HERESY VS. ORTHODOXY: THE
PREUS/TIETJEN CONTROVERSY

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

Melody R. Barnhart, B. S.
Denton, Texas
August, 1991
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Heresy is quite a volatile term, even as a rhetorical concept. The definition of an "heretical" belief or act by a group of the "orthodox" is capable of endangering careers and changing the focus of individual lives. "Heresy" restructures the foundations of scientific theory, governments, or, as in the focus of this research effort, a Christian denomination, specifically the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod in 1972.

In the ancient Christian church, believer battled believer over the question of whether Jesus of Nazareth was more human than divine or more divine than human. In the Middle Ages, the scientific community and the Church struggled over the issue of whether the earth revolved around the sun. During the height of the Cold War, Senator Joseph McCarthy asked if hundreds of Americans deserved the title "American".

In the present study, the discourse of controversy within the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod will be looked at with an eye on the similarities and differences between this controversy and similar ones. The controversy within the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod will be analyzed as a
rhetorical conflict, because the emphasis here is on how discourse shapes perceptions of right belief and community boundaries. The conflict between the two discourse communities, represented by Preus and Tietjen, is an example of the epistemic function of rhetoric and conforms to the stages of heretical conflict projected by Kurtz and Lessl. The goal in pursuing this line of rhetorical criticism is both to illuminate the specific controversy and to add to the body of rhetorical theory on how discourse defines community.

In September of 1972, Dr. Jacob A. O. Preus Sr. released to approximately six thousand parishes the Report Of The Synodical President (Preus personal interview). Dr. Preus was for twelve years president of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, one of the largest Christian denominations in the United States (Adams 5). For the previous two decades the Synod had grappled with questions of doctrinal purity, but the question Preus dealt with in this report was of more urgent concern to the Synod: Were the instructors of Concordia St. Louis, the Synod’s largest seminary, teaching the tenets of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, or were their teachings in violation of these tenets?

This controversy was of major significance to this denomination because one of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod’s most staunchly held beliefs is in the historical infallibility of the Old and New Testaments "as the written Word of God" (Handbook 9). This controversy also was of
wider significance to other communities, for the Watergate investigation was occurring at the time this controversy peaked. Some scholars saw parallels between the two events. Christian Century writer Dr. Robert Jewett observed that these parallels included "the absence of due process and the kind of zealousness which leads to the misuse of political power" (Jewett 336).

The Preus/Tietjen controversy (as it shall be referred to in this research effort) was closely examined at the time it occurred by the larger religious community and the secular world as well, primarily for two reasons. First, the debate concerned the issue of academic freedom---whether or not professors were entitled to teach using the method deemed acceptable by each professor, or whether professors must defer to the requirements of their school. In the foreword to the handbook of The American Association of University Professors, readers are informed that "Since there is no central law-defining authority which has the power to state and administer uniform national standards", this issue is addressed and dealt with by this association (Joughin vi). Second, the larger religious community observed this controversy with some interest because, if belief in a literally infallible Bible were seen to be a tenet of the Christian faith, then the manner in which churches would persuade individuals to become Christians would be somewhat different than if the Old and New Testaments were open to
individual interpretation (Jewett 336). A God who inspires humans to allegory requires a much smaller "leap of faith" than a God of miracles, signs, and wonders. The question in the issue of Biblical inerrancy is, then, the question of how to define the Person of God.

One means of determining whether the seminary taught the tenets of the Missouri Synod was to establish a definition of the theological position of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. Dr. Ralph Bohlmann, then executive head of Commission on Theology and Church Relations, prepared for Dr. Preus a document entitled "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles", which was designed to serve as a guideline for the investigation of the faculty (Preus personal interview). This doctrinal statement later was formally adopted in synodical convention as "a formulation which derives its authority from the Word of God and which expresses the Synod's position on current doctrinal issues" (1973 Convention Proceedings 128). The significance of this action was that documents adopted in this manner "are, pursuant to Article II of Synod's constitution, binding on all members" (1973 Convention Proceedings 115). Article II of the Missouri Synod's constitution speaks of the members accepting certain Lutheran doctrinal statements and creeds "without reservation" (Handbook 9).

Dr. John H. Tietjen was president of Concordia Theological Seminary at St. Louis during the time of this
controversy, and during the period when the adoption of this statement was being offered as a possible solution to that controversy. In the course of an official investigation of the faculty by a Fact-Finding Committee, Dr. Tietjen's professional ethics and personal theology were called into question, despite Dr. Tietjen's insistence that no significant doctrinal differences existed between his faculty and the Synod. He further maintained that those differences which had existed had been addressed (Board of Control 43-105).

One of the consequences of the adoption of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" was the ultimate exodus from the Synod on January 21, 1974 of Dr. Tietjen and the faction who supported him. This movement of faculty members and students was an absolutely unprecedented event in the history of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (Board of Control 102). Dr. Tietjen, forty-six faculty members, and over two-thirds of the student body of Concordia St. Louis went on to form a seminary in exile: Seminary in Exile, later shortened to Seminex (Board of Control 100).

Statement Of The Problem

This research effort will explore the ways in which debate within the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod over what is heretical and what is orthodox belief functions to define community boundaries and maintain power. While the concepts of "heresy" and "orthodoxy" usually are associated with
religious discourse, this study will demonstrate the rhetorical dimensions of the process of defining right belief. The argument is made that the social reality of a community is defined by the "heretical" controversy, a process which establishes the boundaries of that community (Andrews 410-412; Berger and Luckmann 156-157).

Rhetorically speaking, departing from "sacred texts" is one way of detecting heresy. Hence, the occasional "heretical" controversy may be necessary in order to define or maintain the identity of a community and/or to maintain power within a particular community (Berger and Luckmann 127-131). These procedures appear to be especially relevant in communities which have an essentially rhetorical base, such as religious, scientific, and governmental communities (Farrell; Littlejohn 111-115; Willard).

This study will explore the process through which public discourse in the Preus/Tietjen controversy serves to define right belief and correct behavior for Lutherans in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod during the period in question. More specifically, following the theoretical work of Lester R. Kurtz in social theory and Thomas Lessl in rhetorical theory, this research project focuses on public conflict over heresy and orthodoxy as a two-sided process through which a community defines who is inside and who is outside the community and its traditions (Kurtz 1085; Lessl 18). This researcher will attempt to answer the question: How
does the Preus/Tietjen controversy function rhetorically to define the boundaries of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod?

In addition, this study plans to explore the related questions: What is the historical course of the conflict in public discourse? Who are the major rhetors? What are the stakes? What are the rhetorical connections between the definition of orthodoxy and power maintenance? In short, what are some of the more salient connections between history and rhetoric in the Preus/Tietjen controversy?

"The Epistle of Paul The Apostle to the Romans" tells Christians that if they confess "the Lord Jesus" with their mouths, and believe in their hearts "that God hath raised Him from the dead", then they shall "be saved" (NT, Rom. 154). It would appear simple enough, therefore, to be an orthodox Christian. This study will examine some of the rhetorical difficulties encountered when a religious community attempts to refine or expand the definition of the terms "Lutheran" and "Baptist".

Since the publication of Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann's book *The Social Construction of Reality* and the seminal essay "On Viewing Rhetoric as Epistemic" by Robert Scott, rhetorical theorists have been fascinated with the role of language in shaping social realities for individuals and discourse communities. Much recent work on this subject has been done by Andrews, Farrell, and others. The thrust of this research is that the language employed by fields,
disciplines, groups and communities defines how members see the world and what they will accept as true.

Heresy is defined in the *Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary* as "an opinion or doctrine contrary to church dogma" (*Webster* 389). Conversely, orthodoxy is defined as "conforming to established doctrine, especially in religion" (*Webster* 596). Bylaw 6.43 of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod constitution states that a tenured faculty member may be removed from their post for "advocacy of false doctrine or failure to honor and uphold the doctrinal position of the Synod . . . " (*Handbook* 108). In this study, the term "heresy" will be used as a rhetorical concept, not as a strict legal label employed by the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. Within the structure of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, heresy is a serious legal accusation which, in cases involving a seminary faculty member, merits the examination of the Board of Regents, the Commission on adjudication, and the advice of the Commission on Theology and Church relations, as well as the judgment of the District President (*Handbook* 127-133).

The primary reason this researcher chose to approach the Preus/Tietjen controversy from the perspective of the social construction of reality is that, according to a key figure in these dramatic events, the definition of heresy continually changes:
Historically, certain things come under controversy at certain times, and then they cease to be matters of conflict. There were things that they argued about in the days of Luther that were very "Lutheran", that we pay no attention to today. (Preus personal interview)

Furthermore, since no formal charges of heresy were filed in this case, a rhetorical rather than a theological or legal study is justified.

Kenneth Gergen's work in "The Social Constructionist Movement in Modern Psychology" tells us that the social construction of reality is based on four assumptions: First, he postulates that society does not reveal itself objectively to the individual, "but is known through human experience, which is largely influenced by language" (Littlejohn 111). Secondly, reality is viewed via language categories which come from the social interaction within a particular group of people at "a particular place" in a "particular time" (Gergen 267). "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" sought to specify the social reality of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod by defining the language categories by which seminary students must be taught. Any deviation from the paths set by these categories as outlined in that doctrinal statement could be heresy, both from a Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod standpoint (since this document was formally adopted by the Synod) as well as from
the standpoint of the church leaders who composed and defended this document (Tietjen personal interview). Third, the conventions of communication in play at the time determine how reality is understood at a given moment. In this instance, the conventions of communication can be defined as group agreement on basic principles. In the Preus/Tietjen controversy, the conventions of communication were being refined by the author of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles". Finally, "socially constructed understandings of reality shape many other important aspects of life" (Littlejohn 112). It is possible that a key element of the Preus Tietjen controversy was the collision of differing social constructions of reality and the power of Synodical hierarchy to define right belief. Since Dr. Preus held the political power to determine or even to redetermine the social reality of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, any opposing view could be seen to be heretical.

The broader concept of the social definition of reality is illuminated in the case of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod by the work of Thomas Lessl in rhetorical theory as well as by the work of Lester R. Kurtz in social theory. Drawing upon Kurtz, Lessl's article "Heresy, Orthodoxy, And The Politics Of Science", provides a set of stages that appear to explain the progress of the Preus/Tietjen controversy (Lessl 18). These stages are: 1) "the
awareness of a heretical presence, at once both near and remote, brings about a state of crisis in an institution" (Lessl 20). In this case, the heretical presence was the teaching method at Concordia, St. Louis. 2) The second stage is the "struggles over authority", in this instance, Dr. Tietjen’s refusal to make the changes deemed necessary by Dr. Preus, Tietjen’s employer (Lessl 20). 3) A third quality of an heretical conflict "is its potential for building solidarity", seen in the Preus/Tietjen controversy when new grassroots organizations sprang up to defend Dr. Tietjen’s actions and the official hierarchy of the Synod responded by drawing even more closely together (Board of Control appendices: Lessl 21). 4) Fourth, "boundary-work" begins, as evidenced by the publication of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles", in an effort to delineate clearly the orthodox from the heretical beliefs and behaviors (Lessl 21). 5) Finally, "the identification and denunciation of heresy is a ritual activity through which anxieties attendant to orthodoxy are relieved" (Lessl 22). The Fact-Finding Committee set up by Preus accomplished much of this activity, with the remainder of this task left to the 1973 Synodical Convention (Proceedings 241-266). The rhetorical processes are, according to Lessl, at work in other institutions as well (Lessl 18-19).
Definitions appear to be a central issue in this controversy. How is academic freedom defined by the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod? According to Dr. Preus, the definition of orthodoxy, academic freedom, even heresy itself is subject to constant change. (Preus personal interview). What then became the correct definitions in this controversy? This research effort is concerned with this question and with an inquiry into the rhetorical causes and consequences of the heretical conflict itself.

Significance Of The Study

"Heretical" discourse appears in many other communities beyond the religious community. Social definition--defining the community--is important for communities which are essentially rhetorical in their scope. Kurtz tells us:

> It is in the heat of escalating conflicts that orthodoxy is formulated, often through explicit disagreement with a position held by 'heretics', sometimes at the expense, and sometimes for the benefit, of the belief system in question. (1090)

The current study is significant because a rhetorical analysis of modern religious controversy has not often been undertaken by scholars (Buursma 62-63). "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" and the controversy surrounding it, though examined by Lutheran seminarians such as James Wilson, has only recently been analyzed by
rhetorical critics and theorists (Wilson; Vickery; Preus personal interview).

This study, moreover, may help to answer an important list of theoretical questions. First of all, why is definition necessary to a community? Secondly, why is definition important in some circumstances and not in others? Also, what are the rhetorical mechanics by which discourse and controversy define a community? Finally, does definition vary from one discourse community to another?

With this last question in mind, two other "heretical" controversies will be examined briefly in chapter five. This researcher will analyze the controversy surrounding B. Stanley Pons and Martin Fleischmann, the scientific research team who released their findings on cold fusion to the media before seeking publication in scientific journals for review by their professional peers. Their action was said to have caused cold fusion's "fall from grace", swelling the "ranks of disbelievers" (Dagani 8). A glance at this scientific controversy will aid in showing how, as Lessl tells us, suppositions which obviously are at work in research yet which elude careful examination "are drawn to the surface in heretical controversies and in the process are more clearly defined for orthodoxy" (Lessl 184).

Another current "heretical" controversy briefly examined in chapter five will be the struggle for political control of the Southern Baptist Convention between internal factions
known as the "fundamentalists" and the "moderates" (Whitley 65-68). This religious controversy bears some striking similarities to the Preus/Tietjen controversy. Some of the same rhetorical processes, such as the function of rhetoric in power maintenance at work in the Preus/Tietjen controversy, may also be at work in this religious controversy, the cold-fusion dispute and other significant contemporary controversies (Lessl 184).

Scope Of The Study

The scope of this study is limited to the period of Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod history from April of 1970 to the formation of Seminex in September of 1974, with the primary focus on the background, publication and consequences of the document "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles". In addition, a brief review will be made of the effects of the release of the cold fusion findings to the public and of the rhetorical consequences of such actions. Finally, this study will take a brief look at the current "heretical" dispute still smoldering in the Southern Baptist Convention primarily involving the delineation of doctrinal boundaries over the issue of Biblical inerrancy. The primary artifacts under review, in addition to "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles", are original transcripts of personal interviews with Dr. Tietjen and Dr. Preus, as well as a personal letter from Dr. Ralph Bohlmann. In addition, relevant archival, historical, and theological
sources that provide a more complete understanding of the context will be scrutinized. For example, students who formed Seminex published several documents that offered their view of the conflict (Board of Control appendices).

Methodology

This study employs the social reality approach to rhetorical criticism, a methodology that Brock and Scott locate within the broader experiential approach (Brock and Scott 135-146). The fundamental assumption of this methodology is that "economic, social, and psychological conditions, if probed, will reveal symbolic systems through which people interact to create these conditions" (Brock and Scott 142). In short, reality may be seen as intersubjective.

The actual research procedures may be divided into three stages. First, this researcher has gathered relevant and significant samples of discourse from rhetors and publications in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod from the period April, 1970 to September, 1974. The best known of these artifacts is the doctrinal statement "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles". These historical materials will be supplemented by original, personal interviews conducted in 1989 with Dr. Preus and Dr. Tietjen, the leading protagonists in the controversy.

In the second stage of the study, this researcher will perform a critical analysis of these documents and
statements. The specific methodology in this stage of the study is drawn from Lessl's theoretical treatise on the heretical conflict. This study will seek to determine how the discourse: (a) brings about a stage of "crisis"; (b) provokes "struggles with authority"; (c) builds "solidarity"; (d) accomplishes "boundary-work"; and (e) relieves anxiety through "ritual activity" (Lessl 20-22).

In the third stage of the application of the social reality method to the research problem, this researcher will compare and contrast the results of the second stage with the results of a critical analysis of the public discourse of the current controversy in the Southern Baptist Convention. At issue in this dispute is Biblical inerrancy, an argument that has led to a faction known as the "fundamentalists" to wrest political control of the denomination from the hands of a group who refer to themselves as the "moderates" (Whitley 65-68). In addition, this stage will also briefly analyze the public discourse of the cold fusion controversy. Pons and Fleischmann, a research team whose early release of their research on cold fusion before peers in the scientific community could review their findings, came under fire as unorthodox and even as "unscientific". These kinds of claims will be examined, with technical assistance from a scientist employed by the research and development branch of a major oil company. The aim in this stage is not only to understand the scientific controversy in technical terms but also to
identify and understand its rhetorical dimensions. In what sense may one say that the cold fusion controversy is similar to the controversy in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod? What are the commonalities between the religious controversies in the Southern Baptist Convention and the Missouri Synod, and how is the recognition of these commonalities rhetorically significant?

Chapter six will conclude with a report of this study’s findings on the main research question: How does discourse that seeks to define right beliefs and correct behaviors serve to define community? Or, in the words of Lessl: How do heresy and orthodoxy interact to form institutional identities?

Review Of Literature

The clearest explanation of what has been called "the social construction of reality" was expressed by Alfred Schutz in his book, On Phenomenology and Social Relations: The world of my daily life is by no means my private world but it is from the outset an intersubjective one, shared with my fellow men, experienced and interpreted by others: in brief, it is a world common to all of us. (163)

It is largely upon this foundation that Berger and Luckmann based their book, The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. Reality for an individual, Berger and Luckmann tell us, has a specific
structure, largely built by virtue of interaction with other individuals. Individuals with similar reality structures will often unite. To avoid the risk of a breakdown in the reality structure of the group, certain reality-maintaining procedures may come into play in times of "crisis" (Berger and Luckmann 156). This explanation is made even more clear in Kenneth Gergen's work on social constructionism.

Many rhetorical theorists have dealt with controversies over heresy, in political as well as in religious discourse. Of specific note is Robert P. Newman's article on the China White Paper of 1949, and his equally interesting examination of "Nixon's Vietnam Speech of November 3, 1969". Theodore Windt presents three differing social realities in "Differing Realities: Three Presidential Attacks on the News Media", but Windt has made another type of contribution in his study of the diatribe. This researcher also will utilize the work of David Zarefsky, who has published research on political vision and its effect on world views. Finally, no review of political rhetoric would be complete without reference to the body of work done by Kathleen Jamieson, most notably in her *Eloquence in an Electronic Age*.

Thomas Lessl's article "Heresy, Orthodoxy, And The Politics Of Science", mentioned previously as the framework of this study, bears some interesting parallels to similar thoughts of philosopher Sidney Hook. Hook's works *Academic Freedom and Academic Anarchy, Education And The Taming of*
Power, and the classic Heresy, Yes--Conspiracy, No offer personal definitions, both of academic freedom and the full effect of the label "heretic".

Thomas Farrell has written on social knowledge and how knowledge relates to rhetorical theory in two articles: "Knowledge, Consensus, and Rhetorical Theory" and "Social Knowledge II". These works will assist this researcher in the evaluation of knowledge as it applies to "orthodox" thought. Charles Arthur Willard discusses the structure of argument and argument fields in his 1983 book Argumentation and the Social Grounds of Knowledge. Finally, two articles presented at the 1990 Speech Communication Association will aid this researcher in analyzing religious and scientific "heretical" conflict: Michael R. Vickery's "The Rhetorical Construction of Heresy in the Scientific and Religious Communities", and "Unity Symbols as Strategy for Acquiescence in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, 1969-1976" by James E. Wilson.

One of the few treatments of heresy in the field of rhetoric is Kenneth Burke's The Rhetoric Of Religion. While the present study is not based on Burke's dramatistic method of analysis, it is worth noting his concept of logology and his central argument that language is symbolic action. In the 1980s even the opponents of the view that rhetoric is epistemic conceded that rhetoric is perspectival (Cherwitz and Hikins 249-266).
In Christianity, creeds have sometimes been used to define heresy and orthodoxy. For a history of Christian doctrinal statements and creeds, *Early Christian Creeds* by J. N. D. Kelly summarizes the documents of several hundred years. One of the more current books on the creation of church councils and the councils' roles in the development of christian creeds is *Creeds In the Making* by Alan Richardson.

Lutheran doctrinal statements, defined in Missouri Synod constitutional Bylaw 1.09 as setting "forth in greater detail the position of the Synod especially in controverted matters", appears to have begun with the "Smalcald Articles" (*Handbook* 21; Kelly 52). These "articles" were written in the early 1500s in the city of Smalcal by Martin Luther (Kelly 52). For the early Lutheran Church, the culmination of these statements was the *Book of Concord*, adopted in 1580. This book contains the creeds which are the foundation of Lutheran theology, and which are ascribed to by all Lutheran Synods to this day (Tappert 5).

Some background for the Preus/Tietjen controversy may be found in the James E. Adams book *Preus Of Missouri and the Great Lutheran Civil War*. This was the only book this researcher found on this subject that was published by a press outside the religious community, and so appears of interest due to the author’s perspective. Dr. Tietjen's perspective can be viewed in his recent book, *Memoirs In Exile*, published by Augsburg, a press within the religious
community. Concordia Historical Institute, the repository of Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod history since 1847, houses over two hundred pages of documentation on the Preus/Tietjen controversy, much of which they generously opened for this research project. For a more personal viewpoint, Dr. Tietjen and Dr. Preus were kind enough to allow this researcher to interview them in regard to this period of their lives. The transcripts of those interviews appear as appendices to this study. Dr. Ralph Bohlmann, author of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" and current president of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, sent a personal letter to this researcher which answers questions significant to this controversy. A copy of this letter also appears as an appendix to this research effort.

The cold fusion controversy is discussed in detail by a scientist who allowed this researcher to interview him regarding the nature of scientific heresy. The transcript of that interview will appear as an appendix to this study. A book dealing with scientific heresies is *Fads And Fallacies In The Name Of Science* by Marvin Gardner. Gardner's term for heretical scientific work is "pseudo-science" (Gardner vii). The definitive treatment of the emergence of scientific theory from an historical standpoint is Thomas Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 
Plan Of The Study

The plan of this study is as follows: chapter two will examine the background of the Preus/Tietjen controversy; chapter three will discuss the conflict itself; chapter four will analyze the document "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" and discuss the various ways in which this document was used; chapter five will discuss similarities between this religious conflict and conflicts in science and other disciplines; and chapter six will present conclusions and make recommendations for further research.
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CHAPTER II
BACKGROUND

The purpose of this chapter is to acquaint the reader with the history of the Lutheran Church as well as with the specific origins of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. To that end, this chapter will be divided into three sections: First, a brief overview will be made of the origins of the Lutheran Church, specifically discussing the founding of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. The second section will list the tenets of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod and the rhetorical uses of the documents which outline them. Third, the definition and re-definition of the question of where doctrine and gospel separate as that question defines the boundaries of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod will be discussed. These sections should enlighten the reader as to the history of doctrinal controversy within the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, and the foundation of such controversy within an organized religious body which shares a common creed: a confessional church (Webster's 174).

Origins

"Lutheran" was originally a nickname given to the followers of Martin Luther. Martin Luther's arguments with the Roman Catholic Church are well-documented by his
followers (Triglotta 3-1157). Simply stated, Luther argued that the Roman Catholic Church had no divine right in spiritual matters. Luther taught that people are part of a "universal priesthood of believers" who are released from the guilt of sin and accepted as righteous by faith alone. Humans were not, Luther insisted, forgiven and exonerated by the purchase of indulgences offered for sale by the Church, nor were individuals absolved by good works or via church rites (Handbook of Denominations 156). Lutheranism was founded quite basically on God, conscience and the Bible as "the immutable divine truth, or God's own doctrine" (Pieper 51-52). An exploration of Martin Luther's ideology and theology, the "Formula of Concord", was drawn up in 1577. This "formula" came to form the doctrinal basis of the Lutheran Church (Handbook of Denominations 157).

One hundred twenty five years after the first European Lutherans arrived in the United States, Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg organized in 1748 what was to become the first of many Lutheran synods, the ministerium of Pennsylvania. Originally, each synod spoke a different language, and each possessed its own idiosyncratic tenets. Formed in 1820, the General Synod organized the ever-increasing flood of Lutheran immigrants, and broke the last real link with European Lutheranism. By 1870 the Lutherans were the fourth largest Protestant denomination in the United States (Handbook of Denominations 157-158).
From this point in history, the story of Lutheranism in the United States is one of almost continuous boundary-work, definition, and redefinition. At one point in time there were one hundred fifty Lutheran Church bodies in the United States (Handbook of Denominations 159). As the language barriers disappeared, consolidation efforts reduced the number to the eight United States Lutheran Synods which operate today.

The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod is the Lutheran church body with which this research effort will be concerned. With a membership of more than five thousand churches, the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod is the second largest Lutheran church in the United States. One of the recognized purposes of the early Missouri Synod was "to establish a synod in which the sovereignty of the local congregation would be recognized" (Handbook of Denominations 160). Founded in 1845, the original name of the synod was the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. By 1847, the name had been shortened to reflect the synod's birthplace: the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (Wentz 120-121).

Documents of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod

The cornerstone of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod is, as in all Lutheran churches in the United States, The Book of Concord. This book contains the confessional explanation of Lutheranism, focusing specifically upon how
the Bible is to be viewed by Lutheran Christians. Martin Luther tells the reader in a portion of this work, "The Formula of Concord", that:

The Word of God is and should remain the sole rule and norm of doctrine, and that no human being's writings dare be placed on a par with it, but that everything be subjected to it. (Triglotta 779)

What opened the door, then, for Lutheran doctrinal statements and creeds to be brought forth, or even justified? The next paragraph tells the reader that it is permissible to accept and use "as helpful expositions and explanations" other human works, "such as interpretations of the Holy Scriptures, refutations of errors, and expositions of doctrinal articles" (Triglotta 769). Indeed, "The Apostles Creed", "The Nicene Creed", and "The Creed of Athanasius" all fall within these confines, and are therefore presented in The Book of Concord.

Of interest to this study is the rhetorical tension that appears present in these two instructions. One the one hand, "Scripture" alone is the "sole rule and norm", while on the other hand one may add statements to clarify the "Word" (Triglotta 769). This tension lends itself to rhetorical resolutions within the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. These resolutions are an integral part of every synodical convention, and are of interest to this study due to the role of the resolution in setting rhetorical boundaries for the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (Workbook 419).
The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod is a confessional church. By synodical definition, it is the purpose of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod "to confess faithfully the teachings of the Scriptures" (Board of Control 1). Rhetorically, the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod position is that Biblical doctrine is validated by means of the summary and explanation of that doctrine in The Book of Concord.

The contents of The Book of Concord, "The Augsburg Confessions", the "Apology of the Augsburg Confession", "The Smalcad Articles", the "Small" and the "Large" Catechisms of Martin Luther’s and even the aforementioned creeds were all written in different times and in different places by synods. The word "synod" comes from the Greek word "synodos", meaning the governing body of a church (Webster’s 894). Synods were originally composed of men who were respected in the government as well as in the priesthood (Richardson 22). At a central meeting place, the synod would gather to determine the position of the Christian community on disputed questions within the church. These questions dealt with issues such as the power of the Pope, celibacy for priests, Jesus of Nazareth’s intention in regard to communion, and other conflicts (Preus personal interview). Once the answer to the question at issue was determined and agreed upon, a creed was drawn up and issued to the public as authoritative (Richardson 59). It should be noted here that significant political power was held by
the members of these early synods. Members were open to processes of influence, due to the responsibilities of governing which required attending to, even when the official was away at a synod. Familial loyalties also brought a certain obligation to bear in these matters; the position of the household on a particular issue was often well known, prior to a synod, and the representative of that house was expected to vote accordingly, despite his personal point of view (Richardson 116).

