council and, albeit cautiously, to build on these relationships by taking steps in the direction of Lutheran unity. When a series of mergers birthed The American Lutheran Church (ALC) and the Lutheran Church in America (LCA) in the

early 1960s, the LCMS chose to join them as a member of the new Lutheran Council USA (LCUSA), and at its Denver Convention in 1969, it established altar and pulpit fellowship with the ALC. Along this same way, the Synod also flirted with the idea of establishing ties with the Lutheran World Federation (LWF).[4]

With enrollments soaring in its network of colleges devoted primarily to preparing church workers, the LCMS as a rapidly growing church body also decided to upgrade its program of higher education. Most notable in the 1950s was the building of a brand-new two-year Concordia Senior College in Ft. Wayne, Indiana, one that enabled pre-ministerial candidates who had graduated from one of the Synod's eight junior colleges to begin their seminary education with a well-rounded liberal arts bachelor's degree. Academic respectability, moreover, was being sought through the accreditation of all the Synod's colleges and seminaries, and by the recruiting of new faculty members with advanced degrees, which in many cases were from publicly renowned American graduate schools.[5]

But there is another way to view the post-war period. A post-Seminex historical perspective on this era of growth and change tends to emphasize the ways in which the LCMS was progressively drifting away from its "orthodox" religious heritage, one that had been forged in the fires of the Stephan crisis and tested for more than a century.[6] From this viewpoint, the first of the marker moments occurred in 1945, when a group of respected LCMS leaders gathered in Chicago and aired their frustrations with some of the features of their church body in what became known as the "Statement of the 44." While they affirmed their "unswerving loyalty to the great evangelical heritage of historic Lutheranism," those who affixed their signatures to the document clearly stated that they deplored "all man-made walls and barriers and ecclesiastical traditions which would hinder the free course of the Gospel in the world," as well as the charge of "unionism" to any and every contact between Christians of different denominations. They also cited a 1938 Synod resolution that church fellowship was possible "without complete agreement in details of doctrine and practice which have never been considered divisive in the Lutheran Church." The conflict that "the 44" soon stirred up within the Synod caused them to withdraw their

statement of protest in 1947, but the signatories did not repudiate it. Nor were they kept from holding or gaining positions of leadership and influence.[7]

Prior to 1960, several other key moments are often cited. One of them is the participation of the LCMS at the Bad Boll conferences in 1948–49, where its representatives were exposed to the various types of modern biblical scholarship being produced by their German Lutheran counterparts. The dialogues, in part, resulted in the use of the translated works of Werner Elert and Edmund Schlink in courses at the St. Louis seminary and the opportunity for students to do their graduate work at German universities. In addition, there were persistent tensions that Missouri created with fellow members of the Synodical Conference, particularly the Wisconsin Synod (WELS), over such differences in church practice (orthopraxy) as the deployment of military chaplains, prayer fellowship with other Christians, the sanctioning of Scout troops in its congregations, as well as the unilateral resumption of their fellowship conversations with the ALC. In all cases, "unionism" was the infraction with which the LCMS was being charged.[8]

In this same perspective on the post-war decades in the LCMS, another frequently raised red flag is the controversy over the inerrancy of scripture created by Professor Martin Scharlemann in the late 1950s at the St. Louis seminary. The trouble started with a fifteen-page paper that he had intended for faculty eyes only and internal discussion, only to have it leaked to a wider audience. In the paper, Scharlemann openly questioned the sentence in the *Brief Statement* adopted by the Synod in 1932, that the scriptures are "infallible truth," including "those parts which treat historical, geographical, and other secular matters." He called it a "pure rationalization" that assumed the scriptures were "like the Book of Mormon, a gift that fell straight from heaven." He also contended that this same view of the divine inspiration of the scriptures not only deflected "attention from what God was actually revealing of himself to the accuracy of the record of this in the biblical texts," and that it overlooked "the use of literary forms," such as poetry and myth, that can give greater depth to the meaning of what God was revealing of himself.[9] Scharlemann and his paper quickly became the subject of controversy,

resulting in numerous overtures to the San Francisco Convention of the Synod in 1959. In 1962, however, at the Synod's Cleveland Convention, this same St. Louis seminary professor was granted forgiveness when he publicly apologized for the uproar he had caused among its members. Nevertheless, Scharlemann neither recanted his position nor lost his job, and under the supportive leadership of President Alfred Fuerbringer, the St. Louis seminary continued to add like-minded faculty to its expanding program of biblical studies.

This second view of Missouri's post-war years has likewise come to identify several other troubling developments during the 1960s. Among these is a lay empowerment movement led by Oscar Feucht from his position as the Synod's Secretary of Adult Education. While C.F.W. Walther in 1847 had provided a greater role for the laity in the decision-making process of congregations as well as conventions of the larger church, the Missouri Synod remained a church body in which the clergy clearly owned the ministry of Word and sacrament, from which they could claim that all other forms of ministry must flow. Feucht, however, began to emphasize that every LCMS congregation should look upon its lay members as "instruments by which the Christ in them still carries on His mission in the world today." To this end, he became a cheerleader for adult Bible study offerings in congregations led by capable laypersons trained to teach them and for lay evangelism teams capable of sharing their faith in their church's outreach efforts. Feucht's work over the course of this entire period culminated in the publication in 1974 of his book, *Everyone a Minister.*[10]

The contrast in these two historical viewpoints is also apparent regarding the church's role in society. In the first, the post-war LCMS was beginning to become more progressive in its engagement of controversial social issues. LCMS historian Kathryn Galchutt, for example, has provided a window into the Synod's efforts to grapple with racial segregation in the church through the eyes of Andrew Schulze, a white LCMS pastor whose years of experience in serving black mission churches led him to establish the Lutheran Human Relations Association of America (LHRAA) in 1953. The LCMS had played a leading role following the end of Reconstruction in 1877 in promoting mission work authorized by the Synodical Conference

in the "Jim Crow" South and then gave support for the planting of churches, also during the African American migration northward. Nevertheless, white congregations were still excluding African Americans from their worship services. Yet Schulze and his LHRAA allies worked tirelessly and slowly made progress toward integration. They also helped draw up resolutions on race relations that the Synod adopted at its conventions in 1956 and 1962. Furthermore, in Oliver Harms they gained a Synod president who, unlike his predecessor John W. Behnken, was willing to work with them.[11] During the decade of the 1960s, moreover, the editor of the *Lutheran Witness* magazine called attention to other disturbing realities, such as urban decay, poverty, extreme anti-communism, hunger, and war.[12] The LCMS at its Detroit Convention in 1965 adopted a sweeping set of ground-breaking "Mission Affirmations," which stated that "the Church is Christ's mission" to the "whole man" and the "whole society."[13] Two years later, the Synod Convention in New York also recognized that ministering to the "physical" needs of people, especially in the context of medical mission work, was as important as addressing their "spiritual" needs.[14]