For the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, this procedure has seen little variation. Controversies over issues not clearly laid out in The Book of Concord have necessitated the creation of doctrinal statements to provide the "helpful expositions and explanations" earlier approved of by Martin Luther (Triglotta 769). The first recorded example of such a document is the one entitled "Thirteen Theses on Election and Conversion". These theses were presented in 1881 as a clarified statement of the Synod's beliefs (Pieper 157).

"A Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod", was released to the church in 1932 as a means of dealing with "modern" questions and controversies which plagued the Synod at that time (Board of Control 4). The author of this statement was Dr. Francis Pieper, a respected theologian and former president of Concordia Theological Seminary in St. Louis, who had died the previous year. The late Dr. Pieper's academic masterpiece was the
three volume Christian Dogmatics, "setting forth the doctrines of Christianity as taught in the Lutheran Church" (Pieper v).

Whether one is discussing Jesus of Nazareth, Luther, Melchoir or Pieper, the question of authority is raised. One means of establishing authority, ethos, or appeals from character, has always been a very important component of rhetoric. Aristotle and other philosophers discussed at length the rhetorical power of the virtuous person. Aristotle explained in The Rhetoric that:

. . . the orator must not only try to make the argument of his speech demonstrative and worthy of belief; he must also make his own character look right and put his hearers, who are to decide, into the right frame of mind. (90)

It appears, therefore, that doctrinal canons within the structure of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod are released in this century as the work of one person, possibly in order to achieve this "right frame of mind". At the time "A Brief Statement" was released, Dr. Pieper's ethos was high: he had been a respected theologian whose personal and professional behavior had been beyond reproach, and whose presence was sorely missed (Wentz 88). The questions dealt with in "A Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod" were accepted as definitively answered by the Synod and its membership, largely due to the ethos of the author of
the document. Pieper's document was also the first statement to deal strictly with controversies in a United States Lutheran synod (Preus personal interview).

**Boundary Definitions**

So that the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod might speak "with a unified, single voice" in controverted doctrinal matters, the Commission on Theology and Church Relations was created in the Synodical convention of 1962. One purpose of this commission "is fostering and preserving the unity of the faith within the Synod" (Handbook 67). Another purpose is to assist the synodical president "in bringing matters of theology and church relations through special studies and documents" to the governing body and the membership of the Church (Handbook 67). By means of these two purposes, "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" was composed by the head of this commission, Dr. Ralph Bohlmann, in 1972. This document was published as "Appendix IV" in the subsequent Report Of The Synodical President, under the name of Dr. Jacob A. O. Preus Sr., who was the synodical president at that time (Preus Report 152).

At the time of the publication of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles", the ethos of Dr. Preus was fairly high. Preus had been brought in to the presidency primarily because "I was the right guy at the right place at the right time" to forcefully determine the doctrinal boundaries of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod
(Preus personal interview). According to Dr. Preus, what was then perceived to be the conservative faction of the Synod had grown increasingly concerned over the teachings of a large number of the faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary in St. Louis, and Preus was asked to provide "the position of the Synod" regarding these issues (Preus personal interview).

According to Dr. Ralph Bohlmann, the author of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles", this document was initially to provide "assistance to the Board of Regents as it evaluated the fact-finding committee report" (Bohlmann personal letter). The Fact-Finding Committee, so named because that was its purpose, was assembled to serve as "a committee of inquiry" in an effort to determine exactly what were the teachings of the faculty at Concordia Theological Seminary in St. Louis (Preus Report 11). However, "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" came to be viewed as "a clear and concise doctrinal statement in accordance with the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions", and so was adopted synodically in 1973 (Board of Control 52).

In summary, it should be emphasized once more that the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod is a confessional church, which can be taken to mean that the foundation of that church as well as its structure, hinges upon words, and how those words are interpreted and taught. If a Lutheran is "to
confess faithfully the teachings of the Scriptures", that individual must be aware of the boundaries laid out by the common creed (Board of Control 1). There remains the rhetorical tension, however: if the "Scriptures" are to be seen as "the sole rule and norm of doctrine" how is it possible for a creed or doctrinal statement to interpret the "Scriptures" (Triglotta 779)?

The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod has followed the tradition of defining its doctrinal boundaries and, thus, the limits of orthodoxy, through Synodical resolutions, creeds, these, and committee reviews. In these processes, many rhetorical factors are visible. First, the ethos of the rhetor or rhetors is critical. Secondly, the agreement of the majority of the Synod is necessary.

The boundaries of orthodoxy, therefore, may be debated in committee meetings and, finally, in a plenary session. Voting and other parliamentary procedures lend to the process a democratic flavor. The result of the process—a doctrinal position—is seen to have some moral and even legal force.
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CHAPTER III
THE CONFLICT

Leland Griffin's classic article "The Rhetoric Of Historical Movements", suggests that historical movements occur when individuals "become dissatisfied with some aspect of their environment", "desire change", and take action which affects change and results "in some degree of success or failure" (Griffin 184). Movements within the infrastructure of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod may reflect some of these common elements. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the elements of the Preus/Tietjen controversy which led to the dissemination of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles".

The elements of the Preus/Tietjen controversy are complex, and the historical record has strong emotional overtones. Though this controversy ended more than a decade ago, the emotion which surrounded these events is still keenly felt, by participants as well as bystanders. At one point, ego defense and contact with the secular press both became part of this event, and as theorist David Berg would tell us, shaped the character of the rhetorical responses (Berg 226). The identity of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod appeared to be at stake in this situation, and media
images were centered around the grievances which concerned that identity (Adams "Prisoner" 2E).

More than a decade before the Preus/Tietjen controversy, in the *Proceedings* of the 1959 forty-fourth synodical convention, "Resolution 9" resolved that the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod "further clarify its position" by declaring that every synodically adopted doctrinal statement is to be regarded as "public doctrine" and that each of the Synod's "pastors, teachers, and professors is held to teach and act in harmony with such statements" (*Proceedings 1959* 191). It was noted in the 1962 Synodical convention that this resolution specifically referred to the doctrinal statement "A Brief Statement", which had been adopted by the Synod in 1932 (*Proceedings 1962* 105).

In 1962, Resolution 9 was declared unconstitutional (in reference to the Missouri Synod constitution) by the Synodical convention. Committee 3, the committee who examined Resolution 9 had declared that "the status and use of synodically adopted doctrinal statements calls for further study and clarification" (*Proceedings 1962* 106). Other resolutions by this committee contain language which appears to "impose rather than negotiate" the text of the Lutheran Confessions (Sommerville 81). Committee 3 resolved that year "To Preserve and Promote Pure and Correct Teaching" by insisting that Missouri Synod educators "continue to teach in full accord with the sacred Scriptures and our Lutheran
Confessions" (Proceedings 1962 103). The argument between the Synodical hierarchy and Concordia St. Louis Theological Seminary during the course of the Preus/Tietjen controversy appeared to lie with the definition of the term full accord.

On May 19, 1969, Dr. John Tietjen was elected president of Concordia Theological Seminary St. Louis, the sixth in the seminary's history. Dr. Alfred O. Fuerbringer, who had been president for the previous sixteen years, retired before the Synodical Bylaws called for him to do so in order to enable his successor's election prior to the Denver Synodical convention. According to Synodical Bylaws, Missouri Synod seminary presidents are selected "by four electors from a slate of candidates nominated by members of the Synod and screened by a faculty committee" (Handbook 103). Dr. Tietjen's electors were the membership of the Concordia Seminary Board of Control; the Synodical Board for Higher Education; the District president for the state of Missouri, Dr. Kurt Biel; and the Synodical president at that time, Dr. Oliver Harms (Board of Control 15).

This election was significant for two reasons: First, it was the first time in the Missouri Synod that a seminary president was chosen while his successor was still in office. Secondly, Dr. Harms' term of office and the terms of several members of that Board of Control were due to end in July of that year (Board of Control 15). According to observer James E. Adams, this election appears to have been a
managerial move toward power maintenance by Dr. Harms and his associates (Adams Preus 174). Theorist Kurt Lewin in his work on group dynamics determined that the most important attribute of groups is cohesiveness (Lewin 94). Dr. Harms and his associates were considered theological moderates in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (Adams Preus 137). If they were to prevent the Missouri Synod from leaning too far toward theological extremes, Dr. Harms and his associates needed to leave the direction of the Synod’s largest seminary under the leadership of an administrator they felt could be trusted to hold their position (Adams Preus 30).

On July 12, 1969, Dr. Jacob A. O. Preus, Sr. was elected Synodical president at the Synodical convention in Denver, Colorado (Board of Control 18). This election brought about what sociological theorists Berger and Luckmann called the “confrontation of alternative symbolic universes” (Berger and Luckmann 109). The candidacy of Dr. Preus, “highly respected in the Synod for his conservative theological leadership” as a former president of Concordia Theological seminary at Springfield, was considered by many church leaders to be “a major setback for those who had been advocating more liberal positions within the Synod” (Board of Control 18).

Indeed, at this point in the history of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, the beliefs an individual was perceived to have became central to the role that individual
came to play in this controversy. The ethos of Dr. Preus and
the ethos of Dr. Tietjen influenced the loyalty of the
individuals who chose to support the Preus or the Tietjen
view of the Synod, as well as determined the extent to which
supporters would make sacrifices in upholding each view. The
issues facing the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod at that time
were becoming too complicated for the laity (Preus personal
interview). Critical theorist Karlyn Kohrs Campbell pointed
out in *The Rhetorical Act* that an audience such as the
Synod’s laity can become "uncomfortable with subjects
demanding decisions that they do not feel competent to
make". Such audiences can be "often overwhelmed by subjects
with broad ramifications" (Campbell 102). Under
consideration at the Denver Synodical convention was a
proposal to consider uniting with the American Lutheran
Synod, the educational concerns of Committee 3, and the
elections of both Dr. Preus and Dr. Tietjen. Preus supported
the view that these concerns seemed to overwhelm the
convention:

Well, this was too big a bite. A church leader
should never give a convention too much to chew on
at one time, of a controversial nature, because
they gag on it. (personal interview)

Campbell tells us that in this type of situation, "the
rhetor must become an educator", using various rhetorical
devices in a connected series of persuasive operations
designed to bring about a particular result (Campbell 103). Preus and Tietjen fulfilled this need in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (Adams Preus 141).

Since the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod refers to itself as a "confessional church", language is central to its reality (Handbook 10). Words attempt to enlighten and persuade the Missouri Synod membership of the "truth". This is clearly evidenced in titles given to various Synodical resolutions, such as "To Preserve a Proper View of Law", and "To Respond to Specific Needs of Community" (Convention Proceedings 1973 101, 117, 125). Committee names such as the Commission on Theology and Church Relations, as well as publications such as the book Exodus From Concordia, or the booklet "Faithful To Our Calling, Faithful To Our Lord", and the magazine The Lutheran Witness all attempt to use language in this manner.

In March of 1970, less than a year after his election, Dr. Preus began receiving letters from various professors of Concordia St. Louis, expressing their concern about what they contended were the teaching methods employed by some of their associates at the seminary (Board of Control 22). Dr. Robert Preus, Jacob Preus, Sr.'s brother, reported that the differences discussed in the systematic-exegetical department meetings were "far more than mere differences of emphasis and approach" (Board of Control 22). Dr. Ralph Bohlmann, then head of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations,
expressed his concerns both orally and in writing to Dr. Tietjen and to Dr. Preus (Board of Control 22).

The letter requesting that Dr. Preus appoint a committee of inquiry came from Dr. Martin Scharlemann, at that time a graduate professor of Exegetical Theology at Concordia St. Louis. James Adams, religion reporter for the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, writes in his book *Preus Of Missouri* that Dr. Scharlemann was viewed by "moderates" as having "actively sought the Concordia presidency" just prior to Dr. Fuerbringer’s retirement (Adams *Preus* 173). Yet at the 1962 Synodical convention in Cleveland, "Resolution 3-19" had called for Dr. Scharlemann to be relieved of his office as teacher. This resolution was prompted by four of Scharlemann’s published papers which had caused such concern as to require a committee review (*Proceedings 1962* 106-107). Dr. Scharlemann withdrew the four papers in their entirety, and was subsequently officially forgiven by the Synod (*Procedures 1962* 107).

In his letter to Dr. Preus, Dr. Scharlemann expressed his concern over "a kind of theological schizophrenia" which in his opinion had beset the student body, due to the Bible being "dealt with so differently" by the Concordia St. Louis faculty. There were attempts being made to rectify faculty differences, but Dr. Scharlemann’s view was that Dr. Tietjen was moving too slowly and so perhaps not as capably as the
situation warranted. Dr. Scharlemann's letter was dated April 9, 1970 (Board of Control 151-153).

Eleven days later, Dr. Preus announced to the St. Louis Seminary Board of Control that he would be appointing a Fact-Finding Committee to conduct an inquiry in order to:

... help the members and institutions in Synod to remain faithful to the Word of God and the Lutheran Confessions, to assist the Synod in the achievement of the purpose for which it was organized, and to protect the workers in institutions of the Synod from unfounded or unjust allegations (Preus Report 11).

The first Synodical institution to be examined, the Board of Control was told, would be Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. Concordia St. Louis was seen to have "strategic importance for the life and work of the Synod" (Preus Report 11). This synodical examination falls in line with "The Politics of Heresy" as seen by theorist Lester Kurtz: "The boundaries of what is true and acceptable are marked out through a systematic identification of what is false and unacceptable" (Kurtz 1085).

The appointed members of the Fact-Finding Committee were Reverend Karl L. Barth, Dr. Elmer E. Foelber, Dr. H. Armin Moellering, Dr. Paul Streufert, and Dr. Paul A. Zimmerman, who served as chairperson of the committee (Adams Preus 173; Preus Report 17). The Fact-Finding Committee was
instructed to abide by a formal statement on procedure which had been drawn up by Dr. Preus, the Fact-Finding Committee, representatives of the faculty, and the President and Vice-President of Academic Affairs of Concordia St. Louis (Preus Report 14). This statement outlined three criteria for procedure: the committee was to "explore the confessional position" of the faculty, using the Bible and the Lutheran Confessiona as their guide; the faculty member being interviewed was not to be questioned regarding the theological position of the other faculty members, or of the faculty as a group; and, the group who determined procedural criteria would "meet again in the event the need arises" (Preus Report 14-15).

The process through which heresy is constructed in the Preus/Tietjen controversy can be seen in Thomas Lessl's article "Heresy, Orthodoxy, And The Politics of Science". The perception of the teaching of "false doctrine" brought about a "state of crisis" in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, prompting the provoking of "struggles over authority" within the Synod (Lessl 20-21). This struggle appears to have been between groups referred to by James Adams and other observers as the "moderates" and the "conservatives" (Adams Preus x). Dr. Preus and Dr. Tietjen both hold the view that, in the final analysis, the struggle was over who was the primary authority in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (Preus personal interview; Tietjen personal interview).
Lessl's work also states that the members of the institution will "draw together in a community of responsibility devoted to extinguishing the fires of deviance" thereby establishing "solidarity" (Lessl 21). This appears to have been an objective of the Fact-Finding Committee (Board of Control 24).

Dr. Ralph Bohlmann, in his capacity as head of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations, reviewed the "more than 1,000 pages of testimony taken from more than forty professors" (Bohlmann personal letter). Each interview was also audio-tape recorded (Preus Report 14). Concordia St. Louis Seminary faculty interviews were conducted from December 11, 1970 to March 6, 1971 (Board of Control 25; Preus Report 14). Following each interview, each professor was permitted to revise the final written transcript of his tape-recorded interview (Board of Control 25).

On June 15, 1971, the Fact-Finding Committee turned over the transcripts of the interviews, with references to each professor's published writings, a summary of each individual interview, and a general overview of all the interviews to Dr. Preus and the Concordia St. Louis Board of Control (Preus Report 15). At the Synodical convention of July of 1971, the Missouri Synod adopted Resolution 2-28, which instructed the Board of Control to examine the Fact-Finding Committee report and to "take appropriate action" regarding
that information, "commending or correcting where necessary" (Convention Proceedings 1971 122). A "progress report" was to be made to Dr. Preus and to the Board for Higher Education, and Dr. Preus was to report on the progress of these actions within the year (Convention Proceedings 1971 122).

Divergent opinions emerge at this point with regard to the creation of the document "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles". This doctrinal statement was released to the "Congregations, Pastors, Teachers" of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod by Dr. Preus on March 3, 1972 (Adams 175; Preus Report 151). The cover letter stated that "in an effort to give aid to the board of control", Dr. Preus had "in consultation with the vice-presidents of the Synod", drawn up "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" to be used as a guideline for the board as it examined the Fact-Finding Committee report (Preus Letter 1). More specifically, when interviewed by this researcher, Dr. Preus stated that a "lay member" of the Board of Control, or a person without a professorial level of theological expertise, asked, "What is the basis on which we say this guy's right and that guy's wrong, on umpteen different questions?" (Preus personal interview). Dr. Ralph Bohlmann, in his official capacity as head of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations, was asked to provide
his "theological guidance" to the Board (Bohlmann personal letter 2).

In his letter to this researcher, Dr. Bohlmann stated that he then reviewed the interview transcripts "to determine what topics and questions had been asked" (Bohlmann personal letter 2). Dr. Bohlmann's notations on these subjects were the foundation for "establishing the major categories that became topics for treatment in "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" (Bohlmann personal letter 2). After this, Dr. Bohlmann determined that his next task was to present the Synod's viewpoint on each of these subjects. He also attempted "by means of antitheses" to determine the viewpoints that were not acknowledged by the Synod:

In other words, both the topics treated and the specific points addressed under each topic reflected actual questions and answers arranged in such a way that people not familiar with the position of the Synod on various details would be helped to know what that position in fact was. (Bohlmann personal letter 2)

According to Dr. Tietjen, these questions and their answers had been determined before the Fact-Finding Committee had begun their investigation, and "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" "was produced as the noose on which to hang the faculty" (Tietjen personal interview).
Even at this late date, it appears the factual situation is still debated.

"A Statement" is representative of what Lessl calls "boundary-work" (Lessl 21). An organization caught in the throes of heterodoxical disagreement is pressured into the recognition of orthodox belief as well as the identification of unorthodox belief, in order for the organization to determine its boundaries. The thetical and antithetical approach taken by Dr. Bohlmann in "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" reflects this pressure in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.

After reviewing the transcripts of the Fact-Finding Committee interviews, the Board of Control once again asked that each professor amend or correct each transcript as that professor saw fit. At the regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Control on October 18, 1971, the Board conducted its own interview of Dr. Tietjen. During that interview Dr. Tietjen answered questions regarding his personal beliefs, his theological stance, and the theology of the Concordia St. Louis faculty (Preus Report 134). According to "The Report of the Board of Control", the Board also viewed presentations by various groups of faculty members regarding "the nature of confessional subscription", the pros and cons of historical-critical methodology in relation to its usage at the seminary, and Biblical interpretation (Preus Report 135). More faculty interviews were conducted by the
Concordia Board of Control, to answer new questions that had arisen in the light of Dr. Preus' release of "A Statement" (Preus Report 134-136).

The manner in which "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" was released was considered by observer James Adams to have been an adroit political maneuver, since releasing the document churchwide put enormous pressure on the Board of Control (Adams Preus 176). However, the Concordia St. Louis Board of Control chose to accept "A Statement" as internal "guidelines to his [Dr. Preus] assessment of the issues confronting the Synod and to his understanding of how the issues should be resolved" (Preus Report 136). Whether "A Statement" was accepted in this manner by the Concordia St. Louis Board of Control is still a matter of debate in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. According to the staff at Concordia Historical Institute, the tapes and transcripts of the faculty interviews are sealed for twenty five years at the request of any of the participants, or until the death of all the participants (Staff telephone interview). Consequently, the only portions of these artifacts open to students of this event are those excerpts published by Dr. Preus in his Report Of The Synodical President to the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (Preus Report 34-132). Since the complete set of transcripts and interviews are unavailable for study, it is not possible to determine any
effect "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" may have had on the questions asked and the answers given.

Theorists Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann write of "the systematic theoretical conceptualization of symbolic universes", offering the idea that specific procedures are employed to maintain these universes as legitimate (Berger and Luckmann 105). Perhaps in an effort to legitimize their position, on April 4, 1972, the "Response Of The Faculty Of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis" was released by a group which came to be known as the Faculty Majority (Board of Control 31; Preus Report 18). Briefly, this "Response" exposited ten points, which were divided into two categories. Relative to "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" and the Concordia St. Louis Seminary, these faculty members stated that, since the faculty had not read the entire Fact-Finding Committee Report, nor in their view had Dr. Preus "discussed his concerns" regarding their teaching, the Faculty Majority found "A Statement" "to be invalid both as an assessment and as a solution" of seminary difficulties. In relation to "A Statement" and the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, these faculty members found "A Statement" to have been improperly released, "inadequate theologically", to have made "binding dogma out of mere theological opinion", possessing "a spirit
alien to Lutheran confessional theology“, and finally, “unnecessary“ ("Response" 1-6).

The "Progress Report of the Board of Control of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri, to the President of the Synod and to the Board for Higher Education in Response to the Directive of the Synod in Milwaukee Convention Resolution 2-28" was dated June 22, 1972 (Preus Report 133-138). While the title may reflect the Missouri Synod predilection for legalistic clarity, the report itself did not reflect the views of all the members of the Board; therefore, attached to this report was the "Minority Report of the Board of Control of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri" (Preus Report 138-142). Finally, so as to give voice to the concerns of each of the Board members, Charles Burmeister’s "A Letter by Individual Member of The Board of Control" concluded this "Progress Report" (Preus Report 142-143). While the "Progress Report" states in its conclusion that there remained "serious questions which must be asked", up to that date the report was written, the Board had "found no false doctrine among the members of the seminary faculty" (Preus Report 138). At this point in time the Board of Control was unable to commend or correct any of the faculty, rendering the Board incapable of fulfilling its duties as outlined in Resolution 2-28 (Convention Proceedings 1971 122).
Berger and Luckmann state that the outgrowth of "full-time personnel for universe-maintaining legitimation" is often accompanied by opportunities "for social conflict" (Berger and Luckmann 118). In the Preus/Tietjen controversy, these conflicts occurred most often between expert and expert. If the Fact-Finding Committee was assembled to find the facts regarding the teaching methods, rather than the doctrine employed at Concordia St. Louis, then the task of the Board of Control appears to have been to take control of the situation in order to avoid further conflict. These groups appeared to disagree, however, as to what the facts illuminated (Board of Control 30-32).

Following his instruction in Resolution 2-28, "That the President of the Synod report to the Synod on the progress of the Board of Control within one year", Dr. Preus published his Report Of The Synodical President on September 1, 1972 (Convention Proceedings 1971 122). Known Synod-wide as the "Blue Book", this report attempted to outline a brief history of the theology of Concordia Theological Seminary at St. Louis, to summarize the interview transcripts of the Fact-Finding Committee, and to report on the actions of the Concordia St. Louis Board of Control (Preus Report 2-3).

In "Heresy, Orthodoxy, And The Politics Of Science", Thomas Lessl writes that "It is customary to institute dogma as a response to heresy" (Lessl 29). By claiming to clearly see the "truth" emerging from the complex interview
transcripts, and by providing "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" as an illumination of that truth, Dr. Preus instituted a Lutheran dogma of sorts. Whether this action was intentional or unintentional, all major participants in these events perceived "A Statement" to have come to serve in that capacity (Bohllmann personal letter; Preus personal interview; Tietjen personal interview).

It should be noted here that during the early stages of this controversy, numerous documents were published in defense of one position or another. A document would be released to the Synod, another document would be published to refute the first, and many shorter articles, petitions, and letters would emerge in support of one of the first two positions. A very large part of this literature is available for study at the Concordia Historical Institute in St. Louis, and copies of many of these documents may be purchased from their archives. This researcher, however, shall focus specifically upon the direct responses to "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles".

Two groups emerged within the faculty to support Dr. Tietjen and Dr. Preus' positions on these matters. Out of the fifty-member faculty, a group of forty-five members came to be known as the Faculty Majority. One of the first documents issued by the Faculty Majority was the "Declaration of Members of the Faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis", first published in the magazine Lutheran Witness.
Reported on November 15, 1970. This document, released Synod-wide, asserted "the faithfulness of the faculty to its confessional commitment". in order to clearly state the Majority view that a fact-finding investigation was unnecessary (Preus Report 150; Board of Control 27). As this declaration was declared an official faculty resolution, the Faculty Minority was charged to put their disagreement with the resolution in writing (Board of Control 27; Bohlmann personal letter). The Minority's "An Explanation to Our Brethren was their refusal to sign the "Declaration", explaining that these five faculty members had no desire to interfere with the progress of the investigation of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis (Preus Report 150). This "Explanation" was published alongside the "Declaration", having been released for publication by Dr. Tietjen (Board of Control 28).

Lessl reminds researchers at this point of the necessity for these groups to establish their "solidarity" in an attempt to "bring to the surface a regenerated concept of their own pedagogical role within the larger social community" (Lessl 28). Each group appears to insist that their Biblical research methodology and their doctrine be viewed as a banner of infallibility around which the "orthodox" may rally. One is left wondering who the heretics are in this controversy.
The next major response to "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" occurred when the "Study Edition Of A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" was released by the Commission on Theology and Church Relations in November of 1972 (Convention Proceedings 1973 135). This "study edition" was presented as being necessary to present the "Biblical and confessional basis of "A Statement" (Bohlmann Statement 5).

At this point in time, Dr. Preus appointed a committee known (to specifically engage itself with "Seminary issues") officially as Committee Three (Board of Control 43; Convention Workbook 1973 99). The task of this committee was to determine the source of the conflict between the findings of the Fact-Finding Committee and the Board of Control (Convention Proceedings 1973 133-139). Indeed, conflict had arisen within the Board of Control, who, despite their disagreement had decided that there was no "false doctrine" present in the teachings of the Concordia St. Louis Seminary faculty (Board of Control 39; Convention Workbook 1973 99).

The fiftieth Regular Convention of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod was held from July 6 through July 13, 1973 in New Orleans, Louisiana (Convention Proceedings 1973 front cover). On July 10, 1973, the Commission on Theology and Church Relations and Committee Three introduced Resolution 3-01, emphatically stating that "A Statement of Scriptural
and Confessional Principles" would henceforth stand as "Scriptural" and in harmony with "the Lutheran Confessions, and therefore a formulation which derives its authority from the Word of God", which delineated Synodical stance "on current doctrinal issues" (Convention Proceedings 1973:128). Because of this declaration, "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" would officially hold the status of "a more formal and comprehensive statement of belief" (Convention Proceedings 1973:127-128). Such status in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod meant that any individual who so much as partially disagreed with "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" would be viewed as requiring more stringent doctrinal supervision. This resolution was adopted by a vote of 562 to 455—not exactly a majority (Convention Proceedings 1973:127-128).

Why was the formal adoption of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" an essential element in the rhetorical process of this "heretical" controversy? The adoption of a doctrinal statement is a pivotal event in the identification of heresy within an orthodox group. Using Lessl’s terminology, such a "rhetorical response to deviance" enables the modeling and remodeling of "institutional reality" (Lessl 30). By officially determining that any doctrine which was not in full agreement with "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" could possibly be viewed as "false doctrine", the Lutheran Church-Missouri
Synod clearly pointed to the teachings at Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis as being outside their institutional reality. The expression of concern over theological diversity at Concordia St. Louis fanned the embers of dissent among Seminary faculty; this dissent added to the strengthening of Missouri Synod orthodoxy (Lessl 31).

After the Synodical adoption of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles", Reverend Samuel Roth asked that his objections be recorded by the convention secretary and "invited those who agreed with him to present their names in an orderly way" while the group of those who wished to file objections sang the first verse of "The Church's One Foundation" (Convention Proceedings 1973 37).

Committee Three also proposed Resolution 3-09, entitled "To Declare Faculty Majority Position in Violation of Article II of the [Missouri Synod] Constitution" (Convention Proceedings 1973 133). Committee Three recommended that the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod recognize certain documents released by the Faculty Majority as not only denying charges of "false doctrine", but as inexcusable proof of false doctrine. This recommendation was made on the basis of committee Three's study of the "St. Louis faculty majority, with Dr. John Tietjen", and of the documents Fact Finding or Fault Finding?, "Response of the Faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis", "Response of the Faculty of Concordia
Seminary, St. Louis, to the 'Report of the Synodical President'" and *Faithful To Our Calling, Faithful To Our Lord*. Resolution 3-09 concluded by suggesting that these matters be turned back over to the Board of Control Seminary, St. Louis (Convention Proceedings 1973 139). The hidden message was that the Concordia Board of Control should request Dr. Tietjen's resignation; in fact, prior to this session of the convention, delegates from Committee Three had asked Dr. Tietjen to submit his resignation. Dr. Tietjen had refused to resign, determining instead to defend his position at the convention (Adams Preus 1-3). Resolution 3-09 was adopted by a vote of 574 to 451, once more by a vote hard to recognize as a majority (Convention Proceedings 1973 133-139).

According to social theorist Lester Kurtz, the "problem of heresy" is basically a "problem of authority" (Kurtz 1088). Catholic doctrine tells its followers that a "stubbornness of will is required for true heresy" (Kurtz 1088). Following the adoption of resolutions which had, in effect, declared the doctrinal position of a majority of the Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis to be a false one, as well as calling for Dr. Tietjen's resignation as president of the seminary, Dr. Tietjen spoke in response to these charges (Board of Control 58-59; Convention Proceedings 1973 45). Dr. Tietjen stated that he had been "grievously wronged", and that he had refused to resign because it was
his belief that his position as president of Concordia Seminary "is from God" (Board of Control 59). Dr. Tietjen forgave the convention "because I think you really do not know what you are doing" (Board of Control 59). Kurtz reminds us at this point that dogma and institutions which are viewed as being "sacred" require constant vigilance to protect them from "destructive forces" (Kurtz 1089). Since Dr. Tietjen held this to be true of his theological position and the Synodical convention officially held an opposing view, both "authorities" were forced to proceed with their defense, regardless of the cost (Kurtz 1089).

These resolutions calling for adherence to a newly-defined doctrinal standard had long-term implications for the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. The convention had also elected two new members to the Concordia, St. Louis Board of Control: Reverend E. J. Otto and Alfred Briel (Board of Control 61). These elections ended the internal conflicts of this board, as both new members were perceived by observers to be theological conservatives (Adams Preus 198). After almost six months of legal entreaties to Dr. Tietjen in an effort to persuade him either to resign or to recant his position, the Concordia St. Louis Board of Control determined that "no resolution of the issues would be received" (Board of Control 92). On January 20, 1974, Dr. John Tietjen was suspended "from all his duties as president, and as a member of the faculty, of Concordia Seminary"
(Board of Control 93). This action did not amount to dismissal from office, nor did it mean that Dr. Tietjen had been found guilty of anything (Board of Control 94). The charges of false doctrine and administrative malfeasance were simply deemed "serious enough to threaten immediate harm" to the seminary, therefore, in the interest of preventing this harm, Dr. Tietjen was suspended until a formal investigation by the Commission on Theology and Church Relations and a Faculty Hearings Committee could be held (Board of Control 94). After this was accomplished, the Concordia St. Louis Board of Control would "provide for another hearing" and render its formal judgment (Board of Control 94).

It should be noted here that the first investigation into doctrinal disagreement at Concordia Theological Seminary at St. Louis began in the fall of 1970 (Board of Control 24). An investigation of this investigation was begun by the Board of Control in the fall of 1971 (Preus Report 18). In June of 1973, Committee Three investigated both of the previous investigations, turning the matter back over to the Concordia St. Louis Board of Control (Board of Control 43-60).

According to the textbook *Persuasion And Social Movements* by Stewart, Smith, and Denton:

> The established order has time on its side. It can wait until social, economic, and political crises
pass, until a war ends, until establishment leadership changes occur through normal processes, until the public becomes disenchanted with protest and disorder, until the mass media and their audiences become bored with the issue . . . (10)

It appears likely that the multiple investigations experienced by Dr. Tietjen during this period could have been a means of demonstrating that the faction considered to be "conservative" had time on their side. It could also be likely the Synodical hierarchy were simply performing their duties thoroughly.

On Monday morning, January 21, 1974, at an eight o'clock student assembly, copies of "A Student Resolution" were distributed to the student body, and the resolution was read aloud by student body president Gerald Miller (Board of Control 94-95). Dr. Tietjen spoke at length, stating that the legal actions against him offered "no possibility of a fair and impartial judgment", declaring that such proceedings were "the results of collusion" designed to reach the already-determined goal of removing him "from office and from my pastoral ministry of the Synod" (Board of Control 96). Dr. Tietjen also informed the student body and the assembled members of the press that he would not be seeking an injunction in "secular courts" against the suspension (Adams "Students On Strike" 5). He stated that he would continue through Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod channels, but would,
after this date, remain silent (Adams "Students On Strike" 5). Later that day, copies of a collection of documents entitled "Evidence" were released to the press by Dr. Tietjen, containing the transcripts of his most recent interviews and his evaluation of those meetings (Board of Control 96).

In releasing this "Evidence", Dr. Tietjen violated the provisions of a Synodical bylaw to which he was bound as a church member and as a school administrator. Bylaw 5.31j stipulated, "While a case is still undecided or while appeals are contemplated or pending, there shall be no publicity of the case by any party to the proceeding" (Board of Control 96). While to the secular community this may have seemed a minor technicality, Lutheran Synods tend to take the privacy of Synodical investigations very seriously. This violation seriously jeopardized any chance of Dr. Tietjen successfully fighting any subsequent appeals (Board of Control 96).

After Tietjen's statement, the student association president once again read the moratorium resolution which, in part resolved:

To declare a moratorium on all classes until such time as the Seminary Board of Control officially and publicly declares which members of the faculty, if any, are to be considered as false teachers, and what Scriptural and Confessional Principles, if any, have been violated. (Board of Control 175)
The student resolution was passed by a vote of 274 to 92, with fifteen students abstaining. The resolution was then delivered to the Concordia Board of Control and to the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod headquarters in downtown St. Louis (Board of Control 97).

From this point in the controversy, communication appeared to break down fairly quickly. The difficulties at Concordia Theological Seminary were highlighted in the St. Louis newspapers, often on the front page, for the next eight days. Dr. Martin Scharlemann, the newly-appointed acting president of the seminary, found himself answering his front door in the light of television cameras on at least two occasions (Board of Control 103). Richard B. Gregg in his study "The Ego-Function of the Rhetoric of Protest", speaks of three "ego-functions" of protest rhetoric within media images: a powerful exigency to "recognize and proclaim that one's ego is somehow ignored, or damaged, or disenfranchised;" secondly, the need to condemn one's opponents for maligning that ego; and lastly, a need to depict the "strength and virtues of the ego sought after" (Gregg 75). By highlighting this controversy in the media from the outset, Dr. Tietjen and his associates fulfilled all three of these ego-functions.

Three hours after the Concordia St. Louis Board of Control received the moratorium resolution, the following pledge was sent back to the striking students and the
faculty: "The Board of Control pledges itself to make all
deliberate haste in resolving the implications of Resolution
3-09 of New Orleans against the faculty" (Board of Control
97).

The next morning, the Faculty Majority and twelve
executive staff members sent a letter to Dr. Preus in which
they stated that they had "suspended" themselves, and "until
the present uncertainty regarding our confessional stand and
teaching is cleared up", they too were on strike (Adams
"Ultimatum" 1). The Concordia Seminary Board of Control, to
whom the faculty and staff were contractually responsible,
read the announcement in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the
St. Louis Globe-Democrat. According to their later account
of this controversy, Exodus From Concordia, the Board of
Control received "no official communication" regarding this
strike (Board of Control 101).

By the afternoon of January 22, the Faculty Majority had
adopted a resolution which refused to accept the authority of
acting president Dr. Scharlemann and called for his
resignation (Adams and Boyd 1). Dr. Scharlemann was said
to have later declared to the Board of Control, "You don't
negotiate a rebellion; you crush it" (Adams Preus 201).

Because of the student moratorium and Faculty Majority
strike, Dr. Scharlemann suspended classes from January 22
through January 25 (Board of Control 105). However, by
January 25, student leaders had begun "Operation Outreach",
in which approximately two hundred fifty seminary students following prearranged itineraries traveled to certain areas of the United States to garner support for the position of the striking faculty members and students (Board of Control 105-108). By Monday, January 28, fifteen students attended classes taught by Dr. Robert Preus and by Dr. Scharlemann (Prost 4A).

The effect of the Synodical adoption of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" by the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod became concentric, that of a pebble thrown into a still pond. Following the adoption of this doctrinal statement, Dr. Tietjen and the Faculty Majority were publicly admonished for failing to adhere to "A Statement"s precepts. Dr. Tietjen's response was that he had been "grievously wronged" (Convention Proceedings 1973 40-45). The Concordia St. Louis Board of Control suspended Dr. Tietjen from his office as that seminary's president in order to further investigate this conflict (Board of Control 93). A majority of the student body, the Faculty Majority, and certain executive staff at Concordia St. Louis protested this suspension by going out on strike (Adams "Students On Strike" 5).

Finally, after entreaties from Dr. Scharlemann and sternly-worded letters from Dr. Preus, on February 12, 1974, the Faculty Majority sent a letter to the Board of Control (Board of Control 108-110; Adams Preus 202). This letter
stated that, among other "positive steps" requested by the Faculty Majority, either Dr. Tietjen was to be reinstated as president, or instruction of the striking seminarians would be re-established in another location. The Board of Control responded to this letter by issuing a document on February 17 which ordered the striking faculty to resume classes at Concordia Theological Seminary at St. Louis by February 19 (Adams Preus 203-204). Professors who failed to meet this deadline would face immediate dismissal and eviction from staff housing within the following ten days. Written assent to this resolution was to be in Dr. Scharlemann's possession by noon, February 18, 1974 (Board of Control 185-186). The Faculty Majority offered no such assent (Board of Control 117).

On the morning of February 19, the Concordia St. Louis Student Association held a meeting at which they resolved to continue their "theological education in exile, trusting in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Board of Control 119). Dr. Robert Bertram, spokesperson for the Faculty Advisory Committee of the Faculty Majority, stated in the February 7 edition of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch that striking faculty members were "considering establishing a 'Concordia Seminary in Exile' to make possible the continued education of students who support the moderate faction of the faculty and administration" (Adams Preus 200).
In the presence of the national news media, on the morning of February 19, 1974, striking students boarded up the arched entry of Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, and mounted forty-eight crosses on the campus quad to symbolize the "death" of the seminary (Board of Control 120; Adams Preus 205; Stewart, et al 68). Following readings in front of the black-draped statue of Martin Luther, the procession walked up to De Mun Park, to the east of the seminary campus. There the students and professors were welcomed by the academic dean of Eden, a United Church of Christ seminary. The following Wednesday, St. Louis University and Eden Seminary provided classrooms for the "exiles", and the "Seminary in Exile", later to be known as "Seminex" was founded (Adams Preus 206).
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CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS

This analysis is divided into five sections. The first concerns the rhetorical function of documents in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod and the assumption that it is possible to clarify Lutheran belief absolutely. The second section is a discussion of the historical context of the doctrinal statement in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. The third question is concerned with both the short as well as the long term consequences of the doctrinal statement "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles". The fourth section is a discussion of the rhetorical strategies of definition and redefinition. The final section of this analysis is a brief overview of other fields where "heretical" controversy is or has been present.

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the document "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles". This doctrinal statement was originally published in three different places. First, in his Report Of The Synodical President to The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, Dr. Preus provided "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" as a part of his explanation of the controversy at Concordia Theological Seminary at St. Louis (Preus
Report 152-156). Second, this document was also published in the Study Edition Of A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles as part of an analysis of this document by the Commission on Theology and Church Relations (Commission 9-47). Third, "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" was also published as a leaflet, in conformity with Bylaw 1.09 of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod constitution (Handbook 21-22). This research effort will focus on an historical-critical analysis of the rhetorical dimensions of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles", rather than an analysis of the previous evaluations of this doctrinal statement.

What may be gained by a rhetorical analysis of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles"?

Examining this document may aid in determining the structure of what Thomas Lessl calls "boundary-work" (Lessl 21-22). Boundary work is significant in determining the parameters of a group. The examination of that "work" may illuminate commonalities in that process shared by differing groups. When an organization seeks redefinition, the strategies employed "possess universal relevance", due to the reality of the situation and the possibility of its reoccurrence (Olson 131).

The Rhetorical Function of Documents

Any adult affiliated with the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod will likely say that the principle document of the
Lutheran Church is "the written Word of God", or more specifically, "The Scriptures of the Old and the New Testament" (Handbook 9). From a rhetorical standpoint, these documents function epistemically within the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. These documents are a "way of knowing" about the Person of God (Devito 266). Also viewed as principle documents are the "Symbolical Books", which are specifically the "Apostles Creed", the "Nicene Creed", the Athanasian Creed", the "Unaltered Augsburg Confession", the "Apology of the Augsburg Confession", the "Smalcald Articles", the "Large Catechism of Luther", the "Small Catechism of Luther", and "The Formula of Concord" (Handbook 9). These documents "confess" what Lutherans believe about "the written Word of God" (Handbook 9).

Indeed, a primary purpose of documents in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod is to assist the readers in achieving a clarity in their belief. As stated in "The Gospel According To St. John":

But these things are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name.

(NT 20: 31)

For the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, as well as for Christians in general, belief and certain documents are inexorably linked.
From a rhetorical standpoint the assumption appears to be that standards of Lutheran belief can be clarified absolutely. Within this framework, clarified belief is the desired end of searching. This is in contrast to other religious beliefs such as Buddhism, which teaches that individuals must explore and experiment: "Happiness he who seeks may win, if he practice the seeking" (Ross and Hills 53). Lutheran "confessional" documents within the Missouri Synod are held to be "a true and unadulterated statement and exposition" of the Old and the New Testaments (Handbook 9). The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod also adheres to documents called "doctrinal resolutions", which are synodically adopted for the "information, counsel, and guidance of the membership" (Handbook 21). Generally speaking, the functions of the doctrinal resolution is to meet exigencies and to conform to the "previously adopted" position of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (Handbook 21).

"Doctrinal statements" are more specific in detailing the position of the Missouri Synod, especially on controversial issues (Handbook 21). Consequently, doctrinal statements are carefully examined for their structural integrity before they are Synodically adopted (Handbook 22). A doctrinal statement such as "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles", that was submitted by then-Synodical president Dr. Preus, is transmitted "to the colleges and seminaries, and to the
congregations and other members of the Synod for no more than one year" (Handbook 22). The Commission on Theology and Church Relations then reviews requests to "refine" the doctrinal statement, and the statement is submitted to a national Synodical convention for "further consideration and possible adoption by a majority vote" (Handbook 22).

A kind of rhetorical tension exerts itself here. The trust of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod in its orthodoxy appears to be on equal footing with Missouri Synod organizational trust in the democratic process. Thus, the "reality" of but one doctrine is presented as an "external and coercive fact", though the boundaries of this reality have been determined by human beings, albeit individuals who profess knowledge regarding the Person of God (Berger and Luckmann 58).

Following the submission of a doctrinal statement to the national Synodical convention, the Statement is redistributed to the congregations in its final draft. After following these steps, the statement is ratified:

... if a two-thirds majority of the member congregations which respond within six months registers an affirmative vote on a ballot supplied by the Synodical Secretary for that purpose. (Handbook 22).

After lengthy debate and discussion, "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" was adopted at the
fiftieth Regular Convention of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod by a vote of 562 to 429 (Convention Proceedings 1973 127-128). Berger and Luckmann labeled this type of process "legitimation", defined as producing "new meanings that serve to integrate the meanings already attached to disparate institutional processes" (Berger and Luckmann 92). In the case of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles", the objective of legitimation appeared to be to further "development of theological consensus" between the doctrinal position of the Missouri Synod in its position as trustee of the seminaries and what was actually taught in the Synod's largest seminary, Concordia St. Louis (Commission 3). In the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod the doctrinal statement appears as a rhetorical strategy whose aim is the achievement and the enforcement of theological consensuality. As defined by Webster, a "consensus" is "group solidarity in sentiment and belief" (Webster's 177). Since "group solidarity" was not actualized until some time after the departure of the dissenting faculty and students at Concordia St. Louis, it would appear that "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" failed to achieve theological consensus. Instead, the identification of orthodox belief and the denunciation of heretical belief produced what Lessl calls "solidarity" among the faction who voted for the adoption of this doctrinal statement (Lessl 21). Using democratic procedure to pressure dissenting faculty, this
solidarity causes Missouri Synod members to "draw together in a community of responsibility", to insure the eradication of wrong belief (Lessl 21).

Historical Context Of Doctrinal Statements

In the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod the development of theological consensus by the use of doctrinal statements is an ongoing rhetorical process. As early as 1914, theologian F. Bente wrote that to give up the idea of complete Biblical inerrancy left the "Lutheran Symbols" without meaning (Meyer 407). According to Dr. John Tietjen, individuals within the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod who give the appearance of arguing with this view of inerrancy are traditionally held to be in serious error (Tietjen personal interview).

This tradition was evidently begun by C. F. W. Walther, one of the co-founders of Concordia theological Seminary, St. Louis, who is considered to have been the principal architect of the Missouri Synod (Tappert 32). In Walther's view, Christian faith existed as an immovable object. "Doctrinal development could therefore mean nothing but capitulation to error" (Tappert 32). Pastors and teachers were expected to teach and subscribe to Lutheran confessional documents "without reservation", having seated themselves "with childlike simplicity at the feet of our old teachers" (Tappert 33). This view is echoed in "Article II" of the "Constitution Of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod", which states that the Synod and each of its members "accepts
without reservation" the Lutheran confessional documents and "The Scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments" (Handbook 9). Therefore, the context of the doctrinal statement in such a view would be to provide doctrinal specificity and enforceability, rather than doctrinal development.

Such was the case with the "Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States", written by Walther’s successor in the Synod, Francis Pieper (Meyer 404). This doctrinal statement, referred to by Missouri Synod members as simply, the "Brief Statement", was Synodically adopted in 1932 (Meyer 404). This doctrinal statement appeared in response to several theological movements in American Protestantism. Virtually all of these movements, labeled "social gospel" by theologian Walter Rauschenbusch, challenged the concept of Biblical inerrancy (Landis 18). Of the forty-eight propositions in the "Brief Statement", perhaps the most pertinent to this study are the last four propositions, entitled "Of the Symbols of the Lutheran Church" (Pieper 21-22). Essentially, these propositions state that "doctrinal decisions" of the Lutheran Confessions are "binding upon the conscience", due to their being the "doctrinal decisions of Holy Scripture itself" (Pieper 21). These propositions also charge ministerial candidates with the responsibility of teaching "according to the symbols not 'in so far as', but 'because', the symbols agree with
Scripture" (Pieper 21-22). Ministerial candidates who are unable to pledge to do this, says Pieper, "must not be admitted into the ministry of the Lutheran Church" (Pieper 22). Such an obligation not only includes "all doctrines", it also includes "those that are merely introduced in support of other doctrines" (Pieper 22). It would seem then, that the church cannot force laypersons toward a particular belief system as much as the church can pressure the clergy toward orthodoxy.

The heretical cycle as described by Lessl is repeated again and again in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, causing the Missouri Synod to become more specific in regard to these "doctrinal decisions" (Preus personal interview). As such, the historical position of the doctrinal statement in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod lies in its contribution "to the social construction of the belief system" that the Missouri Synod identifies as its own (Lessl 20).

Consequences Of "A Statement"

Rather than privately offering "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" for use as a list of internal guidelines, Dr. Preus chose to release this statement churchwide (Adams 176). Consequently, enormous pressure was put on the Board of Control to settle the issue of whether the instruction at Concordia St. Louis was or was not orthodox (Adams 177). This question originated with
Dr. Preus. By bringing the issue before the church at large, the question of unorthodox teaching became a concern of the membership and pastorate. In his book *Preus of Missouri and the Great Lutheran Civil War*, James Adams tells readers that Missouri Synod members who were not among the conservative faction saw "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" as a prospective new "doctrinal standard" to which they would have trouble adhering (Adams 176).

"Conservative" in this instance may be defined as those who guarded what they believed to be the unchanging tenets of Missouri Synod theology. This attitude produced what Lessl calls "struggles over authority" (Lessl 20). Immediately following the adoption of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles", official objections were filed with the Synod Secretary (*Convention Proceedings 1973* 37).

The first objection was made by the President of the Southern Illinois District, followed by Reverend Samuel Roth, who "invited those who agreed with him to present their names in an orderly way at the Secretary's desk" (*Convention Proceedings 1973* 36-37). Among this group was Dr. John Tietjen and the group known as the Faculty Majority, who joined in the singing of the hymn "The Church's One Foundation", as they filed their objections (Tietjen personal interview). According to the Board of Control book *Exodus From Concordia*, these objections were simply "the first of several well-planned and highly emotional
demonstrations held in protest against convention resolutions" (Board of Control 53). However, no mention was made of any further "demonstrations" in the minutes of the convention.

According to Dr. John Tietjen, "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" was "produced as the noose on which to hang the faculty" (Tietjen personal interview). Dr. Jacob Preus, Sr. informed this researcher that the purpose of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" was to define more clearly the doctrinal position of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod at that time (Preus personal interview). The author of this doctrinal statement, Dr. Ralph Bohlmann, wrote that this statement was provided for the "theological guidance" of the Board of Control as they made their evaluations of the Concordia St. Louis faculty, since "several members" were not "professionally trained theologians" (Bohlmann personal letter). In the final analysis, it could be said that this didactic "Statement" came to serve these purposes: the censure of the Concordia St. Louis faculty by the providing of "theological guidance" that also came to define more clearly the doctrinal position of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.

The long-term consequences of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" are still being debated in the Lutheran Church, both in the Missouri Synod and in other
synods. One of the long-term consequences may be reflected in a change in the rhetorical position of the Missouri Synod. At the 1975 Synodical convention, Resolution 3-05 was adopted, specifically stating that

"A Statement" is not to be used mechanically or legalistically to discipline members of the Synod, but it is to be honored, upheld, and used fraternally and evangelically throughout the Synod in remaining faithful to its confessional position. (Convention Proceedings 1975 135).

Dr. Preus informed this researcher that new faculty members are expected to assent and to teach according to "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles", but "it was not really applied to pastors" (Preus personal interview). According to Dr. Preus, "the problem with doctrine is hardly ever with pastors", but "almost always with professors" (Preus personal interview).

The issue of academic freedom within the confines of a seminary remains the crux of this controversy. Dr. Tietjen told this researcher that there are issues about which "Lutherans can legitimately disagree" (Tietjen personal interview). Dr. Preus stated that "certain things come under controversy at certain times", but that "A Statement" is representative of "mainline Missouri [Synod belief]" (Preus personal interview).
Yet, Dr. Tietjen insisted that "A Statement" proposed "a new confessional statement to be added to the confessional position of the Lutheran Church" (Tietjen personal interview). In fact, the bulk of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" is supported by footnote references to Lutheran confessional documents. However, Dr. Tietjen's argument could be made on the basis of the fact that the subheadings "The Inspiration Of Scripture", "The Purpose Of Scripture", "The Canonical Text Of Scripture", "The Unity Of Scripture", and "Historical Methods Of Biblical Interpretation" are not supported in this manner. Instead, these theses and their antitheses are presented as accepted dogma.

Perhaps one of the most significant long-term consequences of the Synodical adoption of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" was the viewpoint of the group referred to by James Adams as the "moderates" (Adams 8-9). The moderates held that Dr. Preus and his supporters represented a significant threat to the "Lutheran Church life, witness, and ministry they embraced" (Adams 8; Tietjen personal interview). To use Lessl's terminology, this group perceived themselves as orthodox and much of the basic theology behind "A Statement" was considered by this group to be unorthodox (Board of Control 163). An interesting dichotomization occurred between the "moderate" and the "conservative" factions. Each group responded as
though it were the orthodox group, as predicted by Lessl’s model. Within the moderate group, Dr. Preus became the heretical presence, "executing remote agendas" (Lessl 20; Adams 8). As the faculty of Concordia St. Louis felt their institution threatened by what they perceived to be Preus’ demands, they assembled themselves into "a community of responsibility", as evidenced by the organization of the Faculty Majority (Lessl 21; Board of Control 54-55). In like manner, when the "conservative" faction saw Concordia St. Louis instructors and administrators as expressing "their defiance of the Synod in a public fashion", various boards and committees were assembled as arms of the Synod in order to extinguish what Lessl calls "the fires of deviance" (Board of Control 165; Lessl 21). Primary "issues of definition" were brought into the open, virtually demanding that "boundary-work" be accomplished (Lessl 21; Board of Control 54-55).

In the eyes of the moderates, the release and adoption of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" led to a domino sequence of events (Tietjen personal interview). The adoption of this doctrinal statement led to Resolution 3-12 at the same convention, calling for Dr. Tietjen’s resignation (Board of Control 56-57). Slightly more than six months later, Dr. Tietjen was suspended from the presidency of Concordia Theological Seminary (Board of Control 92-93). More than two thirds of the student body
and all but five faculty members went on strike in protest of this suspension, and this group officially "went into exile" one month later (Board of Control 119).

Definition And Redefinition

In the Preus/Tietjen controversy, opposing groups each sought to define themselves as the "correct-belief" Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod members as opposed to the "incorrect-belief" Missouri Synod members. Theorist Kathryn M. Olson tells us that a rhetor who uses definition in this manner is "not merely presenting an undisputed concept", but is one who advocates "adherence to the particular definition and the perspective sponsoring it" (Olson 131). Dr. Tietjen assumed that his faculty were presenting undisputed concepts in their adherence to the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod perspective (Tietjen personal interview).

When that perspective was redefined, whether to change the Lutheran confessional position or simply to provide specificity, Dr. Tietjen and his supporters found themselves no longer grounded in a "particular past that implies certain values" (Olson 133). Finding themselves unable to adhere to the "particular definition" of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles", the Tietjen group sought redefinition as Lutherans (Olson 131). The staff of the seminary-in-exile, dismissed by the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod for breach of contract, ultimately became a part of the American Lutheran Church (Preus personal interview;
Tietjen personal interview). The American Lutheran Church, regarded by some to be one of the more liberal Lutheran Synods, is now an integrated part of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, known by the acronym "Elca" (Preus personal interview).

Finally, Dr. Preus contended that the Tietjen faction "could have broken the back of the Synod" if they had simply opted to stand firm on the belief that they were correct and resumed their duties at Concordia Theological, St. Louis (Preus personal interview). Yet "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" had by then laid out a new definition of those beliefs; a definition that challenged Missouri Synod members to adhere to it or to redefine themselves within another Synod.
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CHAPTER V
COMPARISONS

The common thread that binds all heretical controversy is absolutism, in effect, the "advocacy of a rule by absolute standards or principles" (Webster's 4). If the Bible is absolutely inerrant, its claims hold the force of truth. If there are laws of physics which are absolute, the production of cold fusion by certain means is beyond logical conception. If government is to be maintained by specific rules of conduct, even disagreement with those rules is tantamount to heresy.

On the surface, religious, political, and scientific controversy may appear to have only the most general characteristics in common. Yet heretical controversies within these disciplines are marked by deeper structural and rhetorical similarities. Using Lessl's framework, this chapter will touch on two other controversies where the issue of heresy has been raised. This researcher will analyze these recent controversies and compare them to the controversy in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.