When examined from the post-Seminex standpoint, this same trend is viewed as yet another disconcerting development. Up until this point, the LCMS had condemned the Social Gospel movement in American Protestantism because it tended "to foster a worldly gospel of works rather than the Gospel of salvation by grace through faith in the redemptive sacrifice of Christ."[15] The 1965 Mission Affirmations, however, stressed that since "the church has a corporate responsibility towards the structures of society," it "must witness to God's purpose for the social structure and against those human perversions of society which frustrate God's intention for man."[16] When examined in light of the second perspective, this dramatic shift in the Synod's understanding of mission is considered a way of emphasizing "works of social activism" instead of "Christ's work through Word and Sacrament."[17] An equally troubling feature of the Mission Affirmations of 1965 is that they clearly reinforced the fresh attention Feucht was giving to the "priesthood of all believers" by stating that the "whole church is Christ's mission," and that for this reason, "there can be no distinction of rank or importance among

the members of His body" because "all of its members share alike in His mission."[18]

The Crisis that Created Seminex

The mounting tensions in these differing historical perspectives on post-war developments in the LCMS finally resulted in the traumatic explosion that is most often remembered as the Seminex crisis. The fuse was lit already in the late 1960s, when those in the Synod who believed that their church body was straying from its longstanding brand of orthodox Lutheran doctrine and practice found their voice in Herman Otten, a pastor who had received a call from an LCMS congregation despite the fact that the St. Louis seminary had refused to certify him for ordination. Otten was also a believer in Communist and Holocaust conspiracy theories. From his ecclesiastical niche in nearby New Haven, Missouri, he used his well-circulated weekly newspaper *Christian News* to sound alarm bells about the kind of disturbing changes he saw occurring in the LCMS, and particularly at the seminary that had barred him from the clergy roster. What he alleged often proved to be false or wrongly exaggerated. But enough of it was believed by his expanding base of followers. They also found a candidate in J.A.O. (Jack) Preus, the President of Concordia Theological Seminary, in Springfield, Illinois (now located in Ft. Wayne, Indiana), who not only sympathized with their fears, but was capable of unseating the incumbent Synod President, Oliver Harms. To the surprise of those who tended to favor the more progressive metamorphosis their church body was undergoing, Preus's supporters put together a campaign that marshalled enough votes for him to be elected by the delegates at the 1969 Denver Convention of the Synod. The sea change that this represented, moreover, was one they clearly recognized, as more conservative candidates were also elected to fill key positions on the Synod's administrative boards and commissions.[19]

President Preus wasted no time in addressing the problems within the LCMS that his election had revealed, and his primary target became the St. Louis seminary. Rather than providing an in-depth story of what happened between 1970 and 1974, I will simply call

attention to the major steps that led to the Walkout of forty-five of the fifty seminary faculty members and almost all of the students in residence on February 19, 1974, and to the subsequent creation of a seminary-in-exile (Seminex). I will then consider this trauma's lasting effects upon the LCMS.

On the occasion of receiving a letter of concern from a St. Louis seminary faculty member, who turned out ironically to be Martin Scharlemann, Synod President Preus, by executive order, appointed a Fact Finding Committee of five persons headed by Paul Zimmerman (Along with Jack Preus and his brother Robert, Zimmerman had come from the conservative "little Norwegian" Evangelical Lutheran Synod, a member of the Synodical Conference, that like the Wisconsin Synod, had become a pesky critic of Missouri during the 1950s). In 1971, the Committee began its work of interviewing all of the fifty seminary faculty members. Following the completion of these interviews in 1972, Preus shared with the entire Synod as well as the seminary Board of Control the criteria by which they would be evaluated as expressed in "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles." Later that same year, he issued his "Report of the Synodical President," supported by a 160-page Blue Book in which he focused on the aberrant view of the nature of the Holy Scriptures on the part of some professors, coupled with methods of interpreting them that he believed would erode their authority. In addition, he highlighted permissiveness with respect to certain doctrinal matters (such as historicity of the creation and the fall, nature of messianic prophecy, the physical resurrection of Christ), as well as a conditional subscription to the Lutheran Confessions and to doctrinal positions adopted by the Synod. Preus also called upon the Seminary Board to deal with President John Tietjen "as to his failure to exercise the supervision of the doctrine of the faculty as prescribed in the synodical *Handbook*."[20]

Placed on the defensive, the majority of the St. Louis faculty issued their response to Preus's "Report," first with a Brown Book entitled *Fact Finding or Fault Finding* in which they contended that their Synod President had placed "the worst construction on everything,"[21] and then with a larger set of documents entitled *Faithful to Our Calling, Faithful to Our Lord*, in which they provided a "witness

to our faith" in the triune God together with a more in-depth discussion of the theological issues related to their testimony (Part I). There followed a series of personal confessions of faith and discussion of key issues regarding biblical interpretation (Part II). At stake for them was "the centrality of the Gospel in our faith, our lives, our theology, our ministry, and God's mission to the world through us."[22]

1973 was a national convention year for the LCMS, and the controversy surrounding the St. Louis seminary was bound to be the chief agenda item. Heeding the instructions of President Preus in his Blue Book, the seminary's Board of Control conducted its own set of interviews of the seminary faculty members, and in January of 1973, cleared them all of teaching false doctrine. Not satisfied, Preus assumed a forceful leadership role and, echoing Martin Stephan and Walther, decided to bring the negative conclusions of his Fact Finding Committee to the Synod convention that was scheduled to meet in New Orleans in July of 1973. Meanwhile, the Synod's Commission on Theology and Church Relations (CTCR) provided "A Comparative Study of Contemporary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation," which named the historical-grammatical method as the traditional view in contrast to the more radical features of historical-critical method of interpreting biblical texts. It also dismissed any efforts to take a mediating position.[23] Supporters of what had become the majority of forty-five out of fifty faculty members now recognized that their best way of countering Preus was to unseat him at New Orleans on the ballot for Synod President. They pinned their hope on Oswald Hoffmann, one of "the 44" who had become the popular and respected speaker on "The Lutheran Hour." However, Hoffmann proceeded to remove his name from the ballot because he viewed the possibility of his election as a call that he would need to consider prayerfully rather than an obligation to assume the office of President.[24]