In 1978, Dr. Paige Patterson held a meeting of twenty-five ministers who in his opinion were among the orthodox leadership of the Southern Baptist Convention (Whitley 65).
The purpose of this meeting was to make these "voting messengers" aware that "suspiciously liberal professors" were teaching in Southern Baptist schools, and the need for these "messengers" to attend the upcoming convention and vote for an "inerrantist candidate" for the presidency of the Southern Baptist Convention (Whitley 65). The strategy behind this move was to use the power of a "sympathetic president" to appoint fundamentalist individuals to key positions within the Southern Baptist Convention (Whitley 65). This political maneuver was designed to effectively eliminate the "suspiciously liberal" from any position of power within the Southern Baptist Convention (Whitley 67).

There are many similarities between the Preus/Tietjen controversy and the controversy still smoldering in the Southern Baptist Convention, as well as some important differences (Preus personal interview; Tietjen personal interview). On the surface, the primary issue in each denomination is the question of Biblical inerrancy (Whitley 63; Preus personal interview). The spark that ignited each controversy was how the Bible was being taught at schools controlled and funded by each denomination (Parmley "Baylor to lose" IA; Board of Control 6). Lessl referred to these sorts of events as "the awareness of a heretical presence", resulting in "a state of crisis in an institution" (Lessl 20). In the Southern Baptist Convention, some observers contend that awareness emerged due
to the efforts of Dr. Paige Patterson, currently president of The Criswell College (Whitley 60-68). The similarities between Dr. Patterson and Dr. Preus are striking. Both individuals emerged from childhood well-schooled in the complexities of church politics (Adams 33-53; Whitley 63). Both individuals are reputed to be Biblical scholars and skilled in dealing with similarly educated colleagues (Adams 108-135; Whitley 67-68). Perhaps most rhetorically significant, both men represent themselves as absolutist, regarding Biblical inerrancy. According to Dr. Preus, if the Bible is regarded as largely allegorical, Christians are left with "an abandonment of what has been axiomatic in Christian theology throughout the ages" (Preus Report 22). Nineteen years later, Dr. Patterson would add:

If you give up inerrancy, the first thing to go is eternal punishment. If hell goes, then Jesus Christ doesn’t become nearly as important.

(Whitley 64)

Preus and Patterson both sought to resolve the "state of crisis" in their respective denominations by working within the established political system of each group (Preus Report; Whitley 64-68). At this point in these events the first difference emerges. During the stage Lessl refers to as "the struggles over authority", individuals who were not advocates of Biblical inerrancy in the Southern Baptist Convention found no John Tietjen to lead them (Lessl 20).
Referring to themselves as "moderates", Southern Baptists who stand in opposition to the political control of the Patterson faction do so as a group (Leonard 517-518).

Thus far, Southern Baptists may be placed at the second stage of the Lessl framework. To understand the "state of crisis" in this religious "institution", observers of this controversy should be cognizant of two developments (Lessl 20). First, the Patterson group, who refer to themselves as "fundamentalists", have assumed political control of several Baptist seminaries, among them seminaries in Kentucky, Texas, and North Carolina (Leonard 517). Second, in a stated effort to avoid a "possible fundamentalist takeover", Baylor University's board of trustees redefined itself to allow the university to become self-governing (Parmley "Baptist panel" 1A). Baylor University in Waco, Texas is the largest Southern Baptist educational institution in the world (Parmley "Baptists Withhold" 22A). The Southern Baptist Convention, which owns Baylor, had previously elected the university's forty-eight member board (Parmley "Baptist panel" 1A). On September 21, 1990, Baylor trustees "voted to establish a 24-member board of regents" that will govern the university (Parmley "Baylor" 30A). The preemptive action prompted the Baptist General Convention of Texas to withhold eight million dollars in school funding from Baylor until the governance issue is resolved (Parmley "Baptists" 22A). In addition to power struggles in educational
institutions, the events in this controversy have created such a "state of crisis" that Southern Baptists have also experienced a drop in funding and membership enrollment (Goldman 27C).

The Baylor University controversy has already presented "potential for building solidarity" among the two opposing factions within the Southern Baptist infrastructure (Lessl 21). However, while the "identification and denunciation of heresy" as "a ritual activity" has undoubtedly been taking place for some time in the Southern Baptist Convention, specific "boundary work" has yet to begin (Lessl 21-22). As there is no official Southern Baptist doctrinal statement adhered to by the entire denomination, as yet there has emerged no clear definition or redefinition of Southern Baptist orthodoxy.

The third heretical controversy examined in this chapter is the cold fusion episode from the scientific community. On March 23, 1989, B. Stanley Pons of the University of Utah and Martin Fleischmann of the University of Southampton in England announced to the popular press that they had created nuclear fusion at room temperature (Dagani 8). Several diverse groups considered this announcement extraordinary on many levels (Dagani 8-20). The first group to express surprise at this announcement was the scientific community (Dagani 10). Pons and Fleischmann are electrochemists, and the production of cold fusion is a subject studied by
nuclear physicists (Scientist personal interview). The orthodox method of releasing such a discovery involves submitting completed research findings to scientific meetings for discussion, or publishing in peer-reviewed journals before releasing the information to the general public (Dagani 8). The usual rationale for this process is that review is necessary to maintain the credibility of the scientific community by avoiding public error (Derra 33-39). Rhetorical critics also note how the review process is a rhetorical process that controls what shall be accepted as true.

Within the academic community, university researchers hastily attempted to duplicate the Pons and Fleischmann experiment (Begley 52). Citing patent concerns, initial data from the Pons and Fleischmann work was "fragmented and confused" within the academic research branch of the scientific community (Derra 34). One observation of a scientist who examined the controversy on behalf of a major oil company was that if the experiment had been successful, radiation levels from such an effort would have been lethal (Scientist personal interview). The fact that Pons and Fleischmann did not succumb to radiation poisoning was in itself evidence of their failure (Scientist personal interview).

Using Lessl's model, the "state of crisis" in the scientific community was brought about by the unorthodox
behavior of Pons and Fleischmann in their method of releasing what appears to have been a flawed experiment (Lessl 20). "Struggles over authority" occurred over the question of what individual or institution can claim to be "the authority" on the production of cold fusion (Lessl 20). Current scientific inquiry is by nature a group effort; any theory, however unusual, which emerges from within the scientific community is carefully scrutinized within that community (Gardner 16). [Pons and Fleischmann triggered the "potential for building solidarity" within the scientific community by operating outside that community (Lessl 21).]

Somewhat disparate scientific groups found themselves forced to band together in order to justify to the public the reason cold fusion had not been produced (Dagani 10-20). This type of "boundary-work", this "identification and denunciation of heresy", was a necessary "ritual activity", in order to reduce the public's skepticism of scientific knowledge (Scientist personal interview).

The rhetorical consequences of the cold fusion controversy continue to affect the scientific community. In June of 1990, an attorney representing Pons and Fleischmann sent a letter to physicist Michael J. Salamon threatening legal action unless Salamon retracted a published study which "cast doubt" on Pons and Fleischmann's cold fusion work (Stipp B3). Eight days later, at the University of Utah where Pons is employed, Chase N. Peterson, president of
the university, announced his retirement amid a "furor" over the "hidden transfer of $500,000 that he authorized for the university's cold fusion programs" ("Head of Utah" B5).

An employee of the research and development division of a major oil company had consented to be interviewed for this portion of the current study. As a result of the threatened legal action against Salamon, this individual requested anonymity. The request was made in order to protect the oil company from liability regarding the opinion of this person, but the request also has rhetorical significance. According to the theoretical work of Kathryn Olson, that this person chose to be defined as an anonymous member of the scientific community indicates that the scientist defines her/himself through "adherence to the particular definition and the perspective sponsoring it" (Olson 131). In this instance, this individual's "definition" is that of one who supports "the perspective sponsoring" the "solidarity" of the scientific community against outside threats (Olson 131; Lessl '21).

The rhetorical dynamics of these three "heretical" episodes merits special scrutiny. Each controversy appears to have progressed according to the model presented by Lessl in his article "Heresy, Orthodoxy, And The Politics Of Science" (Lessl 18-34). Each controversy seems to center on the issue of definition, specifically the definition of the group at large versus the definition of an unorthodox
outsider. If the power of the community to bind its members together is to be maintained, the community, apparently, must not only define the orthodoxy of membership, but the heterodoxy and heresy of non-membership.

In each of the two religious controversies examined in this study, similarities emerged. In the Southern Baptist Convention and the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, those who control the church hierarchy struggle with the question of how to define the truth of the Bible. If the Bible is viewed as even marginally allegorical, the question arises as to who has the authority to declare where the allegories lie (Preus Report 57-60). If the Bible is to be accepted as inerrant, the issue becomes one of requiring absolute belief in a document which may be impossible to verify historically (Preus personal interview). In each religious denomination, these questions were not raised by the membership at large, but rather by rhetors who possessed sufficient ethos for the membership to defer to them to determine the definitive answers (Preus Report 2-3; Whitley 60-68). In each of these controversies, the legitimation of the "answers" was and is still being established by the rhetors who have the rhetors who have the ability to modify "the conceptual machineries constructed to ward off the challenge of heretical groups" (Berger and Luckmann 107).

The scientific controversy over cold fusion varies only slightly from these religious controversies. In the final
analysis, it was not simply that the cold fusion work was erroneous, but that the manner in which the information was released left the scientific community unprotected from the possibility of a largely public error. Furthermore, the scientific community was confronted with the possibility that a major shift in research paradigm was necessary. In *The Structure Of Scientific Revolutions*, Thomas Kuhn comments that the "transfer of allegiance from paradigm to paradigm is a conversion experience that cannot be forced" (Kuhn 151). The scientific community was alienated when the community was forced to publicly affirm or deny the work of Pons and Fleischmann without having carefully reviewed that work (Anderson 5).

It would appear that the principle difference between religious controversies discussed in this research effort and virtually any scientific controversy is that "heresy in science's case means that you've done something that's not verifiable" (Scientist personal interview). The scientist who has performed an experiment which can be replicated and verified could then be perceived as ranking among the "orthodox", if the erroneous information has been studied and reviewed by that individual's peers (Derra 39). However, the scientist whose error is discovered after that individual has "gone public" with a discovery is viewed as a "heretic" (Anderson 21). In rhetorical terms, mistakes within the community relate to competence, while mistakes
within the community relate to competence, while mistakes outside the community relate to orthodoxy.

In the ongoing religious argument regarding Biblical inerrancy, only a portion of the Bible is historically verifiable (Preus personal interview; Tietjen personal interview). Therefore, belief in the errancy or inerrancy of the Bible becomes a matter of faith (Preus personal interview). In this context, the person who has the credibility to determine the definition of faith for the orthodox is the person who has the power to identify the heretic.
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CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSIONS

The most obvious commonality in heretical conflicts is the clarification of the undetermined boundaries, the unspoken rules. The conflicts discussed in the current study illuminate the need within the orthodox group to identify and clarify these boundaries, and the practical consequences of those definition processes (Lessl 20). John Tietjen and his associates were not dismissed from Concordia Theological Seminary because of their "heretical" beliefs, but because they breached their contracts with the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (Preus personal interview). Drs. Pons and Fleischmann lost professional credibility not because their work was in error, but because their work was first presented outside the scientific community (Anderson 5). By stepping away from their "orthodox" communities, each of these individuals became more readily identified as a "heretic".

Conversely, Paige Patterson’s efforts to gain control of the Southern Baptist Convention on behalf of the "fundamentalist" group has been successful because thus far the "moderates" and the "fundamentalists" are seeking gains within the Southern Baptist community (Parmley "Baptist moderates" 40A). A moderate group known as The Baptist
Fellowship has, however, planned an "alternative convention" prior to the 1991 Southern Baptist Convention in order to incorporate (Parmley "Baptist moderates" 40A). It would appear possible for the moderates to break away from the Southern Baptist Convention by forming their own "orthodox" group, though as yet The Baptist Fellowship contends that a separation is not in the foreseeable future (Parmley "Baptist moderates" 40A). Lessl comments that such a group, "by claiming that its position is the true version of orthodoxy, forces those who speak for the status quo to set out more precisely what shall be regarded as the official truth" (Lessl 20). In the Southern Baptist Convention, the position of "the status quo" as well as who speaks for it, has yet to be determined.

The controversies examined by this researcher tend to suggest that the determination of a group's boundaries is best accomplished by means of a text, such as a written policy statement. From the Biblical "Ten Commandments" to the Persian Gulf cease-fire agreement of March 3, 1991, policy statements aid the "advocators of orthodoxy" (Lessl 22). By offering "rhetorical solutions", those who speak for the orthodox can "solace the anxieties of their constituents and maintain political quiescence" (Lessl 22). When political unrest occurs within a group which looks to a document to draw clear doctrinal boundaries, leaders of the group need only to renew adherence to such a doctrinal
statement to "maintain political quiescence" (Lessl 22). Controversy arose within the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod when Tietjen and his supporters saw "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" as a doctrinal statement which changed group doctrine, rather than affirmed it (Tietjen personal interview). Controversy arose within the scientific community when Pons and Fleischmann violated behavior standards which were implied, rather than specific (Derra 33). And controversy still smolders in the Southern Baptist Convention because a specific statement of belief has yet to be agreed upon by the community at large (Whitley 66).

Certainly, there is more work to be done in examining these controversies. This researcher is not a physicist, a theologian, or a politician. There are policy issues within each of these communities which may be more effectively illuminated by educated members of each of these groups. Berger and Luckmann observed that institutions such as these are "experienced as possessing a reality of their own, a reality that confronts the individual as an external and coercive fact" (Berger and Luckmann 58). If the leaders within each of these groups were to examine previous heretical controversies as historical trends rather than as emotional conflicts, perhaps specific boundary work could be accomplished with less internal tension.
The current study also suggests the need for further research on rhetoric and the socialization process. The reader should at this point note that this researcher is currently a member of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, though not a member of the Synodical hierarchy. As a member of this community, this researcher was given access to information which was unavailable to non-members, even members of other Lutheran Synods. The scientist interviewed by this researcher spoke briefly of the difficulties of communication between the various branches of the scientific community (Scientist personal interview). A specific structure for the term "community" and more study of that structure is called for by Thomas Kuhn in his book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*:

What is the process and what are the stages of socialization to the group? What does the group collectively see as its goals; what deviations, individual or collective, will it tolerate, and how does it control the impermissible aberration? (209)

In "The Rhetorical Construction Of Heresy In Science And Religion", Michael Vickery questions the "appropriate means for maintaining the authority of amoral institutional agents of social control" (Vickery 2). If the discipline of science or of religion is to be viewed as a "community",
future research may also examine the question of tolerated "aberrations" among the branches of these communities.

Theoretically, there exists no specific rhetorical paradigm which defines heretical discourse. Lessl's work is an important first step. Heresy does have significance as a generalized rhetorical phenomena, but the definition of heretical discourse varies widely, even within disciplines. Further examination needs to be made of the label "heretic" as it is used in the maintenance of political power within communities. Such research might aid scholars who examine communities which claim allegiance to a specific code of conduct, as opposed to communities held together by specific individuals.

Lessl's "Heresy, Orthodoxy, And The Politics Of Science" leaves a number of questions yet to be examined. The role of "faith" in religious explanations of the "truth" needs to be addressed. "Truth" in the sciences appears to be more pragmatic (Scientist personal interview). The structural nature of the "truth" within communities appears to vary, and so affects the reasoning behind the label "heretic".

Theorists who are interested in power (Foucault, Habermas, Maier) can make a major contribution in clarifying the relationship between heresy and power maintenance. Ideology and control appear to be linked in these three controversies. Interests and hidden interests may serve as
a focal point for further research. Hidden interests may be connected to the hidden messages within the power structure of a group.

Rhetorical theorists and critics have a unique opportunity to contribute to the dialogue about heresy. As observers, they may view the rhetorical dynamics of heated debate with some clarity. As humans who cannot remain attached and who share responsibility, rhetorical theorists may speak as participants. This combination of roles—observer and participant—is at the crux of what Ray McKerrow recently called "critical rhetoric" (McKerrow 97). The rhetorical critic, then, may be a conformer or a heretic.
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APPENDIX A

"A STATEMENT OF SCRIPTURAL
AND CONFESSIONAL PRINCIPLES"
A STATEMENT OF
SCRIPTURAL AND CONFESSIONAL PRINCIPLES

Adopted by
The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod
50th Regular Convention, July 6—13, 1973
Resolution 3-01, Proceedings, pp. 127—128
I. CHRIST AS SAVIOR AND LORD

We believe, teach, and confess that Jesus Christ is our Savior and Lord, and that through faith in Him we receive forgiveness of sins, eternal life, and salvation. We confess that "our works cannot reconcile God or merit forgiveness of sins and grace but that we obtain forgiveness and grace only by faith when we believe that we are received into favor for Christ's sake, who alone has been ordained to be the mediator and propitiation through whom the Father is reconciled" (AC, XX, 9). We believe that Jesus Christ is the only way to heaven and that all who die without faith in Him are eternally damned. We believe that those who believe in Christ will enjoy a blissful relationship with Him during the interim between their death and His second coming and that on the last day their bodies will be raised.

We therefore reject the following:

1. That we may operate on the assumption that there may be other ways of salvation than through faith in Jesus Christ;
2. That some persons who lack faith in Christ may be considered "anonymous Christians";
3. That there is no eternal hell for unbelievers and ungodly men.

II. LAW AND GOSPEL

We believe that the two chief doctrines of Holy Scripture, Law and Gospel, must be constantly and diligently proclaimed in the church of God until the end of the world, but with due distinction (FC, SD, V, 24). The Law, as the expression of God's immutable will, is to be used by the church to bring men to a knowledge of their sins as well as to provide Christians with instruction about good works (FC, SD, V, 17—18). The Gospel receives the primary emphasis in the ministry of the New Testament, for it is the message that "God forgives them all their sins through Christ, accepts them for His sake as God's children, and out of pure grace, without any merit of their own, justifies and saves them." (FC, SD, V, 25)

We therefore reject the following:

1. That the Gospel is any message or action which brings good news to a bad situation.
2. That the Gospel is a norm or standard for the Christian life, or that the Gospel, in effect, imposes a new law upon the Christian.
3. That what God's law declares to be sinful (for example, adultery or theft) need not be regarded as sinful in all times and situations.
4. That Christians, as men who have been freed from the curse of the Law, no longer need the instruction of the Law to know what God's will is for their life and conduct.

III. MISSION OF THE CHURCH

We believe, teach, and confess that the primary mission of the church is to make disciples of every nation by bearing witness to Jesus Christ through the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments. Other necessary activities of the church, such as ministering to men's physical needs, are to serve the church's primary mission and its goal that men will believe and confess Jesus Christ as their Lord and Savior.

We 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.

IV. HOLY SCRIPTURE

A. The Inspiration of Scripture

We believe, teach, and confess that all Scripture is given by the inspiration of God the Holy Spirit and that God is therefore the true Author of every word of Scripture. We acknowledge that there is a qualitative difference between the inspired witness of Holy Scripture in all its parts and words and the witness of every other form of human expression, making the Bible a unique book.

We therefore reject the following views:

1. That the Holy Scriptures are inspired only in the sense that all Christians are "inspired" to confess the lordship of Jesus Christ.
2. That the Holy Spirit did not inspire the actual words of the Biblical authors but merely provided these men with special guidance.
3. That only those matters in Holy Scripture were inspired by the Holy Spirit which directly pertain to Jesus Christ and man's salvation.
4. That noncanonical writings in the Christian tradition can be regarded as "inspired" in the same sense as Holy Scripture.
5. That portions of the New Testament witness to Jesus Christ contain imaginative additions which had their origin in the early Christian community and do not present actual facts.

B. The Purpose of Scripture

We believe that all Scripture bears witness to Jesus Christ and that its primary purpose is to make men wise unto salvation through faith in Jesus Christ. We therefore affirm that the Scriptures are rightly used only when they are read from the perspective of justification by faith and the proper distinction between Law and Gospel. Since the saving work of Jesus Christ was accomplished through His personal entrance into our history and His genuinely historical life, death, and resurrection, we acknowledge that the recognition of the soteriological purpose of Scripture in no sense permits us to call into question or deny the historicity or factuality of matters recorded in the Bible.

We therefore reject the following views:

1. That knowing the facts and data presented in the Scripture, without relating them to Jesus Christ and His work of salvation, represents an adequate approach to Holy Scripture.
2. That the Old Testament, read on its own terms, does not bear witness to Jesus Christ.
3. That it is permissible to reject the historicity of events or the occurrence of miracles recorded in the Scriptures so long as there is no confusion of Law and Gospel.
4. That recognition of the primary purpose of Scripture makes it irrelevant whether such questions of
fact as the following are answered in the affirmative: Were Adam and Eve real historical individuals? Did Israel cross the Red Sea on dry land? Did the brazen serpent miracle actually take place? Was Jesus really born of a virgin? Did Jesus perform all the miracles attributed to Him? Did Jesus’ resurrection actually involve the return to life of His dead body?

C. The Gospel and Holy Scripture
(Material and Formal Principles)

We believe, teach, and confess that the Gospel of the gracious justification of the sinner through faith in Jesus Christ is not only the chief doctrine of Holy Scripture and a basic presupposition for the interpretation of Scripture, but the heart and center of our Christian faith and theology (material principle). We also believe, teach, and confess that only “the Word of God shall establish articles of faith” (SA, II, ii, 15), and that “the prophetic and apostolic writings of the Old and New Testaments are the only rule and norm according to which all doctrines and teachers alike must be appraised and judged” (FC, Ep, Rule and Norm, 1) (formal principle). The Gospel which is the center of our theology is the Gospel to which the Scriptures bear witness, while the Scriptures from which we derive our theology direct us steadfastly to the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

We reject the following distortions of the relationship between the Gospel and the Bible (the material and formal principles):

1. That acceptance of the Bible as such, rather than the Gospel, is the heart and center of Christian faith and theology, and the way to eternal salvation.
2. That the Gospel, rather than Scripture, is the norm for appraising and judging all doctrines and teachers (as, for example, when a decision on the permissibility of ordaining women into the pastoral office is made on the basis of the “Gospel” rather than on the teaching of Scripture as such).
3. That the historicity or facticity of certain Biblical accounts (such as the Flood or the Fall) may be questioned, provided this does not distort the Gospel.
4. That Christians need not accept matters taught in the Scriptures that are not a part of the “Gospel.”

D. The Authority of Scripture

We believe, teach, and confess that because the Scriptures have God as their author, they possess both the divine power to make men wise unto salvation through faith in Jesus Christ (causative authority), as well as the divine authority to serve as the church’s sole standard of doctrine and life (normative authority). We recognize that the authority of Scripture can be accepted only through faith and not merely by rational demonstration. As men of faith, we affirm not only that Holy Scripture is powerful and efficacious, but also that it is “the only judge, rule, and norm according to which as the only touchstone all doctrines should and must be understood and judged as good or evil, right or wrong.” (FC, Ep, Rule and Norm, 7)

We therefore reject the following views:

1. That the authority of Scripture is limited to its efficacy in bringing men to salvation in Jesus Christ.
2. That the authority of Scripture has reference only to what the Scriptures do (as means of grace) rather than to what they are (as the inspired Word of God).
3. That the Scriptures are authoritative for the doctrine and life of the church, not because of their character as the inspired and inerrant Word of God, but because they are the oldest available written sources for the history of ancient Israel and for the life and message of Jesus Christ, or because they were written by the chosen and appointed leaders of Israel and of the early church, or because the church declared them to be canonical.
4. That the Christian community in every age is directly inspired by the Holy Spirit and is therefore free to go beyond the doctrine of the prophets and apostles in determining the content of certain aspects of its faith and witness.

E. The Canonical Text of Scripture

We believe, teach, and confess that the authoritative Word for the church today is the canonical Word, not precanonical sources, forms, or traditions — however useful the investigation of these possibilities may on occasion be for a clearer understanding of what the canonical text intends to say.

We therefore reject the following views:

1. That there are various “meanings” of a Biblical text or pericope to be discovered at various stages of its precanonical history, or that the meaning a canonical text has now may differ from the meaning it had when it was first written.
2. That Biblical materials that are judged to be “authentic” (for example, “authentic” words of Jesus, “authentic” books of Paul, or “authentic” ideas of Moses) have greater authority than “non-authentic” Biblical statements.
3. That certain pericopes or passages in the canonical text of Scripture may be regarded as imaginative additions of the Biblical authors or of the early Christian community and therefore need not be accepted as fully authoritative.
4. That extracanonical sources may be used in such a way as to call into question the clear meaning of the canonical text.
5. That the essential theological data of Biblical theology is to be found in the precanonical history of the Biblical text.
6. That certain canonical materials have greater authority than other canonical materials because of their greater antiquity or because they are allegedly more “genuine” or “authentic.”
7. That various statements of Jesus recorded in the Gospels may not actually be from Jesus and therefore lack historical factuality or the full measure of His authority.

F. The Infallibility of Scripture

With Luther, we confess that “God’s Word cannot err” (LC, IV, 57). We therefore believe, teach, and confess that since the Holy Scriptures are the Word of God, they contain no errors or contradictions but that they are in all their parts and words the infallible truth. We hold that
We reject the following views:

1. That the Scriptures contain theological as well as factual contradictions and errors.
2. That the Scriptures are inerrant only in matters pertaining directly to the Gospel message of salvation.
3. That the Scriptures are only functionally inerrant, that is, that the Scriptures are "inerrant" only in the sense that they accomplish their aim of bringing the Gospel of salvation to men.
4. That the Biblical authors accommodated themselves to using and repeating as true the erroneous notions of their day (for example, the claim that Paul's statements on the role of women in the church are not binding today because they are the culturally conditioned result of the apostle's sharing the views of contemporary Judaism as a child of his time).
5. That statements of Jesus and the New Testament writers concerning the human authorship of portions of the Old Testament or the historicity of certain Old Testament persons and events need not be regarded as true (for example, the Davidic authorship of Psalm 110, the historicity of Jonah, or the fall of Adam and Eve).
6. That only those aspects of a Biblical statement need to be regarded as true that are in keeping with the alleged intent of the passage (for example, that Paul's statements about Adam and Eve in Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 11 do not prove the historicity of Adam and Eve because this was not the specific intent of the apostle; or that the virgin birth of our Lord may be denied because the infancy narratives in Matthew and Luke did not have the specific intent to discuss a biological miracle).
7. That Jesus did not make some of the statements or perform some of the deeds attributed to him in the Gospels but that they were in fact invented or created by the early Christian community or the evangelists to meet their specific needs.
8. That the Biblical authors sometimes placed statements into the mouths of people who in fact did not make them (for example, the claim that the "Deuteronomist" places a speech in Solomon's mouth which Solomon never actually made), or that they relate events as having actually taken place that did not in fact occur (for example, the fall of Adam and Eve, the crossing of the Red Sea on dry land, the episode of the brazen serpent, Jesus' cursing of the fig tree, John the Baptist's experiences in the wilderness, Jesus' changing water into wine, Jesus' walking on water, or even Jesus' bodily resurrection from the dead or the fact of His empty tomb).
9. That the use of certain "literary forms" necessarily calls into question the historicity of that which is being described (for example, that the alleged midrashic form of the infancy narratives in Matthew and Luke suggests that no virgin birth actually occurred, or that the literary form of Genesis 3 argues against the historicity of the Fall).

G. The Unity of Scripture

We believe, teach, and confess that since the same God speaks throughout Holy Scripture, there is an organic unity both within and between the Old and New Testaments. While acknowledging the rich variety of language and style in Scripture and recognizing differences of emphasis in various accounts of the same event or topic, we nevertheless affirm that the same doctrine of the Gospel, in all its articles, is presented throughout the entire Scripture.

We reject the view that Holy Scripture, both within and between its various books and authors, presents us with conflicting or contradictory teachings and theologies. We regard this view not only as violating the Scripture's own understanding of itself but also as making it impossible for the church to have and confess a unified theological position that is truly Biblical and evangelical.

H. Old Testament Prophecy

Since the New Testament is the culminating written revelation of God, we affirm that it is decisive in determining the relation between the two Testaments and the meaning of Old Testament prophecies in particular, for the meaning of a prophecy becomes known in full only from its fulfillment. With the Lutheran Confessions, we recognize the presence of Messianic prophecies about Jesus Christ throughout the Old Testament. Accordingly, we acknowledge that the Old Testament "promises that the Messiah will come and promises forgiveness of sins, justification, and eternal life for His sake" (Apology, IV, 5) and that the patriarchs and their descendants comforted themselves with such Messianic promises (cf. FC, SD, V, 23).

We therefore reject the following views:

1. That the New Testament statements about Old Testament texts and events do not establish their meaning (for example, the claim that Jesus' reference to Psalm 110 in Matthew 22:43-44 does not establish either that Psalm's Davidic authorship or its predictive Messianic character).
2. That Old Testament prophecies are to be regarded as Messianic prophecies, not in the sense of being genuinely predictive, but only in the sense that the New Testament later applies them to New Testament events.
3. That the Old Testament prophets never recognized that their prophecies reached beyond their own time to the time of Christ.

I. Historical Methods of Biblical Interpretation

Since God is the Lord of history and has revealed Himself by acts in history and has in the person of His Son actually entered into man's history, we acknowledge that the historical framework in which the Gospel message is set in Scripture is an essential part of the Word. Furthermore, we recognize that the inspired Scriptures are historical documents written in various times, places, and
circumstances. We therefore believe that the Scriptures invite historical investigation and are to be taken seriously as historical documents. We affirm, however, that the Christian interpreter of Scripture cannot adopt uncritically the presuppositions and canons of the secular historian, but that he will be guided in his use of historical techniques by the presuppositions of his faith in the Lord of history, who reveals Himself in Holy Scripture as the one who creates, sustains, and even enters our history in order to lead it to His end.

We therefore reject the following views:

1. That the question of whether certain events described in the Scripture actually happened is unimportant in view of the purpose and function of Holy Scripture.
2. That methods based on secularistic and naturalistic notions of history, such as the following, may have a valid role in Biblical interpretation:
   a. That the universe is closed to the intervention of God or any supernatural force.
   b. That miracles are to be explained in naturalistic terms whenever possible.
   c. That the principle of the economy of miracles may lead us to deny certain miracles reported in the Scriptures.
   d. That the doctrines of Holy Scripture are the result of a natural development or evolution of ideas and experiences within Israel and the early church.
   e. That the message of Scripture can be adequately measured by laws derived exclusively from empirical data and rational observation.
   f. That man's inability to know the future makes genuine predictive prophecy an impossibility.
3. That our primary concern in Biblical interpretation is not with explaining the meaning of the primary sources, namely, the canonical Scriptures, on the basis of the sources themselves.
4. That if the use of historical methods leads to conclusions at variance with the evident meaning of the Biblical text, such conclusions may be accepted without violating the Lutheran view of Scripture or our commitment to the Lutheran Confessions (for example, the claim that it is permissible to deny the existence of angels or a personal devil because of literary, historical, or theological considerations).

V. ORIGINAL SIN

We believe, teach, and confess that God, by the almighty power of His Word, created all things. We also believe that man, as the principal creature of God, was specially created in the image of God, that is, in a state of righteousness, innocence, and blessedness. We affirm that Adam and Eve were real historical human beings, the first two people in the world, and that their fall was a historical occurrence which brought sin into the world so that "since the fall of Adam all men who are propagated according to nature are born in sin" (AC, II, 1). We confess that man's fall necessitated the gracious redemptive work of Jesus Christ and that fallen man's only hope for salvation from his sin lies in Jesus Christ, His Redeemer and Lord.

We therefore reject the following:

1. All world views, philosophical theories, and exegetical interpretations which pervert these Biblical teachings and thus obscure the Gospel.
2. The notion that man did not come into being through the direct creative action of God, but through a process of evolution from lower forms of life which in turn developed from matter that is either eternal, autonomous, or self-generating.
3. The opinion that the image of God in which Adam and Eve were created did not consist of concreated righteousness, that is, a perfect relationship to God.
4. The notion that Adam and Eve were not real historical persons and that their fall was not a real historical event which brought sin and death into the world.
5. The opinion that original sin does not deprive all men of their spiritual powers and make it impossible for them to be in the right relationship to God apart from faith in Jesus Christ.

VI. CONFESSIONAL SUBSCRIPTION

We reaffirm our acceptance of the Scriptures as the inspired and inerrant Word of God, and our unconditional subscription to "all the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church as a true and unadulterated statement and exposition of the Word of God" (Constitution, Article II; cf. also Bylaw 4.21). We accept the Confessions because they are drawn from the Word of God and on that account regard their doctrinal content as a true and binding exposition of Holy Scripture and as authoritative for our work as ministers of Jesus Christ and servants of The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod.

We accept the following clarifications of the nature of our confessional subscription:

1. We acknowledge that the doctrinal content of the Lutheran Confessions includes not only those doctrines of Holy Scripture explicitly treated in the Confessions but also those Biblical doctrines set forth somewhat indirectly or incidentally, such as the doctrines of Holy Scripture, creation, the Holy Spirit, and eschatology.
2. With the fathers, we recognize that not everything in the Lutheran Confessions is a part of its doctrinal content, but we reject all attempts to abridge the extent of this doctrinal content in an arbitrary or subjective manner. We recognize, for example, that subscription to the Lutheran Confessions does not bind us to all strictly exegetical details contained in the Confessions, or even to the confessional use of certain Bible passages to support a particular theological statement. However, since the Confessions want to be understood as Biblical expositions, we reject the notion that we are not bound by our confessional subscription to the exposition of Scripture contained in the Confessions or to the doctrinal content which the Confessions derive from individual Bible passages.
3. We recognize that the Confessions must be read and studied in terms of the historical situations in which they were written, but we reject the view
that our confessional subscription means only that we regard the Confessions as a historically correct response to the problems encountered by the church when the Confessions were written.

4. We recognize that the doctrinal content of the Confessions centers in Jesus Christ and the Gospel of our justification by grace through faith, but we reject the view that the doctrinal content of the Confessions includes only those confessional statements which explicitly and directly deal with the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Accordingly, we do not accept the idea that our subscription to the Lutheran Confessions permits us to reject such confessional positions as the existence of the devil and of angels or that Adam and Eve were real historical persons whose fall into sin was a real historical event.

5. We recognize that the Lutheran Confessions contain no distinct article on the nature of Holy Scripture and its interpretation, but we acknowledge and accept the confessional understanding of the nature of Holy Scripture and of the proper theological principles for its interpretation.

6. We recognize the Lutheran Confessions as a true exposition of Holy Scripture and therefore reject the opinion that our subscription to the Lutheran Confessions leaves us free to reject any doctrinal statements of the Confessions where we feel there is no supporting Biblical evidence.

7. We acknowledge that our subscription to the Lutheran Confessions pledges us to preach and teach in accordance with the entire Holy Scripture. We therefore reject the opinion that all Biblical matters not explicitly treated in the Lutheran Confessions are open questions.

8. We confess that the Holy Scriptures are the only rule and norm for faith and life, and that other writings "should not be put on a par with Holy Scripture" (FC, Ep, Rule and Norm, 1-2). We therefore reject the notion that it is legitimate to maintain the doctrinal conclusions of the Confessions without accepting their Biblical basis, or to regard formal confessional subscription as an adequate safeguard against improper exegetical conclusions.

9. Finally, we affirm that our acceptance of the Lutheran Confessions means not only that we tolerate the doctrinal content of the Lutheran Confessions as a viable option for Lutheran Christians today but that we in fact preach, teach, and confess the doctrinal content of the Lutheran Confessions as our very own.

CONCLUSION

The 1971 convention of The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod reaffirmed the Synod’s desire to abide by its doctrinal position as stated in its constitution (Article II). The Synod clearly stated its conviction that its confessional base is as broad as Holy Scripture and that the Synod accepts anything and everything that the Scriptures teach. Moreover, the Synod declared its right as a Synod to apply its confessional base definitively to current issues and thus conserve and promote unity and resist an individualism which breeds schism.

This Statement expresses the Synod’s Scriptural and confessional stance on a number of important topics. It is hoped that the endorsement of this Statement will be of assistance to the Synod in the “conservation and promotion of the unity of the true faith” (Constitution, Article III).
APPENDIX B

(COPY OF LETTER FROM DR. RALPH BOHLMANN)
Ms. Melody Barnhart  
1517 Kingston Street  
Lewisville, Texas 75067  

Dear Ms. Barnhart:

My Research Assistant, Dr. Arthur Kuehnert, has compiled a number of statements to provide you with some background material and information on the document entitled, "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles." I particularly call your attention to the prefatory remarks to the study edition of "A Statement," as well as the copy of a number of paragraphs that appeared in Dr. Preus' so-called "blue book," which was in fact his report on the results of the fact-finding committee. Virtually every sentence in that report provides a clue as to the reason and purpose for the preparation of "A Statement."

At this time, I would like to turn my attention to the 15 questions you submitted, and attempt to give you a very brief response to each of them.

1. The faculty minority came into being as a consequence of a public statement adopted at a faculty meeting that carried with it a provision that anyone who had voted against the statement had 24 hours in which to explain that vote to the president of the institution. Inasmuch as that statement incorrectly stated that the faculty was unified theologically, when in fact we were not, I voted against it, as did four others. Because the five of us who had voted no were required to submit a statement, we decided to do it jointly, and the so-called "faculty minority" was born.

The "situation" prior to the fact-finding committee was that the church was increasingly plagued with rumors about various theological positions of some faculty members that appeared to be in conflict with the Synod's official position. As a member of the faculty, it was clear to me that there were not only varying theological positions on key doctrinal issues, but that some of those issues were in disagreement with the official position of the Synod.

2. President Preus came to me, in my capacity as the full-time Executive Secretary of the Synod's Commission on Theology and Church Relations, on leave of absence from Concordia Seminary, and asked me to help him provide assistance to the Board of Regents as it evaluated the fact-finding committee report, as requested by the 1971 synodical convention.
Dr. Preus pointed out that his theological counsel had been requested by several members of the Board of Control who were not professionally trained theologians. Inasmuch as the questions that had been asked of faculty members by the fact-finding committee were heavily theological in nature and often rather technical, he stated that theological guidance would be helpful to the Board as they sorted through more than 1,000 pages of testimony taken from more than 40 professors. Dr. Preus stated that he had agreed to provide such guidance and asked me to review the transcripts and then prepare materials for his use.

I proceeded to review all transcripts to determine what topics and questions had been asked. My notes on that process then provided the basis for establishing the major categories that became the topics for treatment in "A Statement." The next step was to state the Synod's point-of-view on each of those categories, and by means of antitheses to identify the positions rejected by the Synod. Both the thetical and antithetical statements reflected actual questions addressed with some regularity by members of the fact-finding committee and the professors who responded. In other words, both the topics treated and the specific points addressed under each topic reflected actual questions and answers arranged in such a way that people not familiar with the position of the Synod on various details would be helped to know what that position in fact was.

In writing the theses and antitheses, I further endeavored to use the actual language of official synodical doctrinal statements and convention resolutions, as well as statements from the Lutheran Confessional writings whenever possible, in order to give the document as much of an official flavor as possible. The study edition, which was put out many months after the basic edition, contains a great deal of the documentation that was summarized in "A Statement."

3. No one assisted me in the design or drafting of the document. After organizing the basic plan as summarized above, I prepared a draft in two late night writing sessions, and put the clean typewritten copy through one more slight revision before sharing it with Dr. Preus as my "first draft." Dr. Paul Zimmerman was on President Preus' staff at the time as an assistant, and today he is a retired pastor in Michigan. Dr. Preus may have consulted with him after the drafting of the document, but he had no direct role in its authorship.

4. My position on the faculty did not affect the structure of the document in any way. I was on leave from the faculty at the time, carrying out the official responsibilities of Executive Secretary of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations, a position that to this day is closely linked with the synodical president's office in providing staff services and counsel in matters of theology and church relations such as this.

5. No, the structure of "A Statement" was determined as described above. It was not influenced by any other document. It was never intended to be a comprehensive statement of belief, but was rather intended to
summarize the Synod's position, pro and con, on the various areas of theological discussion treated by the fact-finding committee in its conversations with faculty members. Had it been intended to be a formal statement of belief for the Synod, it would no doubt have been structured in another way.

6. The antitheses of "A Statement" were included for the reason explained above. It has been a long tradition in Lutheran confessional theology to confess the truth in both theses and antitheses, but this was especially desirable in view of the nature of the fact-finding inquiry.

7. As explained above, the purpose of "A Statement" was to assist the Board of Regents, particularly its lay members and pastors who were not trained in academic theology, to know the position of the Synod on questions that were asked and answered during the fact-finding inquiry.

8. Yes, it was indeed used for that purpose, but not extensively due in large part to the hue and cry raised by the seminary faculty. However, Dr. Preus also chose to share the statement with the church-at-large after only minimal changes in my original draft. (One of the major changes was the omission of an entire section on church fellowship which Dr. Preus felt was clear enough for the Board of Control without including that area in the document.)

After the statement was shared with the church-at-large, there was so much interest in it that it was decided to prepare a study edition that would facilitate widespread discussion of the issues by pastors and laymen of the church. By that time, too, there had been so much negative propaganda about the document that Dr. Preus felt that it was advisable to broaden its intended purpose for use as a study document.

Eventually, however, the reaction to the document was so favorable within the Synod that a grass roots movement in the Synod proposed its adoption by the 1973 convention. Although it was a controversial decision, as I recall, "A Statement" was indeed adopted by that convention and today is regarded as one of the Synod's official doctrinal statements. Shortly thereafter, the Commission on Theology and Church Relations, of which I was the Executive Secretary, prepared a document that was intended to help the church understand the role of "A Statement" now that it had become an official synodical document. That document was also intended to assist those who disagreed with doctrinal formulations in "A Statement."

9. In my opinion, the purpose of "A Statement" was quite clear to Dr. Tietjen and was adequately explained to the faculty and the entire church in the so-called "blue book" and in other ways. Nevertheless, Dr. Tietjen and the seminary faculty bitterly attacked the document, often without regard to its intended purpose and context, and often without taking direct or explicit exception to the official synodical position expressed by "A Statement."
10. It is impossible to state how one would have handled this controversy had he been in Dr. Preus' position. As a close associate of Dr. Preus throughout those years, however, I would emphasize that he endeavored to deal with the controversy with integrity and chiefly in terms of its theological substance. However, from the very beginning of his efforts to deal with the theological confusion at the seminary which was widely known even before Dr. Preus assumed office, his efforts were deliberately misconstrued by faculty sources as well as the secular and religious media. Dr. Preus therefore often found himself having to deal with public relations' interpretation of his efforts that were quite wide of the mark. In retrospect, I would surely wish that the controversy could have been dealt with in a more quiet and professional manner, characterized by sober and rational debate and discussion by the theologians who were chiefly involved in it.

11. The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, as stated in several convention resolutions since 1962, as well as in its bylaws, expects all of its members, including its seminary professors, to honor and uphold its doctrinal position. This means to preach, teach, and act in accordance with those positions. When a member of the Synod finds that he does not agree with the position of the Synod, he is expected to follow clearly defined procedures stated in the bylaws of the church to express his dissent to his peer groups, his theological supervisors, the Commission on Theology and Church Relations, and also in the form of overtures to district and/or synodical conventions, if he so desires. However, it is the Synod's expectation that those who disagree with it, particularly after they have followed the process outlined above, will have the honor and integrity to affiliate with other Christians whose confession they share.

12. I believe that it is entirely appropriate that Dr. Preus be regarded as the author of "A Statement." It was he who requested the preparation of the document and stated its original purpose. In asking me to assist him, he was making use of his official resident staff theologian whose position description then, as now, calls upon him to assist the President of the Synod as requested. Furthermore, Dr. Preus took the responsibility for the document as it was shared with the Board of Control and eventually with the church. My role as author was simply part of my responsibility as a staff person, and the nature of what I wrote, as explained above, makes little provision for personal originality. Author James Adams several years ago stated that I was the "author," and Dr. Preus himself has made that statement before various audiences. It strikes me that the word "author" can be used appropriately for either Dr. Preus or me, given our respective roles in the production of this document.

13. Yes, I still have some of my original longhand notes and a copy of the draft before it was amended slightly by Dr. Preus, perhaps in consultation with some of his colleagues in office.
14. The answer to this question might well require a full-blown article. Suffice it to say that Resolution 3-09 of the 1973 synodical convention identified the faculty majority position as being in violation of the Synod's doctrinal position and turned those matters in question over to the Board of Control of the seminary. The expectation of the convention was that the Board of Control would then deal with each faculty member on an individual basis to see whether he accepted the synodical position as stated in Resolution 3-09. However, before that process could be carried out, the faculty walked out in January of 1974 and founded another seminary in February of 1974. Had that not happened, my assumption is that individual professors, perhaps including President Tietjen, would have stated their agreement or disagreement with the Synod's stated positions and that thereafter the Synod's processes for dealing with disagreement would have been followed. However, the walk-out of the faculty prevented that from happening.

It should also be added that "formal heresy trials," to use your expression, are not the order of the day in The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. I must also take issue with your description of the controversy as a "Preus/Tietjen" controversy. The primary issue was whether The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod can expect its members and its servants to be faithful to their ordination and installation vows as they carry out their ministry on behalf of the congregations and institutions of the Synod.

15. The controversies in which the Synod was involved in the '70s were clearly over doctrinal issues. In the judgment of the Synod, anyone who denies the full authority and truthfulness of Holy Scripture is guilty of false doctrine. The criteria for this determination are the confessional writings of The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod as contained in the Book of Concord of 1580, and as these confessions are also restated in the subsequent doctrinal statements and resolutions of the Synod.

I would prefer to describe the positions taken by some involved in the controversy as "false doctrine" or a failure to honor and uphold the Synod’s doctrinal position. "Heresy," as we understand the term, involves the persistent refusal to accept the truth and teach according to it. The element of persistency is a subjective one and can only be ascertained in individual cases. In other words, when a case of false doctrine is confronted, the usual expectation is that the fraternal and evangelical counsel of one's peers and supervisors would lead to a clear confession of truth. It is only the persistent refusal to accept such admonition and counsel that would lead to a case of "heresy," in my opinion. The events of the walk-out and the subsequent separation from the Synod of a splinter group meant that no perceived instances of false doctrine ever reached the point of a "formal heresy trial," or similar procedure.
Ms. Melody Barnhart  
March 20, 1990  
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I continue to hope that your research moves forward at a good pace and that you find it interesting and helpful to yourself and others. May I request that you provide me with a copy of your final product so that I may retain it for my files. If there is a cost involved, I would be happy to take care of it. God's blessings to you in your research--and in all you do to serve Him and others.

Cordially in Him,

Ralph A. Bohlmann
President
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APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW WITH

DR. JACOB A. O. PREUS SR.
Dr. Preus: You want long answers, or short ones?

Interviewer: Oh, as long as you care to make them. I want to hear what you think about all of this.

Dr. Preus: Well the reason I asked you the questions I did is that I kind of like to know where you’re at (The interviewer had given Dr. Preus information regarding her educational background.) and what kind of level of knowledge you’ve got and so on.

Interviewer: Oh, certainly.

Dr. Preus: So you go ahead and ask, and then I’ll talk.

Interviewer: What was the original purpose of the document, "A Statement Of Scriptural And Confessional Principles"? That seems to have gotten blurred in the volume of literature that discusses why you wrote it.

Dr. Preus: Well, in the first place I think you need to know that, although it bore my name, people in positions like that, presidents and administrators and so on, often sign things that they don’t write. Course they bear the onus for it; they’re responsible for it. It came about in a very peculiar way. Using your starting point as the place to start: the creeds. See, the historic creeds that you’ve referred to were all ancient. And they all originated in the christological controversies which occupied about the first six or seven centuries of the history of the Christian church. Apparently the attitude at that time was to draw up a creed which would express what they believed was the teaching of Scripture on, particularly, the doctrine of the person of Christ, and then later on, subdivisions under that. For example, you had the various aspects of it: whether Christ was true God or true man, that was the Arian controversy. And, at that point, you had the Athanasian Creed. Then later on you had additions to the creeds as new controversies arose, particularly with reference to, oh, whether there are two wills in Christ, the divine and the human will, what’s the relation of the human and the divine natures; many questions deriving from the original question is Christ true God or true man? Then that branched out into a discussion of the doctrine of the Trinity; the relation of the three Persons in the Godhead. Whether there’s one Person; such people were called Subordinationists, who
believed that the basic Person is the Father and that the Son and the Holy Spirit are merely manifestations of the Father.

So they concluded then that Christ is true God and true man, and that there are three Persons in the Godhead, equal. And then they used certain terms: "In Majesty"; they're the same level of God—"In Glory"; they're entitled to the same worship and the same honor—and yet, without confusing the Persons, or abolishing any Person. Then finally you went from the Person the Son, to the Person the Holy Spirit, to the Trinity itself. Now that kept the church in turmoil, but these creeds were designed on the one hand, to exclude heretics, and to become inclusive. Now historically speaking, there was always a certain element of accommodation you might say, so that they were as inclusive as possible, rather than as exclusive as possible. Although at certain points they became very, very raunchy, these arguments, and tied in with, oh as early as the fourth century there was a great deal of travel in those days just as there is now, especially on the Roman road system, and they issued cards to people, so that if you moved from Galatia to Corinth, say, you could be communed at any church along the way. In fact, we used to do this as recently as World War II. Every soldier was given a card, saying he was a member of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, and when he wanted to go to communion he'd present that card showing that he was a confirmed member of the Lutheran church, see, that kind of thing. It may have been done by Methodists and Catholics, or others too, I don't know. Perhaps the card also served in case of burials; the Catholics would be buried by a Catholic chaplain, and so forth, Jewish by rabbis, and so on.

Well then as the Catholic church got a total stranglehold on everything, and as the power of bishops and the power of the Pope became almost omnipotent, then this notion of creeds became unnecessary. You had one great iron curtain drawn between the east and the west, with the Orthodox and the western Catholics, and for centuries, very little was done, although from time to time church councils were held, what we call ecumenical councils.

Interviewer: Like the Council at Nicea?

Dr. Preus: The Council at Nicea was an early one, but you see, you had even Pope John the twenty-second calling a Vatican Council in nineteen—whatever-it-was, fifty-seven, or sixty, or something. So these were called in that period by popes, and councils were always meetings of primarily church leaders, sometimes lay princes and so on would be involved in it, and they would settle questions, well, all these christological questions, and then you had questions regarding the date of Easter, and you had questions regarding the power of the Pope, and then every once in a while attempts would be made to make some kind of rapprochement to
the eastern church, and then there'd be a council on that, and so on. I think there've been twenty or thirty of what they call ecumenical councils, down through the centuries, beginning with the council of Jerusalem, mentioned in Acts 15, but going on down through the council of Nicea and the council of Calcedon, and so forth.

Well, when the Lutherans came along, there was a hue and cry at the time of Luther for calling another council. There had been two or three in the previous century, designed primarily to bring about a reunion among these rival Popes. You may remember the Avignon situation: where at one point they'd had three Popes; one at Avignon, and one in Rome, and one someplace else. Those councils in the fifteenth century were very damaging to the power of the Pope. Luther had of course a certain number of forerunners, like Wycliff, people like that who were basically attacking the power of the Pope; that was the number one target. So the idea of church councils, and of church councils drawing up doctrinal statements dealing with theological questions that were under controversy, was common. Now these councils were sometimes called synods. The word "synod" means basically, a meeting. It's a Greek word meaning a convergence of roads—where people would come on different roads to a central place like Rome or some other place, Constantinople, whatever, and then they would sit there and chew this over, and the results of it were issued in the form of what they called decrees, or canons. In Luther's time they called for a council, the Lutherans, the princes and Luther himself.

The council that finally came out of it was known as the Council of Trent, which began in 1543, I think, just before the death of Luther. But they'd come so totally under the power of the Pope that the Lutherans, at first, did not attend, and then finally when invited, this thing lasted for eighteen years, it dragged out, different sessions. Then when they finally did come, a few of them did come, then they were not given any opportunity to speak. The Council of Trent was a totally and completely Roman Catholic-Jesuit-Dominican-Italian-Spanish-run thing. Which in a certain way, defined Catholic theology and settled a lot of things that, for example, in Luther's time, is was not really a matter of church law that priests had to be celibate. After Trent they did. It was not really a matter of church law that they believed in what they called transubstantiation: that the bread and wine are turned into the body and blood of Christ. That was not really made official Catholic doctrine until the Council of Trent—quite late. So a lot of times you get into arguments with Catholics and you say, "Your own church hasn't been holding this doctrine for more than four hundred years, why try to make it as though it came from the Apostles?"

So the Lutherans didn't get their council, but they did hold a very famous meeting at Augsburg in 1530. Luther was not present, he was out in a castle a few miles distant.
And at that meeting at Augsburg, the Lutherans presented the Augsburg Confession. Now the word "confession" has a very specific meaning: it was a joint effort. It was written by Melanchthon, but it was adopted by the Lutheran leaders. This is our statement; this is our creed; this is our belief; this is our confession; this is what we confess as the Christian faith. The Augsburg Confession was designed to state in the most conciliatory terms what the Lutherans believed, and as far as they could they would point out, at this point we agree with the Catholic church. In other words as I said earlier, part of the purpose was to be exclusive, and part was to be inclusive, and the Augsburg Confession was predominantly an inclusive document. It was attacked by the Catholics, and in the following year it was answered in a document called the Apology to the Augsburg Confession, written by Melanchthon, but again, adopted by these Lutheran bodies, the bodies being, basically, the churches of certain German territories, particularly the territory of Saxony. I think Saxony was the largest dukedom among all those German states. The predominant one, even to the point that their language, so-called high German, was basically Saxon, and that became the official language of Germany. They had all kinds of German dialects, low German and so on, but the language of Saxony was high German.

Well then about 1533, there was again talk about a council, and Luther was asked to write a document which would set forth the position of the Lutherans on controverted points, particularly by that time on justification by faith. That too was adopted: other princes would say, "I subscribe. That's the position of my kingdom. That's the position of the clergy in my area." And that came to be called the Smalcald Articles, because it was adopted in a meeting in the city of Smalcald. Just like Augsburg.

Then as the years went on, and as the Lutherans began to have more and more a sense of being a church, a separate church, separate from Rome—the last meeting was held at the city of Worms, where Luther had been earlier, at a Diet, or, one of these meetings again. This was the last major meeting between Lutherans and Catholics in the year 1557, and it ended in total disaster. The Lutherans fell to squabbling among themselves, and the Catholics said, "Why you don't even know where you stand. Which of you are we supposed to speak to, tra la?" And then of course you've got to consider all of these military and political things that were going on, that made it difficult for the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, who was more Catholic than the Pope, to stamp on it. A little bit like what we witnessed in Beijing, recently. They didn't quite know what to do about all these people. If you stomp on them, you create a civil war, if you don't stomp on them, you're out of business.