The much-anticipated LCMS convention in the summer of 1973, therefore, became one in which the battle lines were quickly drawn between conservative and moderate factions. Once President Preus was re-elected at the outset of the proceedings, however, the convention was his to control. By a fifty-five to forty-five margin, the delegates voted to affirm convention-adopted doctrinal statements

as binding, to regard "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" as one of them, to condemn the St. Louis seminary faculty majority for teaching false doctrine, and to require the newly-elected and more conservative seminary board to deal with the future of John Tietjen as the seminary's president.[25]

The implementation of this convention mandate turned out to be a complex six-month process, one that included the involuntary retirements of professors Arthur Repp and Arthur Carl Piepkorn, the need to consider actual charges brought against Tietjen by several conservative LCMS pastors, the sudden death of Piepkorn, and the board's decision to eliminate nineteen courses from the seminary curriculum. As a result, the board did not suspend Tietjen until January 20, 1974. The next day, a majority of students on the seminary campus declared a moratorium on all classes, and the majority of the faculty announced that they considered themselves to be suspended along with Tietjen. The seminary board officially reacted to these developments on February 17, 1974, by calling upon the faculty to return to their classrooms or be held in violation of the terms of their contracts. Two days later, the faculty majority joined the majority of the students in a Walkout procession from the campus that led to a resuming of their education on February 20, 1974, under the name of Concordia Seminary in Exile (Seminex) at St. Louis University and Eden Seminary in nearby Webster Groves.[26]

Ecclesiastical Fallout from the Crisis

There are several noteworthy features of the immediate fallout this second traumatic moment created within the LCMS. For one thing, the Seminex crisis deepened the division that was already well on its way among its members. Following the New Orleans convention of 1973, the moderates, who had been supportive of the faculty majority, organized themselves as Evangelical Lutherans in Mission (ELIM), began functioning apart from the elected leadership and administration of the Synod, and started circulating their own newspaper, *Missouri in Perspective*. At the 1975 LCMS Convention in Anaheim, California, the conservative majority among the delegates condemned ELIM, censured eight District presidents for ordaining

uncertified Seminex graduates, and authorized President Preus to remove them from office. In 1976, Preus did this in the case of four of them. ELIM reacted to this development by organizing the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches (AELC). All in all, 250 LCMS congregations consisting of 103,263 members and 672 clergy chose to join the AELC. Secondly, the AELC, this group of former LCMS members, in 1978 issued "A Call for Lutheran Union." The ALC, with whom the LCMS was already in the process of cutting its ties of fellowship, and the LCA responded positively and proceeded to join the AELC in a process that led to the creation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) in 1988. Remaining members of the Seminex faculty were at first deployed to and then incorporated into certain faculties of the ELCA seminaries.[27]

In terms of the more lasting effects of this second trauma in the history of the LCMS, the Seminex crisis has reinforced the brand of Lutheran orthodoxy (and orthopraxy) to which its Saxon forebears had made an unwavering commitment in the wake of the Stephan crisis. In this regard, one has only to examine the 1972 "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles." Of the six articles in this document, "Holy Scripture" is the one to which the most attention is given. This article takes the position that since God is the "true Author of every word of Scripture," it contains "no errors or contradictions but that they are in all parts and words the infallible truth," and for this reason, we must reject the view that "only those matters in Holy Scripture were inspired by the Holy Spirit which directly pertain to Jesus Christ and man's salvation," and that "the Gospel, rather than Scripture, is the norm for appraising and judging all doctrines and teachers" (Gospel reductionism). At various points, this same detailed article, moreover, affirms the historicity of Adam and Eve at their creation and fall, the exodus of Israel from Egypt, the story of Jonah, as well as the messianic character of Old Testament prophecies, all of which members of St. Louis faculty majority had made subject to critical inquiry.[28]

Like "A Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod" of 1932, which was originally intended to guide LCMS fellowship negotiations with other Lutheran church bodies but has remained a summary of the "doctrinal position of the Missouri Synod,"

the intention of this Statement of 1972 was to address the concerns that President Preus had previously voiced about the St. Louis seminary. He clearly stated at the time that this document was not to serve as a "new standard of orthodoxy."[29] Yet, it has in fact become an enduring and normative standard in the LCMS for judging issues of doctrine and practice.[30] Furthermore, the inerrancy of the scriptures, which Franz Pieper defined in the "Brief Statement" as "the infallible truth, also in those parts which treat of historical, geographical, and other secular matters," remains a doctrine that Missouri continues to defend zealously.[31] More recently, the Synod in convention has sought to affirm this same document's stated position on God's creation as occurring "in the manner and in the space of time recorded in . . . Gen. 1 and 2, namely by His almighty creative word, and in six days."[32]

In addition, the Seminex crisis appears to have prompted an echo of the penchant of Walther, especially in the late nineteenth-century controversy over predestination, to leave no room for any middle ground with respect to controverted theological issues. At various points in the trauma of the 1970s that focused the Synod's attention on the St. Louis seminary, all attempts at reaching a compromise, first on the part of seminary President John Tietjen in 1972 and then by the Synod's Council of Presidents later that same year, as well as by peacemakers along the way who spoke for some of the Synod's more evangelical clergy, were either ignored or rejected by President Preus.[33] Consequently, the New Orleans Convention of 1973 not only adopted his Statement, which rejected the use of historical-critical tools of biblical interpretation, even when their insights were kept within the boundaries of the Lutheran view of scripture as the Word of God and the Synod's commitment to the Lutheran Confessions. It also declared faculty members of one of its own seminaries to be false teachers.[34]

Martin Franzmann, a well-known and respected biblical scholar within the LCMS and former St. Louis seminary faculty member, received a similar response at a Theological Convocation on the St. Louis Concordia Seminary campus in 1975 when he tried to argue that if we "decide to be unhistorical and uncritical" in interpreting scripture, "the living word of God will rise up and make damned

fools of us all."[35] Franzmann died less than a year later, deeply disappointed by his failure to bring the opposing parties in his beloved Synod back together. The work of a Preus-appointed "Advisory Committee on Doctrine and Conciliation," made up of an equal number of conservative and moderate representatives, came to similar dead end in 1976.[36] The 1977 Dallas convention of the Synod then terminated such discussions by officially voicing its disapproval of the historical-critical method for studying the Bible.[37] Writing from a post-Seminex perspective, one current professor at the Synod's Ft. Wayne Seminary has observed that "many of the Seminex faculty wanted to make it clear that whatever their theology was, it was not that of the Missouri Synod."[38]

Furthermore, the Seminex crisis changed the trajectory of the twentieth-century drive for Lutheran unity in North America. This second trauma not only reversed the course the LCMS was taking prior to 1970, but also appears to have strengthened its historic commitment to Walther's principle of no union without complete unity in doctrine and practice. Particularly alarming for the LCMS, therefore, were the ecumenical ventures of the new ELCA, particularly its declarations of full communion with non-Lutheran church bodies, such as the Presbyterian Church USA, the United Church of Christ, and the Reformed Church in America in 1997, followed by its adoption of the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification* with the Roman Catholic Church. In response, the 1998 LCMS Convention in Milwaukee adopted a resolution "To Express Deep Regret and Profound Disagreement with ELCA Actions," and at its 2001 Convention in St. Louis, the majority of the delegates stated that "we cannot consider them [the ELCA] to be an orthodox Lutheran church body."[39] In 2009 the ELCA's Assembly decided to endorse the ordination of same-sex partners living in monogamous relationships and then in 2010, at the LCMS Houston Convention, delegates chose the more conservative candidate Matthew Harrison instead of the incumbent Synod president, Gerald Kieschnick. LCMS relations with the ELCA had reached a breaking point, even in joint efforts in external matters, such as social welfare and disaster relief.

Today, the LCMS sees itself as the authentically confessional Lutheran church in the United States. On the basis of insisting that

the Lord's Supper is a "profession of unity in [its] confession of faith," the Synod, during the decades since the Seminex crisis and the advent of the ELCA, has repeatedly affirmed and sought ways to define more restrictively its practice of "Close[d] Communion."[40] Looking back at Missouri's declaration of altar and pulpit fellowship with the ALC in 1969, moreover, one LCMS historian, writing from a post-Seminex viewpoint, sees this ecumenical endeavor as a clear violation of Missouri's historic commitment to no union without unity in doctrine and practice, one that was confirmed already in 1970, when the ALC ordained its first female pastor.[41] At the same time, like Walther, the LCMS continues to work toward unity based on its own uncompromising terms with other Lutheran Christians. In this regard, it has turned the bulk of its attention to establishing and preserving fellowship ties with developing and dissenting but confessing Lutheran bodies on the international scene, as well as to exploring the possibility of re-establishing the relationships it once enjoyed with members of the Synodical Conference, particularly the Wisconsin Synod.[42]

Seminex in its Cultural Setting

An under-appreciated feature of the Seminex crisis in the LCMS is the tumultuous social context of the late 1960s that shook the pillars of every American institution, including church-related colleges and seminaries, and the resulting backlash that started to become more apparent during the 1970s. The civil rights movement, the sexual and feminist revolutions, and the unpopularity of the Vietnam War were the chief issues on which people everywhere were voicing opposing opinions. Kathryn Galchutt points out that when a 1963 *Lutheran Witness* article stated that it was "morally wrong" to oppose integration because integration was "morally right," it provoked many critical responses in the form of letters and requests to cancel subscriptions.[43] After the passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965, the riots that erupted in the Watts section of Los Angeles and Detroit as well as in many more cities following the assassination of Martin Luther King in 1968, along with the threat of violence posed by the rise of the Black Power movement among African Americans, the

political winds began to shift in favor of social conservatives. LCMS historian David Settje, in his book on *Lutherans and the Longest War*, highlights the fracturing of the Cold War consensus in support of a containment foreign policy to counter the spread of Communism on the part of the Soviet Union and Red China. A division of opinion, also within church bodies, marked America's military involvement in the Vietnam War. Some Lutherans feared losing another country to these aggressive and atheistic enemies. They also believed that all Americans should support their government when it was waging war. But others were convinced that the conflict was primarily a civil war between North and South Vietnam that was unnecessarily costing the lives of thousands of American military personnel, many of whom were being drafted and sent to the front lines of battle. They also believed they had every right to voice their opposition to the war through various forms of public protest.[44] The anti-war movement that often manifested itself on college campuses, sometimes violently in places like Kent State University, also reared its head at the St. Louis seminary. It took the form of a moratorium on classes for students and faculty in 1969 and a day of Theological Reflection on issues of war and peace in 1970. LCMS historian Lawrence Rast has in fact linked these ways of expressing opposition to the Vietnam War at the St. Louis seminary with the Walkout decision of the students and faculty in 1974 to protest the removal of Seminary President John Tietjen, and he has labeled the Seminex crisis it created as an unwise "immersion" in a "cultural upheaval."[45]

Similarly, James Burkee, in his 2011 book on *Power, Politics, and the Missouri Synod*, directs our attention to this same cultural context by highlighting the diversity of motives among the conservatives who succeeded in electing President Preus in 1969 and in taking the reins of power on the governing boards of the Synod. According to this historian of the LCMS, there were indeed theological conservatives like Jack Preus and his brother Robert who wanted to preserve the inerrancy of scripture and other traditional aspects of the Synod's brand of Lutheran orthodoxy. But there were also social conservatives like the influential layman Chet Swanson for whom the battle was primarily against the political forms of liberalism that he believed were altering the terrain of American society. For still

others, it was a combination of these same motives. *Christian News* editor Herman Otten was not only seeking to combat the inroads of modern biblical scholarship he had personally witnessed in seminary professors like Martin Scharlemann. It was also his frequently stated conviction that any civil-rights activist who supported the work of Martin Luther King was a communist. What kept these conservatives together, says Burkee, was the "war against Concordia Seminary," which in their eyes had become a bastion of theological and political liberalism.[46]

For this reason, I see the Seminex crisis in the LCMS as a trauma that has also resulted in a regressive shift in its post-war posture toward America's culture, one in which features of the "Christ-against-culture" profile once again became evident. James Burkee has argued that this pivotal moment in its history was a hard-fought victory not simply for the theological conservatives but also for the social conservatives in the Synod. To them, the addressing of civil rights, hunger, poverty, affordable housing, and other such social-justice issues, was a form of activism akin to what the Social Gospel movement had advocated in American Protestantism. Hence, in looking back, they also began to find fault with the Mission Affirmations that the Synod had adopted in 1965, particularly with the notion that "the church is God's mission to the whole man" and to "the whole society."[47] Already in Article III of his Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles, President Preus had fired an opening shot across the bow of the Mission Affirmations by stating that the "primary mission of the church" was to "witness to Jesus Christ through the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments," and that "[w]e therefore reject any views of the mission of the church which imply that an adequate or complete witness to Jesus Christ can be made without proclaiming or verbalizing the Gospel."[48] With a conservative majority in control of the Synod's Board for Missions following the 1973 Orleans Convention, moreover, the Executive Secretary for Missions, William Kohn, found it necessary to resign in 1974; by 1975, most of his other key staff members had either quit or been fired.[49] As a result of these changes, the LCMS in its subsequent conventions stopped considering the more progressive social justice issues it had been willing to address for the previous two decades.