After 1555, the Lutherans won a significant military victory which bought them about sixty years of peace, of not
being molested by the Catholics. This really lasted until the outbreak of the thirty years war in 1618. Well during those years, Lutheranism made hay, tremendous hay. But as that happened, and as they began getting a little bit of freedom, and a little bit of opportunity to stand on their own feet, they began to develop heresies, some of which are still with us, some of which were settled, and finally in 1580, on the exact fiftieth anniversary of the Augsburg Confession, the Lutherans adopted a document known as the Formula of Concord. And if you go to your pastor and ask to see the Book of Concord, which was also adopted in 1580, it contains the three great creeds, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Smalcauld Articles; the Two Catechisms of Luther were added because they were considered such magnificent statements of Lutheran theology, and then this Formula of Concord which occupies about one third pages of the book. It was designed on one hand to say to the Catholics, we don’t like what you’re doing; to the Calvinists, who had become very virulent, particularly on the Lord’s Supper, you don’t match up; and to various false teachers or errorists within Lutheranism, (some of whom had fallen into error on justification, some on the Lord’s Supper, some on the doctrine of conversion, others on free will, others on the role of good works in the life of a Christian, things of this kind, arguments which had arisen within the ranks of Lutheranism.) for whom this document was basically a peace document. It was adopted by about seventy percent of German Lutheranism, by Swedish Lutheranism, and ultimately it came to be normative for all of German Lutheranism.

And when they came to America, they brought this Formula of Concord with them, to some extent, so that today, all of the Lutheran churches of America subscribe. So what I’m saying to you is, Lutheranism is always very creedal. Historically creedal, they identified with those ancient creeds; they identified with the ancient church fathers, including sometimes even Popes, who had said good things. And they picked up the idea of the early church, namely that the way to deal with doctrinal squabbles is to draw up confessions, or creeds, or documents of agreement—the name isn’t important, the purpose is the same. Then these would be put under the noses of, for example, myself, and my son, who finished the seminary in 1980, and the boys who graduated last week, all will stand before some kind of audience and swear to uphold the Lutheran Confessions. They are part of the ordination vow of every Lutheran minister, to this day. So they’re very relevant in the life of the church. Likewise, a Lutheran congregation must subscribe, whether they know it or not. If you look in your church constitution—sometimes you’ll see it on the cornerstone of the church: “U. A. C. Unaltered Augsburg Confession, 1892”. So this idea of having creeds, or doctrinal statements, is old stuff.
Now this kind of died out, because, within Lutheranism, beginning about 1700, maybe as early as 1675, you began having a movement known as Pietism which was really parallel to the Methodists and the Pietistic movement in England, and took place in other countries as well, in which people were saying, "We don't have any trouble being Lutherans. We don't have any trouble subscribing to the creeds, but as the Danish hymn writer put, 'tis all in vain that you profess the doctrines of the church, unless you show your faith by word and deed, and help your neighbor in his need." They said, "Let's have a few demonstrations of the faith." Part of this was, due to the fact, among princes, you had a lot of drunks, and you had Henry the VIII, and his wives. A great defender of the faith (laughing)—

**Interviewer**: Who kept redefining the faith to adjust it to his marital status.

**Dr. Preus**: Well at least he redefined the doctrine of marriage considerably! And then of course on the local level—I've been doing a lot of studying in this area—you had these burghers, and these big shots (the burgher being a city officer, a member of city council, that kind of thing) who were just exactly like they are today. They had a very famous prince there, during the time of Luther: he had a mistress tucked away, and cheated on his wife. He had about a dozen children, but he was fooling around with this woman all the time, and the public finally became very indignant about this. And so he hid her in some castle, and then declared that she had died. She kept producing children! Then when he died, he had one son who had become a Lutheran. Now this prince was a virulent Catholic; the last territory in Germany to turn Lutheran. He had kept this place solidly Catholic. His two Catholic sons were killed in a battle. All he had left was this one Lutheran who was kind of the hippie, or the renegade—

**Interviewer**: The black sheep.

**Dr. Preus**: So he didn't want to turn the kingdom over to him. So he tried hauling out one of these bastards by this girlfriend of his, and the public just simply wouldn't stand for it. No way are we going to be ruled over by some person born up in some hayloft or something—no way! (Laughing) And he was forced finally to recognize this Lutheran son.

**Dr. Preus**: Well that kind of thing, multiplied by many many other things, produced this era of Pietism. You can relate to it very well. Because John Wesley and company were not critical of the doctrine of the Anglican church, but they were saying the same thing. Why should these squires and lords be a bunch of debauched characters? We need some new spirituality
into this thing. Wesley tried to stay as close to the Anglican faith as he could, like the term Methodist Episcopal, they had used bishops, and many of the practices of the Anglican church, but they wanted to be pious, put a little godliness into this religion, see. Well, just as you’ve seen in Methodism, when you begin saying it’s more important how you live than what you believe, that sounds good, until you find that you’re believing less and less and less, until finally they change the creeds, or they eliminate them entirely. And they end up with a religion that is really very watered out, and nobody is sure about anything, and nobody has to agree with anybody. There are no standards; probably only do you love God, and that kind of thing, is the final ordination vow.

So that era of it doesn’t make any difference what you believe, the Pietistic movement gave way to what was called Rationalism, in which they attacked the Bible.

Interviewer: I’ve read some of that.

Dr. Preus: Like Thomas Jefferson. He produced a diest’s version of the New Testament which is about that thick.

Interviewer: Yes, I’ve read that.

Dr. Preus: You’ve heard about that, sure. And he eliminated all the miracles, and he eliminated all the references to the deity of Christ. All he had left was a nice guy. So the thing is, this went through Lutheranism, and finally you really had almost nothing left.

Well then in the nineteenth century there was a great revival of Lutheran orthodoxy, Lutheran theology. It was very strong in Norway, it was very strong in Germany. To some extent, it was reflected also in the other Scandinavian countries. It was at about this time that many of these people started coming to America. Now there was an earlier wave of them who had come out of the period of Pietism and Rationalism, settled in Pennsylvania in the Eastern part of the United States, and they are the ancestors of what we call the E. L. C. A., or the old L. C. A. They never had much theology. An additional factor that went into the thing was an attempt on the part of the German government to force the Lutherans and the Reformed into one denomination.

Interviewer: It was my understanding that the original synods in America were divided up linguistically.

Dr. Preus: That’s true. But they were also divided theologically. So that in Germany, after this whole mess was over, instead of having Lutherans in northern and eastern Germany, and Reformed along the Rhine Valley and in western Germany, influenced by Dutch Calvinism and Swiss Calvinism
(coming like two pincers, you might say), you ultimately had three Protestant churches. You had Lutherans, you had these True Reformed, and then you had a group called United, who are half Lutheran and half Calvinists, and who are the ancestors of what we in America call the Evangelical and Reformed, the Evangelical Church and they are now part of the Congregational Church. A peculiar merger took place between the old New England Congregationalists and these kind of footloose Germans—who are very strong here in the St. Louis area. I think they have their seminary here.

I'm getting too far afield. But anyway, the fathers of the Missouri Synod who came to America were the kind who: we want to be true Lutherans. So to show their true Lutheranism they said, "We want to be foursquare on the Bible. We stand foursquare on these Lutheran confessions: the Book of Concord."

Now they did accomplish something on the American scene, in that today all Lutheran church bodies in America—at least all of the major ones, maybe a few spinoffs don't—but I would say ninety-nine percent of the Lutherans in America at least on paper, subscribe to the Book of Concord. Some of their ancestors did not. That took place on American soil.

So the idea of a confessional subscription or a doctrinal position is still with us. Then came new controversies on American soil. For example, the worst one in the history of the Lutherans in America dealt with the doctrine of predestination. That split up many of the so-called western or midwestern synods. It resulted, among other things, in the adoption of doctrinal statements that went beyond the Book of Concord.

**Interviewer**: Is that when the "Brief Statement" came about?

**Dr. Preus**: "Brief Statement" was kind of the culmination of about fifty years of arguing. It dealt with many different topics on which Lutherans had disagreed. Now the "Brief Statement" was published in, I think it was, 1932.

**Interviewer**: I recently read it. It was 1932.

**Dr. Preus**: Yes. It was written by Francis Pieper, who was our ranking theologian at the time, and it attempted to set forth the position of the Missouri Synod in a sort of a positive way of saying what we believe about the Bible, and about justification, and so on. But also with an exclusive concept: namely, this we reject and that we reject and that we reject—positions which were held by other Lutherans in America. It was an American document. It did not deal with the European situation. Now let me continue for a couple more minutes, if that's all right.

**Interviewer**: Certainly. This is interesting.
Dr. Preus: The concept of a synod adopting a doctrinal position which identifies it in contradistinction to anybody. Catholics, Moslems, Baptists, it depends on who you’re talking to. If you get into a discussion with a Texas Baptist, sooner or later you’re going to talk about baptism. You can’t help it. If you get into a discussion with a Catholic, you don’t talk about baptism, because you basically agree with him. You find very little trouble on that. Talk with a Baptist about salvation through faith in Christ, and you and he feel very much on the same wavelength. Talk to a Catholic, and he’s still got a lot of hang-ups with his good works and his masses and his saints, et cetera.

So the doctrinal position of a church body on American soil hits in many different directions if it is to set forth the doctrinal position of the synod. Many of these things are sort of self-evident. I don’t think we’ve ever, in the history of the Missouri Synod, drawn up a particular statement with reference to baptism. We have our doctrine. We speak it, we enunciate it. But we’ve never carried on a full-throated row with the Baptists, in which it became necessary for us to say they are guilty of this, this, and this heresy. At least we haven’t done it officially.

On the other hand, in our teachings, when a young man enters the seminary, he certainly is told, in many different courses and in many different settings, what our position is on baptism—based on Scripture, Lutheran confessions, and maybe the writings of good theologians, or whatever it may be.

(The tape was turned off to be turned to a new side.)

Dr. Preus: You’ll hear people say, maybe you’ve heard your pastor say, "Oh that’s not Lutheran." or "That’s Lutheran." There are many ingredients that go into that statement. Ranging from the criticism of some cornball hymn, to maybe even religious art. Or some kids at some camp, passing out soda crackers and Coca-Cola and calling it communion, we’d say, "That’s not Lutheran. That’s not Scriptural. That’s not the Lord’s Supper." but they think it is, or they treat it as such. You know what I’m talking about.

So you have many different levels at which a church body, through its teaching, through its pulpits, through its classrooms, identifies itself. For example, beginning in the age of Rationalism, and then taking a new hold in the late nineteenth century, and on into the twentieth century, you had a whole new argument that arose on the doctrine of Scripture. This argument did not exist at the time of Martin Luther. He and the Pope did not argue about the Bible being inspired, or on the fact that the Bible is factual. When Martin Luther talked about Jonah being swallowed by the fish, the Pope had no problem with that. And vice versa. New problems arise. Now for example, to give you a good
Illustration coming out of liberal churches: the issue of racism is really in America, about thirty-five years old. That's the first time people started using the word racism. Now they could dig into the Bible and find many passages that say this is a terrible thing, we shouldn't be doing this. Sometimes officials speaking to a Methodist church in Fort Worth say hey, invite those black people to come to your church. We had a church in North Carolina in the Missouri Synod that had a constitutional clause forbidding black people to worship. The President of the district told me, "I'm going down there, and I'm going to tell those people to change that constitution, or I'm going to kick you out of the synod."

And I said, "I don't see that you've got any choice. Go ahead and do it."

He straightened them out.

Interviewer: Was this during your term as President?

Dr. Preus: Yes.

Interviewer: I remember your mentioning it in one of your addresses to the Synodical Convention.

Dr. Preus: Well I mean that's a new controversy, but it's got a Biblical base. In this instance, it was something that liberal churches took far greater interest in than say, Southern Baptists, who are considered quite conservative. So you have different definitions of liberal, conservative; different arguments in different eras, and what I'm saying is, that a church body, when you talk about being relevant to the times, every church body has generally well got to be relevant to the times.

For example, since 1917, churches have talked repeatedly, and ad nauseam, about the evils of Communism. It's anti-church, it's anti-God, it was in its early days, anti-marriage, and so forth. I think we're living to see the day maybe when some of this testimony we bore is bearing a little fruit. Human rights is a theological issue.

So in other words, the matter of a church body having a public position on a subject is not a monopoly of conservative churches. It is something that all churches, if they're worthy of the name, take a position on. They don't all take a position on the same subjects, but they do take positions. And as such, they are just like we are. Or we are just like they are.

Now when these arguments began concerning the doctrine of Scripture, the first wave that hit the Missouri Synod was met with horror. They're denying the inspiration of the Scripture. They're denying the inerrancy of the Scripture. For example, you could find all kinds of theologians who, through various processes that are known only to them, will
say we can’t be sure of a single word that Jesus ever spoke. Therefore, when you’ve said that, you therefore have solved all theological questions about what Jesus did say, are washed out. So that when He says, regarding the Lord’s Supper, “This is My Body,” then the answer of these theologians will be, “Well that’s what He said. We aren’t for sure what He said, or we can’t even be sure there was such a thing.”

Ergo, why argue about it? Therefore, let’s go to communion together. Or let’s get together and forget about the whole thing.

**Interviewer**: Did this controversy begin with the Tietjen/Concordia issue, or was it earlier than that?

**Dr. Preus**: Oh no, no, no, it went back very much earlier. If you’ll read Francis Pieper’s *Dogmatics*, I think it was published in 1932. It was translated in about 1950. You’ll see all kinds of references if you read the chapter on Scripture; but he’s referring to older people. This movement kept right on rolling, and it still is with us, to a very great extent. When your Methodist friends, for example, look rather askance at you for bringing a Bible to church, that is merely a layman’s reaction to several generations of what we would call liberal pastors, who started by having a Bible on the pulpit, and gradually dispensed with it. And said, “This morning we’re going to talk on the subject of love.” or “We’re going to talk on ecology.”

You don’t need a Bible, you can just get up and blow off. For example, I thought the classic case was the American Lutheran Church in their journal, *The Lutheran Standard*, kept harping about things like Nicaragua, and things of this sort, to such an extent that finally the editor, who apparently had a few grains of some kind of sense, finally wrote an article. He said, “The American Lutheran Church is in danger of being regarded as the ecclesiastical wing of the Democratic Party.”

They were absolutely following Mondale, and all these fellows. Well, to give you a better illustration, remember the famous Angela Davis case? That black girl who was a communist, and got thrown in jail? I happened to be in New York in a meeting. It was the only time I’ve ever attended a meeting at the famous church headquarters building. In that building the United Presbyterian Church had its headquarters. We went into a meeting in the Presbyterian headquarters section. I asked the stated clerk, as he was called, meaning the president, what was going on out there. He said, “Oh, we’re drowning in letters on Angela Davis.”

Because the Presbyterian Church, in his office, had contributed some money to her defense fund. See, it struck the race issue, it struck the Communist issue, it struck the liberal/conservative issue, it struck many things. And I
asked the secretary later (who was kind of a loose-lipped gal), I said, "How's your mail run?"

"Oh," she said, "We've gotten five thousand letters."
And I said, "How many of them have supported the position that you've taken?"
She said, "Not one."

Every single letter was damning the leadership of the church for supporting Davis. Now, that's another way to determine the position of a church: the officials state one position, the rank and file—five thousand letters is a lot of letters in a church body on any subject. What I'm saying is that churches take positions and people either agree with them, or disagree. Now the Missouri Synod had this history of coming out of Germany in a situation. They were fighting this union of the Protestants. And thus they came to America with a very strong "We are Lutheran and we are not Reformed."

The chief sticking point was the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, between the two; being very strict on who goes to communion and what order of service is used in communion. Very great care is exercised to demonstrate that we truly believe that the Body and Blood of Christ are present in the Lord's Supper. Not just that Christ is present in some ephemeral way, but that He's there with His Body and Blood.

We began, you might say, building a wall on this point. Or, making a confession, whatever term you want to use. So we began with the predestination controversy, then with this question of unionism, meaning opposed to the union in Germany. And so the Missouri Synod, down through the years, has taken a position on various controverted subjects. Sometimes we agree with the Methodists, a la racism, sometimes we disagree, even with fellow Lutherans.

The Missouri Synod did this, and as the controversy heated up, with reference to the doctrine of Scripture, and the use of the so-called historical-critical method, which has as its final result just washing the Bible out entirely. Treating it as though it was Homer's Iliad, or Virgil's Aeneid, or

**Interviewer:** Any poetic kind of literature?

**Dr. Preus:** Yes. Anything. So the result was, that we began getting some professors here at the St. Louis seminary along in the fifties, with more emphasis in the sixties, who were at variance with the traditional historic position of this church. Now you've got to understand this church. That's why I asked you about your background. See, they are German. This is a very German organization. And Germans are the greatest law and order people in the world. They operate by rules. I don't always like it (laughing). But nobody always likes it. But they're that way. The English are quite a bit that way.
Interviewer: Do you feel as though the purpose of "Scriptural and Confessional Principles" changed as the controversy escalated?

Dr. Preus: No, let me go just a little bit farther. There was a hue and cry about this. People were protesting. We had a kindly old president by the name of Behnken and his desk was inundated with mail, and pastoral conferences were up in arms. Sometimes it involved Old Testament people. For example, they denied the Creation account, they denied that the fall of man—"Well, it's just a myth, that's just a mythological way of describing how man became sinful, but not a literal account, as it purports to teach in the Scripture."

Then sometimes it took New Testament forms: downplaying of miracles, and it got into such questions as to whether Matthew, Mark, Luke and John were written in the form that we presently have them, or whether they were skillfully put together by redactors, as they were called, and again we get lost in this thing: maybe Jesus didn't really say this. Like I remember arguing with one of them about the wedding of Canaan, and Jesus turning the water into wine. All he would say was, "Well something happened."

I said, "But the Bible says right here that this happened."

"Well, we can't be sure about that." See, that kind of thing.

Angels were another thing. And I remember having a board meeting over here with a certain professor who was up for renewal of his contract. And he shilly-shallied and backpedaled, and fiddle-faddled around, until finally one of the board members said, "Well ever since I was born I've been praying, 'Let Thy Holy angels be with me and that the wicked foe may have no power over me'. Now do I have to quit saying that?"

That was the level at which it operated. So, there was this unrest. And then we had Behnken, the old man, he quit as president. I think he was eighty-two years old. And no man eighty-two years old can cope with that kind of thing and six thousand parishes and hundreds of professors and professors tooting off to Harvard Divinity School, and Yale, and this and that. And coming back and teaching Lord knows what. The president of the seminary here at the time was a very permissive guy. Basically, at heart, I think he favored all of this. He wanted to loosen up the Missouri Synod, and wanted to get together with the other Lutherans. Of course, the way to get together with the other Lutherans is not to ask them to change, but we change, that kind of thing. Well now we come more to the point at issue: In 1969, Fuerbringer, the then-president of the Synod, announced his retirement. They hurried up, before the '69 convention was held in July, and elected John Tietjen president of the St. Louis Seminary. The whole problem was complicated by the
fact too that we had before us a proposal to establish fellowship with the American Lutheran Church, which had fallen into many of these things we're talking about. Plus many of the historic issues that were mentioned in the "Brief Statement".

Well, this was too big a bite. A church leader should never give a convention too much to chew on at one time, of a controversial nature, because they gag on it. So they had the election of a new president, they had the A. L. C. question, and they had the recent--I think Tietjen was elected in May. This was looked upon as an effort by the liberals to gain control of the seminary, no matter who got the presidency of the Synod. They'd been talking about me; I didn't take it very seriously, didn't pay much attention to it, but I was willing to let them talk. I didn't say I will not serve. So anyway, I was elected, and here Tietjen and I faced each other: he put in office by one element, and I put in office by the other. Of course my element was the Synod itself, not just a clique of what you call liberals.

Interviewer: Not just a political faction?

Dr. Preus: Right. I was elected by the Synod in convention. So then we began squaring off, and I hope all that I've said has made it clear, because this is the nub of what I'm saying. My position was: you fellows are expected to uphold the doctrinal position of the Synod! Boom.

They would say, "Well it's not in the Lutheran Confessions."

"No," I said, "But it's been taught down through all the history of this church. It's what the rank and file of our people believe, it's what they were taught in parochial school, and you are expected to abide by it."

Well then came a meeting of the Board of Regents, and there was a lay member of the board, and I said, "Now I want you to hold these professors in line."

The Board was divided by six to five, with six of them favoring the liberals, and five of them favoring the traditional position of the Synod. So finally one of these lay members said, "Well what is the position of the Synod? How do we judge them? What is the basis on which we say this guy's right and that guy's wrong, on umpteen different questions?"

I said, "That's a very valid point. You deserve a clear, unequivocal answer."

So I went back to my office, and I began mulling this over in my mind, how to lay out an answer for this guy. Well at that time, our Commission on Theology had as its executive Ralph Bohlmann, who is now the President of the Synod. He himself has a Yale doctorate. He's a very bright, articulate guy. And he said, "Why don't you let me take a hand at that, and see if I can come up with something?"
Now he’d been a professor here at the seminary, and he knew what these guys were saying. Along about that same time, I inaugurated a fact-finding endeavor, which produced this (holds up the Report Of The Synodical President, 1972). I selected five men, and I said, "The only criterion I have for judging these guys, is that they hold to the doctrinal position of the Synod."

But then you see, more and more the question comes what is the doctrinal position of the Synod? Is it necessary for me to believe this, this, this, this, this. So Bohlmann whittled away on this subject, and in a rather short time, I’d say within a couple of weeks, he came to me with this document which came to be known as "A Statement Of Scriptural And Confessional Principles." Well since I’d been asked to do it, and since I was the supervisor of doctrine and administration for this church, I had to put it out over my name. This is what the position of the Synod is.

Now Peeper wrote the "Brief Statement". I don’t know how many other people helped him, or maybe somebody wrote it for him, I don’t know! But the point is, it bears his name. And that bears my name. But I think it’s important for Bohlmann’s sake that he be given the credit that is due him, as the man who actually sat down and wrote it.

So then we published it. To the whole church. And I was amazed at the reception it got. Now the liberal element did a certain amount of squawking. They picked one paragraph in there which you may want to refer to, on the mission of the church, which was not really a point that was particularly at issue. Except that, historically we’ve always said the mission of the church is to preach the Gospel. Matthew 28.

Under the conditions which existed at that time, we also had a lot of people, and you would recognize this, who wanted to say that the mission of the church not only was preaching the Gospel, but also ministering to the poor, feeding the hungry.

Interviewer: Good works.

Dr. Preus: Good works. And of course these things are mentioned, but good works, not so much in the sense of love your children. Or honor your father. But in the sense of socially good works. We must be concerned about the Contras in Nicaragua. We must be concerned about racism in South Africa. I didn’t have any trouble with this. As long as you put justification here and sanctification or good works here, and keep them separate. And certainly it is the mission of the church to proclaim that thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, which embodies the whole thing. But beyond that, it received very, very, very little criticism.
Interviewer: This (holding up a document entitled "A Faculty Response") was in a box from the Concordia Historical Archives called "The Tietjen Case". This is their (the faculty) response to the entire report (holding up the Report of the Synodical President). I was struck by how they appeared to view it as though they were grading a student's paper. The view was held that some of the language in "A Statement" wasn't as specific as it could be.

Dr. Preus: Ah, yes, but "the Statement is unnecessary"—well that's very debatable. I thought it was. The Board members asked for it. Secondly, "the procedure used in issuing the Statement was improper." Well, that's debatable. "The Statement makes binding dogma out of mere theological opinion." Well, that in itself is also debatable.

"The Statement is inadequate theologically." Now finally they're getting to the point. Is it or is it not inadequate? The only paragraph in here that deals with what I was alluding to, is point four. But you can't answer that Statement in one column. Not theologically.

Well, that's how it was done. And then, partly on my own initiative, and partly at the behest of other people, the Statement was brought before the convention of 1973 at New Orleans, and was adopted. It then became on the same level as the "Brief Statement". Now I made a lot of point of this: that I think a church body that does not allow itself the privilege of adopting doctrinal statements—go back to my friend in North Carolina who said, "If that congregation doesn't conform to the doctrinal position of the Synod on the subject of black people, they're out!" Now that's harsh language, and yet had he done that, had he done that in that day,—there wouldn't have been a single person in the Synod who would have raised a voice in opposition to it. Because, although there are plenty of racists, just like there are plenty of male chauvinist pigs around, you don't admit you are one. You don't talk and say "I'm a racist! I hate blacks."

Interviewer: (Laughing) "I'm a racist and I'm proud."

Dr. Preus: (Laughing) No, you can't do that. There are some guys in Texas maybe that do that, but they're very few. I lived in Arkansas for eight years, and I didn't hear any more racist comments in Arkansas than I've heard in Minnesota.

Interviewer: Do you think that the purpose of the document seemed to change as the situation intensified?
The faculty who disagreed with you seemed to be complaining that the "Statement" was like an oath of loyalty that they felt cornered into taking.

Dr. Preus: I'm sure it was. I'm sure that they interpreted it that way. And so were the Lutheran Confessions in 1580. They sure were. And when there were certain people that wouldn't subscribe to them and they were dealt with.

Interviewer: How is this document different from the "Brief Statement"? Were there big specific differences?

Dr. Preus: They deal with different subjects. This document did not attempt to go back to the 1930's and the 1920's, and so on. It attempted to deal primarily with the big row we were having on the doctrine of Scripture. It dealt with some other things; Bohlmann had the idea that it would be good to broaden it a little bit, and I said fine. So there's much in there that nobody--presumably--could disagree with. They didn't like that it was done, they didn't like that the Synod adopted this thing and said now teach according to it. That they didn't like.

Interviewer: But they couldn't disagree with a great deal of it?

Dr. Preus: No, I don't think so.

Interviewer: Do you think that the Synod used the document as effectively as they could have in adopting it?

Dr. Preus: No.

Interviewer: No? How could they have used it differently?

Dr. Preus: Well, I'll tell you what they did. They adopted a resolution that said that this was to be required of all faculties. We had at that time, I don't know what we have now, probably not any more, we had about six hundred professors. And each professor was expected to teach according to it, and when they hired new professors, they were expected to read it and subscribe to it. I've been in on interviews held here in St. Louis in which they were asked, "Do you subscribe to the 'Statement'?

And the fellow would say, "Yes, thank you very much."

If he said, "Well, I don't know . . ." he probably didn't get the job.

But it was never used, for example as part of the ordination vow. It was never used as part of the installation of a pastor in a congregation. It was not really applied to pastors in their situation. Oh the problem, the problem with doctrine is hardly ever with
pastors. It's almost always with professors.

Interviewer: I see. That makes me curious: do you think professors dwell on the small things too much?

Dr. Preus: Well--I don't know if you'll want to let your advisor listen to this--but, professors are in a class of their own. I was a professor. I was in the active ministry for about thirty-eight years. Eight years I was in a parish, and twelve years I was a church administrator. And the rest of those years I was tied up with schools, as a prof, or as an administrator. And professors are a different breed. They belong to a separate category of humanity. They're very filled with their own importance. They're very impressed with their knowledge as compared with the ordinary rank and file human being, and they don't like to be told what to do.

Interviewer: I've run across some that are that way and some that are not. I partially agree with you (laughing) thus far.

Dr. Preus: Let me say that, it's a rule that applies to many of them.

Interviewer: Ah, the ones that you've encountered, specifically.

Dr. Preus: Not all. Some of the nicest people I've ever dealt with in my life were professors. But they have to be dealt with differently. You see, in the Missouri Synod, since these professors all went out and got doctors degrees, and these church administrators were always clucks who had just graduated from the seminary, maybe with a C average. But see I also had a doctors degree, and Ralph Bohlmann has a doctors degree. And I always felt like Paul, when he says to the Corinthians, "Are they Jews? So am I."

See, he could talk with them.

Interviewer: In Adams' book he says that this document became your personal definition of heresy. Do you feel that was true?

Dr. Preus: Well, I guess what I've said to you explains it. I didn't write it. I didn't sit around and memorize it. I didn't run around the church and say, "Now this is my document and you jolly well better agree with it."