Reversals of LCMS Attitudes Toward Culture

After the traumatic experience of Seminex, the LCMS has tended to identify itself instead with features of the cultural backlash in American society that was gaining momentum during the decades following the tumultuous 1960s. "Aftershocks" is the term that Robert D. Putnam and David E. Campbell use in their groundbreaking study in 2012 entitled *American Grace: How Religion Divides and Unites Us.* While the causes were many, what they perceived to be at the core of the reaction was "concern over collapsing sexual morality." They point to two issues in particular. First, what provided a focal point as early as 1973 was the U.S. Supreme Court's landmark *Roe v. Wade* decision. "Abortion," they concluded, "stands in for a bundle of beliefs that, grouped together, can be called moral traditionalism."[50] Already in 1971, at its Milwaukee Convention, the LCMS plainly declared that "willful abortion" is "contrary to the will of God," and at succeeding church-wide assemblies, it passed seventeen additional resolutions affirming this stated position and allowing the procedure only when the life of the mother was at stake. In 1984, moreover, the CTCR provided the Synod with "Abortion in Perspective," which openly supported the pro-life movement being effectively led at the time by Jean Garton, the wife of an LCMS pastor in New Jersey. Suggestions for congregations and their individual members included discussing the issue from a pro-life perspective in sermons, adult bible study, and Sunday school classes, as well as establishing a neighborhood "Lutherans for Life" chapter. In 1995, moreover, the CTCR in its report on the "Lutheran View of Church and State," stated that making all other human needs "equally important" amounted to an "evasion of the prioritizing that human life . . . requires."[51] While the Synod carefully avoided becoming politically partisan, its stance on this social issue clearly influenced the voting patterns of LCMS clergy and laity alike in favor of the pro-life Republican Party.

The second "aftershock" identified by Putnam and Campbell occurred in the 1990s when homosexuality became a divisive social issue within America's churches. It occurred in view of the growing number of "nones" (no religious identity) who saw churches as "judgmental, homophobic, hypocritical, and too political." Therefore,

according to Putnam and Campbell, the conservative evangelical Protestants, who had provided considerable momentum for the cultural backlash of the 1970s and 80s, were now left with the choice of either seeking to accommodate people of all sexual preferences or becoming a "righteous remnant" for the sake of preserving their commitment to "moral traditionalism."[52] For the LCMS, in contrast to the ELCA as well as other progressive Protestant church bodies, the choice has become the latter. Since the 1990s, the LCMS has in fact doubled down on the theological position it took at the New Orleans Convention in 1973: that homosexual behavior is intrinsically sinful, that homosexual orientation is profoundly unnatural, and for this reason cannot be used to excuse such behavior.[53] In contrast to the ELCA, the Synod has also categorically rejected same-sex unions on the basis of the scriptural teaching that marriage is a lifelong union of one man and one woman.[54] By becoming obsessed in their publicity and polity with these same sexual and gender-related issues, both of these Lutheran church bodies are perhaps equally guilty of ignoring other pressing social issues, such as the growing economic disparity in society between the "haves" and the "have-nots," immigration, and gun violence.

Applications of the Christ Against Culture Paradigm

As a result of the trauma of Seminex, the LCMS has in my view returned to its earlier, self-protective "Christ-against-culture" set of social attitudes. In his critique of this type of church body, H. Richard Niebuhr expressed agreement with those who "accuse its representatives of legalism" and "of neglecting the significance of grace in Christian life and thought."[55] With regard to its repeated declarations about abortion and homosexuality, Missouri has leaned heavily on the law set forth in the biblical condemnations of them. In 1979, it even asserted that the tragic necessity of saving the mother's life does not constitute approval of performing an abortion in certain circumstances. The gospel of God's grace is seen as a motivation for addressing both of these social issues and for extending care, love, and forgiveness to those who penitently recognize the sinfulness of their actions.[56] On the other hand, such grace, with its attending promise of God's forgiveness, does not appear to play any distinctive role as such

persons wrestle with the real-life, and often complex, decisions they may be facing and need to make. The point is also one over which the ELCA, with its commitment to engaging rather than attacking the contemporary world, has parted company with the LCMS. At the same time, cultural accommodation, for which Niebuhr criticized liberal the "Christ-of-culture" church types, is not without its own set of theological perils.[57] For Lutherans who have made the gospel of God's grace their exclusive source of authority, it can take anyone into the realm of antinomianism.

In his evaluation of Christ-against-culture church types, Niebuhr also pointed to their often-unrecognized inability to escape from their cultural surroundings. He insisted that everyone is a person "who has become human in a culture," and that everyone remains a person "into whom the culture has penetrated."[58] This cultural reality is one I see in the post-Seminex LCMS, particularly with regard to two social issues with which it has continued to struggle. The first is the role of women in the life of the church. The women's revolution of the 1960s posed a significant challenge for members of the LCMS who, like their nineteenth century immigrant forbears, viewed their place through the hierarchical lens of the biblical "orders of creation" and as primarily in the home. This "second wave of feminism," on the other hand, called for equal rights on many fronts, including higher education, professional and employment opportunities, serving in elected and appointed offices, as well as in church and in family life. In dealing with the decision to ordain women to the pastoral office, the LCA and the ALC chose to open this door of opportunity. In the LCMS of the early 1970s, now in the hands of a socially as well as theologically conservative leadership, that door remained closed. Vigorous opposition to the ordination of women already became evident as a subtext within the conflict over scriptural authority at the St. Louis seminary. In the section devoted to "The Infallibility of Scripture" of his Statement on Scriptural and Confessional Principles, President Preus parenthetically asserted that "we reject" the view "[t]hat the Biblical authors accommodated themselves to using and repeating as true erroneous notions of their day (for example that Paul's statements on the role of women in the church are not binding today because are the culturally conditioned result of the apostle's sharing the views of contemporary

Judaism as a child of his time)."[59] The fifty years of history since Seminex, moreover, appear to have only reinforced this same tendency to connect use of the historical-critical tools in interpreting biblical texts on the part of St. Louis faculty members with the issue of women's ordination.[60]