In fact, because of the fact that I had my name on it, I always kind of kept an arm's length. This action by the Synod to have the professors come under it, was not my idea. Adams I think does me an injustice if he thinks I was on an ego trip. Or if that's what he suggests.
Dr. Preus: That had nothing to do with it. I'm very interested in theology. Always have been. I've spent thirty years of my life translating—I can show you upstairs in my study there—translating the writings of one of the authors of the Formula of Concord. And he was a man who was very precise. He said, "We must be very careful in our language because language can conceal thought, language can deceive, language can mislead, and language can clarify and edify."

And—many of these professors were confused, they weren't very good thinkers. They didn't think theologically. Now if that puts me on an ego trip, so be it! I just felt, this is what the Synod teaches. This, is what the Synod expects. Now why should you guys be given a privilege and dispensation to go pffft! Now that's my real point.

Interviewer: I see. Do you think that any particular individual was responsible for the Synodical break, and the Concordia walkout? That there was somebody specifically who led them?

Dr. Preus: The over-arching person in that was John Tietjen. If Fuerbringer had remained President of the Synod, er, president of the seminary, this thing would never have occurred.

(A new tape was inserted into the recorder.)

Interviewer: We were talking about Dr. Tietjen's role in the Synodical split and the walkout.

Dr. Preus: Tietjen is a very charming fellow. He's witty, and you'd like him. Anybody would like him. But he's an absolute mule. Stubborn as a mule. It showed itself when he left that bishop's job in Chicago. Where he wanted to have a certain person as assistant, and they said no, and alright I quit! It had nothing to do with theology, just stubbornness.

I used to say to my secretary, "You know, these people don't understand anything about me, and they make no effort to understand anything about me."

I'm an absolute pushover for kindness. But if you come at me this way, and start bucking on something that I know something about—I had taught this stuff. I had taught theology, these very subjects on which these profs were going haywire. And I was not a novice. I had gone through graduate school, where we studied questions of this kind as they related to Homer and others. And they knew that. I wasn't born yesterday. And they'd make these statements, like that guy on the wedding of Cana, and that was just pure piffle!

Interviewer: Do you think Tietjen underestimated you?
Dr. Preus: Well I think they underestimated my ability to take punishment, because they dumped it on me. I felt like I was under a dumpster. But I would always come up, you know.

Interviewer: I read a comment where you had said something about feeling as though you’d been hit with a bale of hay, paraphrasing Truman. If you were called upon to face this same situation again today, is there anything you’d have done differently, having the beauty of hindsight now? Anything that you would have handled differently, as difficult as the situation was?

Dr. Preus: Let’s put it this way, there were certain things that I wanted to handle differently, but I was not permitted to do it, because I did not have complete control. I could not tell these boards everything that I wanted them to do. I would have been perhaps a little more patient, and I would have perhaps been much more careful in what I said. I think, going back over it I would have maintained a -- like Bush has done recently: He doesn’t talk until he’s ready to say something. And then when he speaks, like he did on Gorbachev and the East European situation, he spoke in such a way that the whole world sat up and listened to him and said hurray, hurray. But they’d been yelling for two weeks, why doesn’t he say something?

This kind of thing (pointing to the Report of the Synodical President booklet) -- I would have done that fact-finding thing. I would’ve put out that Statement, I don’t think that was a mistake. But I think I would have been more the kind of person, if someone came to me with a bellyache, I would’ve sat down and said, “Thank you. Appreciate what you’re saying.”

And once in a while I’d get a little bit carried away in letters that I’d write, most of which never were published or anything, but I think I could have mollified more people if I’d been a little less forthright.

Interviewer: It seemed that at one point the controversy escalated to such a point that one or the other of the factions had to get out of the Synod. It appeared as if in the end there was no choice. Or was there a choice?

Dr. Preus: No, the first attempt was to take over the Synod, and only when they saw that they couldn’t do that, did they talk about getting out. Their operation was quite well organized, and quite well-orchestrated. And they would say, they talk about getting out. Their operation was quite well "Now we’ll fight it out on this line."

And then everything would proceed. And then if they ran into a stone wall, then they would say, "Well then--we’ll fight it out on this line."

But for example, there was never any real attempt made
to make peace, except on their terms. Namely, we stay, we continue to do as we are doing, and you will figure out how to live with it. My poor predecessor, Oliver Harms, he didn’t like what they were teaching, but he found himself in the wretched position of trying to defend them. And trying to speak well of them, and trying to put the best construction on everything, and the upshot of it was that he lost his job. Now I hadn’t asked for the job, and I thought of resigning every day I was in the job, but I certainly didn’t think that I cared to go down in history as another man who’d gotten up to bat and struck out. And there were certain things I could do, under the constitution of the Synod, and I proceeded to do them. I did nothing that was unconstitutional, I did nothing that was contrary to any regulations of the Synod. I didn’t move as fast as some of these right-wingers, like Christian News and so on, wanted me to move, but I didn’t take my orders from them. I would announce at every convention, "If you don’t like the way I’ve been carrying on my job, now’s your chance. Get another guy."

I wasn’t wedded to it. I didn’t feel that God had destined me to hold that job til I was two-hundred years old. And by my own power, and with my own decision and with nobody telling me anything, after twelve years, I laid it down. The first eight years were pure hell. And the last four years were pure joy. We raised that eighty-million dollar collection, and I concluded that the Synod is now—we’re over it. See I was president during Viet Nam, and I sat every day and watched Nixon and Carter and all these poor fish, and I said the trouble with the Viet Nam war is not that it was any worse war than Korea or anything else. The trouble with Viet Nam is they haven’t decided whether they want to win it, or get out of it. And you cannot keep a country excited about anything when you yourself are undecisive.

I lived through World War II, and Roosevelt says, "We’re gonna win that thing!"

And we poured everything we had into it. And the whole country stood with him. And this was the only kind of leadership that this church can have. You can’t sit there and waffle. Like one guy in Texas one time at a conference said, "Why did you decide to do what you’re doing right now?"

And I laughed, and I said,"Because right now is when I’m president!" (Laughing) I had no other opportunity!

Interviewer: Do you think that in the end, the Synodical split was necessary to maintain the health of the Synod?

Dr. Preus: We had a real deep cleavage within the clergy that was divided partly on doctrine, and partly on the question what kind of Synod did they want the Missouri Synod to be, and how shall it relate to other church bodies. I mean, there was a strong element that wanted to bring us into
what is now the E. L. C. A. (Evangelical Lutheran Church of America). And had that element prevailed, from '69 to '81, and continued to work, and turn out hundreds of seminary graduates, and wait for hundreds of funerals of old conservatives, they would have probably had us in E. L. C. A. right now. I felt that since E. L. C. A. does not represent the theology of the Missouri Synod, has never decided that it wants to dump its theology, I had very little choice. For a while you see, we were carrying water on both shoulders. We'd want to be cosy with these folks, and on the other hand we'd want to keep our doctrine. Now that's an impossible position, and I opted to go with the doctrine.

But you see, in the losses that we suffered--we lost portions of two hundred congregations. Not all of them. The true facts probably are we lost about a hundred congregations, and maybe a 50,000 thousand members. But we lost five hundred preachers. That whole liberal element packed up and moved out. And that's really where they wanted to be; they really preferred the theology and the climate and the permissiveness and the general tra la tra la of the E.L.C.A.

Interviewer : And Seminex?

Dr. Preus : Well Seminex--I have to tell you a story: I was not on a basis of hostility with all those professors, nor did I have any gripes with many of them. They were just misled, led off into the wilderness by Tietjen. One day, maybe a year after the whole mess was over, one of the Seminex profs--I'm sorry, he went out with Seminex, then he took a call into a Missouri Synod church, where he still is, out east. And he was in my office, wanting some money for a book he was publishing--which he got, I got it for him.

I said, "Let me ask you a question. Now you guys staged this great big thing, and of course, neither you nor I believe this all just happened. Those crosses, somebody sat down and nailed those crosses together, sometime in advance of the day they pounded them into the ground out there. (They had many carefully laid plans.) Now you had this big to-do, and you walked out and you had the television all there to take the pictures of the boys driving off the campus, the tears and the wives and the kids and all the traumatic paraphernalia that went with it. Now Tietjen was fired in February, and you guys were fired in March, and the whole church was in an absolute uproar, and I had written you a letter saying please resume your duties, and the Board of Directors had written you a letter saying please resume your duties, and," I said, "you answered by saying we're teaching the same courses, we're teaching the same curriculum, we're doing the same thing that everybody had done before."

"Now," I said, "Suppose along about May--in the whole argument, did it ever dawn on you what was the real argument
"nobody was criticizing your theology. Nobody fired you for false doctrine. They fired you for breach of contract."

And it stuck. Nobody ever challenged that.

"Now," I said, "Suppose along about May, you called out the T.V. cameras again. And had Tietjen standing under the statue of Martin Luther, ready to make his illustrious Patrick Henry speech, and you had driven back onto the campus. And the students had all taken their keys out of their pockets, and opened those doors, and walked into their dormitories, and all lined up in the cafeteria for lunch, and the professors that walked out of their classrooms, and the registrar had resumed his duties--put the records back."

I said, "What would have happened?"

Now they had Scharlemann as the president (of Concordia St. Louis), who cracked up, he was a General in the military.

I said, "Do you suppose General Scharlemann would have called out the National Guard, to run you off? They wouldn’t come. They’d have said that’s a religious fight. Will you call out the St. Louis county sheriff? He wouldn’t have come either. He’d have said that’s a religious fight. And you’d come back. What would we have done?"

(Laughing) He got a funny look on his face. He says, "We never thought of that."

And I said, "Dwayne, I’ll tell you a secret: I never thought of anything else."

Because that was the way they could have done it. They could have broken the back of the Synod. The rank and file of the Synod would have said, "Thank God."

Now that story’s never been told to anyone.

Interviewer : I haven’t run across it.

Dr. Preus : No, nobody’s ever run across it. Jim Adams never got that one.

Interviewer : Have you ever read the document, Faithful To Our Calling, Faithful To Our Lord?

Dr. Preus : Well, not in great detail. I have it. That was their defense.

Interviewer : Did it correspond in any way with the Statement, that you know of?

Dr. Preus : Well, I think that they took a position, and they said we will not budge, and they never budged an inch. I don’t think they had to read the Statement at all. All they had to say is, "We refuse to have something imposed on us!"

Interviewer : So it was just their way of saying we still won’t give up, we still won’t give in?
Dr. Preus: I don't think they would have. I don't think so.

Interviewer: My last question: Just how much differing of opinion is permissible in the Lutheran Church/Missouri Synod? I mean how much argument, how much difference do you allow in the professorship of Concordia Seminary? Or is there any difference? Is there no difference allowed at all?

Dr. Preus: That's a terribly hard question.

Interviewer: (Sympathetically) I'm sorry.

Dr. Preus: No, no, I've thought of it all the time, I was asked that question hundreds of times. Let me give you a five minute answer:

Historically, certain things come under controversy at certain times. And then they cease to be matters of conflict. There were things that they argued about in the days of Luther that were very "Lutheran", that we pay no attention to today. There were certain things we had arguments about in the Missouri Synod, that are not argued about today. For example, I mentioned the predestination controversy of just about exactly a hundred years ago. It tore up the Missouri Synod.

If a boy wrote a term paper today, and came out on the wrong side of that question, he wouldn't get kicked out of the seminary. Some prof might sit down, and try to straighten him out. And probably after a ten-minute interview, he probably would say, "Well, I think I got him straightened out."

Maybe the kid would say, "Nah, I still hold the same view."

It probably today is not considered in the same class that it was then. The fight against "heresy"--to go back to your original word--is often-times, I think best described as a fight against heretics. These guys made the mistake of picking the most controversial subject in Christendom, during the 1950's and 60's. And they chose the world's worst place to start it, namely, in a theological seminary, like the Baptists. You know the Baptists. They fight their seminaries; it's the only place they can get a hold of the issues.

Certain issues become issues, and if you find yourself, at that point, as the storm-center of that thing, and willy-nilly, you find yourself looked upon as the arch-heretic: you're in for trouble. You're going to get slam-banged. Twenty-five years previously, twenty-five years after, it probably would not be the same.

Interviewer: So are you saying the definition of heresy continually changes?
Dr. Preus: Yes, yes. There are certain heresies that have been so, so condemned, down through all generations. For example, you had in the days of St. Augustine a movement known as Donatism. Today if you call a person a Donatist, you are automatically calling them a heretic. Some heresies go on forever. During Augustine's period there was also a fight over salvation by grace alone, as compared to by grace plus works. That's an argument that has never died. It can be raised by any issue at any time.

But there are some that disappear, that fade out. These boys can only be described as being the wrong people in the wrong place at the wrong time. They thought they were going to bludgeon their way into changing the Missouri Synod at a time when the Missouri Synod was not ready to be changed, didn't want to be changed. As I said earlier, the sixty-nine convention was given too big a bite to chew and they gagged on it. They had to accept a (seminary) president whom they knew as being a liberal, they had a new President of Synod, and they faced the A. L. C. question. Those were too many things, and as a result of it, a revolution took place, which resulted in my election.

Nobody wanted me, nobody expected me, I had no great talent for the job, or anything. But conversely, I think I was the right guy at the right place at the right time for that one. Never again--I don't think it would happen ever again. To me--and it may not happen again for a couple generations.

Interviewer: Do you think this will always be an argument, doctrine versus gospel?

Dr. Preus: There will always be arguments. Now like for example there's a big move on to unseat Bohlmann, but they don't have an issue, and they don't have a good candidate. Therefore, they won't beat him.

Interviewer: So why would they try to?

Dr. Preus: Some of them don't think he's tough enough. He's the author of this thing (pointing to "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles"). He's the paragon of orthodoxy!

Interviewer: I had read that he was considered by some to be a pawn that you had moved in to continue your reign.

Dr. Preus: I think the liberals would have said that, but that is not true, and I think Bohlmann has been trying very valiantly and sometimes to my hurt, to avoid that charge. I don't think that would be said today; that maybe would have been said four or five years ago.
Interviewer: Yes, when he was first elected was when I first started reading it.

Dr. Preus: Yes, yes.

Interviewer: As I said before, the more I more I study this, the more I need to learn.

Dr. Preus: But I do want to say to you that I think that Statement--and I can say this because he wrote it and not I--I think it’s an excellent statement. I heard of pastors who handed it out to converts, and said, “Read this, and you’ll get a pretty good picture of where the Missouri Synod stands.”

And I think that’s true. I think that it does pretty well represent mainline Missouri. See, the issues were quite complicated. Many of them were scholarly issues.

Interviewer: I noticed. Some of them still I’m not sure I understand.

Dr. Preus: Well, but they had to be simplified. And in order to make people understand them, or get people to be able to understand them, we had to simplify things. For example, the words "Biblical inerrancy" came in. You would say, "That guy thinks there are errors in the Bible!"

It was an easy argument to use, but the issue of inerrancy is a rather complicated one, and it isn’t answered in a two-minute speech, except the Bible doesn’t contain errors, period. But having said that, them you can go on and still do an awful lot of arguing. The Baptists believe in inerrancy, and all these fundamentalist outfits that you live with in Texas.

Interviewer: I was told that, in this particular thesis that I am not to approach whether or not the Bible is inerrant, because it’s not something you can prove in a worldly sense.

Dr. Preus: No, no. That’s true. It’s an article of faith. But when a man says, “I don’t believe it, and my article of faith is that it contains errors.”

Then he’s in trouble. Well, go ahead, if you’ve got any further.

Interviewer: Oh, that was really all, thank you.
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Interviewer: I am interested in looking at a "Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" rhetorically speaking, and the power that such a document has, and I’ve recently been to Concordia Historical Archives, and plowed through all the information regarding this whole episode. The thing that astonished me most is that people all still have very strong feelings there about what went on, either one way or the other, there are still people clenching their jaws over this. A lot of people that I met said you were very charming, that I should be delighted to meet you.

I was curious, just as a theologian, what can you tell me, a student, about a "Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles"?

Dr. Tietjen: I can tell you a lot about it. A "Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" was produced by President Jacob Preus and his administration as the document that was, publicly, supposed to serve, within the Missouri Synod, for use by the seminary Board of Control to give them the necessary standard by which to determine whether the members of the faculty were teaching according to the doctrinal principles of the Synod. It then also served, and that was its major purpose, it also served as the document that was adopted by the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod in 1973, as a doctrinal statement supposedly completely in accord with the Scripture. What happened at the 1973 convention is that the Missouri Synod first of all, decided that it had the right to adopt doctrinal statements that it could impose on the whole church. That was what I call the major premise.

Interviewer: This hadn’t previously happened?

Dr. Tietjen: No. Secondly, it adopted a "Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" as such a doctrinal statement that could be imposed on the church. That was the minor premise. And then the conclusion from this syllogism, is the next action that they took at that convention: that the faculty of Concordia Seminary, the so-called faculty majority, which was just about all the faculty, were to be condemned for teaching false doctrine that was not in accord with this doctrinal statement. The "Statement" was produced as the noose on which to hang the faculty.

It’s an interesting history: The President of the Synod announced that he was going to investigate the faculty in 1970. He appointed his Fact-Finding Committee that
investigated the faculty through '70 and '71. In '72, he issued a "Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles", supposedly, for the guidance of the Seminary Board of Control to assess the doctrinal position of the faculty. What in fact happened, and one of these days I will have all of that out in print for everybody to see, what in fact happened is that Preus and his group of friends who were in charge of the Synod, particularly Paul Zimmerman, who was the chairperson of the Fact-Finding Committee, and Ralph Bohlmann, who with Zimmerman was the author of a "Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles", those people (whoever else may have been in on that I don't know) but those people sat down and said, "What are the things that the faculty is teaching that are wrong?"

And they assembled six basic areas where they were convinced the faculty was in error. They had before them already at this particular point, even before the investigation began, they had before them a list of things that they considered were teachings of the faculty that were to be condemned, and a list of things that were the teaching of the Synod that were the truth—their understanding of the teaching of the Synod. What they did was to ask the faculty all kinds of questions to demonstrate that they were teaching column B when they should have been teaching column A. The faculty didn't know this of course, they just went into these interviews, which I at that time called a fishing expedition, in which in fact that's what it was, a fishing expedition. But the faculty didn't realize that they were being asked questions that were designed to provide answers that would be measured up against this standard that had already been produced.

**Interviewer**: So in effect, the committee already knew the answers to these questions they were asking? So the document was based on the answers to those questions, rather than just pulled out of Missouri Synod doctrine?

**Dr. Tietjen**: Correct. Correct. And then a "Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" was written after the fact. Preus by his own statement, in a letter to the Board of Control of the Seminary in March of 1972 said, that in the "We reject" parts of the "Statement" those were all the teachings of the faculty. Except for five statements in there. Five statements, I don't know why they were added, I guess to make it seem to be a much better statement than simply one that was condemning the faculty. They were condemning five other things besides what the faculty taught.

**Interviewer**: From what I've found out so far, apparently Dr. Bohlmann felt it would be nicer if they expanded the statement to include some other things.
Dr. Tietjen: Right.

Interviewer: Some things which were apparently going on with the missions area also.

Dr. Tietjen: Correct. And had to do with, presumably, universalism was a problem. That is, the notion that somehow everybody will ultimately be saved, regardless of your relationship to Christ, your faith in Christ. There wasn't a faculty person who taught that, but that was included in the things to be condemned. A Roman Catholic notion of heathen people who would be Christians if only they had had the opportunity—anonymus Christians, that's what it is, anonymous Christians. And of course we didn't—(laughs)—that's Carl Rahner's point of view, it wasn't the faculty's point of view. Things like that were added into the document to make it seem more general, but essentially, the document was produced in order to show that the faculty was teaching all of this heresy that had to be condemned.

Interviewer: So were they? I mean, had any of this any basis in fact at all?

Dr. Tietjen: No. That's the irony of all of this. The faculty responded immediately to a "Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles", and they said two things to the Synod.

The first was, "This does not represent our teaching. It is at best, a caricature of what some of us are saying. But it is in no way the way in which we teach these things."

That's number one. This document is not a valid way of assessing our point of view cause we don't teach what they say we teach.

Secondly, "Watch out for what's going on here, don't you see what's happening? What Preus is proposing is a new confessional statement to be added to the confessional position of the Lutheran Church."

That of course was a major issue in the controversy. One of the major issues was the role of the doctrinal statements in the life of the church, and there was a basic conflict over that. Preus and his group were convinced that it was perfectly appropriate for the Synod to adopt doctrinal statements, and impose them on the life of the church. The Missouri Synod, up until 1973 had a position which the faculty espoused, that doctrinal statements could be adopted in convention, and were valuable, and needed to be listened to, and you needed to pay attention to doctrinal statements, but they were not binding on teachers of the church.

Interviewer: So the "Brief Statement" wasn't binding then?
Dr. Tietjen: It really wasn't.

Interviewer: Did it become binding after this resolution?

Dr. Tietjen: It was used as a binding document by the Missouri Synod in the course of its history.

Interviewer: But technically, it was not?

Dr. Tietjen: No, and when push came to shove and the issue came before the Synod for actual treatment, then the Synod decided no, we cannot change the doctrinal position of our Synod except by going through the constitutional process for changing our constitution. We'd have to change the constitution according to the way that we are supposed to change the constitution, which requires referendum to the congregations and all of that, and that had not been done in connection with the "Brief Statement". So even though the "Brief Statement" was used for about thirty years, on and off as a standard by which, you know, a club to keep people in line--when enough of the Missouri Synod rose up and said, "You can't do that to us!"

The Missouri Synod in 1962 said, "You're right, we can't. But you must honor and uphold these doctrinal statements and work to change them if you think they're wrong."

And we all said, "Yes, that's what we must do."

So we were willing to accept the fact that doctrinal statements have a place in the life of the church, but we were not prepared to allow them to be imposed on us, because we are a confessional church. And you can only be a confessional church if you all agree on what the confession is--that was our argument. We know what the Confession is; we've all agreed to it, it says so in our constitution. It's Article Two of the Constitution. That's what we stand on, together. And we're willing to be normed by that platform. Whatever's in those Confessions, yes, we have to teach according to them. We're not free to go outside of that standard. But that's because we've all voluntarily agreed that that's our standard. And the Missouri Synod in 1973 forsook that tradition by saying, "No, we can, in convention, change our platform any way we want to by adding to it. Of course we're not changing it, we're really not changing it."

That's what they would say, "We are really only making more clear what is already there."

They didn't think that they were teaching anything different from what was in the Lutheran Confessions. But of course we did think that they were teaching something different from what was in the Lutheran Confessions.

Interviewer: So do you think there was a valid purpose for the "Statement"? Could it have been used differently, in a
more useful manner?

Dr. Tietjen: Sure. It could have been used as an instrument for discussion. If the Preus party in the church were concerned that the Missouri Synod was straying from its standards, and wanted to propose this doctrinal statement as a way to get us back to the standards. It could have been used as a useful educational tool, throughout the Synod. We all could have engaged in discussion of it. In fact there were many groups that got organized in order to discuss the "Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles". And the fact of the matter is that in some conferences people thought that this statement was good, and in other conferences they thought that it was severely lacking, so you would have had that kind of disagreement in the life of the church over whether the document was adequate or not. It's not easy to have a creed that everybody is going to agree to (Laughing).

Interviewer: Since we all are human beings, yes.

Dr. Tietjen: Yes indeed!

Interviewer: So rather than use the document in the way they used it, should the document have been used at all?

Dr. Tietjen: No.

Interviewer: By that I mean, do you feel the Board of Control needed an outline, as they said, to follow in order to talk with these professors?

Dr. Tietjen: No they really didn’t, because the Board of Control knew that the standard of Lutheranism was the Bible and the Lutheran Confessions. And when they had to report to the Synod concerning their work, they never did use a "Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" as the standard, because they knew that we would not have submitted to it, we would not have allowed it to happen, we would have refused to answer any questions. And they also in their own hearts knew that the standard by which we were to be judged was: what does the Bible say, and what do the Lutheran Confessions say the Bible says. And on that they had legitimate rights to expect us to respond, and we were prepared to respond, and did, to those questions.

But they knew that Preus was going to say to the Synod what he did say, that is, that they had no standard by which to judge the doctrine of the faculty.

And so the Board said, "Oh yes, we have a standard. We understand doctrine to be what the Commission on Theology and Church Relations of the Missouri Synod said doctrine was in the statement that it issued in 1969, just before Preus was
That document, all of us on the faculty found to be a totally acceptable point of view. It said: **doctrine** is the doctrine of the Gospel, which is the content of the Scripture. Which is what the Lutheran Confessions affirm. That's what doctrine is.

And so, we agree that the Scriptures decide what doctrine is—you have to say what the Bible says about doctrine. And you are helped in discovering what the Bible says, by the Lutheran Confessions, which make it clear that the heart and center of all doctrine is God's justifying grace in Christ through faith. That's the center of the Gospel.

And so we agreed with what the Board of Control was saying about the standard by which they were assessing the faculty's position.

**Interviewer:** If positions had been reversed, if you had been Dr. Preus, how do you think this could have been handled differently? If you, the head of the Synod, had valid concerns about Concordia Seminary and the teachings thereof, what would you have done in his place?

**Dr. Tietjen:** I would have done what Presidents, as they were then called, of the old American Lutheran Church and of the old Evangelical Lutheran Church in America did. Those two church bodies were very much like the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod. They were composed of people who had emigrated to the United States at about the time the Missouri Synod people emigrated here. They were very conservative Lutherans.

They had the same problems that the Missouri Synod had with historical criticism. You just take a look at their journals in the 1940s and the 1950s. The thing is they were always ten years ahead of the Missouri Synod in whatever was taking place, because they didn't have the language problem to the extent that the Missouri Synod did. The Missouri Synod had held on to its language tradition for at least a decade longer than these other churches did. Those other churches became Americanized faster than the Missouri Synod did, so you could see what the Missouri Synod was going to go through in another ten years by watching what these churches were going through (laughing)!

They went through the problem with historical criticism in the forties and the fifties, and it was just as severe a problem for them as it was within the Missouri Synod. They too had the notion of inerrancy, they too dealt with the assumption that we have this perfect Bible, which because it is perfect, provides us with the faith that we can believe. And they had to wrestle through that problem with their professors, who had also gone to schools and had learned all kinds of things about the Bible that were different from the
tradition present in the old A. L. C. and E. L. C. What happened was the presidents of those churches--the national church body President and the regional Presidents, the district Presidents--saw to it that there were intense discussions that involved faculty, and clergy, pastors, and church leadership, all throughout the church. That is, they dealt with the problem in a pastoral way. They assumed that they could work it through, that they could trust one another to work it through, and they did. Now granted, they worked it through to the advantage of the faculty. The faculty came out on top in that one, because they were on the side of what every reasonable twentieth century person had to recognize: You could not function with a wooden understanding of the Scriptures.

Southern Baptists have discovered that; they're going through the same problem these days (chuckling) between the innerrants and those who see the Bible in a different light. Well, the A. L. C. and the E. L. C. went through that problem, and the faculty people, the professors helped the church to understand that you're not going to lose the faith. The faith does not rest on an innerant Bible. Faith is faith. Ultimately, there is no real guarantee. You have to take the leap and believe--but what makes the Bible authoritative is not how it got written, its inspiration, but its content, its good news. And the good news is what you believe.

Interviewer: So do you feel that the "Preus faction", if you will, came into the situation not trusting you guys? Not trusting the faculty and yourself?

Dr. Tietjen: Not only not trusting us, but they came in convinced that we were leading the church to Hell. Whether they really believed all of that or not, or whether individuals believed it or not—I think as a group they believed it. That what we were doing was going to be very detrimental to the life of the church, and that we had to be stopped and the way to stop us, was through politics. That's what happened from '62 on.

You see we had a President. Oliver Harms was a President in the tradition of the Presidents of the A. L. C. and the E. L. C. who was attempting to work this stuff through in a pastoral way. There were all kinds of meetings between faculty and district presidents that Harms himself had initiated, and we were in the process of working through many of these difficulties. But there developed at that time within the Synod another movement which was a political movement rather than a pastoral movement, which said, "We ain't going to tolerate this, because we know what happens. We see it in the A. L. C. and the E. L. C.. We're going to see to it that it gets stopped."