At the same time, Niebuhr's emphasis on the inescapability of a culture's influence remains just as apparent in the ongoing struggle within the post-Seminex LCMS over other forms of service for women in their congregations. While the women's revolution of the 1960s did not succeed in adding an Equal Rights Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, women still continued to assume more prominent roles in almost all areas of American life. For this reason, there were women in the LCMS, including its pro-life champion Jean Garton, who did not question their Synod's opposition to women's ordination, but persistently lobbied for greater opportunities to share their God-given gifts within the life of the church. In response, President Preus, already in 1973, appointed a Task Force on Women, and his successor, Ralph Bohlmann, created a Commission on Women in 1983. Between 1975 and 2004, moreover, Synod conventions adopted four resolutions that called upon its congregations to utilize and to encourage the service of women. LCMS seminaries in St. Louis and Ft. Wayne also established programs on their respective campuses to train more women to become deaconesses. At the same time, the CTCR issued two reports, one in 1985 on Women in the Church and a second in 1994 on The Service of Women in the Church. In 2004, the St. Louis Synod convention affirmed the CTCR report of 1994, which allowed women to serve in any congregational lay office, including that of president and elder, as long as they did not become involved in any of the functions "peculiar to the pastoral office" (preaching, presiding at Communion, public absolution, leading worship).[61] Strong dissent to these changes, however, was signaled by delegates who formed a line at the convention rostrum in order to file their negative votes with the Synod Secretary. Since then, the service of women has in fact remained an unresolved source of conflict and division within the LCMS, one that is currently focused on women serving not only as congregational elders, but also as lay readers in worship services and as assistants in the distribution of Holy Communion.[62]

A second social issue with which I see the LCMS continuing to struggle as a result of its return to a post-Seminex Christ-against-culture posture involves the role of its African American and other non-White ethnic groups in the shaping of its mission and ministry. In 1905, the Synod helped establish a separate Immanuel Lutheran College in Greensboro, North Carolina, for the training of Black pastors and teachers, and in 1922, a historic Black college in Selma, Alabama. In this segregated cultural context, African Americans who desired to enroll at the LCMS seminary in St. Louis or Springfield (now Ft. Wayne), found it difficult, if not impossible, to cross the color line. Kathryn Galchutt cites the case during the 1940s of Samuel Hoard, an African American member of Andrew Schulze's congregation in St. Louis, for whom admission was a lengthy uphill battle.[63] In general, African Americans were (and still are) being assimilated rather than integrated into a nearly all-White LCMS. The Synod's own CTCR pointed to this in its report on *Racism and the Church* in 1994, stating that whereas assimilation calls for "the disappearance of all former cultural differences" on the part of the newer racial or ethnic groups, integration implies the opposite and works toward equity for such groups with respect to "institutional participation and decision-making."[64] Between 1971 and 2007, seven conventions of the LCMS adopted resolutions addressing every form of racism as a sin that is condemned by the Word of God.[65] Nevertheless, integration rather than assimilation of African Americans, as well as an increasing number of other non-White and chiefly immigrant ethnic groups, remains a process in which the Synod has been reluctant to engage.

One telling example of this reluctance is the refusal of the LCMS in 1998 to publish *This Far By Faith*, a supplemental resource for African Americans that contained hymns, spirituals, and liturgies that reflect their cultural heritage in worship. The project was one of the few at the time in which the LCMS and the ELCA were willing to partner with each other. In view of theological concerns raised by some LCMS clergy, however, these Lutheran church bodies ended up parting company, and it was the ELCA's Fortress Press that finally agreed to publish *This Far By Faith*.[66] In 2015, moreover, the LCMS produced and distributed to its members a forty-two minute documentary film entitled "The First Rosa." It featured the story of Rosa

Young (1890–1971), a Black Lutheran educator and missionary who founded numerous schools and churches in segregated Alabama during the early decades of the twentieth century. While the film presented her as a courageous "confessor" of the LCMS brand of Lutheran orthodoxy who sparked a "spiritual" revolution among African Americans, it made no mention of the fact that unlike the second Rosa (Parks), this first Rosa did not support their physical integration into the mainstream of American life during the civil-rights era.[67] In its more recent anti-"woke" rhetoric and its sweeping condemnations of Critical Race Theory, the LCMS also appears to remain reluctant to consider the unique perspective that African Americans bring to any conversations about race from outside as well as within its congregations.[68] The reasons for the ongoing struggle within the LCMS to integrate its multi-cultural members, and thereby to enrich and to expand the scope of its mission and ministry, are no doubt in need of further exploration. But operative in the minds of at least some of its church workers of color is the Synod's self-protective fear of diluting the purity of its brand of Lutheran orthodoxy and orthopraxy.[69]

Concluding Observations

In conclusion, it is my conviction that in order to understand the LCMS, one must consider the entirety of its history. The story is marked by two traumatic moments with long-lasting effects upon its life as a Lutheran church body, one in 1839, the year its Saxon immigrant forebears arrived in Missouri, and the other during the 1970s at its St. Louis seminary. I have sought to demonstrate that the effects of the Stephan crisis were reinforced by the Seminex crisis that shook the Synod more than a century later. There are good reasons to commend the LCMS for preserving key theological features of its Reformation heritage. At same time, its indisputable brand of Lutheran doctrine and practice, in which its Saxon forebears first found refuge following the traumatic exposure of an immoral and domineering bishop, has continued to shape both its internal and its external relationships. In the case of Seminex, the internal outcome was schism. With respect to twentieth-century efforts to achieve

greater cooperation and unity among Lutherans in America, the LCMS has chosen to remain on the sidelines and thus to perpetuate its self-isolation from most of its other denominational family members.

At several points in its history, several of the most respected LCMS leaders have called attention to the dangers connected with its passion for unity based upon complete agreement in doctrine and practice. Among the earliest was Friedrich Wyneken. "'Proud Missouri' is not an unusual expression among our opponents," he observed in 1860. "We must also give them credit that they have diligently applied themselves to show us the bounds of humility."[70] A more incisive critic was Theodore Graebner, an esteemed St. Louis seminary professor during the first half of the twentieth century; as the editor of the *Lutheran Witness* magazine, he served as one of the Synod's staunchest apologists. In 1945, however, Graebner chose to sign the Statement of the 44, and two years before his death in 1950, penned some of his final thoughts in an essay entitled "The Burden of Infallibility." Here he stated that because the Synod in its theological discussions had tended almost exclusively to invoke what it had said in the past, it could not reckon with the fact that circumstances and persons might be subject to change. Nor could it admit to past errors or give a fair hearing to new ideas. In his estimation, the infallibility of what had been said in the past had become a heavy burden, one that prevented the Synod from looking at the scriptures with fresh eyes.[71] The relevance of Graebner's final words in today's LCMS is most clearly evident in the recent refusal of its editors to repudiate Walther's myopic biblically based justification of chattel slavery in America as "intrinsically in contradiction to the Christian faith."[72]

I have also argued that as a result of the second and reinforcing trauma of the Seminex crisis, the LCMS has returned the "Christ-against-culture" stance it had taken following the Stephan crisis at the outset of its history. Since the 1970s, the Synod appears to have done an about-face with regard to the issues of social justice that it had begun to address during the decades following World War II and had chosen to validate with the adoption of the Mission Affirmations in its Detroit Convention of 1965. Instead, the post-Seminex

LCMS has joined forces with other social conservatives seeking to halt the assault on "moral traditionalism" they perceived in the radically liberal revolutions of the 1960s and early 1970s. Hence, the bulk of its attention has been repeatedly focused on the issues of abortion and homosexuality. Once again, the LCMS has found it necessary to distance itself from the Social Gospel movement in American Protestantism. In fact, the rejection of "any views of the mission of the church which imply that an adequate or complete witness to Jesus Christ can be made without proclaiming or verbalizing the Gospel" that President Preus had already set forth in his Statement of 1972, as he did battle with the St. Louis seminary faculty majority, continues to govern the Synod's mode of operation beyond its own congregations in the realm of human care.[73]

Like other "Christ-against-culture" church types, the twenty-first-century LCMS has increasingly come to see itself as a Lutheran church body under siege in the midst of a hostile American environment. In his President's Report to the Milwaukee Convention in 2023, Matthew Harrison, for example, suggested that the Synod is currently at a moment similar to that of Martin Luther in 1521, when he was compelled at the Diet of Worms to confess, "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise." The reason he gave is his belief that with sexuality issues in particular, the "world" is determined "with the greatest intensity" to oppose "conscience and natural knowledge of God, not to mention divine revelation, and thus the teaching of the historical church." Hence, Harrison implored the Synod's members, like Luther, to give "bold witness" to their faith in the contexts of family, congregation, and community.[74]

In view of the reemergence of this same trend in the LCMS, I have attempted to apply two of H. Richard Niebuhr's critiques of this approach to the world on the part of the church. In order to preserve its members from worldly contamination, the LCMS has tended to lean upon various forms of legalism more heavily than the gospel. While the faculty majority at the St. Louis seminary was condemned in 1973 for making the gospel rather than the scriptures its normative authority (gospel reductionism), the post-Seminex LCMS appears to have conflated the gospel of God's grace with some of its own theological positions, such as those set forth in the Brief

Statement (1932) and "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" (1972), which also enable the Synod to differentiate itself from others within as well as outside of its ecclesiastical fold. Resolution 4-07 adopted at the 2023 Milwaukee Convention that calls upon the Synod to recognize the fiftieth anniversary of the Walkout at the St. Louis seminary is in fact entitled "To Give Thanks for Preservation of the *Gospel* [emphasis mine] in The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod." I have also found historical evidence of Niebuhr's observation that churches that fit this same mold cannot escape the culture against which they claim to stand in opposition. In this regard, I have pointed to the inability of the LCMS throughout the course of its history to resolve the issue of the role of women in any context beyond the home and family, and more recently in its struggle to integrate members with African American and other multi-ethnic backgrounds.

Secular as well as religious historians tend to emphasize the necessity of honestly recognizing not just the triumphal moments in one's past, but also the tragic ones and the festering features of their legacies. They also stress that for any entity to free itself of such elements in its past and to move forward into a more favorable future, it needs to grieve them rather than seek to justify the harm it has inflicted upon itself and others over the course of this part of its history. Otherwise, nothing is likely to change. In the case of the LCMS, a denomination that continues to struggle with unresolved issues in the midst of an accelerating decline in membership, any anniversary-motivated study of its past might well include a penitent re-examination of the traumatic effects of the Seminex crisis of the 1970s upon its current state of affairs, which also resemble and reinforce those of the Stephan crisis that preceded it in 1839, when its Saxon forebears arrived in Missouri.

Resolution 4-07 adopted by the Synod's Milwaukee Convention does in fact provide a glimmer of hope that this might occur in light of the fiftieth anniversary of one of the darkest days in its history, where it states "that we commit ourselves to a life of repentance 'with all humility and gentleness, with patience, bearing with one another in love, eager to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace' (Eph. 4:2–3)."[75] Unless this commitment amounts to nothing

more than "virtue-signaling" to its members, I believe it may in fact challenge the LCMS also to recognize the tragic features of its historical legacy, to shed the heavy "burden of infallibility" that it continues to carry, particularly with regard to doctrinal statements that leaders like Walther, Pieper, and Preus made in its past, and to find a new and liberating path forward as a Lutheran church body in twenty-first century America.

NOTES

1. Proceedings of the 2023 (68th) LCMS Convention (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2023), 139.

2. Jon Diefenthaler, "Missouri's Twin Traumas: I. The Stephan Crisis," *Lutheran Quarterly* 39 (2025): 21–42.

3. Lawrence B. Meyer, *Missouri in Motion* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1972).

4. Meyer, *Missouri in Motion*, 16–17.

5. Meyer, *Missouri in Motion*, 50–52.

6. For an example of the post-Seminex revisionist approach to the post-World War II history of the LCMS, see Ken Schurb, ed., *Rediscovering the Issues Surrounding the 1974 Concordia Seminary Walkout* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2023).

7. For the text of "A Statement: Chicago, Nineteen Forty Five," see Mary Todd, *Authority Vested: A Story of Identity and Change in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000), 291–294.

8. See Schurb, *Rediscovering the Issues;* also Mark E. Braun, *A Tale of Two Synods: Events That Led to the Split between Wisconsin and Missouri* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 2003).

9. An unpublished copy of the Scharlemann paper at the library of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, was shared with this writer.

10. Oscar E. Feucht, *Everyone a Minister* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1974).

11. Kathryn M. Galchutt, *The Career of Andrew Schulze, 1924–1965: Lutherans and Race in the Civil Rights Era* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2005).

12. Thomas Coates and Erwin L. Lueker, "Four Decades of Expansion," in Carl S. Meyer, ed., *Moving Frontiers: Readings in the History of the Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1964), 405–406; Meyer, *Missouri in Motion*, 34.

13. "Missions and Evangelism," in August R. Suelflow, ed., *Heritage in Motion: Readings in the History of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, 1962–1995* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1998), 323–325.