And they used the political model in order to stop it.
And they did, they succeeded.

**Interviewer** : From what I’ve read of Dr. Preus, it would seem that his father’s political background influenced the way that he moved in this particular instance.

**Dr. Tietjen** : Well, he was a master politician. Maybe it’s something in the genes, I don’t know, you know it could be. People who are church musicians are *musicians*; it’s in their genes. There are painters who have it in their genes. Maybe politics is in the genes too (laughing).

**Interviewer** : Being a mom, I believe in environmental influence. Do you think that any particular individual was responsible for the Synodical break? That there was a particular person who moved to make that break?

**Dr. Tietjen** : No. I think there was a group of people that were responsible for the political takeover. Preus was a part of that group. He was selected by that group to be its out-front spokesperson. Before 1969, it wasn’t clear who the leader was going to be of that group. Edwin Weber could very well have been chosen by them as their leader, but they decided that he was too gruff, and that Preus had more moxie. And so they selected Preus as their standard-bearer. Preus was captive to the group, though he was the leader of the group. Very often he could not do what maybe even his better reason told him that he should do, because the group was determined that certain things were going to be done.

And the group consisted of a bunch of people. Ralph Bohlmann was very much a part of that group. Edwin Weber was, Karl Barth, Paul Zimmermann, Waldo Werning—and these people called the shots.

From our side, we had been criticized for that, and probably rightly so, we were always reactive. We did not have a program of our own. We were simply trying to do our job as a seminary. Then we got attacked, so we defended ourselves.

**Interviewer** : There were some accusations of media manipulation on the part of the faculty and yourself. Was that true? Did you move out and say, "Yes we’ll do this to get them”?

**Dr. Tietjen** : No, we just were savvy. I was very savvy about how to deal with the church press, and with the television and radio people, because I had come from a position where I was director of public relations for the Lutheran Council. I knew these church press people. I mean I knew them personally. And they knew me. And we also knew that we knew how to relate to the church press, of course. I did, and our people learned very quickly how to relate to the
church press. But there was no campaign on our part, that never was the case, I mean it wasn't. It's just that the press was very interested in the story and, you know, how it is.

Interviewer: Watergate was happening at that same time. There were lots and lots and lots of comparison to the Watergate situation.

Dr. Tietjen: Right. Correct.

Interviewer: One writer even compared it to the House Un-American Activities Committee and their work.

Dr. Tietjen: Yes.

Interviewer: If you were called on today to face this same situation, do you think you would handle it differently? Or would you do the same things?

Dr. Tietjen: Well, I'm not really sure. I think in retrospect, I don't think it would have worked back then in 1970. See, you've got to always put yourself back in that particular time frame. It would not have worked. I think however, that probably we ought to have done it just out of principle. We should have refused to be investigated.

We should have said, "No. If you've got charges, you bring them through the regular channels. We're not going to accommodate your efforts."

Interviewer: So a formal heresy trial would've been more in order.

Dr. Tietjen: Right. It would have been much more difficult for them to bring off--they would've brought it off. They ultimately could've brought it off, because they had the numbers. They always had the votes, and they were not above the shenanigans of making sure that everybody did what they wanted them to do. They controlled the Committee on Constitutional Matters, which meant that they could re-write the laws anytime they wanted to. And they were not above doing that, they just completely rewrote the laws.

Interviewer: And as I recall, Dr. Bohimann was the executive head of the Commission on Theology?

Dr. Tietjen: Correct.

Interviewer: Did you have a particular role-model during this period, anybody that you felt you were emulating?

Dr. Tietjen: No.
Interviewer: Dr. Preus had mentioned something about feeling as though these were very Lutheran actions to take; standing on this kind of ground was a very Lutheran thing for him. He appeared to feel that that was who his role model was, I think.

Dr. Tietjen: Well, that's interesting. No, I didn't feel I had a role model as far as my position was concerned, my office was concerned. I was very concerned to function in a Christian manner in the middle of a controversy. That was very hard to do, because one is governed by all kinds of base motives when you're in a controversy. If there was any model that I tried to follow particularly when they came after me, and I knew that they were going to use me as the person, rather than the faculty, if there was any model, it was Jesus that I was determined to follow. To try to function toward my enemies (chuckling) the way Jesus functioned toward his, by not responding in kind, by not engaging in recrimination.

And as I even said on a couple of occasions at the time when I was suspended, I don't intend to go the route of litigation with these people. If they want to take my coat, they should take my coat, if they want to hit me on the other cheek, they should do it. I'm not going to fight fire with fire.

The other thing that was interesting that Preus should find Luther as his model: We always found it fascinating that a Lutheran church--the Missouri Synod was claiming to be the great Lutheran church--should, in papal fashion, insist that the tradition determined how one taught today, instead of the Bible! (Laughing)

Interviewer: I know that these events affected you professionally. Was there a long-term effect, is this still looked at today? I had heard recently that there was some lady from some Jewish magazine who was going around trying to interview the principals in this to publish an article about it after all these years. Does anybody still quiz you about this--

Dr. Tietjen: Well, you're here. (Laughing)

Interviewer: When they look at you professionally, does this have any effect on you professionally or has it been a good thing, to have broken off and gone to the other Synod?

Dr. Tietjen: Well ultimately, it was a good thing. That is, I experienced blessing out of what was really a very nasty situation, and I attribute that to the grace of God. It's the fulfillment of the promise that, if you seek the kingdom of God, first, and don't worry about yourself, that everything else will follow in place and you'll be taken care
of properly. What's fascinating is, that when Seminex was formed, in February of 1974, we had no income—no assurance that there would be any support for us. The fact of the matter is that we missed one paycheck and after that, the funds were always there to take care of the seminary and its faculty.

I think that the formation of Seminary in Exile was a factor that ultimately lead to the formation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Not us alone, of course. There was the A. L. C. and L. C. A.—but we were a precipitating factor.

(A new tape was inserted into the recorder.)

Interviewer: So what became of Seminex in the end?

Dr. Tietjen: Seminex, in 1983, moved out of St. Louis. We put our faculty in three different locations. Most of the faculty went to Chicago. In Chicago they went to the Lutheran School Of Theology in Chicago. Some went to Berkeley (California) where the Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary was, and our library and our librarian and a faculty person came down to Austin to be part of a seminary program down there. And we did that, because we had had conversations with the leaders of seminary education in the three churches, and it was decided that the best way that we could help long-range when the new church was formed is if we would strengthen three existing seminaries rather than to continue as a separate institution. And we said well, if that’s what we ought to do in 1988, let’s do it now. So we moved in advance of the union, and continued Seminex as a separate entity over that period of time, raising the funds for our faculty in its three locations.

Then in 1988 we went out of business as a separate school. Technically, legally what we did was become a corporation of the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago. So that if there are bequests out there that are for the benefit of Christ’s Seminary Seminex we can still receive those, and the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago will be the beneficiary.

Interviewer: So, speaking as a former school administrator, just how much difference is permissible? That was the thing that fascinated me: how different are theology professors allowed to be, according to your own personal definition? How much difference would you allow theologically?

Dr. Tietjen: Well, there has to be several things said about that. The Seminex faculty was marvelously diverse. To just pick out a couple of illustrations: Frederick Dahnker as a teacher of New Testament was a magnificently free spirit, who would constantly call into question anybody’s bureaucratizing or anybody’s institutionalism. This was a
beautifully free-spirited man. We had people who were concerned for the system of Lutheran teaching, like Robert Bertram, who had marvelous ability at teaching students, and at the same time was always able to keep the whole Lutheran theology in perspective. I wouldn’t want to do without either of those two people on my faculty, because they were so diverse—but they shared a common appreciation for the meaning of the Gospel.

Now, how much diversity can you allow? I think you can allow a lot of diversity. What you have to be committed to, as Lutherans—other people can figure it out for themselves—but as Lutherans what you have to be committed to, is that the standard by which you determine your teaching is the Bible. You can’t teach contrary to the Scriptures.

Now what does the Bible teach, is the central question. From the time of the Reformation on to the present time, Lutherans have been in lots of disagreement about that, and that’s legitimate to be disagreeing, that’s how we instruct one another. Does the Bible teach a six-day Creation? Well, you know, the story says the world was created in six days. From one standpoint you have to say yes, the Bible teaches a six-day Creation. What does the Bible mean by that? Clearly it means something more than some kind of scientific understanding of how the world came into being. If you understand that that particular portion of the Bible was produced at a time when it was being opposed to a Babylonian view of how the world was created—what’s being affirmed is that the Person who is Yahweh is the Creator of everything that is, and was able to do this with this magnificent power. That’s the point; that everything that is is the result of the creating Hand of God, and is not in opposition then to other points of view about long periods of history that were involved in the actual formation of the world as we know it today.

Lutherans can legitimately disagree about those things, but we say, in the Apostles’ Creed and in the Nicene Creed, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Creator of Heaven and Earth."

We’re committed to that. That’s our teaching about what the Bible says in Genesis and elsewhere in the Scriptures.

Interviewer: I’m not yet familiar with your synod. Does your synod abide by the "Formula of Concord"?

Dr. Tietjen: Yes we do. Lutheran confessional writings that are in The Book of Concord are the standard within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Now what you have to be clear about, is that the Lutheran Confessions themselves differentiate the confessions. The Bible is first, and nothing is on a par with the Scriptures. The ecumenical creeds come next; they are next to the Bible as the way in which to discover what the Scriptures teach. After that
comes the Augsburg Confession as the standard of Lutheranism, and then the other Lutheran confessions as explications of what the Augsburg Confession teaches. The "Formula of Concord" is one of those documents. So you always have to see the other Lutheran confessions in the light of the Augsburg Confession.

Interviewer: One question I have yet to ask a Lutheran pastor, which is for my thesis as well as my personal curiosity: do you feel that we're meant, ultimately, to understand the Bible? That men are meant to possess an understanding of everything in the Bible, ultimately? If not today, then somewhere down the road?

Dr. Tietjen: Sure. That is, we are meant to know the truth. We are meant to understand how things really are, what reality is. You know, we're rational people, we're emotional people, we're perceivers of reality—that's what the human person is. Philosophy has wrestled with the problem ever since man has done the thinking, as to what is truth and how does one know, and how you come into touch with reality and all of that. Plato really wrestled with it, Aristotle wrestled with it, and so we continue to wrestle with it from the human perspective.

What the Bible tells us is, that we won't know the truth, we can't know the truth except that we come into contact with God. In God we discover the truth. Jesus is the way, the truth, and the life. Jesus is the ultimate revelation of God, but even with Jesus, now "we see through a glass darkly", we don't know everything the way that it really is. Ultimately we will know, we will see reality in the kingdom of God, and we will understand things as they really are.

So yes, I think we are meant to know the truth. Are we meant to understand, today, in 1989, everything that's present in the Bible? No, there's no way we can possibly do that.

I'm having a fascinating time with a Bible class—we're studying the parables of Jesus. We're trying to figure out what Jesus had in mind with those parables. Not imposing our views on Jesus, but at the same time we know that we only can get at Jesus through Luke or Matthew or Mark; and we have to understand what Mark and Matthew and Luke had in mind when they gave us the parables. Then too, it's interesting how stories communicate. Stories communicate all by themselves.

Interviewer: I'm learning that. It's amazing to see the kind of power that, for instance, the document we've been discussing has, just from a worldly standpoint. Did you have anything else you wanted to tell me regarding this whole episode?
Dr. Tietjen : No. I told you what I think about a "Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" and how it got here and what it was used for.

Interviewer : And how it ultimately affected you. Thank you very much for giving me this time with you.
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Interviewer: I've been reading this book titled *The Structure Of Scientific Revolutions* by Thomas Kuhn, and it deals with the acceptable way to release a revolutionary idea within the sciences. This man has studied the history of scientific revolutions, and was shocked to discover that apparently no one has ever written that down before.

Scientist: No, as far as I know, I've never seen anything written down. There's an established protocol. I think that there's an unwritten rule that everything should be subjected to peer review. Always. By that I mean, if you're going to publish a paper, or you're going to make some kind of a statement, be it revolutionary or what you'd call more routine, you normally will have it reviewed. If it's going to a journal, in fact most journals require a peer review by two or three unknown people (to the authors at least unknown). You submit a paper to the editor; these people review it to make sure it's consistent and it's understandable and it's intelligible, and make a decision as to whether or not it should be published in that journal.

Interviewer: So a scientific journal has a review board?

Scientist: Well the review board is just members of the society who volunteer to serve in that capacity. Almost everybody at one time or another ends up as a reviewer for papers.

The other thing you can do, is you can go to a conference where the papers are not reviewed beforehand, but that is the review process itself.

What happened in the Pons and Fleischman case, is that they did none of the above. They simply made claims of a really revolutionary breakthrough, with no warning from anyone. In addition to violating I think, the protocols, I think what happened is, particularly in the high-energy physics area--a lot of that's funded by the American taxpayer--and it makes them look very bad to find out that somebody is going around making absolutely outrageous claims, because it puts a bad light on everyone who's involved in that sort of research. Fusion research, which is heavily funded by the U. S. government.

Interviewer: So that's why everyone in the scientific community was so upset?

Scientist: That and the fact that it was just, in most
people’s opinion, complete scientific nonsense. The press was certainly also not viewed very favorably by the scientific community, by the way. They participated in this charade, which is what most people considered it to be. Then Pons and Fleischman themselves compounded their problems by not releasing any data of their own. They released no experimental details. All they were doing was making incredible claims, with nothing that anybody could understand to back it up.

Interviewer: If they had been right, if they had actually done what they claimed to have done, would their method of releasing the information been more acceptable?

Scientist: No, it would not have been acceptable under any conditions. As you pointed out, none of this is written down. Anywhere. I mean, there’s no binding code of conduct. For example, internally here (an oil company Research & Development) we do have our own procedures: Anything that’s submitted for an external publication must be reviewed internally. Most people, if they’re in a university, they’ll at least have their college look at something, to protect themselves and their university, if nothing else because anybody is prone to make some kind of conclusion where they’ve missed a point, if you’ve been working on something too long. For your own reputation, normally you have peers review it.

Interviewer: So is the procedure fairly similar between the corporate world and the research community?

Scientist: Oh yes, absolutely. In fact university professors will many times have internal seminars and whatnot before they’ll ever put anything out. If you’ve done something yourself, it’s always possible you’ve missed some crucial point that’s really damaging to your case. And what they (Pons and Fleischman) were doing, I don’t know. Unless they were working in a vacuum, and they came to believe all of these things themselves, ignored all of the warnings, and surrounded themselves by people who were unable to judge on the scientific merits, and were telling them that they were shoe-ins for Nobel prizes and whatnot, and they started believing all that nonsense. The result is the position they find themselves today.

Interviewer: Where do they stand now?

Scientist: I would say that it’s quite likely that, if they did something great now, people wouldn’t take them very seriously (Laughing).

Interviewer: They’d have to work harder at proving it?
Scientist: Oh yes, absolutely. And if you’re making a revolutionary announcement of a revolutionary discovery, it is just really smart to have a lot of people take a look at what you’re doing. They had, theoretically, no support for what they were doing, and their experiments were basically, from all indications in the information that they released, were terribly sloppy. So you couldn’t make heads or tails out of what they were doing. Worse than that, these people were electrochemists, and this was a nuclear physics field that they were delving into, and they knew very little about it. And so they were making incredible claims from nuclear physics that just didn’t make any sense. In fact, they violated everything that people did know about this fusion process.

Cold fusion, by the way, is not an unknown process. It’s been around for many, many years. I think the first person that predicted cold fusion was a man that’s quite famous for another reason now; his name is Andrei Sakahrov. He was doing that work back in the late forties and early fifties. I believe it was Alvarez from the University of California at Berkley actually won a Nobel Prize for cold fusion back in the early fifties. This stuff has been around a long, long, long time. So it’s not that Pons and Fleischman discovered cold fusion. It’s well known, the principles, the theoretical underpinnings, the experimental evidence are well known. What they announced violated everything. (Laughing)

Not only were they announcing a process that had never been observed; if they were right, most of the theory would have been incorrect, and that’s been verified over and over and over again experimentally. Then for them to stand up and say that they had made all these discoveries—Nobody would have liked it if they’d been right in the sense that there’s a certain amount of jealousy that would have been involved of two people on a shoe-string budget doing what people with hundreds of millions of dollars in research funds can’t do. Even the people who were working in that area admitted that.

For example, one M. I. T. professor summed it up, "I don’t like the idea of working on a rocket engine only to find somebody’s come up with an anti-gravity device."

So the way they released it was totally unacceptable, even if they’d been right.

Interviewer: How do you find out about these unspoken rules? Are you taught this in school? When you come up through the sciences, they teach that you do it this way, and you don’t do it this way?

Scientist: If you were going to submit the paper to a journal, it’s automatic. Almost all scientific journals require peer review. So in that sense, that is written down. You find out about that simply because that’s the way that
it's done.

If you were going to make a presentation to a conference or something that was not necessarily going to be submitted ahead of time, almost inevitably, in my experience, people have given seminars. To their peers, their co-workers, be it university, industry, or whatnot, they give them to make sure they're not saying something crazy. (Laughing) Nobody likes to get up only to discover that they made a just completely idiotic statement! For your own self-protection you normally will do that.

Interviewer: That's also common practice among rhetoricians, to present papers, and expound theory, and their peers will either say, "That theory is absurd," or "Yes that theory appears to work, let's run with it awhile." It's interesting how the process is basically the same.

Scientist: Oh, by the way, there's something that a lot of people don't really realize, in physics for example: a theory is not some idea you have. The criteria for a physical theory to be acceptable as a physical theory is it must not make predictions that disagree with any known experimental facts. In fact, it should make predictions that are different from existing theories that are experimentally verifiable. That's what a physical theory is, so there are some real binding rules. That was due to two famous physicists, one of them Albert Einstein, and the other one Paul Dirac, who essentially put down back in the twenties and thirties what they thought constituted acceptable physical theory. Those are some real binding rules.

When I say that Pons and Fleischman violated the acceptable theory—the theory of fusion reactions is a well-established, well-known, verified theory. They didn't even present a theory, as a matter of fact. If you're doing something experimental, you don't have to necessarily provide a theory with it, but if it's violating a bunch of known theories, you certainly should be prepared! (Laughing)

Interviewer: Did Pons and Fleischman seem surprised at the reaction that they received?

Scientist: Evidently they did. Nobody understands what their thought processes must have been. They must have insulated themselves away from anybody that had any kind of questions. I don't know. There was something else that was an unusual twist in this, in that there was some money involved. Evidently people had visions of giant breakthroughs that would lead to huge commercialization projects, and all of that. That evidently created a certain shroud of secrecy around their work. But even then, that's not excusable; even government labs where they're doing highly classified government research, you always subject
your work to peer review. It’s just the peers are a restricted group.

Nothing, I think, that anybody can ever say will make what they did acceptable. It’s deplorable.

Interviewer: So what you do in your position is to investigate cases such as this?

Scientist: Sometimes I do a considerable amount of that, not necessarily just that. Well we were interested in that, but--other sorts of things, where people are making claims of oil-finding schemes, and--I’m not the only one that does this, there are several people who do this. It’s not uncommon to find people violating one of the laws of thermodynamics, or something, to make some invention work. (Laughing) That’s a common type of occurrence. Or some kind of oil-finding device--not those dousing rods so much, but more technology-type things. Never seen one work.

Interviewer: Wouldn’t it be interesting to find one that did?

Scientist: It would be interesting.

Interviewer: Have you ever found someone who looked like a crackpot, but was correct? Has that ever happened in your department?

Scientist: No, we’ve never found somebody that, in terms of technically, that had something that was--We sometimes find people inventing new laws of physics, and whatnot. You can’t live with that stuff! We’ve never seen any of that. Nobody, in any field, has ever seen that. Or certain laws of thermodynamics that, if they’re violated, would be the equivalent of a perpetual-motion machine. We only have to live with the laws of physics as we understand them, and if they violate them, well, we don’t pay much attention to it. (Chuckling)

Interviewer: If this were a revolutionary theory of yours personally, would you release it using the method you just explained?

Scientist: Oh, certainly, because for example if I stumbled across one that I thought was very interesting and it was in chemistry: I wouldn’t trust myself as far as I could see! The first thing I would do is absolutely make sure that I wasn’t just dreaming, and didn’t even understand what I was doing.

Revolutionary theories are really hard to come by, by the way. (Laughing) I think that you would always manage to get the credit for a revolutionary breakthrough. Pons and
Fleischman didn’t do a good job of protecting their university and neither did their administration.

Interviewer: How did their university let them go out and make all these claims and not--

Scientist: They encouraged it! That’ll hurt them for grants, it’ll hurt other programs, I mean, you’re in communication or something, that’ll even rub off on them. No matter who does something crazy like that, it tarnishes the entire university.

Interviewer: Even as far as the state government itself, because the state had made promises that they would make this huge investment, and set up a special governmental committee, and all that sort of thing.

Scientist: As soon as it was verified, I think. The Department of Energy panel that has recently released their report I understand, I haven’t seen it, but they concluded that it doesn’t work, that there’s nothing there.

Interviewer: If what Pons and Fleischmann did was so heretical, and the way that they released it was heretical, why did people take them seriously at all? Because it appears that someone must have; how did they manage to get that much press? Because there are other crackpots out there, as you say.

Scientist: I think you’re going to have to answer that. The University of Utah is far more able to muster the resources to get them into the national press. Also, you’re talking about one of the most phenomenal discoveries ever announced. That alone would qualify for something special, then you have the right publicity agents in the university, whose job it is to handle that. I think in terms of the scientific community they had to take it seriously. This was out of the clear blue, bam, there it was. But it didn’t take people long to realize that what they were reporting didn’t make any sense. The first reaction within a matter of a day or so was this extreme skepticism. Under the prevailing understanding of the fusion processes, if Pons and Fleischmann had died, that would have been far more credible evidence that they were having a fusion reaction. Because you should have put out a lethal amount of radiation, releasing that much power. Normally in a fusion reaction of that sort you have to supply considerably more power than you get out. And it’s always accompanied by fairly lethal radiation levels. But they didn’t die. They should have been dead within a matter of, oh certainly hours. That was what struck everybody as being absolutely wacky; half the people in that department should be dead. I mean, if that
had happened, it should have killed them.

That was the first reaction. In fact that's the first thing we did, was calculate in here the level of radiation that should have been coming off that device. We could easily calculate, you should have been dead. It would have been lethal in minutes, really, but that didn't occur.

In the oil industry we use nuclear logging tools all the time, and so we have to abide by the rules of the regulatory agencies in the way these things are handled. What they were talking about was considerably hotter than anything we ever deal with. They didn't have any of the after-effects, everything was great (Laughter). I would say there's a lot more there than could have possibly been true.

Skepticism was the first reaction. Then it turned into actual frustration, into anger, because they wouldn't release the details. Pons and Fleischman finally published a paper--that evidently was not reviewed, it was one of the worst papers, according to me and everybody else that's ever read it, I've ever seen. It says nothing. In fact it was vaguely written, and it was written in a way almost so that they hoped it would be right, without providing any details. They didn't give you any way to calculate how much energy was going into it: they didn't give you any of the experimental details that one needs, to analyze something like that. So I think the resentment turned into anger.

**Interviewer:** Especially if they were incorrect and received so much press for it.

**Scientist:** And then they would not release any details. They had some neutron detectors put in their lab, and they had produced an energy spectrum, and that thing was just wrong. You couldn't account for what they had presented in this one paper at all. By anything. That was one of the only solid pieces of evidence they presented, and that was one of the first things they had to withdraw.

They had a paper that was scheduled for presentation in *Nature*, which is a prestigious British journal, but it required reviewers. Pons and Fleischman themselves withdrew that paper, because they could not or would not answer the reviewers' questions. So that paper has never appeared, and probably never will. That was another thing that increased people's skepticism by leaps and bounds.

Pons did come to the American Chemical Society meeting here in Dallas, but he would not go to the American Physical Society in Baltimore, nor would he go to the, I think it was a Nuclear Chemistry meeting in San Francisco. The American Physical Society meeting in Baltimore was probably a month or six weeks after meeting here in Dallas, and neither one of them would appear. Then probably a month after the meeting in Baltimore, was the one in San Francisco they would not go to, and Los Alamos actually convened a special meeting in
in Santa Fe----and neither one of them would appear.

**Interviewer**: Do you think it was a result of their reception at the American Chemical Society?

**Scientist**: No, they were highly received at the American Chemical Society for reasons that nobody else could understand, I don't understand that one either. Why there was not a lot more skepticism; but that was an audience that was not into fusion research.

One of Pons' post-doctoral students came here. He was a very friendly, relaxed sort of fellow, and I didn't necessarily get the feeling that he believed these results himself. He was not working on cold fusion, particularly, he was working in electrochemistry.

**Interviewer**: Why do you think the term "heresy" gets applied to science?

**Scientist**: I'm sure it's borrowed from religion, because as I understand it, that came out of the Inquisition days, right? You're guilty of heresy because you're claiming the earth is round, or this or that. I think it's quite an appropriate term, because even though we're not talking about religious dogma, when you're deviating from well-established facts, true scientific progress is of course made when you do find that there are true and significant deviations. A classic example would be Einstein's change of Newton's gravitational theory, but that was done in a very proper way. It was presented in a physics journal; that's the way you do it.

I think heresy is when you make an announcement that's so stunning, so unbelievable. Every discipline has got to have a way to present this. And I think many people think, in these specialized disciplines like physics, that these things should never be presented to the public at all until they're sorted out. I think that's particularly true in medicine, when they're arguing about a cure, a cause, whatnot--

**Interviewer**: Such as with A. I. D. S.?

**Scientist**: Then nobody should ever go public with that stuff. Because until you can get your own internal house in order, and at least get a consensus developed, people have no right. I think the public, which funds a lot of this stuff, is understandably confused, and thinks the people who are doing all of this are a bunch of nuts! And why shouldn't they, when you hear that kind of stuff on T. V.?

**Interviewer**: Is there a lesson to be learned from this type of experience? Does any good come out of this?
Scientist: The only answer to be learned is one that people have known all along: that for an individual, you’re taking your reputation in your own hands, so to speak, if you deviate. It’s not just in the best interest of science, or of the university, or corporation, or whatnot, it’s also in the best interests of the individual. I have never seen anybody that would disagree with that. Pons and Fleischman did. Why they did it, I guess will forever remain a mystery, but they did it, and now they have to pay the consequences. You have a very short-term stardom there, until the evidence starts to accumulate that you’re either a fraud or an incompetent, and you whole life’s work has gone down the tubes. I’m sure that now everything they’ve ever done is questionable.

Interviewer: Any final comment you’d care to make?

Scientist: I think if you’re dealing with religion it’s not so easy to handle. At least in the natural sciences, there’s a lot more exactness that one has to deal with, so the cases are fairly clear. In religion or something like that where there are honest opinions to be expressed, my point is, that I wouldn’t want to necessarily make the analogy too strong between religion and science. In my understanding of it at least, heresy in religion could involve nothing more than for example, Martin Luther’s breaking away from the Catholic Church, producing a major split in the interpretation of the Bible.

Science is far more rigid, because you’re dealing with something far more exact, other than the psychology of the individual and the spirit world.

I think heresy’s a proper word. But these are not a question of people’s opinions, is what I’m trying to say, when you’re dealing with a Pons and Fleischman. The scientific world is a world of experimentation, and that’s the ultimate judge of the correctness or incorrectness of a statement.

The words are the same, and the idea is the same. But heresy in science’s case, means that you’ve done something that’s not verifiable.
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