14. Meyer, *Missouri in Motion*, 49.

15. Coates and Lueker, "Four Decades of Expansion," in C.S. Meyer, *Moving Frontiers*, 434.

16. "Missions and Evangelism," in Suelflow, *Heritage in Motion,* 324.

17. Roy S. Askins, "The Mission Staff Walkout," in *Rediscovering the Issues*, 141.

18. "Missions and Evangelism," in Suelflow, *Heritage in Motion*, 323.

19. James C. Burkee, *Power, Politics, and the Missouri Synod* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011), 75–94.

20. J.A.O. Preus, *Report of the Synodical President to The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod* (Blue Book), September 1, 1972.

21. John H. Tietjen, *Fact Finding or Fault Finding? An Analysis of President J.A.O Preus' Investigation of Concordia Seminary*, September 8, 1972.

22. *Faithful To Our Calling, Faithful To Our Lord: An Affirmation in Two Parts by The Faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri,* Part I: "A Witness to Our Faith," Part II: "I Believe: Personal Confessions of Faith and Discussion of Issues," November, 1972.

23. *A Comparative Study of Varying Contemporary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation*, A Report of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations, The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, March, 1973.

24. Burkee, *Power, Politics, and the Missouri Synod*, 143–144.

25. Burkee, *Power, Politics, and the Missouri Synod,* 144–147.

26. David O. Berger, ed., *Seminex in Print* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2021), 12–13.

27. Berger, *Seminex in Print*, 13–14; *Wikipedia* on AELC.

28. "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles," in *This We Believe: Selected Topics of Faith and Practice in the The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod* (np, 2009), 75–81.

29. Ralph A. Bohlmann, *Study Edition of A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles*," November, 1972, 5. Bohlmann quotes the words of President Preus.

30. See Schurb, *Rediscovering the Issues*, 56, 89, 92, 94, 103–104, 141, 184, 235.

31. "Brief Statement," in *This We Believe*, 60–61.

32. "Brief Statement", in *This We Believe*, 60–61; "Convention Confesses: 'God Created the world in six natural days'," *Lutheran Witness Reporter* (July 24, 2019); 2023 Convention Proceedings, 235.

33. Berger, *Seminex in Print*, 11–12.

34. "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles," in *This We Believe*, 80–81.

35. Martin H. Franzmann, "Historical-Critical Method," in *The Nature and Function of Holy Scripture: Theological Convocation. Concordia Seminary St. Louis, Missouri, April 14–18, 1975*, 16.

36. *Report of the Advisory Committee on Doctrine and Conciliation*, February, 1976.

37. Schurb, *Rediscovering the Issues*, 13.

38. John T. Pless, "After the Walkout: Publications by the Faculty of Seminex," in *Rediscovering the Issues*, 258.

39. "Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, LCMS Relationship to," in *This We Believe*, 21–22.

40. "Lord's Supper, Admission to the," in *This We Believe*, 35–36; *2023 Convention Proceedings*, 153–155.

41. Cameron A. MacKenzie, "Seminex Fallout: Doing and Undoing Church Fellowship with the ALC," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 88 (2024), 203–228.

42. See *2023 Convention Proceedings*, 36–37.

43. Galchutt, *The Career of Andrew Schulze, 1924–1965*.

44. David E. Settje, *Lutherans and the Longest War: Adrift on a Sea of Doubt about the Cold and Vietnam Wars* (Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books, 2007).

45. Lawrence R. Rast, Jr, "Forty Years After Seminex: Reflections on Social and Theological Factors Leading to the Walkout," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 80 (2016), 195–215.

46. Burkee, *Power, Politics, and the Missouri Synod*, 14–15, 58-59, 126–130.

47. Burkee, *Power, Politics, and the Missouri Synod*, 57–94.

48. Article III "Mission of the Church" of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles," in *This We Believe*, 75.

49. Burkee, *Power, Politics, and the Missouri Synod*, 122–123.

50. Robert D. Putnam and David E. Campbell, *American Grace: How Religion Divides and Unites Us* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2012), 116–117, 388–396.

51. Matthew E. Borrasso, "Law, Gospel, and Life in the World: An Exploration of the Practical Effects of Lutheran Hermeneutics in the LCMS and ELCA Regarding Issues of Human Sexuality," PhD diss. (University of Birmingham [U.K.], 2023), 204.

52. Putnam and Campbell, *American Grace,* 120–133.

53. "Homosexual Behavior," in *This We Believe*, 27.

54. "Same-Sex Unions," in *This We Believe*, 49.

55. H. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (New York: Harper and Row, 1951), 79.

56. "Abortion," and "Homosexual Behavior," in *This We Believe,* 1, 27.

57. Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture*, 83–115.

58. Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture,* 69–71.

59. "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles," in *This We Believe*, 78.

60. John C. Wohlrabe Jr., "Church and Ministry," in Schurb, *Rediscovering the* Issues, 231–233.

61. "Women in the Church, Service of," in *This We Believe,* 56.

62. "Women Serving Holy Communion," in *This We Believe*, 57.

63. Galchutt, *The Career of Andrew Schulze, 1924–1965*, 106–108.

64. *Racism and the Church*, Report of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations, February, 1994, 31.

65. "Racism," in *This We Believe*, 48.

66. Interview of John Arthur Nunes, May 3, 2024.

67. *The First Rosa: Teacher, Confessor, Church Planter* (LCMS film production, 2015); Galchutt, *The Career of Andrew Schulze, 1924–1965*, 162, 168. In 1961, Young stated in response to an open letter, "Integration is not the salvation of the world."

68. Matthew E. Borrasso, "The Boogeyman in the Belfry: An Appraisal and Apology of Critical Race Theory," *Lutheran Forum* (Summer, 2022), 35–41.

69. Interview of Gerard Bolling, April 18, 2023.

70. C.S. Meyer, "The Missouri Synod and Other Lutherans Before 1918," in Meyer, *Moving Frontiers*, 253.

71. Theodore Graebner, "The Burden of Infallibility," *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly* 37 (July, 1965), 91–94.

72. Roy S. Askins, "Slaves of Righteousness," *Lutheran Witness* (October, 2023), 16–17; email from the Book Editor of the *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*, John C. Wohlrabe Jr., to this writer regarding Walther on slavery, January 19, 2020.

73. Roy S. Askins, "The Mission Staff Walkout," in *Rediscovering the Issues*, 141–142.

74. *2023 Convention Proceedings*, 69–73.

75. *2023 Convention Proceedings*, 139.